

*Orality, Literacy,
Memory
in the Ancient Greek
and Roman World*

(ORALITY AND LITERACY
IN ANCIENT GREECE,
VOLUME 7)

Edited by

E. ANNE MACKAY

MEMOSYNE SUPPLEMENTA MONOGRAPHS ON GREEK AND ROMAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

BRILL

Orality, Literacy, Memory
in the Ancient Greek and Roman World

Mnemosyne

Supplements

Monographs on Greek and
Roman Language and Literature

Editorial Board

G.J. Boter

A. Chaniotis

K. Coleman

I.J.F. de Jong

P.H. Schrijvers

VOLUME 298

Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World

(Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, vol. 7)

Edited by

E. Anne Mackay



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2008

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data

Orality, literacy, memory in the ancient Greek and Roman world / edited by E. Anne Mackay.

p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum ; 298)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-16991-3 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Classical literature—History and criticism. 2. Language and culture—Greece.
3. Language and culture—Rome. 4. Oral tradition in literature. 5. Literacy—Greece.
6. Literacy—Rome. I. Mackay, E. Anne. II. Title. III. Series.

PA3009.O73 2008

880—dc22

2008018146

ISSN: 0169-8958

ISBN: 978 90 04 16991 3

Copyright 2007 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints BRILL, Hotei Publishing,

IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Notes on Contributors	ix
List of Illustrations	xi
Illustrations: Figures 1-11	
Introduction	1
<i>Anne Mackay</i>	
1. Spatial Memory and the Composition of the <i>Iliad</i>	9
<i>Elizabeth Minchin</i>	
2. Memory and Visualization in Homeric Discourse Markers	35
<i>Anna Bonifazi</i>	
3. Epic Remembering	65
<i>Egbert J. Bakker</i>	
4. “Someone, I Say, Will Remember Us”: Oral Memory in Sappho’s Poetry	79
<i>André Lardinois</i>	
5. Remember to Cry Wolf: Visual and Verbal Declarations of <i>LYKOS KALOS</i>	97
<i>Alexandra Pappas</i>	
6. Social Memory in Aeschylus’ <i>Oresteia</i>	115
<i>Ruth Scodel</i>	
7. Trierarchs’ Records and the Athenian Naval Catalogue (<i>IG i3 1032</i>)	143
<i>Geoffrey Bakewell</i>	
8. What the <i>Mnemonēs</i> Know	163
<i>Edwin Carawan</i>	
9. Getting the Last Word: Publication of Political Oratory as an Instrument of Historical Revisionism	185
<i>Thomas Hubbard</i>	
10. Dialectic in Dialogue: The Message of Plato’s <i>Protagoras</i> and Aristotle’s <i>Topics</i>	203
<i>Han Baltussen</i>	

11. Visual Copies and Memory	227
<i>Joelyn Penny Small</i>	
12. Orality and Autobiography: The Case of the <i>Res Gestae</i>	253
<i>Niall W. Slater</i>	
List of Conference Papers	275
Index	277

PREFACE

In this selected proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Orality and Literacy in the Ancient Greek and Roman World are published twelve papers that cover a wide range of classical research areas, and whose authors reside in different parts of the world. Editorial decisions were therefore required with regard to conventions of spelling and referencing, resulting in the customary inconsistencies. In general Greek names are represented in transliterated form unless they are very well known in Latinate versions. Names of ancient authors and their works are, however, Latinate, which leads to occasional anomalies between the transliteration of the names of people and the Latinate works named for them. Abbreviations follow *L'Année Philologique* for journals and *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3rd ed.) for ancient authors and their works, and other common references; any additional abbreviations are listed in the bibliographies at the end of each chapter.

I should like to acknowledge with gratitude the financial support of the Faculty of Arts Research Fund of the University of Auckland, which made possible the funding of Jocelyn Penny Small as keynote speaker. Acknowledgement is also due of the selfless contribution of colleagues around the world who anonymously read the many manuscript submissions, and my appreciative thanks go too to the editorial assistant, Miriam Bissett. Finally, all who participated in the conference, especially those who engaged in the often challenging discussions after the papers, contributed to the general intellectual outcome of the conference, and so also to the production of this volume of proceedings.

Anne Mackay
Auckland, March 2008

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Geoffrey BAKEWELL, Associate Professor of Classics, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, USA.

Egbert J. BAKKER, Professor of Classics, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA.

Han BALTUSSEN, Senior Lecturer in Classics and Ancient Thought, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia.

Anna BONIFAZI, Marie Curie Fellow, 2005-2008, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA and Università di Torino, Torino, Italy.

Edwin CARAWAN, Professor of Classics, Missouri State University, Springfield, MO, USA.

Thomas HUBBARD, Professor of Classics, University of Texas, Austin, TX, USA.

André LARDINOIS, Professor of Greek Language and Culture, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

Elizabeth MINCHIN, Reader in Classics, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia.

Alexandra PAPPAS, Assistant Professor of Classical Studies, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA.

Ruth SCODEL, D. R. Shackleton Bailey Collegiate Professor of Greek and Latin, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA.

Niall W. SLATER, Samuel Candler Dobbs Professor of Latin and Greek, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA.

Jocelyn Penny SMALL, Professor of Art History, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Chapter 5

- Figure 1 Tondo: Attic red-figure kylix, Onesimos. Louvre G 105. Photograph courtesy Réunion des Musées Nationaux / Art Resource, NY ART351217.
- Figure 2 Exterior: Attic Red-figure kylix, Onesimos. Louvre G 105. Photograph courtesy Réunion des Musées Nationaux / Art Resource, NY ART351218.
- Figure 3 Exergue inscription in tondo: detail of Figure 1.

Chapter 8

- Figure 4 Stele with the Lygdamis Decree from Halikarnassos. London BMI 886. Photograph © The Trustees of The British Museum.

Chapter 11

- Figure 5 “Laocoon.” Charles Addams. *New Yorker* (April 17, 1975). © Tee and Charles Addams Foundation.
- Figure 6 Laocoon. Vatican Museums. Photograph: Archive Timothy McCarthy / Art Resource, NY ART169949.
- Figure 7 Satyrs: Attic red-figure kylix, Oedipus Painter, c.450 BC. Vatican 16541. Photograph: Alinari / Art Resource, NY ART319401.
- Figure 8 Satyrs: Etruscan red-figure kylix, c.425-400 BC. Paris, Rodin Museum Co. 1387 (980). Photograph: Luc et Iala Joubert / Collection d’Antiques du Musée Rodin, Paris.
- Figure 9 Perseus and Andromeda: wall painting from Boscotrecase. Photograph: New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 20.192.17, Rogers Fund, 1920.
- Figure 10 Perseus and Andromeda: wall painting from Pompeii, House of the Dioscuri. Naples 8998; H1186. Photograph: Erich Lessing / Art Resource, NY ART63488.
- Figure 11 Alexander Mosaic. Photograph: Scala / Art Resource, NY ART177052.

INTRODUCTION

ANNE MACKAY

This volume presents a selection of the papers offered at the conference “Orality, Literacy, Memory,” hosted by the University of Auckland, New Zealand, in July 2006. It was the seventh in the biennial series of international conferences on orality and literacy in the ancient Greek and Roman World, which began in July 2004 when Ian Worthington convened “Voice Into Text” in Tasmania, Australia.¹ The next conference, was organized by Anne Mackay in July 1996, in Durban, South Africa, under the title of “Epos and Logos,”² a title that Janet Watson retained in convening the third conference in July 1998 at Victoria University of Wellington in New Zealand.³ In July 2000, Ian Worthington and John Miles Foley hosted the fourth conference, “Epea and Grammata,” at the University of Missouri-Columbia,⁴ and the fifth returned to the southern hemisphere in July 2002, when Chris Mackie organized “Oral Traditions and Material Context” at the University of Melbourne, Australia.⁵ From that point a pattern of north-south alternation seems to have been established, for the sixth conference, “Politics of Orality,” took place again in the northern hemisphere, at the University of Winnipeg in the care of Craig Cooper, in July 2004.⁶ Following the southern location of the seventh in 2006, the eighth will return to the north, as André Lardinois of Radboud University, Nijmegen, the Netherlands, is organizing “Orality, Literacy, Religion” in July 2008, while Elizabeth Minchin has undertaken to convene the ninth in July 2010 at the Australian National University in Canberra ACT.

In a conscious change from the rather more narrowly defined themes of the fifth and sixth conferences, “Memory” was selected as the focus for the seventh, with the expectation that it would provoke a re-engagement with a central issue of the orality-literacy interface: while

¹ He subsequently edited the selected proceedings: Worthington (1996).

² Mackay (1999).

³ Watson (2001).

⁴ Worthington and Foley (2002).

⁵ Mackie (2004).

⁶ Cooper (2007).

specialized focuses are extremely productive (as indeed the latter volumes have demonstrated), it is important from time to time to revisit, and indeed re-evaluate, the conceptual framework within which all orality-literacy studies are broadly situated. “Memory” proved to be a theme on which all the participants had something to contribute, and the seventh conference was thus simultaneously focused on a common issue and richly diversified, which led to particularly active and fruitful interchanges in the discussions after the papers.

Although the chapters in this volume are arranged in order of the chronological reference of their subject matter, the studies themselves tend to fall into one or the other of two distinct categories: cognitive analyses that consider how memory worked, and investigations of what was remembered, which for convenience I am terming experiential. Some chapters address both.

The theme of the conference was well served by the keynote speaker, Jocelyn Penny Small,⁷ whose address incorporated both the cognitive and the experiential approaches to memory. It is always difficult to determine how accurate ancient remembering might have been, especially since in literature we have for the most part only purported quotations and rarely also the originals for comparison. Ingeniously Small uses visual “copies” to examine what in the Greek and Roman worlds was understood by “copy,” but with plentiful reference to ancient literature that demonstrates the wider application of her findings. While literary quotation from memory has occasionally been explored at previous conferences,⁸ here we see graphically that the “close-enough” approach to accurate replication was not just a matter of text-citation among the literati, but was in fact fundamental to the ancient world-view, especially since access to originals, whether visual or textual, was rarely possible in ancient times.

The means by which the social memory of events could be manipulated is variously examined in three chapters. Ruth Scodel shows how in Aeschylus’ *Oresteia* almost every character, including even the Chorus, presents his or her own view of how events should be remembered, as each in turn attempts to control social memory. At the same time the

⁷ Small’s work on memory in relation to orality and literacy in the ancient Greek and Roman world is well known from her iconic *Wax Tablets of the Mind* as well as from her subsequent *The Parallel Worlds of Classical Art and Texts*: Small (1997) and (2003) respectively.

⁸ For instance by Marshall (1996), and Baltussen (2002).

play itself seems to constitute an exemplar for how social memory was established (through written dedications and inscriptions on monuments, for instance), and how it was controlled and manipulated by oral means through speech and re-performance: unless the past is recalled in public, it is not in public memory.

Thomas Hubbard's chapter is also about who controls the record, this time in the more personal sphere of the post-delivery publication of forensic oratory. Through a close analysis of extant pairs of prosecution and defence speeches, he examines in particular prosecutor's frequent anticipations of defence gambits that then are indeed adopted in the matching orations. Discounting guesswork, extrapolation from pre-trial hearings, and gossip, he makes a convincing case for reading these speeches as orators' attempts to have the last word and so "set the record straight," in terms not of what they actually said on a given occasion but rather what they would like to be remembered as saying.

Geoffrey Bakewell is concerned with social memory in his consideration of the nature of the "Athenian Naval Catalogue" inscription (*IG* i³ 1032): how it came to be recorded, and what its commemorative function may have been in Athens c. 410-390 BC. He shows that this unique monument is likely to have been set up at the behest of a private individual, perhaps a *strategos*, intended as it seems to serve a political as well as honorific purpose in recording in unorthodox form the collaboration of diverse orders in the face of shared danger. It may thus represent an attempt to steer Athens' self-definition in a new direction. If so, he concludes, it failed, for it was ignored by the conventional historical record. It is clear, then, that an inscribed monument alone could not realign the public recollection of events.

A Roman historical inscription is discussed in Niall Slater's chapter: the *Res Gestae* that commemorated the achievements of Augustus. Slater suggests that this work, customarily categorized generically as an extension of the traditional Roman funerary oration or alternatively of the inscribed *elogium*, was by its intended situation before Augustus' Mausoleum in the Campus Martius originally designed to induce repeated re-performance of a first-person narrative of his life and achievements. It seems therefore to fall somewhere between oral recital and written account. In this particular form, it anticipates by several centuries the advent of autobiography (normally associated with Augustine).

Of course, self-referential literary composition was no novelty in the ancient world, for "self"-reference to the constructed *persona* of the

singer had been a characteristic of lyric poetry from its earliest beginnings in archaic Greece: Sappho, for instance, made numerous personal comments in her extant fragments. André Lardinois addresses the long-standing issue of Sappho's expectation of poetic immortality, arguing that far from anticipating the survival of her poems as written texts, she is far more likely to have expected to be remembered only by her contemporaries: those who had seen her dance and heard her sing. He draws upon the newly-constituted Sappho poem about Tithonos and old age as further evidence that the posthumous literary life of her poems was not her concern. Rather, her survival consisted in performance, in that Sappho would live on for as long as her voice could be heard. Thus the very nature of being remembered seems to need redefinition, at least in the context of early Greek poetry.

Egbert Bakker is another who challenges the notion of what is meant by "remembering," this time in the context of oral-traditional Homeric epic. Building on his performative interpretation of remembering in Homeric traditional poetry as actualization (whereby to remember the song is to sing it, and to remember the god is to invoke his ritual presence), he now turns to the source of remembering, examining the linguistic roots of remembering-verbs in Greek and demonstrating that μένος is fundamentally related. This leads to a recognition that our familiar dichotomy of body and soul is misleading in the early Greek context, where there seems to be no "divide between rational, cognitive, or mental faculties on the one hand, and irrational or physical sensations on the other." He concludes that epic remembering is a concept as much physical as cognitive, reflecting a holistic construct of human experience.

Edwin Carawan's chapter again addresses both cognitive and experiential aspects of remembering. In a close analysis of the references to *mnemones*, "rememberers," in the Lygdamis Decree, he suggests that the *mnemones* were not expected to remember laws and contracts verbatim, but rather to act as witnesses who might, on some future occasion, be called upon to confirm past transactions. Their own active engagement in the specific transactions constituted a cognitive technique for remembering such details as the appearance of the parties concerned, which at a later date would provide cues for recalling and confirming their identity and involvement.

A purely cognitive approach to remembering is adopted by Anna Bonifazi, who looks at the consistent way the poets of the *Iliad* and *Od-*

yssey use *au-* discourse markers (αὖ, αὖτε, αὐτάρ, αὖτις, αὐτίκα, and αὐτοῦ) to signal the shifts in point of view (in filmic language, “shots”). These are words that can cue specific cognitive responses to visual imagery, which Bonifazi graphically catalogues in filmic terms: shifting between long shots, mid shots, and close-ups; zooming in from less to more detailed depictions; and flashes of special moments within the normal narration. Thus the performer, with a Muse-inspired overview of the entire narrative terrain of his story, is able to prompt his audience to reconstruct in their mind’s eye the same visual focus as his own, within the same narrative space, and in the sequence appropriate to his shaping of the tale.

Elizabeth Minchin is also interested in the poet’s visualization of narrative space. She explains how the description of movement from one place to another forms one of the fundamental substructures of epic narration, so that the narrative is, in effect, a journey. In addition to Homeric epic, she draws on *pikono* songs from Papua New Guinea and the Djanggawul-myth from Australia’s Northern Territory in order to demonstrate the generality of this cognitive practice. She refers the action as narrated throughout the *Iliad* to a schematic representation of the topographical features of the plain of Troy, showing that specific events are attached to (and cued by) particular landmarks in the sparse landscape. In a variant application of the technique, the Catalogue of Ships in *Iliad* 2 with its multitude of geographical references has the form of a mind’s eye journey through the Homeric world. She suggests that the poet constructed a mental image of the landscape of his narrative, using the spatial features of the topography to cue the temporal sequence of events in the unfolding story.

Han Baltussen looks for oral and literary memory in a philosophical context, and finds in Plato’s *Protagoras* an excellent record of the dialectical practices of the Academy. Reading the dialogue in conjunction with Aristotle’s *Topica*, he shows that the two works “reinforce each other in providing, with certain qualifications, a richer understanding of oral performances in the Academy.” He addresses the interpretative problems arising from the interchange of roles and opinions in Plato’s dialogue, arguing that rather than signalling a lack of commitment to the views expressed, it exemplifies the stalemate reached in the dialectical debates of the sophists, with the intention of reinforcing the need for ethics to transcend “the argumentative games of non-committal debate.” He additionally shows that Aristotle in his *Topica* was consciously ex-

ploiting some of the questioning and answering techniques exposed in Plato's playful role-switching, taking what purports to be a record of an oral discussion and by literary means creating of it a powerful philosophical tool.

Visual and verbal phenomena are once more combined in the chapter by Alexandra Pappas, who juxtaposes philosophical and poetic texts alongside a vase-painting in investigating the implications underlying an old Greek superstition that to see a wolf, or to be seen first by a wolf, would render one mute. Initially examining literary references in light-hearted contexts (Plato's *Republic* and Theocritus' *Idyll* 14), she then turns to a red-figure kylix by Onesimos with inscriptions that include *LYKOS* ("wolf," but also, in the context, the name of an Athenian youth) in somewhat ambiguous circumstances on both interior and exterior. She imagines the cup in use, with fellow symposiasts "seeing *LYKOS*" and being led to pronounce the word, so retaining their ability to engage verbally in the occasion. After situating her discussion within a broader consideration of the connotations of *lykos* in Greek culture, she concludes with the suggestion that while the literary instances are concerned with the possibility that vision will suppress voice, Onesimos has playfully constructed a situation in which sight prompts utterance, with the result, appropriate for a sympotic context, that the name of a youth is commemorated.

A subtext can be detected in a number of these studies: the importance of utterance, the spoken word, for the ancient concept of memory in the sense of being remembered. From the fifth century on, monumental inscription is important, but cannot alone constitute public memory of people or events, even in such a highly literate and monument-conscious time as the early Roman empire. It is the voiced sounding of a name, the re-performed recital of achievements, that revivifies the past and commemorates the individuals who peopled it, and from the chapters of this volume it becomes clear that this belief was continuous from early Greece through to Rome in the first century AD, whether in ensuring the lasting record of an emperor's deeds or praising a youth at a symposium. There is a certain irony in our now relying upon mute textual or material documentation as our sole means of bringing the past to life—whether it be antiquity or a recent conference.

At each of the previous conferences, regardless of the theme, there has been a discernible swing towards a particular kind of approach, or a particular interest in a specific area of study, and so these conferences,

and the selected proceedings that to an extent record them, chart the development of a hermeneutics of the field. The story of a conference is, however, a much richer narration than a selective volume can commemorate, and so a list of all the participants in “Orality, Literacy, memory” and the titles of their papers is included at the end of the book in order to preserve a record, albeit brief, of the seventh conference in its entirety.

Bibliography

- Baltussen, H. (2002). “Philology or Philosophy? Simplicius on the Use of Quotation.” In *Epea and Grammata: Oral and Written communication in Ancient Greece. Orality & Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 4*. Mnemosyne Supplement 230. I. Worthington and J. M. Foley, eds.: 173-89. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.
- Cooper, C., ed. (2007). *Politics of Orality. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 6*. Mnemosyne Supplement 280. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Mackay, E. A., ed. (1999). *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition & its Influence in the Greek & Roman World*. Mnemosyne Supplement 188. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.
- Mackie, C. J., ed. (2004). *Oral Performance and its Context. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 5*. Mnemosyne Supplement 248. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Marshall, C.W. (1996). “Literary Awareness in Euripides and His Audience.” In *Voice Into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*. Mnemosyne Supplement 157. I. Worthington, ed.: 81-98. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.
- Small, J. P. (1997). *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Small, J. P. (2003). *The Parallel Worlds of Classical Art and Text*. New York: Routledge.
- Watson, J., ed. (2001). *Speaking Volumes. Orality & Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*. Mnemosyne Supplement 218. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.
- Worthington, I., ed. (1996). *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*. Mnemosyne Supplement 157. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.
- Worthington, I., and J. M. Foley, eds. (2002). *Epea and Grammata: Oral & Written Communication in Ancient Greece. Orality & Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 4*. Mnemosyne Supplement 230. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.

CHAPTER ONE

SPATIAL MEMORY AND THE COMPOSITION OF THE *ILLIAD* ¹

ELIZABETH MINCHIN

In his invaluable work on memory in oral traditions the cognitive psychologist David Rubin has dedicated a chapter to a discussion of imagery.² Here Rubin summarizes evidence, first, for the power of imagery in general as an aid to memory³ and, second, for the particular value of imagery for oral traditions.⁴ He also makes an important distinction between categories of imagery. On the basis of neurophysiological evidence he points out that there is a real separation between *visual* (or object) imagery and *spatial* imagery: that is, information about *what* an object is (its appearance) and *where* it is (its location) are registered in different areas of the brain. It is clear, therefore, that not one but two systems of memory process these complementary data.⁵ In oral traditions we find rich evidence for visual imagery of the object imagery kind (in Homer, for example, we find descriptions of treasured possessions,⁶ and vivid cameo scenes that are the material of similes⁷); and it is on this aspect of imagery that scholars have, for the most part,

¹ I thank Anne Mackay for having organized a stimulating Orality meeting, the participants at this conference for their helpful comments on this paper, and Jenny Clay for showing me a draft of a paper she is writing on space, vision, and memory in the *Iliad*. Clay's focus is on how the poet tracks his characters' movements within the "Trojan theatre." My concern in the present paper is on how the poet uses spatial memory as a prompt for his song.

² Rubin (1995: ch. 3, "Imagery").

³ Rubin (1995: 46-49).

⁴ Rubin (1995: 59-63).

⁵ Rubin (1995: 57); Cohen (1996: 55-56). This distinction between spatial and visual (object) imagery is, however, obscured by the fact that imagery tasks usually involve *both* memory systems (as we shall observe when we consider the use of spatial and object imagery together as aids to memory, below). On this latter point, see Rubin (1995: 57-59).

⁶ In Homer we find such images at *Iliad* 6.289-95 (robe); 9.186-88 (lyre); 22.468-72 (headdress): on such passages of description, see Minchin (2001: ch. 3).

⁷ In Homer consider the strong visual content of similes at, for example, *Iliad* 12.433-35; 22.93-95; 24.317-18. For discussion of imagery, the Homeric simile, and the workings of memory, see Minchin (2001: ch. 4).

concentrated their energies. The spatial component, on the other hand, is a neglected aspect of visual image—and this is despite the fact that, as we shall observe in my examples below, from both Homer and from other oral epic traditions, the narrative of oral epic has a very real spatial dimension. It is my aim in this chapter to begin a discussion of the functions of spatial memory in the composition of the oral epic songs that we associate with Homer; my observations will emerge, in part at least, from a comparison of the Homeric poems with epic poems in living traditions.

What is spatial memory? How do we use it?

Spatial memory is the memory system that encodes information about location, orientation, distance, and direction.⁸ In everyday life spatial memory helps us to follow instructions in order to locate sites, such as a petrol station on the highway, or a friend's house in the suburbs, or to remember how to find things, such as where we last left the car keys. Our ability to remember scenes and the layout of objects within scenes allows us to evaluate routes, to revisit in our mind's eye places we know, and to identify and "inspect" particular sites without actually travelling to them.⁹

Location may be a richer cue to memory than psychologists have until recently assumed. Eugene Winograd and Vaughan Church draw two important conclusions from their studies of spatial location and memory: their first is that location and memorability are linked;¹⁰ and their second conclusion is that spatial information can cue the recall of associated material.¹¹ The consequence of this is that, as Ulric Neisser observes, when we visit a once-familiar spot, memories of events and feelings come flooding back to us.¹² It is clear that remembered events and remembered emotions, like remembered objects, are vividly associated with places. We can conclude with Neisser, therefore, that the spatial

⁸ For a good general discussion, see Neisser (1989: 67-83).

⁹ Cohen (1996: 55-56); on "cognitive maps," see Neisser (1989: 76-77). On cognitive mapping and brain function, see Downs and Stea (1977: 12-29, esp. at 27).

¹⁰ Winograd and Church (1988: 1-7, esp. at 5).

¹¹ Winograd and Church (1988: 6-7); see also Rothkopf, Fisher, and Billington (1982: 126): "place provides productive cues for the recall of other information."

¹² Neisser (1989: 79-80).

system provides a “convenient set of distinctive and dissimilar stimuli” with which memories can be associated.¹³

It is not only in the concrete tasks of life in the everyday world that spatial memory is useful. We draw on spatial memory also as we listen to, or read, reports and stories. So, for example, as we hear a story we will construct a spatial model that represents the location in which the narrative is unfolding.¹⁴ The spatial models that we bring to mind in such circumstances may be actual locations *or* they may be assembled in accordance with the information that we receive. That is, we construct real or imaginary locations and use them to guide our understanding—and to focus our memory. It is through this activity, as we shall observe below, that spatial location becomes a cue to recall.¹⁵ I should note here that the audience’s model of an imagined location may not be as firmly delineated as that of the storyteller: the latter almost always has the advantage of having a particular site in mind. Besides, we must allow for individual differences in performance on spatial tasks and on imagery tasks. Some of us are more successful on tasks that involve spatial perception and manipulation; others will have a clearer image of a location that is being described; some people have very little visual imagery at all.¹⁶ George Miller describes in psychological terms the mental changes that occur when a subject (in this case himself) reads a descriptive passage:¹⁷ “you construct an image *as part of the process of understanding* the passage, and ... the image *helps you to remember* what you have read” (my emphases).¹⁸ Miller goes on to point out that if subjects are asked to reproduce the description they have read, they will reactivate the mental image they have formed, and use it to cue their description. If their memory is good, this description will be roughly equivalent to the

¹³ Memories can be released by other stimuli also—taste, smell, sounds: see Neisser (1989: 79).

¹⁴ Rubin (1995: 51); for an important study of the creation of mental models from verbal descriptions and the nature and value of such models, see Taylor and Tversky (1992).

¹⁵ Just as we can recall where we saw certain information on a page, so we can use a picturable location to stimulate memories of events: for the ability to remember the location of information on a page, see, for example, Underwood (1969: 562); on incidental observations of this everyday phenomenon: Rothkopf, Fisher, and Billington (1982: 126).

¹⁶ Rubin (1995: 58).

¹⁷ Miller (1993: 358-63).

¹⁸ Miller (1993: 359).

original passage that generated the mental image.¹⁹ Thus a mental model has the capacity to become a powerful mnemonic aid.

To this point I have discussed the spatial representation system as a phenomenon of natural, untrained, memory, but this particular memory system (along with object memory) has been exploited from early times.²⁰ As Rubin notes, almost all the artificial mnemonic systems developed from the time of the ancient Greeks and Romans through the Middle Ages to books today on how to improve one's memory are based on visual and spatial imagery.²¹ It is the method of *loci* and *imagines* (the combination of both spatial and object imagery systems) that is still one of the most popular. This method takes us back to Cicero and to the vivid story he tells (*de Or.* 2.86, 351-354) of the poet Simonides and his discovery of the art of memory: or, more precisely, Simonides' realization that *orderly arrangement* is essential for efficient recall.²² Cicero himself used a technique which drew on Simonides' experience to enable him to deliver long speeches from memory and to do so accurately.²³ Frances Yates describes how this may be done.²⁴ First, a mnemonic place system is memorized, following a fixed path through a selected site. This site may be a building, such as a spacious house, with many rooms, all ornamented. This is the *locus*. It provides the orator with a logical spatial sequence that he may follow in his mind's eye as he is speaking. The images by which the speech is to be remembered are placed, in the mind's eye, in these memorized spaces. The orator "visits" the rooms in fixed sequence as he gives his speech, drawing from the memorized places the images he has deposited there. Each image in turn prompts his memory for the point he wishes to make at that moment. Thus, as he moves through the house in his mind's eye, the orator

¹⁹ Miller (1993: 359).

²⁰ Small (1997: chs. 7-9).

²¹ Rubin (1995: 46).

²² Yates (1966: 1-3), and Sorabji (1972: ch.2), on mnemonic techniques and the so-called "place system" more generally, and Aristotle's interest in this technique. For a useful discussion of this phenomenon from the perspective of discourse analysis, see Linde (1981: 104-13). Here, in her study of descriptions of apartments, Linde notes that 96% of the descriptions she collected followed a "tour strategy." She proposes (Linde [1981: 105]) that the reason why speakers prefer this strategy (over the "map strategy") is that the tour strategy "transforms a spatial configuration into a temporal sequence. This permits the speaker to use the *temporal order of language* as an organizing principle for *presenting spatial patterns*" (my emphases).

²³ For discussion of this Roman contribution to mnemotechnics, see Small (1997: 95-105).

²⁴ Yates (1966: 3); see also Rubin (1995: 46-47).

remembers his points in the intended order. Location and image, as cognitive psychology has shown, serve as retrieval cues for associated material.

All this, as Yates says, is laborious.²⁵ Indeed, in the Western world today the sustained system of *loci* and *imagines* that I have described is of relatively little practical use, except as a curiosity. By contrast, in the ancient world, whether the world of Cicero and his fellow orators or, further back in time, the pre-literate world which we associate with the Dark Age and the first tellings of the Troy-story, the training of memory and the exploitation of its spatial system would have been of vital importance.²⁶ Although we in the Western world may have little real use for this system, it is possible still today to observe storytellers making intensive use of the natural connections between *loci* and *imagines*. I suggest that there are instructive parallels in living traditions of oral song from Papua New Guinea and Northern Australia. In their preoccupation with *loci*, with land and landforms, these oral traditions demonstrate an instinctive preference for stories that follow an itinerary or that in some way interact with a changing landscape. Tales of this kind, by their very nature, make the task of retrieval from memory less onerous for the singer.

Journeys and landforms in living traditions

Epic storytelling comprises vivid images and concrete ideas.²⁷ The hero is larger than life. His actions are bold; his speech is assertive. In epic song even ideas that would be represented in our world today as abstractions are, where possible, personified or made visible or audible through action or words.²⁸ Another feature of epic storytelling—a feature that has received too little attention—is that it is characterized by movement.²⁹ Movement from one location to another creates the sub-

²⁵ Yates (1966: 3).

²⁶ Small (1997: 81-82). The singer and the orator trained their memories for different ends: the orator aimed to deliver a speech previously composed at leisure word for word. The oral singer was remembering a song-path or the gist of a tale; he was not trying to reproduce a “fixed” text; rather, he was composing as he performed.

²⁷ Rubin (1995: 60).

²⁸ See Hainsworth (1991: 5-6, 32); Toohey (1992: 7-10).

²⁹ Rubin (1995: 61-62).

structure of the *pikono* songs of the Duna in Papua New Guinea and the Djanggawul myth of Arnhem Land, in Australia's Northern Territory.

The pikono tales of the Duna people

The Duna people in the Southern Highlands province of Papua New Guinea tell fictional epic-like stories called *pikono*, which may be up to six hours in duration.³⁰ Although these journey stories are imaginary, they are set in the real landscape at specific and known locations.³¹ *Pikono* performers often situate their narratives by mapping out the landscape *before* they commence the performance proper.³² The order in which the places are identified sets up a mental map, which prepares the singer, and his audience, for what is to come;³³ the story of the journey is then told as a narrative that moves across the landscape. The mapping sequence, which occurs before the singing of the song proper, is called *ipakana yakaiya*, "counting/naming rivers and mountains."³⁴ In singing this element the performer must observe a proper spatial sequence: Lila San Roque reports (pers. comm.) that Duna people say of their own tradition that a "coherent journey is a feature of "real" *pikono*, and that storytellers who jump all over the place without itemising locations or landscape features along a geographically sensible and coherent "path" are no good."³⁵ *Pikono* do not recount the activities of real people, or known ancestors, but of imaginary people. Sometimes these individuals are unnamed, but storytellers generally draw on a cast of well-known folk or culture heroes for their protagonists.³⁶ These heroes match wits with spirit beings, who feature in the local origin stories and who are considered to be real. They are the spirits who shaped the Duna landscape in ancient times.³⁷

³⁰ Haley (2002). A single performance can last a whole night.

³¹ Haley (2002: 132).

³² Haley (2002: 132): "local mountains, rivers, creeks, caves, ponds, sink holes and lakes are thereby named in sequence."

³³ Haley (2002: 132).

³⁴ Haley (2002: 7).

³⁵ I thank Lila San Roque of the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies and Kirsty Gillespie of the Centre for Cross-Cultural Research at The Australian National University, who are working on the *pikono* songs of the Duna, for their very helpful responses to my questions about memory and location. They in turn acknowledge the contribution of Kenny Yuwi Kendoli and Richard Alo, to whom, they say, they owe most of their knowledge of the *pikono* tradition.

³⁶ Haley (2002: 133).

³⁷ Haley (2002: 133).

Although *pikono* are overtly fictional, they can, through their systematic concern for authentic settings, codify a vast amount of knowledge about the landscape—knowledge which it would be improper to reveal in other contexts.³⁸ This knowledge in fact has played a special role in the land disputes which have arisen in connection with recent mining and prospecting ventures in this resource-rich region. Thus *pikono* have become an alternative means of transmitting the knowledge through which claims to land are established.³⁹

The Djanggawul-myth of Arnhem Land

The myth of the Djanggawul is told in a cycle of songs recorded in north-eastern and north-central Arnhem Land in the late 1940s by Ronald Berndt.⁴⁰ These songs are traditional, even sacred to the Yolgnu people. The Djanggawul-myth concerns fertility and the procreation by three ancestral beings called the Djanggawul of the original ancestors of the present Aboriginal people of Arnhem Land. The songs claim to describe all the incidents that took place during the wanderings of the two Djanggawul sisters and their brother, from the time they left their spirit home at Bralgu (the Island of the Dead, a mythical place) until they reached the neighbourhood of Milingimbi.⁴¹ At each site that they visited children were born, or dreamings were left behind.

³⁸ Haley (2002: 134-35).

³⁹ Haley (2002: 136).

⁴⁰ For a discussion of the myth (which is at the heart of the Djanggawul religious cult and which is more important to Aborigines than other religious cults in this region) and for a translation of the songs with commentary, see Berndt (1952). I thank Professor Nicolas Peterson of the Anthropology Program in the Faculty of Arts, The Australian National University, for introducing me to this material and for helping me understand it; and Dr Claire Bowern of Rice University for her helpful comments on this section of this chapter. As Berndt points out (at 61), the story itself, as a story, is rarely told by a storyteller; its common form is song (“some of the most beautiful literary efforts of Aboriginal Australia”: 60). The version that Berndt records in his volume is the Yirkalla version, which differs in significant ways from the Milingimbi version. The language of the songs is not archaic or highly specialized; it is the ordinary language spoken by the people interspersed with occasional “sacred” words, “singing” words, or invocations used only in this context. The theme is developed in a vivid fashion, with the help of considerable detail (61).

⁴¹ On the Djanggawul, see Berndt (1952: xviii and 24). For a map of the wanderings, see Berndt (1952: 8-9).

As they travel, the Djanggawul are said to “make country.”⁴² By this phrase Berndt assumes that these ancestral beings are adding geographical features to the existing landscape: a sandhill, numerous wells, trees, and so on. They create generous water resources; they make the land fruitful: new vegetation grows; trees bear leaves, blossoms, and fruit.⁴³ All this emphasis on fertility and reproduction is real and vital to the Aborigines of Arnhem Land, living as they do in close proximity to their environment, dependent on its resources.

“Connectedness to country” is an important theme in this and other similar traditions of song—as well as in other genres.⁴⁴ Peter Toner comments that the main aesthetic criterion by which Dhalwangu singers (also of the Yolgnu people) are judged is their capacity in their song-texts to evoke ancestrally-significant places.⁴⁵ The audience members, particularly the elders, strongly associate the evocation of places with people they knew, now deceased, who lived there. For the old people, the evocation of place arouses both *longing* (for places imbued with the spirit of the ancestors, places which belong to them in a profound spiritual sense) and a sense of *belonging* (to a real, but also an emotional, landscape).⁴⁶ Yet although the singer records the movements of his characters across the landscape, often at some length, he does not give *detailed* photographic accounts of the locations themselves. Rather, he uses a broad-brush description to represent a new setting.⁴⁷ He allows his audience to conjure up in their own minds the landscape against

⁴² For example in songs after Song 26 (the first songs describe the sea voyage from Bralgu): see Berndt (1952: Song 30 ff. (35, 38, 42, 44, 45, 46, etc.).

⁴³ Berndt (1952: 304-05).

⁴⁴ See Toner (2005: 7). Yolgnu musical performances of the *manikay* genre consist of long series of songs relating to a single ancestral being or a group of ancestral beings who interacted during the *wangarr* era (at the time of the first human groups): see Toner (2005: 4).

⁴⁵ The Dhalwangu is a patrilineal group with whom Toner has worked closely.

⁴⁶ Toner (2005: 6-7).

⁴⁷ Rubin (1995: 61). Thus in the Djanggawul-story places are described in terms of clouds, sandhills, trees, and sunsets. Compare with what San Roque (pers. comm.) says of *pikono*: “it seems to me that specific named and known real-life places are rarely described directly in the *pikono*. However, there is often a close and reiterated link between a particular place and an emblematic item (e.g., a plant or a bird species) that comes from/grows/lives there, almost like an essential epithet.” Her comment reminds us of the essential epithets of settlements mentioned in Homer’s Catalogue of Ships (on which more below).

which the action will take place—and any associated memories that they too may have.⁴⁸

There is no doubt that these traditions of song that I have described, from Papua New Guinea and Northern Australia, express a relationship between the singer and his audience on the one hand, and the land, on the other, that is more profound and more spiritual than what we find in the Homeric epics.⁴⁹ As Nicole Haley comments in connection with the Duna, land and identity are “mutually implicated”; in the songs that are known as *ipakana yakaiya* “lives and landscapes are simultaneously mapped.”⁵⁰ In these particular living traditions the journey of the hero across the landscape fills social, emotional, spiritual, and even political needs for listener and singer alike.

I suggest, however, that this preoccupation with travel and movement serves also a very practical end for the singer. At this point I return to Rubin, who makes the tantalizing but significant observation that it “may be no accident that epic heroes are always on the move.”⁵¹ He goes on to observe, quite reasonably, that if all actions within a sustained narrative occurred in the one location there is the likelihood that the singer would become confused.⁵² Therefore, if the oral poet is able to invoke a highly-developed spatial-memory system it is likely that he will *reduce* interference and *increase* the memorability of his material.⁵³ I wish to be more specific. I shall argue that the poet of oral song makes intensive use of this capacity for spatial memory that is common to us all. I propose that the “scene-changes” that we observe so frequently in oral song—as, indeed, in everyday storytelling⁵⁴—have a particular significance: they reveal how the singer subdivides his song in memory and

⁴⁸ If this is a real landscape that audience members may know, then they will bring its image to the forefront of their minds. If it is not, they will generate an approximation of their own making. For a detailed account of how we form mental models of descriptive passages as we read, see Miller (1993: 358-63); and see above.

⁴⁹ On this see Harwood (1976: 792); also Knapp (1979).

⁵⁰ Haley (2002: 294).

⁵¹ Rubin (1995: 61-62).

⁵² Rubin (1995: 62).

⁵³ Rubin (1995: 62).

⁵⁴ The use of spatial memory in the act of storytelling has been observed by Wallace Chafe (1990: 93-96, at 93), who comments, “the mind actually requires certain kinds of information in order to operate successfully.” He notes that orientation (location in space, time, and social context) is necessary both for storyteller and for the audience: cf. also Labov (1972: ch. 9), on orientation.

how to cue his singing he uses the new spatial information which each scene-change represents.

Movement across the landscape in Homer

The *Odyssey* is recognizably similar to the oral epics I have been describing, in that its narrative represents a journey: it moves in careful sequence through a foreign world in which at each port of call a new episode begins. The hero, Odysseus, is always on the move. Even when he reaches Ithaka, his homeland, there is movement, between Eumaios' hut and the palace, from hall to bedchamber, from indoors to outdoors, from the palace to Laertes' dwelling.⁵⁵ For this very reason, that the journey-story of the *Odyssey* demonstrates clearly and easily the way in which a singer in this ancient Aegean tradition can harness and exploit the functions of spatial memory, I have turned to the *Iliad*. Here the parallels are not so obvious. We are inclined to think of this long tale as a "one-scene epic," to use Rubin's phrase.⁵⁶ The action takes place in a limited landscape: in Troy, on the battlefield outside its walls, and, beyond the Achaian Wall, by the ships and in the shelters on the shore.⁵⁷ There is no recognizable large-scale journey-plot to sequence the episodes of the epic and to hold them together. If we examine the text closely, however, we find that even here, within the narrow compass of the plain at Troy, there is constant movement.⁵⁸ On the horizontal plane the main events of the narrative occur at a limited number of locations between the citadel of Troy and the sea, all of which are economically described; on a vertical axis, action which involves the gods takes place on Olympus, on other lofty vantage points, at sea-level near Troy, or in the depths of the ocean.

Iliad I

To begin our discussion, we might look at the development of the narrative at the beginning of the epic. Note how each sub-episode within this segment of the tale is prefaced by the movement of the characters into

⁵⁵ Indeed, here in the *Odyssey* (and not the *Iliad*) we have what I would call "pure" description and what Brigitte Hellwig calls "direkte Ortsbeschreibung": Hellwig (1964: 32).

⁵⁶ Rubin (1995: 62). Rubin claims, in fact, that there are *no* "one-scene epics."

⁵⁷ See also Andersson (1976: 15-16).

⁵⁸ Andersson (1976: 27).

position (see Table 1, p.29 below). Only when he has carefully positioned everyone does the poet commence his narration of the episode (or of the scene within the episode). Thus, in *Iliad* 1, Chryses arrives at the fast ships (12); after his vain negotiation with Agamemnon he goes to the sea shore (34), here he prays; in response Apollo strides down the pinnacles of Olympus (44); and disease breaks out amongst the Achaians. There is an assembly of the Achaians (57). When the gathering breaks up Achilles returns to his shelter (306-07). There follows then a double sequence of moves: an embassy leaves for Chryse, to return Chryseis to her father (312); it arrives (430-31) and the restoration of Chryseis to her father is completed along with the propitiation of Apollo; the embassy then sets off again for the Achaian camp (478-83); it reaches the camp (484). Meanwhile heralds go to Achilles (327-28); they return with Briseis, now destined to be Agamemnon's war-prize (347-348). At this point Achilles goes to the sea shore and prays to his mother (348-50), who rises up from the deep and sits with her son (359-60); they talk and she leaves him (428). Later, acting on his request, she leaves her home in the sea depths for Olympus, to intercede on his behalf with Zeus, who, conveniently for Thetis, sits a little way apart from the other gods (495-97, 498-99). In this she is successful and she returns to the sea floor (531-32). Zeus, meanwhile, returns to the dwellings of the gods on Olympus' peak (533).⁵⁹

In the *Iliad* as a whole, just as in *Iliad* 1, this rule of movement followed by (never synchronous with) speech or action applies.⁶⁰ The poet sees little need, however, to offer a detailed description of the settings for such scenes: he leaves it to us, on the whole, to envisage them. His focus is on the action of the moment and the characters' responses to

⁵⁹ In this stretch of text in *Iliad* 1.345-492 there are a number of instances of αὐτάρ or αὐτίς (347, 348, 430, 484, 488). On the function of discourse markers in indicating visual discontinuity (mind's eye shifts), see Anna Bonifazi's "Memory and Visualisation in Homeric Discourse Markers" (Ch. 2 below). Her argument, that Homer signals changes of scene or changes of focus through his use of particular discourse markers, supplements my own study of the poet's careful movement of his characters across the Trojan landscape and his use of spatial cues as prompts for memory.

⁶⁰ This rule applies to the gods also. When the moment comes to introduce one or more of the greater gods into the action, the poet has always positioned them in advance. Take, for example, their sudden appearance at 22.166, where the gods are suddenly and simply introduced as spectators of the scene around the walls of Troy (the pursuit of Hektor). A careful reader will remember that Homer had actually transferred the gods to Olympus, beside Zeus, at 21.518-20, in preparation for this later scene. (I thank Janet Watson for pointing out the *Iliad* 21 reference.)

it.⁶¹ Certain locations, indeed, appear to generate certain behaviours: the beach is associated with isolation, unhappiness, and prayer (1.34, 348-50);⁶² Olympos is naturally associated with gatherings of the gods and major decisions that affect the lives of mortals. Locations in sequence represent a journey: Thetis, for example, emerges from the sea's waves and then goes up to the tall sky and Olympos (1.496-97). Note too that the movement of characters is in some contexts formalized. Many scholars, from Walter Arend on, have discussed the standardized form of the arrival scene.⁶³ This visit-script, as I would call it, with its familiar emphasis on movement—on travel, arrival, and discovery—is a deliberately leisured introduction to an important negotiation within the narrative. It may be, as at 1.327-32, the prelude to the taking of Briseis, or, at 1.495-502, the prelude to Thetis' request to Zeus that he put strength into the Trojans so that the Achaians, in despair, are ready to make recompense to her son.

Iliad 1, which deals with events in the Achaian camp, is for the most part set in the circumscribed location of the ships and the shoreline. Elsewhere in the epic the action moves across the plain to the city of Troy and even within its walls.⁶⁴

Iliad 24

Here again we note the way in which the poet positions his characters in preparation for a new scene (see Table 2, p.30 below). After the funeral games for Patroklos, the heroes go to their shelters, to eat and sleep (1-2). Only Achilles remains awake, tossing and turning (3-5). His restlessness drives him back and forth between his shelter and the beach (12); here, fastening the body of Hektor to his chariot again, he draws it around Patroklos' tomb. The scene shifts to the gods, looking down (23). They are at odds over what to do (33-63). Zeus resolves the dispute

⁶¹ Hellwig (1964: 36); Andersson (1976: *passim*); Richardson (1990: 50).

⁶² As Kirk (1985: 56-57) notes; see also 19.40-41; 24.12.

⁶³ See, for example, Arend (1933: 28-39); also Reece (1993: 5-46), in an Odyssean context. Andersson (1976: 33) notes this also; but, in referring to the "colorless" phrases of the arrival scene in the Homeric epics he does not take into account the oral origins of the poem—or the poet's desire to focus the attention of the audience on what is important: the interactions between characters. See also Richardson (1990: 115-17) on the logical connections that Homer often maintains when he changes scene.

⁶⁴ William Merritt Sale's observations of formulae for "in Troy" and "from Troy" are relevant here: see Sale (1987: 37-39). His conclusion (37) is that we "owe the bulk of the Troy scenes to Homer's invention."

by despatching Iris to summon Thetis (74). The execution of her journey is spelt out (77-82) in more than usual detail (this will be a critical negotiation, although by proxy, between Zeus and Achilles). Iris summons Thetis. They proceed together, in two stages, to Olympos (95-97). There Thetis is shown into the presence of Zeus, who gives her the task of telling Achilles about his displeasure (104-19). Thetis leaves Olympos for earth and the shelter of Achilles (121-22). Again we have the formal sequences of the visit-script (122-25). Thetis passes on Zeus' message; Achilles consents, curtly, to what is asked of him (139-40). We leave mother and son talking, at the ships. Meanwhile Zeus sends Iris to Ilion, to carry a message to Priamos (144-58). She goes (159-60); she arrives (visit-script: 160-68). She passes on Zeus' instruction, that he should go to Achilles by night. Priamos makes ready for this expedition: he orders that the mule wagon be prepared and goes to the storeroom (191-92) to select appropriate gifts for the ransom offering. This is the setting for his discussion with his wife, who protests at his proposal. Nevertheless, Priamos stands firm; he selects his gifts (228-37); and he chases off his sons, who have attached themselves to him to no purpose (237-64). The horses and the mules are now yoked up and the expedition begins: at 323 Priamos and Idaios leave the forecourt and the portico; they make their way through the town (327), and go out onto the plain (329). Here they pass the tomb of Ilos (349) and reach the ford of the river (350). Meanwhile Zeus despatches Hermes to be their guide. Hermes dons his sandals and departs for the mortal world (340-48), reaching the ford in the guise of a young noble. After introductions are made and an offer of an escort is accepted (a charming scene) the convoy moves off again, across the plain (440-42). They reach the fortifications, and the ditch; with Hermes' help they are able to pass the sentries unnoticed and to enter the gates (443-47). Now they are at the shelter of Achilles (448-56), which is represented as a kind of rudimentary palace, complete with forecourt, distinguished by its mighty door.⁶⁵ Here Hermes takes his leave (468) and Priamos goes to the shelter itself and enters, to meet the man who slew his son (the visit-scene begins at 471). This is the setting for an extraordinary conversation between two remarkable men. It is

⁶⁵ Hellwig (1964: 34-35, 38) notes that Achilles' house is described through narrative (448-453): that is, as it had been built. She notes that in the *Iliad*, by contrast with the *Odyssey*, the poet uses the indirectness of action description rather than the directness of description proper to set scenes (on those occasions that he does so) for the events of the *Iliad*.

punctuated only by Achilles' going outside (572), to organize the ransom exchange, away from Priamos' gaze. His separation from his visitor allows him to address Patroklos and to explain his actions. Achilles returns to the old man, sits down again (596-97), and invites him to eat. The two men share a meal, after which Priamos asks that he be allowed to rest. Achilles has a bed set up outside the shelter in the porch. The old man and his herald sleep there (673-74), after they have made arrangements for a truce to enable the funeral (656-70), and Achilles sleeps in the hut (675). Hermes, however, interrupts Priamos' rest, to rouse him for the journey back to Troy. They go through the encampment (691) and on their reaching the ford of the river, Hermes leaves them and returns to Olympos (694). The journey to the city continues. Cassandra sees her father drawing near to the city (699-700); the citizens flock to the gates (709). Here Hektor's family and his people begin their lamentation (710-14), but Priamos asks them to make way for the mules, so that the body may be taken to the palace. Here, in Hektor's home (719-20), mourning proper begins, with the laments of the women close to the hero—Andromache, Hekabe, and Helene (723-76). The narrative moves to its conclusion with the building of the pyre, the carrying out of the body from the palace, cremation, and the burial of the bones in a grave-barrow (782-801). The people then return to the palace for the feast that marks Hektor's death and looks ahead to life without him (801-03).⁶⁶

The narrative of *Iliad* 24 moves back and forward across the plain, in and out of the dwellings of Priamos and Achilles. At each new location there is significant action or speech of some kind. The setting is not only a backdrop for the action; I suggest, drawing on the observations of cognitive psychology, that the setting *cues* the words to be spoken or the actions that arise. What we notice, even here, by contrast with some works of literary fiction, is the poet's emphasis on location.⁶⁷ Of course,

⁶⁶ As noted above in my discussion of *Iliad* 1 the poet uses αὐτάρ here too to signal a mind's eye shift, as he changes scene (at, for example, 675 and 801).

⁶⁷ I was surprised, on looking at Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, to observe that Austen gives very little account of movement at all. The reader is left to guess where many of the conversations that make up the narrative are taking place (including the first, memorable conversation between Mr and Mrs Bennet). Likewise, Margaret Atwood, in *The Penelopiad* (an interesting text to compare with Homer), makes little effort to document movement and setting as a pre-requisite for speech and action. On the other hand, many works of contemporary literature, just like everyday storytelling, set a high value on location. Jay McInerney's *The Good Life: A Novel* is reminiscent of everyday talk in its concern with movement and place.

as I have noted above, location is necessary to any narrative genre, and especially oral narratives. I claim, however, that Homer's concern for location is an indicator of a memory-based strategy developed for sustained oral performance.

Topography and landmarks in the Iliad

Let us now turn to the topography of the land between the citadel and the Achaian Wall, considering first the horizontal axis. What we notice as we read the *Iliad* is, firstly, that the number of significant features on the landscape around Troy, as Homer describes it, is strictly limited; and, secondly, that the poet uses the landmarks he identifies as the backdrop for critical moments in the narration.

Why are there so few landmarks on the Trojan plain? I have, in Table 3 (p.32 below), adapted and augmented Agathe Thornton's schematic representation of the topographical features of the plain.⁶⁸ Between the Trojan wall and the Achaian ditch we have only an oak tree (or possibly two: see 7.22 and 60), a fig tree (or possibly two; compare 6.433-34 and 11.166-68), the grave of Ilos (11.166), the ford of the Skamander (14.433-36), its banks (2.465), the river itself (16.397), and the rise on the plain (10.160-61).⁶⁹ This is a deliberately economical landscape. Such economy has a practical rationale: it would not be possible for a

⁶⁸ See Thornton (1984: 50); for a contrary view, claiming the impossibility of deducing such spatial relationships see Andersson (1976: 17). For discussion see also Hellwig (1964: 24-28, 60-76). I will suggest, however, that there is a sound practical reason for the sparseness of the landscape.

⁶⁹ Homer's topography of the plain is not aiming at authenticity but at creating a credible (and possibly fluid) space which allows him sufficient landmarks to which he can tie his narrative: on the impossibility of using Homer as a primary source for the topography of the Trojan plain, see Cook (1973: 91); Rose (1998: 412); and some further discussion below. For other references to the ford of the Skamander, see below; for other references to the oak tree(s), see 5.692-93, 6.237-40, 9.352-55 (speech), 11.170-71, 21.547-49; to the fig tree(s), see 22.145-48, and to the (unspecific) rise on the plain, see 11.56 and 20. 1-3. As for the relative positions of these features, Kirk (1990: 128) discusses the position of the oak tree at 5.692-93. *Contra* Leaf he argues for one oak tree only, close to the Skaian gate (to which distant point Sarpedon has been carried at this point of the battle). Kirk also (1990: 218) asks how close to the wall the fig tree stands. He concludes that since each of the three passages which mentions the fig tree appears to set it in a slightly different relation to the wall (close, 6.433-34; nearer to the middle of the plain, 11.166-68; or fairly close to the walls but a little out to the plain, 22.145-48), the poet "did not envisage all these fixed points with complete precision." On the other hand it may be that the poet was careless at 11.166-68. I am inclined to accept this last explanation in this particular case (that this is a lapse of concentration), since the fig tree appears to be firmly associated with the walls of the city elsewhere.

poet in performance *both* to retain more than a limited number of features at any one time in active memory, along with the material of his song, *and* to be (relatively) consistent in his references to them as he located and recounted events on the plain.⁷⁰

Secondly, let us observe how the poet uses landmarks in his tale. Whereas the general movement of battle surges across the plain (as we see in the great day of battle that extends from *Iliad* 11.1 to *Iliad* 18.242), significant events within the generalized turmoil are pinned to individual locations. For example, when the Achaians put the Trojans to flight, they rush back towards the city. The poet marks their panic by counting off the landmarks that we have already identified as they pass: the tomb of Ilos (11.166); the centre of the level ground and the fig tree (167); the Skaian Gates and the oak tree (170). Later, however, back on the field, the Trojans gain the upper hand. Paris leans against a column on Ilos' grave mound and takes aim at Diomedes (11.369-72).⁷¹ He brings him down. This is one of a series of worrying moments for the Achaians, as one great Achaian hero after another is put out of action. On the other hand, in *Iliad* 14 (while Zeus slumbers) Aias strikes Hektor with a rock; Hektor collapses (14.409-20). He is carried out of battle in his chariot. Only when his horses reach the ford of the Skamander do they stop and his men lift him out and splash water over him (433-39). It is here that the hero regains consciousness. Somewhat later in the narrative, he will be lying by the ford still when Zeus, now aware of what has been happening while his attention was diverted, sends Apollo to him to put strength in him, so that he can resume the fight. Do other events at other points of the tale happen at the ford? It is here (21.2) that Achilles captures 12 young Trojans and has them taken to the ships (21.26-33); and it is here that he, memorably, meets Lykaon and kills him and

⁷⁰ The standard text on the limitations of memory is Miller (1956): one can hold in active memory seven plus or minus two pieces of information. In addition to the landmarks I have mentioned above there are, however, occasional references to other landmarks that serve an immediate purpose and are never heard of again: see, for example, the single reference to the tomb of Aisyyetes (2.793). Its presence here, an expedient, demonstrates the poet's strong inclination to pin events to a location: see also Kirk (1985: 245). Cf. Kallikolone (a rise beside the Simoeis) at 20.53 and 151 (and see Edwards (1991: 293), who notes that this "invention (?)" stayed in the poet's mind. Hence the poet's second reference at 151.

⁷¹ The tomb of Ilos (10.415) also serves as a focus for action: it is the meeting place for the elders as they hold council on the battlefield. The tomb also serves the narrative as a waymark on Priamos' mission to Achilles: just after passing the tomb the king and his companion stop by the ford of the river (24.349-51) to allow their horses to drink. At this point Hermes approaches.

hurls his body to the fishes (21.34-135). Furthermore, as we have noted already, it is at the ford that Priamos and Idaios encounter, and later part from, their guide Hermes, on their mission to recover the body of Hektor (24.349-51, 692-94). Just as the fig tree and the oak tree of the *Iliad* become emblems of Troy and the promise of safety within its walls, so the river and the ford, in the poet's mind and in ours, serve as boundary-markers, the place at which Greeks and Trojans may meet. The ford is the threshold at which life becomes dangerous for the Trojans.

On the vertical axis of this three-dimensional model of Troy and its surrounds we find the depths of the ocean (18.35-37), where Thetis spends much of her time with her father (1.357-58), and where she and her sister-nymphs will mourn the imminent death of her son. This is a remote realm.⁷² Although it is no surprise that Poseidon has his home here (below Aigai, 13.20-22), the aloofness that characterizes his relations with Zeus is made real in the distance that separates their realms. Next is the sea shore and the plain of Troy, where gods interact with mortals (for example, Thetis comes up from the sea-depths to the shoreline to comfort Achilles in 1.359-61; Athene comes down from Olympos to the plain to infiltrate the Trojans at 4.78-79; Hera and Athene stand by the Achaians at 5.778-79; Poseidon supports the Achaians at 13.36-38; Hera travels from Olympos to earth to visit Sleep (14.225-230);⁷³ Hermes descends from Olympos to earth to provide an escort to Priamos at 24.345-48). The gods will often choose an earthly vantage point from which to watch events at Troy—Mount Ida (8.47-52; 11.181-84), the heights of Samothrace (13.11-14), or even the oak tree near the city (7.58-61)—and, of course, above all this is the realm of Olympos, where the gods have their homes (1.495-99; 8.1-3).⁷⁴

The Catalogue of Ships

Although I am concerned primarily with the relation of spatial memory and the narrative proper, I cannot overlook the special case of the Catalogue of Ships of 2.484-785, which in its structure makes intensive use

⁷² Indeed, it is where Thetis and Eurynome hide Hephaistos (18.394-405).

⁷³ Janko (1992: 186-87) urges us to note Hera's route: her itinerary (Olympos, Pieria, Emathia, Thrace, Athos, Lemnos) to visit Sleep and thence to meet Zeus on Mount Ida (14.281-285) is "erratic." She is avoiding open water, as Greek sailors did.

⁷⁴ Sometimes the gods leave Olympos and visit other peoples: for example, the gods visit the Aithiopians at 1.423-24. Homer always tells us where the gods have gone, when they are absent from Olympos.

of spatial memory.⁷⁵ The Catalogue of all the towns and settlements which sent ships and men to Troy has been organized as a circuit around Greece and the islands, broken only at 2.645-80 to include Crete, Rhodes, and the islands nearby. It has been formatted as a so-called cognitive map, which the singer follows as he sings. The sequential order of the poet's mental journey around Greece acts as a check, to ensure that no place is omitted.⁷⁶ The major geographical or demographical headings of the catalogue, which have been prompted by the "cognitive map," cue in turn lower-order place-names. These are often combined with traditional epithets that provide strong visual images of the towns and settlements in question. The place-names in their turn cue associated non-visual information, such as the names of heroes and their stories, in the same way that locations around Troy cue cognitive units, in the form of narrative segments, of the *Iliad*-song.⁷⁷

How does Homer use spatial memory?

The spatial organization of the *pikono* songs of the Duna and of the Djanggawul story of Arnhem Land helps singers in these traditions achieve the good order of a coherent song; as they map the landscape they are able to locate in memory the episodes or stories that are associated with those places. Although Homer's preoccupation with movement and location is far less profound in its implications, he has this in common with the singers Papua-New Guinea and northern Australia: a readiness to take advantage of the dependability and the durability of the spatial system of memory.⁷⁸ Homer too relies on movement, location, and landmarks, not, in the first instance, because these locations have deep significance for his audience, but because they serve him as prompts for memory, in the manner of Simonides. As Calame observes so graphically, in his discussion of the functions of memory in ancient poetry, "la mémoire s'enracine dans le concret, dans l'espace, le geste, l'image et l'objet."⁷⁹

⁷⁵ For more detailed discussion of the poet's memory for the Catalogue, see Minchin (2001: 79-80, 84-87, along with accompanying notes and bibliography). The above paragraph is a short summary of that material.

⁷⁶ This, indeed, appears to happen in the Catalogue: the Cyclades are omitted, whether by accident or design.

⁷⁷ Harwood (1976: 795-96).

⁷⁸ Neisser (1989: 77).

⁷⁹ Calame (2006: 40).

Homer's reference to landscape serves a number of practical functions. Firstly, because the scene-changes we observe throughout the *Iliad* are regularly presented as a stereotypical action that requires one or two hexameter lines for the telling, we recognize that this formal device has a practical advantage: through its very predictability it allows the singer time to think ahead, to prepare for the next scene.⁸⁰ Secondly, as I have noted already, by specifying scene-changes the poet reduces potential for confusion, for himself and for his audience. What is more important is the point I made earlier in this paper, that these recurrent fixed locations appear to be a feature of a developed spatial memory system that assists the singer in a positive way, in *organizing the sequence* of his song and in *cueing the content* of each scene.

I therefore propose that the poet, by way of preparation for performance, had constructed in his mind's eye a pared-down and relatively stable spatial model along two axes of the world in which his story was to unfold; he could envisage the back and forward movement of the heroes as battle raged now closer to the citadel and now closer to the Achaian ships or the movement of the gods between the sea-depths and the peak of Olympos.⁸¹ He used the spatial configuration of his setting to generate the temporal sequence of events in his narrative, as Charlotte Linde has suggested. Each location that the poet calls up in memory and invokes in song in turn brings with it memories for events that happened at that location, as Neisser has described. As Hellwig notes, these settings are concrete.⁸² The poet, however, gives us little by way of description: this would be a distraction. The poet could, in his mind's eye, take Hektor into Troy in *Iliad* 6, describe his encounters as he moves around the city, now with his mother, now his brother and sister-in-law, now with his housekeeper at his own house, and, finally, moments be-

⁸⁰ From Table 1, for example, note the longer examples: 1. 306-07, 348-50, 359-60, 430-31, 484-87, 495-97, 531-33.

⁸¹ For evidence that the poet holds such a model in mind, see 10.414-17 (the reference to Ilos' tomb at 415). See also the commentary of Andersson (1976: 24), who, taking the point of view of the audience, points out indignantly that the poet has not previously located the tomb in the landscape. I argue, in the poet's defence, that until now it has not been necessary to reveal the location of the tomb to us; and that, furthermore, it is this kind of error on the part of the poet (who has, I grant, forgotten to share his knowledge with us on this point) that reveals to us what he has in his mind's eye. Working from this mind-based perspective, we must conclude that the poet has visualized in his mind's eye the (approximate) location of the tomb and its relation to the general layout of the plain from the ships to the walls of Troy.

⁸² Hellwig (1964: 38).

fore he goes out to the plain again, with Andromache at the Skaian Gates, between the security of home and the world of war. It is this location that prompts the poet's memory for their "last" conversation together. He could enter the citadel and locate Andromache at her loom in an inner room and cue the scene as she comes to recognize the truth of what has happened to Hektor (22.437-515). Alternatively he could send Priamos down to the store chamber to locate ransom gifts for his son and, against that backdrop, the poet can bring to mind, first, Priamos' words to his wife when he announces his intention to go to negotiate with Achilles, her attempt in reply to dissuade him, his firm response, and, then, his selection of the finest gifts in his possession as a ransom offering for his son (24.191-237). In turn, the poet's audience would construct a spatial model from the information he has given them in order to understand the text—just as Miller has proposed.⁸³ That is, the poet takes advantage of the natural capacity of the spatial system of memory (to follow a path through a landscape *and* to cue recall of associated information) to organize both the sequence and the content of his song. From necessity, he uses this resource far more intensively than we do. Thus it is no accident that traditional epic is characterized, as Rubin has noted, by the poet's insistence on movement from place to place; and it is no accident that the poets in this Homeric tradition themselves referred to the storyline of epic as Odysseus does at *Odyssey* 8.481, as an οἴμη—a song-path.⁸⁴

⁸³ Miller (1993: 358-63). The poet, I suggest, would have a clear perception of the setting for his tale (although I acknowledge that he is occasionally prone to inconsistency); his audience may well be less conscious of the precise details: as Miller (1993: 359) says in his report on his own experience of constructing a mental image of a descriptive passage, "the memory image remained vague in many respects."

⁸⁴ Cf. the "dreaming-tracks" or "songlines" of Australian Aborigines. In fact, such an emphasis on movement may also characterize other oral narrative genres, such as moralistic, didactic, or gnomic literature: see Becker (1989: 282, 296), where he describes the plot of the Aridharma story as a "series of monologues and dialogues connected by movements—goings and comings."

Table 1 *The physical moves of characters in Iliad I*

1.12	Chryses comes beside the fast ships (ὁ γὰρ ἤλθε).
1.34	Chryses went beside the sea beach (βῆ δ').
1.44	Apollo strides down along the pinnacles of Olympos (βῆ δέ).
1.57	The Achaians assemble in one place (ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο).
1.306-07	Achilleus goes back to the shelters and the ships (ἤϊε).
1.312	Agamemnon sends a boat to Chryse (ἀναβάντες ἐπέπλεον ὑγρά κέλευθα).
1.327	The heralds go to Achilleus: the route (τῶ δὲ ἀέκοντε βά-την).
1.347	The heralds return beside the ships (τῶ δ' αὐτίς ἴτην).
1.348-50	Achilleus sits alone on the beach (ἔζετο ... θῖν' ἔφ' ἄλός πολιῆς).
1.359-60	Thetis rises up from the depths to the beach and sits beside her son (καρπαλίμως δ' ἀνέδυσεν ... πάροισ' αὐτοῖο καθέζετο).
1.428	Thetis leaves Achilleus (ἀπεβήσεται).
1.430-31	Odysseus arrives at Chryse (εἰς Χρύσην ἴκανε).
1.478	The escort puts out to sea to return to the Achaian camp (ἀνάγοντο μετὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν).
1.484-87	The escort arrives back and pulls up the boat onto the beach (ἴκοντο ... νῆα ... ἐπ' ἠπείροιο ἔρυσσαν ... σκίδναντο).
1.494	All the gods come back to Olympos (πρὸς Ὀλυμπον ἴσαν θεοί).
1.495-97	Thetis rises up from the sea to Olympos (ἀνεδύσεται ... ἀνέβη).
1.531-32	Thetis returns from Olympos to the sea floor (εἰς ἄλα ἄλτο).
1.533	Zeus returns to his home on Olympos (Ζεὺς δὲ ἐὼν πρὸς δῶμα).

Table 2 *The physical moves of characters in Iliad 24*

24.1-2	The people scatter to their ships after the games (λαοὶ δὲ ... ἐσκίδναντ' ἰέναι).
24.11-12	Achilleus goes from his hut to the sea shore (ἀναστὰς ... δινεύεσκ').
24.14-17	Achilleus drags the body of Hektor around the tomb of Patroklos (τρὶς δ' ἐρύσας).
24.23	On Olympus: the gods feel pity for Hektor.
24.77-82	Iris leaves Olympus to take a message to Thetis (ᾧρτο δὲ Ἴρις).
24.95-97	Iris and Thetis leave the depths of the sea for Olympus (βῆ δ' ἰέναι).
24.100	Thetis arrives on Olympus and is seated (καθέζετο).
24.120-21	Thetis speeds down to her son, on the shore near Troy (βῆ δὲ ... ἀΐξασα).
24.159-60	Iris goes to Troy, to pass on Zeus' instructions to Priamos (ᾧρτο δὲ Ἴρις ἀελλόπος).
24.191	Priamos goes down to the storeroom of the palace (ἐς θάλαμον κατεβήσετο).
24.247	Priamos goes after the Trojan men with a stick (σκηπανίῳ διεπ' ἀνέρας).
24.323	Priamos leaves the palace forecourt with the ransom gifts for Achilleus (ἐκ δ' ἔλασε προθύροιο).
24.345-46	Hermes speeds down to intercept Priamos and his attendant (πέτετο κρατὺς Ἀργειφόντης ... αἴψα ... ἴκανε).
24.349-51	Priamos and Idaios stop their horses at the ford of the river (μέγα σῆμα παρέξ Ἴλοιο ἔλασσαν, στήσαν ...) Here they meet Hermes.
24.440-47	Hermes, in charge of the chariot and horses, drives to the fortifications and the ditch, brings sleep to the guards, and leads the chariot and the wagon inside the gates (ἀναΐξας ... ἴκοντο, ... ἐς δ' ἄγαγε ...).
24.468	Hermes departs for Olympus (ἀπέβη).
24.469-79	Priamos goes inside Achilleus' hut and supplicates the hero (ἐξ ἵππων ἄλτο ... ἰθὺς κίεν οἴκου, ... ἄγχι δ' ἄρα στάς).
24.572	Achilleus leaps for the door (ἄλτο θύραζε).
24.596-97	Achilleus returns to Priamos, inside (πάλιν ἦϊε).

- 24.673-74 Priamos and Idaios sleep in the porch (έν προδόμῳ δόμου ... κοιμήσαντο).
- 24.675 Achilles sleeps in a corner of his hut (εὔδε μυχῶ κλισίης).
- 24.682 Hermes stands at Priamos' head and rouses him (στῆ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς).
- 24.691 Hermes drives the horses through the army (ἔλαυνε κατὰ στρατόν).
- 24.692-94 At the ford Hermes departs for Olympos (ὅτε δὴ πόρον ἴξον ... Ἑρμείας ἀπέβη).
- 24.696 Priamos and Idaios drive to the city (ἐς ἄστυ ἔλῳν).
- 24.699-701 Cassandra goes to the heights of Ilion and sees her father and the herald returning, and her brother lying in the wagon (Κασσάνδρη ... Πέργαμον εἰσαναβᾶσα).
- 24.707-09 The people rush to the gates (οὐδέ τις ... λίπετ' ἀνὴρ ... ἀγχοῦ δὲ ξύμβληντο πυλάων).
- 24.719-20 Hektor's body is taken inside the palace and laid on a bier (εἰσάγαγον ... θέσαν).
- 24.782-84 Oxen and mules are gathered in front of the city and bring wood from the hills (πρὸ ἄστεος ἠγερέθοντο ... ἀγίνεον ἄσπετον ὕλην).
- 24.786-87 The body of Hektor is carried out to the pyre (ἐξέφερον ... ἐν δὲ πυρῇ ὑπάτη νεκρὸν θέσαν).
- 24.799 A mound is built (σῆμ' ἔχεαν).
- 24.801-03 The Trojans return to the city to feast (πάλιν κίον).

Table 3 *The setting of the Iliad, horizontal axis: from the city to the ships*¹

beach ships	shelters	Ach. wall	ditch & stakes	rise on plain	fig tree (?)	ford of Skamander	grave of Ilos	fig tree	oak tree	walls of Troy (and gates)
>	□	X	D							XXX
>	□	X	D							XXX
>	□	X	D							XXX
>	□	X	D	Y						XXX
>	□	X	D	Y	Υ			Υ		XXX
>	□	X	D	Y						XXX
>	□	X	D	Y					¥	XXX
>	□	X	D	Y		≅				XXX
>	□	X	D	Y						
>	□	X	D	Y				┬		
>	□	X	D	Y						XXX
>	□	X	D	Y						XXX
>	□	X	D	Y						XXX

¹ Adapted from Thornton (1984: 50): Chart of "movements" over the Trojan Plain. Sites such as the washing pools of 22, 147-57; Mt Ida; and Kallikolone (20.53 and 151) are not included. This chart gives a false indication of the fixity of landscape features. As my discussion indicates, certain landscape features (such as trees) have no certain location.

Bibliography

- Andersson, T. M. (1976). *Early Epic Scenery: Homer, Virgil, and the Mediaeval Legacy*. Ithaca and London: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Arend, W. (1933). *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Atwood, M. (2005). *The Penelopiad*. Edinburgh: Canongate.
- Austen, J. (1951). *Pride and Prejudice*. London: Macdonald.
- Becker, A. L. (1989). "Aridharma: Framing an Old Javanese Tale." In *Writing on the Tongue*, A. L. Becker, ed. Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia, Vol. 33: 281-320. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, Univ. of Michigan.
- Berndt, R. (1952). *Djanggalawul: An Aboriginal Religious Cult of North-Eastern Arnhem Land*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Calame, C. (2006). *Pratiques poétiques de la mémoire: représentations de l'espace-temps en Grèce ancienne*. Paris: Découverte.
- Chafe, W. (1990). "Some Things that Narratives Tell Us about the Mind." In *Narrative Thought and Narrative Language*, B. K. Britton and A. D. Pellegrini, eds.: 79-98. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cohen, G. (1996). *Memory in the Real World*, 2nd ed. Hove: Psychology Press.
- Cook, J. M. (1973). *The Troad: An Archaeological and Topographical Study*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Downs, R.M., and D. Stea (1977). *Maps in Minds: Reflections on Cognitive Mapping*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Edwards, M. (1991). *The Iliad: A Commentary*, Vol. 5. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Hainsworth, J. B. (1991). *The Idea of Epic*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Haley, N. (2002). *Ipakana Yakaiya: Mapping Landscapes, Mapping Lives (Contemporary Land Politics among the Duna)*. PhD diss., Australian National Univ., Canberra.
- Harwood, F. (1976). "Myth, Memory and Oral Tradition: Cicero in the Trobriands." *American Anthropologist* 78.4: 783-96.
- Hellwig, B. (1964). *Raum und Zeit im homerischen Epos*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Janko, R. (1992). *The Iliad: A Commentary*, Vol 4. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Kirk, G. S. (1985). *The Iliad: A Commentary*, Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Kirk, G. S. (1990). *The Iliad: A Commentary*, Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Knapp, P.-A. (1979). "Cognitive Mapping: A Cross-Cultural Perspective." Honours thesis, Australian National Univ., Canberra.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.
- Linde, C. (1981). "The Organization of Discourse." In *Style and Variables in English*, T. Shopen and J. M. Williams, eds.: 84-114. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

- McInerney, J. (2006). *The Good Life: A Novel*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Miller, G. (1956). "The Magical Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two: Some Limits on Our Capacity for Processing Information." *Psychological Review* 63.2: 81-97.
- Miller, G. (1993). "Images and Models, Similes and Metaphors." In *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., A. Ortony, ed.: 357-400. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Minchin, E. (2001). *Homer and the Resources of Memory: Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Neisser, U. (1989). "Domains of Memory." In *Memory: Interdisciplinary Approaches*, P. R. Solomon, G. R. Goethals, C. M. Kelley, and B. R. Stephens, eds.: 67-83. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Reece, S. (1993). *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
- Richardson, S. (1990). *The Homeric Narrator*. Nashville: Vanderbilt Univ. Press.
- Rose, C. B. (1998). "Troy and the Historical Imagination." *CW* 91.5: 405-13.
- Rothkopf, E. Z., D. G. Fisher, and M. J. Billington (1982). "Effects of Spatial Context During Acquisition on the Recall of Attributive Information." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 8.2: 126-38.
- Rubin, D. (1995). *Memory in Oral Traditions: The Cognitive Psychology of Epic, Ballads, and Counting-out Rhymes*. New York and Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Sale, W. M. (1987). "The Formularity of the Place Phrases of the *Iliad*." *TAPhA* 117: 21-50.
- Small, J. P. (1997). *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sorabji, R. (1972). *Aristotle on Memory*. London: Duckworth.
- Taylor, H., and B. Tversky (1992). "Spatial Mental Models Derived from Survey and Route Descriptions." *Journal of Memory and Language* 31.2: 261-92.
- Thornton, A. (1984). *Homer's Iliad: Its Composition and the Motif of Supplication*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Toner, P. (2005). "Tropes of Longing and Belonging: Nostalgia and Musical Instruments in Northeast Arnhem Land." *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 37: 1-24.
- Toohey, P. (1992). *Reading Epic: An Introduction to the Ancient Narratives*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Underwood, B. (1969). "Attributes of Memory." *Psychological Review* 76.6: 559-73.
- Winograd, E., and V. Church (1988). "Role of Spatial Location in Learning Face-Name Associations." *Memory and Cognition* 16.1: 1-7.
- Yates, F. (1966). *The Art of Memory*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

CHAPTER TWO

MEMORY AND VISUALIZATION IN HOMERIC DISCOURSE MARKERS ¹

ANNA BONIFAZI

In everyday language we use adverbs and adverbials that are not relevant to the concepts we are expressing, but rather to the underlying manner of communication. The difference is exemplified by the following uses of the same adverb, “sadly.”²

1a John looked *sadly* at the mess his dog had made.

1b *Sadly*, John’s mother died last night.

In statement 1a “sadly” contributes to the conceptual content of the proposition by expressing the fact that John was not happy about the mess caused by his dog. Conversely, in statement 1b the same adverb is a sentence adverbial that conveys the speaker’s attitude towards the proposition that John’s mother died the night before the time of utterance; in fact it could be substituted by a sad tone of voice. There are two levels at which the meaning of words can be considered, namely the propositional and the pragmatic. The former relates to the (strictly semantic) concepts of a sentence, whereas the latter relates to the context underlying the utterance of a sentence. Some pragmatic meanings specifically deal with procedures, that is, how to process the utterance itself. The meaning of sentence adverbials that cue how to process the utterance containing them is called “procedural meaning.”³ Here is an example that illustrates the difference between propositional meaning and pragmatic procedural meaning (hereafter, procedural meaning):⁴

¹ The research related to this topic is supported by the European Commission through a Marie Curie Outgoing International Fellowship (MOIF-CT-2005, contract n. 8030; PRAGL “Pragmatics of Archaic Greek Literature”). I wish to express my gratitude to the editor of this volume.

² From Bezuidenhout (2004: 102).

³ On the notion of “procedural meaning” see in particular Rouchota (1998).

⁴ From Van Dijk (1979: 453).

- 2a I was sick, *so* I stayed in bed.
 2b John is sick. *So*, let's start.

While the function of “so” in statement 2a is connecting two states of affairs (that is, being sick and staying in bed) by expressing a causal relation, the function of “so” in statement 2b is to mark the fact that the properties of the communicative context allow the chairman of the meeting (the presumable speaker here) to perform the next speech act (“let’s start”). A very important feature that characterizes both “sadly” in 1b and “so” in 2b is that they are sentence initial adverbs, and they are marked by intonation—that is, their utterance includes a higher pitch level and a longer pause before and after; by contrast, “sadly” in 1a and “so” in 2a include a lower pitch level and no pause at all (the reader is invited to verify this by uttering aloud all the four examples). The adverbs, adverbials, and other lexical phrases that typically signal either where the discourse is going or where it comes from (for instance in English “to begin with,” “what else?” and certain uses of “anyway”) are called in pragmatics “discourse markers.”⁵ As Lenk asserts, “one of the most prominent functions of discourse markers is to signal the kind of relations a speaker perceives between different parts of the discourse.”⁶

The first goal of the present work is to show that Homeric language includes several discourse markers. They behave in epic diction exactly as in everyday language, but before demonstrating this and indicating their epic behaviour it is worth clarifying the relationship between the modern notion of discourse markers and the modern notion of ancient Greek particles. “Particle” is a tricky term since there is no complete overlap between different definitions of “particle” both diachronically and synchronically (let us think of the ancient grammarians’ notion of

⁵ On discourse markers forming a separate tone group, see Schiffrin (1987: 328) and Brinton (1996: 33).

