

The Journal of the Classics Students Association

ΠΙΘΟΣ

PITHOS



VOLUME 14
SPRING 2015

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

PITHOS EDITORIAL BOARD

Adriana Javier, *EDITOR-IN-CHIEF*

Kimberly Paton, *ASSISTANT EDITOR*

Nicole L. Guiney, *ASSISTANT EDITOR*

READERS

Mark Bodenchak

Kevin Hunter

Samantha Alfonso

William Chadwick

CLASSICS STUDENTS ASSOCIATION OFFICERS 2014-2015

PRESIDENT Samantha Alfonso

VICE PRESIDENT Kevin Hunter

SECRETARY Kimberly Paton

TREASURER Sarah Garvey

MEDIA Kerry Gray

ARTWORK

Kevin Cahail

CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR	i
AUTHORS' BIOGRAPHIES	iii
 CONSTRUCTING REALISM: HELLENISTIC SCULPTURE AND EKPHRASIS IN HERODAS IV BY <i>ALICE CHAPMAN</i>	 1
THE FEAST POLITIC: THE εἰλαπίνη IN HOMERIC POETRY BY <i>IAN TEWKSBURY</i>	 27
A TRANSLATION OF OVID'S <i>AMORES</i> 3.9 BY <i>MARK BODENCHAK</i>	 49
PHILO'S <i>FLACCUS</i>: A LITERARY DRAMA FOR PEACE BY <i>ERICH WIEGER</i>	 53
INVESTIGATING VICTUALS: A HISTORIOGRAPHICAL LOOK AT FOOD IN PRIMARY SOURCES FROM LATE ANTIQUITY BY <i>TY ROBINSON</i>	 79
<i>TO THE POSEIDONIANS</i> BY <i>KEVIN HUNTER</i>	 101
INFORMATION ON <i>PITHOS</i> AND THE CLASSICS STUDENTS ASSOCIATION	 103

FROM THE EDITOR

ΠΙΘΟΣ (*PITHOS*): a large earthenware jar used for storage.

I am proud to present to you the fourteenth annual volume of *Pithos*, the student-produced journal of the Department of Classics at San Francisco State University.

It is an easy pattern to fall into to compare our own civilization with those of the ancient Greeks and Romans and to eek out the similarities between ours and theirs in an effort to justify why we continue to study Classics. I shan't pass judgment as to whether or not this is a wise or correct course of action. However, I do think that there is, at least at the basest of levels, a certain commonality between ourselves and the people who lived such a temporal and geographic distance from us. This commonality is a human one: as humans we all breathe, we all sleep, we all eat, if we are lucky we even feast, we form bonds with others and fall in love, we experience sensory pleasures like art and literature and music, and we all meet our end.

The contributions that make up this year's volume of *Pithos* have something in common too in that they examine and express these human commonalities. Alice Chapman offers a chapter of her thesis in which she discusses how and why Hellenistic artists and poets manipulate the gaze of their audience to focus on contemporary society. Next, Ian Tewksbury takes a philological approach to reevaluating the Homeric εἰλαπίνη, a particular sort of feast, and its cultural context. Mark Bodenchak's translation of Ovid's *Amores* 3.9, which won our department's Ungaretti Translation Prize, provides a rhymed reminder of the pain that death can cause. Following this, Erich Wieger provides a reading of Philo's *Flaccus*, an account of the anti-Jewish riots in Alexandria in the context of a critique of the Egyptian governor Flaccus, in which he suggests that the author has intentionally dramatized the piece for a particular end. In his turn, Ty Robinson takes up the banner of using food as a category of analysis by investigating the use to which Late Antique historians put what we put in our bodies. Finally,

Kevin Hunter closes the volume with a translation of a Modern Greek poem containing an ancient epigram of Athenaeus that laments that which has been lost.

The sadness that comes with a loss or an end is indeed common to all: Ovid expresses it, as does Athenaeus, and so do I. This is my third year and final year as Editor-in-Chief of *Pithos*. In Spring 2013 *Pithos* practically fell upon me and I embraced it, and have tried to improve it, and am now somewhat sad to see it pass from my care, though I know it will be in fully capable hands in the coming year. Those are the hands of Kimberly Paton and Nicole Guiney, this year's Assistant Editors, without whom this volume would not have come to be. To them I extend the sincerest thanks for their support and patience with my attempts to step away from the reigns.

Others besides Kimberly and Nicole need thanking too. First, to Dr. Gillian McIntosh, our faculty advisor, I extend repeated thanks for her support and trust. Next to Seth Chabay, the program office coordinator, I am grateful for the practical support and lightheartedness he provides. To the Readers, I give thanks upon thanks for the gift of your time and thoughts. And finally, I give thanks to our contributors who have shared with us the product of their extensive thought and effort: *Pithos* is nothing without you.

And, as ever, to you, reader, I leave this volume. *Quiddam utile, quiddam humanum inveniatis.*

Gratias vobis ago.

ADRIANA JAVIER
Editor-In-Chief

AUTHORS' BIOGRAPHIES

ALICE CHAPMAN is a graduate student in the Classics Department. She received her first Master's in Art History from Indiana University in 2012 and her Bachelor's in Art History from Boston University in 2010. She is currently completing a thesis entitled "Constructing Realism: The contemporary gaze in Hellenistic art and poetry" and will begin her doctoral studies at SUNY Buffalo in the fall.

IAN TEWKSBURY is a graduate student in the Classics Department. He is currently completing his thesis and will begin doctoral studies at Stanford University in the fall.

MARK BODENCHAK is a graduate student in the Classics Department and is in the process of completing his Master's thesis. His interests are varied, but lately he has taken a special interest in the economics of the ancient world, and more specifically the implications of the Megarian Decree in the Peloponnesian War. Mark has been studying Latin since his freshman year in high school, and it has been a longtime passion of his. After graduating, he hopes to take some time to travel and take a well needed rest from academia before advancing his education in a doctoral program.

ERICH WIEGER returned to university after 21 years of Christian ministry in Turkey and is currently a graduate student in the History Department with an emphasis on pre-1500 European and Mediterranean religion and society. Prior to beginning the Master's degree, Eric finished San Francisco State's undergraduate program in International Relations with a minor in Middle East and Islamic Studies, took extra history courses in which he focused on the early development of Christianity, Islam and Judaism, and began Ancient Greek. In 2013 Erich, together with Professor Mahmood Monshipouri, co-authored and co-presented a paper for the conference of the International Studies Association on the U.N. doctrine of Responsibility to Protect peoples from genocide in Syria. In 2014 Erich and Prof. Monshipouri co-authored an article about mediation in the Syrian conflict for the I.R. journal *Insight Turkey* and in 2015, he won the scholarship for Turkish Studies at SF State. Erich is fluent in Turkish, happily married for 30 years, has five adult children, and loves long walks.

TY ROBINSON is a graduate student in the History Department and is preparing to complete his Master's degree in May. His research interests include the ancient world and anything food related. After graduating, he plans to teach at a community college.

KEVIN HUNTER is an undergraduate student in the Classics Department with an emphasis in Classical Archaeology and a minor in Modern Greek Studies. His academic interests include the Early Iron Age In Greece, Cycladic Archaeology, and Modern Greek Poetry. Since 2012 he has participated in archaeological excavations in Greece on the Cycladic islands of Despotiko and Kythnos. He is currently the Vice-President of the Classics Students Association for the 2014-2015 academic year.

CONSTRUCTING REALISM: HELLENISTIC SCULPTURE AND EKPHRASIS IN HERODAS IV

BY ALICE CHAPMAN

After the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C.E. a series of monarchies came to dominate the Mediterranean social and political landscape. Greek identity, previously embedded within the structured system of the Greek *polis*, was threatened by foreign intervention into the *polis*. Greek artists and intellectuals, enticed by the wealth of new kings, like those ruling the Ptolemaic dynasty in Alexandria, began to move away from the Greek mainland and towards the edges of the previously established Greek world. There, in newly formed cities, they encountered foreign peoples like Jews, Egyptians, and Persians who inhabited the same geographical area, and immense disparities in wealth.¹ Faced with these new challenges, Greek artists and writers sought to renegotiate their place in the new Hellenistic world, creating artworks that both connected them to the Archaic and Classical Greek past, and forged them a new place in the evolving Hellenistic intellectual landscape. Within this paper I examine Hellenistic literary ekphrasis, the description of a work of art within a work of literature, to reveal how Hellenistic artists, working both in literary and visual media, used the rhetorical tools of the Classical Greek world to turn the gaze of the viewer towards contemporary society as well as connect the audience with the Greek past. Specifically, I examine the short ekphrasis found in *Mimiambos IV* of Herodas in conjunction with veristic Hellenistic sculpture to argue that artists used these media to shift the gaze of the audience onto aspects of everyday life in contemporary society.