⁶ Lenk (1997: 1). I adopt here the view that “discourse marker” as a term refers to this relatively narrow group of words and phrases that do not contribute to the propositional content of an utterance, whereas the much larger group of words and phrases that do not contribute to the propositional content of an utterance at different levels—not only at the mainly procedural one but also at the mainly interpersonal one (such as, for example, in the case of English “you know,” or “I mean,” or “oh!”)—is identified as “pragmatic markers.” I am saying “mainly procedural” and “mainly interpersonal” because very often there are no clear-cut boundaries, as literature on the topic shows. By contrast, according to a different view “discourse marker” is directly the label for the latter group (which means it includes all the levels of non-propositional meaning). A work representing the former view is Lenk (1998); a work representing the latter is Jucker and Ziv (1998). For a problematizing introduction to pragmatic markers, see Brinton (1996).

particula and of the German model adopted by contemporary linguists focusing on “scope particles” and “modal particles”). For scholars of ancient Greek language Denniston’s volume (*The Greek Particles*, whose first edition dates back to 1934) is certainly a landmark, but the well-known limitations of its theoretical framework and the textual analysis that it offers would suggest that a clearer assessment of the communicative functions and verbal features of ancient Greek “particles” is needed.⁷ If we drop the negative definitions of particles as non-adverbs, non-subordinating conjunctions and if, conversely, we adopt a positive perspective, it can be said that ancient Greek particles mostly have a pragmatic meaning, which is concerned with interpersonal, procedural, and a mix of interpersonal and procedural aspects of verbal communication. Instances of mostly interpersonal ancient Greek particles are τοι and ἤ; instances of mostly procedural particles are δέ and γάρ; instances of a mix of the two are ἄρα and γε. For the purpose of this paper, ancient Greek discourse markers are focused on the procedural meaning; thus, they include not only particles that mostly have a procedural meaning, but also other adverbs and adverbials that arguably can have a procedural meaning. Since a major feature of discourse markers is the sentence initial position, ancient Greek discourse markers will be identified within the particles, adverbs, and adverbials that are sentence initial.⁸

Up to this point I have introduced the notion of discourse markers (that is, different lexical items whose pragmatic function is to signal the relation the speaker perceives between different parts of the discourse); I have also anticipated the first part of the argument of this paper, according to which Homeric language includes discourse markers; finally, I have outlined the overlap and the non-overlap between discourse mark-

⁷ The volume by Sicking and Ophuijsen (1993) and the anthology of papers edited by Rijksbaron (1997) represent an important step in this direction. On the ancient notion of *particula* see Schenkeveld (1988).

⁸ By sentence initial position in Homeric diction I mean the first block of words in a main clause, independent of the arbitrary punctuation that precedes them (comma, semicolon or period). The discourse markers in the form of enclitic particles (such as δ’) that occupy the so-called “second position” (Wackernagel’s law) represent an interesting case. The phenomenon of clitics in second position has recently been re-interpreted in terms of intonational relevance: despite their syntactic irrelevance, they play an important role at the prosodic level (which may be connected in turn with their pragmatic role); see Fraser (2001) and Taylor (1996). Under this perspective clitics belong to the sentence initial group of words, in terms of intonational, prosodic and pragmatic relevance.

ers and particles, which can be summarized as follows: some particles can be considered as discourse markers to the extent that they convey a procedural meaning, but discourse markers include also adverbs and adverbials that are not (considered as) particles. In the next section I shall anchor the notion of discourse markers to the idea of Homeric poetry as discourse. This has been variously observed in a number of scholarly publications; I shall present a selective summary overview in order to focus on the level of poetic communication that does not tell us what is said, but rather what is performed by saying.

Homeric discourse

“Discourse” means the dynamic process of meaning negotiation—which implies intentionality and contextual connections, whereas text is the product of such a process. In sum, discourse refers to the manner of communication.⁹ Discourse can occur both in spoken and in written mode; thus, the label “discourse” does not imply any exclusive association with oral means of communication, but it simply identifies the level at which communication is produced, that is, the negotiation of meaning between the participants in the act of communication. Discourse analysis includes the analysis of written means of communication as well, in that “written text is a solidified form of discourse.”¹⁰ The written texts we have of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* can therefore be analysed as solidified forms of discourse. Of course Homeric poetry is a special discourse, or better, to use Nagy’s terminology, it is a special mode of discourse: that is, epic. Epic discourse is a dynamic process of meaning negotiation between the poet and the audience during the performance. On the basis of the linguistic analysis of the *Iliad* and of the *Odyssey* several points that directly or indirectly support this view have already been made elsewhere; I simply summarize some of them here.

First of all, the Homeric poems show evidence of macro as well as micro indications of the narrator’s “presence.” The Homeric narrator is seen by Richardson as a “metacharacter who plays his role not on the level of the story but on the level of the discourse, the telling of the

⁹ “Discourse is a process of interpretation through which intentionality is recognized and a contextual connection is activated”; it is “the pragmatic process of meaning negotiation. Text is its product.” Widdowson (1995: 164).

¹⁰ Lenk (1998: 15 n.1).

story”;¹¹ he is present through summaries, informational pauses, the treatment of speeches, and the manipulation of time, for instance. Irene de Jong identifies 10 categories of subjective elements such as judgments, apostrophes, and “I” statements, which make the Homeric poet a “primary focalizer.”¹² Thus, the meaning negotiation between “Homer” and the audience is first framed within the metanarrative acts of the performer.¹³

Narrative continuity in the Homeric poems is another effect of the narrator’s “presence,” at the propositional level (the content requiring subsequent actions) as well as at the pragmatic level (the context requiring performative procedures for accomplishment).¹⁴ So far, the former level has been investigated much more than the latter.

Another aspect revealing the dimension of the negotiation of meaning between performers and audiences is what I call the “mirroring stage.” Some character’s speeches (on the stage) mirror the performer’s speeches, as Martin (1989) has argued; the internal audience mirrors the external one, as Frontisi-Ducroux (1986 and 1995), among many others, has shown. Information about speech modalities and about reactions to speech within the Homeric “stage” reveals the extent to which inferences on meanings and on intentions intrinsically result from a substantial cooperation and co-production of sense between speakers and listeners.

Using irony, foreshadowing, and giving misdirections¹⁵ constitute some strategies used by the performer in order to highlight the omniscience of the audience, that is, its knowledge of the “total and continu-

¹¹ Richardson (1990: 2). On the structuralist distinction between story and discourse, see Richardson (1990: 3): “Each narrative has two parts: a story (*histoire*), the content or chain of events [...] and a discourse (*discurs*), that is, the expression, the means by which the content is communicated.” The narrator is the link between story and discourse.

¹² Jong (1987: 18-20, and 32).

¹³ On the notion of performative dynamic of narrative and on metanarrative indications by storytellers, see Bauman (1986: 98-100).

¹⁴ Already Bassett (2003: 42), writing originally in 1938, had emphasized: “From the beginning to the end of either poem there is no diaeresis in the poem.” In order to point out anomalous abrupt discontinuities in some *incipit* instances in respect of the end of the preceding book (for example, change of time, of location, and of characters simultaneously), Heiden (2000) surveys some customary elements of narrative continuity and lists literature on the topic. Both the cited works refer just to the propositional level of Homeric continuity.

¹⁵ Seminal works on these topics are respectively Dekker (1965), Duckworth (1933) and Morrison (1992).

ous narration.”¹⁶ Saying something that conflicts with the reality of the events, saying in advance (more or less clearly) what is going to happen, and saying that something is going to happen when this actually will not be the case—all of this requires that the audience fill the gaps, and at the same time it suggests a kind of *τέρψις*, “enjoyment by attending a poetic performance,” that is exclusively pertinent to the audience. That is why I consider this as further evidence of the meaning negotiation conducted during the performance.

A strategy that is very much related to this is represented by the syntactic ellipses that from time to time occur in the Homeric texts (for example, suspended protases without any apodoses). Boegehold (1999) argues that this is a typical case where gestures were expected as non-verbal fulfilment of the conditional sentence. In other words, one may consider syntactic ellipsis as evidence of the extent to which paralinguistic and extralinguistic communication (such as prosodic variations, gestures, and facial expressions) must have been a structurally relevant part of Homeric performance and of Homeric meaning negotiation.

The last points more specifically concern meaning negotiation as a process. They are summarized in two related concepts that are crucial for the contemporary understanding of Homeric performances, namely “re-enactment” and “immediacy.” From the work of Nagy and of Bakker, the term “re-enactment” reminds us that Homeric epic re-enacts what is performed, the narrated events are re-happening during the performance;¹⁷ from Bakker,¹⁸ “immediacy” indicates that in a psychological-cognitive perspective Homeric epic reveals “the coincidence of perceiving and speaking.”¹⁹ Bakker’s research is particularly devoted to Homeric poetry as discourse.²⁰ In summary, this short collection of points about Homeric discourse in terms of meaning negotiation seems to confirm what Fraccaroli (1903) was stating a long time ago: the only

¹⁶ Nagy (1999: xvii).

¹⁷ Nagy (1990); Bakker (1993a) and (1993b).

¹⁸ Bakker (1997) and (2005).

¹⁹ Bakker (2005: 94). Bakker (2005: 97-100) identifies some linguistic traces of immediacy in Homeric ἄρα, δῆ, μέλλειν and in the augmented aorists. All of these show a clear connection with visual imagery; they can be characterized as pragmatic markers visually oriented. In this sense Bakker’s study precedes the present work.

²⁰ A basic assumption of Bakker (1997: 17) is that Homeric poetry “can be said to stylize ordinary discourse.” Some years before, Devine and Stephens (1993: 400) were remarking: “we need to bear in mind that verse is not the creation of patterns out of language but a regularization of the patterns in language.”

real and permanent relationship in Homer is that between the poet and the audience.

Memory and visualization

The extensive role of memory in Homeric performances ranges from the ultimate source of the matter that is going to be told (the muse enhances the activation of the memory of what cannot be forgotten—ἀ-ληθές) to the cognitive scripts that guide the performer as he unfolds the narrative sequence of events.²¹ Memory is also precisely what allows the participants in the performance to visualize the narrated events, and in reverse, visualizing supports memory tasks.²² Since remembering (μιμνήσκεσθαι) in archaic Greek thought is equivalent to making the past present in the *hic et nunc* of the act of remembering,²³ a significant cognitive part of remembering deals with the way in which characters, details, scenes, and moves are introduced not only “on the stage” but also to the mind of the performer on the one hand, and to the attention of the listeners on the other. Of course, there is already much scholarly discussion about the visual relevance of Homeric narrative in respect of different aspects of Homeric reception. Here I summarize those aspects that better introduce the central thesis of this work, which is that the narrative function of some Homeric discourse markers corresponds to a visual function as well.

The visual relevance of what is narrated emerges primarily from the visual activities and the visual signs contained in the narration itself. Besides the innumerable *verba videndi* used to express eye-witness accounts, recognition, and the realization of something by the internal characters, a typical sign of super-human qualities (either divine or heroic) is a visual one, namely radiance; Homeric diction exploits several terms to indicate the special light, brightness or splendour—a sacred

²¹ On Homeric scripts and memory constraints, see Minchin (2001: 39-61).

²² “Imagery aids memory” is Rubin’s motto (1995: 46-48).

²³ Cf. Vernant (1985: 116) “De ces époques révolues le poète a une expérience immédiate. Il connaît le passé parce qu’il a le pouvoir d’être présent au passé. Se souvenir, savoir, voir, autant de termes qui s’équivalent.” And also: “Quelle est alors la fonction de la mémoire? Elle ne reconstruit pas le temps; elle ne l’abolit pas non plus. En faisant tomber la barrière qui sépare le présent du passé, elle jette un pont entre le monde des vivants et cet au-delà auquel retourne tout ce qui a quitté la lumière du soleil.”

one—that emanates from the protagonists of the narrated events.²⁴ The *teichoskopia* of *Iliad* 3 (161-244) represents another means of conveying the powerfulness of visualization: narrating what Priamos and Helene see from the Trojan wall on the battlefield reveals a deliberate intention by the performer to share what is seen with the audience; each member of the audience is in turn engaged in visualizing the same in his mind's eye. A further example that testifies to the visual relevance of what happens within the plot is the “flashbulb memory” activated in Eurykleia's mind as she recognizes Odysseus' scar (*Od.* 19.467-72). “Flashbulb memory” indicates in cognitive psychology the particularly strong visual memories created by attendance at a special event. Scodel (2002) borrows this term in order to qualify Eurykleia's experience and connects that to the required ability adequately to codify certain signs as they appear. I add that Eurykleia's experience is in fact the mirror of the audience's experience to the extent that the audience is also required to be able adequately to codify the verbal and non-verbal evidence of Odysseus' identity throughout the second half of the poem.

The latter point relates to a second set of elements concerning the visual relevance of Homeric poetry. Besides the visual activities of the internal characters, the performer indirectly—or metalinguistically—tells us about the visual activities of himself and of the audience as he unfolds the narrative sequences; in other words, the performer shows through his narrative technique how to process the narrative itself visually (details about combats, descriptions of objects, and similes are typical features that are highly informative in this respect). Literature on Homer has already identified some examples of what I would define as aspects of visual processing.²⁵

Andersson (1976) identifies some characteristics of Homeric scenery. The *Iliad* in particular shows that spatial relations are blurred, locations are often uncertain, “exact arrangements are elusive.” He states “there is no effort to chart positions and events,” and explains that “far from un-

²⁴ Emblematic is the σέλας blazing from Achilles at *Il.* 18.214; see also *Il.* 8.76 and 509; 15.600; 19.17, 366, 374, 375 and 379. See also Scarry (1999: 83) on the Homeric “mental practice of radiant ignition”; the importance of shining in eye contact between characters is the basis of the hot controversy about *Il.* 1.200, on which see most recently Turkeltaub (2005).

²⁵ On the similar mechanisms underlying actual vision and visual imagery, see Kosslyn (1995) and Collins (1991). The main purposes of visual imagery that are parallel to those of vision are “identifying properties of imaged objects” since we retrieve information about real objects from memory, and “projecting an object's trajectory” since in vision we track moving objects: See Kosslyn (1995: 268).

dertaking an evenly conceived or uniform narrative canvas, Homer limits himself to a blurred sweep of battlescape in which a few figures here and there are dilated and brought into focus.” There are just a few landmarks—such as, for example, the Skamander or the tomb of Ilos—and the human component is somehow isolated.²⁶ The *Odyssey* shows a different design, but it offers “spatial anomalies” and “indifference to scenery” as well. Generally speaking, “the perspective is psychological and not scenic”: “it is primarily a state of mind that is illuminated by the description.” On the one hand this insight accounts for the tendency to narrow the visual field and to focus on a single item in the receiver’s mind; on the other hand, it accounts for the importance of symbolism in the scenic technique.²⁷ Beyond the reception of Homeric texts, contemporary cognitive psychology confirms that spatial imagination in reading is piecemeal, and it involves only what it is cognitively relevant to know and “see.” When we read we do not construct a global cognitive map—that is, a model of spatial relations—, but “we construct the story scene by scene, as a series of camera shots or fields of vision.” We form “individual images of strategic locations, but we are usually unable to locate these sites with respect to each other;” we just need some landmarks that allow for orienting our minds’ eye in a schematic way; “we construct mental models of narrative space only as far as we find a cognitive advantage in this activity—only as far as is needed to achieve immersion in the textual world.”²⁸

The cognitive convenience of the articulation of Homeric discourse in general framings and in the addition of details is the core of what Bakker calls the “syntax of movement.”²⁹ The epic performer tends to present first a preview of events, or “framing”³⁰ which close-ups—for example on single characters—together with the addition of details may follow. The frequent shifts between different levels of visualization, from vague hints at the surrounding actions to very detailed accounts of

²⁶ See Andersson (1976: 15-52); see pp. 16, 23 and 32 respectively, for the quotations.

²⁷ See Andersson (1976: 37, 50 and 44 respectively, for the quotations). The cognitive analysis by Minchin (Ch. 1 of this volume) of the Homeric enactment of spatial memory and of the symbolism of relatively few landmarks notably matches Andersson’s remarks.

²⁸ See Ryan (2003: 235, 236 and 238 respectively, for the quotations).

²⁹ Bakker (1997: 54).

³⁰ Framing is “the demarcation of a frame limiting one’s field of vision for the next moments or speech units, the area within which addition of detail can meaningfully take place” (Bakker 1997: 89).

items, from macro to micro descriptions of movements—all of this keeps the cognitive (visual) involvement of the receiver quite intense. Neuro-scientists say that when a stimulus sequence directs subjects to plan and to execute shifts along a certain path we have an “attentional shift.”³¹ Attentional shifts may or may not include eye movements. I anticipate here that the shifts in Homeric visualizations arguably imply attentional shifts including mind’s eye movements, and, more importantly, these shifts are usually enhanced by the utterance of certain adverbs or particles. The next section will be entirely devoted to this matter.

A further aspect of visual processing in Homer is specifically related to memory constraints. Minchin (2001) argues that the descriptive segments in the epic poems are strongly related to the processes of memory—which “monitor and organize the sequential flow of the narrative itself.” She shows that descriptions of objects or lists of items are connected with “procedural formats” that transcend possibly naturalistic ways of description and make them more abstract. These formats supply “cues which lead the poet to a relatively narrow range of ideas, for which he can then seek the words and phrases he needs.”³² Thus it can be said that the performer describes what he “re-sees” in the *hic et nunc* of the performance by following the procedural formats he has in his mind on the one hand, and on the other by adopting the “syntax of movement” that allows him to keep the attention-level of his listeners as high as possible. These cognitive strategies are part of the basic and crucial act of remembering, as the performer re-enacts the mythical past and makes it eternal.

A very recent and most relevant contribution to visual processing in Homer by de Jong and Nünlist regards the spatial standpoint of the narrator. The authors identify a relatively restricted number of standpoints that characterize Homeric epic, which are based on three important criteria: the “relative distance between the narrator and the events described;” whether the standpoint of the narrator is “identical with that of a character [...] or is it not”; and finally, whether the spatial standpoint

³¹ “The flexibility of our attentional systems depends not only on the ability to attend to specific source of information but also on the ability to shift attention between those sources.” See Hazlett and Woldorff (2004: 742-743, also for the quotations).

³² Minchin (2001: 20 and 131 respectively for the quotations).

is “relatively fixed or constantly shifting.”³³ Specific points of this work will be picked up in sections that follow.

All that has been stated up to now concerns the visual relevance of the within-the-story actions and of the performative strategies used to re-enact those actions. The final element deals with literary accounts regarding different historical phases of the reception of Homeric performances. Nagy (forthcoming) points out a strikingly consistent designation of the reception of Homeric poetry in the traditions of the “Lives of Homer” (in particular in the Herodotean life and in the *Certamen*). The lexicon monophonically summarizes that experience as an exclusively visual one: those who attend Homeric performances are *thau-mastai*; attending them is *thaumazein*; the performance itself is called *thauma*. On the whole, the Homeric poetry seems to exhibit different techniques for letting the external audience maximize the *terpsis* of several forms of visualization.

*The central thesis: memory and visualization in
Homeric au- discourse markers*

The previous sections constitute the premises to the central thesis, which considers the existence as well as the functions of some discourse markers in Homer. Let us first discuss their existence in Homer. Homeric poetry can be analysed as (stylized) discourse, in that it shows several aspects of meaning negotiation between the performer and the audience. Since meaning negotiation is a process, the verbal part of the performance has to communicate to the receiver not only concepts but also procedures. In other words, the performer linguistically introduces not only propositions but also signs and signposts for the comprehension of meaning by the receiver. These signs and signposts have a pragmatic function. The linguistic markers that specifically refer to the relation perceived by the speaker between different parts of the discourse (where the discourse comes from and where the discourse is going) are labelled

³³ Jong and Nünlist (2004: 64). The identified standpoints as far as Homeric epic is concerned are (pp. 67-72): “panoramic standpoint”; “scenic standpoint, non-actorial, fixed”; “scenic standpoint, non-actorial, shifting”; “scenic standpoint, actorial, shifting”; “scenic standpoint, fixed on one character, actorial”; “scenic standpoint, fixed on one character, alternating between non-actorial and actorial”; “close-up.” “Scenic” equals “within the scene.” However, except for a brief mention of the “*protos*-formula” and of the adverb *entha*, (pp. 76 and 78) the analysis does not discuss specific words that enhance such standpoints.

“discourse markers.” Homeric texts do display discourse markers, such as, for example, *δέ* and *γάρ*, which are unspecific signposts for the introduction of any new (or different) discourse act (*δέ*), and specific signposts indicating why the immediately preceding discourse act has been performed (*γάρ*).³⁴ The number of occurrences of these two discourse markers is very high, and several scholars have already indicated some features regarding their pragmatic and narrative function;³⁵ here I simply point out to what their discourse marker function relates, before proceeding to a more detailed analysis of a specific group of adverbs and particles. An instance of *δέ* as discourse marker that introduces a different discourse act is offered by *Il.* 1.3-4:

... αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν
οἰωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι, Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή ...

... but [Achilleus' anger] gave their bodies to be the delicate feasting
of dogs, of all birds; the will of Zeus was accomplished ...³⁶

The discourse act of visualizing an emotionally crucial detail about the bodies of the dead Achaian heroes as prey for dogs and birds is followed by a different discourse act, by which the performer comments that in this way Zeus' will will reach its fulfilment. An instance of *γάρ* as a discourse marker that explains why the previous act has been performed is offered by *Od.* 1.6-7:

ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὧς ἐτάρους ἐρρύσατο, ἰέμενός περ·
αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρησιν ἀτασθαλίησιν ὄλοντο ...

Even so he could not save his companions, hard though
he strove to; they were destroyed by their own wild recklessness ...

Here *γάρ* does not equate to the English *because* that expresses a causal link between two states of affairs (as in “I stayed in bed because I was sick”); it rather equates to *because* in the sense of explaining or justifying why the whole preceding discourse act has been performed (as in “Where can I find the best restaurant in town? Because you're the great-

³⁴ By discourse act I mean the smallest unit of communicative behaviour, after Hannay and Kroon (2005: 95): each act denotes “each single step which language producers take in order to achieve their communicative aims.”

³⁵ Cf. in particular Bakker (1993c) and Race (2000) about *δέ*, and Jong (1997) about *γάρ* in Homer.

³⁶ All translations of the Homeric passages are adapted from Lattimore (1951 and 1967).

est gourmet I know”³⁷). The primary speaking “I” indicates how to process the utterance “Odysseus was not able to rescue his companions.” γάρ is for “Why I am saying that? Because [you have to know that].” Then he goes on: “it was for their own wantonness that they died.” Thus γάρ is the linguistic trace of an important communicative act, which is to signal to the participants in the performance the relation between the previous and the upcoming act of the discourse, which shows discontinuity and coherence at the same time.

The discourse markers I focus on more extensively in this paper are αὔ, αὔτε, αὐτάρ, αὔτις, αὐτίκα, and αὐτοῦ. There are essentially two reasons for choosing this group of particles and adverbs. First, some of them exclusively work as discourse markers; and some of them work sometimes as propositional adverbs, sometimes as discourse markers. These differences in use are arguably the cause of several misunderstandings, and are the origin of the “empirical” difficulty in translating them; but they are also a valuable resource in that they allow for identifying much more clearly what it is that characterizes discourse markers as opposed to propositional adverbs in terms of sentence position and meaning. The second reason is that they supposedly share the same etymology, that is, IE **au-*. This fact sheds light not only on understated aspects of Homeric αὐτός, but also on the visual side of their functions.

It must be emphasized that the central thesis of this study regards the existence as well as the functions of some discourse markers in Homer. Their existence has been discussed. Let us now discuss their functions. αὔ, αὔτε, αὐτάρ, αὔτις, αὐτίκα, and αὐτοῦ have specific narrative functions to the extent that they are employed as discourse markers, and these narrative functions correspond to visual functions as well. These words in most of their uses give a procedural sense to what is going on at the level of performance, but they also provide a visual sense. The visual contribution can be summarized as follows: as the narrative unfolds, visual shifts are suggested that permit the mind’s eye of the audience to focus conveniently on different targets through the same source, which is the voice of the performer. The adverb “conveniently” suggests that some cognitive advantages can come from this activity for the par-

³⁷ See Kroon (1995: 16). An early discussion about the different communicative functions of English *because* is in Schiffrin (1987: 195-202). If read aloud, the two quoted *because* examples differ also in intonation: the latter is intonationally marked, whereas the former is not.

ticipants in the performance, and these should emerge in the textual analysis.³⁸

Four different types of visual shifts enhanced by the discourse markers under discussion can be identified, namely long shot shifts, mid shot and close-up shifts, zooms in, and flashes. The film terminology is consistent with what Minchin (2001) and Bakker (1997 and 2005) propose: that is, Homeric epic can be seen as a cinema running in the poet's mind. Long shots technically concern a setting in which the upcoming action is about to occur, typically at the beginning of a new narrative sequence; a typical Homeric wording for this is αὐτάρ ἐπεί. Middle-distance shots along with close-ups draw the receivers' attention to particular subjects; they share a specific visual shift, which is between an item and its parallel focus; typical wordings for these are τόν δ' αὖ and δεύτερον αὖτε. "Zooming in" stands for the isolation of an absolute focus; a typical wording for this is αὐτάρ + name (αὐτάρ Ὀδυσσεύς, αὐτάρ Ἀχιλλεύς). Finally, "flashes" refer to a different kind of visual discontinuity, that is, between an ordinary and a crucial instant of the narration; typical wordings are νῦν (δ') αὖ and αὐτίκα δ' ἔγνων. It is important to keep in mind that the same discourse marker can have different visual functions and the same function can be accomplished by more than one discourse marker; for example, αὐτάρ can introduce a long shot shift but also it can zoom in; flashes can be marked by means of αὖ as well as by means of αὐτίκα.

Long (or establishing) shot shifts

αὐτάρ is a discourse marker primarily involved with the beginning of new narrative sections. This basic function is so important in the flow of Homeric narration that it can even mark the beginning of entire embedded stories or songs (as at *Od.* 3.130, where Nestor by means of αὐτάρ starts his *nostos* song about the bitter homecoming of the Achaians back from Troy, and as at *Od.* 8.517, where the episode is added about Odysseus at Deiphobos' house after emerging from the wooden horse).³⁹ It

³⁸ I draw a connection between these cognitive advantages and the "smooth" character of Homeric transitions which Jong and Nünlist discuss (2004: 73): "The unmitigated clash of two unrelated scenes is comparatively rare: smooth transitions from one scene to the next are the general rule." Discourse markers arguably grammaticize this smoothness.

³⁹ αὐτάρ is also the *incipit* of several books (*Il.* 3 and 15; *Od.* 11, 12, 14, 20 and 22).

typically establishes a new setting, that is, a series of related actions that do not share with the previous setting either the time, or the place, or both time and place.⁴⁰ Very often the gap between the two settings is temporal, and this is made verbally explicit by the occurrence of ἐπεὶ or ἔπειτα after αὐτάρ.⁴¹ However, αὐτάρ does not have the function of reinforcing the temporal gap as we are led to infer by the usual plain translations of “then” for αὐτάρ ἔπειτα; conversely, it conveys a performative break that coincides with the suggestion of a visual shift—by the mind’s eye, of course—that is at that moment needed by the receivers. All of this can be exemplified by the following passage (*Od.* 8.54-6):

... ἀνὰ δ' ἰστία λευκὰ πέτασσαν.
 ὑποῦ δ' ἐν νοτίῳ τήν γ' ὄρμισαν· αὐτάρ ἔπειτα
 βάν ῥ' ἴμεν Ἀλκινόοιο δαΐφρονος ἐς μέγα δῶμα.

... and [the fifty-two young men] hoisted the white sails and set them,
 and they anchored her deep enough in the channel. So, after that
 they made their way to the great house of wise Alkinoös.

The speaker (the performer in this case) helps the audience visually to shift from the harbour where the Phaiakian young men are finishing equipping the ship to carry Odysseus home to the road leading to Alkinoös’ palace, which will be the physical setting for what will happen in the next 50 lines. The fifty-two young men are the same subjects in both places, but the performer and the listeners mentally shift from one setting to a different one. This is the procedural meaning of αὐτάρ in this case.⁴² It is important to notice that αὐτάρ occurs immediately after the bucolic caesura: that is, it introduces the so-called bucolic anticipation.⁴³ This fits with the hypothesis of an intonational pause preceding it; the break is performative not only because it regards the narrative articula-

⁴⁰ Jong and Nünlist (2004: 69) state that the Homeric panoramic standpoint—which roughly corresponds to long shots in the current work—“functions as a starting point and/or as an end point.”

⁴¹ About one third of the occurrences of αὐτάρ in the *Odyssey* are like this; the same holds for the *Iliad*.

⁴² αὐτάρ introduces a new setting that is meant to be the only one for a long part of the subsequent narration at the very beginning of *Od.* 14 (αὐτάρ ὁ ἐκ λιμένος προσέβη τρηχίαν ἀταρπὸν / χῶρον ἀν' ὑλήεντα δι' ἄκριας). The close of book 13 concerns Athene, who decides to go to Sparta to reach Telemachos. Since the two (Odysseus and Athene) at the end of book 13 are supposed to be on the same Ithakan shore, the visual shift conveyed by αὐτάρ is particularly clear.

⁴³ On the concept of bucolic anticipation and its strict relation to *enjambements* (called runovers), see in particular Clark (1997).

tion of the performance but also because it regards the physical articulation of the utterance (one may think of a special pitch in the voice, or a deep breath before, or a specific gesture, or a specific facial expression; I remind the reader of the sentence “So, let’s start”). It can be argued that this feature could represent a major distinction between the discourse marker αὐτάρ and the discourse marker δέ.

There is in addition to the shift another metanarrative phenomenon underlying the use of αὐτάρ at *Od.* 8.55, in that by this means the speaker shows that it is he who has control of the cohesion between the different sections; he it is who handles the different threads of the story. From now on I shall refer to this phenomenon as performative continuity. Richardson in his book *The Homeric Narrator* includes scene changes among the abilities shown by the narrator who weaves his song by means of logical transitions.⁴⁴ I add that αὐτάρ is one of the linguistic traces of that.

What happens when αὐτάρ is associated with a temporal gap (that is, when it occurs together with ἐπεὶ or ἔπειτα) without any change of place? In what does the visual shift consists, in that case? Let us consider *Il.* 9.211-2:

πῦρ δὲ Μενoitιάδης δαΐεν μέγα, ισόθεος φῶς.
αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ πῦρ ἐκάη καὶ φλόξ ἔμαράνθη ...

And Menoitios’ son, a man like a god, made the fire blaze greatly.
So, when the fire had burned itself out and the flames had died down ...

Patroklos is preparing the meal, presumably a sacrificial one,⁴⁵ for the Achaian leaders who just came to Achilles’ tent, that is, Odysseus, Aias and Phoinix. This passage seems to contradict what has been said so far, since there is no visual move at all: Patroklos kindles the fire, and the same Patroklos puts the meat on the embers of the same fire. Yet the two images, as well as their respective temporal moments, do belong to two different shots. It is exactly like in a movie, when a shot darkens and fades out, and a new one, concerning the same visual context, fades in. Two different shots focus on different actions and different events (in this case the fire just beginning to blaze up and the final flames before the embers are ready to barbecue the meat). An analogous well-known formula relating to shared meals is αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἔδητύος ἔξ

⁴⁴ Richardson (1990: 110-119).

⁴⁵ Cf. Nagy (1999: 56).

ἔρον ἔντο ... “so, when they had put aside their desire for eating and drinking ...”).

Mid shot and close-up shifts

These kinds of visual shift (from one mid shot to the next, or from one close-up to the next) are definitely widespread, and they are conveyed by more than one *au-* discourse marker. The shift is between two focuses, the second one being parallel to the first.⁴⁶ The parallel focus may concern either one of two separate subjects when they move, fight, or talk to each other, or they may concern one of two details (parts of the same body or of the same object). The movement can be compared to what film experts call a “pan,” that is, a movement from side to side from a stationary position. The formulas to indicate taking turns in the Homeric conversations include αὐτάρ, αὖ, αὖτις, and most of all αὖτε, as in the very frequent formulation:

τὸν (or τήν) δ' αὖτε προσέειπεν + name of the next interlocutor (nominative)⁴⁷

To him (in turn) said ...

In the cinema of the mind, by means of αὖτε the audience is directed to shift visually from interlocutor A to interlocutor B in parallel focus. The shift between two characters or groups of characters may occur also in other cases, such as, for example, at *Il.* 23.727-28:

... ἐπὶ δὲ στήθεσσιν Ὀδυσσεύς
κάππεσε· λαοὶ δ' αὖ θευντό τε θάμβησάν τε.

... on his chest Odysseus
fell; the people, on the other side, gazed upon them and wondered.

αὖ allows for the external audience to visualize the warriors (λαοὶ) as spatially shifted, literally “on the other side” with regard to the fighters Odysseus and Aias who are “on the one side.”⁴⁸

⁴⁶ The notion of parallel focus is borrowed from Kroon (1995); my early analysis of αὐτάρ has productively drawn from this innovative work on the usages of Latin particles *nam, enim, autem, vero* and *at*.

⁴⁷ For αὖ, see for example τήν (or τὸν) δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ἠῦδα “Then the thoughtful Telemachos said to her (or to him) in answer,” which occurs 43 times in the *Odyssey*. For αὖτις, see for example *Od.* 15.439 τοῖς δ' αὖτις μετέειπε γυνή καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ “then once again the woman spoke to them and said to them.” For αὐτάρ, see for example *Il.* 6. 214 αὐτάρ ὁ μειλιχίοισι προσήδα ποιμένα λαῶν “and in winning words of friendliness he spoke to the shepherd of the people.”

The cognitive activity of focusing on parallel focuses is arguably shown by *au-* discourse markers also in lists and genealogies, which brings us to reflect on what I call the pattern of parallel repetitions. At *Il.* 13.450-51 Idomeneus is proudly telling Deiphobos about his own genealogy (Deukalion was his father):

ὃς πρῶτον Μίνωα τέκε Κρήτη ἐπίουρον·
Μίνωος δ' αὖ τέκεθ' υἷον ἀμύμονα Δευκαλίωνα ...

[Zeus] who first got Minos by Crete, and he cared for his people.
And then Minos was father of blameless Deukalion ...

Here αὖ marks a further entry (whereas δέ introduces the new discourse act that is going on). More frequently δεύτερον αὖ(τε) or, in general, numerals with αὖ(τε) accomplish this function, and also when traditional sequences are recalled (for example, the catalogue of weapons with which a warrior arms for the battle).⁴⁹ I argue that *au-* discourse markers, besides other functions, are the linguistic sign of a specific procedural format, to use Minchin's terminology: that is, the recalling of patterns that include parallel repetitions. Interestingly enough, Liddell-Scott-Jones notes about αὖ that is it "used for repeated actions."

The cognitive activity underlying αὖ and the like from the second entry of a list onward (these words never appear with the first one) is arguably to turn back with the mind's eye to the visualization of a new entry in a parallel sequence. This has a strong relationship with memory cues, as Minchin (2001) has demonstrated, and also with the particular mnemonic and visual efforts required in order to perform catalogues and other kinds of special lists. The idea of return is crucial in respect of the cognitive experience of the speaker who mentally comes back to something or somebody that has already been "seen" in a parallel situation. From this point of view αὖτις represents an interesting adverb. In Homer it usually works as a propositional adverb in sentence-mid position, and its primary meaning is concerned with a return that can be temporal ("again") or spatial ("back") or both (let us think of Sisyphos' stone that continuously rolls back down—αὖτις—in *Od.* 11.598).

However, Homeric αὖτις is also used as discourse marker, not only in turn-taking formulas (see n. 38 above) but also in list entries (cf.

⁴⁸ Other kinds of shifts are represented by αὐτάρ ὑπερθε (upward) and αὐτάρ ὀπισθε (backward).

⁴⁹ Cf. δεύτερον αὖ introducing the armour worn by Paris, Agamemnon, Patroklos, and Achilleus at *Il.* 3.332, 11.19, 16.133, and 19.371 respectively.

δεύτερον αὖτις) where it occupies a sentence-initial position. What is relevant to the present purpose is that the character who utters αὖτις as a discourse marker visualizes something that moves back to the previous position or that recurs in the same way, according to a parallel pattern. I have collected instances of αὖτις and of αὖτως conveying this.⁵⁰ The meaningfulness of an action that is experienced by the speaker in its (visual) repeatability is particularly evident when a ritual/sacred event is seen as it “re-happens” in epic and even more in lyric poetry. Sappho and Anacreon, in particular, use several times in their songs the most poetic δηῦτε, which is δηί + αὔτε.⁵¹

If *au-* discourse markers in parallel entries convey repetition, they deal with a process that is intrinsically anaphoric. What is recalled in parallel repetitions is an old item of information, not a new one. This is supported by two facts: in turn-taking formulas too, *au-* discourse markers introduce characters that have already spoken and are already on the stage, and even more telling, *au-* discourse markers most frequently accompany third-person pronouns—that is, anaphora par excellence (cf. ὁ δ’ αὔτε, αὐτὰρ ὁ, τὸν δ’ αὔ). This latter phenomenon has already been noted by Klein, who hypothesizes that the oldest role of αὔ was “continuative” and “coreferential.”⁵² In a cognitive and pragmatic perspective the enhancement of the anaphoric process by *au-* discourse markers is very important. Far from being simply continuative, the function of αὔ and the like is to anchor the cognitive process of again viewing somebody, something, or some event to the *hic et nunc* of the utterance. If the utterer of these discourse markers is the performer (which is very often the case), the *hic et nunc* is that of the performance.⁵³

In sum, the visual discontinuity in mid shot and close-up shifts consists in the focus on a parallel item or a parallel pattern that is identified in listed objects or in sequential events. This is what emerges in the speaker’s memory and the speaker’s visual imagery. The performative continuity consists in the stationary position of the utterer, of the viewing “I”: the one who uses *au-* discourse markers is the spectator of actions on different sides of his visual field (“on the one side,” “on the

⁵⁰ Cf. *Il.* 10.63; 12.31 (αὖτις); *Il.* 3.339; 7.430; 9.195; 10.25 (αὖτως).

⁵¹ On this effective pragmatic marker in lyric see Nagy (1996: 10) and Aloni (1997: 217).

⁵² Klein (1988: 269-275).

⁵³ All of this is very much related to the uses and the meanings of αὐτός as anaphoric pronoun. This will be investigated in a monograph that is currently in preparation.

other side”)⁵⁴ or he is visualizing different items in parallel sequences by never turning his eyes away from what he watches, and by taking into account what has been already introduced earlier in the narration.

*Zooming in*⁵⁵

Generally speaking, ancient Greek particles are multifunctional. The particles and adverbs that are considered here are multifunctional as well; as discourse markers they can signal the relation perceived between different parts of the discourse in different ways. For example, as Latin *autem* can help in marking a parallel focus as well as an absolute focus, so also do αὐτάρ, together with αὐτε and αὖ. The absolute focus is usually a single character whose visual prominence is underscored. In line with what Andersson, Richardson, and Bakker say about the shifts between more general descriptions and isolated details, several times *au-* discourse markers allow for zooming in on individuals who are mostly singled out from a plurality of persons. For example, out of 45 entries regarding the leaders of the Achaian and Trojan contingents in the Catalogues in *Iliad* 2 (494-759 and 816-877), 23 are introduced by αὐτάρ, or αὐτε or αὖ, as in *Il.* 2.817-20

... ἄμα τῶ γε πολὺ πλεῖστοι καὶ ἄριστοι
λαοὶ θωρήσονται μεμαότες ἐγχείησι.
Δαρδανίων αὐτ’ ἦρχεν εὖς πάϊς Ἀγχίσαο,
Αἰνεΐας ...

... and with him far the best and the bravest
fighting men were armed and eager to fight with spears.

The leader of the Dardanians was [I am visualizing him now] the strong son of Anchises, Aeneas ...

The introduction to the performance of the Catalogue of Ships itself includes an αὖ whose function is that of isolating *just* the leaders among the large amount of people involved (*Il.* 2.493 ἀρχοὺς αὖ νεῶν ἐρέω νῆας τε προπάσας — “I will tell the lords of the ships, and the ships’

⁵⁴ Richardson mentions the sequence μέν ... αὐτάρ about the logical connections expressed by the performer that include “parallelism or at least correspondence of actions” (1990: 115).

⁵⁵ While I agree with Jong and Nünlist (2004: 67 n.6) on the fact that “zooming in” *per se* indicates a gradual process (which is why they do not adopt the term), I retain it for two reasons: first, it implies a principle of selection, which fits the Homeric acts of singling out; second, “jumping from scenic to close ups” in Homer (as the scholars translate “zooming in”) is mediated, so to say, by *ad hoc* procedural discourse markers such as the those under analysis in the present work.

numbers”). It is remarkable, by the way, that this line contains one of the very rare “zero-point” marks that refers to the performer (ἐρέω). Curiously, the “list” of the heroes visualized by Helen and Priam in the *teichoskopia* (*Il.* 3.161-244) includes some instance of αὐ/αὔτε as well (at 191, 200, and 225).⁵⁶ To these cases I add the majority of the occurrences of αὐτάρ + name (the most familiar ones, even to our modern ears, are αὐτάρ Ἀχιλλεύς, αὐτάρ Ὀδυσσεύς, αὐτάρ Ἀθήνη, all of them occurring in the bucolic anticipation) and the majority of the occurrences of αὐτάρ ὁ as instances of the same kind of implied visual discontinuity, that is, zooming in on a specific character about whom something relevant is going to be told in the immediately following line(s).⁵⁷

The borderline between *au*- discourse markers that introduce a parallel focus and those that introduce an absolute focus is not clear-cut. In fact, the flow of narration seems to oscillate between non-emphatic shifts from item A to item B and emphatic zooms in on item B (or even on item C). This typically happens when the items are “you” and “I.”⁵⁸ The following passage (*Il.* 1.282-83) shows this ambiguity very well:

Ἀτρεΐδῃ, σὺ δὲ παῦε τεδὸν μένος· αὐτάρ ἔγωγε
λίσσομ' Ἀχιλλῆϊ μεθέμεν χόλον ...

And you, son of Atreus, give up your anger; [shift your eyes on me now]
I myself am the one who is begging you
to give over your bitterness against Achilleus ...

Nestor is trying to persuade Agamemnon to give up his anger. Here there is not only the visual shift from “you, Agamemnon” to “I, Nestor,” but also a zooming in the effect of which is a spotlight on the speaker himself (see the strong I-deixis ἐγὼ reinforced by γε + the present tense of the explicit performative verb λίσσομαι). Interestingly enough, in the *Lexicon des frühgriechischen Epos*⁵⁹ this αὐτάρ is labelled as *sinnlos*, “meaningless,” presumably because it is neither adversative nor continuative. Conversely, I find it a very valuable occurrence, which allows

⁵⁶ On the complexity of the latter passage with respect to the medium and the context of such visualization, see Elmer (2005: 9-15).

⁵⁷ αὐτάρ followed by a plural is not frequent at all. Within those few occurrences, αὐτάρ Ἀχαιοὶ is predominant; the focus on the Achaians often is a parallel focus that makes a pair with the Trojans (for example in descriptions concerning what happens in the respective camps).

⁵⁸ See *Il.* 1.127, 282 and 333; 10.378; 15.401; 19.319; 21.187; 22.483; 23.69.

⁵⁹ Snell (1955).

me to introduce a major finding of my analysis. If we take into account that *au-* discourse markers are mostly uttered by the narrator, it is remarkable that a large number of those that are uttered by the internal characters are accompanying a “zero-point” mark. By zero-point mark I mean that which linguistically codifies the zero-point of the utterance, the “I, here and now”: first-person pronouns (either singular or plural), *vũv* “now,” the not so frequent *deũro* “here,” and first-person verbs.⁶⁰ In most of the instances the Homeric zero-point mark accompanying *av̄tar̄* is *ev̄gw̄*.⁶¹ *av̄tar̄ ev̄gw̄*, *av̄tar̄ em̄oī*, *av̄tar̄ em̄ē*, *h̄m̄iv̄ d' av̄t̄e*, *vũv d' av̄t̄* may convey either a close-up shift or a zoom in on the source of the utterance, or both.⁶²

In conclusion, zooming in activates in the mind’s eye of the audience a special attention on individuals singled out from a plurality, or on a particular individual singled out from a pair. Whenever the individual singled out is an “I,” the *au-* discourse marker accompanying it attests to the anchoring to the zero-point of the utterance. This fact matches very well what I mentioned above about the performative continuity in linking different narrative sections (see above, about long shot shifts) and in embracing what is literally on the one side and on the other side (see above, about mid shot shifts and parallel focus). In more than one way *au-* discourse markers are indicating the source of the utterance itself, the viewing “I”: they show the filter through which the scenes are visualized; they are signs of the engagement of the “I” that is behind them, even when the “I” is the narrator.

Flashes

The analysis ends with another couple of Homeric words that signal the relations the speaker perceives between different parts of the discourse, namely *av̄tika* and *av̄toũ* (the latter working as locative adverb, not as the genitive of *av̄t̄os̄*). Usually they are considered exclusively as pro-

⁶⁰ Cf. Lyons (1977: 638 and 682).

⁶¹ Cf. the typical closure of the Homeric Hymns: *av̄tar̄ ev̄gw̄ kaī seiō kaī av̄ll̄h̄s̄ m̄nh̄soim' av̄oid̄h̄s̄* “as for me”—which is also “look at me, now, zoom in on me”—“I will remember you also in the remaining part of the song;” it occurs at the end of 11 hymns (see for example *Hymn III to Apollo* 546, *Hymn IV to Hermes* 580, *Hymn VI to Aphrodite* 21).

⁶² Especially in the *Odyssey* a frequent formula is *ws̄ ev̄fat̄', av̄tar̄* + first-person pronoun, which indicates what happens immediately after a speech is over (it occurs 29 times, with variations like *ws̄ ev̄fat̄' h̄m̄iv̄ d' av̄t̄' ev̄pepeĩth̄etō th̄um̄os̄ av̄gh̄n̄w̄r̄*—“So she spoke, and as for us [move your eyes back/again onto us], our proud heart was persuaded” at *Od.* 2.103=12.28=24.138).

positional adverbs, as they contribute to the propositional content of the sentence in which they appear. *αὐτίκα* literally means “in the same moment,” and so “immediately”; *αὐτοῦ* mostly means “in the same place,” and so “on the spot.” I argue that in the Homeric poems they are used not only as propositional adverbs but also as discourse markers. As discourse markers, they occur in sentence initial position. For example, *αὐτίκα* shares with other *au-* discourse markers some topical wordings, such as *αὐτίκ’ ἔπειτα* (25 occurrences) and the turn-taking formulas (cf. *αὐτίκ’ Ἀθηναίην ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα*, *Il.* 21.419).

They also convey a procedural meaning. In what does the procedural meaning consist? *αὐτίκα* and *αὐτοῦ* both draw the attention of the receiver to a special moment of the story; they mark a performative peak of the narration. They show a significant overlap between what happens “there and then” and what the speaker perceives—and lets the audience perceive—as something happening “here and now.” *αὐτίκα* does not mean simply “at the same moment” but also “(exactly) in that moment,” which implies the recognition by the speaker of the exact moment in which a certain event takes (or took) place. When *αὐτίκα* is uttered by the characters, it means “in the same moment as now, exactly in this moment” (cf. the *αὐτίκα νῦν* occurrences).⁶³ The same overlapping potentially involves *αὖθι*, *αὐτόθι*, and *αὐτοῦ*: “the same place” can be “there” but also “here.” Thus, a phenomenon that has already been highlighted is occurring here: *αὐτίκα* and *αὐτοῦ* reveal performative continuity indeed. On the one hand, when they are uttered by characters they anchor the instant of the narration to the instant of their own “here and now”; on the other hand, when they are uttered by the performer they anchor the instant of the narration to the “here and now” of the performance. The only difference is that in the former case the zero-point mark is verbally explicit, whereas in the latter situation the zero-point is implicit (the utterance itself accounts for the performative continuity).

The visual prompts given by the utterance of *αὐτίκα*, *αὐτοῦ* and also *αὖ* in such situations do not signal shifts but rather another kind of vis-

⁶³ Cf. *Il.* 6.308, 9.519, and 23.552 for *αὐτίκα νῦν*. The implied act of recognition by the speaker of the instant in which something relevant happens is somehow explicit in the formulaic *αὐτίκα δ’ ἔγνω* “and exactly in that moment (s)he knew ...” (cf. *Il.* 1.199; 14.154; 17.84; *Od.* 11.153; 19.392). The famous inscription on the so-called Cup of Nestor includes *αὐτίκα*, which strikingly expresses the magic of a sort of wand-waving instant: “I am the cup of Nestor, good for drinking. Whoever drinks from this cup,—here it comes (*αὐτίκα*)—the desire for beautiful Aphrodite will seize that man” (translation adapted from Faraone [1996]).

ual discontinuity, that is, the “radiant ignition” (to use Scarry’s terms) in visualizing what happens “on the stage” in special instants: in a word, a flash. A significant example is *Od.* 17.325-7:

βῆ δ' ἰθὺς μεγάροιο μετὰ μνηστῆρας ἀγαούς.
Ἄργον δ' αὖ κατὰ μοῖρ' ἔλαβεν μέλανος θανάτοιο,
αὐτίκ' ἰδόντ' Ὀδυσῆα ἕικοστῶ ἐνιαυτῶ.

And [Eumaios] strode straight on to the great hall and the haughty suitors,
and as for Argos [turn your eyes back on him], the doom of dark death
closed over him,
just on the spot: he saw Odysseus in the twentieth year and died.

The death of Odysseus’ dog Argos is told in two effective lines that include two *au-* discourse markers. αὖ at line 226 allows for the audience (and the performer as well) to shift with the mind’s eye from Eumaios (subject of the verb βῆ) who is going to Odysseus’ palace, back to the dog he just left. Conversely, αὐτίκα at line 227 links the remarkable instant of the narrated event to the moment in which the performer and the audience are re-experiencing that vision; in other terms, αὐτίκα is a device of Homeric immediacy. The aorist ἰδόντ(α) is a *verbum videndi* that refers to a further “radiant ignition,” internal to the plot, which is Argos’ actual vision of his master’s appearance.

For αὐτοῦ, I quote *Od.* 22.68

ὥς φάτο, τῶν δ' αὐτοῦ λῦτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ

So he spoke, and—exactly at that point—their knees and their heart went
slack.

As Odysseus starts to string his own bow, the suitors begin to realize the identity of the man who is in front of them. Like αὐτίκα in the preceding example, αὐτοῦ links the remarkable time and place of the narrated event to the instant in which the performer and the audience are re-experiencing it all. Again, an aorist accompanies the *au-* discourse marker (λύτο), and, again, the narrated event concerns a further visual experience, which is the thrilling of the internal spectators (the suitors themselves) as they see something really crucial happening in the palace. It is a double memorable flash, one for the internal and one for the external receivers, and the pivotal word for that is αὐτοῦ.

According to the results of the analysis, the discourse markers that arguably convey visual flashes are also markers of the non-impersonal

style of the performer. The Homeric “re-enacting I”⁶⁴ that is behind the epic utterances really discredits the “time-honoured dogma of Homeric objectivity.”⁶⁵ The considered non-impersonal words have in fact not only a procedural but also an interpersonal meaning. The interpersonal part of the meaning concerns the attitude of the speaker towards what is said. A modern example of a discourse marker that clearly also conveys interpersonal reactions is the English “well.” When “well” is sentence initial it is also marked by intonation, and may indicate both the articulation of a different section of the discourse and the frustration of expectations that the following words are likely to cause. Needless to say, “well” as a discourse marker is totally different from “well” as a propositional adverb, which is neither sentence initial nor intonationally marked (as in “I slept well”). In the case of αὐτίκα, αὐτοῦ, and αὔ, the interpersonal meaning depends on the emotional engagement of the speaker (and presumably of the listeners as well) in emphasizing very special moments of the story. Paralinguistic features such as intonational breaks before and after such words, or facial expressions and gestures *ad hoc* could have accompanied their utterance at the level of performance.

Conclusion

The final remarks of this article concern the specific results that emerge from the analysis as well as more general considerations of Homeric diction. The specific results concern αὔ, αὔτε, αὔτις, αὐτάρ, αὐτίκα, and αὐτοῦ as discourse markers. In pragmatics discourse markers express the kind of relations the speaker perceives between different parts of the discourse. As such the markers do not contribute to the propositional content of what is said, or relate to the states of affairs that are mentioned. As far as αὔτις, αὐτίκα, and αὐτοῦ are concerned, I am not claiming that they never have a propositional function; I am simply arguing that they work at either level, the propositional or the pragmatic one; it very much depends on their sentence position.

Discourse markers usually occur in sentence initial position, whereas propositional adverbs usually occur in mid sentence position. The pro-

⁶⁴ I am borrowing the expression “re-enacting I” from Nagy (2004: 27); it seems to me a most helpful synthesis of the complex function of epic as well as lyric sources of poetic utterances.

⁶⁵ See Jong (1987: 221).

cedural meaning of the ancient Greek words considered here rests primarily on the visual discontinuities existing between different sections of the epic narration. In particular, they work as “road-signs” of the discourse, prompting specific cognitive activities related to visual imagery: shifting between different kinds of shots, (long shots, mid shots, and close-ups), shifting between less and more detailed depictions (zooming in), and shifting between ordinary moments and special instants of the narration (flashes). By means of these markers the mind’s eye of the performer and of the audience, who both re-see the mythical events, is helped in visualizing the next focus of the visual field.

In the introductory section I mentioned that cognitive scientists believe that we re-construct narrative space to the extent that there is a cognitive advantage in this activity. As far as Homeric poetry is concerned, the cognitive advantages of re-constructing the narrative space arguably deal with the visualization of specific scenes, faces, and details, rather than with generic map-like views. If this is the case, the “syntax of movement,” that articulates these visualizations and makes the narration itself much more vivid, concerns visual discontinuities and attentional shifts rather than fixed frames and static descriptions. This is in line with the cultural metaphor of the song as a path:⁶⁶ the traditional singer follows a step-by-step narrative progression instead of a map-like narrative progression.⁶⁷ The shifts of the mind’s eye implied by the *au*-discourse markers are also indirectly a strong sign of the anchorage to the viewing “I.” The speaker uttering them very often experiences the parallel repetition of an action, or returns to what has been already introduced onto the stage. If we put this fact together with the frequent zero-point marks that are placed next to αὖ, αὖτε, αὖτις, αὐτάρ, and αὐτίκα when they are uttered by the characters, an important inference can be drawn. Behind every *au*-discourse marker there is a viewing “I,” an experiencing “I” which is the real link between the various kinds of discontinuities I have shown. Shifts from side to side, backward eye movements or retrievals of items already mentioned seem to imply a never-turning gaze of the speaker who utters them, and in most cases this speaker is the narrator. This is what I encapsulate in the expression “performative continuity.”

⁶⁶ Indicated for instance by the occurrences of οἴμη, ὁδός and κέλευθος in reference to performance especially in the Homeric Hymns and in lyric poetry.

⁶⁷ On the route-like as opposed to map-like spatial models, see the critical view by Ryan (2003: 233).

The analysis presented here leads to more general considerations regarding Homeric diction and Homeric discourse. The so-called Homeric particles arguably work at the pragmatic level of communication. Most of the time they convey attitudes and perceptions of the speaker towards what is said, and thus in fact do not contribute to the propositional content of what is said. They simply mark in different ways how the propositional content is meant to be processed, and in the light of which extralinguistic context. The pragmatic meanings of particles may be located in a continuum between the more procedural (for example, δέ) and the more interpersonal (for example, τοι).

Another point concerns the Homeric flow of narration as “cinema in the mind.” The ones who “see” with the mind’s eye actions, faces, and details about mythical deeds, and who shift between different distances and different focuses, are without turning their own gaze spectators of a past that is re-enacted in the *hic et nunc*. Both the performer and the listeners belong in this group. Neither the performer nor the members of the audience transfer themselves into the remote world of the past; rather, they stay respectively in front of the audience or in front of the performer, and re-experience all the events on the spot. This supports the “Mountain goes to Mohammed” principle that Bakker argues in a recent work: “in uttering his speech, the speaker performs the event. He (like Mohammed) makes the mountain come to him and so makes possible our viewing.”⁶⁸ A final consideration relates to the memory constraints in visualizations and the “cinema in the mind.” Every scene in a story is a series of camera shots from which it is possible to infer partial maps; the short-term memory rapidly replaces a previous partial map with the next one. Spatial imagination proceeds piecemeal also in Homeric poetry.⁶⁹ A fundamental task of the performer, who possesses the long-term memory that he received from the Muses, is to connect the single camera shots in order to have a coherent, vivid, and pleasurable narrative piece. All of this seems to confirm that the primary communicative and cognitive attention of the performer is to cleverly indicate his “presence” to the audience as something real but not so evident, without any personalization but also without any impersonality.

⁶⁸ Bakker (2005: 175).

⁶⁹ Collins (1991: 98) compares the alternation between optical fixations and saccades (the basic movements of our eyes) to the successive steps of verbalization: “the consecutiveness of speech accords with the consecutiveness of visual perception.”

Bibliography

- Aloni, A. (1997). *Saffò. Frammenti*. Florence: Giunti.
- Andersson, T. M. (1976). *Early Epic Scenery: Homer, Virgil and the Medieval Legacy*. Ithaca and London: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Bakker E. J. (1993a). "Activation and Preservation: The Interdependence of Text and Performance in an Oral Tradition." *Oral Tradition* 8.1: 5-20 [eOT = <http://journal.oraltradition.org/issues/8i/bakker>].
- Bakker E. J. (1993b). "Discourse and Performance: Involvement, Visualization, and 'Presence' in Homeric Poetry." *CLAnt* 12: 1-29.
- Bakker E. J. (1993c). "Topics, Boundaries, and the Structure of Discourse: An Investigation of the Particle δέ." *Studies in Language* 17: 275-311.
- Bakker E. J. (1997). *Poetry in Speech: Orality and the Homeric Discourse*. Ithaca and London: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Bakker E. J. (2005). *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics*. Washington, DC. and Cambridge, MA: Center for Hellenic Studies, Harvard Univ. Press.
- Bassett, S. E. (2003). *The Poetry of Homer*. New ed., B. Heiden, ed. Lahnam and Boulder: Lexington.
- Bauman, R. (1986). *Story, Performance, and Event: Contextual Studies of Oral Narrative*. Cambridge and London: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Bezuidenhout, A. (2004). "Procedural Meaning and the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface." In *The Semantics/Pragmatics Distinction*, C. Bianchi, ed.: 101-31. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Boegehold, A. L. (1999). *When a Gesture Was Expected*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
- Clark, M. (1997). *Out of Line: Homeric Composition beyond the Hexameter*. Lanham and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Collins, C. (1991). *The Poetics of the Mind's Eye: Literature and the Psychology of Imagination*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dekker, A. F. (1965). *Ironie in de Odyssee*. Leiden: Brill.
- Denniston, J. D. (1954). *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Devine, A. M. and L. D. Stephens (1993). "Evidence from Experimental Psychology for the Rhythm and Metre of Greek Verse." *TAPhA* 123: 379-403.
- Dijk, T. van (1979). "Pragmatic Connectives." *Journal of Pragmatics* 3: 447-56.
- Duckworth, G. E. (1933). *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius and Virgil*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Elmer, D. (2005). "Helen Epigrammatopios." *CLAnt* 24.1: 1-39.
- Faraone, C. A. (1996). "Taking the 'Nestor's Cup Inscription' Seriously: Erotic Magic and Conditional Curses in the Earliest Inscribed Hexameters." *CLAnt* 15.1: 77-112.
- Fracaroli, G. (1903). *L'irrazionale nella letteratura*. Torino: Fratelli Bocca.

- Fraser, B. (2003). "The Clause Start in Ancient Greek: Focus and the Second Position." *Glotta* 77: 138-77.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F. (1986). *La cithare d'Achille. Essai sur la poésie de l'Iliade*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F. (1995). "Il pubblico di Achille." In *Musica e mito nella Grecia antica*, D. Restani, ed.: 237-56. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Hannay, M., and C. Kroon (2005). "Acts and the relationship between discourse and grammar." *Functions of Language* 12.1: 87-124.
- Hazlett, C. J., and M. G. Woldorff (2004). "Mechanisms of Moving the Mind's Eye: Planning and Execution of Spatial Shifts of Attention." *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 16.5: 742-50.
- Heiden, B. (2000). "Narrative Discontinuity and Segment Marking at *Iliad* 3/4, 7/8, and 10/11, and *Odyssey* 4/5, 17/18, and 23/24." *C&M* 51: 5-16.
- Jong, I. J. F. de (1987). *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Amsterdam: Grüner.
- Jong, I. J. F. de (1997). "ΓAP Introducing Embedded Narratives." In *New Approaches to Greek Particles*, A. Rijksbaron, ed.: 175-85. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Jong, I. J. F. de, and R. Nünlist (2004). "From bird's eye view to close-up: the standpoint of the narrator in the Homeric epics." In *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung. Festschrift für Joachim Latacz anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstages*, A. Bierl, A. Schmitt, and A. Willi, eds.: 63-84. Munich: Saur.
- Jucker, A. H., and Y. Ziv, eds. (1998). *Discourse markers. Description and Theory*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Klein, J. S. (1988). "Homeric Greek αἶ: a Synchronic, Diachronic and Comparative Study." *HSF* 101: 249-88.
- Kosslyn, S. M. (1995). "Mental Imagery." In *An Invitation to Cognitive Science*, Vol. 2: *Visual Cognition*, S. M. Kosslyn and D. N. Osherson, eds.: 267-96. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press.
- Kroon, C. (1995). *Discourse Particles in Latin: a Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Lattimore, R. (1951). *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press.
- Lattimore, R. (1967). *The Odyssey of Homer*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lenk, U. (1997). "Discourse Markers." In *Handbook of Pragmatics online* [<http://www.benjamins.com/online/hop/>].
- Lenk, U. (1998). *Marking Discourse Coherence. Functions of Discourse Markers in Spoken English*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*, Vol.1. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Martin, R. P. (1989). *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Minchin, E. (2001). *Homer and the Resources of Memory: Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey*. Oxford and New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Morrison, J. V. (1992). *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the Iliad*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.

- Nagy, G. (1990). *Pindar's Homer: the Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Nagy, G. (1996). *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Nagy, G. (1999). *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*, 2nd rev. ed. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Nagy, G. (2004). "Transmission of Archaic Greek Symptotic Songs: from Lesbos to Alexandria." *Critical Inquiry* 31.1: 26-48.
- Nagy, G. (forthcoming). *Homer the Classic*.
- Race, W. H. (2000). "Explanatory δέ-Clauses in the 'Iliad'." *CJ* 95.3: 205-27.
- Richardson, S. (1990). *The Homeric Narrator*. Nashville: Vanderbilt Univ. Press.
- Rijksbaron, A., ed. (1997). *New Approaches to Greek Particles*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Rouchota, V. (1998). "Procedural Meaning and Parenthetical Discourse Markers." In *Discourse Markers: Description and Theory*, A. H. Jucker and Y. Ziv, eds.: 97-126. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Rubin, D. C. (1995). *Memory and Oral Traditions: The Cognitive Psychology of Epic, Ballads, and Counting-Out Rhymes*. New York and Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Ryan, M.-L. (2003). "Cognitive Maps and the Construction of Narrative Space." In *Narrative Theory and the Cognitive Sciences*, D. Herman ed.: 214-42. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Scarry, E. (1999). *Dreaming by the Book*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Schenkeveld, D. M. (1988). "From *particula* to particle—the genesis of a class of words." In *L'Héritage des grammairiens latins de l'antiquité aux lumières. Actes du colloque de Chantilly, 2-4 Sept. 1987*, I. Rosier ed.: 81-93. Paris: Société pour l'information grammaticale.
- Schiffirin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Scodel, R. (2002). "Homeric Signs and Flashbulb Memory." In *Epea and Grammata. Oral and Written Communication in Ancient Greece*, I. Worthington and J. M. Foley, eds.: 99-116. Leiden: Brill.
- Sicking, C., and J. van Ophuijzen (1993). *Two Studies in Attic Particle Usage: Lysias and Plato*. Leiden: Brill.
- Snell, B. et al., eds. (1955–). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Taylor, A. (1996). "A Prosodic Account of Clitic Position in Ancient Greek." In *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, A. L. Halpern and A. M. Zwicky, eds.: 477-503. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Turkeltaub, D. (2005). "The Syntax and Semantics of Homeric Glowing Eyes: *Iliad* 1.200." *AJPh* 126: 157-186.
- Vernant, J.-P. (1985). *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs*, rev. ed. Paris: Découverte.
- Widdowson, H. (1995). "Discourse Analysis: A Critical View." *Language and Literature* 4.3: 157-72.

CHAPTER THREE

EPIC REMEMBERING

EGBERT J. BAKKER

Memory is complex and protean, both as a function and as a concept. It is a crucial element in the understanding of many things human, such as the brain, education, character, identity, and society, among others. The neurologists, the cognitive scientists, psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, educators, historians, and others who study these phenomena, will each have a different conception of memory and of what it means to remember. Nor does it stop here, for the conception of memory as a cognitive faculty is inseparably connected with the media of communication, and even their associated technology, and these are inevitably subject to change. The computer scientist, for example, is likely to view memory in relation to processing power, whereas scholars (insofar as they do not think in terms of their computers) will tend to see memory as a matter of retrieval: one remembers, when one knows what one has read, and where it was.

Memory, then, is “medially” and therefore historically contingent, for media (computers, books, writing, speaking) and their conceptions change with time. This has consequences for the study of “memory and orality” as proposed in this volume, since one has to be aware of what kind of memory one brings to the study of the cognitive habits of the past. Is a conception of memory that comes from literary scholarship or the social sciences, or even from simply being literate, adequate for dealing with the kind of cognitive processes we commonly associate with oral traditions? Indeed, the very notion of “oral tradition” is likely to be a literate construct already, and the chances of Homer (or whoever acts under that name) calling himself an “oral poet” are just as slim as Empedocles calling himself a pre-socratic philosopher.¹ So what kind of

¹ See Bakker (1999), rewritten as Ch. 3 of Bakker (2005). A similar argument applies to “writing” and “reading” as components of modern literacy that are unreflectively applied.

memory do we have to be prepared for, or to what degree do we have to forget our own memory, in the study of Homer?

One memory that comes to mind is the collective mentality of a society that places fundamental authority in a remote past and considers the κλέα ἀνδρῶν, the record of the achievements of the ancestors that is codified in epic tradition, to be the model for excellence in the present. In such a mentality, epic is traditional because it has to remember, evoke, a past that is different from the audience's present-day world. Epic's traditionality can also be thought of as the feature of epic language that makes its transmission possible in the first place, with memory turning from collective into mnemo-technic. This is of course the perspective of the oral-formulaic approach of Milman Parry and Albert Lord, which saw in epic's formulaic repetitions the strategy necessary for its transmission and survival. This is memory, not in the sense of rote memorization, but as a technique based on rhythmical constraints for composing and recomposing the poem in the absence of the memory aid that comes with the possibility to fix (or even compose) the poem in writing.²

Is it this memory, as substitute for writing, that made the Greeks think that the Muses, the goddesses of poetry, are the daughters of Zeus and Mnemosyne (Memory)? It has been thought that "remembering" is a synonym for singing the oral epic song³ and "the song" is what seems to be the thing remembered in a recurrent closing formula in the Homeric Hymns:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομαι ἀοιδῆς

But I shall remember you as well as the rest of the song.⁴

Does that also, however, mean that from his own perspective the poet remembers the epic formulas? Perhaps, but what he "remembers" is in any case also the god himself to whom the Hymn is addressed, as is confirmed in the first line of the *Hymn to Apollo*:

μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκάτοιο

I shall remember and not forget Apollo who shoots from afar
(*Hom. Hymn Ap. 1*)

² On memory (as a concept from cognitive psychology) and epic tradition, see Rubin (1995).

³ Moran (1975).

⁴ On this translation, see Bakker (2002: 72).

What kind of memory do we need in order to account for this “remembering”? Neither retrieval nor collective or social memory will do, since Apollo is hardly an item of information that can become lost or forgotten; nor is he an aspect of a past that is important for the community. He is a living god, and a dangerous one at that, as the Hymn goes on to show. The “remembering” of Apollo is culture-specific, and we can begin to have a sense of it only when we look at how people “remember” inside the epic tale. “Epic remembering” in the sense of “remembering within epic” will take us closer to what the remembering of epic means to its poets and performers in a society that does not consider “memory” to be a substitute for writing, and where such faculties as speech or thought or physiological processes are conceived of in a radically different way. So I propose to look at epic remembering in what anthropology calls an emic way, as opposed to (though not to the exclusion of) the etic approach of oral-formulaic theory.

A few years ago I proposed a “performative” interpretation for the first line of the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo* and for the conception of “remembering” in epic:⁵ the act of remembering will perform and make present the thing remembered. Remembering the god is to ensure, through assertive song-speech, his (ritual) presence; remembering the song is to perform the song, that is, to bring the world of heroes to the present; and remembering food, or sleep, or physical strength, in Homer means to eat, sleep, or be strong.

I shall now explore a complementary aspect of this idea of memory in Homer by focusing not on the *results* of “remembering” but on its *source*. Remembering something is not only enacting the presence of that thing, but also acting on its *impulse*. Pursuing this idea will lead us first into the well-known problems connected with “body and soul” in Homer, and the lexical semantics of words denoting cognitive and emotional faculties and organs.

First let us look at the verb μμνήσκομαι and the etymology of its central element, the root μνη- (**mne-h₁*), a modified version of μεν-. This root μεν- has an impeccable Indo-European pedigree, as appears from its occurrence as Vedic *man-*. It has given us such memorable Homeric words as μένος “vigour,” “strength”; μέ-μον-α (in o-grade, with the zero-grade participle με-μα-ώς) “being full of μένος,” “being

⁵ Bakker (2002), rewritten as Bakker (2005): 136-53.

eager,” but also μῆνις “anger,”⁶ μάντις “seer,” and μαίνομαι “be in a rage,” and related words.⁷

When we try to determine what these heterogeneous lexical elements have in common, we encounter what seems to be a divide between rational, cognitive, or mental faculties on the one hand, and irrational or physical sensations on the other. If we place μμνήσκομαι in the one group, along with Vedic *manas* “mind,” “intellect,”⁸ and such Latin elements as *memini* or *mens*, we have to concede that the direct Greek equivalents, μένος and μέμονα, belong in the other group, as words for battle rage and adrenaline-driven impulses that are seemingly the very opposite of correct mental retrieval and rational deliberation. Is it specifically early (or proto-) Greek that has developed “irrational” senses for *men- out of an original rational meaning? Or is there some higher or deeper common denominator that goes beyond the body-soul or reason-impulse dichotomy? It seems more fruitful to question that very dichotomy, which raises the possibility that our cognitive conception of memory may not be adequate to deal with epic remembering.

The perfect verb μέμονα and its participle μεμαώς,⁹ along with μένος, the disposition denoted by these verbal forms, are eminently at home in the context of Iliadic battle narrative. Μένος, intimately linked with ἀλκή,¹⁰ is the quintessential impulse of the Homeric warrior, and the participle specifies what the impulse is directed to, as in the following formulaic system:

⁶ For the etymology of μῆνις, see Watkins (1977); Muellner (1996: 177-194).

⁷ The derived form μνη- yields in Greek not only the verb for “remembering” but also μνάομαι “desire (to have as wife),” “woo,” μνηστήρ “suitor,” μνηστή ἄλοχος “wooed wife,” etc. The “woo” word is sometimes thought to derive from *g^hna (cf. γυνή), but I agree with Bartolotta (2003: 52) that it belongs to the same root as μμνήσκομαι. Μνά-ομαι has developed, however, into a different verbal lexeme (although note that, in the *Iliad* [11.71; 16.697, 771], it occurs as equivalent of μμνήσκομαι) with a different “event structure”: its accusative object specifies the *goal* of the action, whereas the genitive object of μμνήσκομαι specifies the *source* of the action (see the text). For another account of the difference between the genitive and accusative complements, see Bartolotta (2003: 52-56).

⁸ Cf. the gloss in Pokorny (1959) for the Indo-European root *men-: “denken, geistig erregt sein.”

⁹ Note that in the formulaic reality of epic diction the nominative of the participle is μεναίων, being metrically equivalent to the inflected forms (μεμαώτα, μεμαώτες, etc.) and so completing the formulaic paradigm.

¹⁰ E.g., *Il.* 6.265 μένεος δ’ ἀλκῆς τε; 22.282 μένεος δ’ ἀλκῆς τε; 9.702 (=19.161) μένος ἔστί καί ἀλκή; *Od.* 22.226.

διαπραθέειν/διαρραΐσαι μεμαῶτες ||

being furiously eager to sack/destroy

κατακτάμεναι μενεαίνων ||

being furiously eager to kill

But the “memory verb” μνησκόμαι is, in aorist form (μνήσασθαι), equally at home in the same battle contexts; its focus is not so much on the state of μένος itself as on the *moment* at which that state is reached or on the *need* to reach it. Thus the verb is naturally at home in commands and exhortations, for example:

ἀνέρες ἔστε, φίλοι, μνήσασθε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς

Be men, my friends, and “remember” fierce strength

ἀλλὰ μνησώμεθα χάρμης ||

But let us “remember” <the joy of> battle

Alternatively the emphasis is on an intensification or a renewal of the state of μένος:

μᾶλλον ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι θόρον, μνήσαντο δὲ χάρμης

Even more they rushed upon the Trojans and “remembered” <the joy of> battle.

(*Il.* 8.252; 14.441; 15.380)

Retrieval from memory is of course not the issue here; rather, the verb μνήσασθαι indicates where the state of μένος comes from. Its genitive complement, true to the original semantic function of this case, specifies the *source* of the warriors’ μένος. The awareness of ἀλκή is so strong that it becomes a physical sensation, strength embodied. With χάρμη “state of joy” we probably have to think of the auto-induced state of adrenaline-intoxication to which warriors can become addicted. That would mean memory after all, but a very physical memory, a strong desire for the repetition of a pleasurable sensation. The drive is to infuse one’s μένος with something that itself possesses μένος, so that one is able to *embody* it and so have μένος oneself.

The idea of embodiment is an important element in the semantics of *men-*. It is especially clear when a young hero is injected with the μένος of his father. This is what Athene says she has done to Diomedes:

ἐν γὰρ τοι στήθεσσι μένος πατρῷον ἦκα
ἄτρομον, οἶον ἔχεσκε σακέσπαλος ἵππότης Τυδεύς

Now I have sent paternal μένος in your breast,
unwavering, just as Tydeus the shield-wielding horseman used to have.
(*Il.* 5.125-126)

Diomedes, who cannot remember his father in our sense,¹¹ “remembers” him in an epic sense through embodiment: a transfer of μένος has taken place across generations, with Tydeus as the source. Instructive cases are also provided by Telemachos and Odysseus:

Τηλέμαχ', οὐδ' ὄπιθεν κακὸς ἔσσεαι οὐδ' ἀνοήμων,
εἰ δὴ τοι σοῦ πατρὸς ἐνέστακται μένος ἤύ,
οἷος κείνος ἔην τελέσαι ἔργον τε ἔπος τε

Telemachos, you will not be base and without understanding,
if indeed the goodly μένος of your father has dripped into you,
such as that man was in accomplishing both deed and word.
(*Od.* 2.270-272)

This is Athene speaking again, in the shape of Mentor, whose name, consisting of *μεν-* with the agent suffix *-τωρ*, well describes her role in Telemachos' life. It is again the μένος of the father that determines a young hero's performance and μένος in the present. The verb used, ἐνέστακται, suggests an even more physical relation, that between the son and his father's semen from which he is born.¹² In the next extract Athene has just disappeared as a bird, after having addressed Telemachos while assuming the shape of Mentēs, another character with a significant name:¹³

τῷ δ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ
θῆκε μένος καὶ θάρσος, ὑπέμνησέν τέ ἐ πατρὸς
μᾶλλον ἔτ' ἢ τὸ πάροιθεν. ὁ δὲ φρεσὶν ἦσι νοήσας
θάμβησεν κατὰ θυμόν· οἶσατο γὰρ θεὸν εἶναι.

And to him in his θυμός
she placed μένος and courage, and made him aware of his father
even more than before; and he in his φρένες he saw and understood,
and was amazed down his θυμός: for he understood that this was a god.
(*Od.* 1.320-323)

Again the “reminding” (ὑπέμνησεν) that takes place is not an activation of the memory of his father (whom he, like Diomedes, has never known), but a shot of paternal μένος, administered by Athene. The shot

¹¹ See *Il.* 6.222-23.

¹² In this connection we may think of the use of μένος for the speaker's ejaculation in the Cologne Epode of Archilochos (W196a.51).

¹³ See Nagy (1990: 113).

is not just physical, like adrenalin, but also mental or spiritual: Telemachos is now seeing that it was Athene who talked to him. The infusion of μένος has sharpened his νόος. Μένος, we begin to see, comprises bodily sensation, “irrational” impulse, and spiritual enlightenment and invites us to reconsider the oppositions created by these separate domains.¹⁴

A further feature of μένος is that for all that it embodies remembrance, it also causes forgetfulness: the hero who is injected with μένος will also forget—he will forget any pain, as for example does Hektor in Zeus’ order to Iris:

Ἔκτορα δ’ ὀτρύνησι μάχην ἐς Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
 αὐτίς δ’ ἐμπνεύσῃσι μένος, λελάθη δ’ ὀδυνάων
 αἶ νῦν μιν τείρουσι κατὰ φρένας

and so that he exhorts Hektor into the battle, Phoibos Apollo,
 and blows anew μένος into him and makes him forget the shots of pain
 that are now afflicting him in his φρένες.

(*Il.* 15.59-61)

Now what is μένος? It resides not only in inspired sons and frenzied warriors, but also in rivers, winds, the light of the sun, and fire, as well as in other natural phenomena.¹⁵ So it does not seem to be *as such* a part of the human anatomy, in spite of its close connection with semen as we saw in Athene-Mentor’s words to Telemachos. It is, however, closely connected with two essential Homeric organs or faculties: the θυμός and the φρήν or φρένες. We saw that Athene-Mentes places μένος in Telemachos’ θυμός, which leads to heightened activity in his φρένες. Also, when μένος is blown into one’s φρένες, it makes any pain that is there go away, as we saw in the previous extract. In general the connections between μένος, θυμός, and φρένες are amply attested throughout Homer. Μένος can be placed or blown into a man’s θυμός or into his φρένες, and both the pair μένος-θυμός and the pair θυμός-φρήν make very frequent formulaic coordinated expressions in Homeric diction:

μένος δέ οἱ ἔμβαλε θυμῷ

he threw him μένος in the θυμός (*Il.* 16.529)

¹⁴ See Nagy (1974: 265-266) for other examples of *men*-words in Indo-European languages designating both physical (sexual) and mental activity.

¹⁵ River: *Il.* 12.18; wind: *Il.* 5.524; *Od.* 5.478; sun: *Il.* 23.190; *Od.* 10.160, 19.440; h. App. 371, 374; fire: *Il.* 6.182; 23.238; 24.792; *Od.* 11.220.

μένος δέ οἱ ἐν φρεσὶ θῆκε

he placed him μένος in his φρένες (*Il.* 21.145)

ἔτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμόν ἐκάστου

he aroused the μένος and the θυμός of each (*Il.* 5.470 *et al.*)

κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν

down his φρήν and down his θυμός (*Il.* 1.193 *et al.*)

We usually translate θυμός and φρήν with terms drawn from what is for us the mental/intellectual sphere, such as “mind” or “spirit” or “heart.” But more than half a century ago, R. B. Onians proposed that φρήν/φρένες in Homer refers to something much less mental, and much more physical, namely the lungs.¹⁶ In addition θυμός, related to Latin *fumus* as well as to other “smoke” or “fume” words in the older Indo-European languages, would be the air breathed into and out of the lungs.¹⁷ It makes great sense to think of θυμός as breath, and so as life, when we think for instance of Peiros, leader of the Thracians, “breathing out his θυμός” at the moment of his death (θυμόν ἀποπνείων, *Il.* 4.524); and θυμός in that physical understanding goes well with the idea of μένος as life’s vital element—warriors in their epic state of battle rage are typically “breathing μένος,” as in the formulaic phrase μένεα πνεύοντες Ἀχαιοί.¹⁸ Moreover, if φρένες is the place where it all happens (and Onians’ anatomical observations are very convincing), it makes sense if there is a considerable amount of overlap between φρήν/φρένες and θυμός, so that they can be used to a certain extent interchangeably (without their becoming synonyms) and that μένος can be placed “in” both of them.

The identification of terms with organs or physiological activity, however, is not the solution to the riddle of Homeric “psychology.” In the abiding dichotomy between “body” and “soul” Onians has simply shifted the onus from the spiritual to the physical, coming close to imposing on Homer the terminology of modern medical science. In the end

¹⁶ Onians (1951: 23-38) with at pp. 39-40 a discussion of the interpretation of the φρένες as the diaphragm, mediated through Plato and the Hippocratics, but rejected for Homer.

¹⁷ Onians (1951: 44-53).

¹⁸ See also *Od.* 22.203. Note too that gods can breathe μένος into heroes, as at *Il.* 15.60 above; see also *Il.* 10.482; *Od.* 24.520. In spite of their strong affinity, however, μένος and θυμός are not synonymous: one can place μένος in the θυμός, but not vice versa; and “breathing out θυμός” would mean “die,” not being at the peak of life.

the issue becomes an acute problem of lexical semantics, as has recently been argued at length by Michael Clarke.¹⁹ Homeric φρένες and θυμός are not merely “lungs” and “breath,” for the simple reason that *we* do not associate the lungs and breath with thought or psychology, at least in the Homeric sense. As Clarke puts it, “the relationship between the bodily and mental identity of these entities [i.e., φρένες and θυμός] is subtle and elusive, with no equivalent in either the psychological or the anatomical language familiar today.”²⁰ Our Western millennia-old body-soul dichotomy hampers our understanding of Homeric conceptions of emotion, cognition, and physiology; the φρένες are at the same time much more physical than the “spirit” and much more spiritual than the “lungs.” The φρήν-derived verb φρονέω may for us, as post-Platonists, denote understanding, reflexion, wisdom, and prudence, but in Homer the verb is applied to wild animals as well as to warriors in the state of battle rage that is required in life-threatening situations.²¹ Conversely, the seemingly more physiological verb πνέω “breathe” is used for the calm deliberation that we like to associate with reflection and rational thought, as when characters are presented as being πεπνυμένος at the moment of their speech.

This leads us back to μένος and “remembering.” If breathing, thinking, and vigorous agency are one and the same thing that takes place in the φρένες (which by now has become an untranslatable word), then remembering is an integral part of this holistic conception of human nature, being physical no less than cognitive. It certainly takes place in one’s φρένες, the inhaling and exhaling of θυμός, as appears memorably in the praise of Penelope by Agamemnon’s ghost:

ὥς ἀγαθαὶ φρένες ἦσαν ἀμύμονι Πηνελοπείῃ
κούρη Ἰκαρίου· ὥς εὖ μέμνητ’ Ὀδυσῆος

How good were the φρένες of blameless Penelope,
daughter of Ikarios: how well she remembered Odysseus
(*Od.* 24.194-195)

Penelope’s remembering is expressed neither in the aorist form μνήσασθαι nor in the perfect μέμονα, which as we saw is reserved for states of extreme frenzy. Instead, another form is used, not created from Ablaut (μεν-/μον-), but built on the already modified root μνη-. Pene-

¹⁹ Clarke (1999).

²⁰ Clarke (1999: 77).

²¹ Clarke (1999: 83-84).

lope's state of μένος is more lasting and much less violent than the state of being μεμαῖα; she is μεμνημένη,²² a condition that comes close to "remembering" in our sense. The language of Agamemnon's praise, however, leaves no doubt that the remembering remains epic: it all happens in Penelope's φρένες, and the praise reads like a poetic gloss, presented at the end of the poem, of Penelope's fundamental epithet περίφρων "excelling in φρένες." Penelope's φρένες are equal to Odysseus', which amounts to the state of marital harmony that Odysseus himself earlier (6.183) characterizes in terms of ὁμοφροσύνη.

Agamemnon's praise, though poetically essential, is strictly speaking illogical, since Agamemnon, having himself as a shade in Hades lost his φρένες and so his μένος, is not supposed to have any remembering left in him. The only one in Hades who remembers is the seer Teiresias; he owes that prerogative to the fact that he retains his φρένες:

εἰς Αἴδαο δόμους καὶ ἐπαινῆς Περσεφονείης,
 ψυχῇ χρησομένους Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο,
 μάντιος ἀλαοῦ, τοῦ τε φρένες ἔμπεδοί εἰσι·
 τῶ καὶ τεθνηῶτι νόον πόρε Περσεφονεία
 οἷῳ πεπνῦσθαι· τοὶ δὲ σκιαὶ ἀΐσσοσιν.

into the houses of Hades and of awesome Persephone
 to receive the word of the soul of Teiresias of Thebes,
 blind seer (μάντις-μένος-man), whose φρένες are solid and steadfast:
 to him, even though dead, Persephone has granted νόος,
 to be the only one to be in a state of breath; and the others, they flutter
 around like shades.

(*Od.* 10.491-495)

Teiresias stands apart from the νεκύων ἀμηνῆνὰ κάρηνα "μένος-less heads of the dead" as the only soul in Hades that has φρένες and that can *breathe* (πεπνῦσθαι).²³ He is thus the only one who remembers; he recognizes Odysseus without having to drink from the blood of the sacrifice. He is also, and explicitly, the only one to have νόος, which, as we saw (see *Od.* 1.320-323 above), is a faculty that comes with a heightened state of μένος. Memory and prophecy, seeing the past and the future as well as what is hidden in the present, are one and the same thing, and make up the totality of the μάντις' vision, as appears also from Kal-

²² Cf. her words at 1.343: τοίην γὰρ κεφαλὴν ποθέω, μεμνημένη αἰεί.

²³ Clarke (1999: 84-85) rightly questions the usual practice of separating πέπνυμαι from πνέω simply on the grounds that the former is always "cognitive/spiritual" and the latter always "physical."

chas' seeing "what is, what is to be, and what has happened before" (*Il.* 1.70).

The similarity of this vision to that of the ἀοιδός as expressed by Hesiod (*Theog.* 32) may prompt us now to return from epic remembering to the remembering of epic, from the characters to the poem and its performer. The remembering of epic is closely associated with the Muses and their mother Mnemosyne, who, far from being associated with memory in the modern sense, are presented in terms that closely resemble the μένος that makes Hektor forget the pains afflicting him in his φρένες (*Il.* 15.59-61 above):

τὰς ἐν Πιερίῃ Κρονίδῃ τέκε πατρὶ μιγεῖσα
Μνημοσύνη, γουνοῖσιν Ἐλευθῆρος μεδέουσα,
λημοσύνην τε κακῶν ἄμπαυρά τε μερμηράων

These in Pieria she bore to Kronos' son, lying with the Father,
 Mnemosyne, who rules the high grounds of Eleuther,
 <to be> forgetfulness of evils and relief from sorrows.

(Hes. *Theog.* 53-55)

αὐτὰρ ἀοιδὸς
 Μουσάων θεράπων κλεῖα προτέρων ἀνθρώπων
 ὑμνήσει μάκαράς τε θεοὺς οἳ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν,
 αἴψ' ὃ γε δυσφροσυνέων ἐπιλήθεται οὐδέ τι κηδέων
μέμνηται. ταχέως δὲ παρέτραπε δῶρα θεάων.

But the Singer, servant of the Muses, the fame of earlier men
 he shall hymn as well as the blessed gods who hold Olympos,
 and straightforward one forgets one's misery and is not aware of one's cares:
 swiftly the gifts of the goddesses have turned these things away.

(Hes. *Theog.* 99-103)

The Muses are instrumental in making "bad breath" (*δυσφροσύνη*) go away in people listening to poetry, and in blocking the remembering of things that have no μένος, such as κήδεα "sorrows." The poet himself, on the other hand, is in his remembering presented as drawing directly on the divine μένος of the Muses as they themselves remember the epic past:

πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω,
 οὐδ' εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ' εἶεν,
 φωνὴ δ' ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δέ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη,
 εἰ μὴ Ὀλυμπιάδες Μοῦσαι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
 θυγατέρες μνησαίαθ' ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον.

<As for> their multitude, I could not turn it into words or name it,
 not if I had ten tongues, ten mouths,
 a voice unbreakable, <not if> a heart of bronze was inside me,
 if the Olympian Muses, daughters of Zeus who holds the aegis,
 did not remember all those who came unto Ilion.

(*Il.* 2.488-492)

Indeed, the Muses' very name marks them as agents of μένος: the word Μοῦσα probably contains an o-grade of μένος,²⁴ so that it could be an erstwhile agent noun. The Muse can set a singer in motion, breathing μένος into him, as when Demodokos starts singing: ὁ δ' ὀρμηθεὶς θεοῦ ἄρχετο "and he, urged on from the god, started singing" (*Od.* 8.499). In so doing, they are for the poet what Athene-Mentor/Mentes is for Telemachos. The Muse can also allow the singer to reach for divine energy himself, as in the opening of the Apollo Hymn, which we can now read as "Let me now draw μένος from Apollo." Either way, a poet in performance, just like a warrior in battle, needs a strong voice and a healthy heart, but for his remembering, his drawing on divine energy, he needs most of all good lungs.

Bibliography

- Bakker, E. J. (1999). "How Oral is Oral Composition?" In *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*, E. A. Mackay, ed.: 29-47. Leiden: Brill.
- Bakker E. J. (2002). "Remembering the God's Arrival." *Arethusa* 35.1: 63-81.
- Bakker E. J. (2005). *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics*. Washington and Cambridge: Center for Hellenic Studies, Harvard Univ. Press.
- Bartolotta, A. (2003). "Towards a Reconstruction of Indo-European Culture: The Semantic Functions of IE *men-." In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, K. Jones-Bley et al., ed.: 37-62. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Chantraine, P. (1968-1980). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Clarke, Michael. (1999). *Flesh and Spirit in the Songs of Homer*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Moran, W. S. (1975). "Μιμνήσκομαι and 'Remembering': Epic Stories in Homer and the Hymns." *QUCC* 20: 195-211.

²⁴ Chantraine (1968-1980: 716). We arrive best at Μοῦσα (Μοῖσα) by seeing the diphthong as the result of compensatory lengthening (<*mon-t-yh₂>); for the -t-, -μνηστis could be a parallel.

- Muellner, L. (1996). *The Anger of Achilles: Mēnis in Greek Epic*. Ithaca and London: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Nagy, Gregory (1974). *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Nagy, Gregory (1990). *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca and London: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Onians, R. B (1951). *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Pokorny, Julius (1959-1969). *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern and Munich: Francke.
- Rubin, D. C. (1995). *Memory in Oral Traditions: The Cognitive Psychology of Epic, Ballads, and Counting-Out Rhymes*. New York and Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Watkins, C. (1997). "On Μῆνις." *JIES* 3: 686-722.

CHAPTER FOUR

“SOMEONE, I SAY, WILL REMEMBER US”: ORAL MEMORY IN SAPPHO’S POETRY

ANDRÉ LARDINOIS

Sappho is often considered a central figure in the transition from archaic to classical Greek culture, especially by German scholars. Bruno Snell, for example, assigned her a prominent place in his discovery of the mind, while Hermann Fränkel hailed her as a proto-philosopher.¹ More recently she has been assigned an important role in the transition from orality to literacy, again mainly by German scholars, but British scholars such as Martin West and Robert Parker have committed themselves to this viewpoint as well.² These scholars argue that fragments of Sappho that express her confidence of being remembered in the future indicate that she wrote her poems down and expected them to be read by future generations. If this interpretation were correct, it would indeed mark a significant stage in the development of literacy in early Greece. It would present us with a poet of the early sixth century who not only committed her poetry to writing but could count on its continued popularity, distribution, and preservation to ensure her immortality in print. This would be a serious blow to those who argue that there were no readers of poetry in any significant numbers before the fifth century, such as Bruno Gentili, Rosalind Thomas, or Andrew Ford.³

I do not believe, however, that Sappho’s references to the recollection of her poetry in the future are related to its being recorded in writing. Building on arguments advanced by Herwig Maehler, Wolfgang Rösler, and Alex Hardie,⁴ I shall argue in this paper that Sappho first of all expected the *performances* of her poetry to be remembered in the future and secondly, perhaps, believed that she would be allowed to play

¹ Snell (1982: 46 ff.) and Fränkel (1968: 91); cf. Fränkel (1962: 212).

² West (1970: 315) and Parker (1981: 161). Cf. Stein (1990: 268-69). For earlier references, see Rösler (1980: 72 n.105).

³ Gentili (1988: esp. 3-23), Thomas (1992), and Ford (2003).

⁴ Maehler (1963: 59-63), Rösler (1980: 72-75), and Hardie (2005).

on as singer-poet in the underworld. I do not deny the possibility that Sappho knew how to write and used writing to record her poetry, but, if she did, such recordings were meant to enable her poetry to be re-performed and not to be enjoyed as literature-on-the-page.⁵ Bruno Currie argues the same for Pindar's recording of his epinician poetry, a full century after Sappho, and it was probably true for the recordings of the Homeric poems in the sixth century as well.⁶ The re-performance of Sappho's poetry would constitute a third way in which her name could live on.⁷ I doubt, however, that she would have staked her reputation on the written records of her poetry. For Sappho these written records would have constituted merely the librettos of her songs, not the final product.

Remembering Sappho

In order to assess the evidence, let us first consider the fragments adduced by those who argue for the memorization of Sappho's poetry in writing. Most important to their argument is fragment 55, which Sappho addresses, according to Stobaeus, to an uneducated woman (πρὸς ἀπαιδευτον γυναικα); according to Plutarch, who quotes the lines as well in two different treatises, they are addressed to a rich or to an uncultured (ἄμουσος) and ignorant (ἄμαθής) woman.⁸ They read as follows:

κατθάνοισα δὲ κείση οὐδέ ποτα μναμοσύνα σέθεν
 ἔσσειε' οὐδὲ πρόθα εἰς ὕστερον· οὐ γὰρ πεδέχης βρόδων
 τῶν ἐκ Πιερίας· ἀλλ' ἀφάνης κὰν Αἶδα δόμῳ
 φοιτάσης πεδ' ἀμαύρων νεκύων ἐκπεποταμένα.⁹

⁵ Cf. Andersen (1987: 39-40) and Schmitz (2002: 71-72).

⁶ Currie (2004: 56) and, for Homer, Nagy (1996: 29-112), who refers to written texts of the Homeric epics in the sixth century as "transcripts" of (re)performances. On the reperformances of archaic Greek poetry in general, see Herington (1985) esp. 48-50.

⁷ Jong (2006) has recently argued that the Homeric poet expected eternal fame through the reperformance of his epics.

⁸ Stob. 3.4.12, Plut. *Coniug. praec.* 145f-146a and *Quaest. conv.* 646ef, quoted by Campbell (1990: ad loc).

⁹ For the fragments and testimonia of Sappho, I have adopted the text of Campbell (1990), unless noted otherwise. My translations are also based on those of Campbell, with some adaptation. The reading οὐδὲ πρόθα in line 2 is uncertain (see Voigt 1971: ad loc.), but changing or removing these words does not affect my interpretation of fr. 55.

But when you die you will lie there and afterwards there will never be any memory of you nor longing later, since you have no share in the roses of Pieria; unseen in the house of Hades also, flown from our midst, you will go to and fro among the shadowy corpses.

Pieria is a mountain in northern Greece sacred to the Muses, and propo- nents of a literary Sappho suggest that by the words “roses of Pieria” she means her poems. Because Sappho composed such poems and they are preserved in writing, she will be remembered, unlike the “uncultured” (ἄμουσος) woman, to whom the lines are addressed. This woman did not record “roses of Pieria” and therefore will not be remembered after her death.

This interpretation of fragment 55 is defended with reference to two other fragments of Sappho. In fragment 147, Sappho would be expressing her confidence that she and whomever she is addressing will be remembered: μνάσασθαι τινά φαιμι † καὶ ἕτερον † ἀμμέων (“I say that someone (and the other?) will remember us”). In a related testimonium (fr. 193), the second century orator Aelius Aristides reports that one can hear Sappho boast, presumably in her poetry, that the Muses have made her truly blessed and that she will be remembered even after her death:

οἶμαι δέ σε καὶ Σαπφοῦς ἀκηκοέναι πρὸς τινὰς τῶν εὐδαιμόνων δοκουσῶν εἶναι γυναικῶν μεγαλαυχουμένης καὶ λεγούσης ὡς αὐτὴν αἱ Μοῦσαι τῶ ὄντι ὀλβίαν τε καὶ ζηλωτὴν ἐποίησαν καὶ ὡς οὐδ’ ἀποθανούσης ἔσται λήθη.

I think you must have heard Sappho too boasting to some of those women reputed to be fortunate and saying that the Muses had made her truly blessed and enviable, and that she would not be forgotten even when she was dead.¹⁰

Sappho’s honoured status as a poet and her fame after death appear to be the subject of fragments 32 and 65 as well. In fragment 32 some female personages have honoured the I-person by the gift of their works: αἶ με τιμίαν ἐπόησαν ἔργα / τὰ σφὰ δοῖσαι (“who made me honoured, having presented me with their gifts”). It has been plausibly suggested that these female figures are the Muses, whom Aristides also mentions in his testimonium as making Sappho blessed and enviable.¹¹

¹⁰ Fr. 193. Voigt (1971: *ad* fr. 55) believes that Aristides in this passage was thinking of the poem from which fr. 55 is derived. Lobel & Page (1955: *ad* fr. 193) relate the testimonium to fr. 147, but this connection is rightly rejected by Maehler (1963: 61 n.2) and Rösler (1980 72-73: n.107).

¹¹ Campbell (1990: *ad loc.*) and Aloni (1997: 66).

In the badly damaged fragment 65, both fame and the underworld are mentioned together. Sappho is directly addressed in line 5 and someone, perhaps the goddess Aphrodite,¹² promises her in the last two lines “fame everywhere (πάνται κλέος) ... even in the house (or on the shores?) of Acheron (καί σ’ ἐνν Ἀχέρ[οντ].” Acheron is one of the rivers that flow through the underworld and is also mentioned in Sappho fr. 95.

These five fragments form the basis for the belief that Sappho expected to be remembered as a poet in the future. While they clearly speak about poetic activities and Sappho’s fame after death, however, some important questions remain: how do Sappho’s fame and her poetry exactly relate to one another? is she necessarily the speaker in all these fragments? and do the gifts of the Muses or the roses of Pieria, mentioned in fragments 32 and 55, necessarily refer to written texts through which Sappho will be remembered?

Memory in Sappho’s Other Fragments

In order to answer these questions I shall first take a look at some other poems of Sappho in which people are remembered, because memory is an important theme in Sappho’s poetry and recurs repeatedly.¹³ In all these cases the first person speaker refers to her recollection of the *performance* of a young woman, and I will argue that this is also what Sappho is primarily thinking of when she speaks about memories of her poetry after her death: the recollection of the performances of her poems by her near-contemporaries.

The first poem I would like to discuss is fragment 16 of Sappho. In lines 15-16 of this fragment something or someone reminds the first person speaker of a woman named Anaktoria, who is not with her: με νῦν Ἀνακτορίας ὄνέμναισ’ οὐ παρείσσας (“... has reminded me now of Anaktoria, who is not here”).¹⁴ In the next strophe she recalls two particular features of Anaktoria: her lovely walk (ἔρατόν τε βᾶμα) and the bright sparkle of her face (κάμάρυγμα λάμπρον ... προσώπω). It

¹² Thus Campbell (1990: ad loc.) and Aloni (1997: 116-17). For a new and imaginative reconstruction of this fragment, connecting it with frs. 60, 66c, 67, and 86, see Ferrari (2007: 62-64). He also suggests that Aphrodite is the speaker.

¹³ Cf. Maehler (1963: 59-63) and Burnett (1983: 277-313).

¹⁴ The subject of this sentence is Eros, Aphrodite, or Helena; see Voigt (1971: ad loc.).

is these two features she would rather see than the chariots or armed infantrymen of the Lydians (fr. 16, 17-20). The bright sparkle of Anaktoria’s face betrays her age: Anaktoria was a young, marriageable woman, to whom such brightness of the face is often attributed in archaic Greek poetry.¹⁵ It has been suggested that she had recently left Sappho’s circle in order to marry. I find this suggestion entirely plausible, as long as we recognize that Sappho’s circle was not “ein Mädchenpensionat,” as Wilamowitz tentatively suggested,¹⁶ nor a gathering of adult, sympotic women, as more recently advanced,¹⁷ but a choral group which performed and danced to the songs of Sappho, as Reinhold Merkelbach and Claude Calame have argued.¹⁸

In accordance with this choral interpretation of Sappho’s group, Anton Bierl has recently proposed that into the description of Anaktoria’s lovely gait (ἔρατον βᾶμα) should be read a reference to her movements while dancing.¹⁹ Sappho or the first person speaker would be missing in particular the elegance and radiance Anaktoria displayed while dancing in the chorus line. I admit that this reading is speculative, but it gains support from two other fragments in which Sappho speaks about the recollection of young women. The first of these two fragments is fragment 96. Its opening lines read as follows:

]Σαρδ . [. .]	
πόλ]λακι τυίδε [ν]ῶν ἔχοισα	2
ὡσπ . [. . .] . ὠομεν , . [. . .] . . χ [. .]	
σε θέαι σ' ἰκέλαν ἀρι-	
γνώται , σαῖ δὲ μάλιστ' ἔχαιρε μόλπαι·	5
νῦν δὲ Λύδαισιν ἐμπρέπεται γυναι-	
κεσσιν ὡς ποτ' ἀελίω	
δύντος ἅ βροδοδάκτυλος Σελάννα	
πάντα περρέχοισ' ἄστρα· φάος δ' ἐπί-	
σχει θάλασσαν ἐπ' ἀλμύραν	10
ἴσως καὶ πολυανθέμοις ἀρούραις·	

¹⁵ Brown (1989).

¹⁶ Wilamowitz (1905: 26). For the context of his remark, see Calder (1986).

¹⁷ Parker (1993), to be read with my reply in Lardinois (1994).

¹⁸ Merkelbach (1957), Calame (1997: esp. 210-14) and (1996). Following this choral interpretation of Sappho’s group, I have argued that there are among the fragments of Sappho more choral songs than is generally recognized (Lardinois [1996]). For example, I have argued that fr. 16 was probably sung by a chorus of female friends of Anaktoria: Lardinois (1996: 166-67) and (2001: 83-85).

¹⁹ Bierl (2003: 118) with earlier references.

ἄ δ' ἔέρσα κάλα κέχυται, τεθά-
 λαισι δὲ βρόδα κᾶπαλ' ἄν-
 θρυσκα καὶ μελίλωτος ἀνθεμῶδης·

πόλλα δὲ ζαφοίταισ', ἀγάνας ἐπι- 15
 μνάσθεισ' Ἄτθιδος ἱμέρω
 λέπταν ποι φρένα κ[α]ρ[τέρ]ω<ι> βόρηται.²⁰

... Sardis... often turning her thoughts in this direction... (she honoured) you as being like a goddess for all to see and took much delight in your song-dance. But now she stands out among Lydian women like rosy-fingered Moon after sunset, surpassing all the stars, and her light spreads alike over the salt sea and the flowery fields; the dew is shed in beauty, and roses bloom and tender chervil and flowery melilot. Often as she goes to and fro she remembers gentle Atthis and is consumed in her tender heart by strong desire (for Atthis).

In this case it is not Sappho nor the singer of the song who remembers the young woman named Atthis, but another woman, who currently resides in Lydia. She too may recently have left Sappho's group. What this woman in Lydia remembers in particular is the *molpa* or song-dance of the poem's internal addressee, who probably is Atthis.²¹ Memory in these fragments of Sappho for young women is based on the oral performance of songs, not their written record. Furthermore, the recollection of the girls, whether Anaktoria, Atthis or the woman in Lydia, is kept alive through song. It is through the performance of these songs that the audience is reminded of the young women and their earlier performances.

The next poem I would like to discuss is fragment 94 of Sappho, which contains a dialogue between Sappho and another woman who left her reluctantly, perhaps again in order to get married.²² The beginning of this fragment reads as follows:

...
 τεθνάκην δ' ἀδόλωσ θελω·
 ἄ με ψισδομένα κατελίμπανεν 2

²⁰ I have adopted in line 17 the supplement proposed by Kamerbeek (1956: 101). For my justification of this reading, see Lardinois (2001: 86 n.55). I further agree with Janko (1982) that σελάνωα in line 8 most probably represents the personal name of the goddess and have adjusted Campbell's text and translation accordingly.

²¹ Page (1955: 92), Burnett (1983: 302-303), and Campbell (1990: 123 n.1). More likely than not, this *molpa* was a song-dance composed by Sappho.

²² Merkelbach (1957: 12-13); cf. Rauk (1989: 110) and Foley (1994: 135).

πόλλα καὶ τόδ' ἔειπέ [μοι·
 'ὦμι' ὡς δεῖνα πεπ[όνθ]αμεν,
 Ψάπφ', ἦ μάν σ' ἀέκοισ' ἀπυλιμπάνω·

5

τὰν δ' ἔγω τὰδ' ἀμειβόμεν·
 'χαίροισ' ἔρχεο κᾶμεθεν
 μέμναισ', οἴσθα γὰρ ὡς σε πεδήπομεν·

αἰ δὲ μή, ἀλλὰ σ' ἔγω θέλω
 ὄμναισαι [σὺ δὲ] δ[ὴ φρ]ασσαι

10

ὄσ[σ' ἴμερτά τε] καὶ κάλ' ἐπάσχομεν·²³

... “honestly I wish I were dead.”²⁴ She was leaving me with many tears and said this: “Oh what bad luck has been ours, Sappho; truly, I leave you against my will.” I replied to her thus: “Go and fare well and remember me, for you know how we cared for you. If not, well then I want to remind you, and you consider all the lovely and beautiful things we experienced.”

The next six strophes list some of the beautiful things Sappho and the young woman did together. Lines 21 to 23, in which Sappho speaks about a longing the girl satisfied on soft beds, have, for obvious reasons, drawn most critical attention, but the other activities Sappho mentions are just as important for the interpretation of the song: lines 12 and following speak about the stringing of flower-wreaths, and the next two strophes about the donning of garlands and the wearing of perfume. After the strophe about soft beds, there is mention of going to holy places, where there is sound (ψόφος) and perhaps choral activities (χ[ό]ρος).²⁵ This whole list of activities, with the possible exception of lying on soft beds, is compatible with the activities of a choral group. One can even read a linear progression into them, starting with the preparations for a choral performance (the stringing of flower-wreaths, the donning of garlands and perfume) and leading up to musical performances at temples and other holy places.²⁶ It is of such performances that Sappho wants to remind the girl.

²³ I have adopted the reconstruction of Slings (1994) in lines 10-11.

²⁴ The speaker of this line could be either Sappho or the girl; see Lardinois (1996: 163 n.66) for a list of supporters of both points of view. The reference to Robbins (1980) there should be Robbins (1990).

²⁵ Cf. fr. 44.25-26: καὶ ψ[ό]φο[ς] κ[ι]ροτάλ[ων], λιγέ[ω]ς δ' ἄρα πάρ[θ]ενοι / ἄειδον μέλος ἄγν[ου].

²⁶ Cf. Lardinois (1994: 70). I agree with Wilamowitz (1913: 50) that the girl in lines 21-23 is probably satisfying her longing for sleep (cf. Hom. *Il* 13.636-37). For this and other suggestions, see Burnett (1983: 298 n.56), Lardinois (1996: 164 n.70) and (2001: 86 n.51).

The bond between Sappho and the girls who have left her group thus rely on shared memories of performances of Sappho's songs. These performances are so vivid and, by implication, so good that they outlive the occasion and are remembered many years after. Such memories, of course, reflect well on both Sappho and the girls. It is her songs as well as the gait of Anaktoria and the voice of Atthis that are remembered long after the occasion. If we keep this function of memory in the fragments of Sappho about young women in mind and return to those that speak about the recollection of her poetry, we can see that they too relate in all likelihood to the *performance* of her poetry, which is long remembered after the event, and not to its recording in writing.

Remembering Sappho in Performance

The first poem discussed in the section on "Remembering Sappho" above was fragment 55, in which is addressed a woman of whom there will be no memory because she did not share in the roses of Pieria; instead she will flutter unnoticed among the corpses in the underworld. Sappho is not in this poem saying that the woman will not be remembered because she did not write poetry. Rather, I would suggest that the woman is not remembered because, unlike Atthis or Anaktoria, she did not participate in the performances of Sappho's songs. It is to such performances that the roses of Pieria, mentioned in this fragment, probably relate. It has been suggested that these roses refer specifically to a garland, such as the *stephanos* Sappho and the girl in fragment 94 string together.²⁷ Such a reading would fit my interpretation of the fragment as relating to the performance of Sappho's songs. At the same time, these roses probably bear a larger, metaphorical meaning as well, but I doubt that they refer just to her poems, let alone to poetry books. The roses of Pieria stand for all of Sappho's poetic activities, including the performance of her songs by groups of young women.

That we may suspect a group activity behind the image of the roses is suggested by the verb *πεδέχης*: the uneducated or ignorant woman has no "share in" / does not "participate in" the roses of Pieria.²⁸ Instead of sharing in the roses of Pieria with Sappho and her group, the woman

²⁷ Hardie (2005: 18 n.36) with earlier references.

²⁸ The verb *πεδέχω* is the Aeolic equivalent of Attic *μετέχω*, meaning "to partake of, share in."

shares her activities with the shadowy corpses in the underworld (πεδ' ἀμαύρων νεκύων), where the same preposition πεδά (= Attic: μετά) recurs.²⁹ These underworld activities of the woman consist of “moving around unseen” (ἀφάνης... φοιτάσης), movements which may be contrasted with the radiant and memorable dancing of Anaktoria or Atthis, referred to in fragments 16 and 96.

It is, furthermore, quite likely that the woman did first participate in Sappho's group but left it prematurely and against Sappho's wishes, as do some other girls mentioned in her poetry.³⁰ According to Alex Hardie, this is what the participle ἐκπεποταμένα is meant to express “flown away,” or, as Campbell translates, “flown from our midst.”³¹ Hardie quotes fragment 131, where Sappho uses a similar verb and image for Atthis, who at this point had become unfaithful.³² The flying away of the woman in fragment 55 could refer to her premature departure from Sappho's group, denying her the possibility of making an everlasting impression through her participation in the choral performances of Sappho's songs.

Finally, I do not exclude the possibility that the speaker in this fragment is not Sappho but a chorus of young women: who better than they could point out to the girl what she is missing and contrast their own company, which may be dancing while singing this song, with the shadowy corpses among whom the “uncultured” girl will pass unseen in the future? The fact that Plutarch and Stobaeus say that it was Sappho who addressed these words to the woman hardly registers as counter-argument because ancient commentators are notorious in identifying the first-person speaker of archaic Greek poetry with the poet/composer himself and in reading the poems autobiographically.³³

If we look at the other fragments that speak about Sappho's poetic activities and their remembrance in the future, we find that they too can better be connected with the performance of her songs than their recording in writing. In fragment 147, someone tells someone else that

²⁹ Hardie (2005: 17-18). My reading follows closely Hardie's interpretation of fr. 55.

³⁰ E.g. frs. 71 and 131. For other fragments in which girls are mentioned who left Sappho's group prematurely, see Page (1955: 133-36) and Rösler (1980: 73 n.109).

³¹ Campbell (1990: 98).

³² Hardie (2005: 19-20).

³³ Lefkowitz (1981: Introd. 8) and Lardinois (1994: 60-62) with examples from among the fragments of Sappho.

they will be remembered (μνάσασθαί τινά φαίμι ἴκαί ἕτερον ἄμμέων). Again, it is far from certain that Sappho is the speaker in this fragment. The first-person speaker could just as well be a chorus, which expresses its confidence that it will be remembered, as a group, because of its brilliant performance and the possible re-performance of the song.³⁴ Even if the speaker is Sappho, however, she would be including at least one other person, if not the whole group, in the recollection of her, and the fact that she “says” or “declares” (φαίμι) that they will be remembered shows her reliance on the voice and the performance of this song to spread the news about their future fame. The same is implied by the word *kleos*, which the first-person speaker uses in fragment 65, line 9. This word is most often used, at least in the archaic age, for a report that is spread through oral communication.³⁵

That Sappho’s fame is related to her poetic activities is confirmed by Aristides’ report (fr. 193). Aristides says that the Muses have made Sappho blessed, enviable, and memorable, even after death, but whether this blessed state or memory is based on a written record or on the recollection of her performances is not specified. In fragment 32, Sappho speaks about gifts of the Muses, if they are the antecedent of the relative clause, as seems likely: with these gifts they “have made her honoured” (αἷ με τιμίαν ἐπόησαν ἔργα / τὰ σφὰ δοῖσαι).

For the nature of these gifts we may turn to the opening lines of the much-discussed “new Sappho poem” about Tithonos and old age, where Sappho talks about “gifts of the Muses” as well.³⁶ Unfortunately only the second half of these opening lines is preserved. According to the first editors of the newly reconstituted poem, the speaker, whom they identify as Sappho, makes a first-person statement in these lines about her own poetic activities to a group of children: “I bring these lovely gifts of the violet-bosomed Muses, children, picking up again the clear,

³⁴ Cf. Bakker (2002/2005) on the close connection between memory and performance.

³⁵ Olson (1995: 1-23) with reference to Snell (1955-: 1438-40) and Redfield (1975: 31-35). After the oral presentation of this paper at the conference in Auckland, Ruth Scodel objected that *kleos* was too strong a term for the oral report of a local performance of Sappho’s songs, but line 174 of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, in which the narrator promises to spread the *kleos* of the Delian maidens after he has heard them sing on Delos, constitutes a close parallel. On the significance of πάντα in fr. 65.9, see Rösler (1980: 74 n. 113).

³⁶ In reality this is not a new poem of Sappho, but a newly reconstituted one, based on an old Oxyrhynchus papyrus (fr. 58) and new fragments from Cologne, published by Gronewald and Daniel in 2004.

melodious lyre” (φέρω τάδε Μοίσαν ἰορκ[ό]λῳπων κάλα δῶρα, παῖδες, / [λάβοισα πάλιν τὰ]ν φιλάοιδον λιγύραν χελύνναν).³⁷ Martin West, on the other hand, has suggested that Sappho is addressing the children and commands them with the words: “You for the lovely gifts of the violet-bosomed Muses, children, be zealous and for the clear melodious lyre” (“Υμεις πεδὰ Μοίσαν ἰορκ[ό]λῳπων κάλα δῶρα, παῖδες, / [σπουδάσδετε καὶ τὰ]ν φιλάοιδον λιγύραν χελύνναν).³⁸ In both cases, however, the gifts of the Muses refer to poetry *in performance*. Sappho is producing these gifts and playing the lyre, while the children she addresses are probably dancing to her song. I shall return to this poem later. For now it is enough to have shown that for Sappho the works or gifts of the Muses consist of more than letters on a page. They include the whole performance context: song, music, and dance. It is because of these that she expects herself and her choruses to be remembered.

Remembering Sappho in the Underworld?

What the references in Sappho’s poetry to her fame after death primarily entail is the memory of the performances of her songs by her near-contemporaries. However, I do not exclude the possibility that Sappho in her poetry argued for a distinctive and better existence in the underworld, arising from her status as a gifted musician, as well. Wolfgang Rösler first advanced this idea and it has recently been proposed again by Alex Hardie.³⁹ The reason that Hardie decided to revive Rösler’s suggestion is the publication by Gronewald and Daniel of a Sappho fragment preceding the reconstituted poem about Tithonos and old age on the Cologne papyrus.⁴⁰ This fragment, unlike the Tithonos poem, constitutes a truly new poem of Sappho, which was not known previously. It has received, however, little critical attention, probably because it is so badly preserved. I have printed below the *editio princeps* of this fragment, which I have labelled Cologne Papyrus Poem 1. It is followed by two possible reconstructions of the poem, one by Hardie and the other by Martin West.⁴¹

³⁷ Gronewald and Daniel (2004a: 7).

³⁸ West (2005: 4).

³⁹ Rösler (1980: 73-74) and Hardie (2005).

⁴⁰ Gronewald and Daniel (2004a: 2 and 5-6).

⁴¹ Hardie (2005: 22-27) and West (2005: 1-3).

A. *Editio Princeps* of the Cologne Papyrus Poem 1

]. ο. [
]. υχ. . [
] νῦν θαλ[ί]α γ. [
]. νέρθε δὲ γᾶς γε. [...].
].. ν ἔχοισα γέρας, ὡς [ἔ]οικεν, 5
]. οιν, ὡς νῦν ἐπὶ γᾶς ἔοισαν
] λιγύραν [α]ῖ κεν ἔλοισα πᾶκτιν
].... α. κάλα, Μοῖσ', αἰίδω.

B. Reconstruction of the Cologne Papyrus Poem 1 by Hardie (2005)

] νῦν θαλ[ί]α πα[ρέστω
]. νέρθε δὲ γᾶς περ[ί]σχοι
 μολπά μ' ἔτι Μοῖσαιον ἔχοισα γέρας, ὡς [ἔ]οικεν, 5
 αὔθις δὲ με θαυμάζοιεν, ὡς νῦν ἐπὶ γᾶς ἔοισαν
 αἶνεσι μ' ἄοιδον λιγύραν [α]ῖ κεν ἔλοισα πᾶκτιν
].... α. κάλα, Μοῖσ', αἰίδω.

C. Reconstruction of the Cologne Papyrus Poem 1 by West (2005)

] νῦν θαλ[ί]α πα[ρέστω
]. νέρθε δὲ γᾶς περ[ί]σχοι
 κλέος μέγα Μοῖσαιον ἔχοισαν γέρας, ὡς [ἔ]οικεν, 5
 πάντῃ δὲ με θαυμάζοιεν, ὡς νῦν ἐπὶ γᾶς ἔοισαν
 κάλεισι χελίδω λιγύραν [α]ῖ κεν ἔλοισα πᾶκτιν
 ἢ βάρβιτον ἢ τάνδε χελύγγιν θαλάμοισ' αἰίδω.

Even if we consider just the bare text of the *editio princeps*, it is obvious that the poem draws a contrast between a *thalia* or festivity now (νῦν θαλ[ί]α in line 3) and something under the earth (νέρθε δὲ γᾶς in line 4), where some woman is holding a *geras* or honorary gift, while being in the same situation as she is now on earth (ὡς νῦν ἐπὶ γᾶς ἔοισαν, line 6) and singing (αἰίδω).

Hardie's reconstruction is very explicit about the poem's reference to Sappho's existence as a poet after death. In Hardie's reconstruction, the poem reads: "Now let a feast be present ... but below the earth may song-dance surround me, still holding the honour that comes from the Muses, as is appropriate, and may they [i.e. the dead] wonder at me afresh,⁴² just as now, when I am on earth, they praise me as a sweet singer, if, having picked up the lyre ..., I sing beautiful songs, o Muse."

⁴² Hardie (2005: 23) justifies this reading by pointing to a possible echo of this scene in Horace, *Od.* 2.13.29-30: *utrumque* (sc. Sappho and Alcaeus) *sacro digna silentio / mirantur umbrae dicere* ("the shades [in the underworld] marvel at each as

Martin West’s reading is not dissimilar and quite explicit about Sappho’s privileged position in the underworld as well. He reconstructs the poem as follows: “Now let a feast be present . . . but below the earth may great fame surround me, holding the honour that comes from the Muses, as is appropriate, and may they wonder at me everywhere, just as now, when I am on earth, they call me a sweet-sounding swallow, if, having picked up the *pektis* or *barbitos* or this tortoise-shaped lyre, I sing in (bridal?) chambers.”⁴³

Both Hardie and West connect this poem with fragment 65, where someone speaks about the *kleos* Sappho enjoys everywhere, even in the house of Acheron. They argue that this *kleos* not only refers to the worldly fame that reaches Sappho in the underworld, but that she enjoys the same fame and reputation among the dead as she did among the living. This is a possible interpretation, but fragment 65 does not have to be read in this way, as we have seen, and their reconstruction of Poem 1 of the Cologne papyrus remains speculative. However, even if Sappho expressed such eschatological views, they have nothing to do with the recording of her poetry in writing. On the contrary, Sappho would be continuing her existence and enjoying her reputation as a singer and performer, not as a writer of poetry, in the underworld.

I would like to end this discussion by saying something about the newly reconstituted Sappho poem, whose opening lines I have already discussed above. One cannot write about Sappho these days without at least mentioning this poem, whose translation has figured in almost every newspaper and magazine since its publication in 2004. The poem is, however, relevant to the theme of Sappho’s poetic immortality. I will not discuss here the problems surrounding the reconstruction of the poem.⁴⁴ Instead, I have printed below text and translation as proposed by Martin West:

they utter things worthy of sacred silence”). Cf. Di Benedetto (2005: 7), who suggests reading ψῦχαι κέ με θαυμάζοιεν at the beginning of line 6.

⁴³ West reads the last line of the poem differently from Hardie and the *editio princeps*.

⁴⁴ For recent discussions of the poem, see Gronewald and Daniel (2004a), (2004b), (2005), Janko (2005), West (2005), Di Benedetto (2006), Rawles (2006), Bettarini (2007) and Ferrari (2007: 179-86 with earlier references). One of the biggest questions surrounding the new poem, to which I hope to return in the future, is whether or not it originally continued with four lines that follow in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus (fr. 58.23-26) but are absent from the Cologne papyrus: see the contrasting views of Bernsdorff (2005) and Edmunds (2006).

Ἕμμες πεδὰ Μοῖσαν ἰοκ[ό]λπων κάλα δῶρα, παῖδες,
σπουδάσδετε καὶ τὰ]ν φιλάοιδον λιγύραν χελύνναν·

ἔμοι δ' ἄπαλον πρίν] ποτ' [ἔ]οντα χροὰ γῆρας ἦδη
ἐπέλλαβε, λεῦκαι δ' ἐγ]ένοντο τρίχες ἐκ μελαίναν·

βάρυς δέ μ' ὁ [θ]ῦμοξ πεπόηται, γόνα δ' [ο]ὐ φέροισι, 5
τὰ δὴ ποτα λαΐψηρ' ἔον ὄρχησθ' ἴσα νεβρίοισι.

τὰ <μὲν> στεναχίσδω θαμέωξ· ἀλλὰ τί κεν ποεῖην;
ἀγήραον ἄνθρωπον ἔοντ' οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι

καὶ γάρ π[ο]τὰ Τίθωνον ἔφαντο βροδόπαχυν Αὔων 10
ἔρωι φ⁴⁵. . αἰθῖσαν βάμεν' εἰς ἔσχατα γὰς φέροισα[ν],

ἔοντα [κ]άλλον καὶ νέον, ἀλλ' αὐτον ὕμωξ ἔμαρψε
χρόνωι πρόλιον γῆρας, ἔχ[ο]ντ' ἀθανάταν ἄκοιτιν.

[You for] the fragrant-bosomed Muses' lovely gifts,
[be zealous,] girls, [and the] clear melodious lyre;

[but my once tender] body old age now
[has seized,] my hair's turned [white] instead of dark;

my heart's grown heavy, my knees will not support me, 5
that on a time were fleet for the dance as fawns.

This state I oft bewail; but what's to do?
Not to grow old, being human, there's no way.

Tithonus once, the tale was, rose-armed Dawn,
love-smitten (?), carried off to the world's end, 10

handsome and young then, yet in time grey age
o'ertook him, husband of immortal wife.

In the first two lines Sappho addresses a group of children, who are probably dancing while she is singing and playing the lyre. In the next four lines she explains that she has grown old and, as a result, is no longer able to dance. She has often complained about this situation, but at the same time reconciled herself to it, because, as she says, it is impossible for any human being not to grow old. She then illustrates this gnomic thought with the story of Tithonos, who married the Dawn goddess but nevertheless grew old.

Central to the interpretation of this poem is the question of how much of the Tithonos story we are meant to recall. Richard Janko has pointed

⁴⁵ My own observation of the papyrus and consultation of Michael Gronewald and Robert Daniel has convinced me that a *delta*, *labda*, or *alpha* should be read in this spot rather than the *phi* proposed by West.

out that according to a known version of the myth, Tithonos, as husband of Dawn, withered away and changed into a cicada, a creature that in Greek literature is often compared to singers and poets.⁴⁶ If we adduce this part of the myth, the similarities between Tithonos and the first person speaker increase and the poem would end with a surprising twist: like Tithonos, Sappho inevitably has grown old, but just like him she is still capable of singing and playing the lyre, as demonstrated by her performance of this song. If read in this way, the poem would comment on Sappho’s poetic survival as well. In this case it would not extend beyond the grave, but, like all other memories referred to in Sappho’s poetry, it is rooted in performance: both Sappho and Tithonos live on as long as their voices can be heard. The fact that we modern classicists have to settle for the tattered remains of silent papyrus columns does not mean that for an archaic Greek poet like Sappho they would have presented a viable alternative to the memory of her living voice.

Bibliography

- Aloni, A. (1997). *Saffo. Frammenti*. Florence: Giunti.
- Andersen, Ø. (1987). “Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im frühen Griechentum.” *A&A* 33: 29-44.
- Bakker, E. J. (2002). “Remembering the God’s Arrival.” *Arethusa* 35.1: 63-81, reprinted in E. J. Bakker (2005). *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics*: 136-53. Washington and Cambridge, MA: Center for Hellenic Studies, Harvard Univ. Press.
- Bernsdorff, H. (2005). “Offene Gedichtschlüsse.” *ZPE* 153:1-6.
- Bettarini, L. (2007). “Note esegetiche alla nuova Saffo: I versi di Titono (Fr. 58, 19-22 V.)” *ZPE* 159: 1-10.
- Bierl, A. (2003). “‘Ich aber (sage), das Schönste ist, was einer liebt!’: Eine pragmatische Deutung von Sappho Fr. 16 LP/V.” *QUCC* 74: 91-124.
- Burnett, A. (1983). *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Brown, C. (1989). “Anaktoria and the Χαρίτων ἀμαρύγματα: Sappho fr. 16.18 Voigt.” *QUCC* 61: 7-15.
- Calame, C. (1997 [1977]). *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece*, transl. J. Orion and D. Collins. Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Calame, C. (1996). “Sappho’s Group: An Initiation into Womanhood.” In *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches*, E. Greene, ed.: 113-24. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

⁴⁶ Janko (2005). For criticism of Janko’s interpretation, see Edmunds (2006). Janko’s reading is supported by Rawles (2006).

- Calder, W. M. III (1986). "Welcker's Sapphobild and its Reception in Wilamowitz." In *Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker: Werk und Wirkung*, W.M. Calder III et al., eds.: 131-56. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Campbell, D. A. (1990). *Greek Lyric I*, 2nd rev. ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Currie, B. (2004). "Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes." In *Oral Performance and Its Context*, C. J. Mackie, ed.: 49-69. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Di Benedetto, V. (2005). "La nuova Saffo e dintorni." *ZPE* 153: 7-20.
- Di Benedetto, V. (2006). "Il tetrastico di Saffo e tre postille." *ZPE* 155: 5-18.
- Edmunds, L. (2006). "The New Sappho: ΕΦΑΝΤΟ (9)." *ZPE* 156: 23-26.
- Ferrari, F. (2007). *Una mitra per Kleis: Saffo e il suo pubblico*. Pisa: Giardini.
- Foley, H. (1994). *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Ford, A. (2003). "From Letters to Literature: Reading the 'Song Culture' of Classical Greece." In *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*, H. Yunis, ed.: 13-37. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Fränkel, H. (1968 [1924]). "Eine Stileigenheit der frühgriechischen Literatur." In *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, 3rd ed.: 40-96. Munich: Beck.
- Fränkel, H. (1962). *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*. Munich: Beck.
- Gentili, B. (1988). *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century*, transl. A. T. Cole. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Gronewald, M., and R. W. Daniel (2004a). "Ein neuer Sappho-Papyrus." *ZPE* 147: 1-8.
- Gronewald, M., and R. W. Daniel (2004b). "Nachtrag zum neuen Sappho-Papyrus." *ZPE* 149: 1-4.
- Gronewald, M., and R. W. Daniel (2005). "Lyrischer Text (Sappho-Papyrus)." *ZPE* 154: 7-12.
- Hardie, A. (2005). "Sappho, the Muses, and Life After Death." *ZPE* 154: 13-32.
- Herington, C. J. (1985). *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Janko, R. (1982). "Sappho Fr. 96.8 L-P: A Textual Note." *Mnemosyne* 35: 322-24.
- Janko, R. (2005). "Sappho Revisited." *TLS* Dec. 23 & 30: 19-20.
- Jong, I. J. F. de (2006). "The Homeric Narrator and His Own Kleos." *Mnemosyne* 59: 188-207.
- Kamerbeek, J. C. (1956). "Sapphica." *Mnemosyne* 9: 97-102.
- Lardinois, A. (1994). "Subject and Circumstance in Sappho's Poetry." *TAPhA* 124, 57-84.
- Lardinois, A. (1996). "Who Sang Sappho's Songs?" In *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches*, E. Greene, ed.: 150-72. Berkeley and London: Univ. of California Press.

- Lardinois, A. (2001). “Keening Sappho: Female Speech Genres in Sappho’s Poetry.” In *Making Silence Speak: Women’s Voices in Greek Literature and Society*, A. Lardinois, and L. McClure, eds.: 75-92. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. (1981). *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Lobel, E. & Page, D. (1955). *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Maehler, H. (1963). *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Merkelbach, R. (1957). “Sappho und ihr Kreis.” *Philologus* 101: 1-29.
- Nagy, G. (1996). *Homeric Questions*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.
- Olson, S.D. (1995). *Blood and Iron: Story and Storytelling in Homer’s Odyssey*. Leiden: Brill.
- Page, D. L. (1955). *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Parker, H. (1993). “Sappho Schoolmistress.” *TAPhA* 123: 309-51.
- Parker, R. (1981). “The Audience of the Lyric Poets.” Review of Rösler (1980). *CR* 31.2: 159-62.
- Rauk, J. (1989). “Erinna’s *Distaff* and Sappho Fr. 94.” *GRBS* 30: 101-16.
- Rawles, R. (2006). “Notes on the Interpretation of the ‘New Sappho.’” *ZPE* 157: 1-7.
- Redfield, J. (1975). *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Robbins, E. (1990). “Who’s Dying in Sappho Fr. 94?” *Phoenix* 44: 111-21.
- Rösler, W. (1980). *Dichter und Gruppe: Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher griechischer Lyriker am Beispiel Alkaios*. Munich: Fink.
- Schmitz, Th.A. (2002). “Die ‘pragmatische’ Deutung der frühgriechischen Lyrik: Eine Überprüfung anhand von Sapphos Abschiedsliedern frg. 94 und 96.” In *Klassische Philologie inter disciplinas*, J. P. Schwindt, ed.: 51-72. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Slings, S. R. (1994). “Sappho, fr. 94.10.” *ZPE* 102: 8.
- Snell, B. et al., eds. (1955–). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Snell, B. (1982 [1948]). *The Discovery of the Mind in Greek Philosophy and Literature*, transl. T. G. Rosenmeyer. New York: Dover.
- Stein, E. (1990). “Probleme der Entwicklung vom Sänger zum Autor.” In *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen*, W. Kullmann and M. Reichel, eds.: 265-70. Tübingen: Narr.
- Thomas, R. (1992). *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Voigt, E. M. (1971). *Fragmenta: Sappho et Alcaeus*. Amsterdam: Athenaeum, Polak & van Gennep.
- West, M. L. (1970). “Burning Sappho.” *Maia* 22: 307-30.
- West, M. L. (2005). “The New Sappho.” *ZPE* 151: 1-9.

- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. (1905). "Die griechische Literatur des Altertums." In *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache*, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff et al., eds.: 1-312. Berlin: Teubner.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. (1913). *Sappho und Simonides: Untersuchungen über griechischer Lyriker*. Berlin: Weidmann.

CHAPTER FIVE

REMEMBER TO CRY WOLF: VISUAL AND VERBAL DECLARATIONS OF *LYKOS KALOS*¹

ALEXANDRA PAPPAS

There is a curious Greek superstition that being seen by a wild animal could render a person mute. In the proverb's earliest literary instance, Sokrates, bullied by a "beastly" Thrasymachos, observes, "when I heard him I was struck with fear, and looking at him I became afraid, and I think that if I had not looked at him before he looked at me, I would have lost my voice."² Theocritus and other subsequent authors, from Vergil and Pliny to Milton, reiterate this danger, each with his own variation,³ but a red-figure cup painted by Onesimos in the early fifth century hints at the existence of an archaic version of the superstition.⁴ The odd placement of the Greek word for wolf, *lykos*, invites the association of this inscribed kylix with the later literary attestations since all share the elements of gaze, animal, and speechlessness. Furthermore, the cup's text as well as the literary texts neatly encapsulates the dangers

¹ Thanks are due to the audiences of this paper at the American Philological Association (Boston, 2005) and the Orality, Literacy, Memory conference in Auckland, New Zealand (2006) for their insightful contributions. Several individuals especially deserve gratitude: Marcy Dinius, Patricia Rosenmeyer, and Holly Sypniewski for their attention to this paper's multiple versions, and Anne Mackay for graciously hosting the Auckland conference and overseeing this volume. Finally, without the financial support of the University of Arkansas, I would not have been able to present this material in Auckland. Any errors are, of course, my own.

² Pl. *Resp.* 336d. All translations are my own.

³ Theoc. *Id.* 14.22-25; Verg. *Ecl.* 9.53-54: *vox quoque Moerim / iam fugit ipsa: lupi Moerim videre priores*; Plin. *HN* 8.37: *in Italia quoque creditur luporum visus esse noxius vocemque homini, quem priores contemplantur, adimere ad praesens*; Milton *Epitaphium Damonis* 27: *nisi me lupus ante videbit*. See Eckels (1937: 26-29) for the rustic accounts in St. Isadore, St. Ambrose, and Hugo de St. Victoire; the scientific exegeses of the phenomenon by St. Hildegarde and Alexander Neckam (the foster brother of King Richard Lion-Heart); the spiritual interpretations of St. Albert the Great and Girolamo Cardano; and the sceptical responses of many, including Sir Thomas Browne. Eckels reports that the belief was still held in Southern Germany as recently as 1900.

⁴ Louvre G 105 (*ARV*² 324.60, 1645; *Para.* 359; *Add.*² 215).

inherent in the loss of the voice and the resulting threat to one's memory. This essay has three primary aims: to explore the relationship of Onesimos' cup to the proverbs preserved in Plato and Theocritus; to perform a close reading of the proverb, asking how and why it is invoked by both the kylix and the literary passages; and, finally, to situate the superstition in the symposium specifically, where spoken and written modes of communication vie with one another, just as do textual and iconographical modes of commemoration in late archaic and early classical Greece.

To See a Wolf

Let us return in more depth to the earliest literary attestation of the proverb. In the beginning of Plato's *Republic*, Sokrates describes a conversation between him and a number of young men at the elder Cephalos' house. At ease on cushioned chairs arranged in a semi-circle, and presided over by their garlanded host, Sokrates questions his companions about the true nature of justice. Thrasymachos, who had been trying to interrupt for some time, eventually inserts himself into the debate (336b). Irritated by Sokrates' methods, he breaks into the conversation aggressively, like a wild beast (θηρίον) looking to tear them apart, and challenges a now frightened and trembling Sokrates to define justice himself rather than continue to ask the question of others.⁵ The end of Thrasymachos' beastly tirade is especially interesting (336c-d):

καὶ ὅπως μοι μὴ εἰρῆς ὅτι τὸ δέον ἐστὶ μὴδ' ὅτι τὸ ὠφέλιμον μὴδ' ὅτι τὸ λυσιτελοῦν μὴδ' ὅτι τὸ κερδαλέον μὴδ' ὅτι τὸ ξυμφέρον, ἀλλὰ σαφῶς μοι καὶ ἀκριβῶς λέγε ὅ τι ἂν λέγῃς· ὡς ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀποδέξομαι, ἐὰν ὕθλους τοιοῦτους λέγῃς.

And don't tell me that it [justice] is that which is proper, nor that which is advantageous, nor that which is profitable, nor beneficial, nor useful; rather, tell me clearly and precisely what exactly it is you mean! For, I won't allow you to speak such nonsense.

Rattled by the anger of Thrasymachos, Sokrates explains that although he was afraid upon looking at Thrasymachos (προσβλέπων αὐτὸν ἐφοβούμην), he is glad that he looked at his aggressor first. For, as Sokrates explains, if Thrasymachos had looked at him first (εἰ μὴ πρότερος

⁵ Adam proleptically dramatises the interruption: "Thrasymachus comes down like a wolf on the fold" (1963: 23).

ἐωράκη αὐτὸν ἢ ἐκεῖνος ἐμέ), Sokrates would have lost his ability to speak (ἄφωνος ἂν γενέσθαι).

Typically, commentators on Plato such as James Adam (1963: 24) will explain this as the earliest reference to the superstitious notion that being seen by a wolf could deprive a person of the powers of speech. Although Thrasymachos is only a wild beast here, and not specifically a wolf, the comment is justified by echoes of this passage in the next literary instance of the proverb, where it is explicitly a wolf that has the ability to affect one's voice.⁶

Theocritus' *Idyll* 14 tells of the lovesick Aischinas, who is driven by desire for a certain young woman named Kyniska. Aeschinas' friend Thyonichos, seeing that Aischinas is thin and pale, presses for details of his troubles and, in turn, Aischinas laments his recent discovery that the woman he loves is in love with another man (1-11). In the following lines, he explains that he and some friends had been drinking together at a symposion—a setting reminiscent of the passage above from the *Republic*—and they all decided to toast the object of their desire by name. Kyniska, who was also present, grew silent and was unable to answer when asked the name of her beloved.⁷ Responding to her silence, one symposiast asked, “Won't you speak?” and when she remained unable to answer, jokingly probed, “Did you see a wolf?” (22-25):

‘οὐ φθεγξῆ; λύκον εἶδες;’ ἔπαιξέ τις. ‘ὡς σοφός’ εἶπεν,
κῆφλέγετ’· εὐμαρέως κεν ἄπ’ αὐτᾶς καὶ λύχνον ἄψας.
ἔστι Λύκος, Λύκος ἐστί, Λάβρα τῷ γείτονος υἱός,
εὐμάκης, ἀπαλός, πολλοῖς δοκέων καλὸς ἤμεν·

“Won't you speak? Did you see a wolf?” someone joked. “How clever,” she said,

and blushed; you could have easily lit a lamp by her.

There is a Lykos! Lykos it is, the son of my neighbour Labas,
tall, delicate, and considered handsome by many.

In light of the exchange between Sokrates and Thrasymachos in the *Republic*, the second question clearly refers to the superstition that the

⁶ It is tempting to link Sokrates' discussion of the thief Autolykos, “the wolf himself” (*Resp.* 334a-b), with our proverb, especially because it directly precedes Thrasymachos' aggressive entry into the conversation. Since Plato does not state explicitly that Thrasymachos is compared with a wolf, however, we can never know if this is more than coincidence.

⁷ Kyniska's presence at the symposion suggests that she was a hetaira, but Dover (1994: 189) cautions that Aischinas' social class may not have observed the exclusion of all women other than hetairas from symposia.

sight of a wild animal, here explicitly a wolf, could make a person mute. When Kyniska regains her voice, she affirms that she has, in fact, seen a wolf, saying “ὡς σοφός” because Theocritus has turned this proverbial statement into a pun on the name of her beloved: he turns out to be a certain Lykos, the son of a neighbour.⁸ As Aischinas narrates, this Lykos is tall, delicate, and considered handsome (καλός) by many. It may also be no accident that a woman whose name means “bitch-puppy” (LSJ) finds herself in love with a man named “wolf,” since wolves and dogs were often considered in tandem in antiquity: the wolf’s best *dolos* is its similarity to the dog (Pl. *Soph.* 213a), and the dog is the tame, human-friendly version of the wild wolf (Diod. Sic. 1.88.6). So, too, in the *Aesopica* wolves trick dogs into a shared guardianship of a flock of sheep only to kill the dogs and eat the sheep, or a dog tricks a wolf into trusting him and thus avoids being eaten.⁹ I suggest that we may see reminiscences of these animal characterisations in the erotic relationship between Lykos and Kyniska.

In Plato’s *Republic*, Sokrates was able to avoid becoming mute because he looked at Thrasymachos, whose behaviour was like a “wild beast,” and avoided being looked at first. So, too, the animal, the gaze, and the danger of losing one’s voice are present in *Idyll* 14, although with some innovation: Kyniska’s silence is the result of seeing the beast—now a wolf—rather than being seen by it, and the idiom as a whole becomes part of an erotic context since it is presented in a symposiastic setting and is a play on the name Lykos, the handsome man she fancies. The discrepancy between these two accounts in their initial agents of viewing is significant, and, since it creates a dispute about viewing, it is worthwhile to turn to a visual object for its resolution.¹⁰

The Eyes Have It

To put these literary passages into a clearer cultural context, I turn now to Onesimos, an innovative painter of red-figure pots at the end of the

⁸ The French idiom “elle a vu le loup,” meaning that a young woman has lost her virginity (Eckels [1937: 29]), is of particular interest here.

⁹ Respectively Perry (1952) nos. 342 and 134; see also Mainoldi (1984) *passim*.

¹⁰ Because Theocritus differs from Plato and the rest of the tradition in the direction of viewing, some scholars, following the early suggestion of Schaefer (1829), have wanted to amend Theocritus’ text to read λύκος εἶδέ σ’, “did a wolf see you?” As Dover (1994: 192) points out, however, this cannot be right since the Doric accusative of τύ is τυ and cannot be elided. Thus we must account for the discrepancy.

sixth and beginning of the fifth century.¹¹ Onesimos was a younger contemporary of the well-known red-figure painter and potter Euphronios, as the signatures on one kylix, Louvre G 105, attest. Rather late in his life after his career as a painter was over, Euphronios signed as the potter, *Euphronios epoiesen*, on this cup's tondo (Figure 1), while the fragmentary signature on the exterior that once read *Onesimos egraphsen*, although hardly visible today, identifies Onesimos as the painter. This kylix, however, is of interest beyond its combined signatures of these important red-figure personalities.

The tondo shows a horseman riding to the right and carrying two spears. He is flanked by painted inscriptions: in addition to Euphronios' signature, which curves in front of him, the phrase *Erothemis kalos* arcs behind him and marks out a male named Erothemis as handsome. On the exergue below the horse the lone name *Lykos* stands out. The horse and rider theme continues around the exterior, where a series of horsemen, horses, and a groom stand, walk, and ride, probably near a stable represented by the columns (Figure 2). Painted inscriptions grace the exterior of the kylix as well, although they are not easy to see: between the horse and human heads around the rim both names from the interior appear again, *Erothemis* and *Lykos* along with the adjective *kalos*; the remnants of *Lykos* can be made out on the column capital next to the horse's head on the left side in Figure 2. Finally, on the other exterior side, the signature of Onesimos as painter was formerly more clearly visible. While the types of inscriptions on this kylix—the painter- and potter-signatures and the so-called *kalos*-inscriptions—are standard for a vessel made for use in a symposion, the placement of the name *Lykos*, particularly on the exterior, is extraordinary. In the context of the literary texts discussed above, I propose that the decorative schema of this cup can be understood as a playful game that hinges on the proverbial dangers of seeing a wolf and subsequently becoming unable to speak and thus, to commemorate.

On the interior and exterior of the kylix both the names, *Lykos* and *Erothemis*, share the adjective *kalos*—in the erotic context of the symposion both men are honoured as handsome and sexually desirable—but that is the extent of their common characteristics. The name *Erothemis* appears where tradition dictates and the viewer expects. It is painted in

¹¹ For a discussion of the relationship of Onesimos to Euphronios, see Boardman (1975: 133). General sources on Onesimos: Beazley (1963: 313-21); Boardman (1975: 133-35); Sparkes (1985); Immerwahr (1990: 81, 83-85).

the same dark reddish-purple paint as the word *kalos*, barely standing out against the black paint, and has been placed in the same field as the word *kalos*, in the amorphous background of the cup.¹² Notably, however, Onesimos has not rendered the name *Lykos* in the same way. Rather, in the tondo, *Lykos* stands out boldly in painted black against the reserved lighter red background of the exergue, physically and chromatically set apart from the other word with which it is to be read (Figure 3).¹³ Likewise, on the cup's exterior, *Lykos* is painted black on the reserved surface of the column's echinus, firmly situated on a spatially defined material object within the cup's image. Thus, in either case, to read the phrase "*Lykos kalos*," the reader must reconcile two disparate dimensions. This reconciliation, I want to suggest, is not only necessary to making sense of the game of Onesimos' cup, but also to understanding the literary accounts of the superstition with which this essay began.

First, though, it remains to situate the unorthodox inscriptions of *Lykos* on Louvre G 105 within the larger context of late archaic and early classical Attic red-figure vase-painting. Although relatively rare, Onesimos was not the only painter to inscribe objects within a painted scene rather than observe the customary placement of the words in the scene's background. While he does seem to have a particular predilec-

¹² Boardman (1975: 213) generalises about red-figure inscriptions: "[they] are painted in red, rarely white or incised, on the black background." Immerwahr, however, in his discussion of inscribed vases from the Persian Wars to the mid-fifth century, notes that inscribing objects within a painting is an old practice, but does not cite its relative frequency or examples. He also observes that in this later period inscriptions increasingly "appear on objects on which something could indeed be written," such as book rolls, stelae, tripod bases, herms, and pillars (1990: 99-101). I maintain, however, that while some subject matter was suitable for architectural inscriptions, it is extremely improbable that a *kalos*-inscription would have appeared on an actual column capital.

¹³ It has been suggested to me by Anne Mackay that the rider in the tondo may be *Lykos* himself, in which case the name on the exergue would be a tag-inscription, or kind of label. Conventionally, names that appear alone, without the attendant *kalos*, are classified as tag-inscriptions and are thought to identify a specific figure in a scene; names that appear with *kalos* do not appear to refer to anyone in particular (Immerwahr [1982: 59]). Louvre G 105 remains an ambiguous case. If we read the *kalos* with both *Erothemis* and *Lykos*, then we do not have a depiction of *Lykos* himself on the kyllix. If, however, we see the name on the exergue as independent from the adjective, it could be *Lykos* on the horse. Of the other nine vases on which Onesimos painted *Lykos* (see n.17 below), only one lacks *kalos*, and its fragmentary state may account for the absence. What is preserved there of the scene where *Lykos* is painted, however, is again youths and a horse: Louvre G 113 (*ARV*² 324.62; *Add.*² 215). We cannot securely conclude this debate one way or the other, but its possibilities do offer multiple readings of the cup's interior (see n.21 below).

tion for the practice,¹⁴ other vase-painters occasionally adopt it as well: Apollodoros (c. 510-500 BC) paints *kalos* on the rim of a kantharos held by a satyr; the Kleophrades Painter (c. 505-475 BC) paints *kalos ei*, “you are handsome,” on a base upon which a rhapsode stands and sings; and the Brygos Painter (c. 480-470 BC) paints *kalos* on a wineskin next to a satyr.¹⁵

Nor, indeed, was Onesimos the only painter to declare the beauty of the apparently popular Lykos, whoever he may have been.¹⁶ While Onesimos recorded Lykos’ beauty on no fewer than ten cups,¹⁷ his name appears on cups by at least four other painters or painter’s groups, including eight cups attributed to the Antiphon group, and one from the Foundry Painter.¹⁸ As these data attest, neither the practice of inscribing

¹⁴ See also, e.g., Brussels A 889 (*ARV*² 329.130, 1645; *Para.* 359; *Add.*² 217); Brunswick, Bowdoin College 1930.1 (*ARV*² 328.114; *Add.*² 216); Basel BS 439 (*ARV*² 323.56; *Para.* 359; *Add.*² 215); Erlangen I 870 (*ARV*² 325.80; *Add.*² 216); Boston 10.179 (*ARV*² 327.110; *Para.* 359; *Add.*² 216).

¹⁵ Apollodoros: Florence 4211 (*ARV*² 121.22); Kleophrades Painter: London E 270 (*ARV*² 183.15, 1632; *Para.* 340; *Add.*² 187); Brygos Painter: New York 12.234.5 (Immerwahr [1990: no. 558, fig. 117]. The Brygos Painter also inscribes a wineskin near Dionysus (Munich 2645: *ARV*² 371.15, 1649; *Para.* 365; *Add.*² 225) and a phiale held by a woman (London E 68: *ARV*² 371.24, 1649; *Para.* 365, 367; *Add.*² 225). On these vases *kalos* must be read with the other words that blend chromatically into the background of the cup, and contrasting colours (dark on light) highlight the atypical placement of the word(s).

¹⁶ Lykos was a common heroic name (e.g., one of King Pandion’s sons: Herodotus 1.173.3; Pausanias 1.19.3), but one attested for real people too (Cancik and Schneider [1996-2003]; Robinson [1937: 33, 137-38]). The reference to a certain Lykos by Aristophanes (*Vesp.* 389-94) has only clouded identification. While some maintain that he was a hero with a shrine in Athens, Boegehold (1967) demonstrates that he need not have been a hero. Attempts to link this reference to the person on our cup, however, are not fruitful. Of more relevance is Immerwahr’s study, which groups *kalos*-names by their appearance alongside other *kalos*-names, and by painter. Although the black-figure Edinburgh Painter also inscribed *Lykos kalos*, and Immerwahr associates that Lykos with Olympiodoros, he cautions, “it is doubtful whether the *kalos* of the red-figured cup painters is the same as that named by the painters of the end of the 6th century” (1982: 63). It may be, however, that the black- and red-figure painters were honouring the same person, in which case we might learn more by exploring the association with Olympiodoros. The identification of this historical Lykos invites more exploration as a whole.

¹⁷ In addition to Louvre G 105, Onesimos painted *Lykos* on Perugia 89 (*ARV*² 320.8; *Para.* 359; *Add.*² 214); Louvre C 10892 (*ARV*² 320.13); Basel BS 439 (*ARV*² 323.56; *Para.* 359; *Add.*² 215); Louvre G 113 (*ARV*² 324.62; *Add.*² 215); Bonn 1227 (*ARV*² 324.63); Bari 6097 (*ARV*² 328.121; *Add.*² 216); Orvieto, Faina 65 (*ARV*² 329.132; *Para.* 359; *Add.*² 217); and two cups formerly in private Swiss collections, now Boston 1972.44 (*ARV*² 322.37; *Add.*² 215), and Kassel, Dierichs (*ARV*² 328.122; *Add.*² 216).

¹⁸ Robertson (1992: 107).

an object within a cup's scene nor the name *Lykos* is unique to Onesimos or Louvre G 105, but the particular combination of the two is, and that, I suggest, is significant.

As was noted above, on both the exterior and the tondo of Louvre G 105, the name *Lykos* is painted on a representation of a three-dimensional object within the image on the cup, while its semantic complement *kalos* lies in the spatially undefined background of the real three-dimensional object, the kylix itself. The necessary reconciliation of the spatial difference between the two words that combine to make one phrase, *Lykos kalos*, occurs during the act of drinking. When we imagine the kylix in use, the name *Lykos* on the cup's exterior would have been most visible to the drinker's fellow symposiasts: it is high up on the rim, highlighted in black against the much lighter background of the column capital, and oddly placed on an architectural feature within the scene, seen therefore by the drinker's companions as he tilts the kylix to consume its wine (Figure 2). Upon seeing the name, a symposiast would read out aloud, "*Lykos*." In this initial utterance of the name we have the essential elements of the Platonic passage: because the cup's viewer has "seen *Lykos* first," he, like Sokrates, has neatly escaped the threat of becoming mute, his salvation realised the very moment he voices the word.¹⁹ As another drink requires the cup to be tipped up once again, and perhaps rotated as it passes from one drinker to the next, the emergence of the word *kalos* completes the phrase and it, too, is read out aloud.²⁰ Now, just as in *Idyll* 14, after a moment of suspense and

¹⁹ Pace Boardman (2003), who argues that vase inscriptions were not intended to be read aloud at symposia. I do not find his proposal convincing, and so follow the conventional and, I think, well-founded approach to vase-inscriptions as integral to the spoken exchanges at symposia. See, e.g., Slater (1999).

²⁰ Although I have not had the benefit of autopsy, the images of Louvre G 105 available to me suggest that if the drinker held the cup so that the handles were in the middle, without regard for the orientation of the figure in the tondo, the exterior *Lykos* would face the person(s) either to the immediate left or to the right of the drinker. Indeed, with dark wine in the kylix, it was probably not easy (or necessary) to orient the cup so that the rider in the tondo was upright and facing to the right, as it is in our images. Of course, as the wine was consumed and the cup was passed, the handler's inclination would likely have been to orient the cup this way, especially with the cup's interior inscriptions as additional encouragement. If the rider of the tondo was aligned to the drinker's perspective, Side A, which features the dipinto on the column capital, would have faced outward with the name itself most visible to those on the drinker's right. That the cup might have been passed from left to right is suggested by Plato (*Symp.* 177d) and the many vase-paintings that depict drinkers reclining on their left sides while drinking, holding, and passing vessels to their right (e.g., London B 46 [ABV 91.5], Florence 3922 [ARV² 432.55; *Add.*² 237]; but cf.

then identification, *Lykos* is declared handsome to the assembled participants in the drinking party.

I also want to suggest that Onesimos engaged the audience of the cup's interior in a similar game. As the symposiasts drain the cup's contents, the name *Lykos* emerges from the dark wine with its letters prominent against the light background of the exergue (Figure 3). Because it is near the bottom of the tondo, it would have been among the first words to emerge, along with the much darker *kalos* and *Euphronios*, the other words closest to the rim (Figure 1). Just as on the cup's exterior, so here too, the drinker joins his companions in "seeing the wolf" and pronouncing the very name that prevents him from becoming mute.²¹

If we can imagine this scenario, then we can conclude that although the Plato passage is customarily read as the earliest instance of the superstition that to be seen by a wolf or, alternately, to see a wolf would render a person mute, the inscriptions on Onesimos' cup hint at the existence of an earlier, archaic version. Knowledge of the proverbial danger of the wolf's gaze enhances our reading of the words inscribed on this cup's surface, whose disparate positions lead the reader to utter the speech act that then saves him from losing speech. As the audience of both the cup's text and the literary texts, we are encouraged to "cry wolf" lest we, too, are made silent.

This fascinating superstition can contribute more to the larger issues under consideration here. In the remainder of this essay, I pursue the proverb further, exploring what it is about the figure of the wolf that lends itself to this superstitious notion, why it is the power of speech that is compromised, and in what particular ways becoming mute is a threat. These observations will allow us to think further about the relationship of orality, literacy, and memory in the late archaic symposion.

London E 68 [*ARV*² 371.24, 1649; *Para.* 365, 367; *Add.*² 225]). In this case, the column capital on Side A becomes ever more visible to all in the room as it travels and rotates. Even if the kylix moved to the left, however, the process of revelation would not be much changed.

²¹ Alternatively, if we consider the interior *Lykos* a tag-inscription rather than part of the phrase *Lykos kalos* (see n.13 above), we might note the trick played by the profile position of the rider, *Lykos*: because he faces to the side, the audience always has the advantage of seeing him first, since he can never turn his gaze toward us. In this scenario, too, Onesimos poses a risk only cleverly to resolve it.

What's in a Name?

In a survey of ancient Mediterranean wolves and wolf-like characters in myth and ritual, an interesting theme emerges: the wolf is a figure that navigates transitions between binaries in a dialectical relationship, that is, between life and death, male and female, civilised and barbarian, or even human and animal.²² In the Etruscan vocabulary wolves are female animals explicitly associated with the underworld. In the archaic iconography of urns, wall-paintings, and pottery they often appear near graves.²³ Popular myth represents wolves as indispensable in the magic of rebirth and nurturing, the most obvious example of which is the *Lupa Capitolina*; even the language used to name the animals may have chthonic connotations if we accept A. W. F. Holleman's argument that the early Latin *lupus* is from the Etruscan word *lupu-*, "dead," which was used of both men and women in funerary inscriptions.²⁴

Conversely, in the Greek corpus, the wolf is nearly always male and very aggressive, as in the *Iliad's* striking simile describing the Myrmidons, in which deadly and bloodthirsty wolves tear at raw flesh with blood dripping from their jowls (*Il.* 16.156-166). The same is true in the *Aesopica* where the wolf appears repeatedly as a conniving, calculated, persuasive, eloquent, dangerous, and above all, hungry hunter of sheep and other animals.²⁵ We should include, too, Dolon in both Homer's *Iliad* (10.313-464) and Euripides' *Rhesus*, whose attempted deception and infiltration of the Greek camps begin with donning a wolf-skin.²⁶

²² Recent treatments include Gernet (1981: 125-39), Mainoldi (1984), and Buxton (1987).

²³ Elliott (1995).

²⁴ Holleman (1987).

²⁵ Perry (1952). The fables with wolves are (by Perry numbers) 32, 97, 98, 134, 153-160, 187, 190, 209, 210, 234, 258, 260, 261, 267, 342-348, 365, 366, 392, 404, 407, 417, 451-453, 474, 477, 478, 547, 568, and 572. The latter fables (474, 477, 478, 547, 568, and 572) are in Latin; the rest are Greek. Of particular interest is the phrasing in 134, λύκος θεασάμενος and 159, λύκος ἐθεάσατο, where the wolf catching sight of his prey initiates the moment of his aggression.

²⁶ *Il.* 334-35; *Rhes.* 208-13. There is much to be said about the figure of Dolon in this context; it will suffice to mention only a few of the most interesting points here. As Diomedes prepares for this mission, he dons the hide of a lion (*Il.* 10.176), and so the notorious enmity between wolf and lion is dramatised when Diomedes ultimately captures and slaughters Dolon (10.454). In another significant preparation, Odysseus arms himself in the famous boar's tusk helmet (10.266), which Autolykos, his maternal grandfather, had stolen and which had then become a gift of *xenia*. Since this is the only mention of Autolykos in the *Iliad*, it seems likely that Homer here invites us to connect Odysseus with Autolykos, "the wolf himself," or

Indeed, two protagonists from Greek myth with “wolf” names point to this animal’s liminal position between nature and culture. One is Autolykos,²⁷ the son of Hermes and grandfather of Odysseus whose name means “the very wolf himself,” and is characterised by Homer in one breath as ἐσθλόν, “noble,” and as a notorious thief in the next, ὃς ἀνθρώπους ἐκέκαστο κλεπτοσύνη θ’ ὄρκω τε. (*Od.* 19.395-6). Early Greek myth further attributes to this wolf-like character the ability to make things invisible and change young animals into different shapes, skills which aid in his thievery, like his attempt on the herds of Sisyphos.²⁸

Our second story concerns Lykaon, the mythical first king of Arkadia, who is credited with bringing civilization to the region.²⁹ This glory was short-lived, however. After serving up human flesh to Zeus for dinner—his own grandson, according to the archaic tradition—he suffered the wrath of the god and was ultimately transformed into a wolf.³⁰ Richard Buxton (1986) points out that in this story the wolf figures as a transition between human and animal, civilised and barbarian worlds: Lykaon brings culture to Arkadia only to violate the laws of sacred hospitality. According to Pausanias, members of the subsequently formed cult of Zeus Lykaios were turned into wolves at the sacrifice to Lykaian Zeus, but if they abstained from human flesh for nine years, could be turned back into humans.³¹ Humans, too, can navigate opposing states of being when in wolf form.

“the very wolf,” who will ultimately outsmart and destroy Dolon, the man fashioning himself in the guise of a wolf. So, too, as Odysseus interrogates Dolon about the intentions of Hektor and the Trojans, he refers to Hektor as ποιμένα λαῶν, “the people’s shepherd” (10.406), which, I suggest, is ironically accurate since Dolon, as a wolf, ultimately brings destruction to Hektor’s flock by getting caught and providing the enemy Greeks with information. Finally, Dolon is εἶδος κακός, “an ugly sight to behold” (*Il.* 316; Hainsworth [1993: 186]), but Diomedes and Odysseus, in a critical moment, see him first and are thus able to rush him from behind (10.330ff.), ensuring their victory. Like Plato, Theocritus, and Onesimos, Homer hinges the outcome of this exchange, at least in part, on the element of vision. For more on the literary figure of Dolon, see Gernet (1981: 125-139); Mainoldi (1984: 18-22); and Hainsworth (1993: 151ff. with references). For representations of Dolon in Greek vase-painting, see for instance Thomson (1911), and Lissarrague (1980).

²⁷ See n.6 and n.26 above.