During the reign of the Ptolemaic kings (312-221 B.C.E.), Alexandria was the cultural and economic center of the Mediterranean world, made rich by its land holdings among the Aegean Islands and its trade relationships in Asia and Africa.² Under the patronage of Ptolemy II (283-246 B.C.E.), Alexandria became a great center for learning, housing both a *mouseion*, an institution in which scholars from around the Greek world could conduct scientific research and study literature, and Library and playing host to

some of the greatest minds of the Hellenistic world including the poets Callimachus, Theocritus, and Apollonius.³ Despite the desire on the part of the monarchy to create a fundamentally Greek city which espoused Mediterranean values, Alexandria remained a city geographically divided by cultural, racial, and social boundaries. As Susan Stephens discusses, a surge of immigrants during the reign of Ptolemy II left Alexandria without a distinct cultural identity.⁴ The disjunction between different racial and social groups can be seen especially in the plan of the city, which divided various groups into five zones, creating distinct spaces for aristocratic Greeks, who lived in lavish double storied houses, and impoverished Jews, Greeks, and Egyptians, who lived in three story tenements first introduced to the city by Ptolemy I.⁵ It is in the context of this city, divided both culturally and economically, that we must understand the *Mimiambi* of Herodas and the veristic sculpture of Hellenistic artists.

Although the biography of Herodas is not attested, most scholars believe that he composed his *Mimiambi* in the third century B.C.E. in or near Ptolemaic Alexandria or perhaps in Kos.⁶ His *Mimiambi* consist of eight long fragments written in dialogue that cover a wide range of subjects from contemporary life. Here, I focus exclusively on *Mimiamb IV*, in which two women visit an Asclepeion, a Greek sanctuary dedicated to the God Asclepius and his healing powers. As Ian Cunningham describes it, this poem was written in a ring composition, in which the ekphrasis contained within the poem is framed by religious ceremony related to the Asclepic cultic ritual.⁷ The two participants in the ritual, Kynno and Kokkale, stop to admire the marvelous artworks contained within the temple and discuss them with one another. It is within this context that the ekphrasis is housed (ln 27-38):

Κο: ὄρη, φίλη, τὴν παῖδα τὴν ἄνω κείνην
 βλέπουσας ἐς τὸ μῆλον· οὐκ ἐρεῖς αὐτήν,
 ἦν μὴ λάβῃ τὸ μῆλον ἐκ τάχα ψύξειν·-
 κείνον δέ, Κυνοῖ, τὸν γέροντα· - πρὸς Μοιρέων 30
 τὴν χηναλώπεκ' ὥς τὸ παιδίον πνίγει.
 πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν γοῦν εἴ τι μὴ λίθος, τοῦργον,
 ἐρεῖς, λαλήσει. μᾶ, χρόνῳ κοτ' ὦνθροπωι

κῆς τοὺς λίθους ἔξουσι τὴν ζοὴν θεῖναι –
 τὸν Βατάλης γὰρ τοῦτον, οὐχ ὀρῆς, Κυννοῖ, 35
 ὅκως βέβηκεν, ἀνδριάντα τῆς Μύττεω;
 εἰ μὴ τις αὐτὴν εἶδε Βατάλην, βλέψας
 ἐς τοῦτο τὸ εἰκόνημα μὴ ἐτύμης δείσθω.

Ko: Look, dear, at that girl over there
 Gazing towards the apple; wouldn't you say that she
 Will faint straight away if she does not seize the apple? –
 And there, Kynno, that old man; - suitable for the Fates
 How the boy strangles the goose.
 If it were not stone, upon closer inspection, one would say
 That the sculpture could speak. Someday, in time, men
 Will be able to fashion a living thing from stones
 Do you not see, Kynno, that this statue,
 Walks like Batale daughter of Myttes?
 If someone had not seen Batale, when they looked upon
 This image, he would not be in need of her herself.

In this passage, Kokkale focuses on the description of four specific artworks; we see a statue of a young girl reaching for an apple, an old man, a boy strangling a goose and finally a portrait statue of Batale, probably a local woman. By using the description of artworks in his *Mimiambos*, Herodas constructs an ekphrasis, a literary trope that has a long history of use in Greek literature.⁸ Ekphrasis is defined by Shadi Bartsch and Jaś Elsner as “words about an image, itself often embedded in a larger text,”⁹ This type of description becomes an embedded feature of epic, mime,¹⁰ tragedy,¹¹ satyr plays,¹² and, finally, of Hellenistic poetry, where it appears prominently in the poems of Callimachus, Theocritus, and Herodas. The *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius, a rhetorical manual for aspiring orators written in the fourth century C.E. defines it as, the “Ἐκφρασις ἐστὶ λόγος περιγηματικὸς ἐναργῶς ὑπὸ ὀψιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον”¹³ (ekphrasis is a descriptive speech which vividly brings the thing shown into view). This definition, although it may include the description of artworks, has a much wider reach, using the vividness (ἐναργῶς) of words and combination of seeing (δηλούμενον) and speech (λόγος), rather than the content of speech to separate ekphrasis from other rhetorical devices. Similarly, Graham Zanker pairs ekphrasis with *enargeia*, which he defines as a “stylistic quality