²⁸ Gantz (1993: 110-11; 176).

²⁹ Apollod. 3.8; Paus. 8.1-2

³⁰ Hes. fr. 163 MW.

³¹ For this as the foundation story for the cult of Zeus Lykaios and its wolf transformations as *rites de passage*, see also Eckels (1911: 49-60) and Mainoldi (1984: 11-18). In general, rituals involving humans and (were)wolves revolve around transitions between life and death, human and animal, or inside and outside, and involve

A final example from Greek ritual completes this brief survey. As Walter Burkert observes, Apollo Lykeios, or Apollo the “wolf-like,” is associated with the initiation of young men who have come of age into the society of men.³² In this incarnation Apollo is the “epitome of that turning-point in the flower of youth, the *telos hebes*, which the *ephebos* has attained and which he also leaves behind with the festival.”³³ Just as the adherent to the cult of Zeus Lykaios takes on animal and then human form again, or “wolf-like” Apollo attends the shift from boy to man, so, too, I propose, the figure of Autolykos treads the line between noble lineage and ignoble kleptomania. In sum, the wolf is at once a cunning male intent upon tricking and butchering his next meal, and a female source of life and nourishment, who is also present at death. A facilitator of transitions, present at liminal moments, the wolf interfaces between opposing states of being.³⁴

In light of these associations, then, it is wholly appropriate that the wolf in our superstitious proverb is instrumental in fracturing the closely linked senses of sight and speech, which produce rich meaning in tandem, but, as Silvia Montiglio has explored, can diminish in their communicative capacities when separated.³⁵ The passages from Plato and Theocritus reveal that a particular mode of viewing can lead to silence and, like the wolf of Etruscan iconography who attends the dead, a wolf presides over this loss as well. An additional dialectical relationship is built into the structure of the proverb itself as it inverts its account of active and passive viewing: while Sokrates escaped the threat of silence by avoiding being looked at first by “the beast” Thrasymachos, Kyniska lost her voice because she looked at the wolf first. Thus the qualities and

changing states of being, taking off one’s clothing, crossing water, etc.: Buxton (1987: 69).

³² Burkert (1985: 145).

³³ See also Eckels (1937: 60-66) and Mainoldi (1984: 22-28) for further discussion of Apollo Lykeios.

³⁴ The wolf’s transformative qualities are not limited to Etruscan, Greek, or Roman culture. In Finnish folklore, for example, the wolf was created from a man transformed by a magician into an animal state (Thompson [1955-58: A1833.3]), and in the myths of the North American Indians of the Central Woodlands, the wolf, brother to an important cultural hero, drowns, is revived, and ultimately becomes ruler of the dead (Leach [1972: 1180]).

³⁵ Montiglio (2000: 181ff.). It may be significant, too, that wolves are born blind. As Aristotle reports (*Gen. an.* 742a8), “all polydactylous quadrupeds ... like the wolf ... produce their young blind, and the eyelids do not separate until after birth.” The element of vision may be so fundamental to the wolf’s proverbial aggression since it emerges after birth and development and thus signifies life, growth, and power.

roles of the wolf in myth and ritual in general reverberate in the features of this proverb in particular. This structural parallel, I contend, applies to Onesimos' cup and its symposiastic audience as well. Indeed, what better figure could Onesimos have invoked on a vessel made in Athens by two Athenian artisans *par excellence*, but exported for an Etruscan audience? Beyond the kylix's travels, the wolf signifies the transition between binaries, and itself negotiates the cultural transition, as I will illustrate in what follows.

In Viva Voce

Just as the name *Lykos* suggests a connection between the classical and Hellenistic literary passages and the archaic kylix, so does the posed threat, shared by all three, of losing one's voice in a social setting where the ability to speak is critically important. If Sokrates loses his voice, he cannot guide those seated around him toward the true meaning of justice. Although the terms of his intellectual conflict with Thrasymachos momentarily shift from the verbal to the visual, they ultimately settle in the verbal again, and Sokrates retains the power. Likewise, if Kyniska becomes silent, she is unable to participate in the erotic conversation at a drinking party where the ability to speak also briefly becomes a question of seeing, but all is salvaged as the pun on Kyniska's lover's name, *Lykos*, reconciles her silence, and her contribution to the party's survey of crushes is complete.

If a participant in a real-life symposion—such as one where Onesimos' kylix would have been in use—does not take part in the conversation at the party, he fails to join the political discourse, witticisms, recitation and composition of poetry, and other speech-acts that define him as an active, participating member of his peer group. Indeed, the Greek perspective on those who are silent is generally couched in negative terms: they are often female and/or passive. Here we might think of Cassandra, or Aristophanes' effeminate Agathon—the antithesis of the self-advertised characteristics of the citizen attendants of archaic symposia.³⁶ Recalling the shape-shifting metamorphoses of Autolykos and Lykaon, the wolf has the power to transform the symposiast into an

³⁶ I suggest that the structure of the proverb, which hinges on the interplay between the active act of seeing and the passive experience of being seen, parallels the symposiastic exchange between the active *erastes* and the passive *eromenos*.

emasculated, passive, and thus apolitical version of himself. In the imagined literary gatherings as well as the real one, I suggest, silence is a handicap that threatens to undermine not only casual conversation but one's political identity since a silent citizen is a disenfranchised citizen, as in Athenian oratory.³⁷

In fact, the symposion is a fitting setting to encounter this threat, since it is a space where temporary inversion and transformation are sanctioned, or even invited. Overseen by Dionysos, symposiasts and komasts are free to embrace behaviours that subvert their normative roles. Representations of transvestism on Anakreon vases, for example, have led Françoise Frontisi-Ducroux and François Lissarrague to suggest that komasts embraced this gathering as an opportunity to play "the other": "by appropriating certain signs of the feminine, they show themselves off to be ambisexual beings, striving to transcend gender categories."³⁸ I see the transformations and binaries presented by the wolf as analogous to those of the sympotic space, where attendants are encouraged both to act out and to subvert proper citizen roles, to try on safely and temporarily the characteristics of "the other"—becoming inebriated, ambisexual, feminised, or apolitical—only to undergo retransformation to the normative state in the end. Like the adherent of the cult of Zeus Lykaios, who becomes a wolf and then a human again, these symposiasts, too, successfully traverse opposing states of being.

Structuralist notions of mediation help us understand the roles of reading, speech, and memory in this interpretation of the wolf proverb and the reverberations of its binary oppositions in the symposion. The act of commemoration, of decoding, pronouncing, and recalling the beauty of Lykos as recorded on Onesimos' cup, resolves the tension underlying the dialectical binaries of human and animal, alive and dead, civilised and barbarian, or citizen and "other." When the phrase *Lykos kalos* is called out the symposiast confirms his identity as human, alive, and a participant in a gathering for citizens in a civilised world. Although the inscriptions on Louvre G 105 playfully threaten to contribute to these tensions, rather than resolve them, the acts of reading, speaking, and remembering Lykos ultimately restore order to the chaotic symposion scene and confirm the identity of its participants.

³⁷ Montiglio (2000: 116ff.).

³⁸ Frontisi-Ducroux and Lissarrague (1990: 228-29, 231-32); see also Price (1990) and Miller (1999).

Remember to Cry "Wolf"

Onesimos has built one final hazard into the inscriptions on this cup, this time directed specifically at Lykos and his *erastes*. Intended to evoke and perpetuate memories of Lykos' beauty, this drinking cup is also a "monument" or "memorial," and thus certain memories are at stake should it fail to communicate as a commemorative monument. As Sue Alcock frames the questions in her own study of monuments and memory, "Who wants whom to remember what, and why?"³⁹ Addressing the answers provided by Louvre G 105 further underscores the role of memory in the symposion.

If the viewer is rendered mute by Onesimos' "wolf," he can neither memorialise Lykos' reputation as a beloved who warrants a commissioned kylix nor sing out the erotic and proprietary claims of Lykos' *erastes*.⁴⁰ The implicit relationship between speech and memory is exemplified by the character of Thamyris, the boastful singer of the *Iliad* (2.594-600), whom the angered Muses punish by disabling his talent: "they took away his wondrous voice and caused the kitharist to forget" (ἄοιδὴν θεσπεσίην ἀφέλοντο καὶ ἐκέλαθον κιθαριστύν: *Il.* 2.599-600). Commemoration and recollection also mingle at the onset of the "Catalogue of Ships," where Homer's ability to sing the list relies on the Muses' ability to recall it (*Il.* 2.484ff.).⁴¹ In the same vein, should those in the company of the cup be struck silent, so should the memorialisation of Lykos and his *erastes* be erased from social memory;⁴² if unsung, and thus forgotten, Lykos and his lover become invisible.⁴³

³⁹ Alcock (2002: 17), quoting Burke.

⁴⁰ W. Rösler (1990) includes the praise of an *erastes* for an *eromenos* in his schema of *mnemosyne* at the symposion. He suggests that in this setting, *mnemosyne* helps an individual or group situate its present existence in the events of the (recent) past: "*mnemosyne* in the *symposion* meant, above all, the collective memory of the group which met for feasting ... They met together at the *symposion* precisely because they had common aims and interests outside it ... thus the feast was the natural place in which to define the position of the group" (233-34). Personal remembrance, including praise, expressed in the company of others in the symposion, was one of the ways to affirm the status and identity of the symposiasts. For Rösler, a poem of praise composed by an *erastes* for an *eromenos* exemplifies commemorative praise (e.g. Pl. *Resp.* 368a), and I suggest we add the *kalos*-inscriptions on symposiastic vessels.

⁴¹ For a full discussion, see Minchin (2001: 79-80, 84-87 and nn.), and her Ch. 1 in the present volume.

⁴² It is tempting to read an additional joke into this cup's inscriptions, which, if present, additionally puts the memory of Lykos' *erastes*, the likely commissioner of the kylix, at stake. We know from Plato (*Phdr.* 241d) and the *Greek Anthology*

It is precisely this array of dangers, I contend, that Onesimos cleverly introduces, only to dismiss them playfully in the end. His odd and thus highly visible placement of the name *Lykos* on Louvre G 105 controls our gaze and creates a dramatised moment in which speech, and all the power of commemoration it carries, is momentarily arrested. Although sight and speech typically combine in reciprocal exchange, the kylix's *Lykos* untangles the mesh of vision and vocalization and places them rather in a dialectical relationship of tension and opposition. Ironically, it is only through the act of reading across two disparate dimensions within the cup that the symposiast, enacting his own salvation, resolves this opposition, by pronouncing the beauty of *Lykos*; sight and speech are once again conjoined and the memory of *Lykos* and the status of his *erastes* are preserved.

Conclusion

As I have argued, Louvre G 105 and the complex dynamics of its viewing incorporate a series of transformations and reversals – a fitting context, we now know, for a wolf. Indeed, even the phrase itself seems constructed of reversed halves: the ΛΥΚ- of the first half nearly inverts the ΚΑΛ- of the second. A final comparison of the passages from Plato and Theocritus to Onesimos' cup contextualises the point in terms of the oral and the written: whereas the literary accounts of the proverb privilege the verbal over the visual as a mode of communication—it is the visual exchange, after all, that initially threatens to halt conversation—Onesimos presents a different scenario. In keeping with Jocelyn Penny Small's observation that “literacy and orality are an exchange that uses the currency of memory,”⁴⁴ and with careful negotiation of the ever-evolving relationship between the two modes of communication, One-

(12.250) that *lykos* was sometimes used as a nickname for *paiderastai* (LSJ). If the phrase on Onesimos' cup carried this layer of meaning with it as well, then the symposiasts would have proclaimed the beauty not only of the *eromenos*, but also the aristocratic “goodness” of his patron. It is possible, then, that just as the memory of *Lykos*' esteem might have gone unvoiced and thus been forgotten, so, too, could that of his *erastes*.

⁴³ I adapt Alcock's suggestion that, in the context of social memory, the “loser,” i.e. the one forgotten, is made invisible (2002: 5). Although this applies more strictly to monuments that conventionally commemorate specific people or events, this reading works here, too, if we categorise Louvre G 105 as a monument in its own right.

⁴⁴ Small (1997: xiv).

simos ensures that the visual produces the verbal, and now his joke is complete: Nearly robbed of speech by “seeing a wolf,” the symposiasts avoid the proverbial danger, and instead repeatedly commemorate Lykos’ reputation as a beloved, ensuring that it not go unvoiced.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

*Add.*² = Carpenter, T. H. (1989). *Beazley Addenda*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press (for The British Academy).

*ARI*² = Beazley, J. D. (1963). *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.

LSJ = Liddell, H. G. and R. Scott. (1968). *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. reprint rev. with supp. by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press

Para. = Beazley, J. D. (1971). *Paralipomena: Additions to Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters and to Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.

Adam, J., ed. (1963). *The Republic of Plato*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Alcock, S. E. (2002). *Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscape, Monuments, and Memories*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Boardman, J. (1975). *Athenian Red Figure Vases: The Archaic Period, A Handbook*. New York and Toronto: Oxford Univ. Press.

Boardman, J. (2003). “‘Reading’ Greek Vases.” *OJA* 22: 109-14.

Boegehold, A. L. (1967). “Philokleon’s Court.” *Hesperia*. 36: 111-20.

Burkert, W. (1985). *Greek Religion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

Buxton, R. (1987). “Wolves and Werewolves in Greek Thought.” In *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, J. Bremmer and F. Graf, eds.: 60-79. Totowa, NJ: Barnes & Noble.”

Cancik, H. and H. Schneider, eds. (1996–). “Lykos.” In *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, Vol. 7: 572-76. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Dover, K. J., ed. (1994). *Theocritus, Select Poems*. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci.

Eckel, R. P. (1937). *Greek Wolf-Lore*. Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Pennsylvania.

Elliott, J. (1995). “The Etruscan Wolfman in Myth and Ritual.” *EtrStud* 2: 17-33.

Fraser, P. M. and E. Matthews, eds. (1987). *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Frontisi-Ducroux, F. and F. Lissarrague (1990). “From Ambiguity to Ambivalence: A Dionysiac Excursion through the ‘Anakreontic’ Vases.” In *Before Sexuality*, D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler, and F. I. Zeitlin, eds.: 211-56. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.

- Gantz, T. (1993). *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, Vols. 1-2. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Gernet, L. (1981). *The Anthropology of Ancient Greece*, transl. J. Hamilton and B. Nagy. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Hainsworth, J. B. (1993). *The Iliad: A Commentary*, Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Holleman, A. W. F. (1987). "Lupus." *LCM* 12: 12.
- Immerwahr, H. R. (1982). "A Lekythos in Toronto and the Golden Youth of Athens." In *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History, and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool. Hesperia Suppl.* 19: 48-65.
- Immerwahr, H. R. (1990). *Attic Script: A Survey*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Leach, M., ed. (1972). *Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology, and Legend*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.
- Lissarrague, F. (1980). "Iconographie de Dolon le loup." *RA* 1980: 3-30.
- Mainoldi, C. (1984). *L'image du loup et du chien dans la Grèce ancienne d'Homère à Platon*. Paris: Éditions Ophrys.
- Miller, M. C. (1999). "Reexamining Transvestism in Archaic and Classical Athens: The Zewadski Stamnos." *AJA* 103: 223-53.
- Minchin, E. (2001). *Homer and the Resources of Memory: Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Montiglio, S. (2000). *Silence in the Land of Logos*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Perry, B. E. (1952). *Aesopica*. Urbana, IL: Univ. of Illinois Press.
- Price, S. D. (1990). "Anacreontic Vases Reconsidered." *GRBS* 31: 133-75.
- Robertson, M. (1992). *The Art of Vase-Painting in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Robinson, D. M. and E. J. Fluck (1937). *A Study of the Greek Love-Names Including a Discussion of Paederasty and a Prosopographia*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Rösler, W. (1990). "Mnemosyne in the Symposium." In *Sympotica: a Symposium on the Symposium*, O. Murray, ed.: 230-37. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Schaefer, G. H. (1829). *Theocritus, Bion et Moschus*. Leipzig: Tauchnitz.
- Small, J. P. (1997). *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sparkes, B. A. (1985). "Aspects of Onesimos." In *Greek Art: Archaic into Classical, A Symposium Held at the University of Cincinnati April 2-3, 1982*, C. G. Boulter, ed.: 18-39. Leiden: Brill.
- Thompson, S. (1955-58). *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature: A Classification of Narrative Elements in Folk-Tales, Ballads, Myths, Fables, Mediaeval Romances, Exempla, Fabliaux, Jest-Books, and Local Legends*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press.
- Thomson, J. A. K. (1911). "Dolon the Wolf." *CR* 25.8: 238-39.

CHAPTER SIX

SOCIAL MEMORY IN AESCHYLUS' *ORESTEA*

RUTH SCODEL

τί τοὺς ἀναλωθέντας ἐν ψήφῳ λέγειν, [570]
τὸν ζῶντα δ' ἀλγεῖν χρὴ τύχης παλιγκότου; [571]
καὶ πολλὰ χαίρειν συμφοραῖς καταξιῶ, [572]
ὡς κομπάσαι τῶδ' εἰκὸς ἡλίου φάει [575]
ὑπὲρ θαλάσσης καὶ χθονὸς ποτωμένοις
“Τροίαν ἐλόντες δὴ ποτ' Ἀργείων στόλος
θεοῖς λάφυρα ταῦτα τοῖς καθ' Ἑλλάδα
δόμοις ἐπασσάλευσαν ἀρχαῖον γάνος.”
τοιαῦτα χρὴ κλύοντας εὐλογεῖν πόλιν
καὶ τοὺς στρατηγούς· καὶ χάρις τιμήσεται
Διὸς τὰδ' ἐκπράξασα. πάντ' ἔχεις λόγον.¹

Why put the dead into the account, and the one who lives has to suffer over malignant fate? And I think it appropriate to bid farewell to miseries, since it is reasonable to boast to this light of the sun, flying over sea and land: “The expedition of the Argives once, having captured Troy, pegged up these spoils in the gods’ houses throughout Greece, an ancient splendour.” Hearing such things people should praise the city and the generals. And the kindness of Zeus who brought it about will be honoured. You have the whole account.²

Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 572-82

In this passage, the herald who announces the Greeks’ victory at Troy curiously combines two conventional forms. The victors are imagined as

¹ This is Page’s text, which follows M except in transposing 573-74 before 570. Fraenkel brackets 570-72 and reads Weil’s conjecture πετώμενα (“[words] ... flying”) in 576, in the commentary inclining to τὰδε ... πετώμενα, so that it is the words that fly over land and sea rather than the victors (there is still slippage between spoken and written). West not only transposes 573-74, but posits a one-line lacuna after 572 and two lines after 576 in which the herald would mention the dedications and imagine a speaker whose words would be quoted at 577-79. The default text cited here will be West (1998); because this paper is not primarily concerned with textual issues, I shall refer to them only as needed and shall cite only Fraenkel (1950), Page (1972), Bollack-Judet de la Combe (1981-82) and Judet de la Combe (2001), and West (1998).

² Translations throughout are my own, but I have consulted Lloyd-Jones (1979) in many difficult places.

flying over land and sea. This is peculiar. A victor may “fly” simply in exultation and in anticipation of future success, but the generalizing doublet seems to point to the universal diffusion of glory. The image thus surely evokes the wings of song or fame as they appear in Theognis and Pindar (*N.* 6.48). We expect the flight of a victor to be the consequence of his being celebrated, yet while the voice of others powers the victors’ flight, the victors themselves then speak the boast.

At the same time, they boast in a style clearly modelled on that of dedicatory inscriptions. It borrows the convention of such inscription when it expresses in the present the imagined perspective of a distant future reader: δὴ ποτ’, ἀρχαῖον γάνος (“long ago”; “ancient splendour”).³ The boast refers, however, not to one dedication, but to temples throughout Greece, and it seems to imagine the dedications as visible simultaneously: λάφυρα ταῦτα (“these [various items of] booty”). The adaptation of dedicatory style is therefore odd in itself. Yet the theme of flight to some extent mitigates the strangeness of the dedicatory language, since the bird’s-eye view allows the victors to see all their dedications at the same time.

Furthermore, it is easier to understand how fame is so widely diffused that flight is an appropriate metaphor when there is a delay between victory and fame: that is, if the sequence is victory—dedications honouring the victory—universal fame of the victors. Yet the boast, whose content demands that it be spoken in the future, belongs emphatically to this day.⁴ Even if we understand the dative as depending on κομπάσαι (“boast”) rather than as temporal (boasting “to the sun’s light” rather than “on this day”), the deictic τῶδ’ (“this here”) connects the action to the immediate, visible light of the sun, and so to the present moment.⁵ This boast, though delivered on high, demands an immediate response in earthly praise, τοιαῦτα χρῆ κλύοντας (“[people,] hearing this, should”).⁶ The (implied) voice of others powers the Argives’ flight,

³ Young (1983) discusses lyric’s adaptations of this “inscriptional” ποτ’ (“once”).

⁴ Judet de la Combe (2001: 1.218) argues that the sun here cannot denote the day, but is a witness (“de sorte qu’il est juste que ceux qui (déjà) survolent a mer et la terre proclament fièrement à la lumière du soleil que voici”), but I do not see that this solves the temporal confusion.

⁵ It is tempting to see the light of Helios here metatheatrically, as pointing to the present of the audience, who still remember the glory of the Trojan War.

⁶ This is the χρέος-motif; see Bundy (1962a: 10-11), (1962b: 42).

they themselves boast while flying, and this boast prompts further speech by those who hear it.

The passage therefore inextricably merges the present moment with a remote future, the voice of the victors with the voices of those who transmit their praise, inscription with speech. Even West's text, whose lacunae posit an easier transition from the flying victors to a spectator of their dedications, presents an inscription that refers to all of Greece at the same time. The passage is thus obviously relevant in a discussion of orality and literacy: why, in a context so permeated with speech, do we find this echo of inscriptional language? Why is there only an echo, rather than an overt allusion to writing, since the trilogy refers explicitly to writing in its metaphors (*Cho.* 450 and 699, *Eum.* 275)? The passage is also relevant in a discussion of memory, since it so strongly evokes the future reader of the imagined inscriptions. This use of dedications in a boast exposes the reality of dedicatory practice, that gifts to the gods are also, even primarily, aimed at mortal audiences. Poetry typically describes dedications as proof of the giver's piety. Here, however, the dedications are evidently less intended to honour the gods in whose houses the Greeks deposit them than to preserve the glorious trophies of the victory, to ensure that this success is visible across both time and space. The inscriptional language links the immediate fame of the Trojan victors to their place in social memory.

What is "social memory"? I follow Fentress and Wickham in using this term rather than Halbwachs' perhaps more familiar "collective memory" because memory, strictly speaking, always belongs to the consciousness of an individual.⁷ People remember things; groups do not. Of course, people talk about what they remember, and some of these shared memories of members of particular groups—families, religious communities, nations, academic departments—are central to their identities. Groups formalize and institutionalize ways of maintaining and transmitting important memories, by celebrating birthdays and commemorative holidays, building shrines and monuments, generating texts. An individual who lives generations after an event "remembers" it by remembering stories about it, through participation in rituals, and by its location in a landscape that serves as a reminder or its physical traces on the land or in a monument. People often argue about the meaning and relative importance of these memories, for they are profoundly significant for the

⁷ Fentress and Wickham (1992); Halbwachs (1950); Assmann (1992).

present. Different groups within a society constitute different memory communities, and they have their own versions of the past, which may contradict each other or compete for attention.

Even in profoundly literate cultures, social memory has a powerful oral component. Of course, many aspects of contemporary social memory depend on literacy. History textbooks are a frequent battleground in the culture wars because they are such an important vehicle for telling new generations what matters in the past and how it matters. Monuments are typically inscribed. Still, direct storytelling to the young by the old, oral tradition in the purest sense, is often vital to social memory even of events that have been extensively recorded in writing. Even if the monument has an inscription, often parents explain its full significance, or its personal relevance, to their children. The Vietnam Memorial in Washington is a list of names: one sees people touching a name as they explain to their children that this was an uncle or a childhood friend.

Greek tragedy is deeply engaged with social memory, within a culture in which social memory is predominantly, but not exclusively, orally transmitted. In classical Athens, canonical texts transmitted much of the social memory of the remote past. People knew these texts—the Homeric poems and other epics—primarily through oral performance, but they were relatively fixed. The Panathenaia offered an occasion for ritualized re-performance. Other important songs about this distant past, such as Stesichoros' *Oresteia*, were available to the elite in written form, while many of the elite had probably memorized extracts from them. Works of art, both in public places and in private possession, frequently showed events of this remote past, and served as memory prompts. Some recurring rituals were associated with stories and characters of the heroic age and served as further memory prompts. The more recent past was recalled in family traditions, popular storytelling (such as anecdotes about the Seven Sages) in some *polis* rituals, in monuments, and in poetry like the Harmodios-song. The process of poetic and monumental commemoration of the immediate present was continuous and clearly contentious. Since memory of the distant past could have powerful implications for the present, it too could be contentious.

This paper deals with two aspects of social memory in the *Oresteia*. It will look at how characters and chorus in the *Agamemnon*, in particular, attempt to control speech and future memory, and how they manipulate the memory of the past. The play shows social memory in process.

Second, it will discuss *Eumenides* as itself an intervention in social memory. Tragedy, obviously, re-creates the past, and does so against a background of canonical, fixed texts that offer differing versions of the same events. It therefore makes overt and vehement claims of its own.⁸ *Eumenides*, like the imagined inscriptions, is an attempt at defining future public memory of the past. The optimistic end of the trilogy may seem to some viewers like the herald's speech: it creates a master narrative that allows the future to ignore the difficulties that preceded the happy ending.⁹

There is a rich scholarly literature about speech in the *Oresteia*, but most of it addresses deception, persuasion, and power—speech as immediate social control.¹⁰ The herald's citation of the imagined inscription, however, shows that this control is also directed at memory. Like so many other speakers in the play and the trilogy, the herald is self-conscious about his speech and its occasion. Because the speech is boastful, he unobtrusively defends it even before he delivers it, insisting that it is only “natural” (εἰκός) that the Greeks boast. Throughout, the characters argue and ponder both what they can appropriately say and how to say it, both what of the past they can use and how they should speak and act in the present so that the future will use it as they prefer.

Aeschylus' herald, before he offers the boast as the conclusion of his message, must bracket much of the rest of what he has said. He not only dismisses the miseries of the campaign, but claims that it is appropriate for him to do this (καταξιῶ, 572). He argues this point, using the language of accounting:

τί ταῦτα πενθεῖν δεῖ; παροίχεται πόνος·	
παροίχεται δέ, τοῖσι μὲν τεθνηκόσι	
τὸ μήποτ' αὔθις μηδ' ἀναστῆναι μέλει,	
ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς λοιποῖσιν Ἀργείων στρατοῦ	[573]
νικᾷ τὸ κέρδος, πῆμα δ' οὐκ ἀντιρρέπει.	[574]
τί τοὺς ἀναλωθέντας ἐν ψήφῳ λέγειν,	[570]
τὸν ζῶντα δ' ἀλγεῖν χρὴ τύχης παλιγκότου;	[571]

⁸ We do not know at what date the presentation in the theatre of war orphans who had been supported by the state was introduced, but if it already took place in 458, it would presumably have featured the sons of the men who died at the Eury-medon, while the current war with the Peloponnesians would not yet have produced many candidates. On this event, see Goldhill (1990: 105-6).

⁹ On the problems of resolution, see Porter (2005).

¹⁰ On speech in relation to the confusion between human and animal, see Heath (2005: 215-58); on good and bad persuasion, Buxton (1982: 105-14).

Why grieve over this? The labour is past. It is past, for the dead not even to care about ever arising again, but for us who are left from the army of the Argives, the profit wins, and pain does not weigh equally against it. Why put the dead into the account, and the one who lives has to suffer over malignant fate? (*Ag.* 567-71)

The suffering is past: the dead cannot be revived; if they are included in the account, the survivor would also be unhappy, but if they are excluded, the profit of the victory outweighs the suffering it cost. The herald is not without justification for his calculation. He follows traditional Greek morality in insisting that no human action is without grounds for criticism, and only the gods can enjoy a life without trouble:

Of the same events over a long time, one would say some came out well, while others were deserving of criticism. But who, besides the gods, is without grief for the time of a whole life? (*Ag.* 551-54)

Because this is so, human success need not be perfect to be worthy of praise. Yet whether the herald's reckoning is good or not, it demonstrates just how much the boastful commemoration seeks to exclude from public memory. As long as we consider only whether an action deserves praise now, it is easy to acquiesce in the suppression of inconvenient details. Once we are presented with such an impoverished account as the one that the future will remember, however, the suppression becomes disturbing. The herald's speech seeks to exclude from a master narrative significant parts of what he has himself reported.¹¹

Indeed, the herald's initial message turns out not to be all that he has to report, since the chorus, by asking him about Menelaos, forces him to talk about the storm. The herald would not speak fine falsehoods (620-21); the chorus points out that the separation of Menelaos from Agamemnon cannot easily be hidden (623). When the chorus asks for an account of the storm, the herald describes his difficulty (636-49): it is appropriate (*πρέπει*, 645) for a messenger who brings news that a city's army has been defeated to deliver his evil news, but the joy of victory should not be contaminated:

It is not fitting to pollute a day of blessed speech with a tongue that reports evil. The honour of the gods is distinct. (*Ag.* 636-37)

The herald has a consistent and cautious view of the proprieties of speech. If official reports such as his require that all bad news be sup-

¹¹ On the herald's problems with maintaining auspicious silence, see Montiglio (2000: 210-12).

pressed for good news to have its full force, his practice will strengthen the universal tendency of social memory to simplify the complex reality of events. Yet reality cannot be ignored so easily. Nobody can fail to notice Menelaos' absence, and the elders expect the herald to explain it.

The herald's concern with memorialization could hardly have failed to remind an Athenian audience of 458 BC of their own memorialization of the Persian Wars through dedications, monuments, and memorial practices, both those they shared with the other Greeks who opposed the Persians and those the Athenians put up by themselves. The Athenians, after all, built a stoa at Delphi, directly beneath the temple, to hold the ὄπλα seized from the Persians. There was a painting of the battle of Marathon in the Stoa Poikile. The Greeks dedicated Phoenician triremes at the Isthmus, on Salamis, and at Sounion (Hdt. 8.121). An inscription survives from an Athenian monument honouring the dead of Salamis.¹² The Simonides elegy on Plataia links the Persian and Trojan Wars. The original audience of the *Oresteia* sat beneath the still-ruined temples commemorating the *hybris* of the Persians. Every Athenian would have been familiar with Persian booty, both dedicated in temples and in private possession.¹³ Athenian funeral orations honoured the year's war dead by placing them in a heroic narrative that went back through the Persian Wars to the mythological past.¹⁴ At the time of the *Oresteia*'s production, the transformation of the Delian League into the Athenian Empire was not yet complete, and the last great battle against Persia, Kimon's victory at the Eurymedon, was less than ten years in the past.

Athenians were thus immersed in practices of social memory, and there is every reason to think that they were entirely conscious of their significance. Aeschines (*In Ctes.* 184-85) quotes the verse inscriptions on three Herms honouring Kimon's victory over the Persians at the Strymon. These very explicitly locate Athenian heroism against the Persians in the context of the epic, Trojan past. The first epigram does this obliquely:

Those also, it seems, were enduring of heart, who once at Eion, around the streams of the Strymon, attacking the children of the Medes with fiery famine and mighty Ares, first discovered an assault against which their enemies were helpless.

¹² Meiggs and Lewis (1969: n. 26). Page (1981: 255-59), "Simonides" XL.

¹³ Miller (1997: 29-55).

¹⁴ Loraux (1986).

The first line is spoken in the voice of someone who is conscious of other great examples of endurance, but has only just recognized this one. It does not specify those in whose company “also” places these Athenians.¹⁵ The second Herm makes the heroism of these particular leaders, and the gratitude and honour shown by the monument itself, an incitement for future Athenians to emulate these men:

The Athenians gave this as a reward to its leaders for their benefactions and their great merit. Someone in the future who sees this will be more willing to take up burdens for the common good.

The third, finally, asserts the continuity of Athenian greatness in war from the Trojan War to the present.

From this city, once, Menestheus was a leader along with the Atreidai in the holy plain of Troy, whom once Homer said went as an excellent director of battle over the Danaans with their tunics of tightly-fitted bronze. So it is not unnatural for the Athenians to be called directors when it comes to both war and manliness.

The epigram moves from the time of the Trojan War, to the time of Homer’s praise of Menestheus, to the present.

Each Herm performs a distinct task in the realm of social memory, and together they constitute a powerful attempt to unite in social memory the remote past, the recent past, and the indefinite future. These recent monuments, familiar to Aeschylus and his original audience, show a clear understanding of how memory reaches into the past to define the present and organize the future.¹⁶ The herald’s decision to edit his story in order to create a simple and glorious memory thus belongs to recognizable contemporary practice.

The herald’s self-consciousness about his own speech is not unusual. *Agamemnon* is repeatedly concerned with problems of public speech—of what can or should be said aloud in public space of what is known, thought, or remembered. The chorus, when Agamemnon enters, greets him by sharply distinguishing, much as the herald does, how they felt in the past and how they feel now:

οὐ δέ μοι τότε μὲν στέλλων στρατιὰν
Ἐλένης ἔνεκ’, οὐκ σ’ ἐπικεύσω,

¹⁵ Wade-Gery (1933: 74-75) argues that the comparison is to more recent achievements, the inscription having been put up after the Eurymedon.

¹⁶ Steiner (1994: 78-79) discusses cases in which both the Spartans and the Athenians erased dedicatory inscriptions (of Pausanias and Peisistratos).

κάρτ' ἀπομούσως ἦσθα γεγραμμένος
 οὐδ' εὖ πραπίδων οἴακα νέμων,
 [. . .] θράσος ἐκούσιον
 ἀνδράσι θνήσκουσι κομίζων.¹⁷
 νῦν δ' οὐκ ἄπ' ἄκρας φρενὸς οὐδ' ἀφίλωσ
 εὐφρων [.
 . .] πόνος εὖ τελέσσασιν [ἐγώ].¹⁸

You, when once you sent out an expedition for Helene's sake—I will not hide it—were inscribed very unmusically, and not steering your intelligence well ... voluntary boldness providing courage to dying men. But now, not from the top of the mind, nor in an unfriendly way, well-meaning ... labour to those who have well completed. (*Ag.* 799-806)

The elders need to stress that they did not admire Agamemnon's actions earlier because they desperately need to distinguish the praise they offer now from flattery.¹⁹ Much speech is shallow or insincere (788-94), and only by explaining that events have altered their judgment can they manage to attain the ideal of praise that is neither inadequate nor excessive (785-87). At this moment in the play, all their reflections on the evils of the Trojan War—the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, the Argive casualties—become a mere rhetorical foil to praise. Yet the very problems of praise require that they allude to their earlier feelings, and so, very indirectly, to the causes of those feelings. The needs of what has been marked by the herald's speech as a would-be master narrative—the Trojan War as, in the end, a triumphant success—carry the concealed counter-narrative with them.

Private memory and open discourse are in frequent tension throughout the play. The watchman ends his opening monologue with the troubling announcement that there are “other matters” about which he will be silent.

But I am silent about the rest. A great ox has come over my tongue. The house itself, if it could get the power of speech, would say most clearly.

¹⁷ Another famous crux: I follow West (1990: 202) in an interpretation that goes back to Weil (“recovering deliberate outrageousness [i.e., Helene] with men's lives”)—but see the objections of Judet de la Combe (1981-1982: 174-75).

¹⁸ West (1998) suggests something like εὔδει here (Fraenkel [1950] proposed, e.g., ἠδύς). Judet de la Combe (1981-1982: 177-79) tentatively defends the transmitted text.

¹⁹ So Thiel (1993: 201-2), against Neitzel (1986), whose otherwise convincing discussion of the argument of the passage makes the criticism of Agamemnon the goal.

So willingly I speak out to those who understand, and for those who do not, I forget. (*Ag.* 36-39)

The watchman's formulation echoes that of speakers who allude to speech understandable only by an elite. However, in imagining that the house itself could speak, he evokes not esoteric meaning but intimate, private knowledge (and he is, of course, not an elite speaker). Presumably the Watchman is referring to Klytaimestra's adultery, which the house has witnessed. Some people other than the Watchman, presumably some who are not members of the household, have this intimate knowledge. Others, evidently, do not. The Watchman's knowledge thus belongs only to a particular memory community. Ordinarily, though, we imagine memory communities as competing to have their versions of the past given authority. The Watchman not only does not want the responsibility of transmitting the information, but he prefers not to remember it among those who do not already have it. In the world of the play, there is a hidden stratum of memory, a memory that denies itself outside its own community—and that community is defined only by access to the memory.

The Thyestean banquet presents similar issues. Although the language of the *parodos* may indirectly evoke this history, the play does not refer to it overtly until the *Kassandra* scene.²⁰ The chorus up to this point has not considered any event earlier than the abduction of Helene. *Kassandra*, however, unmistakably, if obscurely, refers to the past murder and cannibalism as "evidence" relevant for the murder she predicts. Initially the chorus insists that they are not trying to hire a prophet, but when she openly announces that a new horror is on the way, the elders admit that, although they do not know what these new prophecies are about, they know the past events—indeed, that the whole city "shouts" them:

KASS. Yes, I have confidence in these proofs: here are infants weeping for their slaughter, and roasted flesh consumed by a father.

CHO. Indeed, we have heard the fame of your clairvoyance. But we are not seeking any prophets.

KASS. Alas, what is being planned? What is this new grief? A great evil is planned in this house, unbearable for friends, hard to cure. And defence stands away, far off.

CHO. I have no knowledge about these prophecies, but I recognized those earlier ones. For the whole city shouts them. (*Ag.* 1095-1106)

²⁰ Lebeck (1971: 33).

Like the herald's speech, the chorus' response to Cassandra is odd if we try actually to imagine the nature of the speech to which it refers. The elders apparently do not want Cassandra to talk about the Thyestean banquet, since they state (in an unusual use of the plural for themselves) that they are not in the market for prophets. Yet this same story is "shouted" by the whole city. If the whole city cries this aloud, how have the old men managed not to mention it? It would surely be relevant to the political situation in Argos. There is a paradox in this "shouting" of a story the chorus evidently has avoided, which gives us the impression that this "shouting" is not actually a loud sound: it is a persistent speech that is excluded from public discourse, and it sounds like a loud cry because they hear it when they would rather forget it in silence. The entire city is thus, in effect, an oppressed memory community, while the elders have been complicit in the suppression of this memory. The sacrifice of Iphigeneia they have been unable to avoid, probably because it was a public, official event, and intimately bound to the favourable omens they want to remember. The banquet took place indoors and is not part of their "official record," yet everyone knows about it. Within the deeper logic of the family curse, the evil of the past is alive whether anybody mentions it or not. At the public level of social memory, however, it can be possible to suppress the past until it is forgotten—but this past has not been successfully suppressed. (This is not "the return of the repressed" in any Freudian sense, since the repression is completely conscious.)

Kassandra returns to the house's past in her speech, where she speaks first of the Erinyes' loathing for Thyestes' adultery with his brother's wife (1191-93), and then, in a more intense prophetic disturbance, of the children murdered and eaten (1219-22) and the vengeance that is now planned. The elders understand only the references to the past, to Thyestes' children (1242-44). Klytimestra refers to the feast at 1501-1504, and the elders, although they do not agree with her understanding of herself as merely the embodiment of the *alastor*, agrees that the ancestral spirit might also be at work. After Agamemnon's murder, Aigisthos enters to express his pleasure in his revenge, and tells the story of the banquet again:

For Atreus, ruler of this land, this man's father, my own father, Thyestes, to put it clearly, his own brother, because his power was in dispute, exiled from his city and home. And coming back as a suppliant of the hearth, poor Thyestes found a safe portion, that he did not in death bloody his

own ancestral ground. But this man's godforsaken father, more enthusiastically than with friendship, as hospitality, on the appearance of cheerfully holding a day of meat-sacrifice, gave my father a feast of the meat of his children. (*Ag.* 1583-93)

Although all versions stress the banquet as the crucial moment, Cassandra's version does not include the dispute over power; Aigisthos' ignores the adultery; Klytaimestra's brief allusion isolates the banquet from its context completely. Aigisthos' version straightforwardly whitewashes Thyestes; Cassandra's ignores the political, and everything except the extraordinary acts of evil (she is not interested in Thyestes' exile, for example). These differing accounts of the past allow us no certainty about what exactly it is that the whole city cries out. There does not seem to be an authoritative narrative of these events, which is not surprising if they have been excluded from the public realm, where they could have been debated. Yet at the end of the play, social memory has changed. The banquet can no longer be ignored. The significance of each item in the history of the family is not determined, but the feast cannot be suppressed.

Characters argue about what aspects of the past matter now. In their exchange at 1407-1576, Klytaimestra and the chorus engage in what could be called, in modern terms, memory wars. In order to define her killing of Agamemnon, each side looks for an appropriate context in which it can be located and understood. The meaning of the present depends on what counts as the relevant context from the past. While Cassandra and Aigisthos evoke a memory that has previously been ignored, Klytaimestra and the chorus exploit available public memories. Klytaimestra justifies her actions by citing the sacrifice of Iphigeneia and complaining that the chorus failed to oppose it or act against Agamemnon (1415-1420). When she also speaks about Cassandra and Agamemnon's other sexual partners at Troy (1438-43), they sing in blame of Helene (1454-61). Both Iphigeneia and Helene have been topics of choral songs already; unlike the banquet of Atreus, they are already part of public discourse. However, the chorus cannot accept Klytaimestra's version of the story, in which her act is justified revenge for Agamemnon's unpunished murder of the daughter. Equally, she will not accept their possible account, in which Agamemnon's death is yet another of the evil consequences of Helene's madness. The memories available fail as sources for a shared account. Even though the story of the past is itself shared, its applicability is in dispute.

The chorus therefore refers to the *daimon* of the house (1468-71). The passage is corrupt and the reference uncertain:

δαῖμον, ὃς ἐμπίτνεις δώμασι καὶ διφύ-
οισι Τανταλίδαισιν,
κράτος [τ'] ἰσόψυχον ἐκ γυναικῶν
καρδιόδηκτον ἐμοὶ κρατύνεις·

Divine force, who falls upon the house and the two descendants of Tantalos, and who wields power with a power whose soul comes equally from women, a power that bites my heart ...

Since the elders have just been singing about Helene, Fraenkel is probably right that an obvious referent of the Tantalids is Agamemnon and Menelaos. Yet nobody speaks of such a *daimon* if he is thinking only of the present, and Klytaimestra immediately goes on to praise the chorus for invoking the *daimon*:

νῦν δ' ὠρθωσας στόματος γνώμην,
τὸν τριπάχυντον δαίμονα γέννης τῆσδε κικλήσκων·

Now you have set right the opinion of your mouth, when you call on the triple-fatted *daimon* of the family! (*Ag.* 1475-77)

She understands this *daimon* as ancestral. The elders probably therefore should be understood as intending a double reference to the two sets of brothers. In both cases, they claim, the power of the *daimon* has been exercised through women. Klytaimestra takes from their memory what is useful to her, the *daimon*, and ignores the possible allusion to Airopé's adultery. When she claims to incarnate the *alastor* of the Feaster Atreus, she selects from the available pasts the one that best suits her rhetorical needs.

The Thyestean banquet thus passes from hidden speech to public discourse. Yet this is not the only theme in the play where a distinction develops between open or official speech and the secret voice of other memories. During the war, the initial response of the soldiers' families is an apparently silent endurance:

ὁ πᾶν δ' ἀφ' Ἑλλανος αἴας συνορμένοισι ἀπέν-
θεια τλησικάρδιος
δόμῳ ἕν ἐκάστου πρέπει.
πολλὰ γοῦν θιγγάνει πρὸς ἦπαρ·
[- ×] οὐς μὲν γάρ ἔπεμψεν²¹

²¹ See West (1990: 188)—but I do not like his suggestion γαῖα δ', since the emphasis here is on people.

οἶδεν, ἀντὶ δὲ φωτῶν
τεύχη καὶ σποδὸς εἰς ἐκά-
στου δόμους ἀφικνεῖται.

Everywhere, of those who set out from the Greek land, grieflessness of an enduring heart is evident in the house of each one. Still, many things touch the heart. Whom he sent, he knows, but instead of men, urns and ash arrives at the house of each one. (*Ag.* 429-36)

When the ashes of the dead come back from Troy, people (especially, we assume, those who sent them) praise them:

στένουσι δ' εὖ λέγοντες ἄν-
δρα τὸν μὲν ὡς μάχης ἴδρις,
τὸν δ' ἐν φοναῖς καλῶς πεσόντ'—
“ἄλλοτρίας διαὶ γυναικός”²²
τάδε σιγά τις βαύζει,
φθονερόν δ' ὑπ' ἄλγος ἔρπει
προδίκους Ἀτρεΐδαις.

They lament, praising one man as capable in battle, another who fell nobly in the gore, “because of someone else’s woman”—this someone mutters in silence, and a resentful grief creeps invisibly against the Atreidai who seek justice. (*Ag.* 445-51)

The praise that fills their laments sounds as if it should be a semi-public speech, funeral lamentation, familial speech but delivered in public. Yet only a moment later it becomes barely audible. We are perhaps to imagine that the praise is spoken or sung aloud, the angry supplement “because of someone else’s woman” added under the speaker’s breath.²³ The passage however evokes the power of such hidden speech, which spreads resentment invisibly (ὑπ'). A few lines later this buried language has the effectiveness of the most public language possible:

βαρεῖα δ' ἀστῶν φάτις σὺν κότῳ,
δημοκράντου δ' ἀρᾶς τίνει χρέος·

Heavy is the speech of the citizens with anger.
It pays the debt of a publicly-enacted curse (*Ag.* 456-57)²⁴

²² See Bollack (1981-82: 453-44); also Bers (1997: 37-38 with note 23).

²³ That is, precisely the kind of lamentation that many believe the Athenians curtailed for political reasons; see Foley (2001: 19-55).

²⁴ δημοκράντου is Porson’s conjecture for δημοκράτου. Fraenkel (1950: *ad loc.*) translates “a debt arising out of a curse pronounced by the people,” assuming that the people pronounced a curse earlier, and that the people’s angry speech, as the prelude to revolt, fulfils the curse. West (1990: 188-89) considers various alterna-

The language of memory, praise of the dead, quickly becomes language directed at the future, complaints about the rulers. In epinician language, the victory obligates the poet to celebrate it, and so creates a debt on his part: this is the *χρέος*-motif to which I have already referred. Here, this theme is reversed: as victory creates an obligation to praise, the needless deaths demand a response. The people's angry speech repays a debt that is owed the Atreidai for the urns containing the dead, and this angry speech is the equivalent of a public curse.²⁵ In democratic Athens, a public enemy could be cursed by the priests and priestesses, but since the public enemy in this case is also the king, such public, magically effective language is not possible. Yet this murmuring of the people is clearly as dangerous as the curse would be, for the chorus is anxious.

My anxiety waits to hear something covered in night. For the gods do not fail to notice those who kill many ... (*Ag.* 459-62)

The dangers of the people's mutterings are political and practical, since they deprive the king's authority of legitimacy. Yet they are also, like those of a curse, supernatural, for their voices help attract the attention of the gods, who in any case notice those who kill.

The almost-silent mutterings of the people, worrisome as they are, are only one aspect of the speech that worries the chorus. A moment later, after contemplating divine vengeance on "those who kill many," the elders continue:

Having an excessive glory is heavy. For the thunderbolt is thrown by the eyes of Zeus. I judge [best] unenvied prosperity. May I not be a city-sacker, nor, however, myself, captured, may I see my life subject to another. (*Ag.* 468-74)

The general rule is tricky enough. If to be excessively praised is as dangerous as to be the object of resentful speech, a wise man avoids both. Yet the old men turn from this danger to their wish for moderate good fortune, specified as being neither a city-sacker nor a victim. It seems therefore to be the city-sacker who is excessively praised, as it is the general responsible for the deaths of his own citizens who is cursed. Since Agamemnon is both, he is the target of both kinds of dangerous speech. Although the context of the excessive praise is not specified, it can fairly be inferred to be as different as possible from the secret talk of

tives, concerned that the term "at least suggests a formal resolution by an assembly" instead of private cursing; I think that this is precisely the point.

²⁵ On the practice of the public curse, see Parker (2005: 76-77).

the people. It is presumably the kind of public speech represented by the inscription, or the chorus' attempt at a moderate public welcome. Such speech seeks to define public memory.

If we compare the play's treatment of memorial practice with that of contemporary Athenians, it is striking that in the world of the play, the men who die at Troy are not honoured in public discourse. It is their own friends and family who praise them. The herald speaks of dedications, but not of monuments for the dead. Scholars have debated whether the sending of the urns recalls the Athenian practice of bringing back the cremated remains of the war dead for public burial, but the point surely lies in the mixture of similarity and difference: the dead are returned, but there is no funeral oration.²⁶ The problem represented by the public curse is thus not isolated. In the Athenian democracy, public memory honours those who die in war, and successful leaders are presumably not praised in excess. The intense danger of excessive praise for Agamemnon in public speech is the other side of the failure to praise the dead officially.

Over and over, characters in the play refer to their own difficulty in expressing themselves correctly or refer self-consciously to their linguistic choices. The chorus repeatedly sings of its *aporia* in how to mourn Agamemnon:

Oh, Oh, king, king, how shall I weep for you? From a friendly heart, what can I say? You lie in this weaving of the spider, breathing your life away in an impious death; alas, you lie not like a free man, overcome by a treacherous death, with a two-edged weapon from [her] hand.

(Ag. 1490-96 = 1514-20)

Each time, Klytaimestra takes issue with something in the stanza. The second time, she objects to the word ἀνελεύθερον ("unfree"). In insisting on the justice of her actions, she extends her concern over the control of speech and so public memory to the Underworld:

Having suffered what he deserved, let him not boast at all, having paid in death by the sword what he did. (Ag. 1527-29)

Agamemnon, had he not suffered vengeance, would be able to "boast." Klytaimestra implies that even the sacrifice of Iphigeneia could be in-

²⁶ Jacoby (1944: 44); Gomme (1945: 95); Leahy (1974: 4). Controversy has continued since Jacoby about when the Athenians introduced the custom of the public funeral; bibliography in Hornblower (1991: 292 on 2.34.1). If, as seems to be the present *communis opinio*, the custom began only in the late 470s or the 460s, it would have been even more salient to Aeschylus' audience.

cluded in a triumphalist narrative, if Agamemnon had not paid the price for it. By killing him, she has ensured that his story cannot be told as glorious.

The characters debate not only speech but ceremonial acts that simultaneously commemorate a past (and so define it for social memory) and constitute memorable events for the future to remember. Thus the elders worry about Agamemnon's funeral:

Who will bury him? Who will lament? Will you bring yourself to do this, after killing your own husband, to cry out in lament, unjustly to perform a thanks that is no thanks for his soul, in return for his great deeds? Who, speaking forth the eulogy at the tomb for the godlike man with tears, will make the effort with truth of heart? (*Ag.* 1541-50)

Klytaimestra insists that she will perform the funeral herself (1551-59). This funeral then becomes part of the memory of at least the household, for Elektra and chorus recall it in *Choephoroi*, and urge Orestes to write it in his mind (429-50). Similarly, one reason Klytaimestra wants Agamemnon to walk on the tapestries is precisely what makes him reluctant:

KL. Do not respect criticism from people.

AG. Yet the talk that goes among the people has much power.

KL. The one who is not resentfully envied is not admired. (*Ag.* 937-39)

What the people think of Agamemnon will have no immediate effect on Klytaimestra's plans. She will surely kill him whether he is popular or not. Her plans for the future, however, will be more easily realized if the people are acquiescent, and the less favourably they remember Agamemnon, the less trouble she and Aigisthos are likely to have. Hence it is to her practical advantage to have him be seen performing an action that would be typical of Priamos. Furthermore, walking on the tapestries is in part a re-enactment of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, as she implies by asking him whether he would do it if he had vowed it to the gods:

KL. Would you, in fear, have vowed to the gods to do this in this way?

AG. If someone who really knew had declared this ritual. (*Ag.* 933-34)

The public display can thus both evoke a hostile memory that might otherwise be ignored, and create a new negative memory for Agamemnon. Klytaimestra seeks not only to kill her husband, but to control his story so that he cannot be remembered simply either as the splendid conqueror of Troy or as an innocent victim. She at least partially succeeds.

Agamemnon, then, is pervasively concerned with social memory and the ways power can and cannot control it. The most powerful force of memory seems to be quiet, private speech; public proclamations and rituals attempt to manipulate it, but only partially succeed. Public memory is unstable. The herald's speech, by eliding the differences between speech and writing, past and present, tries to finesse the difficulty, but does not succeed. Indeed, some of the trilogy's metaphors associate writing, as a memory tool, precisely with private memory and interiority: Elektra, urging her brother to be mindful of her sufferings as well as those of her father, tells him to write in his mind what he hears, τοιαῦτ' ἀκούων [τάδ'] ἐν φρεσὶν γράφου (*Cho.* 450), namely what she tells him of the tears she shed in hiding, χέουσα πολύδακρυον γόον κεκρυμμένα (449) when she was confined in the inside of the house μυχῶ δ' ἄφερκτος (447). Writing stands for the power of memory, but it is a memory of private acts to be held in an individual's mind. The Furies say that "Hades watches with a mind that writes on a tablet" the crimes humans commit: δελτογράφῳ δὲ πάντ' ἐπωπᾶ φρενί (*Eum.* 275). Klytaimestra, in the corrupt *Cho.* 699, alludes to a public register on which the hope Orestes represented will be marked as vanished or from which it will be removed: although this is public writing, it records an absence. Since Klytaimestra is actually wrong that this hope is gone, the allusion hints not at permanence and reliability in the written record, but at its inability to offer more truth than is available at the limited moment it is produced.²⁷

Since the metaphor describes a change in an existing record, the metaphor is also a reminder that the mutability of human life requires that the record constantly change. The permanent inscription evoked by the herald's speech is not a faithful carrier of accurate memory. At *Ag.* 1328-29, Cassandra refers to a human life as a marking: εἰ δὲ δυστυχῆ, / βολαῖς ὑγρώσσωσιν σπόγγος ὤλεσεν γραφήν. ("If he is unlucky, a damp sponge destroys the marking by touching it"). Whether she means a text or, as commentators think, a picture, what has been recorded can easily be obliterated with a wet sponge. Yet Cassandra says that she laments not out of fear, but in order that the chorus may bear witness when vengeance comes:

I am not panicked with fear like a bird before a bush, pointlessly. Bear witness for me in this when I am dead, when a woman dies in return for

²⁷ See Garvie (1986) on the textual possibilities of *Cho.* 698-99.

me, a woman, and a man ill-married dies in return for the man. (*Ag.* 1316-20)

She has faith in the power of individual memory: her own death is significant enough that the later deaths of Aigisthos and Klytimestra will prompt the elders to remember her. She presents this memory, however, in legal and thus public terms: the private memories she is creating for each member of the chorus are to become part of the social memory of the murder of Agamemnon.

Yet the trilogy itself engages in aetiology, and I want to conclude by briefly hinting at the issues I referred to above: the production itself as an intervention in social memory. Aetiology almost inverts the practices whereby people try to control how their own time will be remembered. The inscriptions implicit in the herald's speech seek to project a contemporary view into the future, both establishing a memory trace (the dedication) and providing a fixed definition for it (the inscription). Aetiology, in contrast, appropriates existing institutions—cults, buildings, forms of social organization—and associates them with stories that may not have been connected with them, and may even be invented.²⁸ A successful aetiology “writes” itself by attaching a particular memory to a durable trace.

Eumenides seems to be a massive exercise in the recreation of the Athenian past. Jacoby argues that the trial of Orestes before the Areopagus was Aeschylus' invention (*FGrH* III B Supp. 24-25). Even if we reject this view, it certainly looks as if the sacrifice of the Amazons to Ares mentioned at 689 is a desperate attempt to evade the traditional etymology (which would exclude Orestes' trial as the first).²⁹ In addition, *Eumenides* is almost certainly innovating in making the Athenian Semnai the same divinities as the Erinyes who pursued Orestes.³⁰ This invented past is without question designed to make sense of the present. This is not the place for a full discussion of Aeschylus' view of the re-

²⁸ See in particular Scullion (2000).

²⁹ Sommerstein (1989: 3-5) argues for three innovations in Orestes' trial: having mortals instead of the Olympians as jury; making the Erinyes the prosecutors; and making Orestes' trial at the Areopagus the first. He also argues (11) that Aeschylus first identified the Semnai, who were especially protectors of suppliants, with the Erinyes.

³⁰ Lardinois (1992: 316-22) points out that this identification gives the local divinities the stature of the Erinyes of Panhellenic epic.

forms of Ephialtes.³¹ Clearly, however, the play makes a present claim about recent events by narrating an origin, and it also projects the origin of the Argive alliance into the mythical past. There is potentially something disturbing in a performance that so carefully explores the difficulties and complexities of social memories, and then tries to intervene so intensively in the memories of its own community.

The play also indulges in an aetiology of Athenian claims to Sigeion and perhaps beyond (*Eum.* 397-402), when Athene announces that she has just taken possession of the land that the Achaian leaders assigned her. She emphasizes her complete and permanent possession (αὐτόπρεμνον ἐς τὸ πᾶν ἐμοί, 401); but the gift is simultaneously a gift to the sons of Theseus (402). Athene's announcement requires that the audience ignore the disturbing version of the sack of Troy that they experienced in *Agamemnon*; it rewrites the past as it has just been presented.³² While Athene's claims may have been almost universally welcome in Athens, they could not be easily accepted elsewhere.

Still, the disagreements of interpreters about the precise political implications of the description of the Areopagus in *Eumenides* may point to how the trilogy's awareness of problems of social memory affects its handling of aetiology. The play praises the Areopagus as a vitally important institution, but leaves considerable room for different understandings of its precise function.³³ The Areopagus of the play is originally a homicide court, and so performs the function left it by the reforms; at the same time, Athene describes its importance in vague but grandiose terms (700-6). Since the trilogy might easily allow its audience to feel that all problems that do not result in murder are relatively minor, the homicide court could perhaps stand for all the institutions that maintain social order. Yet the play repeatedly calls the Areopagus a βουλευτήριον (580, 685, 705). So the play tries to create a shared past,

³¹ There is a history of the debate in Braun (1998: 105-33). While older interpreters saw Aeschylus as a defender of the pre-reform Areopagus, more recently he has been seen as a supporter of the reforms (Dover [1957]); as resisting further proposed reforms (Podlecki [1966: 96-98]); and as concerned with a larger context than the immediate disputes (MacLeod [1982]).

³² Anderson (1997: 130-32).

³³ Braun (1998: 198-200); so also Dodds (1960) sees the reconciliation of the Erinyes as a paradigm for a compromise between the reformers and their opponents. Dover (1957: 234-35) argues that the play treats homicide law as the foundation of all order, and so can give the Areopagus limited powers while treating it as extremely important.

but allows space within that past for at least some disagreement.³⁴ Similarly, *Eumenides* offers what may have been a new history for the cult of the Semnai at Athens, but because this history is a historical break for the characters involved, it does not narrowly redefine the present. The goddesses of Athenian cult extend their functions to include those of the Erinyes, but do not give anything up in the process.³⁵ These aetiologies seek consensus even without complete agreement.

The aetiologies of the play were, indeed, successful; they became part of shared Athenian memory. Though Aeschylus' version of the founding of the Areopagus did not erase others, his version of the trial was standard enough to be the basis of further innovations at Euripides *IT* 968-69 and *Electra* 1270-72. This is worth some thought, since a tragic performance was not like a dedication or a ritual. It had no mechanism for automatically having its message repeated. The success of the play's aetiologies must have been at least partially independent of its further life as a text. Although re-performances, recitations of extracts at symposia, and even reading would have both continued the life of the text and promulgated its version of the Athenian past, the aetiologies must have had a life of their own in oral tradition. This may mitigate some unease about the play's intervention in social memory. A tragedy could only offer its version to its audience, and that version would become widely known or fall into obscurity depending not only on the popularity of the text, but on whether the version met the narrative, social, and political needs of those who, having heard it, were in a position to retell and use it themselves.

Yet there is something peculiar about the aetiologies. When the Erinyes are won over, they sing songs of blessing. The logic of the play seems to demand that the audience hear these as effective, as powerful songs; but they are utopian, and do not describe a world in which any audience actually lived. If the song were truly powerful, Attic crops could never be blighted; every nanny-goat would bear two healthy kids.

May no harm that damages trees blow—I speak of the favour I give—
flames that kills plants' buds may not pass over the boundary of these
places, nor can a terrible disease that makes crops fruitless make its way.

³⁴ This is a common view in recent scholarship; so Pelling (2000: 172-73) and Bowie (1993).

³⁵ Brown (1984) argues that Aeschylus does not identify the Erinyes with the Semnai Theai, but he is not convincing. See Lloyd-Jones (1990: 208-9).

But may Pan nourish successful flocks with double young ... (*Eum.* 938-47)

Life is not like that. Young men died at Athens as elsewhere, despite 956-57.

In addition, most relevant to social memory, Athene asks the chorus not to afflict Athens with internal war:

μήτ' ἐκζέουσ' ὡς καρδίαν ἀλεκτόρων³⁶
 ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἀστοῖσιν ἰδρύσης Ἄρη
 ἐμφύλιόν τε καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους θρασύν.

Nor making their hearts boil like those of fighting-cocks, settle among my citizens war that is within the tribe and bold against each other (*Eum.* 861-63)

After being won over, the chorus at *Eum.* 976-87 prays that the Athenians avoid *stasis*:

τὰν δ' ἀπληστον κακῶν μήποτ' ἐν πόλει Στάσις
 τᾶδ' ἐπεύχομαι βρέμειν,
 μηδὲ πιοῦσα κόνις μέλαν αἶμα πολιτᾶν
 δι' ὄργαν ποινάς
 ἀντιφόνους, Ἄτας
 ἀρπαλίσαι πόλεως,
 χάσματα δ' ἀντιδιδόειν
 κοινοφιλεῖ διανοία
 καὶ στυγεῖν μιᾶ φρενί·
 πολλῶν γὰρ τόδ' ἐν βροτοῖς ἄκος.

I pray that civil discord, insatiable in evil, never roar in the city, nor that the dust, drinking the black blood of citizens, vengeance for blood exacted in anger, seize civic disasters. But let them exchange joys with each other in an attitude of shared friendship, and hate with one heart. This is the cure of many things among mortals.

If this blessing is to be received as valid and powerful, the Athenian audience must have been able to imagine that its wish had been fulfilled until now and still would be. Yet there was political violence in Athenian history. It was precisely on the altar of the Semnai, according to Thucydides (1.126.11) that Kylon and his followers were killed. The murder of Ephialtes was recent and directly connected with the reform

³⁶ ἐκζέουσ' is Musgrave's conjecture for ἐξελοῦσ'. West (1998) and Page (1972) obelize, perhaps rightly.

of the Areopagus.³⁷ (In this context, it does not matter whether he was in fact murdered by a faction: people believed that he had been.) If Athens had not just gone through *stasis*, it had come very close. The dust had drunk the black blood of at least one man, and it is clear that many believed that conspirators to murder had escaped scot-free. While Athens had so far avoided the worst case against which the song prays, it had not avoided completely the troubles the chorus seems to promise will not come. If the song bridges the history from the time of the play to the audience's present, the history is inaccurate.

On the other hand, this history of violence appears mild compared to the threat of political violence either just passed or yet to come, when opponents of the democracy were encouraging a Peloponnesian invasion before the Long Walls could be completed (Thuc. 1.107.4). Between the anti-democratic factions' willingness to summon foreign help, and the possibility of violent retaliation against oligarch plotters and in response to Ephialtes' death, it would seem appropriate to deny the name of *stasis* to any earlier event while deprecating the possibility now.³⁸ When Athene praises external war and the passion for glory (864-65), it seems clear that the intense pressures of the present generate the implied idealization of the past. By locating civic harmony as a foundational principle, and by suggesting that it has prevailed thus far, the play argues that it can continue to prevail.

Athene famously warns the people against changing the laws:

...
 πέτρα πάγος τ' Ἄρειος. ἐν δὲ τῷ σέβας
 ἀστῶν φόβος τε ξυγγενῆς τὸ μὴ ἀδικεῖν
 σχήσει τό τ' ἡμαρ καὶ κατ' εὐφρόνην ὁμῶς,
 αὐτῶν πολιτῶν μὴ ἴπικαιούτων† νόμους·
 κακαῖς ἐπιρροαῖσι βορβόρω θ' ὕδωρ
 λαμπρὸν μαινῶν οὐποθ' εὐρήσεις ποτόν.

Here, the citizen's reverence and their native fear will prevent wrongdoing alike by day and night, if the citizens do not introduce innovations (?) in the laws with bad influxes. If you pollute bright water with mud, you will never find a drink. (*Eum.* 690-95)

³⁷ Meier (1993: 115-16), while arguing that the play is about much more than the reforms, suggests that Athene's formulation of the role of the Areopagus hints that its members should punish the assassins of Ephialtes.

³⁸ See Sommerstein (1989: 25-32), and Wallace (1989: 92-93).

Given the recent reform, Athenians cannot have believed their laws had never changed.³⁹ It is also possible that the reformers argued, and even believed, that they were returning the constitution to an older, superior form, so that Aeschylus here endorses the reform (cf. *Ath. Pol.* 25.2, where powers beyond those of the court are called ἐπιθετα, “additions”). Either way, however, the speech denies the real history of the laws, both the recent changes and their long historical development. Draco, Solon, Ephialtes, and all the other traditions of Athenian law are transformed into a single pure moment of divine gift.

Eumenides thus indulges in the kind of manipulation of social memory that *Agamemnon* seems to have shown to be impossible. Like the Thyestean banquet, the murder of Ephialtes should be hard to forget, even if official history does not want to remember it.⁴⁰ Yet there may be a significant difference. While the trilogy has shown characters trying to manipulate future memory and disagreeing about events of the previous generation, *Eumenides* creates a very remote past in order to provide a narrative through which recent events are to be interpreted. Another difference, as with Orestes’ killing of his mother, lies in the motives and circumstances. Earlier in the trilogy, attempts at the control of social memory have been the work of self-interested parties who have struggled over the past. *Eumenides* implies that its version serves the benefit of the city as a whole, and presumably this position above particular interests and factions both justifies the attempt at controlling memory and gives it a chance of success. *Eumenides* is trying to perform a different kind of memory work. Indeed, *Eumenides* seems to have been extremely successful, and the memory of Ephialtes’ death is not salient for later Athenians. Still, we are entitled to our doubts.

Bibliography

- Anderson, M. (1997). *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*. Oxford and New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Assmann, J. (1992). *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. Munich: Beck.
- Bers, V. (1997). *Speech in Speech: Studies in Incorporated Oratio Recta in Attic Drama and Oratory*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

³⁹ MacLeod (1982: 128) thinks that this refers to the homicide laws, which Athenians believed had been stable since Draco.

⁴⁰ Thomas (1989: 203) comments on how little the orators remember Ephialtes.

- Bollack, J. and P. Judet de la Combe (1981-82). *L'Agamemnon d'Eschyle: le texte et ses interprétations*. Cahiers de Philologie 6-8. Lille: Presses universitaires de Lille.
- Bowie, A. M. (1993). "Religion and Politics in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*." *CQ* 43: 10-31.
- Braun, M. (1998). *Die "Eumeniden" des Aischylos und der Areopag*. Classica Monacensia 19. Tübingen: Narr.
- Brown, A. L. (1984). "Eumenides in Greek Tragedy." *CQ* 34: 260-81.
- Bundy, E. (1962a). *Studia Pindarica I: the Eleventh Olympian Ode*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press.
- Bundy, E. (1962b). *Studia Pindarica II: the First Isthmian Ode*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press.
- Buxton, R. G. A. (1982). *Persuasion in Greek Tragedy: A Study of Peitho*. Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Dodds, E. R. (1960). "Morals and Politics in the *Oresteia*." *PCPhS* 6: 19-31.
- Dover, K. J. (1957). "The Political Aspects of Aeschylus' *Eumenides*." *JHS* 77: 230-7.
- Fentress, J., and C. Wickham (1992). *Social Memory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Foley, H. (2001). *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Fraenkel, E. (1950). *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Garvie, A. F. (1986). *Aeschylus. Choephoroi*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Goldhill, S. (1990). "The Great Dionysia and Athenian Civic Ideology." In *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context*, J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin, eds.: 97-129. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Gomme, A. W. (1945). *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Halbwachs, M. (1950). *La mémoire collective*. Paris, Presses universitaires de France.
- Heath, J. (2005). *The Talking Greeks: Speech, Animals, and the Other in Homer, Aeschylus, and Plato*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Hornblower, S. (1991). *A Commentary on Thucydides*, Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Jacoby, F. (1944). "*Patrios nomos*: State Burial in Athens and the Public Cemetery in the Kerameikos." *JHS* 64: 37-66.
- Judet de la Combe, P. (2001). *L'Agamemnon d'Eschyle. Commentaire des dialogues*. Villeneuve-d'Ascq: Presses universitaires de septentrion.
- Lardinois, A. (1992). "Greek Myths for Athenian Rituals: Religion and Politics in Aeschylus' *Eumenides* and Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus*." *GRBS* 33: 313-27.
- Leahy, D. M. (1974). "The representation of the Trojan War in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*." *AJPh* 45: 1-23.
- Lebeck, A. (1971). *The Oresteia: A Study in Language and Structure*. Washington and Cambridge, MA: Center for Hellenic Studies, Harvard Univ. Press.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1979). *The Oresteia*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press.

- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1990). "Erinyes, Semnai theai, Eumenides." In *Owls to Athens: Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover*, E.M. Craik, ed.: 203-11. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Loroux, N. (1986). *The Invention of Athens: the Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, transl. A. Sheridan. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Meiggs R. and D. Lewis (1969). *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon.
- MacLeod, C. W. (1982). "Politics and the Oresteia." *JHS* 102: 124-44.
- Meier, C. (1993 [1988]). *The Political Art of Greek Tragedy*, transl. A. Webber. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Miller, M. C. (1997). *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century B.C.: a Study in Cultural Receptivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Montiglio, S. (2000). *Silence in the Land of Logos*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Neitzel, H. (1986). "Zur Interpretation von Aischylos, 'Agamemnon' 783-809." *Hermes* 113: 19-34.
- Page, D. L. (1972). *Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Page, D. L., ed. (1981). *Further Greek Epigrams*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Parker, R. (2005). "Law and Religion." In *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*, M. Gagarin and D. Cohen, eds.: 61-81. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Pelling, C. (2000). *Literary Texts and the Greek Historian*. London: Routledge.
- Podlecki, A. (1966). *The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
- Porter, D. (2005). "Aeschylus' 'Eumenides': Some Contrapuntal Lines." *AJP* 126: 301-331.
- Scullion, S. (1999-2000). "Tradition and Invention in Euripidean Aetiology." In *Euripides and Tragic Theatre in the Late Fifth Century*, M. Cropp, J. Lee, D. Sansone, eds.: 217-33. = *ICS* 24-25. Champaign: Stipes.
- Sommerstein, A. (1989). *Aeschylus: Eumenides*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Steiner, D. (1994). *The Tyrant's Writ: Myths and Images of Writing in Ancient Greece*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Thiel, R. (1993). *Chor und tragische Handlung im "Agamemnon" des Aischylos*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 35. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Thomas, R. (1989). *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Wade-Gery, H. T. (1933). "Classical Epigrams and Epitaphs: A Study of the Kimonian Age." *JHS* 53: 71-104.
- Wallace, R. W. (1989). *The Areopagos Council, to 307 B.C.* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- West, M. L. (1990). *Studies in Aeschylus*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- West, M. L., ed. (1998). *Aeschylus. Tragoediae: cum incerti poetae Prometheo*, 2nd ed. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner.

Young, D. (1983). "Pindar *Pythians* 2 and 3: Inscriptional ποτῆ and the 'Poetic Epistle'." *HSCP* 87: 31-48.

CHAPTER SEVEN

TRIERARCHS' RECORDS AND THE ATHENIAN NAVAL CATALOGUE (*IG i³ 1032*)

GEOFFREY BAKEWELL

The inscription *IG i³ 1032*, known as the Athenian Naval Catalogue, consists of eleven fragments of Pentelic marble dating from the late fifth or early fourth century BC. Found atop and near the Akropolis at different times, these fragments were painstakingly assembled by Laing to reconstruct a monument that once stood at least 2.15 m. tall and 1.0 m. wide, and was inscribed with a complete listing of the crews of eight Athenian triremes spread out over ten columns.¹ Graham's recent re-examination of the fragments has confirmed Laing's reconstruction in its essentials.² The extant portions of the inscription permit detailed analysis of the crews of four of the triremes, labelled for convenience T1, T2, T3, and T4. Lines 1-140 constitute the remains of T1's crew list; lines 141-275, those of T2's list; lines 276-406, those of T3's list; and lines 407-484, those of T4's list.³

Each ship was manned by roughly two hundred men, listed hierarchically. The two syntrierarchs come first, followed by ten ἐπιβᾶται (marines). Next come the remaining members of the ὑπηρεσία (petty officers and assistants to the trierarchs).⁴ Last but not least are the remaining 170 or so men who toiled at the three banks of oars. This group, the sailors proper, were subdivided into contingents based on civic status and again listed hierarchically. Citizen sailors, listed under the heading

¹ Laing (1965: 49-50).

² Graham (1998: 93): "the only matter where my examination of the fragments led me to differ from Laing concerned the unscripted parts of the inscription, or *vacats*."

³ Lewis (1994: 687-692, # 1032) offers the most recent text of the inscription, which is followed here. While the adjustments Graham (1998: 94-98) would make to Laing's and Lewis' *vacats* affect calculations regarding the inscription's missing portions, they have little effect on the arguments and analysis presented here.

⁴ For this meaning of ὑπηρεσία in 432 BC and thereafter see Morrison (1984: 49-56).

ναῦται ἄστοί, lead the way.⁵ Next come the ξένοι, that is, foreign allies and metics.⁶ The θεράποντες, slaves, bring up the rear. While these aggregate data are revealing about the overall composition of the crews, the Catalogue also offers further information about each individual crew member. Citizens are listed with their demotic, metics with their deme of residence, foreigners with their ethnikon, and slaves with the name of their master in the genitive.⁷

One of the most striking facts to emerge from the inscription's demographic information is that non-citizens comprised approximately 60-70% of the crew of each of the four ships.⁸ It is unclear whether the inscription reflects common Athenian practice in this regard.⁹ Many attempts to contextualize the monument have centred on the question of date. Its Ionic letters, deployed in a non-stoichedon pattern, place it towards the end of the fifth century or the beginning of the fourth.¹⁰ The most significant piece of internal evidence is that each of the ships is commanded by not one but two trierarchs, who are listed under a heading with a dual noun, τριηράρχω.¹¹ Although the syntrierarchy existed by 409-405 (Lys. 32.24), Graham rightly notes this is a *terminus ante quem* for the origin of the practice, rather than a *terminus post* or *ante*

⁵ Headings: lines 3, 50, 172, 305. Cohen (2000: 70-78) has argued that the term ἄστοί essentially meant "insider" and included non-citizen residents of Attica. On the shortcomings of this view see Osborne (2002: 93-98).

⁶ On the restoration of the heading ξένοι at lines 71 and 417 see Laing (1965: 33 n.33). There is some uncertainty about how metics were actually listed. On T2, the sailor Euphronios is described as ἐπὶ Σου (line 226), literally "in the region of Sounion." Despite the use of the preposition ἐπί instead of the more customary ἐν, Euphronios is universally regarded as a metic (e.g., Laing [1965: 64], Graham [1998: 98]). The fact that he comes right before the θεράποντες begin suggests that he was listed among the ξένοι. See also n.7 below.

⁷ The bulk of the inscription's metics are listed on fragment g, which has no physical joins with any other fragments and contains a number of anomalies. Although some men here are clearly metics, listed with the preposition ἐν + deme of residence (lines 424, 425, 427, 428, 433, 436, 437, 440, 442, 445, 448), the status of the seven men listed with the prepositions ἐκ/ἐξ or ἐς + demotic (lines 421, 422, 423, 429, 430, 432, 434) is less obvious. Moreover, mixed in among the men of fragment g we find at least one citizen (Tunnon from Phaleron, line 426) and one foreigner (Simos from Thasos, line 431). One plausible explanation for these anomalies is that this ship's trierarchs differed from the others in their record-keeping.

⁸ Laing (1965: 93).

⁹ Hunt (1998: 83-101) argues persuasively for the routine use of considerable numbers of non-citizens, especially slaves.

¹⁰ Laing (1965: 94).

¹¹ Lines 21, 141, 276, 407.

quem for our inscription.¹² Earlier scholars saw in the inscription's substantial servile contingents a link to Arginousai; yet Hunt has shown that what was unusual about this battle in 406 was not that slave rowers participated, but that they were subsequently freed for their service.¹³ Others have focused on the number of triremes apparently listed on the monument, namely eight. Laing identified these ships as those that fled from Aegospotami with Conon, sought refuge with Euagoras, and eventually returned to Athens.¹⁴ Welwei linked the monument's ships to the same battle, but claimed they were those that escaped and fled back to the city, not Cyprus.¹⁵ Significant objections have been raised to each of these views.¹⁶ Other scholars have called attention to the disproportionate Erechtheid presence among syntrierarchs and crews,¹⁷ and to the fact that eight of the eleven fragments were found in or near the Erechtheion.¹⁸ Most recently Graham has sought to connect the inscription with an expedition led by the prominent Erechtheid Strombichides in 412. Yet even he admits that "without the heading of the inscription we shall never know for certain what occasion generated it."¹⁹

The numerous uncertainties surrounding date and context argue for a different approach to the monument. Laing maintained that it was a rare example "of the type of administrative record that was kept for each ship that ever left the Piraeus, but which in the normal course of events would never be transferred into a more durable form such as this."²⁰ To

¹² Graham (1992: 265 n.34).

¹³ Hunt (1998: 92). See further Graham (1992: 266), who notes that "there [is] always a danger of circularity in arguing that the composition of the crews suits the time of Arginusae (or Aegospotami) and deducing a date from that."

¹⁴ Laing (1965: 107-119), accepted by Osborne (1983: 34).

¹⁵ Welwei (1974: 86).

¹⁶ Among the objections to Laing are: the twelve years intervening between the battle which led to their flight (Aegospotamoi) and the battle permitting their return (Knidos); and the fact that the composition of the ships' crews would have changed considerably over this interval. See further Welwei (1974: 84). Of Welwei's own conjecture Graham (1992: 265) remarks, "it seems basically improbable that those who successfully fled from a disastrous defeat would be honoured."

¹⁷ Four of the eight syntrierarchs were Erechtheids; of the 106 securely identifiable demotics, 32 are from Erechtheis. See further Graham (1998: 107).

¹⁸ Fragments *a*, *f*, *g*, *h* and *i* were found built into structures erected on the site of the Erechtheion; fragment *b* was found to the east of the Erechtheion; and fragments *j* and *k* were found in the lower area of the north slope of the Akropolis. See Laing (1965: 5-8)

¹⁹ Graham (1998: 108).

²⁰ Laing (1965: 50).

date no one has scrutinized his claim from the standpoint of naval record keeping. In particular, *IG* i³ 1032 needs renewed examination in light of three important issues: how the Athenians manned their triremes; the type of records ordinarily kept by trierarchs; and the changes these records underwent prior to inscription.²¹ A process-oriented analysis suggests that the Naval Catalogue is more honorific than administrative, and that it thoroughly reshaped trierarchs' accounts to emphasize Athens' naval dependence on non-citizens. In this regard the monument constituted not only a record of the city's past, but a vision for its future, and the fact that it is *sui generis* in the inscriptional corpus has important implications for the intersection of orality, literacy, and social memory in classical Athens.

Detailed military record keeping at Athens began in the aftermath of the Persian Wars in response to three main factors: changes in the nature of warfare, the establishment and growth of empire, and democratic developments at home. Individual commanders found it in their own self-interest to keep written lists of personnel to protect themselves from an increasingly antagonistic *demos* intent on holding them to account.²² Although the Naval Catalogue dates from at least half a century later, it too should be considered within the same basic framework. Like other officers (such as *strategoï* [generals], *phylarchs* [tribal hoplite commanders], *hipparchs* [cavalry commanders], and *taxiarchs* [unit commanders]), naval officers had every incentive to create and maintain detailed records of those serving under them.

Central to the Naval Catalogue are its lists of crew members' names. The question of where these lists came from and who maintained them is related to how Athenians manned their ships. At moments of exceptional crisis the city resorted to mobilization across the board. In 480, for instance, the Themistokles Decree directed that all available, able-bodied Athenians and metics be embarked on two hundred ships.²³ After making provisions for appointing trierarchs and petty officers, it further instructed the generals to divide up the remaining men among the ships and write their names up on whiteboards, drawing the names of

²¹ Davies (2003: 329) emphasizes the importance of such factors in the analysis of public documents.

²² Bakewell (2007: 96-97).

²³ Many scholars accept the accuracy of the decree's provisions while thinking the document itself a fourth-century literary product. See for instance Morrison et al. (2000: 108).

citizens from the deme registers (*lexiarchika grammateia*) and those of metics from the polemarch.²⁴ We see a similar process at work over a hundred years later in 362, when the members of the Boule and demarchs created catalogues of demesmen and returned lists of sailors' names to the trierarchs.²⁵ Yet recruitment rather than conscription was the general rule in the classical Athenian navy, with the trierarch ultimately responsible for finding his own oarsmen and ὑπηρεσία.²⁶ Regardless of whether he received the initial personnel lists from others or created his own from scratch, it was up to him to maintain them, and this was no simple matter. Many of those drafted might not report for duty, and of those who did, some were unfit for service.²⁷ Of those shipping out, some eventually fell ill and were sent home. Others died, were captured or lost at sea, or deserted. Some even pressed their commanders to accept substitutes they had hired to replace themselves.²⁸ It is thus a mistake to regard trireme crews as unchanging entities. Their membership tended to be dynamic rather than static; trierarchs kept run-

²⁴ Meiggs and Lewis (1988: 23, lines 27-31): ἀναγράψα-ι δὲ κα[ὶ] τοὺς ἄλλους κατὰ] ναῦν τοὺς στρατηγούς εἰς λευκώ[ματα, τοὺς μὲν Ἀ]θηναίους ἐκ τῶν ληξιαρχικῶν γραμματεῖ[ων, τοὺς] δὲ ξ[έν]ους ἐκ τῶν ἀπογεγραμμένων πα- [ρ]ὰ τῶι [πολε]μ[άρχ]ω[ι] (“And for the generals to write up the others by ship on whiteboards, [taking the names of] the Athenians from the *lexiarchika grammateia* and [the names of] the metics from those registered with the polemarch.”). For this interpretation of the clause see Hammond (1986: 145-146).

²⁵ [Dem.] 50.6: ἐψηφίσασθε τάς τε ναῦς καθέλκειν τοὺς τριηράρχους καὶ παρακομίζειν ἐπὶ τὸ χῶμα, καὶ τοὺς βουλευτὰς καὶ τοὺς δημάρχους καταλόγους ποιεῖσθαι τῶν δημότων καὶ ἀποφέρειν ναύτας ... (“You all voted for the trierarchs to drag down the ships and bring them alongside the jetty, and for the Bouleutai and demarchs to make lists of demesmen and return [names of] sailors”). For additional instances of naval conscription see Gabrielsen (1994: 248 n.6).

²⁶ Gabrielsen (1994: 107); Jameson (1963: 398).

²⁷ E.g., [Dem.] 50.7: ἐγὼ δ' ἐπειδὴ μοι οὐκ ἦλθον οἱ ναῦται οἱ καταλεγέντες ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν, ἀλλ' ἢ ὀλίγοι καὶ οὗτοι ἀδύνατοι, τούτους μὲν ἀφήκα, ὑποθεῖς δὲ τὴν οὐσίαν τὴν ἑμαυτοῦ καὶ δανεισάμενος ἀργύριον πρῶτος ἐπληρωσάμην τὴν ναῦν, μισθωσάμενος ναύτας ὡς οἶον τ' ἦν ἀρίστους, δωρεὰς καὶ προδόσεις δούς ἐκάστῳ αὐτῶν μεγάλας (“After the sailors selected by the demesmen did not come, except for a few [and these unable], I let these go, mortgaged my own property, borrowed money, and myself filled the ship, hiring the best sailors possible, giving gifts and large advances to each man.”). On draft-dodging in Athens see generally Christ (2004).

²⁸ Thuc. 7.13.2; see Hunt (2006: 28).

ning track of their men with the help of erasable media like *sanides* or *leukomata*.²⁹

In addition to personnel lists, trierarchs also kept detailed financial records. Many of these were directly related to sums spent on their crews. From early on sailors regularly received a maintenance allowance enabling them to purchase provisions in local markets where they were deployed,³⁰ and by the 430s at the latest it was standard practice for the members of a ship's crew to draw a *per diem* wage for their service.³¹ Although scholars sometimes refer to a standard naval wage of a drachma a day, in actuality rates of pay varied considerably.³² Nor were wages the only element to consider. Bonuses were sometimes required to entice men to enlist; those with specialized skills were particularly sought after.³³ Once embarked, even ordinary sailors might use opportune moments to extract additional funds for their continued service.³⁴ Being a trierarch thus entailed a formidable amount of arithmetic. In a suit against his fellow syntrierarch Polykles shortly after 362, Apollodoros asks the clerk to read aloud to the jurors:

τὰς μαρτυρίας τῶν τε τὰ στρατιώτικα τότε εἰσπραττόντων καὶ τῶν ἀποστολέων, καὶ τοὺς μισθοὺς οὓς ταῖς ὑπηρεσίαις καὶ τοῖς ἐπιβάταις κατὰ μῆνα ἐδίδουν, παρὰ τῶν στρατηγῶν σιτηρέσιον μόνον λαμβάνων, πλὴν δυοῖν μηνῶν μόνον μισθὸν ἐν πέντε μηνσὶν καὶ ἑνιαυτῷ, καὶ τοὺς ναύτας τοὺς μισθωθέντας, [καὶ] ὅσον ἕκαστος ἔλαβεν ἀργύριον.

the testimony of those then collecting the military things/funds and of the dispatchers, and the wages which I was paying out each month to the petty officers and marines, receiving from the generals only the maintenance allowance, and wage-money for but two months out of a year and five months, and the sailors who had been hired, and how much money each received. ([Dem.] 50.10)

²⁹ At [Dem.] 50.65, Apollodoros has the names of his deserters read aloud to the court some time after the fact: ἀναγνώσεται ... τοὺς λιπόνεως (“he will read out [the names of] the ship-deserters”). In this regard, trierarchs were like taxiarchs (Lysias 15.5) and hipparchs (Lysias 16.3). Lysias 16.6 refers expressly to phylarchs’ use of a *σανίδιον* to record the names of cavalrymen. On *sanides* see Fischer (2003).

³⁰ Casson (1995: 262-263).

³¹ Loomis (1998: 38-39).

³² Gabrielsen (1994: 111).

³³ On the workings of supply and demand with regard to foreign sailors at the start of the Peloponnesian War see Thuc. 1.143. At 6.31.3 the historian mentions bonuses paid to θραυῖται (oarsmen of the top bank) during the Sicilian Expedition.

³⁴ [Dem.] 50.12.

Apollodoros' ability to state precisely how much money each member of his crew received is impressive.

Complicating the administrative picture for trierarchs was their need to keep track of income as well as expenses.³⁵ Ordinarily the assembly allocated to the generals a specific sum in support of a particular expedition, and they in turn parcelled it out among their subordinates.³⁶ Yet the process was often far from straightforward. For instance, the passage above suggests that at least two additional groups had a hand in outfitting Apollodoros' ship and crew: τῶν τε τὰ στρατιώτικα τότε εἰσπραττόντων and τῶν ἀποστολέων. The verb from which the participle εἰσπραττόντων is formed regularly denotes the collection of funds; the adjectival substantive τὰ στρατιώτικα may refer to money as well as materiel.³⁷

Naval campaigns were not just complicated; they were also expensive. As Gabrielsen notes, "the aggregate resource demands accruing from the operation of fleets exceeded the amounts actually spent for that purpose by the state. Private funds were therefore needed to supplement the public ones."³⁸ In other words, trierarchs were frequently left holding the bag.³⁹ Even though he came from a wealthy family, Apollodoros claimed that he was forced to mortgage his own property and to borrow money from his dead father's guest-friends in order to fulfil the obligations of his command.⁴⁰ Nor was financial ruin the worst that might befall a trierarch. As a recipient of even limited public funds, he was officially ὑπεύθυνος, subject to a range of potentially unpleasant accountability proceedings both during and after his term of office.⁴¹ It is no wonder trierarchs were keen to demonstrate their ability to account for all of the funds entrusted them.

³⁵ A need complicated by the fact that the double-entry accounting ledger was unknown in classical Greece. See generally De Ste. Croix (1956).

³⁶ Gabrielsen (1994: 115).

³⁷ On the ἀποστολεῖς see: Aesch. 2.177; Dem. 18.107, 47.26; and Morrison et al. (2000: 121-122).

³⁸ Gabrielsen (1994: 114).

³⁹ Gabrielsen (1994: 118): "the individual trierarch ... alone acted as the formal and ultimate guarantor of the state of the finance of naval operations."

⁴⁰ [Dem.] 50.7.

⁴¹ At [Dem.] 50.50, Apollodoros says that the kybernetes Poseidippos refused to follow the sailing instructions of Kallippos, on the ground that as trierarch Apollodoros alone was ὑπεύθυνος.

In his speech against Polykles, Apollodoros describes his own accounts as meticulously as he kept them:

οὕτω γάρ μοι ἀκριβῶς ἐγέγραπτο, ὥστ' οὐ μόνον αὐτά μοι τὰναλώματα ἐγέγραπτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅποι ἀνηλώθη καὶ ὅ τι ποιούντων, καὶ ἡ τιμὴ τίς ἦν καὶ νόμισμα ποδαπόν, καὶ ὅπόσου ἡ καταλλαγή ἦν τῷ ἀργυρίῳ.

I kept such accurate records that not only were my expenditures written down, but also their purposes (ὅποι ἀνηλώθη) and purchasers (ὅ τι ποιούντων), and the price paid (ἡ τιμὴ τίς ἦν), and the currency of the transaction (νόμισμα ποδαπόν), and the prevailing rate of exchange (ὅπόσου ἡ καταλλαγή ἦν τῷ ἀργυρίῳ). ([Dem.] 50.30)

Now the wealth of detail contained in these records may be atypical. Apollodoros came from a skilled and savvy banking family, and claimed he had spent lavishly on his ship from his personal funds, drawing the ire of his fellow trierarchs and of his own syntrierarch.⁴² He thus had both the training and the motivation to justify his expenditures and document the extent of his own contributions. In addition, he was a prominent man with a number of personal enemies, any one of whom could approach the *logistai* or *euthunoi* with complaints about his conduct as trierarch.⁴³ Yet even if the circumstances of his case were exceptional,⁴⁴ record keeping was still a daunting task for trierarchs. Apollodoros' use of the dative of agent μοι in the clause οὕτω γάρ μοι ἀκριβῶς ἐγέγραπτο suggests his extensive personal involvement in the process. Elsewhere in his speech he shows that he, like other trierarchs, relied heavily on his *pentekontarchos*, a petty officer specializing in logistics and financial matters.⁴⁵

The primary impulse for detailed record keeping came from those with the most to lose: the trierarchs themselves. Yet other parties also took an interest in their accounts. Members of trireme crews will have wanted to make sure that their wages were calculated accurately. This

⁴² Cawkwell (1984: 336) notes, "it was hardly to Apollodoros' advantage to dwell on the extravagance of his arrangements and so arouse sympathy for his opponent [Polykles]."

⁴³ On these officials and their role in εὔθυναί (accountability proceedings) at Athens see Tolbert Roberts (1982: 17-18).

⁴⁴ According to Cawkwell (1984: 334), Apollodoros' trierarchy fell during "a period when Athens' naval and military resources were exceptionally and unpredictably under stress."

⁴⁵ For the help Euktemon lent Apollodoros see [Dem.] 50.18, 24. On the role of the *pentekontarchos* in general see Gabrielsen (1994: 39).

was particularly important given the common practice of withholding half of their accumulated pay until their ship returned to the Peiraeus.⁴⁶ Crew members' families will have demanded information about the fates of loved ones who failed to accompany the ships home, and the city itself had a vested interest in the trierarchs' records. Athens' legal system relied heavily on interested volunteers, οἱ βουλόμενοι, to prosecute lawsuits for derelictions of military duty such as γραφαὶ ἀναυμαχίου, ἀπονauτίου, ἀστρατείας, and δειλίας.⁴⁷ Commanders' records, along with eyewitness testimony confirming or contesting them, were important pieces of evidence in such trials.⁴⁸ In certain circumstances lists of military personnel attracted very broad public interest. Following 402, for instance, the assembly commanded the phylarchs to produce for inspection their lists of those who had served in the cavalry during the time of the Thirty Tyrants.⁴⁹ Naval officials could thus expect their accounts to be objects of considerable scrutiny, some of it hostile, and one of their most effective means of self-defence will have been to maintain them as honestly and openly as possible. Thus over time naval records tended to become not so much the private possessions of individual trierarchs as communal resources accessible to many if not all.⁵⁰ Once endorsed by decisions of magistrates, the assembly, or the law courts, they became a point of reference for the city, contributing to the various public stelai the names of the fallen and the disfranchised, for instance.⁵¹

⁴⁶ Gabrielsen (1994: 113, 250 n.17). Masters will have wanted an accounting of the wages due them for their slaves' service—see Hunt (2006: 27)—and in the aftermath of Arginousai slaves likely took pains to ensure their accurate listing in their trierarchs' records.

⁴⁷ On the role of οἱ βουλόμενοι see Harrison (1998: II.32). On the definition of these charges see Harrison (1998: II.32, 82); Osborne (1985: 56) and Carey (1989: 143-144) note the overlapping nature of many of the terms.

⁴⁸ E.g., Lysias 16.6. As trierarch Apollodoros kept a record not only of deserters, but of how much (wage) money they fled with, and of the places where they deserted (ἀναγνώσεται δὲ ... καὶ τοὺς λιπόνεως, ὅσον ἕκαστος ἔχων ἀργύριον ἀπέδρα καὶ ὄπου) ([Dem.] 50.65). Harrison (1998: II.32) cites Lysias 14 and 15 as evidence that trials of this sort were held before juries composed of a defendant's fellow soldiers, with the relevant *strategos* presiding.

⁴⁹ Lysias 16.6.

⁵⁰ Bakewell (2007: 99).

⁵¹ On the stelai listing those disfranchised for military cause see Andokides 1.74. On the transfer of names from impermanent media to stelai see Boegehold (1990: 154-156).

In order for trierarchs' records to be useful, they had to be properly detailed. A man's name and tribal affiliation might suffice for casualty lists, which were more concerned with honouring the dead in general terms than with identifying them precisely.⁵² The frequency of homonyms within tribes, however, meant that greater specificity was required for practical ends involving the living. When trierarchs kept their records, it therefore behoved them to add further identifying information about the men under their command. In the case of citizens, this was their demotic; if necessary, fellow demesmen could subsequently be found to vouch for these men's identities and activities.⁵³ Metics were listed with their deme of residence;⁵⁴ interested parties could seek out their homes, or consult the polemarch to determine who their *προστάται* (citizen sponsors) were.⁵⁵ Foreigners were listed with their *ethnika*; Athenians could contact local officials from the sailors' home *poleis* to track them down, and if necessary pursue action against them.⁵⁶ Finally slaves were listed with the names of their masters, who had every reason to keep close tabs on their property. In its precise identification of crew members, our monument resembles several roughly contemporary inscriptions, namely the building accounts of the Erechtheion [*IG* i³ 474-478].⁵⁷ Like the Naval Catalogue, these stones docu-

⁵² The epigrams accompanying casualty lists tend to be colourless and fairly interchangeable (e.g., *IG* i³ 1162, lines 45-48; *IG* i³ 1163, lines 34-41; *IG* i³ 1181). The lists themselves contain numerous homonyms even within tribes. *IG* i³ 1147 features six homonymous pairs and one set of homonymous triplets among its Erechtheids. Doubles: Charisandros, lines 25, 50; Euthydemos, lines 31, 77; Mnesigenes, lines 58, 83; Lysias, lines 93, 99; Anaxilas, lines 112, 142; Glaukon, lines 136, 160. Triplets: Philinos, lines 79, 95, 101. Another casualty list, *IG* i³ 1162, lists twin Aristarchoi (lines 26, 29) among the Kekropid fallen. A third list, *IG* i³ 1184, records two entries for Pentakles from Antiochis (lines 36, 41).

⁵³ Whitehead (1986: 85) notes that "one is constantly brought back to the crucial point that, in the microcosm of deme society, men knew one another." The fullest pattern of civic nomenclature was name, patronymic, and demotic [Dem. 39.7, 9]. That the Athenians did not consistently employ patronymics, even in contexts where precision was desirable, is shown by, e.g., the preambles to numerous fifth-century ψηφίσματα (decrees of the assembly).

⁵⁴ Citizens' deme affiliations were by contrast inherited.

⁵⁵ Whitehead (1977: 90) argues for some form of ongoing relationship between a metic and his *πρόστατης*.

⁵⁶ Thuc. 1.143.2 and Gomme (1956: 461 *ad loc.*).

⁵⁷ Hunt (2006: 27-28). Laing (1965: 94 n.1) noted the similarity between the letter forms of the Naval Catalogue and a hand involved in the carving of *IG* i³ 475. The Erechtheion inscriptions date to the period 409-405; *IG* i³ 474 lines 5-6, and 476 line 1 contain archon dates of 409/8 and 408/7 respectively.

ment the efforts of a mixture of citizens, metics, and slaves working side by side to benefit the city, and they too are based on personnel and financial records originally kept on impermanent media and later edited and inscribed on stone.

While the activity of the Peloponnesian War undoubtedly led to advances in logistics and record keeping, even during the last decade of the fifth century there was nothing approaching a centralized military bureaucracy or set of archives at Athens.⁵⁸ Although trierarchs kept detailed records about the personnel and finances of their ships, they tended to do so in non-standard, idiosyncratic ways. When we look beyond the apparent uniformity of the Naval Catalogue, we find evidence of several differences among its four surviving crew lists.⁵⁹ For instance, although each ship lists its *ὑπηρεσία* separately from its sailors, the order in which the individual members of the *ὑπηρεσία* are listed varies from ship to ship.⁶⁰ For trireme T2, the inscription lists the officers in the following order (lines 156-167): *kybernetes* (helmsman), *keleustes* (rowing master), *pentekontarchos* (purser), *auletes* (flute player), *naupegos* (shipwright), *prorates* (bow officer). The (partially restored) listing for T3, however, proceeds differently (lines 290-301): *naupegos*, *kybernetes*, *prorates*, *keleustes*, *auletes*, *pentekontarchos*. Another discrepancy is related to the order in which slave sailors are listed. As Pope first noted, the slaves of each trireme's officers tended to be listed towards the end of its *θεράποντες* contingent.⁶¹ Yet within this common practice there is considerable variation. For trireme T3 the *ἐπιβῆται* are listed at lines 279-289, and their slaves at lines 388-93. The order in which the slaves are listed clearly follows that of their masters Mnesias, Phourarchos, Apikes, Hippodamas, and Iason. There is no similar pattern for T2. Slaves belonging to the officers are not listed in the order of their masters; indeed, the three slaves of the syntrierarch Charidemos are not even listed together (lines 256, 257, 272). One plau-

⁵⁸ On the *strategeion*, whose date, function, and precise location in the agora are disputed, see Wycherley (1957: 174-177).

⁵⁹ Graham (1998: 98) offers a salutary reminder that Laing's whole reconstruction depends on certain regularizing assumptions. In addition to the two mentioned by Graham, we should remember that in the course of a year a trireme might well have had significantly more crew members than the 200 needed to staff it fully at any given time.

⁶⁰ Laing (1965: 33) does not do full justice to the variations in the listings of the *ὑπηρεσία* contingents.

⁶¹ Pope (1935: 20). See further Laing (1965: 126-128).

sible explanation for these variations in the crew listings is that they derive from differences in the records kept by individual trierarchs.

Other discrepancies in the Naval Catalogue go beyond differences in recording procedure. The most obvious anomaly lies in the ἐπιβᾶται contingents. On trireme T3, seven of the ten marines listed are from the Erechtheid deme of Agryle (lines 280-286).⁶² On T2, however, the marines are members of nine different demes from six different tribes (lines 145-155).⁶³ A reasonable hypothesis is that the bulk of the marines aboard T3 were conscripts drawn from a list originally compiled by the demarch of Agryle, whereas the marines aboard T2 were volunteers recruited by its syntrierarchs from all over.⁶⁴ This hypothesis receives additional support from the fact that the ναῦται ἄστοί on T3 seem to have been listed in demotic clusters; lines 306-312 record seven sailors from Kephisia, lines 313-314 two from Kollytos, and lines 346-347 (perhaps) a pair from Euonymon.⁶⁵ It is a different story, however, with the ναῦται ἄστοί of T2 (lines 175-204). With the possible exception of lines 178-180, no pattern of deme grouping emerges anywhere here. Of the twenty-four men with legible demotics, fully twenty-one come from different demes. These differences in how individual triremes were staffed may be related to variations in the overall composition of their crews. As noted above, non-citizens comprised approximately 60-70% of the personnel of each of the four ships. Yet the numbers of foreigners and metics on the one hand, and of slaves on the other, varied widely, and in inverse relation to one another.⁶⁶ Aboard T2, for instance, the maximum number of slaves was “forty plus a very few,” whereas the maximum aboard T3 was approximately 97.⁶⁷ Apparently the trierarch of T3 relied more heavily on conscripted sailors and slaves; the trierarch of T2, on volunteer foreigners and metics.⁶⁸

⁶² An eighth (line 287) comes from an additional Erechtheid deme, Kephisia. All three of the legible ἐπιβᾶται demotics on T1 likewise come from an Erechtheid deme, Lamptreus.

⁶³ Laing (1965: 61) notes the relative scarcity of Erechtheids in this contingent.

⁶⁴ *IG* i³ 60 lines 15-17 contains an apparent reference to marine volunteers ([ἐ]χς ἔθελοντο-[ν ἐπιβᾶτον]).

⁶⁵ Cf. however line 343, where Charon of Kephisia is listed separately from his fellow demesmen.

⁶⁶ Laing (1965: 92-93).

⁶⁷ Graham (1998: 101).

⁶⁸ Laing (1965: 70) argues that “if a great number of maritime allies had been available to Athens at the time of the activity commemorated in this text, we would

Although the Naval Catalogue preserves traces of the differing mustering and recording practices followed by individual trierarchs, it is in all likelihood not, *pace* Laing, “a formal roster of these crews as it would have been prepared for administrative purposes.”⁶⁹ On the contrary, while it is derived from such records, the Naval Catalogue is the product of an editorial process driven by a different set of concerns. For one thing, there is no obvious administrative advantage to dividing the sailors into citizen, foreigner/metic, and slave contingents. When it came to wages, all sailors were ordinarily paid at the same rate, with any bonuses related not to citizenship but to shipboard duties, and to supply and demand.⁷⁰ Here again the Erechtheion building accounts provide a valuable point of reference. Their labourers also received equal pay for equal work; what mattered was the task a man had, not his civic status.⁷¹

If the Naval Catalogue were truly an administrative document, it would likely have grouped the crews in more practical ways. The handiest sort of personnel record might well have been a seating chart showing each man’s regular position.⁷² Each bank of oarsmen had a slightly different task, and individual sailors took pride in belonging to a particular bank.⁷³ Moreover, the narrow confines of the trireme made embarkation tricky and time-consuming; men had to line up single file according to their places aboard.⁷⁴ Another useful schema would have been to group the men by deme. Yet as noted above, the inscription only does so now and again; there is no evidence of any arrangement by tribe. Finally, there is the issue of provenience. None of the inscription’s frag-

surely see fewer slave names in these lists and more aliens. I am quite ready to believe that the foreign sailors in this document were either volunteers, with an eye to the pay, or ‘impressed’ seamen who were not entirely free to choose their role.”

⁶⁹ Laing (1965: 96).

⁷⁰ Morrison (2000: 108, 119). See also n.33 above. The primary difference between free men and slaves with regard to wages was that the former earned for themselves, the latter mainly for their masters. See Hunt (2006: 27) and Laing (1965: 137).

⁷¹ Randall (1953: 209). Significantly, the Erechtheion accounts do not divide the workers into contingents based on civic status.

⁷² Morrison et al. (2000: 236): “it is quite likely, moreover, that [oarsmen] occupied regular positions within the ship, since this would have allowed them to perfect their timing by training with the same people in the same positions around them. This approach certainly worked best in [the reconstructed trireme] *Olympias*.”

⁷³ Aristophanes *Acharnians* 162 suggests that the θρανήται held themselves in high regard.

⁷⁴ Morrison et al. (2000: 236). The boarding of passenger aircraft offers a modern analogy.

ments come from the Peiraieus, home to the fleet and find-spot of many naval inscriptions related to shipsheds, triremes, inventories, and the like.⁷⁵ Nor do any fragments hail from the Agora⁷⁶, where the monument of the eponymous heroes and the *strategeion* (generals' building) served as obvious focal points for military matters.⁷⁷

On the contrary, several factors suggest that the Naval Catalogue's primary purpose was honorific. First, there are the findspots in and around the Erechtheion. The Akropolis contained numerous temples and *temene* (sacred precincts) housing countless dedications to the gods. It also displayed other public lists of names intended to convey honour or shame. Moreover, administrative documents were generally meant to be consulted; the Naval Catalogue was not designed for easy reading or reference. Its inscribed surface measured nearly 2.35 m², and was taller than anyone alive. Its two thousand plus lines originally listed approximately sixteen hundred men, who were not organized by deme, trittys, or tribe, and neither alphabetized nor indexed. Readers would have been hard-pressed to find specific listings, especially given the fact that each letter was less than a centimetre high. Thus while the monument consisted of men's names, it did not so much honour individuals as the larger groupings to which they belonged.⁷⁸

Casualty lists are undoubtedly the most famous honorific compilations of names from ancient Athens, and many scholars once thought the Naval Catalogue belonged to this corpus. They were however mistaken. At one level this is clear from some of the inscription's technical details, including its provenance and Ionic letter forms. One of the men it lists, Morychos of Thria, was sufficiently alive to erect a dedication on the Akropolis early in the fourth century.⁷⁹ There are also weighty arguments from probability. Rarely did all two hundred men aboard a trireme perish when it was swamped or disabled,⁸⁰ and rarely did both

⁷⁵ E.g., *IG* ii² 1604.

⁷⁶ Graham (1998: 91) argues that the inscribed fragment Agora I 4682 also belongs to the Naval Catalogue. It is however tiny, contains but few letters, and was found in a "marble dump."

⁷⁷ On the monument of the eponymous heroes see Shear (1970). On the publication of call up notices there see Christ (2001: 403).

⁷⁸ The apparent absence of any subsequent corrections to the Naval Catalogue may be significant. By contrast, Bradeen (1969: 146-147) notes that casualty lists were often subsequently added to or emended.

⁷⁹ *IG* ii² 4882. See Laing (1965: 82).

⁸⁰ Graham (1992: 264).

syntrierarchs serve on board their ship at the same time. The possibility that the Athenians lost all hands (including all sixteen syntrierarchs) from the eight ships listed on the monument is extremely remote. Finally, there are crucial discrepancies with regard to genre. The Naval Catalogue does not group its men by tribe; casualty lists do not contain demotics;⁸¹ and while casualty lists tend to offer minimal information about the rank and position of the dead, these facts are central to our inscription.⁸² Above all, casualty lists do not call attention to the military contributions of allies, metics, and slaves. As Loraux puts it, “when they buried non-Athenians in the civic polyandria of the Kerameikos, the Athenians accorded them much in inscribing their names, if only by way of an afterthought, under the general heading *Athenaion hoide apethanon*,” (“of the Athenians the following men died”).⁸³

The Naval Catalogue emphasizes the contributions of non-Athenians to the fleet and to the city. Each heading of ξένοι and θεράπροντες, and every ethnikon, deme of residence, and master’s name underscores the city’s reliance on its non-citizens. In this regard the monument resembles *IG ii² 10*, which honoured the non-citizens assisting Thrasyboulos’ return to the city.⁸⁴ In each instance the men listed are identified with precision and separated into groups. There are, however, important differences between the two inscriptions. To begin with, while *IG ii² 10* records a decree of the assembly, the Naval Catalogue does not.⁸⁵ The latter was inscribed on one side only, with little space remaining at top or bottom for the necessary preamble or postscript.⁸⁶ Moreover, *IG ii² 10* lists its men by occupation rather than deme of residence, ethnikon, or master’s name. The effect is to suggest that these are worthy men

⁸¹ Bradeen (1969: 147).

⁸² Loraux (1986: 32) notes that casualty lists “provide scant information about the rank of the combatants.”

⁸³ Loraux (1986: 33).

⁸⁴ For the text of the inscription see Osborne (1981: 37-41, D6). He elsewhere (1982: 42-43) distinguishes the decree from Thrasyboulos’ earlier abortive proposal, which was blocked by Archinos and cited at [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 40.2. See further Taylor (2002: 385).

⁸⁵ *IG ii² 10*, Face A, line 3: “Ἐδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳι” (“Resolved by the Boule and the Assembly”).

⁸⁶ Graham (1998: 92) notes that the joining cluster of fragments “*h+a+b+i* reached to near the top of the original inscription, and *c+f+j* reached to near the foot.”

who just happen to be non-citizens.⁸⁷ By contrast, the Naval Catalogue's headings make the men's civic status a crucial part of their identity. Finally, the two inscriptions' lists of names suggest a difference in perspective. *IG* ii² 10 is arguably more historical, focusing on a distinct sequence of discrete events. The men listed are divided into groups based on when they joined Thrasyboulos. Some came at the beginning and took part in the descent from Phyle (ἄσοι συνατῆλθον ἀπὸ Φυλῆς, Face A, line 4); others fought together with him at Mounychia (συνεμάχησαν δὲ τῆμ μάχην τῆμ Μονιχίαισιν, Face A, line 7); and some stood by the *demos* in the Peiraeus (οἶδε [π]αρέμ[ενον τῶι] ἐμ Περαιεῖ δ[ήμωι], face B, column II, lines 27-28). In addition, like other decrees, *IG* ii² 10 records the time of its own enactment: Xenainetos was eponymous archon, Lysiades was scribe, Hippothontis held the prytany, Demophilos presided, and Thrasyboulos spoke (Face A, lines 1-4). By contrast, the Naval Catalogue sees things somewhat differently. As noted earlier, syntrierarchs almost never commanded their ship together: when one was aboard, the other was not. The listing of each pair of syntrierarchs together thus suggests that the inscription stands at a slight temporal remove, regarding the year or campaign it records as something unitary and continuous. Moreover, the chronological relation of the inscription to the trireme crews is uncertain: does it record them before, during, or after their service? Put in photographic terms, *IG* ii² 10 resembles a series of date-stamped snapshots laid side by side; *IG* i³ 1032, a time-lapse exposure made at an unknown time.

The Naval Catalogue's temporal perspective is so broad as to approach the ideological. Many scholars have noted that public monuments by their nature constitute an attempt at civic self-definition,⁸⁸ and this is certainly true of *IG* i³ 1032. Yet the Athens it depicts is not the familiar one based on Kleisthenic demes and tribes. On the contrary, its

⁸⁷ The *demos*' gratitude towards non-citizens was in any case limited, even for heroes who fought against the oligarchs. Taylor (2002: 396) interprets Archinos' decree as a statement that "we Athenians will acknowledge and honor the foreigners who helped us restore Athens to democracy, but we shall not make them part of ourselves. The 'indigenous *demos* of the Athenians' will not be sullied." Additionally Osborne (1982: 43) notes that Thrasyboulos was ultimately able to gain citizenship only for a few of his followers, "the small nucleus, probably all men of hoplite status."

⁸⁸ E.g., Davies (2003: 333), who notes that "codifications [of laws] as publicly displayed monuments primarily expressed civic self-definition and the symbolism of law, not its day-to-day application."

Athens is built on triremes and the civic orders that man them. By prominently honouring non-citizens, the Naval Catalogue broke with convention.⁸⁹ Its message was that citizens, allies, metics, and slaves had in the past accomplished something of military moment by working together. Even more important was its implication that they could do so again: its lists of names assume a representative dimension, and the monument itself becomes an idealizing vision. As such the Naval Catalogue is akin to other artistic representations of Athenian self-identity, such as the Panathenaic procession at the end of the *Eumenides*, and the Parthenon Frieze. Each representation is rooted in history, extends into the future, and touches on myth; each assigns non-citizens a significant role in the community;⁹⁰ and each is erected or enacted in a sacred space on or beneath the Akropolis, thus coming under divine protection.

While the Naval Catalogue may resemble other artistic representations of Athens, it is *sui generis* within the corpus of Attic inscriptions. To date not a single fragment from another monument listing trireme crews has come to light. Moreover, despite the Naval Catalogue's impressive size and prominent location, no surviving periegete, historian, or scholiast refers to it or anything like it.⁹¹ So far as we know, no individual or group sought to emend, duplicate, emulate, or even displace it. Given the pervasive influence of generic conventions in literature, art, and epigraphy, and the intensely agonistic ethos of classical Athens, this apparent indifference is noteworthy. For us today the inscription is an invaluable piece of historical evidence. Yet for its contemporaries it was something different: an unorthodox account of the city's past with radical and unsettling implications for the future.⁹² The Athenians responded by ignoring it. *IG* i³ 1032 stands as a reminder that even at the end of the increasingly logocentric fifth century, inscribed monuments could not create history all by themselves. On the contrary, that was up

⁸⁹ To continue the photographic analogy, the Naval Catalogue is like a positive print made from the negative image recorded, for instance, at [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 10-12.

⁹⁰ On *Eumenides*' favourable depiction of the Erinyes as metics see Bakewell (1999: 52-54). Neils (2001: 150, 186) notes the inclusion of metic *skaphephoroi* (tray bearers) on the Parthenon Frieze.

⁹¹ Pausanias makes no mention of it in his description of the Erechtheion complex (1.26.5-1.27.6), nor is there any apparent connection with any of wreaths listed in the Erechtheion inventories. See Harris (1995: 215-217).

⁹² Similarly, the Athenians opted to reinstate the restrictive provisions of the Perikleian citizenship law following the overthrow of the Thirty. See Ostwald (1986: 507).

to living, breathing, and often illiterate individuals free to consult, mis-read, and ignore them as they saw fit.⁹³

Bibliography

- Bakewell, Geoffrey (2007). "Written Lists of Military Personnel in Classical Athens." In *The Politics of Orality: Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World VII*, Craig Cooper, ed.: 89-102. Leiden: Brill.
- Bakewell, Geoffrey (1999). "εὔνοος καὶ πόλει σωτήριος/μέτοικος: Metics, Tragedy, and Civic Ideology." *SyllClass* 10: 43-64.
- Bing, Peter (2002). "The Un-Read Muse? Inscribed Epigram and its Readers in Antiquity." In *Hellenistic Epigrams*, M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, G. C. Wakker, eds.: 39-66. Leuven: Peeters.
- Boegehold, A. L. (1990). "Andokides and the Decree of Patrokleides." *Historia* 39: 149-62.
- Bradeen, Donald (1969). "The Athenian Casualty Lists." *CQ* 19.1: 145-59.
- Carey, Christopher (1989). *Lysias: Selected Speeches*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Casson, Lionel (1995). "The Feeding of the Trireme Crews and an Entry in *IG ii2* 1631." *TAPhA* 125: 261-70.
- Cawkwell, G. L. (1984). "Athenian Naval Power in the Fourth Century." *CQ* 34.2: 334-45.
- Christ, Matthew (2004). "Draft Evasion Onstage and Offstage in Classical Athens." *CQ* 54.1: 33-57.
- Christ, Matthew (2001). "Conscription of Hoplites in Classical Athens." *CQ* 51.2: 398-422.
- Cohen, Edward (2000). *The Athenian Nation*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Davies, J. K. (2003). "Greek Archives: From Record to Monument." In *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions: Concepts of Record-Keeping in the Ancient World*, Maria Brosius, ed.: 323-43. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- De Ste. Croix, Geoffrey E. M. (1956). "Greek and Roman Accounting." In *Studies in the History of Accounting*, A.C. Littleton and B.S. Yamey, eds.: 14-74. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Fischer, John (2003). "Sanides and Sanidia." In *Gestures: Essays in Ancient History, Literature, and Philosophy Presented to Alan L. Boegehold*, Geoffrey Bakewell and James Sickinger, eds.: 237-50. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Gabrielsen, Vincent (1994). *Financing the Athenian Fleet: Public Taxation and Social Relations*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Gomme, A. W. (1956). *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Graham, A. J. (1992). "Thucydides 7.13.2 and the Crews of Athenian Triremes." *TAPhA* 122: 257-70.

⁹³ Bing (2002: 44) claims that in ancient Athens much inscribed material, including stelai, went unread.

- Graham, A. J. (1998). "Thucydides 7.13.2 and the Crews of Athenian Triremes: An Addendum." *TAPhA* 128: 89-114.
- Hammond, N. G. L. (1986). "The Manning of the Fleet in the Decree of Themistocles." *Phoenix* 40.2: 143-48.
- Harris, Diane (1995). *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Harrison, A. R. W. (1998). *The Law of Athens*, 2nd ed. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Hunt, Peter (1998). *Slaves, Warfare, and Ideology in the Greek Historians*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Hunt, Peter (2006). "Arming Slaves and Helots in Classical Greece." In *Arming Slaves: From Classical Times to the Modern Age*, Christopher Brown and Philip Morgan eds.: 14-39. New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press.
- Jameson, M. H. (1963). "The Provisions for Mobilization in the Decree of Themistokles." *Historia* 12: 385-404.
- Laing, Donald R. (1965). *A New Interpretation of the Athenian Naval Catalogue*, IG ii², 1951. Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Cincinnati.
- Lewis, David M. (1994). *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Vol. I Fasc. II: *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis Anno Antiores*, 3rd ed. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Loomis, William T. (1998). *Wages, Welfare Costs, and Inflation in Classical Athens*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
- Loroux, Nicole (1986). *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, transl. Alan Sheridan. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Meiggs, R., and D. Lewis, eds. (1988). *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Morrison, J. S., J. F. Coates, and N. B. Rankov (2000). *The Athenian Trireme: The History and Reconstruction of an Ancient Greek Warship*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Morrison, J. S. (1984). "Hyperesia in Naval Contexts in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC." *JHS* 104: 48-59.
- Neils, Jenifer (2001). *The Parthenon Frieze*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Osborne, M. J. (1981). *Naturalization in Athens*, Vol. 1. Brussel: AWLSK.
- Osborne, M. J. (1982). *Naturalization in Athens*, Vol. 2. Brussel: AWLSK.
- Osborne, M. J. (1983). *Naturalization in Athen*, Vols. 3 and 4. Brussel: AWLSK.
- Osborne, Robin (1985). "Law and Action in Classical Athens." *JHS* 105: 40-58.
- Osborne, Robin (2002). Review of Edward Cohen, *The Athenian Nation*. *CPh* 97: 93-98.
- Ostwald, Martin (1986). *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law: Law, Society, and Politics in Fifth-Century Athens*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Pope, Helen (1935). *Non-Athenians in Attic Inscriptions*. New York: Cosmos Greek-American.
- Randall, R. H., Jr. (1953). "The Erechtheion Workmen." *AJA* 57: 199-210.
- Shear, T. Leslie, Jr. (1970). "The Monument of the Eponymous Heroes in the Athenian Agora." *Hesperia* 39.3: 145-222.

- Taylor, Martha (2002). "One Hundred Heroes of Phyle?" *Hesperia* 71.4: 377-97.
- Tolbert Roberts, Jennifer (1982). *Accountability in Athenian Government*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.
- Welwei, Karl-Wilhelm (1974). *Unfreie im Antiken Kriegsdienst*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Whitehead, David (1977). *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
- Whitehead, David (1986). *The Demes of Attica 508/7- ca. 250 BC: A Political and Social Study*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Wycheley, R.E. (1957). *Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*. The Athenian Agora, Vol. 3. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

CHAPTER EIGHT

WHAT THE *MNEMONES* KNOW

EDWIN CARAWAN

Sometime around 460 BC a decree was passed at a meeting of “Halikarnassians and Salmakians and Lygdamis” (commonly called “The Lygdamis Decree”).¹ The text has an intriguing history, going back to the eighteenth century; it has been a focus of study since the 1860s, yet with no satisfactory solution to the major problems. The main provisions of the decree deal with *mnemones*, official “rememberers.” The aim of this essay is to reach a better understanding of their role in this particular context. The investigation is complicated by gaps in the text and in the historical record and (perhaps most of all) by conflicting assumptions about what early *mnemones* might be expected to do. We cannot hope to solve all the difficulties, but it may help to untangle the other complications if we can more clearly characterize the *mnemones*’ essential function—how they used their memory. Let us first re-examine the broken text and trace the main lines of interpretation that diverge from it (Section 1), then consider the closest comparanda, in order to see what it is that early *mnemones* are especially called to witness and how they apply that knowledge (Section 2). Based on that profile I propose a new reconstruction of the role that *mnemones* were expected to play in the Lygdamis decree (Section 3).

1. *Text and Main Lines of Interpretation*

τάδε ὁ σύλλο[γ]ος ἐβoλεύσατο
ὁ Ἁλικαρνατ[έ]ων καὶ Σαλμακι-
τέων καὶ Λύγδαμις ἐν τῇ ἱερῇ[ι]

Thus resolved the assembly of
Halikarnassians and Salmakians and
Lygdamis, in the sacred agora: on

¹ Meiggs and Lewis (1969: 69-72, no. 32); Tod (1985: no. 25); *Syll.*³ 45. Cf. Valeton (1908-9), who lists earlier studies. Maffi (1988) is the most systematic treatment of this problematic text, with a thorough review of earlier scholarship. Effenterre and Ruzé (1994: 90-93, no. 19) recognize Maffi’s contribution but discount his solution; cf. Körner and Hallof (1993: 316-23, no. 84). I am indebted to Maffi for critical comments on a draft of this paper (not that he is at all persuaded).

ἀγορηι, μῆνος Ἑρμαίωνος πέμ-
 πτη ἰσταμένο, ἐπὶ Λέοντος πρυ- [5]
 ταν[εύου]τος τὸ Ὁατᾶπιος κα-
 [ι] Σα[ρυσ]ῶλλο τὸ Θεκυίλω νε-
 [ωπ]οί[ο, πρ]ὸς μνήμονας· μὴ παρ[α-]
 δίδο[σθαι] μῆτε γῆν μῆτε οἰκ[ι-] [10]
 [α] τοῖς μνήμοισιν ἐπὶ Ἀπολλω-
 νίδεω τὸ Λυγδάμιος μνημονε-
 ύουτος καὶ Παναμίω τὸ Κασβώ-
 λλιος καὶ Σαλμακιτέων μνη-
 μονεούτων Μεγαβάτεω τὸ Ἀ- [15]
 φυάσιος καὶ Φορμίωνος τὸ Π[α-]
 νυάπιος. ἦν δέ τις θέληι δικάζε-
 σθαι περὶ γῆς ἢ οἰκίων, ἐπικαλ[έ-]
 τω ἐν ὀκτωκαίδεκα μηνσὶν ἀπ' ὅτ[ε] [20]
 ὁ ἄδος ἐγένετο· νόμωι δὲ κατὰπ[ε-]
 ρ ὑν ὀρκώ {1}σ·α·ι τὸς δικαστάς· ὅ τ[ι] [20]
 ἂν οἱ μνήμονες εἰδέωσιν, τοῦτο
 καρτερόν ἔναι. ἦν δέ τις ὕστερον
 ἐπικαλήι τούτο τὸ χρονο τῶν
 ὀκτωκαίδεκα μηνῶν, ὄρκον ἔναι τ- [25]
 ῶι νεμομένωι τὴν γῆν ἢ τὰ οἰκ-
 [ι]α, ὄρκον δὲ τὸς δικαστάς ἡμί-
 [ε]κτον δεξαμένους· τὸν δὲ ὄρκον εἶ-
 [ν]αι παρεόντος τὸ ἐνεστηκότος. κ-
 αρτερός δ' εἶναι γῆς καὶ οἰκίων οἵτινες
 τότ' εἶχον ὅτε Ἀπολλωνίδης καὶ Πανα- [30]
 μύης ἐμνημόνευσον, εἰ μὴ ὕστερο-
 ν ἀπεπέρασαν. τὸν νόμον τοῦτον
 ἦν τις θέληι συγχέαι ἢ προθητα- [35]
 [ι] ψῆφον ὥστε μὴ εἶναι τὸν νόμο-
 ν τοῦτον, τὰ ἔοντα αὐτο πεπρήσθω
 καὶ τὰ πόλλωνος εἶναι ἱερά καὶ α-
 ὑτὸν φεύγεν αἰεὶ· ἦν δὲ μὴ ἦι αὐτ- [40]
 ῶι ἄξια δέκα στατήρων, αὐτὸν [π-]
 επρήσθαι ἐπ' ἐξαγωγῆι καὶ μη[δ-]
 ἀμὰ κάθοδον εἶναι ἐς Ἄλικαρν- [40]
 ησσόν. Ἄλικαρνασσέων δὲ τῶς σ-
 υπάντων τούτωι ἐλεύθερον εἶ[-]
 ναι, ὃς ἂν ταῦτα μὴ παραβαίνειη κατό-
 περ τὰ ὄρκια ἔταμον καὶ ὡς γέγραπτ- [45]
 αὶ ἐν τῶι Ἀπολλωνίωι, ἐπικαλῆν.

the fifth of Hermaion, with Leon in
 the prytany, the son of Oassassis,
 and Sarussollos, son of Thekuillos,
 temple administrator, (regarding?)
Mnemones:² (One is) not to transfer
 land or buildings to the *mnemones*
 under the *mnemonship* of Apol-
 lonides the son of Lygdamis and
 Panamyas the son of Kasbollis, and,
 for the Salmakians, Megabates the
 son of Aphyasis and Phormio the
 son of Panyassis. But if anyone
 wishes to bring suit regarding land
 or buildings, let him make his claim
 within 18 months from the date of
 this decree; in accord with current
 law let the judges administer the
 oath; whatever the *mnemones* know
 shall prevail. And if anyone brings
 suit after this 18-month period, the
 oath shall be for the holder of land
 or buildings (to swear) and the
 judges shall administer the oath,
 receiving “a twelfth”; the oath shall
 be (sworn) in the presence of the
 opponent. They have decisive right
 to land or buildings who held them
 when Apollonides and Panamyas
 were *mnemones*, unless they sold
 thereafter.

If anyone attempts to alter or ab-
 rogate this law his property shall be
 forfeit to Apollo and he shall be
 punished with eternal exile; if his
 net worth is not 10 staters, he shall
 be sold abroad, never to return to
 Halikarnassos. Any Halikarnassian
 has the right to bring suit who does
 not transgress these rules, just as
 they concluded the settlement and
 as it is written in the Apollonion.

² πρ]ὸς μνήμονας· μὴ παρ[α]δίδο[σθαι] is the reading given by Meiggs and Lewis (and others), followed by Körner and Hallof, translating “betreffend die Mnemones: Weder Land noch Häuser sollen den Mnemones übergeben [werden].” Effenterre and Ruze (1994: 88-89) print τὸ]ς μνήμονας· μὴ παρ[α]δίδο[σθαι], but render it, “(Pour?) les *mnèmons*: Que ne soient confiées aux *mnèmons* ni une terre ni des maisons.”

Crucial problems in the text begin with lines 8-9. To make sense of the supplements, it will help to recall how this much-studied inscription came to light. In 1749 the Earl of Charlemont saw the stone intact and made a transcription that seems generally competent. Thereafter the stone was cut into two planks which were used as window jambs; that is the condition in which the inscription was rediscovered by Newton (1863: 671, with plate 85). If we compare Charlemont's transcription, it looks as though the stone had already suffered damage on the left side of lines 8-9 when he read it, and we should be careful about relying on his letters and spacing here, on the border of what was doubtful or illegible to him. Nevertheless, the notations Charlemont made here, perhaps casually, have shaped much of scholarly opinion, for he indicated letter-spacing that practically demands the reading, τ]ὸς μνήμονας μὴ παρ[α]διδό[ναι: that is, the prescript has ended and the content here begins with the order, "the *mnemones* are not to transfer land or houses to the *mnemones* under Apollonides et al." That reading has inspired the view that two successive boards of *mnemones* are involved, that one board would ordinarily transfer property (or registry) to the other; the effect of the decree is to discontinue that transfer, whatever the reason.

The rationale most widely embraced is that the board of *mnemones* under Apollonides et al. are the incoming board and they will be involved in disposing of properties confiscated or abandoned in recent conflict; these properties are now in the registry—if not under direct control—of outgoing *mnemones*.³ The aim of the decree may have been cynical, or quite fair. Assuming that Apollonides is the uncle or son of the tyrant, we might suppose that the process favours those who sided with Lygdamis (especially Valetton [1908-9]): the properties in question are no longer sequestered; anyone who wishes to make a claim is given access to the courts and testimony from the incoming *mnemones*. Alternatively perhaps the board anchored by the son of Lygdamis and the son of Panyassis is bi-partisan (so, for instance, Reinach [1888]); the transitional procedure represents an honest effort to restore title fairly or to establish a reliable record for the future. Much depends on how we construct the political background, but whatever construction we put upon

³ See Maffi (1988: 19-37) for a review of the nineteenth-century scholarship. Initially scholars were preoccupied with the question of how this evidence might bear upon the biography of Herodotos (beginning with Sauppe [1863]); but Panyassis (mentioned in lines 15-16) turns out to be a fairly common name (Rühl [1882]; cf. Hirschfeld [1893: 52-53]).

it, the whole set of implications, proceeding from the picture of one board of *mnemones* handing over properties or records to another, seems more and more doubtful.

Close examination of the stone soon suggested that Charlemont's marks for letters missing or illegible do not match the prevailing pattern; the letters seem to be more closely spaced. So Rühl found that in line 9 a more likely restoration is παραδίδο[σθαι; and later Dittenberger in *Syll.*³ proposed that the space in line 8 calls for πρ]ὸς μνήμονας. We cannot be sure of these supplements—the letter-spacing is variable from line to line. On balance, however, I would say that the later restorations are the more likely. If we look at the inscription on the stele (BMI 886: Figure 4), without regarding the sense but simply envisioning what fits the space, in each instance two letters look more likely than one.⁴ If we then consider the sense, this reading fits a familiar pattern and seems less awkward than the alternative: the long prescript beginning with τᾶδε ends with the party to whom the decision is particularly addressed; thereupon the substance of the decree begins with a prohibition for all concerned to heed (παραδίδοσθαι is passive or impersonal). That is the reading adopted by Meiggs and Lewis, and preferred by Körner and Hallof, and it is most probably the right reading, though the older one has been stoutly defended.

The older reading has been especially attractive to those who envision the *mnemones* at Halikarnassos as “archivists,” keeping a documentary record in much the same capacity that Aristotle attributes to *mnemones* in the fourth century (*Pol.* 1321b 34-40). By this rationale, the *mnemones* “transfer land and houses” from one board to the next, by means of a written registry of title or transactions (initially Sauppe 1863). Swoboda, however, raised objections against the archivist model:⁵ there is no reference to documentary proof in the decree itself, whereas, in early comparanda, documentary materials are usually identified explicitly if they are available. The emphasis upon oath-taking—who has the duty to administer the oath and who will swear it—indicates that oral evidence is decisive. Finally, most compelling (when it is not dismissed), is the historical pattern: property registries under city supervision seem to be a regular development of the Hellenistic

⁴ Certain combinations tend to be more widely spaced, especially involving Δ, Μ, and Τ (with prominent “serifs” = *sampi*); but the letters in question—Θ, Ν, Π, Ρ, Σ, Τ (*tau*) are usually compact.

⁵ Swoboda (1897: 123-28).

period, not the mid-fifth century. Swoboda's study may have relied too much upon Germanic parallels, and his model is flawed in other respects (see below), but his objections have never been squarely answered.

The archivist model was reinforced by Partsch's magisterial essay on Ptolemaic real-estate records, as it included a brief reconstruction of the procedure indicated in the Lygdamis decree.⁶ Partsch does not, however, deal with Swoboda's objections and, it is fair to say, he largely retrojects the working principles of a later era: without any direct evidence, he proceeds as though the *mnemones* at Halikarnassos must have relied upon written *anagraphai* as their successors elsewhere would do. He suggests that Plato's rule for a written registry of property (*Laws* 754d, 850a, 914d) corresponded to contemporary practice in Ionia, but, even if that is so,⁷ it is no proof that the same practices prevailed a hundred years earlier.

The issue was redefined in the 1980s by two major contributions. First, Lambrinudakis and Wörrle authored an exhaustive study of the important inscription at Paros dealing with *mnemones* in the second century BC. In this relatively late example the *mnemones* appear indeed as keepers of an archival record, *grammata mnemonika*, which they hand over (*paradidonai*) from year to year to a "receiver" and (apparently) a titular *Mnemon*. To lend perspective to this role Wörrle contributed a wide-ranging study of earlier *mnemones*, including the Lygdamis decree.⁸ Despite the similar wording, he observed that the *mnemones* at Halikarnassos (three hundred years before the Paros text) appear to be oral rememberers: after all (much as Swoboda insisted), there is nothing to suggest that these *mnemones* relied on official documents. An oral practice seems better suited to an era of marginal literacy: these *mnemones* may yet be much like their ancient predecessors, "öffentliche 'Merker' aus einer schriftlosen Frühzeit."⁹ Moreover, as Wörrle concurs, the letter spacing makes the later reading, πρ]ὸς μνήμονας· μὴ παραδίδο[σθαι, more plausible. Wörrle's rationale is preferred by Effenterre and Ruzé,¹⁰ over the more thorough study that succeeded it.

⁶ Partsch (1921: 107-29, esp. 117-20). Maffi (1988: 46) suggests that Partsch simply (and rightly) dismissed Swoboda's study ("non penso per ignoranza").

⁷ Faraguna (2000) does much to show that Plato's construction reflects current practice (while faulting Partsch for fixing upon *anagraphēin* as a technical term: 68 n. 10).

⁸ Lambrinudakis and Wörrle (1983: 328-44).

⁹ Swoboda (1897: 333).

¹⁰ Effenterre and Ruzé (1994: 90).

Alberto Maffi's monograph builds upon Partsch's archivist model and defends the earlier reading, τ]ός μνήμονας μὴ παραδιδό[ναι.¹¹ Indeed, for Maffi, the key to the puzzle is that regular transfer of records from one board of *mnemones* to the next, which this decree interrupts. The reason for the change is likely to be "technical," not political: the old registry (from whatever cause) is no longer reliable, and so a new record of title must be established; he treats the law at Paros as a close parallel. That turn of the argument seems doubtful, but by meticulous reading of the Lygdamis decree Maffi arrived at a correction that is crucial to any solution.

Maffi recognized that the *mnemones* under Apollonides et al. must be an *earlier* board, not the incumbent or incoming board as is usually assumed.¹² This is the natural sense of the central provision (lines 28-32): after the 18-month period, "the decisive right belongs to him who *held* the property when Apollonides and Panamytes *were mnemones*." The indicatives (εἶχον ... ἐμνημόνευον) cannot be simply discounted; in every other clause that looks ahead to future contingencies the subjunctive is used (lines 16, 21, 23, 33, 43). The timeframe is most clearly indicated in the exception, "unless they sold it thereafter" (εἰ μὴ ὕστερον ἀπεπέρασαν). As Maffi emphasized, this would be utterly superfluous if referring to future transactions and especially odd in a decree that is otherwise devoid of pleonasm. What the exception indicates is that the era of Apollonides was *some time* prior to the decree, followed by an unspecified period (in which the property might have been sold) leading up the decree. However, convinced that the *mnemones* had charge of a written registry, Maffi interprets the first provision essentially as follows: "The *mnemones* (outgoing) are not to transfer (the documentary

¹¹ Maffi (1988: 72) concludes: "In definitiva mi pare più facile presupporre una metonimia che una metafora." That is, the decree speaks of "land and houses" when it means the documents representing those properties (whereas Wörrle's approach involves a more abstract metaphor—"land and houses" means control). The time frame, "under the mnemonship of Apollonides et al.," applies to the documents indicated by that metonymy (rather than τοῖς μνήμοσιν). Cf. Faraguna (2000: 110-12).

¹² This implication was seen by Comparetti (1885: 151-57), but he read νεωποισί[εν τ]ός μνήμονας ("the mnemones are to administer sacred properties"; cf. Maffi [1988: 31-33]). Hirschfeld's translation (1883: 52) points to the past ("the Mnemones of the time when Apollonides ... held office"), but his commentary (p.53) treats this tenure as subsequent to the decree.

record of) land and houses, (recorded) under Apollonides et al., to the *mnemones* (incoming).¹³

Maffi's reconstruction relies on the older reading (τὸ]ς μνήμονας μὴ παραδιδόναι), with the regular transfer of records that it implies. If, however, we follow Swoboda's argument that *mnemones* at Halikarnassos were oral recorders (with the reading, πρὸς μνήμονας· μὴ παραδίδοσθαι), then the timeframe of that central provision carries a different implication. This decree intervenes in a situation where the *mnemones* who served sometime in the past, under Apollonides et al., might be the official receivers of property that the old owners will now reclaim (the property in question is not simply *registered* under their tenure, as Maffi supposed). The effect of the decree is to bar the claimants from taking possession solely on the word of the *mnemones* (as they might otherwise do). Scholars have not pursued this implication largely because it does not fit with prevailing assumptions about how early *mnemones* operated.

2. *Mnemones and Memory*

Most of the theories regarding *mnemones* at Halikarnassos—whether assuming a documentary record or an oral tradition—seem to rely on a standard model of how the *mnemon* became a scribe: the *mnemon* was once a sort of “living archive,”¹⁴ master of an extensive oral record, and so, in time, he adopted the written copy to reinforce his memory.

That very process is captured, supposedly, in the curious decree honouring Spensithios in central Crete, around 500 BC.¹⁵ Here, perhaps forty years before the Lygdamis decree we find an official who is responsible both for writing down matters of record (sacred and secular) and evidently reporting them in the manner of a *mnemon*: *mnamoneuein*. He appears to be the titular head of a larger group, his kinsmen and others to whom he may delegate those duties; thus (in person or through his agents) he is to “attend and have an equal share in all matters ... wherever the *kosmos* is present.” How exactly the scribing and remembering go together remains puzzling. The first editors suggested that the role of scribe is an adaptation: ordinarily “a *mnemon* need not be literate, his

¹³ Maffi (1988: 71-77).

¹⁴ E.g., Reinach (1888: 42).

¹⁵ See Jeffery and Morpurgo-Davies (1970: 118-54, esp. 150); cf. Effenterre (1973: 31-46).

memory is the essential.”¹⁶ What sort of memory? It seems to be assumed that the *mnemon* must have an *active command* of extensive material: he recites the relevant text of rules and rituals; and he keeps written copy to refresh his memory.¹⁷

We seem to have a record of that process in the addendum to the curse-law at Teos.¹⁸ The text is addressed to public spokesmen called *timocheontes* or *timochoi*, and to stewards, *tamieuontes*. They are not called *mnemones* but seem responsible for reciting a text in a manner that might well qualify as *mnemoneuein*. In this role they are assisted by a scribe, *phoinikographeon*. The memorable text prescribes the citizen’s oath and curse against anyone who undermines the regime or alters the law. The officers must “say again” (*analegein*) the very text that stands inscribed on stelai, *epi mnemei kai dynamei*; those who fail are subject to some penalty. Rosalind Thomas reads the phrase *epi mnemei kai dynamei* as evidence for official memorization and a further sign that public inscriptions were respected more as monuments than text that observers could read with any facility; she sees *mnemones* in a similar role: supposedly the phrase means “to the best of their memory and power.” There is perhaps an opposition between the officers’ performance *epi mnemei kai dynamei*, and the scribe’s obligation to read back the text “when the officers order.” Hermann, who made the most thorough study of this text, was however doubtful.¹⁹ After all the same verb (*analegein*) also applies to the scribe’s performance, and presumably the scribe is to read what is written. It may be that for marginal readers memory is simply essential to deciphering the concatenation of characters: to assist those readers, the text is systematically punctuated to make

¹⁶ Jeffery and Morpurgo-Davies (1970: 1950).

¹⁷ Effenterre (1973: 39) reasons, “Je croirais plutôt que l’essentiel était la conservation des rites et des usages (ou leur restauration après des négligences ...) et que l’écriture n’était qu’un moyen, récemment mis à la mode un peu partout.”

¹⁸ Published by Herrmann (1981: 1-30); cf. Thomas (1995: 59-74, esp. 66-71).

¹⁹ Herrmann (1981: 12-13): “Ich muß aber gestehen, daß ich den Sinn gerade der neuen Doppelwendung nicht verstehe: wie können die Beamten verpflichtet werden, die Verlesung der ἐπιγραφή <nach besten Wissen> bzw. <Erinnerungsvermögen> vorzunehmen, wenn doch die Stele mit dem Text öffentlich ausgestellt war?” Cf. Wörrle’s interpretation (cited by Herrmann n. 29): “damit es in Erinnerung und in Kraft bleibt.” The addendum disproves the old notion that a similar recitation *epi dynamei* earlier in the curse text (Meiggs and Lewis [1969: 62-66, no. 30 at line 31]) refers to a deified Dynamis.

the phrasing more easily intelligible;²⁰ and when the officer cannot make it out, the scribe must give some prompting. Alternatively it may be as Wörle suggested: *epi* with the dative conveys an object or purpose: “for memory and power”—that is for public recognition and to assure that the officers are mindful of the law. Thus, on three occasions every year, the relevant rules are read out repeatedly to the assembled community so that the memory of those curses is revived. The officers need not memorize the text—on the contrary, the ritual reading, with the scribe to prompt them, suggests to me that they were not expected to remember it verbatim. Nevertheless, if Thomas is right, the officers were to speak *from memory*, and the scribe was to read back the same text in order to verify or reinforce that fallible recitation.

Such theories—how, supposedly, Spensithios functions as *mnemon*; and what Thomas suggests at Teos—presume that early *mnemones* or other officials in that role were responsible for an extensive body of text. There seems to be an unwavering faith (especially in the case of Swoboda) in the primitive *mnemon* as a prodigious memorizer who once mastered the cumulative record of transactions and legal decisions by internalizing it orally. Then, as certain decisions become precedent for more general rules, the *mnemon* evolves from an oral recorder of cases to a reciter of laws and rituals. Like the lawsayer of Norse tradition, he might be expected to master the whole corpus and recite it periodically, or summon up the relevant rule whenever he is consulted. Subsequently he readily adapts to writing, using the text to *refresh* his memory of long and elaborate materials. The parallel is intriguing but the theory is unsupported: memorizing or reciting an extensive “oral text” is never attested to or clearly suggested by the Greek evidence for *mnemones*. No doubt, there were prodigious memorizers of rules and rituals, but that appears to be the role of specialized experts in oral tradition (one thinks, perhaps, of Kerykes at Eleusis and the *Exegetai* at Athens).²¹ If we look closely at what the *mnemon* is actually called upon to do, he seems to be using his memory in a very different way.

²⁰ What appear as “colons” at word-breaks, at odd angles but better preserved than the letters, look as though they may have been dowel holes (added after inscription?) to attach markers of some sort.

²¹ For the (fallible) recollection of Kerykes, cf. Andoc. 1.115-16. Even the *Exegetai* may not have relied on an internalized text: as Svenbro (1993: 120-2) points out in regard to [Dem.] 47. 68-9, their basic function seems rather to “explicate” the written text of the law; see Ong (1982: 34-5) on “oral law” and formulaic wisdom, and (62-3) on verbatim memorization of rites.

Consider the examples from the Great Code at Gortyn,²² roughly contemporary with our text from Halikarnassos. The evidence is frustrating on many points: The *mnemon* (or *mnamon* in this dialect) may or may not be the keeper of a written record—there is no explicit reference to a *mnemon* with text in hand. He was probably present for many procedures where he is not named in the extant laws, but in the three instances where he is specifically called upon we can perhaps detect a certain basic competence: he witnesses public proceedings (apparently not private transactions), and, as we might expect, he is especially useful when a decision is later challenged or reversed. Yet he is not the sole authority for those decisions; the original magistrate and interested witnesses may carry the burden. Thus in col. 9.31-40, where someone sues the heirs for what their father owed from a lawsuit or other liabilities, the *mnemon* will testify, “if he is yet alive and a citizen” (*ai ka doei kai poliateuei*);²³ if not, they proceed without him. Similarly in col. 11.46-55, regarding a suit against a divorced woman, where (apparently) the husband or his relatives claim that she has what is theirs and the judge has decreed that she can quash the suit by her oath, the *mnemon* is to be among those present when the plaintiff makes his formal claim three days before the woman takes her oath. There is no indication when, what, or even whether the *mnemon* would testify. The important thing seems to be that he should *be there* when the parties join their dispute face to face. Witnessing that face-to-face encounter also seems essential in the other instance col. 11.11-17, where the *mnemon* is called upon to pay out the ten staters’ severance to the disinherited son: he was present, presumably, in the public forum when the father proclaimed the adoption and, surely, when he disavowed it.

I suggest, therefore, that one essential role of the early *mnemon*, even in Crete (where his duties are specialized), is a sort of face-to-face recognition: when he later encounters one of the parties to a lawsuit or is

²² *IC* 4.72: 9.31-40; 11.11-17; 11.46-55. For detailed discussion, see Maffi (1983: 121-70) on col. 9.

²³ One clear implication is that *mnemones* were expected to have been present for any legal action affecting the deceased or his property. *Poliateuein* is more doubtful: it may indicate that *mnemones*, like anyone else, could lose their rights or become unreliable; or there might be non-citizen *mnemones* for some transactions (involving assets abroad?) who are barred from these estate proceedings (thus Maffi [1983: 148 n.7]).

shown the property at stake,²⁴ he can verify that this is the man who once brought suit against the owner now deceased (*de cuius*); this is the farm or the house claimed by the husband or his heirs; or this was the son publicly adopted or disinherited. Now at Gortyn we find that the individual *mnemon* is attached to a particular magistrate,²⁵ so it is likely that he would acquire detailed knowledge of procedures and transactions within that area, but we have no clear sign that he was called upon to recite or produce any extensive “text” of that court business (oral or written). He seems to have been especially responsible for the elements of the case: who were the parties and what was the property or payment at issue.

Of course there were other ways of proving who is who and what is what: the heirs who contest what their father owed will bear witness for themselves. Nevertheless, self-serving testimony often proves false and Greek remedies for false witness are mostly late and often ineffective.²⁶ So one crucial competence of the early *mnemon* is to know the parties involved and the property at issue—to minimize disputes over who had received or claimed a particular asset and precisely what it was.²⁷ He does this not by internalizing an oral text but by visual recognition.

In this role he relies upon a particular mechanism of memory that will serve him well when he becomes an archivist. By contrast, those who have a special skill at internalizing extensive materials orally are the least likely candidates for scribe. What is required of the *mnemon* is a special confidence in “recognition memory” and “implicit memory,” when he is prompted by visual signs or distinctive features. It is also that “character recognition” that enables the early reader.²⁸ Such is the proc-

²⁴ Cf. Körner and Hallof (1993: no. 129) = *IC* 4.42B: the *mnemon* and *dikastas* convene at the boundary of the properties involved in the dispute (ἄι ἀκριαῖ ἀτερεα γᾶ) where the claimant calls upon them to swear (to a previous decision?).

²⁵ Thus in the matter of adoption and disinheritance, the *mnemon* is attached to the *kosmos* for aliens. *IC* 4. 87 (Körner and Hallof [1993: 161]) refers to “the *mnemon* of the *esprattai*” (revenue officials?).

²⁶ Aristotle (*Pol.* 1274b) seems to assign suits for false testimony to Charondas, as he was the first to institute *episkepsis* for such wrongs; but it is not clear how or how well that early institution worked (if, indeed, it is authentic). Even on the well-trodden path of litigation at Athens it remained a doubtful remedy (Harrison 1971: 192-7).

²⁷ Cf. Wörrle, in Lambrinudakis and Wörrle (1983: 333-4).

²⁸ Learning to read requires a strong “phonological loop” (Baddeley [1998: 63-4, 98-101]), but once grounded in literacy, the reader relies largely on visual recognition.

ess illustrated at Teos, where the officials may sound out the groups of letters (marked off by punctuation) in order to piece together what the text says. That sort of reader recognition may be closely allied with “what *mnemones* know.”

Before he could read, the *mnemon* does not appear to recite transactions from some text or disembodied narrative; he recalls the parties and their property when they stand before him. It is an aptitude that many members of any community might have. Indeed (aside from Gortyn), the acting *mnemones* often appear to be numerous, sometimes organized in several committees, subordinate to a titular official (eponymous *mnemon*, scribe, or *tamias*), and perhaps chosen *ad hoc*, because they knew the tenants and would recognize the lie of the land.

That appears to be an important value for “*mnemon*” in early literary uses. About the time of the Lygdamis decree, the Prometheus of Aeschylus tells Io where she will go and what she will see to mark her route—and the peculiar peoples who live there—and she is to keep her prophecy in her memory, fixed in *mnemones deltoi*.²⁹ The metaphor is all the more evocative if the familiar function of *mnemones* is simply to recognize proprietor and property.³⁰

Much the same role fits the two Homeric examples. In the *Odyssey* we may detect the scorn of the true memory-expert towards the business notary who dares call himself “rememberer,” when a Phaiakian lord snidely describes the stranger Odysseus as resembling a ship captain *phortou mnemon* (“mindful of his cargo”: *Od.* 8.163), and the sneer is all the more cutting if it suggests a trader who transports cargo for others and has to know what property belongs to whom.

The most suggestive instance is perhaps the earliest: when Odysseus in disguise awaits his turn at the bow, Antinoos protests that it is a futile contest; he knows the look of Odysseus whom he saw when he was a child, and he can confirm that no one present matches his prowess—of that Antinoos is *mnemon* (*Od.* 21.95); that is, if there were an Odysseus present he would know him on sight. Of course, the real Odysseus is

²⁹ Aesch, *PV* 700ff; *mnemones deltoi*: line 798.

³⁰ The earliest written “reminders” for *mnemones* (like these *deltoi*) may have simply identified the owner and distinctive landscape. Similarly among Delphic Amphichtyones, the *hieromnemon* was to survey the boundaries of sacred property, probably relying on markers or prominent features: *IG* ii² 1126 (380/79 BC). In an arbitration decision of c. 290-80 BC (?) *hieromnemon* fix the boundary (-stone?) ([ὄ]ρον ἱερομνήμονες πεποι[η]κάν) and verify it thereafter (Ager [1996: 83, no. 22]).

right there and, I suggest, the irony is all the more effective because the original audience understood that *mnemones* were supposed to be reliable at just this sort of character recognition.

Let us now turn back to the historical evidence (free, at least, of literary ironies) and focus on the one inscription that describes the duties of *mnemones* in closest parallel and proximity to the decree at Halikarnassos: this is the law at Iasos, just up the coast from Halikarnassos.³¹ It comes a century later, but the conditions appear to be remarkably similar. Here, it is clear, we have an arrangement for redistribution of property after civil conflict; and although this text belongs to an era and an area where literacy appears well established and official decisions were certainly kept in documentary form, nonetheless the *mnemones* in this case do not appear responsible for that text. Instead the several committees of *mnemones* are called upon as official partners in the sale of confiscated property: *mnemones sunepolesan*. It is particularly indicative that *mnemones* are only invoked in certain transactions, about half of those listed. In all the sales where *mnemones* take part, the original owner is prominently named—it seems to be essential to identifying the property. That has to be part of what the *mnemon* knows. In the other transactions, evidently, the original owner is no longer significant, and so *mnemones* are not involved.³²

This text is perhaps the best illustration of a role that scholars once found essential: early *mnemones* often acted as official partners in the transaction.³³ This has a number of advantages. First of all, those memories in which we view ourselves as participants—“field memories”—are remembered in a different way from those we view from outside the event as observers.³⁴ The practice of making the *mnemon* a formal partner in the transaction therefore makes good sense, not just because the *mnemon* confers a sort of official legitimacy but because the

³¹ *Syll.*³ 169 (= Blümel [1985: I, no. 1]). On the historical context, see Hornblower (1982: 112-14).

³² In the one case where several properties are handled by the same committee of *mnemones*, they all belonged to the same owner (Pyron Skylakos: 36-43). In one case without *mnemones* or mention of the old owner, we find that *gnomones* “stood by” (51-3), presumably fixing boundaries of the property.

³³ Cf. Weiss (1931: 2263). The face-to-face recognition of a partner might be especially important in communities such as Iasos, where several persons (over two or three generations) seem to have the same or similar names.

³⁴ Freud found that observer memories are more subjective (and open to distortion); cf. Schacter (1996: 21-5).

mnemon will remember more vividly a transaction in which he sees himself as one of the parties. Adding to that “field effect” may be a certain prior history: at least in the Iasos decree it looks as though *mnemones* were chosen to be “partners in the sale” because they already knew the persons and property involved (the old owners had fled). As *mnemones* became official functionaries, as they were at Gortyn, they seem to have lost much of that character of partners in the transaction, but even at Gortyn there is perhaps a vestige of that role in the one clear case where the *mnemon* officiates in the reversal of an earlier decision, paying off the disinherited son.³⁵

By this theory the memory of the transaction is “elaborately encoded,” to borrow terms from Daniel Schacter.³⁶ The *mnemon*, as official partner in the transaction, especially remembers what he himself did to formalize the decision, and in the process his memory encodes a complex of signs and significant features, any of which can be the cue that prompts his memory when he is later invoked to verify that this is indeed the property that passed from one owner to another. Thus, when presented with the right faces or markers, the *mnemon* can provide visual recognition that this is the property in question and those are the persons who once forfeited or sold it, when he might not have been able to recite that record without those cues. This kind of memory is especially valuable when there is a dispute over the title or the boundaries to that parcel—if some neighbour or prior owner claims the land is really his.

We arrive therefore at one answer to the basic question: what is it that early *mnemones* know? Whatever else they remember, they must recognize the properties and persons in the transaction—that property P was sold or forfeited by former owner Q to receiver R; and *mnemones* do this not by reciting some oral text but relying on an elaborately encoded memory, one that can be cued by distinctive features or faces, reinforced by the field effect, seeing themselves as participants in the transaction. Now let us apply these findings to the Lygdamis decree.

³⁵ IC 4. 72. 11. 11-17. So Wörrle supposed: Lambrinudakis and Wörrle (1983: 334).

³⁶ Schacter (1996: 44-71).

3. *The Mnemones at Halikarnassos*

There are two connected problems. The decree orders some change in the role of *mnemones* in connection with the transfer of property: how does this procedural setting square with the basic recognition that we have assigned to the early *mnemon*? Further, there is the question of the Salmakian *mnemones*, who seem unimportant in the later provisions: what became of them?

In the preceding sections I concluded first that the *mnemones* in our decree are oral practitioners (as Swoboda argued), and secondly the *mnemones* under Apollonides were not the incoming board but had served some time prior to the decree (as Maffi showed). These two findings together suggest that the past *mnemones* were expected to provide first-hand verification for decisions that were made under their tenure. The natural implication of the decree, then, is that (prior to it) citizens expected to “transfer” property to the *mnemones*. Presumably this transfer was authorized or implicitly allowed under the terms of the settlement invoked at the end of the decree. The likely aim of this presumptive procedure was for the *mnemones* to restore property to those who were somehow recognized as rightful owners under the tenure of Apollonides et al. but lost or sold the property in that same “base year” (not thereafter, as the exception makes clear in lines 31-2). The parallel at Iasos suggests that the *mnemones* under Apollonides et al. were official “partners in the sale” of confiscated or abandoned properties and that an important part of “what the *mnemones* know” was recognition of the original owners. The presumptive procedure at Halikarnassos was for the old owners to take possession of their property, with the *mnemones* confirming their rights; but, instead, the decree now requires court proceedings.

In the belief that Apollonides and his group must be the incoming board, commentators have sometimes supposed that the aim of this decree is to disband the *mnemones* altogether: for eighteen months they are reduced to the role of witnesses in court; and thereafter claims to property will be decided by oath of the principals, without invoking *mnemones*. Even on the old assumption, however, it is not at all a necessary implication, and if we conclude that Apollonides et al. must be an earlier board who are now called upon to assist in the disposition of property that had been sold or forfeited during their tenure, the end of the *mnemoneship* is all the less likely. For the decree deals only with

properties that were handled in that particular timeframe; the natural implication is that transactions under the new regime will proceed in the ordinary way, with *mnemones* functioning just as they have done in the past.³⁷

In the closing we read that any citizen of Halikarnassos has the right to bring suit “so long as he does not transgress these provisions just as they concluded the settlement and as it is written in the Apollonion.” In other words, this decree is presented as a corollary to the settlement: it must be seen as consistent with it, not in contradiction. That linkage suggests that the original settlement included a provision for citizens to claim their property and for *mnemones* to participate in that reclamation, and this decree simply fixes the procedure: The old owners are not to reclaim their properties solely on the authority of *mnemones* but, rather, any claim must go before the court, within the eighteen-month window for litigation. Aside from this clarification, presumably, transactions carry on in the usual way, with *mnemones* in their traditional function.

Thus the settlement appears to have established a “base year” when there were two boards of *mnemones*, one at Salmakis and one at Halikarnassos, and the decree deals with difficulties that arose in implementing that settlement. The eponymous *mnemones* addressed in the decree—Apollonides and Panamytes at Halikarnassos, Megabates and Phormio at Salmakis—had presided over local *mnemones* in each area acting as official partners in some now-disputed transactions. Some time thereafter the settlement was sworn and inscribed in the Apollonion; then problems arose regarding the (re)distribution of property. This was a process in which ordinarily the word of the *mnemones* would be decisive and those whom they recognized as rightful owners would take possession.³⁸ Most probably there is a group of exiles who forfeited their property in the course of civil conflict and are now entitled “each to return to his rightful estate,” but the terms of the settlement did not

³⁷ This model is in fact consistent with *Syll.*³ 46 (fifth century at Halikarnassos), where *mnemones* are not mentioned (but assumed by Partsch [1921: 112-13]). This is a measure to guarantee title to those who have purchased property that was confiscated for “debts to Apollo”; the god himself will guarantee title (*bebaiousein*)—or the *neopoios* acting for the god. That probably means that there can be no reversion and thus little need for *mnemones* to recognize the original owner.

³⁸ Reinach (1888: 29) argued that the reading in lines 20-21 should be ἄν[ο δ'] ἄν οἱ μνήμων[ες εἰδέωσιν—“celui en faveur duquel les mnémons feront leur déclaration, sera reconnu propriétaire” (p.48)—as καρτερός is used in this way only of persons.

specify a procedure whereby they could recover their property.³⁹ Ordinarily, if a man comes to claim that he is the rightful owner and the local *mnemones* who witnessed the relevant transaction can identify him as the original owner, we might expect that whoever holds the property must hand it over (or sell it back). That summary reclamation, however, is precisely what this decree disallows. In this situation for whatever reason, the assembly has decreed that such summary reversion of property is no longer valid: for eighteen months the owner or his heir, or whoever has a claim, must make his case to the judges, and they (apparently) will administer the oath to the *mnemones*⁴⁰ and decide the case according to what the *mnemones* know or recognize. Thereafter—even when Apollonides and his group may no longer be active—the holder of that once-disputed property can defeat any claim by *his* oath that he (or his forebears) held the property under Apollonides, unless he later disposed of it under terms of the settlement.

During the transitional period—the eighteen months while judges decide—in many cases the outcome may be much the same as if the *mnemones* had simply recognized the returning owners. Evidently, however, a more public recognition of rights was needed to forestall divisive recriminations. By replacing the presumptive procedure with a court decision, this decree creates a more secure arrangement for the future, giving a stronger title to those who held property in the “base year” established by the settlement.