of descriptive representation which makes a vivid appeal to the senses, in particular sight.”¹⁴ As Ruth Webb asserts, however, the goal of both ekphrasis and *enargeia* was not simply to appeal to the eye, but to involve the audience “both imaginatively and emotionally.”¹⁵ She goes further to assert that ekphrasis gave the author the power to become a “metaphorical painter” with the ability to create images in the mind of the viewer, which carry the same weight as physical objects¹⁶. Therefore, by definition, an ekphrasis has the unique ability to communicate with the visual world through descriptions of the physical world, including people, landscapes and actions, which create a clear, detailed, and above all vivid, picture in the mind of the audience. Therefore, ekphrasis has a direct connection to the gaze of the viewer. Using ekphrasis in this way, the author has the ability to direct the audience’s gaze both inward, towards the experience contained within the piece of literature itself and the object it describes, and outward, endowing the reader with a critical gaze with which to view society.¹⁷

Like Herodas does in this passage, many Hellenistic authors used ekphrasis to describe works of art within their works. Hellenistic poets employed two different types of ekphrasis, classified by Graham Zanker as descriptive and non-descriptive exchange.¹⁸ He couches these classifications within his discussion of reader supplementation, the process by which an audience member creates a mental picture of an object using both the author’s description and images from memory. He suggests that descriptive exchange is intended to create a picture of an object for the listener with a detailed description of each aspect of the piece. For example, the shield of Achilles is described by Homer with great detail (Il.18.478-608). It catalogues a long series of visual fields that show men battling, celebrating, working, etc. It is an immensely complex poetic construction that uses detail to create a vivid picture of an unreal object.¹⁹ Zanker asserts that non-descriptive exchange, on the other hand, forces the reader to supplement a short description with already familiar images.²⁰ This is not to say that non-descriptive ekphrasis was meant to reference a real object, although this may have been the case, but that it would evoke a type of object recognizable to a contemporary audience from daily life rather than a fantastical one such as Achilles’ shield.

Herodas' use of densely packed and pithy non-descriptive ekphrases indicates that he is relying on the audience to supplement the majority of the imagery themselves with direction from the author. In the first line of the passage, Kokkale tells her friend to look (ὄρη) at the beautiful artworks in front of her and the passage is full of similar words that direct the gaze of the viewer (βλέπουσαν (28), ὀρήs (35), εἶδε (37), βλέψας(37)). Without being able to look at actual objects, however, the audience must supplement images to create a mental picture of the artworks from the short descriptions which Kokkale provides to them.

The first statue Kokkale discusses depicts a young girl reaching for an apple. Herodas creates a parallel between Kokkale, Kyno and the statue by pointing out that she is gazing (βλέπουσαν) at the apple, just as the two women are gazing at her. The extreme emotional intensity with which the young girl reaches for the apple creates a sense of agitation and excitement (ἦν μὴ λάβῃ τὸ μῆλον ἐκ τάχα ψύξειν), and although she is not explicitly connected here with a mythological subject, scholars have found mythological parallels and artistic models for this sort of figure among nymphs in the garden of the Hesperides.²¹

Although the description of this artwork is brief, the emotion captured by the figure and the possible mythological context of this piece make it likely that Kokkale is describing a work in the baroque style, one of the three artistic styles represented in this ekphrastic passage. Sculpture in the baroque style is defined by its theatricality and extreme emotional intensity.²² Although this statue does not remain or perhaps never existed, an example of the Hellenistic baroque can be found in the "Pasquino Group," a heavily restored Roman marble copy of a 3rd century original, now housed in the Loggia di Lanzi in Florence (Figure 1).²³