On this model the sequence of events runs roughly as follows:

- a) The era of Apollonides was a time in the recent past when properties were initially in the hands of the old owners but were then confiscated or sold off. That period, in which the properties changed hands, is now the “base year” for legitimate title.
- b) The settlement, mentioned in the closing (lines 43-5), brought to an end the tenure of Apollonides and its dubious transactions. In order

³⁹ One might argue that the beneficiaries could have been those who purchased property under Apollonides et al., but in such cases the buyers would simply take possession, once their rights were recognized in the settlement; the decree addresses a situation in which legal remedies must be invoked to “transfer” title from current holders to the rightful owners.

⁴⁰ It is possible that in the eighteen-month transition the claimant is to swear (parallel to the holder thereafter, lines 24-5; e.g., Reinach [1888: 46-7]; Partsch [1921: 118-19]). I find Swoboda’s argument more convincing (1897: 120-3); cf. *IC* 4.42B, with n. 24 above.

to reclaim their property returnees simply called upon the *mnemones* who “partnered in the sale” to affirm that they were indeed the original owners.

- c) Under the present decree, those who owned the property under Apollonides must now, within the eighteen-month window, reclaim it by court proceedings.
- d) After the eighteen-month window is closed, the owners who held the property in the year of Apollonides will have an incontestable right to it, “unless they sold thereafter.”

The exception, εἰ μὴ ὕστερον ἀπεπέρασσαν, refers to transactions in the period after Apollonides but before this decree (between the second and third steps: b and c above). This would include owners who held onto their property through the period of disruption but then chose to sell out (rather than accept the new *modus vivendi*) and, presumably, exiles who returned only long enough to dispose of their property (rather than remain among their old enemies). These sales were carried out under terms of the settlement (b above) and must therefore be honoured.

What then of the Salmakians? When Alexander advanced through Karia, perhaps a hundred and twenty years later, Salmakis was the stronghold of Halikarnassos (which even Alexander could not take: Arr. *Anab.* 1.23.3). We do not know how far back the unification goes, but our decree seems to reflect a stage in that process.⁴¹ Under the Athenian empire, Salmakis was not recognized as a separate entity in the tribute lists, so it was probably counted with Halikarnassos.⁴² Yet in the pre-script to our decree the Salmakians seem to maintain a certain autonomy, with their own *mnemones*: presumably there were disputes involving property at Salmakis, and there what the local *mnemones* know would be decisive, just as what Apollonides and his colleagues know would prevail at Halikarnassos. The parallel suggests that the transactions in question were likely to involve changes of ownership in both areas.

⁴¹ Hornblower suggests (1982: 85-8), plausibly enough, that synoikism in the early fourth century is the best date for full annexation of Salmakis (physical and political union).

⁴² Cf. Virgilio (1988: 60-71). Reinach (1888: 39) suggested that Salmakis was the Karian “citadel” of Lygdamis and remained secure during civil conflict. There was probably some need for separate, Karian *mnemones* at Salmakis, even after unification.

In settling civil conflict, one tried-and-true expedient is simply to segregate the hostile communities. At its worst it amounts to “cleansing,” but in many cases it may be the safest solution. One way to facilitate this relocation is to make formal arrangements, legally enforceable, for partisans who find themselves in the endangered minority in their own area, to sell their land or exchange it with those similarly situated on the other side. Without formal guarantees there is bound to be the sort of chaotic relocation that has been under way for some time now in Iraq,⁴³ but in ancient Greece we find that treaty arrangements for relocation or peaceful removal were common and widely adaptable.⁴⁴ Thus, to cite the most famous example, in the Athenian Reconciliation of 403 BC there were specific covenants for city partisans to register their property and relocate to Eleusis, and for Eleusinians to relocate to Athens; indeed, the Eleusinians could be forced to sell out. At Athens some citizens voluntarily registered their estates before departing; for those who forfeited their estates, the demarchs identified properties for confiscation and sale.⁴⁵

What happens then if the partition fails? The final settlement must include some arrangement for the original owners to reclaim their property, if they choose to do so. When Attika was reunified (in 401), it looks as though the same expedient they resorted to in 403 remained in place (or in reverse):⁴⁶ if property had not been sold for state revenue it could be simply reclaimed; if it had been sold, the returning owner must buy back the property, probably at the same bargain rate (or perhaps splitting the cost).⁴⁷ The inevitable disputes were assigned to a special

⁴³ Attested even in a cable issued by the US embassy in Baghdad, 6 June 2006, reported in *The Washington Post*, 18 June 2006: see esp. Section 6, “Evictions.” For the pattern of relocation and a stark description of the process see Dexter Filkins in *The New York Times* for 25 June 2006.

⁴⁴ For instance, relocation within the Athenian alliance, with property rights protected, *IG* ii² 111, regarding Ioulis, 363 BC; *isopoliteia* allowing periodic relocation between Miletus and Magnesia: *Syll.*³ 633 (c. 180 BC).

⁴⁵ Voluntary registration: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 39. For the disposal of properties, see Walbank (1982: 83-5) on the role of demarchs.

⁴⁶ On the problematic sequence at Athens, from the first settlement to the second, see now Carawan (2006).

⁴⁷ For recovery of property, cf. Lys. *Against Hippothereses*, fr. 165 Carey (2007) (= *P.Oxy.* 1606 fr. 2; with Loening (1987: esp. 51-2), followed by Carawan (2002: 7-8). Disputes regarding property of the oligarchic partisans or other revenue were decided by a special court of *syndikoi* (Lys. 16.7; 18.26; 19.32).

court of *syndikoi*, and in the end Athens and Eleusis resumed their political union.

The Lygdamis decree seems to record a similar process: in the midst of civil conflict people relocated to safe areas, sold or traded property, or forfeited it for the polis to dispose of. The local *mnemones* were official partners in those transactions, under Apollonides at Halikarnassos and Megabates at Salmakis. The settlement that ended hostilities, under sworn covenants inscribed in the Apollonion, also ended that era of dislocation. After the settlement, we find that Salmakians join with the Halikarnassians in a common *syllogos* and, if returnees should meet with some dispute, they call upon the old *mnemones*, whether at Halikarnassos or at Salmakis, with local knowledge of the lie of the land. In the cardinal rule—title belongs to those who held the property under Apollonides unless they sold it thereafter—the Salmakian *mnemones* are not mentioned, probably because the situation at Salmakis was more secure and matters of ownership were readily resolved. The reclamation of property at Halikarnassos, by contrast, was a prolonged and contentious process.

Some way of restoring property to the former owners is essential to resolving civil conflict. What is needed is proof that those who have come to claim the property were indeed the original owners. At Athens that verification would rely on demarchs and interested witnesses, assisted by a written registry, but at Halikarnassos, half a century earlier, it is just “what the *mnemones* know.”

Bibliography

- Ager, Sheila L. (1996). *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337-90 B.C.* Berkeley: Univ. of California.
- Baddeley, A. (1998). *Human Memory: Theory and Practice.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Blümel, W. ed. (1985). *Die Inschriften von Iasos.* 2 vols. Bonn: Habelt.
- Carawan, E. (2002). “The Athenian Amnesty and the ‘Scrutiny of the Laws’.” *JHS* 122: 1-23.
- Carawan, E. (2006). “Amnesty and Accountings for the Thirty.” *CQ* 56: 57-76.
- Carey, C. (2007). *Lysiae Orationes: cum fragmentis.* Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Comparetti, D. (1885). “Su di una iscrizione di Alicarnasso,” *Mus. Ital. Antich. Clas.* 1 (ser. 2, Florence): 151-7.
- Efferterre, H. van (1973). “Le contrat de travail du scribe Spensithios.” *BCH* 1973: 31-46.

- Effenterre, H. van and F. Ruzé (1994). *Nomima: Recueil d'inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l'archaïsme grec*, Vol. I. Collection de l'École Française de Rome 188. Rome: École Française de Rome.
- Faraguna, Michele (2000). "A proposito degli archivi nel mondo greco: terra e registrazioni fondiariae." *Chiron* 30: 65-115.
- Harrison, A.R.W. (1971). *The Law of Athens*, Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Herrmann, P. (1981). "Teos und Abdera im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: ein neues Fragment der Teiorum Dirae." *Chiron* 11: 1-30 [with plates 1-2].
- Hirschfeld, G. (1893). *The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*. Pt. 4, Sect. 1, *Knidos, Halikarnassos, and Branchidae*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hornblower, S. (1982). *Mausolus*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Jeffery, L., and A. Morpurgo-Davies (1970). "Ποινικαστάς and ποινικάζειν: BM 1969.4-2.1, A New Archaic Inscription from Crete." *Kadmos* 9: 118-54.
- Körner, R. and K. Hallof, eds. (1993). *Inchriftliche Gesetzestexte der frühen griechischen Polis*. Cologne: Böhlau.
- Lambrinudakis, W., and M. Wörle (1983). "Ein hellenistisches Reformgesetz über das öffentliche Urkundenwesen von Paros." *Chiron* 13: 282-368.
- Loening, T. (1987). *The Reconciliation Agreement of 403/2 BC in Athens*. Hermes Einzelschrift 53. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Maffi, Alberto (1983). *Studi di Epigrafia Giuridica Greca*. Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Diritto Romano 17. Milan: Giuffrè.
- Maffi, Alberto (1988). *L'iscrizione di Ligdamis*. Università degli studi di Trieste, Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità. Trieste: Bernardi.
- Meiggs, R. and D. Lewis, eds. (1969). *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon.
- Newton, C. T. (1863). *A History of Discoveries at Halicarnassus, Cnidus, & Branchidae*, Vol. 2. London: Day.
- Ong, W. J. (1982). *Orality and Literacy: the Technologizing of the Word*. London and New York: Methuen.
- Partsch, J. (1921). "Die griechische Publizität der Grundstücksverträge im Ptolemäerrechte." In *Festschrift für Otto Lenel zum fünfzigjährigen Doctor-jubiläum am 16. Dezember 1921*: 77-203. Leipzig: Tauchnitz.
- Reinach, T. (1888). "L'inscription de Lygdamis." *REG* 1: 27-48.
- Rühl, F. (1882). "Herodotisches." *Philologus* 41: 55-77.
- Sauppe, H. (1863). "Inchrift von Halikarnassos." *NGG* 1863: 303-30.
- Schacter, D. (1996). *Searching for Memory: the Brain, the Mind, and the Past*. New York: BasicBooks (HarperCollins).
- Svenbro, J. (1993). *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*, transl. J. Lloyd. Ithaca NY: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Swoboda, H. (1897). "Epigraphisch-historische Beiträge I." *Archeologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Österreich-Ungarn* 20: 115-30.
- Thomas, R. (1995). "Written in Stone? Liberty, Equality, Orality and the Codification of Law." *BICS* 40: 59-74.

- Tod, M., ed. (1985 [1946-8]). *Greek Historical Inscriptions from the Sixth Century B.C. to the Death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C.* Repr. of Oxford: Clarendon. Chicago: Ares.
- Valeton M. (1908-9). “*De Inscriptione Lygdamensi.*” *Mnemosyne* 37 (1908): 289-334; 38 (1909): 60-6.
- Virgilio, B. (1988). “Conflittualità e Coesistenza fra Greci e non-Greci, e il Caso di Alicarnasso del V Secolo A.C.” In (idem) *Epigrafia e Storiografia. Studi di Storia Antica*, vol. 1: 53-71. Pisa: Giardini.
- Walbank, M. (1982). “The Confiscation and Sale by the Poletai in 402/1 B.C. of the Property of the Thirty Tyrants.” *Hesperia* 51: 74-98.
- Weiss, E. (1931). “*Mnemonēs.*” In *RE* 15: 2261-64.

CHAPTER NINE

GETTING THE LAST WORD: PUBLICATION OF POLITICAL ORATORY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF HISTORICAL REVISIONISM

THOMAS HUBBARD

Most students of Attic oratory make the automatic assumption that the 150-odd speeches we have extant accurately preserve the techniques and actual words used by the orators in oral delivery before the original audience. Of course, everyone acknowledges a few exceptions, such as the *Tetralogies* of Antiphon and the epideictic speeches of Isocrates, but even these speeches carefully maintain a fiction of actual delivery, in some cases before a very specific audience. Antiphon's *Tetralogies* and perhaps even his other speeches were mainly intended to provide textbook models.¹ Epideictic speeches like the *Erotikoi logoi* attributed to Lysias and Demosthenes were clearly literary exercises, and even more serious works like the longer epideictic orations of Isocrates were published to serve as political pamphlets advancing the author's views to all of Greece.² Neither Isocrates' weak voice nor the elaborate *Kunstprosa* of these orations was well suited to oral delivery.

Wilamowitz, Eduard Meyer, and more recently Mogens Herman Hansen have suggested that even Demosthenes' symbouleutic speeches should perhaps also be considered political pamphlets: out of the many thousands of symbouleutic speeches delivered in fourth-century Athens, and even among the dozens of such speeches that Demosthenes himself doubtless delivered, only a handful were ever published, judging from those extant as well as the fragments and testimonia.³ One can well

¹ On the intended audience of the *Tetralogies*, see Gagarin (2002: 103-6).

² For the political and educational functions of Isocrates' published work, see Mathieu (1925), Bringmann (1965), Masaracchia (1995: 81-149), and Poulakos (1997).

³ Wilamowitz (1907: 75-76), Meyer (1909: 770-72), Hahn (1910), Hansen (1984: 68). Against the idea, see Adams (1912), Canfora (1988), and Trevett (1996), the last of whom argues that Demosthenes' symbouleutic speeches were never in-

imagine that the subsequent course of events would dictate Demosthenes' choice which speeches to publish: those in which an orator had predicted something that did not happen would hardly be to his credit, but those in which he warned of ill consequences that did in fact transpire would make him appear visionary and prophetic, in the eyes both of his contemporaries and of posterity. Such is the case with Demosthenes' speeches against Philip. The even more interesting question is to what extent these speeches may have been rewritten prior to publication to conform with events. In discussing Lysias' speech against the proposal of Phormisios, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Lys.* 49.11-13) raises the possibility that it may never have been actually delivered at all, suggesting that the rhetorician held the view that some published symbouleutic speeches may have been just as fictional in their setting as epideictic speeches. This was certainly the case with Andocides' *On the Peace with Sparta*, as with Isocrates' *Plataicus*, *On the Peace*, and *Areopagiticus*.⁴ Evidence also suggests that some published speeches, such as Demosthenes' *On the Chersonesus*, actually combined elements from more than one orally delivered oration.⁵

For symbouleutic speeches, the extent of post-delivery revision is largely unknowable, but I would argue that we are in a somewhat stronger position in respect of forensic oratory. When forensic trials involved politically prominent personalities, the publication of these speeches could also serve the function of a political pamphlet, making the author's views known both to posterity and to those of his contemporaries who could not be at the original trial, but had perhaps heard enough gossip about it to be interested. Even in cases where a litigant may not have been successful, indeed especially in those cases, he had an interest in both besmirching the reputation of his opponent and defending his own. Certainly by the time of Demosthenes, orators were aware that their published speeches might be read by future students of rhetoric, even as they had the models of Antiphon, Andocides, Lysias, and Isocrates in front of them. The temptation to control public memory

tended for publication by the author himself, but were found among his papers after his death.

⁴ See the discussion of Kennedy (1963: 204-6), who believes that the publication of fictitious symbouleutic speeches began with Thrasymachos of Chalcedon and other metics who wished to influence Athenian policy.

⁵ See the arguments of Adams (1938) and Daitz (1957). Schwartz (1894: 40-44) suggested that such synthesis was the norm for most of Demosthenes' published symbouleutic speeches.

by “getting the last word” or “setting the record straight” was in many instances irresistible and frequently took the form of responding to arguments an opponent made in his speech that could not possibly have been anticipated in the speaker’s original speech delivered in court.

Some critics have nevertheless resisted the notion that there was any widespread deviation between the orally delivered original and the published version of a speech, in part due to a tacit assumption that the informed public would never let a politician get away with revising the historical record of what he had said.⁶ However, I would argue that fidelity to a historical record was simply not a primary concern of ancient aesthetics, any more than the ancients’ view of *aletheia* was identical to our constructions of historical or scientific “truth.”⁷ Indeed, historical preservation of an originary moment of oral delivery would not have occurred to most Attic orators as a necessary or desirable end, even though all written speeches maintain a dramatic pretence of oral delivery. As we have observed, some of the earliest speeches of Gorgias, Antiphon, and Isocrates are purely fictional models, addressing hypothetical cases or situations. The differing accounts of Sokrates’ *Apology* by Plato and Xenophon,⁸ not to mention the lost *Apology* of Lysias (Diog. Laert. 2.40; Cic. *De Or.* 1.231) and Polykrates’ version of Anytos’ accusation (Isoc. 11.4), suggest the malleability of the written medium: it was not so important to record the actual words said on that occasion as to compose words appropriate to the ethos of the speaker and the underlying significance of his predicament. Even as scrupulous an historian as Thucydides says he cannot remember the precise words of the speeches he heard and no one else can either: instead, he claims, “my method has been, while keeping as closely as possible to the general sense of the words that were actually used, to make the speakers say what, in my

⁶ See, for example, Dorjahn (1935: 293-95) and Lavency (1964: 190-2). An important exception to this general belief is Worthington (1991); however his argument for significant revision is principally based on a controversial theory concerning detailed ring-composition in one written speech of Dinarchus.

⁷ On ancient Greek constructions of truth, see the seminal work of Detienne (1967). Essential truth (i.e., being true to the ethos of a divine or human character) was more at issue for the Greeks than our concepts of literal truth and historical accuracy.

⁸ For comparison of the two, see Vrijlandt (1919), Waerdt (1993), Pucci (2002: 21-30), and Danzig (2003). The divergence between the two works argues against the historicity of either.

opinion, was called for by each situation” (Thuc. 1.22).⁹ Our expectation that the written version is parasitical and merely derivative from the oral reflects precisely that “metaphysics of presence” against which Derrida’s grammatology warns us.¹⁰ The written should rather be recognized as an innovative medium in its own right, with a unique set of communicative strategies and generic objectives. It bears noting that both Aristotle (*Rh.* 3.12.1-2) and Plutarch (*Vit. Dem.* 9) take it for granted that written and oral speeches are stylistically different and appeal to different audiences.¹¹

Sir Kenneth Dover treated the problem of post-delivery revision briefly in his Sather Lectures on Lysias published in 1968, examining the cases where we possess both the prosecution and defence speeches of Aeschines and Demosthenes, namely the famous false embassy trial of 343 BC and the trial on the Crown in 330 BC.¹² In both of these cases, we see the defence speech respond to points allegedly raised by the prosecution, but nowhere to be located in the extant version of the prosecution speech. For instance, Demosthenes’ *On the Crown* (18.95, 238) twice refers to Aeschines’ vilification of Euboeia and Byzantium in his speech, but no such passage is to be found in the *Against Ctesiphon*. Similarly, Aeschines’ defence in the embassy trial (2.10) says that Demosthenes’ speech likened him to the tyrant Dionysios of Syracuse, whose rise to power had been foretold in the dream of a Sicilian priestess; however, Dionysios is never mentioned in Demosthenes’ extant speech. Neither of these allusions concern central details likely to have been included in the written indictment or pre-trial hearings; they are instead matters of rhetorical expansion that can only have been known from the speech itself. The conclusion therefore seems inescapable that these passages allude to elements in the original prosecution speeches that were removed before the speech was published. If they had been effectively criticized by the defence as cases of rhetorical exaggeration, one can even understand the prosecutor’s decision to delete them from his published speech.

⁹ On this programmatic statement and the techniques of intentional omission, selection, and concentration that surely made Thucydides’ record of the speeches different from a transcription, see Dover (1973: 21-27), Cogan (1981: xii-xvii), and Hornblower (1987: 45-72).

¹⁰ See especially his seminal treatment of the problem in Plato’s *Phaedrus*: Derrida (1981: 63-155).

¹¹ As observed by Worthington (1991: 57).

¹² Dover (1968: 168-70).

Even more common are the many cases in which a prosecution speaker anticipates something the defence will say. The defence always had a built-in advantage in trials in that it was able to speak last, refuting every prosecution point and making counter-charges of its own to which the prosecution could not reply. However, the published version of a speech provided the prosecution with just that opportunity, which must have been tempting in Athens' environment of never-ending disputation and zero-sum competition for personal prestige. This must, I think, be the explanation for most of the passages in Attic oratory where a prosecution speaker uses the formula ἀκούω ("I hear") + future infinitive to suggest advance knowledge of what the defence will assert.

However, let us first examine the other possible explanations for such passages, so that we can better isolate those that actually reflect post-delivery revision from those that may reasonably be attributed to other causes. Some predictions of defence arguments are couched in hypothetical terms and may just reflect good guesswork on the part of the speaker. For example, Aeschines' *Against Timarchus* 1.160 starts out with the conditional clause: "if they try to argue that a man has not prostituted himself if he did not make a contract to hire himself out, and demand that I provide witnesses and documentation ...". Given the weakness of Aeschines' case in this regard, it is reasonable for him to expect that the defence will take this line, and so his anticipation of the point is likely to have formed part of the original speech. Similarly, Demosthenes' *Against Timocrates*, which prosecutes the defendant for an illegal proposal, employs the verb οἶμαι ("I believe," 24.190-91) to anticipate the defence argument that the proposed law was merciful, intended to spare citizens from jail. Here too we have fairly clear signposting that the speaker is just making a plausible guess.

Another possible context for prosecution anticipation of defence arguments might be information gleaned from the preliminary hearings that would take place before a case is set for trial. All cases would go through a preliminary procedure known as the *anakrasis*, to determine whether the case was *eisagogimos*. Although our references to this procedure in extant oratory are scanty, it seems to have included the litigants' responding to questions posed by the magistrate and by each other.¹³ Bonner and Smith suggest that the kind of preliminary questions

¹³ On *anakrasis*, see Bonner and Smith (1930: 1.283-93), MacDowell (1978: 240-42), and Harrison (1998: 94-105).

anakrasis resolved would include: “Was the plaintiff eligible to appear in court? Was the defendant qualified to answer the charge or claim? If the defendant failed to appear, had he been duly summoned? Were the documents—plaint or indictment—properly drawn? Was the matter at issue actionable? Was the proper form of action chosen? Did the magistrate have jurisdiction in this case? Was the action brought at the proper time according to law? Was the matter *res judicata*?”¹⁴ One might suppose that skilled litigators would attempt to use the interrogatory format of the *anakrasis* to discover as much as possible about their opponents’ plan of conducting the case, but it is equally likely that skilled litigants on the other side would try to avoid giving away too much information and might even attempt to plant calculated disinformation.¹⁵ There is absolutely no reason to believe that litigants were in any way required to present the whole of their evidence at the *anakrasis* in the way that they did in a case assigned to arbitration. It was not the magistrate’s function at this hearing to make any judgment on the merit of the case itself, but rather on its technical suitability to proceed to trial in a given court.

We might therefore suppose that some of the more technical legal arguments that a prosecutor anticipates from the defence would be based on lines of inquiry pursued in the *anakrasis*. However, information about the broader range of extra-legal arguments, the order of presentation, or particular language of the defence speech would not be revealed at this hearing. Even in the case of legal technicalities, it is striking that prosecution speakers almost never cite the *anakrasis* specifically as their source for “hearing” a given argument of the defence. Instead, we often have the same literary fiction as on other points, implying that the speaker has heard from others that his opponent will say X, Y, and Z. For example, the ἀκούω + future infinitive formula introduces a prediction in Demosthenes’ *Against Timocrates* (24.144-45) that the defendant will cite another statute as precedent for his proposal, proving that it is not illegal. The specificity of this information is sufficient that this passage can hardly be guesswork, but we can readily imagine that citation of a specific case as justifying precedent would indeed be the kind of information proffered at the *anakrasis*. We find a similar citation of precedents predicted in another Demosthenic *graphe paranomon*, the *Against Aristocrates* (23.95, 100). Most striking is *Against Meidias*

¹⁴ Bonner and Smith (1930: 1.289).

¹⁵ See Dorjahn (1935: 274-77), who demonstrates that arbitration procedures were often manipulated for exactly this purpose.

(21.25), where Demosthenes anticipates a jurisdictional argument Meidias will make about the type of lawsuit that should be brought, but specifically prefaces it by saying “it has been reported to me” (ἀπηγγέλετό μοι) by certain people to whom Meidias said it; this formulation seems to exclude the possibility that Demosthenes himself could have heard it at the *anakrasis*, even if he actually did hear it there.

The one explanation for these various predictions of defence arguments that I think we can safely reject is that the prosecutor has actually heard secrets of the defence strategy from mutual acquaintances. Dover has given some credence to this possibility, influenced by an old article of Alfred Dorjahn.¹⁶ While ancient Athens was, like any modern academic community, doubtless a gossipy place,¹⁷ defendants and their advocates had a substantial self-interest at stake in these trials, which they would hardly have wished to jeopardize with loose talk. Broadcasting to others the intimate details of their legal and rhetorical strategies would cause them to lose whatever advantage normally accrued to the defence by speaking last. This is why they are unlikely to have done it. Indeed, it seems more likely that they might try to throw their opponents off course by spreading disinformation concerning their plans.

Let us now turn to a handful of prosecution speeches and examine within each one of them the various ways defence arguments are anticipated. The conclusion is inescapable that at least some of these cannot be explained as clever guesswork, deductions from preliminary hearings, or mere gossip, but must be attributed to post-delivery revision. Demosthenes’ earliest speech of public prosecution was that *Against Androtion* from 355 BC. Here we do not yet encounter the dramatic pretence of “hearing” these arguments from mutual acquaintances. At several points, the prosecutor anticipates technical legal arguments Androtion will use, but he uses present-tense verbs such as φησί (22.5-6 “he says”), ἐπιχειρεῖ λέγειν (22.21 “he undertakes to say”), or the conditional ... ἐὰν φῆ (22.33 “if he says”), suggesting that he is already saying these things. Many of these legal positions are precisely the sort of issue one might expect to be raised at the *anakrasis*, especially the jurisdictional arguments of 22.21-23 and 33-34; to the extent that these arguments have already been raised, the present tense marks them appropriately. However, the prosecutor also anticipates some of the more

¹⁶ Dover (1968: 169-70), citing Dorjahn (1935).

¹⁷ For the nature of gossip in Athenian society, see the useful discussions of Dover (1988: 45-52), Hunter (1990), and Lewis (1996: 9-23).

rhetorical and emotional arguments that Androtion will try. In 22.42, he uses οἶμαι (“I believe”) + future infinitive to suggest that Androtion will assert that the prosecution stems precisely from his effectiveness as a tax collector; this assertion could be good guesswork, but is specific enough to arouse our suspicion. In 22.35-38 he anticipates at greater length an argument that all five hundred councillors are impugned by the prosecution, and even imagines specific individuals leaping to the Council’s defence. Again, this is not really a legal argument and is specific enough that it could reflect post-delivery revision. It seems strange that the prosecutor would respond to the point at such length if it were a mere guess whether the defence would even utilize this strategy.

The most significant cases of post-delivery revision can be identified in the series of high-profile legal confrontations between Aeschines and Demosthenes. It seems unlikely that Demosthenes ever chose to publish his speech *For Timarchus*, since the case was a spectacular success for his opponent despite less than compelling evidence and it would have seemed better for Demosthenes not to continue harnessing his own reputation to a now discredited ally. The triumphant Aeschines did however choose to publish the oration *Against Timarchus*, and sweetened his victory even further by adding to it multiple attacks and insinuations against the various enemies he wished to link with Timarchos, especially Demosthenes, while at the same time refuting the various charges they had apparently made against him at the trial. In 1.71 he refers to arguments about lack of witnesses that he anticipates from Hegesander, whom he had earlier accused of being one of Timarchos’ lovers, and Krobylos, while in 1.119 he claims that Demosthenes demands tax records proving that Timarchos had paid a prostitution tax, and at 1.123 says he will demand to know the specific locations where the acts occurred. In 1.94, he merely designates Demosthenes as the “logographer,” who will accuse Aeschines of contradicting himself by claiming that Timarchos both prostituted himself and had an inheritance to squander; in 1.125-26, he says Demosthenes will attack the credibility of common report. What is striking in this series of responses is that Aeschines seems to know precisely which argument each of the several defence speakers will make. Weighing the evidence or pointing out contradictions in the opponent’s arguments would not have been the province of the *anakrisis*. The specificity of this information goes far beyond what could merely be guessed.

Aeschines is particularly anxious in the published version of the speech to respond to the personal attacks upon him by the defence.¹⁸ In 1.132-35, he uses ... ὡς ἀκούω to claim that he has “heard” that one of the generals will mount the platform, giving himself airs and supremely self-conscious, to defend the noble institution of pederasty, citing Harmodios and Aristogeiton, Achilles and Patroklos, and the righteous praise by all men of beauty linked with character. He will moreover claim that Aeschines himself has a notorious reputation as a pederast with many poems and lovers’ quarrels to his credit. Aeschines proceeds to devote the next twenty-five paragraphs to defending himself against this evidence by distinguishing between the noble, spiritual pederasty he has practised and the debased, prostituted form of Timarchos. This entire section of the speech must be a post-delivery revision: it is hardly credible that Aeschines could have guessed the content of the general’s speech or that such emotional, rhetorical arguments could have formed part of the *anakrasis*. It is even less credible that Timarchos’ advocates would have gossiped in such detail about the specific legendary examples they would use or the nature of the evidence they had about Aeschines’ amatory adventures.

Similarly, close to the end of the speech, in 1.166-69, Aeschines predicts that Demosthenes will drag Philip into the case and even make nasty insinuations about Aeschines’ fondness for the ten-year-old Alexander. It might have been predictable enough that Demosthenes would accuse Aeschines of collusion with Philip, since this was the basis of the original lawsuit that the prosecution of Timarchos was meant to forestall. The bit about Alexander is, however, hardly consequential or credible enough to be worth an anticipatory reply, but one can well imagine its inclusion in a published speech in which Aeschines was anxious to refute every miscellaneous point of his opponent.

Of course, sixteen years later, by the time of the *Against Ctesiphon*, it was altogether predictable that Demosthenes would denounce Aeschines for his connections with both Philip and Alexander (3.215), but even at this point Aeschines maintains the dramatic fiction that he has learned about his opponent’s strategy by “inquiry from others” (πυθάνομαι λέξειν). In addition to anticipating and refuting several of Demosthenes’ technical legal arguments (3.13, 28, 35-36), the speech *Against Ctesi-*

¹⁸ I have previously argued this point in Hubbard (1998: 67-68). Carey (2000: 55 n.97) prefers to take Aeschines at his word that he has heard about the defence strategy through gossip.

phon is particularly notable for its detailed rhetorical criticism and mockery of Demosthenes' oration *On the Crown*. Aeschines displays a level of familiarity with that speech's structure, language, and imagery that can only be explained by actually having heard it before he incorporated these passages into his own speech. For example, he knows that Ktesiphon himself will only deliver a short prelude to Demosthenes' speech (3.201-2); he proceeds to criticize the order of topics within Demosthenes' speech, warning the audience to insist on the proper canonical arrangement, in which the legal issue of accountability for his office should be first addressed (3.202-6). Since Demosthenes programmatically asks for the audience's indulgence in permitting him to order his speech as he sees fit in the prologue of *On the Crown* (18.2), Aeschines' remarks on the topic seem directed against that very request. Aeschines also says that Demosthenes will devote a "long discourse" (πολὺν λόγον) to redefining his office as one not subject to the usual rules on accountability (3.28).

At several points, Aeschines refers to specific language and turns of phrase Demosthenes will use, such as Demosthenes' comparison of Aeschines to a doctor who advises the family of the deceased how he might have been saved after the fact (3.225 ≈ 18.243). Similarly, he refers to Demosthenes' invoking the example of the boxer Philammon, who won an Olympic crown by defeating his contemporaries, not the greatest boxers of the past like Glaukos (3.189 ≈ 18.319). In both cases, Aeschines again employs the fiction that he has discovered the content of Demosthenes' speech through "report or inquiry" (πυθάνομαι). Aeschines utilizes the same verb in 3.228, where he says Demosthenes will compare his rhetoric with the Sirens' song; however, we find no such metaphor in *On the Crown*. Similarly, Demosthenes never uses the catchwords ἄφικτον λόγον ("irrefutable argument") or εὐνοίας εὐθύνα ("audit of good intentions") that Aeschines puts into his mouth in 3.17, even though the general line of argument that Aeschines imputes to him in that paragraph does appear (18.111-18). The passage 3.216 also mentions some specific charges against Aeschines that we do not find in our version of *On the Crown*. These discrepancies, together with the passages we earlier noted where Demosthenes referred to something in Aeschines' speech that was not there, suggest that both written versions appeared more or less simultaneously, since each appears to respond to

the oral version of their opponent's speech rather than to the version we possess.¹⁹

In the two earlier speeches of the embassy trial in 343 BC, we see even closer correspondences.²⁰ The most recent editor of Demosthenes 19, Douglas MacDowell, reckons that the speech as we have it is much too long to have been actually delivered in court;²¹ indeed, it is almost twice as long as Aeschines' speech in defence. Although conceding that speeches often were redacted for publication after delivery and that this was probably the case with Aeschines 2, MacDowell argues that Demosthenes 19 could not have been so edited; it was instead a manuscript of possible arguments for use at the trial that Demosthenes prepared for his own use some time in advance and never intended for publication, which was found among his papers after his death.²² This explanation for the length of the extant speech seems inherently unlikely. Surely as experienced an orator as Demosthenes knew how long a speech he could fit into the allotted time and would prepare a draft that carefully selected the most effective arguments to use within that limited period, rather than composing a speech that was at least fifty percent too long and deciding extemporaneously which parts to leave out; the court's water clock did not give the speaker a yellow light to tell him that he had only ten minutes left. Moreover, as Paulsen's list of responsive passages in Aeschines shows, there is hardly any part of Demosthenes' extant speech to which Aeschines does not reply in some form; this suggests that no substantial section or line of argument can have been left out of the speech that Aeschines knew.

MacDowell's conviction that Demosthenes 19 cannot have been a post-delivery redaction stems entirely from an erroneous interpretation of certain passages pertaining to another ambassador, Philokrates: Aeschines (2.6) responds to an argument he attributes to Demosthenes, to the effect that it would be inconsistent for Athens to acquit Aeschines of treason after having condemned Philokrates to death, since he in ef-

¹⁹ See Schaefer (1856-1858: 3.2.72-81) for other examples of passages where the speeches seem to respond to something not in the extant version of their opponent's speech. Like me, he concludes that both were redacted prior to publication.

²⁰ Paulsen (1999: 423-31) provides an exhaustive list of the parallel points each speaker makes, but reaches the curious conclusion that the number is so great as to exclude significant post-delivery revision, although he does concede that some limited revision must have occurred.

²¹ MacDowell (2000: 22-23), criticizing the thesis of Worthington (1989: 204-7) that some trials could take longer than one day.

²² MacDowell (2000: 24-25).

fect admitted his guilt by fleeing into exile. Yet Demosthenes nowhere in his extant speech makes such a remark, but instead refers to Philokrates as if he is still in Athens (19.206) and has not yet been punished (19.138, 229-31, 328). Owing to this inconsistency, MacDowell follows Blass and others in believing that Demosthenes 19 must have been written quite some time before the actual trial of either Philokrates or Aeschines.²³ However, at least three other explanations are possible: (1) Philokrates' trial may have occurred after that of Aeschines, in which case Aeschines 2.6 must have been a passage later added to his published version, perhaps in response to something Demosthenes said after the trial; or (2) Demosthenes chose to leave out of his published speech the remark that Aeschines 2.6 attributes to him, precisely because Aeschines had such a clever retort to it, whether in his oral or published speech; or finally (3) Demosthenes never actually made the remark at all, but merely implied it through his repeated association of Aeschines and Philokrates, and Aeschines feels the need to respond to the implication.²⁴ Moreover, it is not so clear that Demosthenes' speech actually does refer to Philokrates as still in Athens or unpunished: the passage in 19.206 need not be construed so literally, but τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει ...; ("Who of those in the city . . .?") could just be a periphrasis for "what citizen?" and the men who are referred to as paying no penalty in 19.138, 231, and 328 may refer to the ambassadors other than Philokrates.²⁵ Indeed, Paulsen has plausibly argued that Philokrates' flight and trial likely occurred some months before and were what inspired Demosthenes to think the time opportune to resurrect his prosecution of Aeschines, which he had seemingly abandoned in the wake of his disastrous collaboration with Timarchos three years earlier.²⁶ In Paulsen's view, Demosthenes does not mention Philokrates' flight and condemna-

²³ Blass (1887: 3.1.363-65); see also Weil (1883-1886: 1.234-36). However, unlike MacDowell, they both believe that other passages do point to post-delivery revision. They do not explain why Demosthenes would not have also revised those passages dealing with Philokrates.

²⁴ For this last possibility, see Harris (1995: 10). In his view, the jurors would not remember that Demosthenes had not said this *expressis verbis*, but only implied it.

²⁵ For this view of the passages, see Paulsen (1999: 444-45). Alternatively, one could explain the last three passages as including Philokrates, but considering him "unpunished" in the sense that he "got away," i.e., fled to Philip's protection before the Athenians could exact the penalty.

²⁶ Paulsen (1999: 443-44).

tion *in absentia* because he did not need to; everyone was already aware of it, and his rhetorical task was to connect him with Aeschines.

Demosthenes' prosecution speech does anticipate Aeschines' defence at multiple points. Close to the end, he claims that someone has just now in front of the court told him that Aeschines will attack the general Chares (19.332), as he indeed does at some length (2.70-73), even though it is relatively extraneous to his case. Even if we accept that the last-minute discovery of this news is a piece of dramatic fiction, MacDowell's thesis requires that Demosthenes had heard the details of his opponent's defence long before the actual trial, since in his view Demosthenes' text was entirely fixed before Philokrates' trial. At no fewer than three points (19.88, 95, 336), Demosthenes warns the jury that Aeschines will attempt to distract them from the issue of bribery with "encomia of peace" (ὄλως ἐγκώμι' εἰρήνης ἐρεῖ, 19.88), as he indeed does in a sweeping historical survey (2.172-77) that denounces the war party throughout Athens' history as foreigners and schemers. Although Demosthenes might reasonably foresee that Aeschines would attempt to defend the particular peace treaty he had helped negotiate, it is uncannily prescient to anticipate that Aeschines will embark on a general encomium of peace.²⁷

In 19.234-36, Demosthenes predicts that Aeschines will attempt to argue that Demosthenes himself approved of the negotiations at the time because he entertained the ambassadors, but says that Aeschines will cloud the issue by "not distinguishing when" (19.235 τὸ πότε οὐ διορίζων). Indeed, Aeschines does conflate the first and second embassy when he mentions this matter in 2.121-22; moreover, Demosthenes' eagerness to explain why his entertainment was so lavish makes sense as a response to Aeschines' remarks at 2.111. Although Demosthenes might have been able to predict that Aeschines would say something about this matter, the specificity of his knowledge about how Aeschines will treat the incident can only come from having heard the actual speech.²⁸

²⁷ MacDowell (2000: 25) characterizes this passage as "a general survey of peace and war in Athenian history, which is a rather different matter." However, the bias of Aeschines' narrative is clearly to praise the peacemakers and malign the war party.

²⁸ See Paulsen (1999: 439-40). MacDowell (2000: 26) attempts to dismiss this passage by saying that Aeschines' chronology does not confuse the two passages when he first mentions the dinner (2.45-46), but Demosthenes is correct in predicting that he will cloud the matter by confusing them at another point in his speech.

Similarly, at 19.182, Demosthenes says he has learned that Aeschines will complain of having to submit to “audit” (εὐθύνας) “alone of those speaking among the citizens” (μόνος τῶν ἐν τῷ δήμῳ λεγόντων), because of mere “words” (λόγων). Demosthenes goes on to assert that mere words can indeed be culpable if bought through bribery. His prediction of Aeschines’ actual language at 2.178 is too exact to be mere guesswork or something heard through the grapevine: Aeschines does indeed complain that he “alone” (μόνος) has to submit to “audit” (εὐθύνας) when he is only “in control of words” (τῶν λόγων κύριον), not deeds.²⁹ Another case of close linguistic anticipation is in 19.188-91, where Demosthenes defends himself against what will be a *leitmotif* in Aeschines’ speech, namely the implication that he has betrayed his “fellow ambassadors” (συμπρέσβειων, 19.188 ≈ συμπρέσβειων, Aeschin. 2.22), those who “make libations together” (συσπένδουσιν, 19.190 ≈ ὁμοσπόνδων, Aeschin. 2.163), those who “dine together” (συνδειπνοῦσιν, 19.190 ≈ συσσίτων, Aeschin. 2.22, 163), and has forgotten “their common table and libations” (ποῦ τράπεζα; ποῦ σπονδαί; 19.189 ≈ οὔτε σπόνδων οὔτε τραπέζης φροντίσας, Aeschin. 2.183).³⁰

Close to one-third of Demosthenes’ extant speech consists of passages anticipating his opponent’s arguments (19.72-82, 88-90, 95-97, 120-49, 182-220, 236-40, 288-99, 331-43). Given that Demosthenes would have been hard pressed to fit his speech into the time allotted, one must wonder whether he would really choose to expend so much time anticipating points that he does not know for certain will even be in his opponent’s speech. Since the rebuttal sections are dispersed throughout the course of his speech, these hardly constitute material that he could choose to leave out at the end if he sees that he might be running short

²⁹ MacDowell (2000: 25-26) takes Demosthenes at his word that he has heard this through a mutual friend (ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθάνομαι, “as I learn”), even while dismissing as “fictional spontaneity” the similar claim in 19.332 about someone just now in front of the court telling him about Aeschines’ plan to attack Chares. Are we really to believe that orators were so indiscreet before a trial that they would drop hints about a particular turn of phrase they were planning to use?

³⁰ Demosthenes again resorts to a dramatic fiction to explain how he is able to know this in advance: he claims that Aeschines has been “going around declaring these things in a tragic manner” (ταῦτα γὰρ τραγωδεῖ περιών, 19.189), making a jibe at his opponent’s background as an actor. Aeschines himself clearly responds to Demosthenes’ critique of his colourful language in a passage (2.22) that was probably added to his own published version after he had read Demosthenes’ parody of his words.

of time during actual delivery. On the other hand, if we subtract these sections, considering them additions to the speech at the time of its publication, the overall length of the speech that was actually delivered would be entirely appropriate for a one-day trial.

There is no doubt that Aeschines' speech must have been redacted for publication after the trial, because it refers to specific anecdotes in Demosthenes' speech.³¹ Even if we assume that these were addressed on the day of the trial in Aeschines' oral speech, they cannot have formed part of any written text Aeschines had prepared in advance, but were inserted later either to reflect what Aeschines actually said in response or as inventions of what he wished he had said. I think the latter possibility is more likely in many cases: Aeschines' responses seem too calculated and well prepared to have been merely brilliant outbursts of courtroom improvisation. Could he really have foreseen Demosthenes' anecdote about the actor Satyros intervening to rescue two maidens (19.193-95), or the allegedly invented story about Aeschines himself manhandling an Olynthian woman (19.196-98), to have been able to refute them so neatly with witnesses (2.153-57)?³² Neither event was in any way central to Demosthenes' indictment or likely to have been mentioned at the *anakrisis*.

Of the two published speeches, Demosthenes' is likely to have been the first to circulate, perhaps out of a desire to vindicate his unsuccessful prosecution and tarnish his victorious opponent's image in the court of public memory. Aeschines does seem to respond in 2.22 to a passage that we have argued must have been unique to Demosthenes' published speech (19.188-91). Moreover, Demosthenes criticizes Aeschines' tendency to blame others by giving what appears to be a catalogue of whom he will attack and in what order (19.72 "first the Lakedaimonians, then the Phokians, then Hegesippos"). Information about the order of a defendant's topics is hardly likely to have been available to the prosecu-

³¹ Schaefer (1856-1858: 3.2.68-72) and Paulsen (1999: 420-46) share my view that both speeches were redacted by their authors prior to publication, although the latter believes the changes were limited in scope.

³² Aeschines claims in this passage to have introduced Aristophanes of Olynthos as a witness to Demosthenes' attempt to bribe him to support this fabricated story, but if Aeschines actually had refuted this charge so compellingly at the original trial, one is surprised that Demosthenes leaves this story in the published version of his speech. Just as likely is the possibility that Aeschines' witnesses are a fabrication. On the other hand, Aeschines' witnesses at 2.86, refuting Demosthenes' charge that he had driven away Kersobleptes' ambassador Kritoboulos, were probably real, since Demosthenes chose to drop this issue in the published version of his speech.

tor until he has heard the defence speech, but what Demosthenes says here does not correspond to the structure of Aeschines' speech as we have it, since neither the Lakedaimonians nor Hegesippos are topics at all. Accordingly, Demosthenes must refer to the oral version of Aeschines' speech here with no awareness that the selection and order of topics will be different in the written version.³³ On the other hand, those passages in which Aeschines refers to something not in the written version of Demosthenes' speech (for instance, 2.10 on the dream of the Syracusan priestess or 2.86 on driving Kritoboulos away from the ceremonies—see n.32 above) concern vivid anecdotes that people might still remember from the oral speech, even if Demosthenes had edited them out of his published speech.

The published versions of forensic speeches clearly had a very different audience from the original speech delivered to the jury. The limited level of Athenian literacy suggests a rather small elite as readers. Interesting conclusions might be drawn concerning the ways that the social class of the audience would affect the type of evidence and arguments employed in each version. I demonstrated in a previous study that the entire section of the *Against Timarchus* in which Aeschines defends a noble, Platonic version of pederasty in contrast to Timarchos' self-indulgent dissipation must have been unique to the published version, since it responded to personal attacks on Aeschines' own pederasty in the defence speeches; such reflections, replete with a series of literary quotations, would clearly appeal to an upper-class, educated readership more than to the masses, and would thus support a view of pederasty as an institution more widely practised among the elite.³⁴ Similarly, the detailed, point-by-point rhetorical criticism of Demosthenes' language and arrangement that Aeschines undertakes in the *Against Ctesiphon* is likely aimed at an audience interested in studying rhetoric, as we can imagine with the many examples of detailed legal *Auseinandersetzung* that we find in other published speeches. This class analysis of Athenian oratory must however await further exploration in another paper.

³³ Paulsen (1999: 437-38) thinks that this passage is mere guesswork on Demosthenes' part, but ignores the fact that Demosthenes posits a specific order to the topics, which can hardly be a matter of educated conjecture.

³⁴ Hubbard (1998: 67-68).

Bibliography

- Adams, C. D. (1912). "Are the Political Speeches of Demosthenes to be Regarded as Political Pamphlets?" *TAPhA* 43: 5-22.
- Adams, C. D. (1938). "Speeches VIII and X of the Demosthenic Corpus." *CPh* 33: 129-44.
- Blass, F. (1887). *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, 2nd ed. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Bonner, R. J., and G. Smith (1930). *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, 2 vols. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Bringmann, K. (1965). *Studien zu den politischen Ideen des Isokrates*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Canfora, L. (1988). "Discours écrit/discours réel chez Démosthène." In *Les Savoirs de l'écriture en Grèce ancienne*, M. Detienne, ed.: 211-20. Lille: Presses Universitaire de Lille.
- Carey, C. (2000). *Aeschines*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.
- Cogan, M. (1981). *The Human Thing: the Speeches and Principles of Thucydides' History*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Daitz, S. G. (1957). "The Relationship of the *De Chersoneso* and the *Philippica Quarta* of Demosthenes." *CPh* 52: 145-62.
- Danzig, G. (2003). "Apologizing for Socrates: Plato and Xenophon on Socrates' Behavior in Court." *TAPhA* 133: 281-321.
- Derrida, J. (1981). *Dissemination*, transl. B. Johnson. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Detienne, M. (1967). *Les maîtres de vérité dans la Grèce archaïque*. Paris: Maspero.
- Dorjahn, A. P. (1935). "Anticipation of Arguments in Athenian Courts." *TAPhA* 66: 274-95.
- Dover, K. J. (1968). *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Dover, K. J. (1973). *Thucydides*. Greece & Rome New Surveys in the Classics, 7. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Dover, K. J. (1988). *The Greeks and their Legacy: Collected Papers*, Vol.2. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gagarin, M. (2002). *Antiphon the Athenian: Oratory, Law, and Justice in the Age of the Sophists*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.
- Hahn, K. (1910). *Demosthenis contiones num re vera in contione habitae sint quaeritur*. Giessen: Kindt.
- Hansen, M. H. (1984). "Two Notes on Demosthenes' Symboleutic Speeches." *C&M* 35: 57-70.
- Harris, E. M. (1995). *Aeschines and Athenian Politics*. New York and Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Harrison, A. R. W. (1998). *The Law of Athens*, Vol. 2: *Procedure*, 2nd ed. London: Duckworth.
- Hornblower, S. (1987). *Thucydides*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Hubbard, T. K. (1998). "Popular Perceptions of Elite Homosexuality in Classical Athens." *Arion* ser. 3, 6.1: 48-78.

- Hunter, V. (1990). "Gossip and the Politics of Reputation in Classical Athens." *Phoenix* 44: 299-325.
- Kennedy, G. (1963). *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Lavency, M. (1964). *Aspects de la logographie judiciaire attique*. Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain.
- Lewis, S. (1996). *News and Society in the Greek Polis*. London: Duckworth.
- MacDowell, D. M. (1978). *The Law in Classical Athens*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- MacDowell, D. M. (2000). *Demosthenes: On the False Embassy*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Masaracchia, A. (1995). *Isocrate: retorica e politica*. Rome: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale.
- Mathieu, G. (1925). *Les idées politiques d'Isocrate*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Meyer, E. (1909). "Isokrates' zweiter Brief an Philipp und Demosthenes' zweite Philippika." *SPA* 31: 758-779.
- Paulsen, T. (1999). *Die Parapresbeia-Reden des Demosthenes und des Aischines*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.
- Poulakos, T. (1997). *Speaking for the Polis: Isocrates' Rhetorical Education*. Columbia: Univ. of South Carolina Press.
- Pucci, P. (2002). *Xenophon: Socrates' Defense*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Schaefer, A. (1856-1858). *Demosthenes und seine Zeit*, 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Schwartz, E. (1894). *Demosthenes erste Philippika*. Marburg: Elwert.
- Trevett, J. (1996). "Did Demosthenes Publish his Deliberative Speeches?" *Hermes* 124: 425-41.
- Vrijlandt, P. (1919). *De Apologia Xenophontea cum Platonica comparata*. Leiden: Sijthoff.
- Waerdt, P. A. van der (1993). "Socratic Justice and Self-Sufficiency: The Story of the Delphic Oracle in Xenophon's Apology of Socrates." *OSAPh* 11: 1-48.
- Weil, H. (1883-1886). *Les plaidoyers politiques de Démosthène*, 2 vols., 2nd ed. Paris: Hachette.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1907). "Die griechische Literatur des Altertums." In *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache*, 2nd ed., U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff et al., eds.: 3-238. Berlin and Leipzig: Teubner.
- Worthington, I. (1989). "The Duration of an Athenian Political Trial." *JHS* 109: 204-7.
- Worthington, I. (1991). "Greek Oratory, Revision of Speeches and the Problem of Historical Reliability." *C&M* 42: 55-74.

CHAPTER TEN

DIALECTIC IN DIALOGUE: THE MESSAGE OF PLATO'S *PROTAGORAS* AND ARISTOTLE'S *TOPICS*¹

HAN BALTUSSEN

If ever there was a dialogue of Plato from which one could get the impression that Sokrates is a sophist, it is the *Protagoras*:² the setting, main characters and the debating style all seem to point in that direction. First impressions, however, can be deceiving. Sokrates is competing with sophists and, although familiar with the debating rules, he does not always abide by them. His behaviour is also out of character, most markedly in that he has clear opinions on matters. My working hypothesis is that we can make better sense of the dialogue if we can assess why Sokrates is pitted against the sophists in this way.³

In this paper I intend to show that a well-informed reading of the debating technique in this dialogue is the key to unlocking the message underlying the confusing role-reversals and un-Socratic behaviour of Sokrates. An investigation into the oral background of this dialogue may

¹ The idea for this paper (cf. Baltussen 2004, n.11) arose during a postgraduate seminar on the *Protagoras* at Kings College London 2000-1 organised by M. M. McCabe, Verity Harte, and Peter Adamson, where I learned a lot from the weekly discussions. I am grateful to the organiser of the Orality conference, Anne Mackay, for providing encouragement and a perfect platform for presenting my views on this topic, and to the audience for stimulating comments (in particular Michael Gagarin, Edwin Carawan and Ruth Scodel). My interpretation of the *Topics* goes back to my PhD thesis of 1993 (re-issued in revised form as Baltussen [2000]; see also Baltussen [1992] and 1996).

² See Taylor (2006) for a new examination of the similarities between Sokrates and the sophists.

³ Different interpretations of the encounter have been offered: Gagarin (1969: 144) suggests that Sokrates and Protagoras have more in common than is usually acknowledged, and takes Plato to be aiming for wider acceptance of some of Protagoras' views; Guthrie (1956: 22) offers a compromise in seeing Sokrates as engaging the sophist in a discussion on virtue without pushing through his own view "in a genuine attempt to put their views in the most favourable light." I offer my interpretation of the exchange between Sokrates and Protagoras as complementary to those of Gagarin and Frede (1992), while I disagree with Guthrie on the message of the dialogue.

lead to further insight into its broader message. I will explore the value of Plato's *Protagoras* for our knowledge of dialectical debating practices in Athens (and possibly in the Academy as well), by looking at the dialogue as a written record of oral debating techniques. I here follow up a hunch of Michael Frede, who already remarked in passing that the dialogue probably could yield valuable information on this aspect.⁴ Although he himself says much to clarify the dialogue in this regard, he did not pursue the matter systematically. It may initially seem somewhat paradoxical or nonsensical to try and demonstrate that a Platonic dialogue would resemble real debates in the Academy. I am not, however, disputing the real-life connection which undoubtedly resides in this work, but wanting rather to disentangle from the fictional dialogue those elements which represent that connection beyond the parody, bias and other literary devices. In addition, since the debate contains a rejection of a certain discussion style (see Section 3 below), Plato seems intent on raising the question of how to conduct a proper discussion on education and moral issues in the dialogue itself. This self-referential aspect needs to be taken into account, as it is such a prominent feature in the encounter between Sokrates and Protagoras.

A second and connected thread of interest for the orality and literacy theme of this collection of essays is the references to Sokrates' memory at several stages. As so often, Plato uses the ploy of the "straight man" for the purpose of audience manipulation. Here Plato's collusion with the audience contributes to the comic effect of the dialogue, but it also forces the audience (or readers?) to retrace the steps of the argument. An important factor here is that long speeches are portrayed as a manipulative tool bringing on forgetfulness. Both protagonists are in fact guilty of this, despite statements to the contrary.⁵ Thus memory and its limitations become an integrated part of the dialogical strategy, reinforcing the point about the discussion format.

With an initial focus on these two aspects I shall argue that the way in which the playful debate between Sokrates and Protagoras is being described shows up striking similarities with the more serious and systematic account of dialectic as found in Aristotle's *Topics* 8. Their ex-

⁴ Frede (1992: xv): "The *Protagoras* is perhaps the most important source of knowledge about this [general dialectical] practice, a source which has not yet been sufficiently explored."

⁵ See, e.g., Sokrates' long monologue 319a-320c, Protagoras' long speech 320d-328d, and the next note.

changes include comments on how to proceed in their debate, selecting in almost democratic fashion and with audience participation from the agreed methods of either “long answers” (monologue) or short question-and-answer (dialogue).⁶ I believe that these aspects can be given sharper contours and context by using the Aristotelian work as an external check on Plato’s fictional representation of debating, allowing us to compare the dialogical *practice* with the dialectical *theory*. A reader armed with the necessary knowledge of Aristotle’s detailed account can easily confirm Frede’s hunch (and correct Guthrie’s compromise [n.3 above]), when we look more closely at both these ancient works. In other words, the similarities are there for the taking and chart an interesting development in dialectical techniques from the sophists to Aristotle. This part of my analysis will be relatively uncontroversial.

In contrast, there are to my mind also important implications resulting from this comparative analysis, which may provoke scepticism. They concern two conundrums associated with the *Protagoras*: the uncharacteristic portrayal of Sokrates as someone with strong opinions, and the troubling lack of commitment to views discussed by both protagonists. Here I shall propose that the confused and confusing nature of the discussion on this point is intentional on Plato’s part, because he wants to encourage us to think that in education and ethics a non-committal debate in the traditional style leads us nowhere.

After some preliminary considerations regarding Plato’s dialogical practice (Section 1) and Aristotle’s notion of dialectic (Section 2), a discussion of the most significant passages in the *Protagoras* will illustrate how the technical aspects can be picked out. The conclusion seeks to evaluate further how this can assist in assessing the fictionality of the dialogue, but also in understanding why, despite its announced central theme (the teachability of virtue), we find quite a variety of opinions, which in addition become detached from their speakers in a most unexpected way. I will suggest that theme and message are connected but distinct, and that Plato seems to indicate that in order to create a new morality there is a need for a *new orality* separated from the sophistical analysis of poetry (340c-48a).

⁶ See, e.g., 320c “story,” 324d-e “plain argument” (*both* appear at 328c3); cf. 333c, 334d, 338c-d, 341d, 348a-b. Protagoras is said to be capable of both 335bc, but other passages represent him as being uncomfortable with question-and-answer (e.g., 335a). Sokrates claims he prefers short question-and-answer (335c), but does not practise what he preaches (on Sokrates’ long speeches see previous note, and Gagarin [1969: 148]).

1. *Dialogical practice: Plato's Protagoras*

Plato's *Protagoras* is a particularly rich dialogue, in framing, in themes, and in subthemes: most central, at least on the surface, is a discussion of the teachability of virtue, but we also find passages devoted to such topics as the measuring of praise and blame, Plato's preference for interactive discourse, his dislike of sophistic approaches to education, and the role of texts in education. This variety of themes, resulting from the different perspectives of the interlocutors, is partly due to the fact that the dialogue is situated in the circle of Sophists. Plato is clearly making a more general point about this environment in relation to the theme of education and the teachability of virtue. From our perspective it is very appropriate that he has chosen Protagoras as the main character for his treatment of debating styles: the later tradition attributes to Protagoras the honour of having pioneered dialectical jousting by introducing competitions (Diog. Laert. 9.52: λόγων ἀγῶνας), the so-called Socratic discussion method (9.53: τὸ Σωκρατικὸν εἶδος τῶν λόγων), and the eristic disputes on how to attack or defend any given proposition (9.53: πρῶτος κατεδείξε τὰς πρὸς τὰς θέσεις ἐπιχειρήσεις). Plato was no doubt aware of this, although Diogenes' summative statement is of course a more systematic assessment from hindsight. In parallel, it is noteworthy that Plato himself is acknowledged as the pioneer in introducing the question and answer technique *into dialogue* (Diog. Laert. 3.24).

The *Protagoras* is also an extremely funny work: it contains striking characterisations of the speakers: for instance, the young Hippokrates who like an excited puppy wakes Sokrates before sunrise in order that his more senior friend may introduce him to the grand old man Protagoras who is visiting Athens (309d);⁷ or the pomp of the Sophist Hippias (347a-b) and pettiness of Prodikos (337a-c)⁸; or Sokrates' conceit about his limited abilities and knowledge (Section 3.3 below), and so on. Of course most of Plato's dialogues have dramatic power, but the *Protagoras* is in parts as close as Plato gets to writing comedy, an ob-

⁷ Fröhlich (2004: 73-4, 80-1) suggests the prelude is meant to test the reader in the same way Sokrates tests Hippokrates on the grounds that the reason for waiting (because it is too early to enter) turns out to be a pretext on Plato's part when we find out that Kallias' place is already very crowded when they arrive.

⁸ Despite the comical characterisation of Prodikos, Plato is using him to allude in subtle ways to themes of major sections of the dialogue (Gagarin 1969, 150 n.35).

servation already made in antiquity.⁹ The liveliness comes across in the characterization of individuals, especially the cheeky satirical streak in the portrayal of Protagoras and Sokrates (e.g., 328d). Nonetheless, Sokrates' respect for Protagoras is also clear, so that we cannot simply say the dialogue is a full-blown attack on all sophists and their methods. Plato's respect for the leading intellectual of the sophistic movement shines through in clear recognition of his debt to him.¹⁰

It is not merely the choice of protagonists or the liveliness of the debate that justifies a closer look at this dialogue and its significance for orality and literacy. Instead of relying on the rather general argument that these dialogues can be regarded as representations of debating practices intelligible to a contemporary audience, I want to show that we can be much more accurate in assessing how close these dialogues are to actual debates on the basis of the external evidence in Aristotle.

Plato has given us an encounter between a young Sokrates and an old Protagoras, thus making the encounter itself an illustration of the issue discussed: the dialogue shows how a wise man with long experience might teach the young, but also how the clash of generations was playing out in Athens.¹¹ When it comes, however, to the positions on education that they assume, it is a moot point whether they are genuine.¹² In fact, the starting positions on the question of whether virtuous behaviour can be taught, a view firmly held by Protagoras in the early stages of the conversation (*Prt.* 319b) and rejected by Sokrates, have become reversed at the end of the discussion (361a-b). Overall, the forthrightness of Sokrates in this dialogue is quite out of character (for instance, 319b and 320b).

Secondly, whilst a lot of space is given to the debate between Protagoras and Sokrates, towards the end they abandon the discussion conducted in the spirit of dialectic that is characterized by question-and-

⁹ Cf. the verdict of Athenaeus 11.506 (quoted by Wolfsdorf [1998: 129 n.18]): "Plato's wonderful *Protagoras* in addition to attacking numerous poets and Sophists, out-dramatizes even Eupolis' *The Flatterers* in its treatment of Callias' lifestyle." See also Guthrie (1975: 235), and Long (2005: 1). Wolfsdorf (1997: 224) dates Eupolis' play to 421 BC.

¹⁰ Here I am in agreement with Gagarin (1969: 133-4, 150, and 163).

¹¹ Cf. Gagarin (1969: 164): "if the reader himself learns something about *arete* from reading the *Protagoras*, then the dialogue itself is direct proof that *arete* is indeed teachable."

¹² See esp. McCabe (2000: 29-32) on the problem of genuine opinions in Socratic conversation, and Wolfsdorf (2004) on how Sokrates' (dis)avowal of knowledge depends heavily on the context.

answer, and Sokrates proposes they test their own opinions. This surprising comment, implying they have so far done otherwise, seems to be a move towards a different debating style, which tries to get away from sophistical techniques of the kind used by Protagoras, in particular in the famous Simonides passage.¹³ It is my claim that Aristotle's account of dialectic can throw further light on these two puzzles. In the next section I start with some comments on Aristotelian dialectic. This will prepare for the comparative analysis indicating what kind of similarities with the *Topics* we can find, and what these imply for the "message" of the dialogue (Section 3).

2. *Dialectical theory: Aristotle's Topics*

Aristotle's work on dialectic, the *Topics*, is thought to be largely a product of his time in the Academy, but with significant additions and elaborations.¹⁴ It is probably one of his most neglected works.¹⁵ In many ways this is understandable as the central books (2-7) consist of a "database" of some three hundred *topoi* which have a rather technical nature: propositions are categorized into four main groups, the so-called *predicables*.¹⁶ These debating strategies are sandwiched between an introductory book which sets out the aim and value of the dialectical method, and a more general description of how the debates were practised and regulated (8th and last book of the *Topics*). Books 1 and 8 thus provide us with a typically Aristotelian reworking of an existing practice, advancing the technique by providing a theoretical framework, while giving also a highly informative account of the training debates, their rules and usefulness.

It might be objected that the proposed comparative approach, by assuming (rightly) that both authors draw upon a common practice, would naturally reveal similarities between their approaches, but things are not

¹³ On this episode in the *Prt.* see especially Scodel (1986), D. Frede (1986), Carson (1992), and Baltussen (2004).

¹⁴ Huby (1962), and Moraux (1968: 292-3).

¹⁵ Until the revised *Complete Works* (Barnes [1984]), a full modern translation was available only in Italian (Zadro, A. [1974]), while half of the work (books I-IV) appeared in a French translation (Brunschwig, J. [1967]). In English we now have the useful translation of books 1 and 8 with commentary by Robin Smith (1997).

¹⁶ Derived from "predication," the technical term for the ways in which subject and predicate are being connected. There is a helpful clarification in Smith (1997: xxix-xxx).

so simple. It can be shown that a shared origin need not, and does not, imply that their approaches as found in these works are the same: they differ significantly in their method, aims, and proposed application.¹⁷ To begin with, the dialogical approach in Plato is not identical to what he himself calls dialectic (*dialektike technē*). The latter he describes in the *Sophist* as a technique of conceptual analysis based on dichotomies, and so here theory and practice diverge. Moreover, Aristotle's idea of dialectic is different yet again: conceptual analysis has been brought to an advanced stage, with a clear theoretical framework that indicates that dialectic has become a heuristic tool, a methodology for preparing research (*Top.* 8.1), at its core the argumentative method of arguing in favour and against a thesis (*Top.* 1.1).¹⁸ These differences justify taking the works as related, yet distinct.

How then does Aristotle describe the dialectical debate? What Plato's dialogue shows, and Aristotle's confirms, is that we are dealing here with a contest of gentlemen.¹⁹ There are firm rules upon which all participants agree, and there is an audience to appreciate the moves and an adjudicator to keep an eye on the rules.²⁰ Where Aristotle's account is particularly helpful is in offering a more complete and systematic description of how things proceed in dialectic. In a nutshell, the dialectical debate as described in *Topics* 8 can be summarised as follows.²¹ Central to his treatment is clear definition of subject and terminology, a progression based on agreement, and finally, consistency in building an argument.²² There is more: unlike what one might expect when we speak of

¹⁷ Nor do the (presumed) early date of the *Protagoras* within Plato's corpus and the early date of the *Topics* within Aristotle's corpus (Huby [1962] with further literature) allow for conclusions on this point. Wolfsdorf (1997) discusses the dramatic date of the *Protagoras* and the difficulty of determining it with accuracy.

¹⁸ Central books deal with the so-called four predicables, or labels for predication—that is, ways in which statements express specific relations between concepts that betray the Platonic background (definition, genus, accident, and distinct property).

¹⁹ Compare Guthrie (1956: 20, 24), and *Top.* 8.14 “you ought not to discuss with everybody or exercise yourself against any casual person; for against some people argument is sure to deteriorate ... those who are practising cannot forbear from disputing contentiously” (164b8-15, transl. Lamb [1977]).

²⁰ *Top.* 160b21-22 and *Prt.* 337e2-4, 338b2-4. Cf. Smith (1997: xiv) and Moraux (1968: 277-8).

²¹ Here I rely on Moraux (1968), Brunschwig (1967), Galston (1982), and Baltussen (2000), but with special attention for those features which are most clearly relevant to the *Protagoras*.

²² For definition, see *Top.* 1.6, 102b34-6: all predicables are in a way (τρόπον τινά) “definitional” (ὀριστικῶς); agreement is essential to the progression, since the

“debate” and “discussion,” while the encounter proceeds there is a rather strict division of the roles between questioner and answerer. It is the role of the respondent that is very important: in principle he can answer only “yes” or “no” (*Top.* 8.7; cf. *Prt.* 350e1). According to Aristotle this leads to the specific skill of assessing the potential of propositions to refute their thesis (*Soph. el.* 1, 164b25-6; 7, 169a23-b17; 10, 170b12ff.).²³ In effect, the thesis is the opposite of that of the questioner, reflected in its binary options. For example, a dialectical problem²⁴ typically presents a bifurcated question “Is the cosmos destructible or not?” The conclusion aimed at is therefore either “the cosmos is destructible” or “the cosmos is not destructible.” It is up to the two interlocutors to provide the chain of propositions leading up to either of these conclusions.

The pool of material from which to select one’s thesis in dialectical training is reputable opinions (τὰ ἔνδοξα, *Top.* 1.1, 100a20; b21-2). This, as Moraux has aptly remarked, is why the discussion is neatly placed between two extremes: on the one hand reputable views—that is, views that some people or all agree upon—and on the other, the unacceptable or minority views (ἄδοξον).²⁵ Aristotle wanted the search for truth to be located in the realm of opinion, while Plato thought opinion to be unsuitable as a means for finding the truth. The agreement among certain people, and especially experts, constituted for Aristotle a marker of truth. He thus formulated an early version of a principle of falsification in humanities studies: a view is true if all agree and no justified objection can be formulated.

With these key terms (definition, agreement, testing of propositions, consistency, and roles of interlocutors) in place, some further general specifications need to be added into the mix. Aristotle’s concept of dialectic has another dimension which has only recently become appreciated.²⁶ He indicates that the switching of roles is an important part of the skills acquired (*Top.* 8.1-5, esp. 159a33-35), in particular for assess-

answerer has to admit (συγχώρειν) a proposition; consistency follows from the correct starting-points (*Top.* 158a31-b4; b36ff.). I have dealt with these aspects in more detail in Baltussen (1992), (1996), and (2000: 197-9).

²³ Aristotle claims originality here, 159a25-38.

²⁴ πρόβλημα, *Top.* 1.11. Cf. Brunschwig (1967: xxv-xxix).

²⁵ Moraux (1968: 293): “C’est une argumentation axée sur l’ἔνδοξον et l’ἄδοξον.”

²⁶ Seminal are Galston (1982), Evans (1977), and Berti (1977). I here summarize Baltussen (2000: ch. 2.1).

ing implications of propositions.²⁷ Since for the answerer disproving a thesis under discussion means anticipating the connection between preliminary propositions and the conclusion, and blocking the potentially destructive ones, an important outcome of the training debates will be that one can *foresee* the implications of a proposition.²⁸ In addition, Aristotle also mentions impersonation as a useful part of the exercise situation, if for example the ἔνδοξον of a famous person is used for debate.²⁹

There are other helpful comments on generic modes of analysis (*Top.* 1.13-18), and the levels of argumentation for beginners and more advanced debaters, and arrangements for the structure and supervision of the training exercises (*Top.* 8). For our purposes, however, this selection of characteristics is sufficient to make clear how dialectical discussion proceeds and how it differs from what *we* think of as a discussion.³⁰ The overall aim indicated by Aristotle—to test propositions and say nothing contradictory, in short to maintain consistency³¹—is specifically formulated within the training context, but extends beyond it, as I have argued elsewhere (Baltussen [2000]) from the three aims mentioned in *Top.* 1.2. The three different concepts of dialectic also show that a certain development can be observed: the sophistic kind (formalized by Protagoras³²), the Platonic kind as represented in the dialogues, and the Aristotelian kind as outlined in *Topics* 1 and 8. My summary has selected the core features shared by the two main texts under review. What we may end up with is a compromise, in that neither the fictionalised version of Plato nor the further advanced version of Aristotle allows us to establish a straightforward connection with Academic practice, yet to

²⁷ Baltussen (2000: 34-39); Moraux (1968: 296, 310).

²⁸ Galston (1982: 86). Cf. *Top.* 157b26 προορᾶν, 160a13.

²⁹ E.g. *Top.* 159b28-35, where Herakleitos' view is mentioned.

³⁰ Cf. M. Frede (1992: xv): "the dialogues do not portray what we would think of as real discussions—full exchanges of views."

³¹ *Topics* 1.1: "the purpose of the present treatise is to discover a method by which we shall be able to reason from generally accepted opinions about any problem set before us and shall ourselves avoid saying anything self-contradictory." (100a18-20). *Topics* 8.14: "In a word, as a result of dialectical exercise you should try and achieve either a syllogism on some subject, or a solution or a proposition, or an objection, or a determination whether a question has been put correctly or incorrectly" (164a16-b1); cf. "to put the matter simply, the man who can make propositions and objections is the skilled dialectician" (164b3-4). Transl. Tredennick and Forster (1960).

³² Cf. Frede (1992: xv): "Our dialogue, however, shows that this style of argument was not peculiar to Socrates, but characteristic of a more general practice, cultivated also by the sophists, which was familiar to the audience and conducted according to certain agreed-upon rules (cf., e.g., 335a4ff.; 338a8ff.)."

gether they constitute a better basis for assessment than either one could provide by itself.

3. *Points of view, personas and the role of memory: a new orality?*

3.1 Problematic as Plato's dialogues are for extracting *any* particular view, let alone system—that is, it is often unclear which character(s) if any speak(s) on his behalf—the *Protagoras* may well be one of the most problematic in this respect, given the way in which the positions espoused are being dissociated from the specific characters. Existing explanations more often than not try to explain these discrepancies away.³³

From the moment that the young Hippokrates and Sokrates set out for the house where Protagoras is a guest, we get certain hints that we are in for an interesting treatment of sophistic educational issues: Hippokrates wants to meet the great teacher and early on (*Prt.* 311), while they wait for the sun to rise, Sokrates the narrator states that he wanted to see what Hippokrates is made of, so he “started to examine him with a few questions.” The verb for examining here is ἀποπειρώμενος, a cognate of πειραστικός, which is used by Aristotle to characterize dialectic as having the ability to examine or test.³⁴ Sokrates (Plato?) also makes clear that teaching is to do with “care for the soul” (312c). Soon, however, things go beyond subtle hints as the two young Greeks engage with the wise Protagoras. Some of the more salient points will be reviewed here.

In his usual ironic manner Sokrates interrogates Protagoras about what he might have to offer young Hippokrates, who is eager to become his pupil. For our purposes Protagoras' answer—that he teaches the art of citizenship (319a)³⁵—is not our concern, but rather how the debate is

³³ See Guthrie (1956: 8-9); Taylor does not really broach the issue (1976: 162-4, 174, 176). Frede's analysis is more balanced and accepts the inconsistency, but refrains from inferring a moral (1992: xvii).

³⁴ See, e.g., *Top.* 1.2, 101b3-4; 8.5, 159a25-36; 8.11; *Soph. el.* 2, 165b4-7; 8, 169b23-9; and cf. Smith (1997: 54-5). See also Mansfeld (1994: 74-5).

³⁵ In 317b4-5 Protagoras had admitted to being a *sophistes* and to teaching men (παιδεύειν ἀνθρώπους), after indicating the risks in doing so. This may partly explain Hippokrates' embarrassment (312a2 ἐρυθρίασας) when Sokrates presses him on the implications of becoming Protagoras' pupil, sc. that he will become a sophist (311d-e). There is much play on *sophistes* and *sophos* in this dialogue, presumably because they were still semantically close. The distinction was much clearer for Aristotle: see *Soph. el.* 165a18-31.

framed. Protagoras first enquires whether he should explain by telling a story (μῦθος) “as an older man to a younger audience” (320c) or by developing an argument (λόγος). The decision based on a general consensus is that he may proceed in whatever way he wants.³⁶ Protagoras then goes on to tell the wonderful story of the birth of the human race, with a significant role for Prometheus and Epimetheus, cultural progress, and humankind’s natural share in virtue and education, all meant to show that virtue is everywhere, but also that it can be taught (320c-28a).

In reaction to this splendid display of knowledge and epideictic prowess Sokrates is (or pretends to be) dumbfounded: “I was entranced (κεκηλημένος) and just looked at him for a long time as if he were going to say more. I was still eager to listen, but when I perceived that he had really stopped I pulled myself together with great difficulty (μόγις πως ἑμαυτὸν ὥσπερ εἰ συναγείρας)” (328d7). Picking up on a comment by Protagoras Sokrates now starts asking further questions again (not by agreement) on the unity of virtue, expressing the confidence that Protagoras will easily take care of the small problem that remains (σικρόν τί ... ῥᾶδιως ἐπεκδιδάξει, 328e4-6). Protagoras is first drawn in after vague praise of his ability to answer in brief (unlike orators³⁷). At first he does think the question is easy to answer (329d3), but he soon experiences what so many undergo when being questioned by Sokrates: he gets confused and agitated and wants to get out of the nitty-gritty of defining justice. At 331c he states, “*if you want*, we’ll let justice be pious, and piety be just.”³⁸ In one of several uncharacteristic moves by Sokrates, a second-order comment is made about Protagoras’ lack of commitment: he will not allow Protagoras to dissociate himself from the view put forward. Protagoras’ “if you want” is picked out as objectionable; Sokrates exclaims:

³⁶ There are several other moments where such a decision over the *modus operandi* in the debate is brought to the fore: see, e.g., 317d, 320c, 334d, 336b-c, e, 337a-c, 338b, 350e.

³⁷ Before asking his question Sokrates first introduces a hypothetical questioner (328e6) and reflects on the possible answers he might get, comparing orators, who always give long answers even on small issues (here Plato seems to create a pun on σικρόν as “small point” and “short answer” in contrast to “long” μακρόν and “drawn-out” δόλιχον), to dialecticians who give answers that are in proportion to the question: Protagoras is capable of doing both.

³⁸ On the relation between holiness and justice Wolfsdorf (1998: 116) points to the discrepancy between *Prt.* 330c1-32a1 and *Euthphr.* 12d5-e2. Sokrates’ “considered” views appear to be determined by context and by Plato’s strategy.

Don't do this to me! It's not this "if you want" or "if you agree" business I want to test (ἐλέγχεσθαι). It's you and me I want to put on the line and the argument is best tested when we take the "if" out. (transl. Lombardo and Bell.)

Such meta-commentary on the discussion, with the "bracketing" of individual words, is unusual, first, because of its self-referential nature, and secondly, because Sokrates is acting completely out of character in steering the discussion towards scrutiny of *their own* views. Sokrates stating his own views? For a modern audience, especially when remembering Sokrates from other dialogues and in particular the *Apology*, this seems very odd. Surely Sokrates knows only that he knows nothing?³⁹ Had he only expressed an interest in *examining* their views, he would have avoided this contradiction. If we add to this anomaly the switching of roles and views, as well as the "impersonations" to be discussed shortly—some in the form of an imaginary (third) interlocutor⁴⁰—we come to see that much of the dialogue is intent on showing how dialectical discussion without commitment to the views expressed creates confusion and inconsistencies.

I therefore want to suggest that Plato is playing around with the debating styles or modes in order to make a point about what happens if one were to follow the sophistical techniques in ethical debates. They seem to be clever argumentative moves which are not anchored in conviction.⁴¹ A strong indication of how this kind of interpretation was part of sophistic displays is the comment by Hippias in which he offers his set piece on the poem.⁴² Sokrates' uncharacteristic expression of strong views, positively stated, has confused readers, but I think this may be intentional, because his demand for testing their own views uncondi-

³⁹ For Sokrates' knowledge as a special type ("I only know that I know nothing"), and for the importance of expert knowledge, see Paul Woodruff's excellent paper (1990). Wolfsdorf (2004) elaborates on the problem of how to understand the disavowals of knowledge in context.

⁴⁰ See below where I discuss four such passages (*Prt.* 330c-331c, third interlocutor; 350cd impersonation of Sokrates by Protagoras; impersonation of Sokrates and Protagoras by Sokrates; Sokrates countering the many, 353c-355a; cf. 355c-e; 356-358; 361a-c where *logos* itself turns on them!).

⁴¹ Note Hippokrates' first description of Protagoras to Sokrates: "everyone says he is a very clever speaker" (310e6-7, φάσιν σοφώτατον εἶναι λέγειν).

⁴² 347a6-b2: "I am favourably impressed by your analysis (εὖ ... διεληλυθέναι) of this ode, Sokrates. I have quite a nice talk (λόγος εὖ ἔχων) on it myself, which I will present (ἐπιδείξω) to you if you wish." For διεληλυθέναι as a technical term in exegesis see Baltussen (2004: 29 n. 31); cf. Halliwell (2000: 105 n.41).

tionally (taking out the “if”) also recurs at a later stage at a turning point in the dialogue.

The Simonides exegesis (340a-347a) seems to be a prime example of the more traditional debate of ethical issues,⁴³ but it ends in a clear rejection of the method, which gets bogged down in linguistic wrangling and manipulation. At 347c-348a Sokrates strikes a different note, once the interpretation of a Simonides poem has illustrated, and made a mockery of, sophistic poetic interpretation (cf. n.43). In a way 347c-348a is a crucial passage telling us what this dialogue is about: it points to a break with the traditional form of aristocratic education, in which the study of poetry is the basis for ethical guidelines (stated by Protagoras at 318). This much is clear from earlier statements (e.g., 316c-317c) and from the treatment of the poem, where detailed knowledge of the text and its possible meanings is displayed.⁴⁴ If we accept an early date for the dialogue, the rejection of the study of poetry could point forward to Plato’s views on poetry in his *Republic*: “we should put the poets aside and converse directly with each other, testing the truth and our own ideas” (348a).⁴⁵ The message here seems to be that, whether written or oral, neither lyric poetry *nor* epic (347b9-10, *περὶ μὲν ἄσμάτων τε καὶ ἐπῶν ἕάσωμεν*) offer a clear message on ethical behaviour, nor do sophisticated methods, as they lead to confusion and contradictions. It is this rejection which shows how Sokrates is leading the way in a new orality, which is the dialogical debate viewed as a “joint investigation” (347c2 *μετὰ σοῦ σκοπούμενος*, cf. 330b6-7 *κοινῇ σκεψώμεθα*; 343c6 *ἐπισκεψώμεθα δὴ αὐτὸ κοινῇ*; 361d6 *μετὰ σοῦ ἂν ἥδιστα ταῦτα συνδιασκοποιήν*). These claims in regard to the debate as a joint inquiry carry clear echoes from the dialectical training debates.⁴⁶

3.2 The interpretation of the broader message of the dialogue that I have just offered can be further substantiated with other examples which confirm the dialectical nature of the encounter in line with the account

⁴³ On this section see Halliwell (2000) for an excellent characterisation of the poet’s authority in an oral society. On the exegesis of Simonides see Scodel (1986), Carson (1992), Halliwell (2000, 104-6), Baltussen (2004).

⁴⁴ See Baltussen (2004: 29-32).

⁴⁵ On the dramatic date see now Wolfsdorf (1997).

⁴⁶ For *κοινὸν ἔργον* see *Top.* 8.11, 161a20-1, 161a37-9; for the objective of the argument as aimed at someone else (*πρὸς ἕτερον*) see e.g. 155b10-11. I have described this in detail in Baltussen (2000).

we find in the *Topics*. In *Protagoras* 331-348 there are additional features which match the dialectical account in Aristotle.

Specifications for the roles of the questioner and answerer are in fact given at 335a. They show how this style of debating with its peculiar “role-playing” was well known to a wider audience. The audience’s own role in these debates is either described (e.g., 320c, 336b, 337a-c, 338b) or illustrated, and there are further comments on whether any of this debating style can lead to truth. Moreover, several references to the endoxic nature of the opinions can be found. For instance, in 319b Sokrates includes “the rest of the Greek world” in his statement of the opinion that the Athenians are wise. Protagoras attributes the view that a man who acts unjustly is temperate (333c) to “many people.” Here Sokrates does not, of course, miss an opportunity for another teasing remark: “shall I address myself to them or to you?” implying that Protagoras’ defensive move—hiding, as it were, behind what everybody thinks—is inappropriate because it is not what Sokrates is after. This is confirmed when he wants to abandon poetry and rather to investigate “our own opinions and the truth” (348a). Further reference to the scope of opinions under scrutiny can be found in other passages.

In an oral society the embedding of a view within its proper social environment is part of a rhetorician’s armour to ensure that his arguments have sufficient appeal for the audience. If the arguments themselves are scrutinized for their truth value, independent of the question of who might agree with them (by custom or appeal to other ingrained views), this aspect will lose importance: the distancing from certain “opinion groups” (*endoxic contexts*) marks a further shift in the move away from oral reflexes, and is an important factor in creating a need for a new morality, one that is based on rational argument, not custom or convention.

It is useful also to go over some interesting examples of role-switching (a sign of the continuous dissociation of characters from their views), and how this is exploited in a clever way. As indicated at the outset of this paper, Sokrates and Protagoras somehow swap views on the teachability of virtue, ending up contradicting themselves.⁴⁷ Dialec-

⁴⁷ Frede (1992: xvii [section IV. “Reversal”]) suggests, “that a dialectical argument is sometimes meant to refute the respondent’s claim to knowledge rather than to show that his thesis is false, helps to explain the odd reversal of positions on which Sokrates remarks near the end of the dialogue (361a3 ff.)”. In dialectical training situations it is *always* the aim to refute, yet in this case I think more is going

tic for training purposes (as distinct from its role in testing and investigation, *Topics* 8.5; 14) will enable the trainee to step into the ‘shoes’ of a Heraclitus or Zeno, in the full awareness that role-play is needed. At *Topics* 8.5, 159b28-34 Aristotle specifically states that one has to defend another person’s opinion “with an eye to that person’s thought” in conceding or refuting a proposition. In the *Protagoras* the handling of the positions put forward emphasize that the focus is on the argument(s), not the interlocutors.⁴⁸

This brings me to a subcategory of role-switching, the “impersonations.”⁴⁹ In dialectical training, part of the preparatory stage involves assuming the *persona* of someone else. In the *Protagoras* the switching of roles adds an extra layer of framing, when little “pretend-dialogues” presented by one interlocutor are inserted. Four cases in particular deserve our attention:

- a) At 330c Sokrates moves from questioning Protagoras to proposing a hypothetical questioner addressing both of them (in 330c2-5, note the optatives and dual verb form at c3): “suppose someone asked you and me ‘Protagoras and Sokrates, tell me about this thing you just named justice. Would you say it is just or unjust?’” (εἰ τις ἔροιτο ἐμέ τε καὶ σέ· ὦ Πρωταγόρα τε καὶ Σώκρατες, εἶπετον δὴ μοι, τοῦτο τὸ πρᾶγμα ὃ ὠνομάσατε ἄρτι, ἢ δικαιοσύνη, αὐτὸ τοῦτο δίκαιόν ἐστιν ἢ ἄδικον). This shift of perspective (both being questioned) is interesting, as it suggests that Sokrates thinks they have a common task (see n.46 and text thereto).
- b) Again, at 350c-d Protagoras reproaches Sokrates for not representing Protagoras’ statements properly. This move hands over control of the debate to Protagoras, who goes over the arguments, indicating at each step where Sokrates “mis-remembered” his words (on memory see Section 3.3 below). It includes hypothetical questions (“had you asked ... I would have answered ...” 350c9) and a different trajectory of the argument, allowing him to correct the foregoing account in detail. Remarkably, here Protagoras’ mode of discourse is in fact a hy-

on, especially when we take the different usages of dialectic and all the evidence from the dialogue into account.

⁴⁸ I owe this idea to a comment made by M. M. McCabe in discussion (see n.1 above). Cf. *Chrm.* 161c5-6 (in Halliwell [2000: 94]): “we should not be at all concerned with who said it, but with whether it is true or not.”

⁴⁹ Cf. Smith (1997: xv).

brid between long speech and short question-and-answer, the former framing the latter.

- c) At 352a-c Sokrates imagines himself to be in dialogue with Protagoras, recounting it from his own point of view. The mind boggles at the framing of the discussion here: Sokrates-the-narrator recounts how Sokrates-the-interlocutor represents the discussion as a virtual “trialogue” between an imagined objection from Sokrates against himself and Protagoras!⁵⁰
- d) Finally, at 361a-c a miraculous move is made in which the *argument itself* (ἡ ἔξοδος τῶν λόγων, 361a4; cf. d8) turns on them, reproaching them for having completely reversed their views.⁵¹ This passage is worth quoting at length, as it provides further evidence for my interpretation of the overall message:

It seems to me that our discussion has reason to make accusations against us (ἡμῶν ... κατηγορεῖν), and *if it had a voice of its own*, to mock us saying “Sokrates and Protagoras, how ridiculous you are, both of you. Sokrates, you said earlier that virtue cannot be taught, but now you are arguing the very opposite and have attempted to show that everything is knowledge—justice, temperance, courage—in which case, virtue would appear to be eminently teachable. On the other hand, if virtue is anything other than knowledge, as Protagoras has been trying to say, then it would clearly be unteachable. But, if it turns out to be wholly knowledge, as you now urge, Sokrates, it would be surprising indeed if virtue could not be taught, but now he thinks the opposite, urging that hardly any of these virtues turn out to be knowledge. On that view, virtue could hardly be taught at all. (transl. Lombardo and Bell, modified.)

The use of personification (note 361a4 ὡςπερ ἄνθρωπος) is striking and ingenious, but it also constitutes the final blow to the effort of the protagonists to find a clear solution for their problem. The argument itself has turned on them, in that *both* are contradicting themselves (a7: σεαυτῶ τάναντία; cf. 361c3: they have things completely “upside down,” ἄνω κάτω ταραπτόμενα δεινῶς⁵²). This being the case, the

⁵⁰ On the function of elaborate framing in the dialogues Johnson (1998: 588 ff.) offers a plausible explanation, but his proposal does not explain cases like the ones I discuss here.

⁵¹ It is striking how the prefix ἐξ- in ἔξοδος (361a4) and διέξοδος (361d8) is used in referring to the argument itself—indicating a solution to the argument, a *way out* of the argument.

⁵² ἄνω κάτω reminded me of the ‘*upside-down back-to-front*’ sceptic mentioned in Lucretius, where *self-contradiction* is at issue (*DRN* 4.472). Burnyeat (1976) does not mention this passage from the *Prt.* in his seminal article on the origin and meaning of self-refutation in ancient philosophy. He traces the expression

result is a failure in its material outcome, but also in view of the dialectical aim stated in *Topics* 1.1: “not to say anything contradictory.”

Many more examples could be adduced, but I think the point is clear: dialectical strategies found in the dialogue are a recurrent feature of the work, and a considerable number fit the Aristotelian description. We may therefore conclude that this provides us with empirical and accurate evidence of the oral discussion practice in Athens as well as its lasting influence in the Academy.

3.3 As part of the presentation to, and interaction with, the audience, the references to Sokrates’ memory also deserve our attention. Plato’s mention of memory in this dialogue could be taken as a literary device within the fiction of a “real-life” dialogue. Four instances make it clear how Sokrates is portrayed in different ways by himself or others as a forgetful person. At the very start of the dialogue he is “suffering” from selective memory, when he claims he had not noticed Alkibiades at a meeting and “often forgot about him altogether” (309b, ἐπελανθανόμεν). After a rather long answer by Protagoras and picking up a remark of Sokrates in 334c8-9 that he is a forgetful person (ἐγὼ τυγχάνω ἐπιλήσιμων τις ὢν ἄνθρωπος; cf. 334d1, ἐπιλανθάνομαι περὶ οὗ ἂν ἦ ὁ λόγος), it is Alkibiades (ironically?) who states: “not that Sokrates will be the one to forget it; I guarantee that, in spite of his little joke about being forgetful” (336d4, ἐπιλήσιμων), effectively exposing Sokrates’ conceit. Significantly, the connection is made between long speeches and their tendency to make the audience forget about the real issues (334c-d), because they become entranced by the long speech; Protagoras puts people in a trance as Orpheus did with his songs (315b)—a dangerous aspect which carries echoes of Gorgias’ enchantment (magical “charm”, ἐπώδα) and perhaps another allusion to the risks to which the soul is exposed when dealing with a sophist (cf. 312c, 313a). A further passage has Sokrates ask that they go back to the be-

back to Epicurus (cf. Burnyeat [1978: 200-203]), especially the peculiar phrase περικάτω τρέποντες (referring to passage [34] [28] in Arrighetti [1960], but quoting the improved text in Sedley [1973: 27]) and citing interesting parallels in [Pl.] *Ax.* 370a, Gal. *Libr. Prop.* 44 (who wrote a work on self-refuting statements: Burnyeat [1976: 58, n.23]), and Lucretius (Burnyeat [1976: 57, n.22], discussed in Burnyeat [1978]). The whole expression ἄνω κάτω παραττόμενα δεινῶς may allude to an “earth-shattering” (earthquake?) or disruptive event, cf. Pl. *Th.* 153d3 and *Resp.* 564b; Aristotle *Gen. an.* 741b28, *Mete.* 360b23. ἄνω κάτω can either refer to the (horizontal) outer limits of the cosmos or to lateral movement. Clearly, if the universe is in disarray (“upside down”), something has gone badly wrong (δεινῶς).

ginning, while he also asks to be reminded of some things (349b). This comment marks a fresh start on the same question, declaring the previous episode (which includes the Simonides poem) as unsuccessful. Finally, we see Protagoras reproach Sokrates for not having remembered correctly what the former had said (350c6, οὐ καλῶς μνημονεύεις, also discussed above under “Impersonations”).

All four cases, from different perspectives (Sokrates, Alkibiades, Sokrates, Protagoras) confirm Sokrates’ supposed poor memory. The function of the passages can be explained, if we consider how they can help an audience keep up with the argument. They do more, however: the audience is also being reminded of the difference between monologue and dialogue: the former is represented as causing forgetfulness, the latter as one stimulating engagement. In this way Plato manages to make the point in a humorous way: it is ironic that despite Protagoras’ reputation for his ability to speak briefly and expansively (e.g., 334e), Plato has him prefer long speeches (335a) and in the end refuse to be subjected to questioning (348b). It is also clear that Sokrates’ self-declared forgetfulness is playfully contradicted, by Alkibiades’ comment and by Sokrates’ actual conduct (especially 359a when with remarkable detail he harks back to Protagoras’ *first* answer at 329d-330b and 349d). Although such “reminders” would have a place in oral reports and are not the sole prerogative of literary accounts, they draw attention to the progression of the argument (and Sokrates’ role in it), and allow us, as an external party observing the debate, to stay informed about the direction and format of the discussion.

4. *Conclusions*

In comparing the *Protagoras* and the *Topics* regarding the nature of the dialectical debate, I have argued that the playful version of Plato and the theorized description of Aristotle together provide us with a richer account of the dialectical practice in Athens and the Academy than is found in any single existing account. Thus Frede’s hunch about the value of the *Protagoras* as a source for dialectical practice is confirmed, and Guthrie’s compromise regarding the message of the dialogue is corrected (n.3 above). I conclude that Plato is seen to argue for a new orality in ethical debate, while Aristotle clearly marks an advanced stage of the transition from orality to literacy. By repeated reference to Sokrates’ memory Plato also uses the play of the “straight man” (perhaps as Wat-

son to Holmes), most likely for the purpose of audience manipulation, forcing us to retrace the steps of the argument in order to keep track of it better. These references to memory also reinforce the implicit argument against long speeches that make you *forget* what the *logos* is about (334d1, ἐπιλανθάνομαι περὶ οὗ ἂν ἦ ὁ λόγος; cf. “public address” 336b) and in favour of question and answer, the give and take of debate—Sokrates’ (and no doubt Plato’s) preferred mode of discourse.⁵³ It is worth remembering that the fleeting but unmistakable reference (βιβλία, 329a3) to the *Phaedrus* argument on the failure of books to be interrogated or answer questions *includes* speeches (329a6) and epic poetry (347e3). As Plato no doubt was aware, this sustained emphasis on oral debate reintroduces the awkward and paradoxical position that his dialogues, once put into writing, stand a better chance of not being forgotten.

With this broader framework in mind, three specific conclusions emerge from the comparison between the *Protagoras* and *Topics* 8. Two arise directly out of our review of dialectical debating strategies, and the third supervenes upon the foregoing results in connection with our inquiry after the “message” of the dialogue.

- a) There is clear and precise evidence that Plato’s *Protagoras* dialogue is an excellent source for the oral debating practice in the Academy. The potential problem—that parody, exaggeration and bias are all possible sources of distortion—cannot be defused with evidence from within the Platonic corpus. Greater accuracy is achieved, if we take the *Topics* as an external check, allowing us to separate out literary devices from dialectical practice proper. It is the technical aspects that stand out in this dialogue (Section 2, especially nn.18-27). The *Protagoras* self-consciously and explicitly considers the appropriate modes of discourse during the discussion, specifically by contrasting monologue and dialogue. Question and answer, agreeing on how to progress, the use of *endoxa*, and several other features well illustrate the nature of dialectic at this stage—though Plato is of course not yet thinking as systematically about these matters as Aristotle was to do. I have illustrated this by indicating how Aristotle has taken the technique further, in part with an eye on the actual practice in the Acad-

⁵³ See Long (2005: 7-12) for an interesting argument on *why* question and answer is preferred: interestingly it involves consensus as an important component in Sokrates’ approach, thus corroborating my point on the cooperative aspect of dialectic in *Top.* 8 (see n.46).

emy, but also with a view to developing dialectic into a more serious research tool with philosophical and logical potential for other areas of scientific investigation. As a result, dialectical techniques became rehabilitated as a philosophical tool (cf. *Top.* 1.2 and 8.1), marking a further step in the rise of a more literate philosophical community. Aristotle still shares a concern with Plato about the intention of the interlocutors in using dialectical strategies. I suggest that the foregoing comparison, creating a “dialogue” between the two works, provides a welcome confirmation from an outside source and a useful tool to assess the extent to which the *Protagoras* reflects oral practices. The two works reinforce each other in providing, with certain qualifications, a richer understanding of the oral performances in the Academy.

- b) A reading of the *Protagoras* according to Aristotle’s account of dialectic (understood in the narrow sense as found in *Topics* 8) also allows us to suggest a way out of the problem that has haunted the interpretation of the *Protagoras*: the representation of the (lack of) commitment to the views presented. The more recent developmental reading of dialectic in the *Topics* (Galston [1982], Baltussen [2000]) provides the key to this solution, taking the training as a technique that allows for the switching of roles and opinions. In the *Protagoras* this phenomenon may be Plato’s way of showing what kind of confusion ensues when a non-committal discussion of views is in this way engaged in, in particular on moral issues. His rejection through Sokrates of traditional debates of moral issues (especially by way of poetry, 348a) shows that not all debating modes are appropriate for discussing ethical problems. Moreover, we saw that there are several different dialectical modes, despite some broader common ground: the relation between the sophistic debating technique (Protagoras’ question-and-answer, n.6 above) and Plato’s dramatised version in this dialogue are not identical nor easily separated. With the participation of Sokrates in debate with the Sophists we have to assume that the representation of early dialectical practice is influenced by an agenda that is critical of sophistic claims to education. Yet they do not seem to disagree on the main outline of discussion techniques; rather, *the commitment* to the views at issue and the *purpose to which*

these are put are the cause of their disagreement.⁵⁴ If we try to gain very specific insights from these speakers on the debate, we will be disappointed. Much of the dialogue is an illustration of Plato's message, the stalemate reached in dialectical debates among sophists. I conclude that Plato's dialogue uses the confusion over roles and opinions to demonstrate that ethics must transcend the argumentative games of non-committal debate. In this sense, the aporetic ending *is* the solution.⁵⁵

- c) A third and last point that emerges is related to one already made, that Aristotle's work not only marks a progression in dialectic, but also represents an advanced stage in the transition from orality to literacy. By clarifying how the aspects of role-switching and impersonations allow the philosopher to slip into the role either of questioner or of answerer, exploiting the effects of training, I have tried to show that the *Topics* should not simply be viewed as a representation of dialectic in the Academy. While the *Protagoras* may seem rather close to the practice among aristocratic Athenians and Plato's students (perhaps as we imagine it), Aristotle progresses with the method beyond the training ground, as is palpable from his treatises. With its insight into the implications of particular propositions, this method became a powerful tool to examine the claims and theories of others on their logical validity and coherence (*Top.* 8.1). This process of interiorization (one person wearing the hats of both the questioner and answerer⁵⁶) would put Aristotle in a position to perform elaborate critical assessments of his predecessors (*Metaph.* A, *Ph.* A) using dialectical strategies, which are thus the immediate result of oral dialectical training, but performed in writing.

⁵⁴ At *Prt.* 348a Sokrates rejects the poets and wants to test the truth and "our own views." Note, however, that at 331d1-3 "it is the argument he faults and not the interrogative form Sokrates requires" (Long 2005: 4). By contrast Aristotle emphasises that the blame for failure or wrong use goes to the user, not the dialectical method itself (e.g., *Top.* 160b4-5, 10-14; 161a23-4).

⁵⁵ Some ambivalence remains regarding the use of poets, in that Plato does not want to do away completely with them, but rather wants to "submit this authority ... to the standards of discourse and reason embodied in, and advocated by, his own philosophical writings" (Halliwell 2000: 109).

⁵⁶ Baltussen (2000), 37 n. 27: "The method of arguing *pro* and *contra* thus materializes as an argument from 'within' and from 'without' someone's theory".

Bibliography

- Arrighetti, G. (1960). *Epicuro Opere*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Baltussen, H. (1992). "Peripatetic Dialectic in the *De sensibus*." In *Theophrastus: His Psychological, Doxographical and Scientific Writings*, W. W. Fortenbaugh and D. Gutas, eds.: 1-19. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers.
- Baltussen, H. (1996). "A 'dialectical' argument in *De anima* A 2-4. On Aristotle's use of *topoi* in systematic contexts." In *Polyhistôr. Studies in the History and Historiography of Ancient Philosophy: presented to Jaap Mansfeld on his sixtieth birthday*, K. A. Algra, P. van der Horst, and D.T. Runia, eds: 333-43. Leiden: Brill.
- Baltussen, H. (2000). *Theophrastus Against the Presocratics and Plato. Peripatetic Dialectic in the De sensibus*. Philosophia Antiqua vol. 86. Leiden: Brill.
- Baltussen, H. (2004). "Plato *Protagoras* 340-48: Commentary in the Making?" In *Philosophy, Science and Exegesis in Greek, Arabic and Latin Commentaries*, 2 vols, P. Adamson, H. Baltussen, and M. W. F. Stone, eds. *BICS Supplement* 83. Vol. 1, 21-35. London: Inst. of Classical Studies.
- Barnes, J. ed. (1984). *Complete Works of Aristotle: the Revised Oxford Translation*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Berti, E. (1977). *Aristotele. Dalla dialettica a la filosofia prima*. Padova: CEDAM.
- Brunschwig, J. (1967). *Topiques*, vol. 1. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Burnyeat, M. F. (1976). "Protagoras and Self-Refutation in Later Greek Philosophy." *PhR* 85.1: 44-69.
- Burnyeat, M. F. (1978). "The Upside-Down Back-to-Front Sceptic of Lucretius IV 472." *Philologus* 122: 197-206.
- Carson, A. (1992). "How Not to Read a Poem: Unmixing Simonides from Protagoras." *CPh* 87: 110-30.
- Evans, J. D. G. (1977). *Aristotle's Concept of Dialectic*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Frede, D. (1986). "The Impossibility of Perfection: Sokrates' Criticism of Simonides' Poem in the *Protagoras*." *Review of Metaphysics* 39: 729-53.
- Frede, M. (1992). "Introduction." In Lombardo and Bell (1992): vii-xxxiv.
- Fröhlich, G. (2004). "Überlegungen zur Argumentationsstruktur in Platons *Protagoras*." *C&M* 55: 49-84.
- Gagarin, M. (1969). "The Purpose of Plato's *Protagoras*." *TAPhA* 100: 133-64.
- Galston, M. (1982). "Aristotle's Dialectic, Refutation and Inquiry." *Dialogue* 21: 79-93.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. (1956). *Plato. Protagoras and Meno*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. (1975). *A History of Greek Philosophy*, Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Halliwell, S. (2000). "The Subjection of Muthos to Logos: Plato's Citation of the Poets." *CQ NS* 50: 94-112.

- Huby, P. M. (1962). "The Date of Aristotle's *Topics* and Its Treatment of the Theory of Ideas." *CQ* NS 12: 72-80.
- Johnson, W. A. (1998). "Dramatic Frame and Philosophic Idea in Plato." *AJPh* 119: 577-98.
- Lamb, W. R. M. (1977). *Plato. Laches, Protagoras, Meno, Euthydemus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Lombardo, S. and K. Bell (1992). *Plato. Protagoras*. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett.
- Long, A. (2005). "Character and Consensus in Plato's *Protagoras*." *PCPhS* 51: 1-20.
- McCabe, M. M. (2000). *Plato and his Predecessors. The Dramatisation of Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Moraux, P. (1968). "La joute dialectique dans les *Topiques*." In *Aristotle on Dialectic. The Topics. Proceedings of the Third Symposium Aristotelicum*, G. E. L. Owen, ed.: 277-311. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Scodel, R. (1986). "Literary Interpretation in Plato's *Protagoras*." *AncPhil* 6: 25-37.
- Sedley, D. (1973). "Epicurus on Nature, Book XXVIII." *Cronache Ercolanesi* 3: 5-83.
- Smith, R. (1997). *Aristotle. Topics I and VIII*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Tarrant, H. (1996). "Orality and Plato's Narrative Dialogues." In *Voice into Text: Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece*, I. Worthington, ed.: 129-47. Leiden: Brill.
- Taylor, C. C. W. (1976). *Plato. Protagoras*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Taylor, C. C. W. (2006). "Sokrates the Sophist." In *Remembering Sokrates. Philosophical Essays*, L. Judson and V. Karasmanis, eds.: 157-68. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Tredennick, H. and E. S. Forster (1960). *Posterior Analytics. Topica*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Wolfsdorf, D. (1997). "The Dramatic Date of Plato's *Protagoras*." *RhM* 140 (3-4): 223-230.
- Wolfsdorf, D. (1998). "The historical reader of Plato's *Protagoras*." *CQ* 48: 126-33.
- Wolfsdorf, D. (2004). "Sokrates' Avowals of Knowledge." *Phronesis* 49: 75-142.
- Woodruff, P. (1990). "Plato's Early Theory of Knowledge." In *Epistemology*, S. Everson, ed.: 60-84. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Zadro, A. (1974). *I Topici*. Napoli: Loffredo.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

VISUAL COPIES AND MEMORY ¹

JOCELYN PENNY SMALL

We live in a world of copies not just of books and art, but of virtually everything we use from computers to cars to the furnishings of our home and the games we play. We are so surrounded by facsimiles and reproductions that it is difficult for us to imagine a world with limited means of making copies. It is jolting to remember that the assembly line was an invention of the Industrial Age and did not become a major economic force until Henry Ford produced his Model Ts in the early 1900s. It is not that copies did not exist in classical antiquity, but rather that their nature differs in some cases dramatically from modern ones. We expect our copies to look so like their originals that not even an expert can distinguish a digital reproduction from its original. In antiquity, except for certain restricted categories of die- and mould-made objects, like coins, seals, and lamps, each copy could generally be distinguished from every other. While classicists have long been accustomed to the idea of variations between stories and manuscripts, classical art historians approach the problems of copies with an ingrained bias toward Greek art that makes them treat Roman copies, if they judge them aesthetically fine, as exact replicas of lost Greek originals. Although that bias has begun to shift in recent years in the study of sculpture, painting

¹ It was a great honour to have been invited to give the keynote address at the Seventh International Orality/Literacy Conference. In particular I would like to express my deep gratitude to Anne Mackay for her exemplary organization of the conference and for her gracious hospitality. The reaction and comments from the attendees were most helpful and are reflected in the notes. I would especially like to single out Ed Carawan for our refreshing discussion. It is a pleasure, as always, to acknowledge the help of A. A. Donohue and Susan Woodford, both of who made the supreme scholarly sacrifice of reading a draft of this paper without the notes. I also thank Brunilde S. Ridgway and Miranda Marvin for their observations. Please note that references are kept to a minimum both for objects mentioned and the extensive literature on copies. All translations are from the Loeb Classical Library editions unless otherwise noted. All web sites were accessed in March 2008.

has received little attention.² Nor have classical art historians considered the implications of the results from studies of orality and literacy. In this paper I shall try to redress that lack of balance.

I begin with a consideration of what Greeks and Romans thought about copies. The English word “copy” comes from the Latin *copia*, which, however, does not mean “copy” but “abundance” or “plenty”—meanings which explain its later extension to our sense of “copy.”³ Pollitt’s extremely useful compendium of technical Greek and Latin words for art history, *The Ancient View of Greek Art*, contains no entry in the indices for “copy.” With a knowledge of Greek and Latin, however, one can find παράδειγμα and *exemplum* together with *exemplar*. Pollitt notes for the Greek term that its “basic meaning ... is ‘model’ or ‘pattern’.”⁴ Similarly, he says that “the terms *exemplum* and *exemplar* can mean both ‘model’ and ‘copy.’ When the word means ‘copy,’ however, it always has the sense of a ‘representative copy’ and hence is still very close in meaning to ‘model’.”⁵ In other words, the Greek and Latin words focus on the source for copies rather than on the copies themselves, ironically like scholars today.⁶

² Lippold (1951) remains the basic study for the idea that Greek paintings stand behind almost every Roman painting. Bergmann (1995) is one of the few to consider painting. Hallett (2005: 433-35) has a brief section on painting in his review of Gazda (2002) and Perry (2005). Even the recent fascicle of *Art History* (Trimble and Elsner [2006]), devoted to the problem of classical copies, has no article on painting.

³ According to the *OED Online* (s.v. *copy* A II.3), the meaning of “copy” as “a picture or other work of art, reproducing the features of another” dates to 1584. The earlier meaning, more literally after the Latin, as “abundant” or “copious” is daggered as obsolete (A I.1). The earliest citation is 1596 for “copy” as “something made or formed, or regarded as made or formed, in imitation of something else; a reproduction, image, or imitation” (A II.4a). It is probably not coincidental that the modern meaning of “copy” as artistic reproduction follows the invention of the printing press with its multiple copies that are portable and hence can be compared to each other. Compare Muller (1989), who similarly dates the beginning of the desire for “authenticity” to the sixteenth century.

⁴ Pollitt (1974: 211). τύπος is another problematic word, when used in sculptural contexts. It probably does not mean “model” but rather “mould” or “relief,” both of which terms remove it from my current concern about “copies.” See Pollitt (1974: 272-93) for a summary of the scholarship and especially 291 for the “best” usage. I thank A. A. Donohue for bringing this term to my attention in this context.

⁵ Pollitt (1974: 367).

⁶ This usage parallels the classical interest in firsts. Pliny the Elder records who invented what artistic technique. That sometimes the stories, such as for the invention of portraits in clay (*HN* 35.151) and paint (*HN* 35.15) are the same did not bother him, if he noticed at all. It would appear, then, that the classical interest in firsts parallels the modern interest in originals except that Greek and Latin seem just

It is therefore no surprise, as Isager notes, that “the extensive private market in modifications or adaptations of Greek art constitutes an area which Pliny [the Elder] fails and probably did not wish to include.” In fact, Pliny refers only once to a copy of a painting.⁷ The reference is instructive:

In his youth Pausias [the painter] loved ... Glykera, the inventor of flower wreaths. Imitating her in rivalry [*certandoque imitatione*] he extended his method of encaustic painting to represent a very numerous variety of flowers. ... A copy of [his] panel [*huius tabulae exemplar*] [of Glykera], an ἀπόγραφον as they say, by Dionysios in Athens was bought by Lucius Lucullus for two talents.⁸

I find it interesting that Pliny falls back on a Greek word, because Latin lacks the appropriate word.⁹ Now the absence of a particular word does not mean that a particular phenomenon does not exist, but rather that no need was felt for such a word. For example, Latin was quite content to use the same word, *pollex*, for both big toe and thumb.¹⁰ Sometimes context is all.

In this case, however, I do not think that context fully accounts for the absence of our sense of “copy.” In the first part of the passage, Pliny refers to “imitating ... in rivalry”—two terms we are accustomed to seeing in classical texts on copying. “Rivalry” obviously means competition and a number of anecdotes describe both formal and informal artistic competitions.¹¹ For the most part, I am not concerned with that aspect here. “Imitation,” however, is a more complex term that may include copying but does not have to.¹² I could, for example, be inspired by Seurat to paint a picture using only dots of paint. My painting need

as parsimonious with words for “original” as they are for “copy,” since Pollitt (1974) similarly does not have a listing for “original.”

⁷ Isager (1991: 174) for both the quotation and the information. Lucian (*Zeuxis* 3-5) refers to an “extremely accurate copy” (3.10) of a painting by Zeuxis in terms remarkably similar to the way scholars today refer to copies. Yet, as will be seen, there is no way for Lucian to have known how accurate the copy is, since the original, according to him, was lost at sea. Lucian, like Pliny the Elder, uses a similar word to refer to copy, ἀντίγραφος.

⁸ Plin. *HN* 35.125 (my translation).

⁹ A similar situation exists with “symmetry.” Compare Plin. *HN* 34.65: *non habet Latinum nomen symmetria*.

¹⁰ *OLD* 1397, s.v. *pollex*.

¹¹ The most famous “contest” for artists that we know of may be the one among five sculptors to make the best Amazon, on which see Plin. *HN* 34.53. For another example in painting, consider that between Zeuxis and Parrhasios (Plin. *HN* 35.65).

¹² In general, on artistic *imitatio* see Perry (2005: 111-22).

not share the same colours much less the same subject as any of Seurat's paintings. It would only loosely be an imitation of his style. In a sense this is the kind of imitation Pseudo-Longinus (*On the Sublime*, 13.2-4) describes when he says that Plato imitated Homer. When art historians, however, refer to "copies," they generally are not talking about inspiration as imitation. They mean something that has the same subject and elements as the original and is portrayed in the same manner. The three requirements of subject, elements, and style must all be met.

In the *Academica* (2.85-86) Cicero talks about such exact replication:

Tell me, could not Lysippus, by means of the same bronze, the same blend of metals, the same graver and all the other requisites, make a hundred Alexanders of the same shape [*modi*]? then how [*qua ... notione*] would you tell them apart? Well, if I imprint a hundred seals with this ring on lumps of wax of the same sort, will there possibly be any means of distinction to aid in recognizing them? Or will you have to seek out some ring-maker?¹³

It is significant that Cicero chose two types of reproduction that really can produce identical copies. Because the case for identical sealings from a signet ring is obvious, I discuss only bronzes here. Classical bronze statues are a rarity today, because bronze was presumably worth more as money as material than as art. Moreover, what has survived seems to be variants rather than exact replicas. A stock type received modifications from minor adjustments in pose to the treatment of details. Mattusch presents the somewhat surprising example of the Riace bronzes.¹⁴ At first, and even second, glance the differences in their heads mask the sameness in their bodies, in part because we are "hard wired" to notice heads, and not just heads but faces—a fact which explains, in part, why the Romans concentrated their efforts on the heads for their portraits and often used stock bodies.¹⁵ Gazda presents the example of Vespasian and Titus from the Shrine of the Augustales at Misenum, made after both had died.¹⁶ Like the Riace bronzes, only the heads vary. The skill needed, however, to replicate stone images may be greater than that for bronzes, which can repeatedly use the same moulds.

¹³ Translation adapted from the *LCL*. Compare Platt (2006).

¹⁴ Mattusch (1996: 64 and 66-67, fig. 2.18). For example, Botbein (1996:72) refers to "the stylistically earlier of the bronze warriors from Riace" and hence does not see them as twins in body.

¹⁵ Massironi 2002: 44-47.

¹⁶ Now in Baiae, Castello, after AD 96. Gazda (1995: 141-42 and 155, fig. 7). Stewart (2003: 47-59) discusses the practice of the individualized portrait head joined to a generic body.

The most obvious extant example of Roman copies of a Greek original is that of the Erechtheion caryatids with replicas in the Forum of Augustus in Rome and at Hadrian's villa at Tivoli.¹⁷ Because moulds can be taken from existing statues, as Lucian mentions for a Hermes in the Agora at Athens, there is no logistical reason why the three sets of caryatids should not match.¹⁸ Moreover, for us today it is a relatively simple matter to compare the three sets through photographs, which demonstrate that the copies meet the criterion of "close enough." The Romans, however, would not have been able to see even two of the sets of caryatids together.

Statues, no matter the material, can be shipped from site to site. Bartman suggests that copies of official Roman portraits in lighter weight materials like plaster or wax would have been sent to various parts of the Roman Empire for copying locally.¹⁹ Yet that does not mean that they are identical portraits, such as for Queen Elizabeth II in British embassies throughout the world. Bartman, like Mattusch, comments on the fact that "variants are frequent in Livia's portrait corpus, perhaps more the norm than close copies ... [because of] the rudimentary nature of the system by which it [the portraits] was produced."²⁰ In particular, she notes that "the Roman sculptor ... seems often to have reproduced assiduously those aspects of the image that were unfamiliar while executing more freely those he already knew."²¹ To put it in Thucydidean terms, even where we might expect precision, generally only

¹⁷ Schmidt (1973) is the basic study for all copies of the Erechtheion caryatids, including the three mentioned in the text. She also provides full photographic documentation: for the caryatids from the Forum Augustum, Rome: pls. 1-5; for the caryatids from Hadrian's Villa: pls. 6-32. For the Erechtheion caryatids see, among many others, Stewart (1990: pls. 431-32). On "exact copies," see Perry (2005: 90-96) with two caryatids from Tivoli illustrated on 92-93, figs. 19-20.

¹⁸ The Hermes was so frequently copied that it became black from the pitch used. Lucian, *Iupp. trag.* 33. Compare Mattusch (1996: 191).

¹⁹ Bartman (1999: 18-24) discusses the logistics of copying.

²⁰ Bartman (1999: 20 and 24). Compare Albertson (2004: 300) who, in a study of portraits of Marcus Aurelius, says that "as we progress from the 1st through the 2nd centuries the actual copying of an official model becomes more accurate, the dependence on models greater and greater." Bartman obviously illustrates a number of Livia portraits, but one of those on which she focuses in this section is the head now in Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery 23.211: Bartman (1999: 19, figs. 13-14). I also know of one instance where "copies" were made based on a verbal description, but obviously not of a portrait. The device of the Marsyas in the Forum shows a distinct difference on Greek Imperial bronzes compared to the original in the Forum Romanum: his right hand is no longer raised above his head, but in an *adlocutio*. See Small (2003: 114-16 with figs. 58-59).

²¹ Bartman (1999: 19).

gist is captured.²² If sculptors have trouble accurately reproducing heads, consider what may happen when copying statuary groups.

To understand the problem, first try a thought experiment. Imagine the Laocoon, a three-figured statuary group.²³ We now know that Laocoon's right arm no longer extends more or less straight up in the air, but is bent back at the elbow toward his head, which falls to our right in intense agony. Now think of his two sons. Which is the older boy and where does the snake wrap around him? Where is the head of the snake that bites Laocoon? Where is the second snake's head? Which is Laocoon's weight-bearing leg? Are there the usual bits and pieces of drapery and, if so, where are they? The more questions I ask, the more I hope you will realize that, like me, you really do not have a clear picture in your mind of this well-known group.

If you look, for example, at an illumination from the *Vatican Vergil*, Laocoon looks quite reasonable, even if his two sons are awfully small and his red cloak in contrast rather voluminous.²⁴ His left leg is the weight-bearing leg, because he kneels on the altar with the other one. The snakes are a bit hard to find, but they encircle Laocoon and the boys around their torsos and around the arms of Laocoon. I pass over that the image of Laocoon, on the left, clearly labelled, has no beard and no cloak, but is dressed like a *victimarius*. Let us try another version, the marvellous cartoon by Charles Addams (Figure 5).²⁵ Typical of twentieth-century artists, he has placed the group in a specific, three-dimensional setting and has based his rendition on the earlier restoration of the Laocoon with the right arm extended upward. What about his sons? They, too, are raising their right hands. Is that correct? Let us look

²² Thuc. 1.22. See my discussion in Small (1997: 191-93).

²³ The Laocoon remains the subject of long debate as to whether it is a Roman copy of a Greek original or a Roman original, and even whether the Laocoon we have is the one Pliny the Elder mentions. Deciding the answer to these questions has no bearing on my use of it as an iconic example that everyone "knows." See Brilliant (2000: 2-3 figs. 2-3 with the two different restorations, and 98 fig. 20 for the back view); also Décultot et al. (2003), and Varner (2006: 679) with bibliography.

²⁴ Verg. *Aen.* 2.191-98: Folio 18v. See Wright (1993: 22-23), Brilliant (2000: 13 fig. 8), and Small (2003: 149-150 with fig. 69).

²⁵ Addams (1991: 215). First published in *The New Yorker* for April 17, 1975. To date, *The New Yorker* has published four cartoons spoofing the Laocoon: another one by Addams for November 22, 1982, one by William O'Brien for January 25, 1958, and one by Vahan Shirvanian for January 12, 1987. I treasure them all, but this one the most. For all of these cartoons, see the two CDs that came with Mankoff (2004); search under the date, the artist, or "Laocoon."

at the “real” Laocoon (Figure 6).²⁶ Artistic license is perhaps too kind a word. The illuminator of the *Vatican Vergil* not only gave Laocoon two little boys instead of an older boy and a youth, but also has changed the pose of Laocoon, who now helplessly raises his hands rather than vainly trying to remove the snakes. In addition the statuary Laocoon is more or less seated on the altar with his left foot touching the ground to the side of it. The older son on our right is trying to step out of his snake, so to speak, while the younger one is more securely ensnared. The head of the second snake is difficult to discern, because the left hand of the left son covers its head, as he tries to push it away.

The phenomenon you have just experienced is known as recognition memory. When you see the Laocoon, you know it. To understand what I mean, consider the infamous penny test from 1979.²⁷ Diabolical cognitive psychologists—they are always diabolical—showed fifteen possible obverses for the American one-cent coin and then asked American college students to identify the real one. Most could not pick out the right one. I have rerun the test with my students and had the same results. As Norman points out, “the students, of course, have no difficulty using the money: in normal life, we have to distinguish between the penny and other U.S. coins, not between several versions of one denomination.”²⁸ Since I am talking about a basic human skill, the Romans and their artists would have the same kind of recognition memory that we have today. Artists making copies, however, should be better at this task than we are. Some experimental evidence exists to support that position. When chess masters are asked to memorize the arrangement of men in the middle of a game, they recall it with remarkable accuracy. On the other hand, when the same chess masters are asked to memorize a chessboard with randomly sprinkled men, they do no better than anyone else.²⁹ Hence it is likely that Roman artists might not have been able to

²⁶ As Brunilde Ridgway (pers. comm.) points out, the illumination in the *Vatican Vergil* does not necessarily depend on the Vatican Laocoon sculptural group. Yet, when we think of a representation of the death of Laocoon, we think of the sculptural group. Moreover, because we know the sculptural group, we can recognize the same subject in the *Vatican Vergil*. At the same time we consciously or unconsciously “measure” all Laocoon versions against that group. On the iconographical history of Laocoon, see *LIMC* 6, pp. 196-201 with pls. 94-95: “Laocoon” (Erika Simon).

²⁷ Nickerson and Adams (1979: 297, fig. 6).

²⁸ Norman (1988: 57).

²⁹ Cognitive psychologists refer to this phenomenon as the differences between experts and novices, the results of which would also apply to the abilities of expert

have recalled today's modern art accurately, but only pieces within their expertise.³⁰

If artists are able to copy an object right in front of them, as in a second cartoon of the Laocoon by William O'Brien,³¹ they should have no problem with accuracy. Yet Bartman says that, at least for portraits of Livia, accuracy is a real issue.³² I do not know of any sneaky cognitive tests of artists' memories compared to ordinary folks. I do, however, have the cover from a *TV Guide* that appeared shortly after I had accepted the invitation to deliver the keynote address represented by this paper.³³ *TV Guide* re-created nine famous covers, one of which shows Reba McEntire taking the pose of Lucille Ball in the iconic trampling of the grapes.³⁴ Because the original cover was available to the re-creators,

artists and of the lay public to remember precisely how a statue looked. Here I have chosen a particular variation that tested visual memory. Also note that the chess masters recall only the layout and not what the pieces look like. I thank Barbara Tversky for this observation. The bibliography on the topic is now quite large: for a summary see Didierjean et al. (2004).

³⁰ Compare Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 50: "Sculptors and painters without long experience in training the eye by studying the works of the old masters would not be able to identify them readily, and would not be able to say with confidence that this piece of sculpture is by Polyclitus, this by Phidias, this by Alcámenes; and this painting is by Polygnotus, this by Timanthes and this by Parrhasius."

³¹ William O'Brien: *The New Yorker*, January 25, 1958; Mankoff (2004: CD).

³² Cohen (2005: 997) "attempts to determine what those who draw accurately do differently than those who do not" and concludes that "high gaze frequencies may facilitate drawing accuracy by (1) allowing the artist to hold less information in working memory, (2) reducing memory distortion, and (3) facilitating the reduction of context effects through inattentional blindness." In other words, a copyist must look frequently at the original to get it right. Presumably the sculptors Bartman discusses did not compare their Livias to the "original."

³³ *TV Guide* (October 9-16) 2005.

³⁴ Michael Gagarin suggested at the Conference that there is a substantive difference between a "re-creation" and a "copy" and that therefore I was expecting a greater accuracy than *TV Guide* intended. Yet an examination of the "nine tribute covers" shows that *TV Guide* went to great trouble to choose look-alike stars and then to pose and dress them as closely as possible to the original covers. I believe that they used the word "re-create" rather than "copy," because they viewed the covers more as "copies" of live performances and hence "re-create" more precisely captured their intention. One does not "copy" a performance. In fact, *TV Guide* (p. 30 of the same issue as the cover) said in the caption to a photograph of Reba's blouse being adjusted before the shoot, "every stitch had to match the original." The original cover can be seen at [<http://www.tvguide.com/celebrities/lucille-ball/photos/163025/4>]; the re-creation is at [<http://www.tvguide.com/celebrities/reba-mcentire/photos/171072/34>]. In any case, my basic point remains valid: except for digital reproductions it is nigh impossible to get all the details right, especially in complex scenes with numerous figures and objects. Perry (2005: 94) comments, "it was a basic tenet of Stoic thinking ... that there was no such thing as an exact duplicate of any object in the phenomenal world." The *TV Guide* re-creations also should be

there should be no inaccuracies except for the fact that the newer rendition is in colour and the original was shot in black and white. Both Lucy and Reba are similarly dressed, but their headscarfs have different patterns. Reba manages to keep her blouse firmly on both shoulders, while Lucy's has slipped off her right shoulder. Their hands do not match. Reba holds her right thumb out and extends her left fingers, while Lucy has formed loose fists with each. Lucy is looking more downward with her eyes half-closed compared to the open-eyed Reba. Like a good art historian, I could go on, but I think I have mentioned enough differences. Making an accurate copy, even in the best of circumstances, is not easy. For the purposes of *TV Guide* the two images are close enough even in a direct comparison, but for art historians "close enough" is often not enough. We want to know exactly what the original looked like. Unfortunately even today we live in a Thucydidean world. I wonder if your mind drifted off during my comparisons, because basically many of us do not care about that much precision. Good enough is good enough. I think Romans must have been similar. Some cared for accuracy; most were happy with gist.³⁵ There is additionally, of course, the fact that most could not easily compare original and copy in the absence of photographs.

With this background let us switch our focus to classical copies of classical paintings. The situation immediately becomes more complicated. The only securely identified copies I know for painting are on vases. The Museum of Fine Arts in Boston owns two Attic red-figure kylikes by Aristophanes with identical subjects and scenes.³⁶ The mu-

distinguished from parodies, which reproduce the poses, dress, and setting, but with twists on the originals to amuse the viewer. For example, *Smithsonian* (2005: 116) compiled ten takes on the classic Grant Wood painting *American Gothic* that range from cartoon characters (Beavis and Butthead) to vizsla dogs to Paul Newman and his daughter Nell. On the problems with our terminology, see Raggianti (1964: 14). Compare the title of Bergmann's article (1995): "Greek Masterpieces and Roman Recreative Fictions."

³⁵ Compare Perry (2005: 60): "This [the variety in the posture and proportions of the Olympias-Aphrodite sculptures] implies that it might have been a general visual familiarity, and not the exact replication of a particular model, to which patrons and viewers responded." Fullerton (2006: 483) suggests, "Alternatively, perhaps the images we have are signs, the form of which derive from a mental image of the things being signified ... but which employ a few salient features ... that would suffice to indicate the subject. ... in any case, no one disputes that these representations are not pictorially accurate, but we might question more carefully whether they were even intended to be so."

³⁶ Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 00.344 and 00.345 (*ARI*² 1319.2 and 3 respectively; *Para.* 478; *Add.*² 363). They date to c.425-400 BC. For online photographs of

seum even displays the vases next to each other. Like the photographs of Reba and Lucy, only a close analysis separates the two. For example, in the tondos Herakles fights Nessos who still holds Deianeira. In addition to the issues of preservation that distinguish the two vases today, Boston 00.344 has an inscription in the exergue and Boston 00.345 does not. The lower edge of Deianeira's drapery at the ankle differs slightly in its treatment and she has larger feet on the former. Similar discrepancies can be found in the exterior scenes of Lapiths fighting centaurs. For example, the leftmost centaur on each of the reverses has slightly different gestures for his arms and hands.³⁷ Again, I could extend my analysis of such details, but none is as striking as the fact that they are so closely matched. More importantly, this kind of copying does not concern me here, because the two vases are twins, produced at the same time in the same workshop by the same painter.³⁸ In a sense both are originals, since there is no way for us to know which was painted first or even if more of these were made at the same time. Nor is there any way to tell whether another vase was the model for these two. Similar twins exist in sculpture, such as Kleobis and Biton.³⁹ Immediate duplication of objects is economical no matter what the material, because once the artist has figured out how to make a particular object, the next one will be that much easier to produce even if it has to be carved or painted from scratch.

I am, however, concerned with the production of copies separated in time and space from their "originals." The sole example I know of a painting that has survived in both model and copy occurs on an Etruscan red-figure kylix that adapts the exterior scenes from an Attic red-figure kylix (Figure 7).⁴⁰ While the interior scenes differ—satyrs for the Etrus-

Boston 00.344: *BAD* 220534 and 220535 respectively; also search by museum and inventory number at <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu>.

³⁷ On Boston 00.344 the leftmost centaur has his right arm by his head and his left arm extended; but on Boston 00.345 both his hands are raised on either side of his head.

³⁸ Connor (1981) discusses the same phenomenon of contemporary "replicas," but in this case for an Attic black-figure painter, the Painter of Louvre F 6 (*ABV* 123-29; *Para.* 50-53; *Add.*² 34-35).

³⁹ Marble, early 6th cent. BC: Delphi Museum inv. 467 and 1524. Stewart (1990: pl. 56). On "twins," see Mattusch (1996: 1-8). Boardman (2006: 17 fig. 9 and 29 n.35 with bibliography) remarks that the two figures are "intermittently regarded as being rather the Dioskouroi."

⁴⁰ Etruscan red-figure kylix: Paris, Rodin Museum 980; c. 425-400 BC. Martelli (1987: 320-21 No. 160 with pls. 210-211). Attic red-figure kylix: Oedipus Painter, Vatican 16541; c. 450 BC (*ARV*² 451.1, 1654; *Para.* 376; *Add.*² 242; *BAD* 205372).

can kylix and Oedipus and the Sphinx for the Attic kylix—the exterior scenes of both show satyrs revelling. The Etruscan vase-painter simplified the Attic scene by removing one figure on each side with the result that one of the sides makes less sense than the original, because the youth about to be beaten with a sandal has been omitted. On the other side, the Etruscan artist omitted the satyr pissing in a pot (Figure 8). On the whole the Etruscan satyrs seem less elegant and more awkward, but the leftmost satyr, seen from a three-quarters rear view, is actually more accomplished on the Etruscan kylix than on the Greek one. Hence it is very important to keep in mind that just because something is clearly a copy does not mean that the copy cannot be better than the original, whether overall or only in sections, as in this case.

Large-scale paintings, either on panels or on the wall, present great difficulties for the copyist, because the methods available for making copies of paintings do not permit the accuracy possible for mould-made objects. Panel paintings do have the advantage of being transportable and are therefore capable of being directly copied in a painter's workshop. Alternatively the reverse could happen, with the painter setting up his easel in front of the original. Quintilian remarks, "Shall we follow the example of those painters [*pictores*] whose sole aim is to be able to copy pictures [*describere tabulas*] by using measurements and lines [*mensuris ac lineis*]?"⁴¹ It is important to examine Quintilian's vocabulary. First, he may be referring only to panel paintings, for he uses the word *tabula*. Second, *mensura* can easily be translated as "measurements," but *lineae* is more complicated. It can simply mean "lines" or, according to Pollitt, may refer to the drawing of outlines.⁴² Hence Quintilian is not talking about imposing a grid on the original—a practice that would destroy the original—but instead he probably means making sure that the basic sketch, that is the lines of the scene, is accurate by checking its measurements.⁴³ He does not assess the precision of such

It is important to note that the Attic red-figure kylix was found in Vulci, the probable provenience for the Etruscan kylix.

⁴¹ Quint. *Inst.* 10.2.6. Translation adapted from *LCL* (1st ed.). Butler translates the phrase *mensuris ac lineis* as "by using the ruler and the measuring rod," based on the assumption that the original was divided into a grid. I have provided a more literal reading.

⁴² Pollitt (1974: 392-395 s.v. *lineamenta, linea*).

⁴³ A. A. Donohue (pers. comm.) suggests that they could have used string for a temporary grid. Such a grid could be attached temporarily to the picture by bits of wax. It might also be possible, for example, to mount such a grid on a wooden frame and place it against the original. We have no evidence for or against these sugges-

copies. Nor does he mention the problem of colour nor how those colours are laid on, such as with broad, visible strokes or small, nigh invisible ones.

In contrast, both Pliny the Elder and Piny the Younger discuss colour. Pliny the Elder deplors the inaccuracy of illustrated texts on botany:

Crateuas, Dionysius and Metrodorus adopted a most attractive method, though one which makes clear little else except the difficulty of employing it. For they painted likenesses [*effigies*] of the plants and then wrote under them their properties. But not only is a picture [*pictura*] misleading [*fallax*] when the colours are so many, particularly as the aim is to copy [*aemulationem*] Nature, but besides this, much imperfection arises from the manifold hazards of the copyists.⁴⁴

Pliny does not rate the ability of the copyists highly, because they are virtually incapable of achieving accurate colours. Even today we simi-

tions. The best evidence we have for grids comes from Egyptian art, but as far I know, the grids were used for the paintings being made and not on ones being copied. The grids were used not as a mechanism for making accurate copies but for maintaining the appropriate proportions for figures: the Egyptian “canon.” Robins (1997: 109) says, “Grids, which were usually laid out in red paint, were often uneven, and it is clear that artists were not aiming at mathematical accuracy. The lines were merely an aid to drawing acceptably proportioned human figures, and artists did not have to follow them slavishly.” Compare Davis (1981:64-65). I thank Anthony Spalinger for discussing this matter with me. Cennini (1954: 1.23-26, pp.13-14) suggests using tracing paper, “fastening it nicely at the four corners with a little red or green wax.” He also gives instructions on how to make tracing paper by scraping parchment and then soaking it in linseed oil. While parchment was available from the second century BC and later, this particular use is not mentioned, to my knowledge, in ancient sources. It should also be noted that it is one thing to make a grid for an “original” painting and quite another to use one for copying. For example, the scene with the rape of Persephone from the “Tomb of Persephone” at Vergina may show faint traces of a grid with very large squares that are more useful in roughing out the figures than in making precise copies of existing figures: see Gallazzi and Settis (2006: 40-41, figs. 15-16). Scheller (1995) offers a wonderful compendium on model-books that also considers the Egyptian and Classical evidence. Note especially that (p.72) “the second half of the 14th century saw an upsurge in the application of labour-saving devices.” He also remarks (p.383), “In 1839 the French archaeologist Adolphe Didron called at Mount Athos on his tour of Greece. He was amazed to see how the Greek fresco painters designed their large compositions directly on the wall, without any preparation. In the West this method had been superseded in the late Middle Ages by a step-by-step, complex and time-consuming design process.”

⁴⁴ Plin. *HN* 25.4-5 (8-9). Translation adapted from the *LCL*. On copyists “improving the original,” recall how the Etruscan artist improved one of the figures he was copying from an Attic red-figure kylix. Compare my discussion on the “Reproduction of Pictures” in Small (2003: 134-38).

larly lament the lack of accuracy in colour photographs, some of which, even in expensive coffee table books, are often wildly off from the originals. Pliny the Elder's nephew, Pliny the Younger, addresses the difficulties of accurately copying portraits painted on panels, a process that involves many of the same problems as copying manuscript illuminations. He writes to Vibius Severus:

The well-known scholar Herennius Severus is very anxious to place in his library portraits [*imagines*] of your fellow-townsmen, Cornelius Nepos and Titus Catus, and asks me to have them copied [*exscribendas*] and coloured [*pingendas*] if, as seems likely, they are in your possession. . . . All I ask is that you find as accurate [*diligentissimum*] a painter [*pictor*] as you can, for it is hard enough to make a likeness from life [*ex vero*], but an imitation of an imitation [*imitationis imitatio*] is by far the most difficult of all. Please do not let the artist you choose depart from the original even to improve on it.⁴⁵

Pliny the Younger recognizes the variability in individual reproductions of works of art.⁴⁶ He describes the process of reproducing painted portraits as requiring two steps: the drawing or outlining of the figure, like the *lineae* of Quintilian, and then the addition of colour. It makes sense that the same order would be followed no matter what the subject and thus applies to all painting. What is interesting for us is that Pliny considers "an imitation of an imitation by far the most difficult of all." In other words, Pliny the Younger, who should be acquainted with both originals and copies of paintings, implies that most copies of paintings fall far short of the originals.⁴⁷

To get some understanding of the problems painting presents, consider two Roman wall paintings of Perseus and Andromeda, one from the House of the Priest Amandus at Pompeii and the other from

⁴⁵ Plin. *Ep.* 4.28. Translation adapted from Radice (1963).

⁴⁶ Compare Dion. Hal. *Din.* 8, who expresses strikingly similar thoughts about copies and originals: "a certain sponaneous charm and freshness emanates from all the original models, whereas in the artificial copies, even if they attain the height of imitative skill, there is present nevertheless a certain element of contrivance and unnaturalness also. It is by this rule that not only orators distinguish other orators, but painters the works of Apelles and his imitators, modelers the works of Polyclitus, and sculptors the works of Phidias." Translation adapted from the *LCL*.

⁴⁷ Miranda Marvin (pers. comm.) suggests that Pliny the Younger is referring to Plato's denigration of painting and sculpture (*Resp.* 10.598b) rather than actual copies of copies. Perry (2005:95), on the other hand, has the same reading of the passage as I do.

Boscotrecase (Figure 9).⁴⁸ A glance is enough to tell that they represent the same subject with the same elements: Perseus flying in from the left; Andromeda manacled to the cliff jutting up in the centre with the ketos on the left and her mother Kassiopeia below on the right; and finally Perseus repeated and being received by her father Kepheus on the right. The iconographical differences are minor. Kassiopeia, for instance, sits on a separate outcropping in the one from Pompeii, but at the bottom of the same cliff in the Boscotrecase painting. Despite their iconographical similarities, their renderings are strikingly different. The Boscotrecase painting is seen from farther away and is rather atmospheric. The ketos stands out in the Boscotrecase example, whereas the palace of Kepheus is much clearer in the Pompeian panel. Finally, of course, as both Pliny the Elder and the Younger would have noted, the colours differ. For instance, the Pompeian panel depends more on a bluish-green for its background, while the Boscotrecase painting uses a deeper green overlaid with more greys and browns. Which is the original? Should it be the one from Boscotrecase from the decidedly upper class villa of Agrippa Postumus? Remember, however, that accomplished execution is not always the most reliable guide—or all the satyrs on the Etruscan kylix would have been more poorly drawn than their Attic models. Then, again, another painting, no longer extant, may be the original.

What about the other Pompeian type of Perseus freeing Andromeda? A slightly later moment is chosen in a version from the House of the Dioscuri (Figure 10).⁴⁹ Perseus has released Andromeda's right arm from its manacle and is helping her step down. I pass over the fact that her left arm, which Perseus awkwardly supports, remains pinned to the cliff. Neither is looking at the other. This painting focuses less than the other two on placing the protagonists in an overall setting, and more on the pair alone. In fact, the only subsidiary figure is the dying ketos, as usual on the lower left. Perhaps this version goes back to a Greek original, since the Greeks never lost their focus on the main figures. Recall

⁴⁸ For the Boscotrecase version: New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art 20.192.16: Anderson (1987/88: 53, colour), and *LIMC* Andromeda 1 32 with pl. 629. For the Pompeian version: Kraus and von Matt (1975: 186 fig. 250, colour). *LIMC* Andromeda 1 33. Note that Richardson (2000: 36) attributes both paintings to the Boscotrecase Painter, but he has assumed that because they show the same elements they must be by the same hand. Compare my discussion of their use of space to portray continuous narrative: Small (1999: 568, with 569 fig. 8).

⁴⁹ Pompeii 6 9.6-7. Naples 8998; H1186. *LIMC* Andromeda 1 69, p.781 with pl. 634, where it is assigned to the Fourth Style. Bergmann (1995: 95-96 and 113 fig. 6, bottom left).

that Pliny the Elder (*Natural History* 35.116) said that it was a Roman, Studius, who invented landscape painting. Pliny (*Natural History* 35.132) even offers us a Greek candidate for the representation of such an Andromeda: Nikias of Athens. It was among his “large pictures” (*grandes picturas*) not to speak of the fact that Nikias was known for “paint[ing] women most carefully.”⁵⁰ This Andromeda and Perseus differ too much from the other two to be their model, however, and so let us eliminate Nikias.

There is a second possibility: a Roman painter took the model and bettered it. Quintilian, in the same passage I quoted above, directly continues, “It is a positive disgrace to be content to owe all our achievement to imitation [*imiteris*]. For what, I ask again, would have been the result if no one had done more than his predecessors?”⁵¹ In other words, Quintilian not only believes that Romans can do better than their predecessors, but also that they should do so. If that is true of rhetoric, why would it not be true of painting? Would Roman artists be bettering Greek paintings, however, or would they merely be bettering the works of their peers and their own ancestors? I can only partially answer this question. I think that it is highly unlikely that absolutely no changes or only changes for the worse occurred in painting since the fourth century BC when Nikias lived. I think that the Romans’ two greatest contributions to painting were full illusionism, and landscapes with figures integrated within those landscapes and not dwarfing the setting. The Greeks never lost their belief in the idea that “man is the measure of all things.”⁵² The fourth century BC painting that we do have from Vergina emphasizes the figures, as with the second pair of Perseus and Andromeda, rather than having the landscape dominate the figures.⁵³

At this point let us expand our discussion to consider the most famous and complex example from Pompeii: the Alexander Mosaic from c. 100 BC in the House of the Faun (Figure 11). Without its border it measures a little over five metres by nearly three metres.⁵⁴ With its borders it expands to nearly six metres by just over three metres—the size

⁵⁰ Plin. *HN* 35.131, my translation. Compare Pliny the Younger’s remarks quoted above. Lippold (1951) provides a useful compendium of “traditional” scholarly attributions of Pompeian paintings to Greek artists. He discusses Nikias (93-101) and the Perseus and Andromeda (94 with fig. 76).

⁵¹ Quint. *Inst.* 10.2.7; translation from the *LCL*, 1st ed.

⁵² Protagoras *apud* Pl. *Th.* 160d.

⁵³ Andronicos (1993: 97-119 with colour pictures *passim*).

⁵⁴ The measurements and statistics are taken from (Moreno 2001: 11 and 16).

of an average Manhattan living room. It contains over fifty men and approximately twenty horses. The vagueness of these numbers is due to the incomplete preservation. No doubt exists that the mosaic represents Alexander and Darius. Which of their two major encounters, Issos in 333 BC or Gaugemela in 331 BC, remains debated. For my purposes here it does not matter. Similarly, at least seven different Greek painters have been proposed as the artist.⁵⁵ Recent attributions have centred on Philoxenos and Apelles. Pliny the Elder (*Natural History* 35.110) says that Philoxenos not only was the court painter of Kassandros in Macedonia after the death of Alexander, but also the painter of a battle [*proelium*] between Alexander and Darius. Apelles is a possible candidate, first because Pliny (*Natural History* 35.85) records that Alexander the Great often visited his workshop. Second, according to Pliny, Apelles “surpassed all the painters that preceded and all who were to come after him.”⁵⁶ In addition, scholars tend to assign extant works of high quality to the artist rated most prestigious in the ancient texts.⁵⁷ Pliny describes Apelles’ style as “unrivalled for graceful charm . . . he knew when to take his hand away from a picture . . . he used to acknowledge his inferiority to Melanthis in grouping, and to Asclepiodorus in nicety of measurement.” Comments like these are useless in making attributions, especially for a Roman copy made in another medium three hundred years later. Even more important, not only have no paintings by Apelles survived, but also we do not have even a single scrap painted by any classical Greek painter mentioned in the extant literary sources.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Cohen (1997: 138-142).

⁵⁶ Plin, *HN* 35.79. Also see extended discussion in Moreno (2001: 29-38).

⁵⁷ Compare Ridgway (2004: 733). There are a number of resonances between Ridgway’s essay on the Laocoon and my treatment of copies, although I read the article after I gave the keynote address but before I prepared it for publication. The original article, “Le Laocoon dans la sculpture hellénistique,” appeared in Déculot et al. (2003: 13-31).

⁵⁸ Stewart (1993: 150-157), among others, relates the Alexander Mosaic to Apulian vases by the Darius Painter (c. 330 BC according to Stewart, [150]) that portray encounters of a Greek warrior on a horse pursuing a Persian. In the end, however, Stewart concludes (152-53), “Clearly, the Darius Painter cannot have seen the original of the Mosaic, a sketch of it, or any other painting of Alexander produced for the Macedonian court. He simply did not know what Alexander looked like. Had he done so, he would not have shown him bearded. . . . but in the absence of any precise indication of Alexander’s real appearance had to resort to guess work.”

Just because we do not have *the* original and cannot know its painter, it may still be possible to posit *an* original Greek painting that stands behind the Alexander Mosaic. First, Alexander the Great by dint of his date obviously dates the subject to no earlier than the last third of the fourth century BC. Furthermore, as I indicated above, we know of at least one painting from the fourth century BC depicting a battle between Alexander and Darius. Hence the appearance of Alexander and Darius in a Roman mosaic from c. 100 BC is not in and of itself surprising. The second major support for a fourth century BC original lies in the palette of the mosaic which follows earlier practice and is limited to four colours—“red,” black, yellow, and white—though Cohen notes “some green elements.”⁵⁹ Third, the focus of the scene is on the figures, not the setting, which has the proverbial Greek lone, barren tree. The depiction of the spears extending above the fray reflects the way they actually looked in a battle, as I discovered in an otherwise forgettable movie about the battle at Marathon. Other elements are variously interpreted. Some scholars maintain that the armour is authentic fourth century BC, others that it is a mixture of elements from the Hellenistic period.⁶⁰ Some mistakes are apparent on close examination. For example, there are traces of “a white horse that anatomically cannot be put together” among the four black ones on the right quadriga.⁶¹ These errors are considered to prove that the mosaic must be a copy, because surely the original painting got it right. Again, this argument does not matter, since originals can have mistakes. Even the scholars who know about and notice these errors still consider the mosaic an “excellent copy,” as Hölscher puts it, of a Greek original painting from the fourth century BC.⁶²

At this point we must consider the logistics of making a copy of a painting larger than a Persian rug in an average New York living room. We should not worry about whether the original was in Pella or even

⁵⁹ Cohen (1997: 167-69, esp. 168). It is interesting to note that the restriction to four colours is not apparent unless pointed out, in part, I believe, because battles scenes on barren plains are naturally often limited in their palette

⁶⁰ While most scholars accept the *realia* as fourth century BC, Michael Pfommer (1998) has devoted a monograph to a study of the individual elements, especially of the armour and the dress of the figures. He concludes (215) that “Die Realien des Mosaikgemäldes entsprechen *keinesfalls* alexander- oder diadochenzeitlichen Vorgaben.” (My emphasis.) He believes (216) that the *realia* indicate that the mosaic dates most likely in the late third or early second century BC.

⁶¹ Cohen (1997: 79) with other mistakes discussed.

⁶² Hölscher (2004: 23): “an excellent copy of an important painting dating from the late fourth century BC soon after the death of Alexander the Great.”

Alexandria, as others suggest, since either location presents the same problems for copying.⁶³ I begin with the obvious limitations: no photographs, no casts, no imposing a grid over the precious original. A sketch could be made, but not to scale, since the available materials—papyrus, wax or wood tablets, clay slab—were not manufactured on such grand scales. Even photographing the whole mosaic in one shot is not easy, and details blur and sometimes disappear. We still need details. In the absence of a picture of the whole, joining these details together is also not easy. Consider that the copy being made in Ravenna today has a life-size photograph displayed in the workshop and that that photograph shows faint vertical lines indicating that it was pieced together.⁶⁴ Next the Ravenna mosaicists made:

... a tracing of the photo with a dark marker and covered it with a thin layer of tissue to make a negative impression. Now they had their design. ... Instead of using a single large wooden [frame] ... covered in lime as the ancient mosaicists might have done, the Italians decided to use 44 separate clay frames and work on the mosaic section by section.⁶⁵

Even today with all of our technical equipment it is no simple matter to make a copy of something that size. What is the likelihood that some 44 sketches, each totally accurate, were precisely pieced together in antiquity?⁶⁶

⁶³ For Alexandria: Fehr (1988). Cohen (1997: 59) suggests that the so-called original painting was “perhaps ... carried off to Rome from Macedonia as part of the booty from the battle of Pydna (168 B.C.).”

⁶⁴ Merola (2006: 36-37).

⁶⁵ Merola (2006: 38). One scholar (Donderer [1990]) believes that the mosaic is an “original” Greek mosaic that was removed in sections from a Hellenistic palace. Against this idea Dunbabin (1999: 43) argues, “In my opinion this theory remains unlikely in view of the size and fragility of the work and the difficulty that would be involved in dividing it into sections.” She then adds, “the mosaic was laid on the spot by a team of craftsmen, who may safely be taken to have been Greek. Everything else is uncertain ...” One cannot assume *prima facie* that all good artists must be Greek. Even Greek names are no guarantee that they are not Romanized Greeks, as the variety of names in the United States so eloquently testify. On the mechanics of laying a mosaic, see Dunbabin (1999: 279-90).

⁶⁶ There is virtually no extant evidence of actual copybooks. While most scholars would agree that artists must have shown some kind of designs to prospective clients and that artists must have had access to designs for their own use, nonetheless, it remains highly speculative what forms these designs took. The closest example may be the sketches on the reverse of the Artemidorus papyrus, but these comprise separate drawings of animals and monsters, as well as details like hands, feet, and heads. Canfora (2007), among others, questions the papyrus’ antiquity. Nothing comparable to what would be needed to replicate the Alexander Mosaic is preserved. The best colour pictures appear in Gallazi and Settis (2006: esp. 142-55).

Next the Alexander Mosaic, to state the obvious, is a mosaic. It is not a painting. The closest analogy to what it is like to copy a painting into a mosaic-like format is that twentieth-century invention of paint by numbers. Consider the cover of *Esquire* with the portrait of Lyndon Johnson by Richard Hess from June 1967.⁶⁷ Johnson's head is divided into a number of irregular sections that are then numbered with the colour of the paint to be used. One should look particularly at how artificial the nose appears with its precisely defined sections, rather than the looser, more feathery strokes that are actually used in painting. Alexander's nose is similarly constructed, except for its sections being less curved due to the square tesserae. Although the average size of the tesserae is small (0.04-0.08 inches), they still produce more precise edges than Roman wall painting has, like those in the paint-by-number pictures. At the same time the stones—and these are stones not coloured glass—have no real way of matching the colours in a painting. Recall what Pliny the Elder and Pliny the Younger said about matching colours when the original was right in front of the copier. It is highly improbable that the painters could have taken so many precisely cued swatches back to Pompeii with them, especially when the number of tesserae involved is a staggering two million.⁶⁸

So how did the Romans produce an “excellent copy,” as Hölscher puts it, of a Greek original painting from the fourth century BC? They did not.⁶⁹ They could not. First—and this argument is insurmountable—in the absence of any original we actually do not have the foggiest notion whether the Alexander Mosaic is a good, bad, or indifferent copy of it.⁷⁰ One simply cannot judge the quality of being a copy without the

Note that Settis (31) refers to the Alexander Mosaic as a “riproduzione intenzionalmente fedele”—a judgement similar to that of Hölscher.

⁶⁷ In addition to the actual cover, an online reproduction may be found at: [http://americanhistory.si.edu/paint/Images/Large_Images/IMAGE_HTML/lbj.html] This image was part of an exhibition (at the Smithsonian National Museum of American History) on paint by number pictures, for which see Bird (2001) with the Johnson portrait appearing on p. 112

⁶⁸ Merola (2006: 38) for both the size of the tesserae and their number.

⁶⁹ Raghianti (1964: 24-36) is especially salutary to read on the idea of exact copies of lost Greek paintings. He heads one chapter (p. 30) “The Impossibility of Making ‘Perfect’ Reconstructions of the models of ‘Classical’ Artists.”

⁷⁰ Some scholars' desire for a Greek original is so great that they make some remarkable arguments. For example, Cohen (1997: 52) says, “to argue that the surviving image is solely a Roman creation would be to forestall discussion of its rich fourth-century Greek imagery, and the historical associations of this imagery, and confine oneself to issues of reception.”

original for comparison. At this point, then, I think it is necessary to pull together the strands of my discussion to understand what the Alexander Mosaic is and how it works. From the outset, making a copy of a painting presents more problems than that of a single statue. In the case of the Alexander Mosaic two issues are paramount: its size and the colours. I hope I have established that neither was likely to be copied with any degree of exactness. Even today when a model is right before us, as in the case of Lucy and Reba, we are unable to make an exact replica without digital assistance. In classical antiquity, however, one thing was on the side of the copyist that is not the case today: very few people, if any, could or would check to see how well the copy matched the original. At the same time, in part because of these limitations, their standards of precision were different from ours.

Consider the preface to Cicero's *Topics*:

on reaching Velia I saw your family [Gaius Trebatius Testa] and your home, I was reminded of ... [my] debt [to write a translation of Aristotle's *Topics*]. ... Therefore, since I had no books with me, from memory recalled I wrote down these things on the voyage itself.⁷¹

Since we have Aristotle's *Topics*, we are in a position to judge the quality of Cicero's translation. Most scholars find little in common between the two works except that they both do discuss the use of "topics" "for inventing arguments ... [using] a rational system."⁷² As the artist of the Alexander Mosaic changed paint into tesserae, so Cicero changed Aristotle's examples into legal ones which would be more appealing to Trebatius, a lawyer. Similarly Trebatius is not likely to compare Aristotle's text to Cicero's, but, like many an art historian today using the *Loeb* translations and not checking the Greek or Latin original, not only will Trebatius be relieved that he does not have to slog through Aristotle's text, which he found difficult and obscure, but also he will believe that he does, indeed, have Aristotle's *Topics*. In fact, while I have just used the *Loeb* translation myself—so much easier than making translations from scratch—I have actually adapted that translation to more literally capture what Cicero says. The translator says "I wrote up what I could remember," when Cicero never uses "could"; instead he says *conscripsi*—"I wrote down"—for Cicero believes he has remembered eve-

⁷¹ Cic. *Top.* 1.5; translation adapted from the *LCL*. See fuller discussion in Small (1997: 217-19).

⁷² Cic. *Top.* 1.2.

rything. He needs no text in front of him. Like most Romans, especially those who were lawyers, he prided himself on his recall. Because he lived in a world still dominated by orality and not literacy, he felt free to switch examples to legal ones because his standard for “copy” is “equivalency” not “identity.” In Thucydidean terms the gist is sufficient. Hence we can recognize the three Laocoons discussed above as all being imitations of the “real” Laocoon. In the case of the Alexander Mosaic precision is neither possible nor desired. What we have is a Roman creation in the spirit of Cicero’s *Topics* after a Greek original—something that Quintilian would have approved of. As we could not re-create Aristotle’s *Topics* from Cicero’s *Topics*, so we cannot reconstruct any Greek original from the Alexander Mosaic.⁷³ Nor in truth can we reconstruct any Greek painting from any Roman painting or mosaic.⁷⁴ In classical antiquity gist always trumped precision, because even in the rare cases where precision was possible no one could really check. Orality governs not just the world of texts but also of art.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

*Add.*² = Carpenter, T. H. (1989). *Beazley Addenda*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press (for The British Academy).

*ARI*² = Beazley, J. D. (1963). *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.

BAD = Beazley Archive Database:

[<http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/BeazleyAdmin/Script2/default.htm>].

LCL = *The Loeb Classical Library*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

⁷³ Such a reconstruction would be analogous to reconstructing portions of the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and the *Ilioupersis* from Vergil’s *Aeneid*. The *Aeneid* stems from the same tradition, but it is an utterly Roman creation that no one suggests is “an excellent copy” of any Greek work.

⁷⁴ Compare Ragghianti (1964: 27): “If we look at copies actually made by artists (and those which Rubens and Cézanne made of Carvaggios’ *Deposition* exist) we find we are faced with another phenomenon, that is that they are really quite new works, in spite of the fact that they depend on an artistic precedent; they are works where the link with a form that was already personal and definite, if it exists at all, is very slight, overwhelmed and obliterated by other values, by a new language. Sometimes the model is completely buried.” Bergmann (1995: 81-83) believes (82) that it is a “common illusion that we can anchor them [also the *Doryphoros* of Polykleitos] in two distinct cultures—Greece and Rome—and make sense of them.” She later (97) says, “I would suggest that the primary aim of most muralists was not to replicate exactly a Greek original.” She does not, however, appear to consider the Alexander Mosaic a Roman creation.

- LIMC* = *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (1981-1997). Munich, Zürich, and Düsseldorf: Artemis.
- OED Online* = *The Oxford English Dictionary Online*: [www.oed.com].
- OLD* = *The Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968-1982), P. G. W. Glare, ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Para.* = Beazley, J. D. (1971). *Paralipomena: Additions to Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters and to Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Addams, Charles (1991). *The World of Charles Addams*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Albertson, Fred C. (2004). "The Creation and Dissemination of Roman Imperial Portrait Types: The Case of Marcus Aurelius Type IV." *Jdai* 119: 259-306.
- Anderson, Maxwell L. (1987-1988). *Pompeian Frescoes in The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Bulletin of The Metropolitan Museum of Art* 45.3. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Andronicos, Manolis (1993). *Vergina. The Royal Tombs and the Ancient City*. Athens: Athenon.
- Bartman, Elizabeth (1999). *Portraits of Livia: Imaging the Imperial Woman in Augustan Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Bergmann, Bettina (1995). "Greek Masterpieces and Roman Recreative Fictions." *HSCP* 97: 79-120.
- Bird, William L. (2001). *Paint by Number*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Boardman, John (2006). "Sources and models." In *Greek Sculpture. Function, Materials, and Techniques in the Archaic and Classical Periods*, Olga Palagia, ed.: 1-31. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Borbein, Adolf H. (1996). "Polykleitos." In *Personal Styles in Greek Sculpture*, Olga Palagia and J. J. Pollitt, eds.: 66-90. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Brilliant, Richard (2000). *My Laocoön: Alternative Claims in the Interpretation of Artworks*. Berkeley and London: Univ. of California Press.
- Canfora, Luciano (2007). *The True History of the So-called Artemidorus Papyrus*. Bari: Edizioni di Pagina.
- Cennini, Cennino d'Andrea (1954). *The Craftsman's Handbook. The Italian "Il Libro dell'Arte"*, transl. Daniel V. Thompson, Jr. New York: Dover.
- Cohen, Ada (1997). *The Alexander Mosaic. Stories of Victory and Defeat*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Cohen, Dale (2005). "Look Little, Look Often: The Influence of Gaze Frequency on Drawing Accuracy." *Perception and Psychophysics* 67: 997-1009.
- Connor, Peter J. (1981). "Replicas in Greek Vase-Painting: The Work of the Painter of Louvre F6." *BABesch* 56: 37-44.
- Davis, Whitney M. (1981). "Egypt, Samos, and the Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture." *JEA* 67: 61-81.

- Décultot, E., J. Le Rider, and F. Queyrel, eds. (2003). *Le Laocoon: histoire et réception. Revue Germanique Internationale* 19 (Special Issue).
- Didierjean, André, Vincent Ferrari, and Evelyne Marmèche (2004). "L'expertise cognitive au jeu d'échecs: quoi de neuf depuis de Groot (1946)?" *L'année psychologique* 104: 771-93.
- Donderer, Michael (1990). "Das pompejanisches Alexandermosaik—Ein östliches Importstück?" In *Das antike Rom und den Osten: Festschrift für Klaus Parlasca zum 65. Geburtstag*, Christoph Börker and Michael Donderer, eds.: 19-31. Erlangen: Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen.
- Dunbabin, Katherine M. D. (1999). *Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Fehr, Burkhard (1988). "Zwei Lesungen des Alexandermosaiks." In *Bathron: Beiträge zur Architektur und verwandten Künsten für Heinrich Drerup zu seinem 80. Geburtstag von seinen Schülern und Freunden*, H. Büsing and F. Hiller, eds.: 121-34. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag.
- Fullerton, Mark (2006). "(Re)presenting the Roman 'Culture of Statues'." *JRA* 19: 479-83.
- Gallazzi, Claudio and Salvatore Settis (2006). *Le tre vite del Papiro di Artemidoro. Voci e sguardi dall'Egitto greco-romano*. Milan: Electa.
- Gazda, Elaine (1995). "Roman Sculpture and the Ethos of Emulation: Reconsidering Repetition." *HSCP* 97: 121-56.
- Gazda, Elaine, ed. (2002). *The Ancient Art of Emulation. Studies in Artistic Originality and Tradition from the Present to Classical Antiquity*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
- Hallett, Christopher H. (2005). "Emulation versus Replication: Redefining Roman Copying." *JRA* 18: 419-35.
- Hölscher, Tonio (2004). *The Language of Images in Roman Art*, transl. Anthony Snodgrass and Annemarie Künzl-Snodgrass. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Isager, Jacob (1991). *Pliny on Art and Society: the Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*. Odense: Odense Univ. Press.
- Kraus, Theodor and Leonard von Matt (1975). *Pompeii and Herculaneum: the Living Cities of the Dead*, transl. Robert Erich Wolf. New York: Abrams.
- Lippold, Georg (1951). *Antike Gemäldekopien*. Munich: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Mankoff, Robert, ed. (2004). *The Complete Cartoons of the New Yorker*. New York: Black Dog & Leventhal.
- Martelli, Marina, ed. (1987). *La ceramica degli etruschi: la pittura vascolare*. Novara: Istituto Geografico de Agostini.
- Massironi, Manfredo (2002). *The Psychology of Graphic Images. Seeing, Drawing, Communicating*, transl. Nicola Bruno. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mattusch, Carol C. (1996). *Classical Bronzes: the Art and Craft of Greek and Roman Statuary*. Ithaca and London: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Merola, Marco (2006). "Alexander Piece by Piece." *Archaeology* 59.1: 36-40.

- Moreno, Paolo (2001). *Apelles: the Alexander Mosaic*, transl. David Stanton. New York: Skira.
- Muller, Jeffrey M. (1989). "Measures of Authenticity: The Detection of copies in the Early Literature on Connoisseurship." In *Retaining the Original. Multiple Originals, Copies, and Reproductions*, Kathleen Preciado, ed. Studies in the History of Art, Vol. 20: 141-49. Washington: National Gallery of Art, Hanover, NH.
- Nickerson, Raymond S. and Marilyn Jager Adams (1979). "Long-term Memory for a Common Object." *Cognitive Psychology* 11: 287-307.
- Norman, Donald A. (1988). *The Psychology of Everyday Things*. New York: Basic Books.
- Perry, Ellen (2005). *The Aesthetics of Emulation in the Visual Arts of Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Pfrommer, Michael (1998). *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Komposition des Alexandermosaiks auf antiquarischer Grundlage*. Mainz am Rhein: von Zabern.
- Platt, Verity (2006). "Making an Impression: Replication and the Ontology of the Graeco-Roman Seal Stone." In Trimble and Elsner (2006): 233-257.
- Pollitt, J. J. (1974). *The Ancient View of Greek Art: Criticism, History, and Terminology*. New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press.
- Radice, Betty, transl. (1963) *The Letters of the Younger Pliny*. Baltimore: Penguin.
- Ragghianti, Carlo Ludovico (1964). *The Painters of Pompeii*, transl. Shirley Bridges. Milan: Edizioni del Milione.
- Richardson, Lawrence Jr. (2000). *A Catalog of Identifiable Figure Painters of Ancient Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Stabiae*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Ridgway, Brunilde Sismondo (2004). *Second Chance: Greek Sculptural Studies Revisited*. London: Pindar.
- Robins, Gay (1997). *The Art of Ancient Egypt*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Scheller, Robert W. (1995). *Exemplum. Model-Book Drawings and the Practice of Artistic Transmission in the Middle Ages (ca. 900 – ca. 1470)*, transl. Michael Hoyle. Amsterdam: Amsterdam Univ. Press.
- Schmidt, Erika E. (1973). *Die Kopien der Erechtheionkoren. Antike Plastik* 13. Berlin: Gebr. Mann.
- Small, Jocelyn Penny (1997). *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Small, Jocelyn Penny (1999). "Time in Space: Narrative in Classical Art." *ABull* 81: 562-575.
- Small, Jocelyn Penny (2003). *The Parallel Worlds of Classical Art and Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Smithsonian* (October 2005). "This Side of Parodies": 116.
- Stewart, Andrew (1990). *Greek Sculpture. An Exploration*. 2 vols. New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press.

- Stewart, Andrew (1993). *Faces of Power: Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press.
- Stewart, Peter (2003). *Statues in Roman Society. Representation and Response*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Trimble, Jennifer and Jas Elsner, eds. (2006). "Art and Replication: Greece, Rome and Beyond." *Art History* 29.2: 201-342.
- Varner, Eric R. (2006). Review of Perry (2005). *AJA* 110: 678-79.
- Wright, David H. (1993). *The Vatican Vergil: a Masterpiece of Late Antique Art*. Berkeley and Oxford: Univ. of California Press.

CHAPTER TWELVE

ORALITY AND AUTOBIOGRAPHY: THE CASE OF THE *RES GESTAE*¹

NIALL W. SLATER

In AD 14 on the 19th of the month that had already been renamed for him, the emperor Augustus died. To the Roman world he had transformed from a warring republic to a peaceful empire, he left behind, deposited along with his will in the keeping of the Vestal Virgins, some final words addressed to the Roman people, a text now known as the *Res Gestae*.² Nothing quite like the *Res Gestae* is known from Rome, either before or after it.³ Its value as a historical source has been disputed almost from the beginning: where Wilamowitz found it “kurz und knapp, klar und wahr,”⁴ others have seen the skilled work of a “memory entrepreneur,” whose details are to be used only when other sources fail.⁵ In the ongoing debates over the nature of the Augustan imperial settlement, however, discussion of the form of the *Res Gestae* as an act of communication has usually been pushed to the background, as has its importance as autobiography, however brief. Although Augustus’ own words more than once (4.4; 7.2; 35.2) acknowledge the status of the *Res Gestae* as writing, the first person mode of discourse seems to position

¹ Mark Toher and Herbert Benario offered invaluable advice on, and careful reading of, the arguments here advanced; neither necessarily endorses these conclusions nor bears any responsibility for the errors which remain. Christopher Pelling most generously shared his forthcoming paper on Augustus’ *Commentaries* with me. I remain grateful to the audience in Auckland for their salutary discussion. A travel grant from Emory’s Institute for Comparative and International Studies as well as support from my own department facilitated my participation in the conference, and I acknowledge both with gratitude.

² Suetonius, *Aug.* 101.4, cited p.262 below.

³ Kienast (1999: 208) declares magisterially: “Für diesen *index rerum a se gestarum* gibt es in der ganzen antiken Literatur keine wirkliche Parallele.” Cf. Wilamowitz (1886: 624): “... vielleicht passt sie in kein Fach unserer litteraturgeschichtlichen Registratur.”

⁴ Wilamowitz (1886: 625). Cf. Ramage (1987: 11): “The *Res Gestae* is the single most important historical document of the Augustan period ...”

⁵ Güven (1998: 30), borrowing the concept of the “memory entrepreneur” from James Young. For historians’ views of the *Res Gestae*, see Yavetz (1984: esp. 22).

the text somewhere between the oral and the written. While the text of *Res Gestae* reaches back to the orality of archaic tomb inscription⁶ and funerary oration, Augustus' placement of it within his architectural and topographical plan for Rome invites a particular performative experience, of hearing Augustus speak, even as it constructs the imperial identity.⁷ It thus looks forward toward a long and developing tradition of political autobiography.

Notably, Augustus' own oral praxis was so recursively engaged with writing that Suetonius found it worthy of special remark:

nam deinceps neque in senatu neque apud populum neque apud milites locutus est unquam nisi meditata et composita oratione, quamvis non deficeretur ad subita extemporalis facultate. ac ne periculum memoriae adiret aut in ediscendo tempus absumeret, instituit recitare omnia. sermones quoque cum singulis atque etiam cum Livia sua graviore non nisi scriptos et e libello habebat, ne plus minusve loqueretur ex tempore. (Suet. *Aug.* 84)

Moreover he never addressed the Senate or the people or soldiers except in carefully composed speeches, although he had no lack of extemporaneous speaking ability. Lest he risk forgetting his words or waste time in memorizing, he regularly read everything out. More serious conversations with individuals and even with his wife Livia he also conducted from a written text, lest he say too much or too little spontaneously.

This last anecdotal touch seems not so much a criticism of political pomposity (“the emperor reads memos even to his wife”) as it is an insight into writing as a key to control over speech. Like other contemporaries, Augustus used writing to extend the range and power of speech. As early as 36 BC, he published some of his own speeches as part of the contest for public opinion.⁸ More unusual is an account of his achievements that, two decades later in 13 BC, the well-established *princeps* composed and then instructed the quaestor to read out in the Senate.⁹ Speeches discussing his own actions were undoubtedly in first person. Of the latter account nothing more is known, though its potential for overlap with the final form of the *Res Gestae* is obvious.

⁶ Hohl 1947. 112 [1969. 194] attributes the interpretation of the *RG* as a “grave inscription” first to H. Nissen and E. Bormann.

⁷ See Sturrock (1993: 25) on how “autobiography ... appeal[s] to ... its readers to progress in intimacy with the autobiographer.”

⁸ Appian *BC* 5.130: καὶ τὰ εἰρημμένα συγγράψας τὸ βιβλίον ἐξέδωκε. These speeches defended τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν ἑαυτοῦ.

⁹ Cass. Dio 54.25.5.

The *Res Gestae*, moreover, were not Augustus' first written and published narrative of his life and times. The ghostly presence of this earlier narrative, surviving only in a few fragments, has the potential to keep us from seeing the autobiographical ambitions of what does survive in the *Res Gestae*, and so some attention to the potential and limits of this earlier work are in order. Suetonius reports among Augustus' works in prose one of thirteen books that reached down to the Cantabrian War, mentioned by other writers as well:

multa varii generis prosa oratione composuit, ex quibus nonnulla in coetu familiarium velut in auditorio recitavit, sicut "Rescripta Bruto de Catone," quae volumina cum iam senior ex magna parte legisset, fatigatus Tiberio tradidit perlegenda; item "Hortationes ad philosophiam," et aliqua "De vita sua," quam tredecim libris Cantabrico tenus bello nec ultra exposuit. (Suet. *Aug.* 85)

[Augustus] composed many prose works of various kinds, including some that he performed aloud before family and friends, as if in a public hall, such as his *Reply to Brutus concerning Cato*. When as an older man he had already recited most volumes of this work, worn out, he handed over the rest to Tiberius to read. He also wrote *Exhortations to Philosophy* and something concerning his own life, in thirteen books, which went no further than the Cantabrian War.

The Cantabrian War was a part of Augustus' pacification campaign in Spain, soon after he was granted the title of Augustus. Orosius (6.21) dates it between 28 and 24 BC, although Syme argues forcefully that the term should be applied only to the campaign Augustus conducted personally in 26 BC.¹⁰ A brief exploration of the little known about this lost work provides an instructive backdrop to viewing the *Res Gestae*.¹¹

Its very title is in question. English language scholarship most often cites this work as Augustus' *Autobiography* or occasionally his *Memoirs*, but the ancient sources do not agree on a designation. What Suetonius and Ulpian call *de vita sua*, Tertullian cites (*De anim.* 46) as *commentarii*, while Servius speaks of the work both as *de memoria vitae suae* and *in commemoratione vitae suae*.¹² Greek sources such as Plu-

¹⁰ Syme (1934: esp. 305-10).

¹¹ Still fundamental are: Blumenthal (1913a), (1913b), and (1914). More recently (and more speculatively), Lewis (1993: 669-89).

¹² Suet. *Aug.* 85, cited p.255, above. Ulpian (*Dig.* 48.24.1) is cited in full, p.257, below. Tert. *De anim.* 46.8: *in vitae illius commentariis conditum est* ("It is found in the commentaries on his life"). Servius auct. *ad Verg., Ecl.* 9.46: *hoc etiam Augustus in libro secundo de memoria vitae suae complexus est* ("Augustus included this also in Book 2 of the memoir of his life"). Servius auct. *ad Aen.* 8. 696: *et Augustus in*

tarch and Appian refer to it as ὑπομνήματα, which seems to have been a regular translation for the Latin *commentarii*.¹³ While “Memoirs” rather than “Commentaries” might better convey in English the association of the work with memory that all these designations imply,¹⁴ the latter title helps us see potential connections with other writers of *commentarii*.

Malcovati’s edition of the fragments of Augustus numbers some 23 items under the heading of *Commentarii de vita sua*, of which the latter five Malcovati herself considers somewhat speculative. Even a shorter list may present a misleading picture of our knowledge of this lost early work, since some do no more than attest to its existence, and others cite its authority for facts in Augustus’ life otherwise attested. Only one purports to offer a significant direct quotation from the Latin text—and I shall shortly try to cast doubt on the correctness of attributing these lines to the *Commentaries*.

While there is no direct date for the *Commentaries*, the extensive reconstruction by Fritz Blumenthal places the beginnings of its composition no earlier than 16 January 27 BC, the date on which the Senate gave him the title of Augustus, and its termination no later than the beginning of his second eastern journey in autumn 22 BC.¹⁵ Blumenthal speculates that its publication might be linked to Augustus’ second closure of the gates of the Temple of Janus in 25 BC.¹⁶ Augustus dedicated the work to Maecenas and Agrippa.¹⁷ All scholars see this earlier work as a significant part of Augustus’ justification of his own role and policies down

commemoratione vitae suae refert ... (“Also Augustus in the memoir of his life refers to ...”).

¹³ Plut. *Brut.* 27: ὡς αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν εἶρηκεν (“As Augustus himself says in his notes/commentaries”); cf. App. *B. Civ.* 4.110: ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν. As Bömer (1953) shows, the Roman concept is older. The equivalence of the terms is not exact, nor are *commentarii* a tightly defined genre: see especially Rüpke (1992: 202-4). As evidence for Augustus’ title for his work, however, the Greek citations are persuasive.

¹⁴ See Pelling (forthcoming), citing also Marincola (1997: 181).

¹⁵ Blumenthal (1913a: 113-14). Hahn (1958-1960: 147) suggests a wider span of 29-23 BC.

¹⁶ The first closure was in 29 BC. One should bear in mind that the second closure might loom much larger in retrospect than at the time. Augustus says that the Senate voted for a third closure (*ter me principe senatus claudendum esse censuit*, *RG* 13), probably in 11 BC, but it may never have been celebrated due to war on the Dacian frontier: see Bosworth (1999: 14 and n.87, with further references).

¹⁷ Plut. *Comp. Dem. and Cic.* 3.1 (Malcovati [1962: fr. 8]), although Pelling (forthcoming) raises some intriguing doubts as to whether there might be a misunderstanding in the tradition.

to its publication. There is no evidence that he ever intended to continue the work beyond thirteen books, though that is certainly a curious number.

It is intriguing that so little of this text survives. Some form of it was still available in the third century when Ulpian cited the tenth book on a point of law:

Ulpianus libro nono de officio proconsulis: corpora eorum, qui capite damnantur, cognatis ipsorum neganda non sunt, et id se observasse etiam divus Augustus libro decimo de vita sua scribit. (Ulp. *Dig.* 48.24.1)

Ulpian in Book 9 on the duties of the proconsul: “the bodies of those condemned to death are not to be denied to their relatives, and this the Divus Augustus writes in Book 10 concerning his own life that he himself has observed.”

Otherwise the work left remarkably little direct trace. While such is an argument from silence, this absence of citation suggests that, although Augustus himself must have been responsible for publishing the *Commentaries* in the 20s, he made no effort later in his life to ensure their dissemination or even preservation. It seems curious that Suetonius, who could cite letters of Augustus from the imperial archives, could not or did not choose to quote directly from the *Commentaries*.¹⁸ These thirteen books covered his entire public career as Octavian—but only a year or two of his life as Augustus. It is hard to imagine that Augustus did not see his return of the state to the Senate and Roman people on 13 January 27 BC as a major dividing point in his own life. Why then continue with the beginning of his ten-year imperium in Spain—but only down through the Cantabrian War?

There is one apparent exception to the general tendency to refer to this work only briefly: one and only one extensive direct quotation commonly attributed to the *Commentaries*.¹⁹ It appears in Pliny’s dis-

¹⁸ Murray and Petsas (1989: 71 and n.77) do suggest that Suet. *Aug.* 18.2 adapts, though does not quote directly, the text of the dedicatory inscription on Augustus’ Actian victory monument from a copy of the *Commentaries*, but one might postulate other means of transmission. Pelling (forthcoming) comments on the curious absence of childhood anecdotes about Augustus in the biographical tradition (and see much more briefly Pelling [1990: 216]). This might be a result of early neglect of the *Commentaries*—but why assume they contained such anecdotes at all? Such material, beloved by the writer of *bioi*, may have had little or no place in the *Commentaries*.

¹⁹ I leave aside here the issue of the words of Lucius Antony and Augustus rendered in direct speech in Greek by Appian *B. Civ.* 5.42-45 (Malcovati [1962: fr. 13]). Appian gives as his source τῶν ὑπομνημάτων (5.45), but as Hahn (1958-

cussion of astronomical prodigies in Book II of his *Natural History*. Here is the relevant text, with the quotation of Augustus' own words italicised:

cometes in uno totius orbis loco colitur in templo Romae, admodum faustus divo Augusto iudicatus ab ipso, qui incipiente eo apparuit ludis, quos faciebat Veneri Genetrici non multo post obitum patris Caesaris in collegio ab eo instituto. namque his verbis in [...]

[94] gaudium prodit is: *ipsis ludorum meorum diebus sidus crinitum per septem dies in regione caeli sub septentrionibus est conspectum. id orientatur circa undecimam horam diei clarumque et omnibus e terris conspicuum fuit. eo sidere significari vulgus credidit Caesaris animam inter deorum immortalium numina receptam, quo nomine id insigne simulacro capitis eius, quod mox in foro consecravimus, adiectum est.* haec ille in publicum; interiore gaudio sibi illum natum seque in eo nasci interpretatus est.²⁰ (NH 2. 93-94)

The only place in all the world where a comet is worshipped in a temple is at Rome. The Divine Augustus considered this comet very propitious to himself, because it appeared at the beginning of his career when he was holding games for Venus Genetrix not long after the death of his father Caesar, under the auspices of a college he had founded. In fact in the following words in ... he proclaimed his joy: "*In the very days of my games a comet was visible for seven days in the northern part of the sky. It rose about the 11th hour [i.e., an hour before sunset] and was bright and visible from all lands. The public believed this comet signified that Caesar's soul had been welcomed among the spirits of the immortal gods. For this reason this emblem [of a star] was added to the image of his head which we thereafter dedicated in the Forum.*" These things he said publicly; with inward joy, he interpreted the comet as having been born for him and himself as born in it.

Mayoff first noted a lacuna in the manuscript after *in* at the very end of section 93. Though at least one scholar has suggested the quotation

1960: 140) points out, apart from any translation difficulties (alluded to by Appian), no author is cited, and it is doubtful whether Augustus' original work contained such direct speeches, so dramatization by Appian or an intermediate source may be suspected, even if the *Commentaries* are the ultimate source.

²⁰ I wonder if this last sentence, a clear specimen of interpretive psychonarration, has played some unconscious role in the desire to find in the preceding direct quotation an example of autobiographical statement. Note, however, that this sentence represents precisely Pliny's and *not* Augustus' "retrospective summary of the experiencer's thoughts and feelings" (Löschnigg [2006: 5]) such as characterizes the experientiality of later autobiographical narrative (notably Augustine's and other spiritual autobiographies). It is, however, beyond improbable to think that the *Commentaries* themselves would have reflected on the difference between the author's public claims and his real private motivations.

might come from one of Augustus' speeches rather than the *Commentaries*, some supplement to the text indicating the latter has been widely accepted.²¹

Because of the unique status of this fragment as evidence for the form of the lost *Commentaries* or *Memoirs*, the question of its attribution seems worth reopening. Two words here, the personal possessive *meorum* and the first person plural verb *consecravimus*, are the sole direct evidence, if correctly attributed, for a first-person narration within the *Commentaries*.²² If Pliny in fact quotes rather from one of the speeches published in 36 BC or even from the account read out in the Senate in 13 BC, there would be no evidence for the narrative voice of the lost *Commentaries*. Notably, there is no independent date for the public action Augustus mentions here: we do not know which statue (or is it only a bust?) in the Forum he means. Statues of Caesar existed already at the time of the assassination, and some were pulled down in its aftermath.²³ Thereafter Antony erected a statue of Caesar on the Rostra,²⁴ but Octavian can hardly have claimed that he dedicated (*consecravimus*) that statue. A series of coins from the teens BC, however, shows a renewed emphasis on Caesar's apotheosis. One coin of the moneyer Lentulus, perhaps as late as 12 BC, shows Augustus placing a star on the statue of Caesar.²⁵ The specific action Octavian/Augustus mentions in the passage quoted is therefore hard to date, but Pliny's interpretation of the emotional tone of the passage (*gaudium prodit*) may suggest a time of composition closer to the original events.²⁶

²¹ See also Hahn (1958-1960: 140) for problems with the fragment "in auffallenden Berichtsstil und ohne Quellenangabe." Comparisons with Suet. *Iul.* 88 on the comet (p. 143) make Hahn suspect a common source which is *not* directly the text of the *Commentaries*.

²² Marincola (1997: 196 n.101) claims another example of first person, accepting the attribution by Peter (1967: 64) of Isidore of Seville, *De rerum natura* 44.4, to the *Commentaries*. The entire text reads: *et Augustus inquit, nos venimus Neapolim fluctu quidem caeco*. Malcovati (1962) does not include this in the fragments of the *Commentaries*, nor do I see any reason to place it there.

²³ App. *B.Civ.* 3.3.7.

²⁴ Cic. *Fam.* 12.3.1.

²⁵ White (1988: 338-39 and n.15) discusses the series of coins and suggests "the star or comet is a more insistent focus of the new coins than of pre-Action coins in Caesar's honor." For the coin of Augustus crowning Caesar's statue, see Mattingly and Sydenham (1923: no. 415); illustrated and discussed also in Beacham (2005: 152-53 and fig. 6).

²⁶ Ramsey and Licht (1997: 135-47, and esp. 144 n.33) make one very important point: the term Octavian/Augustus uses for the comet here, *sidus crinitum*, is "without precedent." Before this moment, a comet was always termed either *cometes* or

Thinking of this work as Augustus' *Commentaries* (as few writing in English do) may help us to a new framing of it. While Augustus in the 20s BC no longer needed to establish himself as Caesar's heir, which was the critical issue in the immediate aftermath of the assassination in 44, his decision to write a large-scale narrative of his own actions and in particular his military campaigns cannot have been taken without an awareness of the precedent of Julius Caesar's own *Commentaries*. They were already a literary classic, and while Syme argued that the well-established Augustus moved to distance himself from the dictator Caesar, Peter White has amassed considerable evidence that Caesar's memory was still well cultivated under Augustus.²⁷ In particular, the Caesarian literary model might make more sense of the curious ending point of Augustus' work: the Cantabrian War. As Suetonius points out, this was the last campaign that Augustus led personally:

externa bella duo omnino per se gessit, Delmaticum adulescens adhuc, et Antonio devicto Cantabricum. (Suet. *Aug.* 20)

Augustus commanded personally in only two foreign wars, the Dalmatian War when still a teenager, and the Cantabrian War, after conquering Antony.

Although militarily of far less consequence than his previous campaigns, the Cantabrian War was the end of Augustus' personal military career—and he could feel relatively secure at the time that it was so.²⁸ If his own military career was a major structuring element in the composition of the *Commentaries*, their natural end came in Spain.

The *Commentaries on the Gallic War* alone will have established the distinctly Caesarian third-person style. While no previous Roman *com-*

stella crinita or *stella comans*, and the use of the noun *sidus* for a single star is quite rare (normally it means “constellation”). In their view the neologism *sidus crinitum* represents a later partial concession in a debate whether the heavenly portent was a comet (normally boding ill) or a new star (a positive sign of Caesar's apotheosis). One might speculate that the speeches of 36 BC could have been the right time for such a compromise term.

²⁷ White (1988).

²⁸ Syme suggests that severe illness and thoughts of imminent mortality led Augustus to write up his career when he did, remarking oracularly “for the year 25 B.C. Augustus would have had nothing but his maladies to recount” (Syme [1934: 306 n.39]). Such a motivation would not exclude another literary and structural “sense of an ending” for the work as well. Lewis (1993: 686-88) imagines a connection with promoting the young Marcellus, but this depends on Lewis' own expansive reconstruction.

mentarii used the third person,²⁹ Caesar's example may have influenced Josephus's choice to write of his own generalship in that way.³⁰ For Caesar's adopted son and heir to write *Commentaries* on his own life and wars in the first person would be a marked break with both an instant literary classic and the father figure that first legitimized his role in the state.³¹

A definitive settlement of all questions of genre and intent for the *Commentaries* is not in sight; nevertheless, opening up the question of the form in which the *Commentaries* presented themselves does help place them within the context of Augustus' long life. They were not history per se—but neither need they have been an autobiography in our modern sense, either psychologically or in narrative voice.³² Insofar as they recorded parts of a life, they were mostly deeds of Caesar Octavianus. Their lost status makes it tempting to imagine they offered a sense of private or interior experience as well as a record of public life and deeds,³³ but there is no particular reason to suppose this. In turning to the *Res Gestae*, we need simply hold open the possibility, indeed the strong possibility, that this inscription was *not* a return by Augustus to a first-person mode of narrating his life and deeds that had already been practised and abandoned more than three decades before, but rather a quite different way of communicating to the Roman people his account of his conduct as *princeps* through nearly six decades, as he was laying down that charge.

²⁹ Marincola (1997: 196).

³⁰ Joseph. *BJ* 3: Kraus (2005: 188).

³¹ Pelling (forthcoming) calls Caesar's *Commentaries* "probably the most important single antecedent of Augustus' work." Cf. Peter (1967: lxxii). Julius Caesar certainly remains important in the *Res Gestae*, though called only *parens* (2) or *pater* (10.2, 15.1, 20.3), with one exception: Augustus' building of the Temple of Divine Julius (*aedem divi Iuli*, 19.1). Cf. Le Glay (1993: 116-17).

³² Syme (1934: 306 and n.38) forcefully separates history from autobiography, citing App. *Ill.* 15 as the grounds for considering Augustus' work nothing but an autobiography. Yet Appian's comment that Augustus wrote not of other's deeds, but his own (οὐ γὰρ ἀλλοτρίας πράξεις ὁ Σεβαστός, ἀλλὰ τὰς ἑαυτοῦ συνέγραψεν) could apply just as well to Caesar's *Commentaries*—and few have claimed these as autobiography. The earliest citation of the term "autobiography" in the *OED* is from 1797, and as Ferry (1983: esp. 1-70) shows, a psychological voice of "inwardness" is a very late development.

³³ André (1993) seems to imagine the lost *Commentaries* and the *Res Gestae* as a paired inner and outer autobiography, but there is no evidence Augustus conceived them in this way.

What was the intended performance context of the *Res Gestae*? Suetonius tells us of the instructions Augustus had deposited along with his will in the care of the Vestal Virgins:

tribus voluminibus, uno mandata de funere suo complexus est, altero indicem rerum a se gestarum, quem vellet incidi in aeneis tabulis, quae ante Mausoleum statuerentur ... (Suet. *Aug.* 101.4)

three volumes, one of which contained instructions for his funeral, another a record of his personal achievements, which he wanted engraved on bronze tablets, to be erected in front of his Mausoleum ...

The text we have has been put together from three inscriptions, all from the province of Galatia: the bilingual *Monumentum Ancyranum* from the Temple of Rome and Augustus in Ankara, a fragmentary copy of the Greek version in Pisidia, and a fragmentary Latin text from Antioch.³⁴ The introductory sentence on the *Monumentum* states that it is a copy of the text erected at Rome, though this text indicates that the original was erected on bronze pillars, rather than tablets:

Rerum gestarum Divi Augusti, quibus orbem terrarum imperio populi Romani subiecit, et inpensarum, quas in rem publicam populumque Romanum fecit, incisarum in duabus aeneis pilis, quae sunt Romae positae, exemplar subiectum.

A copy is set out below of ‘The achievements of the Divine Augustus, by which he brought the world under the empire of the Roman people, and the expenses which he bore for the state and people of Rome’; the original is engraved on two bronze pillars set up at Rome. (transl. Brunt and Moore)

Before contemplating this small but perhaps significant apparent variation between intended and actual display, let us look for a moment at the purported setting.

Augustus wanted his *Res Gestae* to stand before his Mausoleum, an enormous earth and brick structure he had erected in 28 BC in the Campus Martius, the centrepiece of his reconstruction of this area of Rome. One of the earliest and certainly one of the most massive elements of the Augustan building program, it not only rivalled in scale its namesake,

³⁴ The monumental first edition is Mommsen (1883) (reprinted 1970). Brunt and Moore (1973: 1-2) offer a convenient history with further references. The text is quoted from Scheid (2007), which reached me only in the final stages of preparation; translations are my own, unless noted as from Brunt and Moore. Güven (1998) is an excellent recent study of the *Monumentum Ancyranum* in its provincial context, with numerous illustrations.

Mausolus' tomb in Halicarnassus, but in its remarkable mixture of plantings, statuary, and architecture, as Henner von Hesburg points out, it alluded to another of the seven wonders of the ancient world, the hanging gardens of Babylon.³⁵

Whether Augustus had planned to link a text such as the *Res Gestae* with his Mausoleum from the beginning, a text he thereafter revised until his death, or came to this idea only later has been long discussed, with no resolution in sight. If there was an *Urtext* of 28 BC, with later accretions, no one has made a compelling argument for discerning the layers.³⁶ It is true that the *Res Gestae* list few datable events or achievements after 2 BC—yet that is most likely a consequence of the work's rhetorical structure. In 2 BC the Senate bestowed upon Augustus the title of *pater patriae*. This achievement, recorded in the penultimate sentence, is clearly the high point of Augustus' career and arguably the goal toward which the whole composition has been aimed:³⁷

tertium decimum consulatum cum gerebam, senatus et equester ordo populusque Romanus universus appellavit me patrem patriae, idque in vestibulo aedium mearum inscribendum et in curia Iulia et in foro Augusto sub quadrigis quae mihi ex senatus consulto positae sunt censuit. cum scripsi haec annum agebam septuagensimum sextum. (*RG* 35)

In my thirteenth consulship the senate, the equestrian order, and the whole people of Rome gave me the title of Father of my country and resolved that this should be inscribed in the porch of my house and in the Curia Julia and in the Forum Augustum below the chariot which had been set there in my honour by decree of the senate. At the time of writing I am in my seventy-sixth year. (transl. Brunt and Moore)

Undoubtedly, at first glance, the *Res Gestae* seem a resolutely written act of communication, for this last sentence is Augustus' third reference

³⁵ Hesburg (1988: 248), though not repeated in his later discussion of the gardens in Hesburg and Panciera (1994: 35-36). The statement of Hesburg (1988: 248) that "das Mausoleum des Augustus übertrifft sein Vorbild in Halikarnassus um einige Meter an Höhe" depends on particulars of reconstruction. Reeder (1992: 269), following Ganzert, gives the edge to Mausolus's tomb. The construction date of 28 BC relies on Suet. *Aug.* 100: *id opus inter Flaminiam viam ripamque Tiberis sexto suo consulatu exstruxerat circumiectasque silvas et ambulationes in usum populi iam tum publicarat.*

³⁶ Hohl (1947: 111 [1969: 191]) criticizes the notion of a first version of the *RG* composed as early as 23 BC. Koernemann eventually tried to distinguish seven stages of composition, but has won few adherents: see the brief summary in Ramage (1987: 132), with ample references, and now briefly Scheid (2007: xxv-xxvi).

³⁷ Eder (2005: esp. 17-18, 29-32).

to his own act of writing contained within the composition. Twice before he refers insistently to the time and act of his writing:

consul fueram terdecies cum scribebam haec... (RG 4.4)

I was consul for the 13th time, when I was writing this ...

princeps senatus fui usque ad eum diem, quo scripseram ... (RG 7.2)

I have been princeps of the Senate up to the day on which I wrote this ...

Yet these references seem more to dramatize the moment of the reader's encounter with the author finishing his account of his actions than to fix attention on form. The text of the *Res Gestae* itself also shows how Augustus used writing or abstention from writing as a means of controlling the speech (and therefore performance) of others. He ordered that the restoration of Caesar's Basilica Julia, which he had begun after a fire, be dedicated:

solo sub titulo nominis filiorum meorum ... (RG 20.3)

only in the name of my sons [i.e., Gaius and Lucius]

For other building and restoration projects he notes:

Capitolium et Pompeium theatrum utrumque opus impensa grandi refeci sine ulla inscriptione nominis mei. (RG 20.1)

I restored the Capitol and the theatre of Pompey, both works at great expense without inscribing my name on either. (transl. Brunt and Moore)

Even subtler is his strategy with the Porticus Octavia:

porticum ad circum Flaminium, quam sum appellari passus ex nomine eius, qui priorem eodem in solo fecerat, Octaviam ... (RG 19.1)

[I built] ... the portico at the Flaminian Circus, which I permitted to bear the name of the Portico of Octavius after the man who erected the previous portico on the same site ... (transl. Brunt and Moore)

Augustus' silence about the long list of his other buildings nonetheless allows us to infer that he *did* inscribe his name on all those,³⁸ but within the *Res Gestae*, Augustus represents himself as more the inscribed rather than the inscriber. The two crowning achievements of the *Res Gestae*, when he is first named Augustus by the Senate and then *pater patriae* by the Senate, the equestrians, and the whole people of Rome, each result

³⁸ According to Le Glay (1993: 199), "Aucune de ces constructions n'est innocente."

in an inscription. The latter honour is triply inscribed (*RG* 35): in the *vestibulum* of his house,³⁹ in the Senate, and in the widest public space, the Forum. The much earlier title of Augustus was marked most conspicuously by an inscription in the Senate:

clupeus aureus in curia Iulia positus, quem mihi senatum populumque Romanum dare virtutis clementiaeque iustitiae et pietatis causa testatum est per eius clupei inscriptionem. (*RG* 34.2)

a golden shield was set up in the Curia Julia, which, as attested by the inscription thereon, was given me by the Senate and people of Rome on account of my courage, clemency, justice, and piety. (transl. Brunt and Moore)

This shield inscription is now commonly called the *Clupeus virtutis*. E. S. Ramage suggests that Augustus “quotes the inscription [on the shield] as if he is reading it . . . Along with his reader, he is firmly in the position of observer.”⁴⁰ This may overstate the case slightly—the text on the shield is reported in indirect discourse⁴¹—but Augustus here does model the reading of an inscription within another inscription. It is also possible that a marble copy of the *Clupeus virtutis* appeared on Augustus’ Mausoleum.⁴²

It is precisely the difference from familiar types of Roman honorific inscriptions, including the *Clupeus virtutis*, that make the *Res Gestae* so remarkable. The Senate and people granted titles and honours, and then recorded these in inscriptions set up in standard places, the Senate and Forum. The *Res Gestae* is a first-person account apparently intended to stand before his Mausoleum and speak somehow directly to the Roman populace enjoying the Campus Martius. Intended, says Suetonius—but we cannot be absolutely sure that Augustus’ intentions were carried out precisely.

³⁹ Itself a public space, since he had established there an altar and shrine for Vesta, once he became pontifex maximus; see Ramage (1987: 84). Augustus died at Nola, and his body was carried back to Rome, for the last stage by Roman equites, who laid his body in state precisely in this vestibule, where the inscription appeared: *a Bovillis equester ordo suscepit, urbique intulit atque in vestibulo domus conlocavit* (Suet. *Aug.* 100).

⁴⁰ Ramage (1987: 26).

⁴¹ See Ramage (1987: 73-100) for the importance of the shield and its virtues in the structuring of the *Res Gestae*.

⁴² See Panciera’s discussion and reconstruction in Hesberg and Panciera (1994: 113-18, ills. 15 and 15a, and pls. 5a and 5b): doubted by G. Alföldy, *CIL* VI 40365: see Scheid (2007: 90-91).

The medium here seems to be a key part of the message. In a fundamental study, Callie Williamson has argued that all the evidence of surviving Roman bronze tablets underscores a profound ontological symbolism, quite consistent with Augustus' ambitions for the *Res Gestae*: "Bronze tablets were eternal."⁴³ From the overwhelming evidence for the location of bronze tablets at Rome (temple walls and precincts, most often on the Capitoline), she offers an even more striking thesis:

"... all bronze tablets were conventionally considered sacred. They were objects intended for or belonging to, and therefore protected by, the gods."

Strong support for this claim comes from two incidents in the late Republic when bronze tablets on the Capitoline were struck and melted by lightning, prompting profound religious concern and Senate consultations with religious authorities on expiations.⁴⁴

What sort of statement was Augustus therefore making when he left specific instructions that his *Res Gestae*, like international treaties and statutes of the Roman people, should be engraved on bronze? Even more intriguing, what did Augustus' plans for the location of this inscription say about his conception of that space—and of himself? Suetonius records his intention that the *Res Gestae* be inscribed on bronze tablets before the Mausoleum: *quem vellet incidi in aeneis tabulis, quae ante Mausoleum staturerentur ... (Augustus 101.4)*. The surviving introduction on the *Monumentum Ancyranum* says something slightly different; his *Res Gestae* were on two bronzes "pillars" or "piers": *rerum gestarum Divi Augusti ... incisarum in duabus aeneis pilis, quae sunt Romae positae*. If the religious associations of inscriptions on bronze were as powerful as Williamson asserts, did Augustus' original plans for placing the *Res Gestae* before his tomb mean he expected that space to

⁴³ Williamson (1987: 169). Note the key evidence she cites from Pliny the Elder for this conscious contemporary understanding: *usus aeris ad perpetuitatem monumentorum iam pridem tralatus est tabulis aereis, in quibus publicae constitutiones inciduntur (HN 34.99)*. I am most grateful to Linda Zollschan for calling my attention to Williamson.

⁴⁴ Williamson (1987: 174-75): in 65 BC, just before the Catilinarian conspiracy (Cic. *Cat.* 3.19; *Div.* 1.12.19) and in 43 BC (Cass. Dio 45.17.3). Cf. Meyer (2004: 99-100): "the divine seemed to be rendering its low opinion of the laws it chose to liquefy, and to be changing reality back to what it had been before the law had come into being." When Julius Caesar ordered citizenship grants inscribed on bronze to be torn down (Cic. *Fam.* 13.36), this destruction cancelled the grants.

be understood as sacred, even divine?⁴⁵ The son and heir of Divus Julius might well have expected to become, as he did, Divus Augustus.

It is worth contemplating the possibility that Tiberius, Augustus' heir, not only revised the text of the *Res Gestae* slightly to bring it up to the very date of his death,⁴⁶ but also chose to revise Augustus' very specific "performance" instructions for the inscription. Both Suetonius and Cassius Dio refer to Augustus' *plans* for the *Res Gestae*, but only the *Monumentum Ancyranum* cites the existing inscription.⁴⁷ Some have seen no difference between *pilis* (bronze pillars) and *tabellis* (tablets).⁴⁸ The simple citation of the inscription's location as "in Rome" (*Romae positae*) however, seems curious if its final location were indeed in front of the Mausoleum—all the more so in light of Williamson's evidence that the Romans regularly cited locations for bronze inscriptions quite precisely: for instance, not merely on a particular temple wall, but high or low on that wall.⁴⁹ A Galatian audience may not have expected such

⁴⁵ Reeder (1992: esp. 300) argues from architectural allusions and motifs in the Mausoleum, particularly the annual passageways within that dictated a slow, circular progression to the burial chamber, that: "The Mausoleum of Augustus, then, was not merely a funerary monument but a cultic one as well. It served as an Augusteum or temple for the living ruler and later for a daily sacrifice to the *divus* Augustus." Bosworth (1999: 1) claims "strong resonances of the Hellenistic doctrine of apotheosis" in the language of the *Res Gestae*, although I would not share his emphasis on the golden stele of the human, later divinized Zeus in Euhemerus's work (p.11) as a precedent.

⁴⁶ Augustus says in the text of the *RG* that he is writing "in my seventy-sixth year" (*agebam septuagesimum sextum*, 35.2). His will, deposited with the Vestal Virgins along a text of the *RG* (Suet. *Aug.* 101.4), was dated 3 April of the year preceding his death. Most scholars assume that all the documents were deposited at the same time, on or immediately after the date of the will. If so, at a minimum Tiberius has to have revised dates and figures such as the number of grants of tribunician power. The text of Suetonius will bear other constructions (separate dates of deposit for documents other than the will, for example), but a scenario of some Tiberian reconstruction seems simplest.

⁴⁷ Cass. Dio 56.33 gives an account which seems either to confuse or amalgamate the versions of Suetonius and the *Monumentum Ancyranum*: τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἔπραξε πάντα, ἃ καὶ ἐξ χαλκᾶς στήλας πρὸς τῷ ἡρώῳ αὐτοῦ σταθείσας ἀναγραφῆναι ἐκέλευσε ("all the deeds he had done which he ordered to be inscribed onto bronze stelai erected at his heroon").

⁴⁸ The στήλαι of Cass. Dio 56.33 seem more likely to be free-standing pillars or piers, as Kornemann (1921: 12-18) interprets them, though he considers such pillars to be Augustus' original plan, not a Tiberian variation, dismissing the words of Suetonius as "wie so oft, ungenau" (p.17). Luigi Crema, cited approvingly by Richardson (1992: 248), suggested that the inscribed marble tablets on the exterior of the tomb of the Plautii at Tivoli might imitate Augustus' design, but *pilae* does not seem the right term for these. Cf. most recently Hesberg and Panciera (1994: 31-32).

⁴⁹ Williamson (1987: 165-66), with examples.

precision—but there may be a bit more to say about the difference between *pilis* and *tabellis*.

While tablets are very much the standard practice, there is some evidence for Roman inscriptions on bronze columns. Varro mentions an intercalary law of the fifth century BC “engraved on a column” (*lex incisa in columna aerea*).⁵⁰ Direct and indirect evidence for free-standing inscriptions on bronze stelai survives from fifth century BC Athens (and perhaps earlier), stelai both flat and triangular—intriguingly, quite often condemnations of state enemies such as Diagoras the Melian.⁵¹

If Tiberius indeed changed Augustus’ plans and ordered the *Res Gestae* placed on free-standing pillars, he would have rendered Augustus’ words architecturally more impressive—but concomitantly perhaps much less legible. Henner von Hesberg estimates the text would have occupied on the order of 10 square meters of bronze, even with letter heights of less than two centimetres.⁵² The meticulous punctuation of the copies in the provinces, as Christina Kraus argues, shows that “someone was making very sure that it was legible.”⁵³ Williamson suggests that conventional Roman bronze inscriptions were meant much more as symbolic statements about the eternity of their contents than as documents to be read *in situ*, but Augustus presumably wanted both eternity and legibility.⁵⁴ The profound irony is that, whatever his intentions in doing so, Tiberius’s new design for Augustan history and memory may have deracinated the text from its planned intimate and performative connection with the Mausoleum and threatened its actual immortality.

Brunt and Moore attempt to relate the *Res Gestae* both to the *elogium*, a normally third-person inscription set up by an elite office-holder or his heirs to record his achievements for posterity, and to traditional Roman elite funeral orations, usually delivered by a relative of the deceased. There is no evidence for *elogia* on bronze, nor for any in the first person. The *Res Gestae* text remains *sui generis*—but, if anything,

⁵⁰ Recorded in Macrobian *Sat.* 1.13.21, cited in Williamson (1987: 170). Scheid (2007: ix) simply dismisses the notion of bronze stelai for the *RG* as “peu vraisemblable.”

⁵¹ Stroud (1963) comprehensively studies the evidence.

⁵² Hesberg (1988: 32). He imagines two rather squat piers, with tablets no more than two metres high on one face—but then why set them on piers at all, rather than the outer wall of the Mausoleum?

⁵³ Kraus (2005: 192 n.27).

⁵⁴ Williamson (1987: 162-70); cf. the view of Le Glay (1993: 122) that “Rome augustéenne est conçue et organisée pour être éternelle.”

seems closer to Roman funerary practice, an attempt by Augustus in effect to deliver his own funeral oration. Georg Misch notes intriguing parallels to the funerary *laudatio* for the pontifex L. Caecilius Metellus delivered by his son in 222 BC, partially preserved in Pliny the Elder.⁵⁵ Though spoken in third person, this oration, like the *Res Gestae*, frames the old pontiff's life more as a set of achievements than a narrative, and more as works completed than a journey along milestones.⁵⁶ If we accept Suetonius's testimony, Augustus wished to link experience of the inscription to the space before his Mausoleum, on the Campus Martius he had so profoundly redesigned. Augustus seems to have imagined a reader taking the time to peruse the inscription in detail—or perhaps over and over, as a visitor returned to its park-like surroundings.⁵⁷ As most readers would have read aloud, the experience would have been one of hearing the first emperor give an account of his life and service to the people of Rome.⁵⁸

The *Res Gestae* is not, then, the autobiography of the human being who was successively named Octavius, C. Julius Caesar Octavianus, and Caesar Augustus—but only of the last who had utterly subsumed everything else into the new role he had fashioned for himself. Augustus relates the story of a public life that springs into being at the moment of his liberation of Rome from the faction created by Caesar's assassins:

annos undeviginti natus exercitum privato consilio et privata impensa comparavi, per quem rem publicam a dominatione factionis oppressam in libertatem vindicavi. (*RG* 1.1)

⁵⁵ Misch (1951: 217, 278-79) and Plin. *HN* 7.43.

⁵⁶ Here it is useful to contrast the so-called *Laudatio Turiae*, a funerary oration in second person, inscribed 9 BC or earlier (Flach [1991: 6]), on two great marble plaques that perhaps once adorned her tomb, wherein the virtuous Roman wife does not speak, but is spoken to by her grieving husband. See Durry (1950), Gordon (1958: 40-42, no. 28 and pl. 17), Flach (1991). The wife's achievements have a narrative flow, one deed building on another (which makes it more appealing to the modern reader). The life of Metellus, like that of Augustus, is a finished whole made up of parts which do not fit into a continuous narrative.

⁵⁷ Note again Suet. *Aug.* 100, *circumiectasque silvas et ambulationes in usum populi*, and from Strabo's description of the Mausoleum (5.236), μέγα ἄλλος περιπάτους θαυμαστός ἔχον.

⁵⁸ Baslez (1993: 74-75) cogently compares the public account, both oral and written, that Lycurgus of Athens gave at the end of his career ([Plut.] *X Orat.* 842-43). For a recent theoretical treatment of "Autobiography as Oratory," see Howarth (1980: 88-95). For reading reanimating inscription, Mark Toher has suggested to me (pers. comm.) the parallel of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C., where visitors often read aloud Lincoln's inscribed words.

At the age of nineteen on my own responsibility and at my own expense I raised an army, with which I successfully championed the liberty of the republic when it was oppressed by the tyranny of a faction ... (transl. Brunt and Moore)

He does so, as Kraus shows,⁵⁹ in words which allude to Julius Caesar's own account of his reasons for crossing the Rubicon:

cuius orationem Caesar interpellat: se non maleficii causa ex provincia egressum, sed ... ut se et populum Romanum factione paucorum oppressum in libertatem vindicaret. (Caesar, *Bellum Civile* 1. 22. 5)

Caesar interrupted his speech and said he had not departed from his province with intent to harm but ... to champion his own liberty and that of the Roman people, oppressed by the faction of a few.⁶⁰

The *Res Gestae* ends, not with his death, which is more of an implied postscript, but with Augustus' ascent to the ultimate paternal role in his naming as *pater patriae*.⁶¹ Indeed it is this sense of an ending—the “retrospective teleology” that makes the journey from nineteen-year-old son and heir to his present (and eternal?) position as father of his country seem the only possible story—that most strongly stamps the *Res Gestae* as autobiography.⁶²

Ironies multiply here, but the text Augustus so carefully planned for one performance context vanished from that place without a trace, even if Tiberius allowed it to be executed as planned. It survived only because it was both transported to and translated in one of the provinces, there to outlast almost every trace of his earlier *Autobiography* or *Commentaries*. This is not the modern interior as well as exterior autobiography, often seen to begin with Augustine.⁶³ Nonetheless the text of the *Res Gestae* allows Augustus to speak to us even today *in propria persona* of the life he wished to be remembered for. Through a re-imagined first-person orality, Augustus recounts and justifies the public self he created in an enduringly compelling autobiography.

⁵⁹ Kraus (2005: 192-93).

⁶⁰ Further adapted from Kraus's translation. Does Augustus offer an “Alexandrian correction” of Caesar? Caesar defends both himself and the public (*se et populum Romanum*), Augustus only the oppressed republic (*rem publicam ... oppressam*). Of course, he also does so in the first person.

⁶¹ See also (Ramage 1987: 19, 73-75 and *passim*) on the connections between the opening paragraphs and the closing.

⁶² Brockmeier (2001) on “retrospective teleology” in autobiography.

⁶³ On Augustine, see most recently Zimmermann (2005); cf. also the intriguing remarks on the logic of conversion and its effects on spiritual autobiography in Löschnigg (2006: 4-5).

Bibliography

- André, J-M. (1993). "Les *Res Gestae* d'Auguste, ou les nuances de l'égotisme politique." In *L'invention de l'autobiographie d'Hésiode à Saint Augustin*, M-F. Baslez, P. Hoffmann, and L. Pernot, eds.: 97-114. Paris: Presses de l'école normale supérieure.
- Baslez, M-F. (1993). "Écriture monumentale et traditions autobiographiques: L'apport des inscriptions grecques." In *L'invention de l'autobiographie d'Hésiode à Saint Augustin*, M-F. Baslez, P. Hoffmann, and L. Pernot, eds.: 71-80. Paris: Presses de l'école normale supérieure.
- Beacham, Richard (2005). "The Emperor as Impressario: Producing the Pageantry of Power." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus.*, Karl Galinsky, ed.: 151-74. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Blumenthal, Fritz (1913a). "Die Autobiographie des Augustus, I." *WS* 35: 113-30.
- Blumenthal, Fritz (1913b). "Die Autobiographie des Augustus, II." *WS* 35: 267-88.
- Blumenthal, Fritz (1914). "Die Autobiographie des Augustus, III." *WS* 36: 84-103.
- Bömer, F. (1953). "Der Commentarius: Zur Vorgeschichte und literarischen Form der Schriften Caesars." *Hermes* 81: 210-50.
- Bosworth, Brian (1999). "Augustus, the *Res Gestae* and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis." *JRS* 89: 1-18.
- Brockmeier, Jens (2001). "From the End to the Beginning: Retrospective Teleology in Autobiography." In *Narrative and Identity: Studies in Autobiography, Self and Culture*, J. Brockmeier and D. Carbaugh, eds.: 247-80. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Brunt, P. A., and J. M. Moore (1973). *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*. Rev. and corr. impression. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Durry, Marcel (1950). *Éloge funèbre d'une matrone romaine (éloge dit de Turia)*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Eder, Walter (2005). "Augustus and the Power of Tradition." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, Karl Galinsky, ed.: 13-32. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Ferry, Anne (1983). *The "Inward" Language: Sonnets of Wyatt, Sidney, Shakespeare, Donne*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Flach, Dieter (1991). *Die Sogenannte Laudatio Turiae*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Gordon, A. E. (1958). *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions*, Vol. 1. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Güven, Suna (1998). "Displaying the *Res Gestae* of Augustus." *JSAH* 57: 30-45.
- Hahn, Herbert (1958-1960). "Neue Untersuchungen zur Autobiographie des Kaisers Augustus." *NClío* 10: 137-48.

- Hesburg, Henner von (1988). "Das Mausoleum des Augustus." In *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik*, M. R. Hofter, ed.: 245-49. Mainz: von Zabern.
- Hesburg, Henner von and Silvio Panciera (1994). *Das Mausoleum des Augustus: Der Bau und seine Inschriften*. Munich: Beck.
- Hohl, Ernst (1947 [1969]). "Das Selbstzeugnis des Augustus über seine Stellung im Staat." *MH* 4: 101-15. Reprinted (1969) in *Augustus*, Walter Schmitthenner, ed.: 176-98. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Howarth, William L. (1980). "Some Principles of Autobiography." In *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*, James Olney, ed.: 84-114. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Kienast, Dietmar (1999). *Augustus, Prinzeps und Monarch*, 3rd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Kornemann, E. (1921). *Mausoleum und Tatenbericht des Augustus*. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner.
- Kraus, Christina S. (2005). "From 'Exempla' to 'Exemplar'? Writing History around the Emperor in Imperial Rome." In *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, J. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J. Rives, eds.: 181-200. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Le Glay, M. (1993). "A propos des *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*: Héritage et nouveauté dans la pensée politique d'Auguste." In *L'invention de l'autobiographie d'Hésiode à Saint Augustin*, M-F. Baslez, P. Hoffmann, and L. Pernot, eds.: 115-22. Paris: Presses de l'école normale supérieure.
- Lewis, R. G. (1993). "Imperial Autobiography, Augustus to Hadrian." *ANRW* II.34.1: 629-706.
- Löschnigg, Martin (2006). "Narratological Perspectives on 'Fiction and Autobiography'." In *Fiction and Autobiography: Modes and Models of Interaction*, S. Coelsch-Foisner and W. Görtschacher, eds.: 1-12. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Malcovati, H. (1962). *Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti Operum Fragmenta*, 4th ed. Torino: Paravia.
- Marincola, John (1997). *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Mattingly, Harold and Edward A Sydenham (1923). *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, Vol. 1, *Augustus to Vitellius*. London: Spink.
- Meyer, Elizabeth A. (2004). *Legitimacy and Law in the Roman World: Tabulae in Roman Belief and Practice*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Misch, Georg (1951). *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity*, transl. G. Misch and E. W. Dickes, vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Mommsen, Theodor (1883). *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: ex monumentis Ancyrano et Apolloniensi*. Berlin: Weidemann [reprinted 1970, Aalen: Scientia].
- Murray, William M. and Photios M. Petsas (1989). *Octavian's Campsite Memorial for the Actian War*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

- Pelling, Christopher (1990). "Childhood and Personality in Greek Biography." In *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, C. Pelling, ed.: 211-44. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Pelling, Christopher (forthcoming). "Was There an Ancient Genre of 'the Memoir'? or, Did Augustus Know What He Was Doing?"
- Peter, H. (1967). *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, vol. 2. repr. with supplement of 1906 ed. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Ramage, Edwin S. (1987). *The Nature and Purpose of Augustus' "Res Gestae."* Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Ramsey, J. T. and A. Lewis Licht (1997). *The Comet of 44 B.C. and Caesar's Funeral Games*. Atlanta, GA: Scholar's Press.
- Richardson, L. (1992). *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, s.v. "Mausoleum Augusti": 247-49. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Reeder, Jane Clark (1992). "Typology and Ideology in the Mausoleum of Augustus: Tumulid and Tholos." *CLAnt* 11: 265-307.
- Rüpke, Jörg (1992). "Wer las Caesars bella als commentarii?" *Gymnasium* 99: 201-26.
- Scheid, John (ed.) (2007). *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Stroud, Ronald S. (1963). "A Fragment of an Inscribed Bronze Stele from Athens." *Hesperia* 32: 138-43, pl. 54.
- Sturrock, John (1993). "Theory Versus Autobiography." In *The Culture of Autobiography: Constructions of Self-Representation*, R. Folkenflik, ed.: 20-37. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- Syme, Ronald (1934). "The Spanish War of Augustus (26-25 B.C.)." *AJPh* 55: 293-317.
- White, Peter (1988). "Julius Caesar in Augustan Rome." *Phoenix* 42: 334-56.
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, U. von (1886). "Res Gestae Divi Augusti." *Hermes* 21: 623-27.
- Williamson, Callie (1987). "Monuments of Bronze: Roman Legal Documents on Bronze Tablets." *CLAnt* 6: 160-83.
- Yavetz, Zvi (1984). "The Res Gestae and Augustus' Public Image." In *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*, F. Millar and E. Segal, eds.: 1-36. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Zimmermann, Bernhard (2005). "Augustinus, Confessiones—eine Autobiographie? Überlegungen zu einem Scheinproblem." In *Antike Autobiographien*, M. Reichel, ed.: 237-49. Köln: Böhlau.

LIST OF CONFERENCE PAPERS

- Rochelle Altman (Sivan College), *Captured in Process: the Transition from Oral Memory to Written Record*.
- Geoff Bakewell (Creighton University), *Orality, Literacy, Memory: The Athenian Naval Catalogue*.
- Egbert Bakker (Yale University), *Remembering the Gaster*.
- Han Baltussen (University of Adelaide), *Orality on Paper? Dialectical Practice and Theory*.
- Michael Barnes (University of Missouri-Columbia), *Kleos, semata, and aitiology in the Argonautica of Apollonius*.
- Anna Bonifazi (Harvard University), *Homeric Discourse Markers as Visual Prompts*.
- Edwin Carawan (Missouri State University), *What the Mnēmōnes Know*.
- Jacqueline Clarke (University of Adelaide), *Mourning and Memory in Catullus 65*.
- Nancy Felson (University of Georgia), *How Not to Get Skinned: Politics and Poetics in The Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.
- Michael Gagarin (University of Texas), *Remembering and Recording in Archaic Greek Law*.
- Andrew Gallia (University of Minnesota), *Inscribed Memory? The Roman Exemplary Tradition between Orality and Literacy*.
- Karen Gunterman (UCLA), *Picture This: The Robbers' Cave in Apuleius' Metamorphoses*.
- Molly Herbert (University of Washington), *I Know What You're Going to Say: Oral Reading and Homeric Variation*.
- Thomas Hubbard (University of Texas), *Getting the Last Word: Publication of Political Oratory as an Instrument of Historical Revision*.
- Akio Ito (Tokyo Christian University), *Scriptural Citations in the New Testament*.
- Peter Keegan (Macquarie University), *Texting Rome: Graffiti as Speech-Act and Cultural Discourse*.
- André Lardinois (Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen), *"Someone, I say, will remember us": Oral Memory in Sappho's Poetry*.
- Birgitte Martens (Free University of Brussels), *Discursive Strategies, Memory Training and Early Modern Religious Schoolbooks in the Southern Netherlands (1500-1700)*.
- Joseph McAlhany (University of New Mexico), *In memoria bonorum: Language and Memory in Varro's Literary Monuments*.
- Elizabeth Minchin (Australian National University), *"And she went in a flash of speed down from the pinnacles of Olympos ...": Spatial Memory and the Composition of the Iliad*.
- Jim Morrison (Centre College), *Oral and Literary Aspects of the Gospels*.

- Sophia Papaioannou (University of Cyprus), *The Poetics of Simulated Orality in the Ovidian Metamorphosis of the Epic List*.
- Alex Pappas (University of Pennsylvania), *Always Cry Wolf: Visual and Verbal Declarations of Lykos Kalos*.
- Marianne Rhydderch (Macquarie University), *Is that Her Voice We Can Hear? An Analysis of the "Sense of Female" in 5th/4th Century BCE Texts*.
- Brett Rogers (University of Georgia), *The Politics of Being "Self-Taught" (Autodidaktos) in Homer and Aeschylus*.
- Ruth Scodel (University of Michigan), *Social Memory in Aeschylus' Agamemnon*.
- Niall Slater (Emory University), *Orality and Autobiography: The Case of the Res Gestae*.
- Jocelyn Penny Small (Rutgers University), Keynote Speaker, *Copies and Memory*.
- Tony Spalinger (University of Auckland), *Egyptian Folktales: The Royal Influence*.
- Christopher Stanley (St. Bonaventure University), *Quotations, Allusions, and Echoes: What Do They Tell Us About Ancient Literacy?*
- Johanna Stiebert (University of Tennessee-Knoxville), *Texts of the Prophet Balaam and the Patriarch Esau*.
- David Tandy (University of Tennessee-Knoxville), *The Politics of Remembering at Mytilene, 612/09-590 BCE*.
- Isabelle Torrance (University of Nottingham), *From Shields to Letters: Visual and Visualized Literacy in Greek Tragedy*.
- Haijo Westra (University of Calgary), *Memory, Myth and History*.
- Marcus Wilson (University of Auckland), *Reading, Memory, and Stoic Self-sufficiency in Seneca's Epistles*.
- Linda Zollschan (Ben-Gurion University of Negev), *Memory and Ritual in the Roman Treaty Ceremony*.

INDEX

- accountability, 149, 150, 194
 Addams, Charles, Laocoon cartoon of, 232
 Aeschines, 121, 188, 189, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200
 Aeschylus, 2, 115, 119, 122, 130, 133, 134, 135, 138, 139, 174; *Agamemnon*, 120, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133; *Choephoroi*, 117, 124, 125, 131, 132; *Eumenides*, 117, 119, 132, 133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 159; *Oresteia*, 2, 118, 119, 121; *Prometheus Bound*, 174, 213
Aesopica, 100, 106
 agreement, 207, 209, 210, 213
 Alexander Mosaic, 242, 243, 244, 245, 247
 Alkibiades, 219, 220
anakrisis, 189, 190, 191, 193, 199
 Anaktoria, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87
 Andocides, 151, 186
 Antiphon, 104, 185, 186, 187
 Apollo, 19, 24, 29, 56, 66, 67, 71, 76, 108, 163, 178
 Apollodoros, 103, 148, 149, 150, 151
 apotheosis, 259, 260, 267
 Aristotle, 12, 109, 166, 173, 188, 204, 205, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 216, 217, 219, 221, 222, 223, 246; *Topica*, 5
 Arnhem Land, 14, 15, 16, 26
 Athene, 25, 49, 69, 70, 71, 76, 134, 136, 137
 Athenian Naval Catalogue (IG i3 1032), 3, 143
 audience, 5, 11, 14, 16, 17, 20, 26, 27, 28, 38, 39, 41, 42, 45, 47, 49, 51, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 66, 84, 105, 109, 116, 121, 122, 130, 134, 135, 136, 175, 185, 194, 200, 203, 204, 205, 207, 209, 211, 213, 214, 216, 219, 220, 221, 253, 268; manipulation of, 138, 204, 215, 221
 Augustus, 3, 231, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270; *Commentaries* of, 255, 256, 259; Mausoleum of, 3, 262, 263, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269
 autobiography, 3, 253, 254, 261, 269, 270
 bias, 197, 204, 221, 227
 body-soul dichotomy, 4, 67, 68, 73
 Campus Martius, 3, 262, 265, 269
 Cantabrian War, 255, 257, 260
 caryatids, 231
 casualty lists, 152, 156, 157
 Catalogue of Ships, 5, 16, 25, 54, 112
 characterization, 207
 Cicero, 12, 13, 230, 246; *Academica*, 230
 citizenship, art of, 155, 158, 213, 266
Clupeus virtutis, 265
 comet, 258, 259
 commitment, lack of, 5, 205, 214, 222
 conscription, 147
 consistency, 209, 210, 211
 copies: visual, 228, 229, 231, 232, 234, 238, 239, 242, 244, 246, 247, 257
 copies, visual, 2, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 265
 crews, trireme, 143, 144, 146, 148, 149, 152, 153
 daimon, 127
 debating (in the Academy), 6, 98, 102, 134, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 211, 213, 214, 215, 216, 218, 220, 221, 222, 232, 260
 definition, 36, 37, 133, 151, 159, 209, 210
 Demosthenes, 185, 186, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200; [Demosthenes], *Against Polyycles*, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 171

- Derrida, 188
 dialectic, 204, 205, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 217, 221, 222, 223; debating practice, 5, 204, 205, 206, 208, 209, 210, 211, 214, 216, 217, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224; heuristic tool, 209; jousting, 206
 dialectical strategies, 219, 222, 224
 dialectical theory, 205
 dialogical practice, 205
 dichotomies, 4, 68, 73, 209
 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 186, 263
 disagreement, 223
 discourse, 5, 12, 19, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 110, 123, 125, 126, 127, 130, 194, 206, 222, 223, 265; interactive, 206; mode of, 38, 218, 221, 253
 discourse markers, 5, 19, 36, 37, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60
 Djangawul-myth, 5, 14, 15, 16, 26
 Dover, Kenneth, 99, 100, 134, 188, 191
- Eleusis, 171, 181, 182
 embodiment, 69, 70, 125
 emic (*see also* etic), 67
 Empedocles, 65
endoxa, endoxic, 216, 222
 Ephialtes, 134, 137, 138
 Epimetheus, 213
 epithet, 16, 74
 Erechtheion: building accounts of, 145, 152, 155, 156
 eristic disputes, 206
 etic (*see also* emic), 67
 Euphronios, 101, 105, 144
 exegesis (of Simonides), 215
- falsification, principle of, 210
 fame, 75, 80, 81, 82, 88, 89, 91, 116, 117, 124; fame after death, 81, 82, 88, 89, 90
 fictionality, 205
 filmic terminology, 5, 43, 45, 48, 49, 51, 53, 56, 58, 60
 foreigners, 144, 155
 foreseeing implications, 211
 forgetfulness, 27, 41, 65, 66, 67, 71, 75, 81, 112, 124, 125, 138, 198, 204, 219, 220, 221
 formula, 45, 50, 56, 66, 189, 190
 funerary oration, 3, 254, 268, 269
- Gortyn, Great Code at, 172, 173, 174, 176
 gossip, 3, 186, 191, 193
- Halikarnassos, 163, 166, 167, 169, 172, 175, 177, 178, 180, 182
 herald, 22, 30, 115, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 130, 132, 133
 Hesiod, 75
 Hippokrates, 206, 212, 213, 215
 Homer, 9, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 52, 54, 63, 65, 67, 71, 72, 73, 80, 107, 112, 122, 230; *Iliad*, 5, 9, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 38, 42, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 76, 106, 107, 112, 247; *Odyssey*, 5, 18, 21, 28, 38, 42, 43, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 56, 57, 58, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 91, 107, 174, 247
Homeric Hymns: Hymn to Apollo, 66, 67, 88
- Iasos, 175, 176, 177
 imagery, 5, 9, 11, 12, 40, 42, 53, 60, 194, 246
 impersonation, 211, 214
 inscriptions, 3, 6, 57, 102, 105, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122, 130, 132, 133, 143, 144, 146, 153, 156, 157, 158, 160, 165, 166, 167, 171, 175, 236, 254, 257, 261, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269; bronze tablets, 262, 266, 267, 268; dedicatory, 116, 117, 122, 257; funerary, 106; *kalos*, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 111; signature, 101; tag, 102, 105
 Isocrates, 185, 186, 187
- Julius Caesar, 260, 261, 266, 269, 270
 landmarks, 5, 23, 24, 26, 43

- Laocoon: representation in *Vatican Vergil* manuscript, 232, 233; statue, 232, 233, 234, 242, 247
- lawsayer (of Norse tradition), 171
- lexical semantics, 67, 73
- literacy, 1, 2, 6, 13, 65, 79, 106, 113, 117, 118, 146, 167, 170, 173, 175, 200, 204, 207, 221, 222, 223, 228, 247
- Lord, Albert, 66
- Lygdamis decree, 4, 163, 165, 167, 168, 169, 174, 176, 182
- lykos*, 6, 97, 112
- Lykos, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 109, 111, 112, 113
- Lysias, 148, 151, 152, 185, 186, 187, 188
- memorability, and location, 10, 17
- memory: and Penelope, 73, 74;
cognitive, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 22, 26, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 52, 53, 60, 61, 65, 66, 67, 68, 73, 74, 233, 234;
collective, 66, 111, 117; flashbulb, 42;
memorization, 66, 80, 170, 171, 254;
public, 3, 6, 119, 120, 130, 187, 199;
quotation, 2, 229, 256, 257, 258;
recognition, 4, 41, 57, 171, 172, 173, 175, 176, 177, 179, 207, 233;
remembering, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 19, 41, 44, 56, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 79, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 111, 116, 117, 120, 122, 124, 125, 131, 132, 133, 138, 153, 169, 171, 175, 176, 187, 196, 200, 214, 218, 220, 221, 227, 234, 247, 271; social, 2, 3, 66, 112, 117, 118, 121, 122, 125, 126, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 146; spatial, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 23, 25, 26, 27, 42, 43, 44, 52, 60, 104;
verbal, 6, 11, 37, 40, 42, 45, 68, 109, 113, 231; visual, 5, 9, 11, 12, 19, 26, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 100, 109, 113, 173, 176, 234, 235; visual, 6 metics, 144, 152, 155, 159
- mnemon*, 4, 163, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 182
- mnemonic systems, 12, 13
- mnemonic systems (*see also* Simonides), 12, 52
- model, 11, 25, 27, 37, 43, 66, 166, 167, 168, 169, 178, 179, 228, 231, 235, 236, 238, 241, 246, 247, 260, 265
- morality, 120, 206, 216
- muses, 41
- narrative: journey, 5, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 26, 270; landscape, 5, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 26, 27, 28, 117; space, 5, 43, 60; topography, 5, 23; topography, 5; topography, 23; topography, 254
- oath, 163, 166, 170, 172, 177, 179
- Onesimos, 6, 97, 101, 102, 103, 105, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113
- oral tradition, 9, 13, 65, 118, 135, 169, 171
- orality, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 17, 18, 20, 23, 28, 38, 65, 66, 67, 79, 84, 88, 106, 113, 117, 118, 135, 146, 166, 167, 169, 171, 173, 176, 177, 185, 187, 195, 196, 199, 200, 203, 204, 207, 215, 216, 219, 220, 221, 223, 228, 247, 254, 269, 271; new, 206, 212, 215, 221
- oratory: epideictic, 185, 186, 213; forensic, 3, 186, 200; symbouleutic, 185, 186
- originals, 2, 187, 188, 189, 200, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, 234, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 262
- painting, 102, 107, 228, 229, 230, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247; panel, 229, 237, 239; vase, 6, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 110, 236, 237, 242; wall, 23, 106, 121, 237, 238, 240, 241, 245, 267, 268
- painting, wall, 240
- Papua New Guinea, 5, 13, 14, 17, 26; Duna, 14, 17, 26; *pikono* songs, 14, 15, 16, 26
- parody, 198, 204, 221
- Paros, property registry at, 167, 168
- particle, Greek, 36
- pater patriae*, 263, 264, 270

- pay (naval), 148, 151, 155
 pederasty, 193, 200
 Peloponnesian War, 137, 148, 153
 performance, 3, 4, 11, 14, 23, 24, 27,
 36, 38, 40, 41, 44, 45, 47, 50, 52, 53,
 54, 57, 59, 60, 67, 70, 76, 80, 82, 84,
 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 93, 98, 118, 131,
 134, 135, 170, 224, 234, 262, 264,
 267, 270
 performative continuity, 50, 53, 56, 57,
 60
 Persian Wars, 102, 121, 146
persona, 4, 217, 271
 Pieria, roses of, 25, 81, 82, 86
 Pindar, 80, 116
 Plato, 72, 98, 99, 100, 105, 107, 109,
 112, 113, 167, 187, 188, 203, 204,
 205, 206, 207, 209, 210, 212, 213,
 214, 215, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223,
 230, 239; *Phaedrus*, 188, 221;
Protagoras, 5, 203, 204, 205, 206,
 207, 208, 209, 211, 212, 213, 214,
 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221,
 222, 223, 241; *Republic*, 6, 97, 98, 99,
 100, 112, 215, 219, 239, 266
 Pliny: the Elder, 228, 229, 232, 238,
 239, 240, 241, 242, 245, 266, 269; the
 Younger, 239, 241, 245
 Plutarch, 80, 87, 188, 256
 portrait, 230, 231, 245
 praise, 73, 74, 91, 111, 115, 116, 117,
 120, 122, 123, 127, 128, 129, 130,
 193, 197, 206, 213
 procedural meaning, 35, 37, 38, 49, 57,
 60
 Prometheus, 174, 213
 prophecy, 75, 124, 125, 174, 186
 propositions, 45, 208, 210, 211, 223
 prostitution, 192
 psychology, 13, 22, 42, 43, 66, 73
 publication, 3, 156, 186, 195, 199, 256

 question and answer, 206, 221
 Quintilian, 237, 239, 241, 247

 recruitments, 147
 rememberer (*see also mnemon*), 174
 reminders, 174, 220
 reputable opinions (*see also endoxa*),
 210

Res Gestae, 3, 253, 254, 255, 256, 261,
 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268,
 269, 270; *Monumentum Ancyranum*,
 262, 266, 267
 restoration (of monuments), 144, 232,
 264
 retrieval, 13, 65, 66, 68
 Riace Bronzes, 230
 role play, 216, 217
 role-reversal (*see also impersonation*),
 6, 203, 217, 223
 Rubin, David, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18,
 28, 41, 66

 Sappho, 4, 53, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85,
 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93; Cologne
 Papyrus, 89, 90
 Senate (Roman), 254, 256, 257, 259,
 263, 264, 265, 266
 Simonides (*see also exegesis*), 12, 26,
 121, 208, 215, 220
 Sokrates, 97, 98, 99, 100, 104, 109, 187,
 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 212,
 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219,
 220, 221, 222, 223
 Sophists, 206, 209
 soul, care of the, 212, 220
 Spensithios, 169, 171
 stelai, 151, 160, 166, 170, 267, 268
 Suetonius, 253, 254, 255, 257, 260, 262,
 265, 266, 267, 269
 Svenbro, J., 171
 symposium, 98, 99, 101, 102, 106, 110,
 111

 Temple of Janus: closure of, 256
 Teos, curse-law at, 170, 171, 174
 Theocritus, 6, 97, 99, 100, 107, 109, 113
 Theognis, 116
 Thrasymachos, 97, 98, 99, 100, 109
 Tiberius, 255, 267, 268, 270
 Tithonos, 4, 88, 89, 93
topoi, 208
 trance, 220
 translation, 15, 57, 66, 84, 91, 168, 208,
 229, 241, 246, 256, 258, 270
 trierarchs, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 154
 Trojan War, 116, 121, 122, 123
 Troy, 5, 13, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26,
 27, 30, 48, 115, 122, 126, 128, 130,
 132, 134

- TV Guide*, 234; Lucille Ball, 234, 236, 246; Reba McEntire, 234, 236, 246
- Ulpian, 255, 257
- Vestal Virgins, 253, 262, 267
- virtue, teachability of, 205, 206, 217
- wolf: Etruscan, 106, 108, 109; myth of, 106, 107, 109; ritual of, 106, 108, 109; superstition about, 6, 97, 98, 100, 102, 105
- writing, 3, 4, 9, 38, 39, 65, 66, 67, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 88, 91, 98, 102, 113, 115, 117, 118, 131, 132, 146, 147, 150, 163, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 178, 182, 187, 188, 195, 196, 199, 200, 204, 207, 215, 221, 224, 246, 253, 254, 255, 257, 260, 261, 263, 264, 267, 269
- Yates, Frances, 12, 13
- Zeus, 19, 20, 24, 25, 29, 30, 46, 52, 66, 71, 76, 107, 108, 110, 115, 129, 267

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY H. PINKSTER, H.S. VERSNEL,
I.J.F. DE JONG AND P.H. SCHRIJVERS

Recent volumes in the series

260. BUIJS, M. *Clause Combining in Ancient Greek Narrative Discourse*. The Distribution of Subclauses and Participial Clauses in Xenophon's *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14250 9
261. ENENKEL, K.A.E. & I.L. PFEIJFFER (eds.). *The Manipulative Mode*. Political Propaganda in Antiquity: A Collection of Case Studies. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14291 6
262. KLEYWEGT, A.J. *Valerius Flaccus*, *Argonautica*, *Book I*. A Commentary. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13924 9
263. MURGATROYD, P. *Mythical and Legendary Narrative in Ovid's Fasti*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14320 3
264. WALLINGA, H.T. *Xerxes' Greek Adventure*. The Naval Perspective. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14140 5
265. KANTZIOS, I. *The Trajectory of Archaic Greek Trimeters*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14536 2
266. ZELNICK-ABRAMOVITZ, R. *Not Wholly Free*. The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14585 0
267. SLINGS, S.R. (†). Edited by Gerard Boter and Jan van Ophuijsen. *Critical Notes on Plato's Politeia*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14172 3
268. SCOTT, L. *Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book 6*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14506 0
269. DE JONG, I.J.F. & A. RIJKSBARON (eds.). *Sophocles and the Greek Language*. Aspects of Diction, Syntax and Pragmatics. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14752 7
270. NAUTA, R.R., H.-J. VAN DAM & H. SMOLENAARS (eds.). *Flavian Poetry*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14794 2
271. TACOMA, L.E. *Fragile Hierarchies*. The Urban Elites of Third-Century Roman Egypt. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14831 0
272. BLOK, J.H. & A.P.M.H. LARDINOIS (eds.). *Solon of Athens*. New Historical and Philological Approaches. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-14954-0, ISBN-10: 90-04-14954-6
273. HORSFALL, N. *Virgil, Aeneid 3*. A Commentary. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14828 0
274. PRAUSCELLO, L. *Singing Alexandria*. Music between Practice and Textual Transmission. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14985 6
275. SLOOTJES, D. *The Governor and his Subjects in the Later Roman Empire*. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15070-6, ISBN-10: 90-04-15070-6
276. PASCO-PRANGER, M. *Founding the Year: Ovid's Fasti and the Poetics of the Roman Calendar*. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15130-7, ISBN-10: 90-04-15130-3
277. PERRY, J.S. *The Roman Collegia*. The Modern Evolution of an Ancient Concept. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15080-5, ISBN-10: 90-04-15080-3
278. MORENO SOLDEVILA, R. *Martial, Book IV*. A Commentary. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15192-5, ISBN-10: 90-04-15192-3
279. ROSEN, R.M. & I. SLUTER (eds.). *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*. 2006. ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15043-0, ISBN-10: 90-04-15043-9
280. COOPER, C. (ed.). *Politics of Orality*. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 6. 2007. ISBN 13: 978-90-04-14540-5, ISBN 10: 90-04-14540-0

281. PETROVIC, I. *Von den Toren des Hades zu den Hallen des Olymp. Artemiskult bei Theokrit und Kallimachos*. 2007. ISBN 13: 978-90-04-15154-3, ISBN 10: 90-04-15154-0
282. PETROVIC, A. *Kommentar zu den simonideischen Versinschriften*. 2007. ISBN 13: 978-90-04-15153-6, ISBN 10: 90-04-15153-2
283. GAERTNER, J.F. (ed.). *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*. 2007. ISBN 13: 978-90-04-15515-2, ISBN 10: 90-04-15515-5
284. KORTEKAAS, G.A.A. *Commentary on the Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*. 2007. ISBN 13: 978-90-04-15594-7, ISBN 10: 90-04-15594-5
285. BOEKE, H. *Wisdom in Pindar. Gnomai, Cosmology and the Role of the Poet*. ISBN 978 90 04 15848 1
286. LUSCHNIG, C.A.E. *Granddaughter of the Sun. A Study of Euripides' Medea*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16059 0
287. LAZARIDIS, N. *Wisdom in Loose Form. The Language of Egyptian and Greek Proverbs in Collections of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16058 3
288. JENNINGS, V. & A. KATSAROS (eds.). *The World of Ion of Chios*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16045 3
289. DEN BOEFT, J., J.W. DRIJVERS, D. DEN HENGST & H.C. TEITLER (eds.). *Ammianus after Julian. The Reign of Valentinian and Valens in Books 26-31 of the Res Gestae*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16212 9
290. VAN MAL-MAEDER, D. *La fiction des déclamations*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 15672 2
291. DE JONG, I.J.F. & R. NÜNLIST (eds.). *Time in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, volume 2*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16506 9
292. KITZINGER, M.R. *The Choruses of Sophokles' Antigone and Philoktetes. A Dance of Words*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16514 4
293. CONWELL, D.H. *Connecting a City to the Sea. The History of the Athenian Long Walls*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16232 7
294. MARKOVIĆ, D. *The Rhetoric of Explanation in Lucretius' De rerum natura*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16796 4
295. GEIGER, J. *The First Hall of Fame. A Study of the Statues in the Forum Augustum*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16869 5
296. KIM ON CHONG-GOSSARD, J.H. *Gender and Communication in Euripides' Plays. Between Song and Silence*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16880 0
297. KEULEN, W. *Gellius the Satirist. Roman Cultural Authority in Attic Nights*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16986 9
298. MACKAY, E.A. (ed.). *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 7*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16991 3