Figure 1
Pasquino Group

This pyramidal composition contrasts the straining muscles of the hero Menelaus with the lifeless body of Patroclus as he is dragged from the battle field. The body of Patroclus, still perfect even in death, creates a deep sense of *pathos*, an evocation of deep suffering, for the audience, who will at once connect this scene to the deep loss and mourning of Achilles and anticipate his blinding rage and his part in the destruction of Troy. By using a canon of recognizable figures, the artist allows the viewer to supplement the rest of the mythological narrative, aided by his knowledge of literature and other art images.²⁴ Brunilde Ridgeway asserts that baroque sculptures “leave scope for the imagination, often suggesting a background story bound to arouse compassionate response.”²⁵ If Hellenistic artists working in the baroque style sought to use the body as a theatrical tool to illicit deep emotional responses in their audience, they used the idealized bodies of heroes and the stories of Greek mythology to relate a specific emotional message, in the case of the Pasquino group, of injury and loss. In Herodas’ description of the girl and the apple, he asks his audience, using only the briefest of descriptions, to supplement both the mental image of this statue group and the emotional intensity of the scene, in this case a sense of longing and anticipation.

In contrast, the next statue described by Kokkale is one of a very old man, who is just at the point of death (πρὸς Μοιρέων). This short phrase omits a verb, instead using a preposition (πρὸς) and an implied (ἐστί) to convey its meaning: the effect is that Kokkale, excited by the statues in front of her, blurts out short, broken sentences as her eyes flick to different statues in the room.²⁶ Kokkale, in her haste, omits conventional structural elements necessary to create a complete sentence. Herodas uses the descriptive language of ekphrasis to create in his audience an auditory experience that stimulates a visual one. Thus, the audience’s mind’s eye, the creator of imaginative spaces, would have to quickly supplement images from memory, just as the ear quickly turns from one subject to the next, all in parallel to Kokkale’s constructed eye as it moves between sculptures. As Ruth Webb describes: “The souls of both speaker and listener are stocked with internal images of absent thing, and these provide the raw material with which each part can ‘paint’ the images that ekphrasis puts into worlds.”²⁷

Using his characters as models of behavior for his audience, Herodas educates them on the way that they should be viewing by inviting them to imaginatively mimic the actions of his characters by directing the external audience's gaze through the internal gaze of Kokkale. Walter Headlam sees the characters described in the *Mimiambi* as sources of mockery for the audience.²⁸ The desire, on the part of the poet, to address the low, base or everyday features of society is not only found in the Hellenistic poetry of Herodas, but also in the earlier *Iamboi* of Archilocus and Hipponax. In the *Mimiamboi*, Herodas uses an appropriation of dialect and meter to connect directly with the iambic poetry of Hipponax. He chooses to compose his poems in Choliambis, a meter which consists of three iambic trimeters and an extra "limping" foot, a meter that was invented and used by Hipponax.²⁹ The connection between Herodas and Hipponax also manifests itself in direct literary allusion. For example, Herodas appropriates some of the character names from Hipponax 78 and integrates them into his third *Mimiambos*.³⁰ As Ralph Rosen argues, there was a strong sense of temporal continuity between the iambic poetry of Hipponax and that of the Hellenistic poets, who considered themselves part of the ancient iambic tradition. Like the *Mimiamboi* of Herodas, Archaic *Iamboi* brought the world of the everyday laborer to a public audience.

Although the invocation of the everyday women may be a tie to an earlier poetic genre, it is possible to see them as otherwise productive as Zanker has suggested: "The audience's or viewer's imagination is shown at work in the interpretive commentary offered by the describer, who is made to see to it that the person for whom he is describing the art object becomes integrally involved not only in the object but also in the process of interpretation."³¹ The insights and emotions of the describer, therefore, form an integral part of the audience's imaginative experience. As Simon Goldhill puts it "We read [or listen] to become lookers, and poems are written to educate and direct viewing as a social and intellectual process."³²

After the abbreviated description of the old man, Kokkale moves on to a statue of a boy strangling a goose, an image which exists in many copies throughout the Hellenistic world and is assigned by Pollitt to a genre he

calls *rococo*.³³ Pollit describes the *rococo* as a lighthearted and playful art form with characters removed from the heavy emotion of the baroque. This style often features statues of children, lovers, and sleeping/intoxicated members of the retinue of Dionysus. The statue of the boy and the goose is attributed to Boethos of Calcedon (2nd century B.C.E.) by Pliny in his *Natural Histories*, although clearly this is a later artist working with a well-known and often used theme.³⁴ In a Roman marble copy located in the Kunsthistorische Museum in Vienna (figure 2)³⁵, which Ridgeway asserts is the statue described by Herodas, we see a young boy, who resembles figures of the infant Eros or Dionysus, reaching out towards the viewer and bracing a small goose in his left hand.³⁶

A pyramidal composition is created by the arms and legs of the boy, whose face betrays a sense of urgency, willing the viewer to engage emotionally with the child. His pudgy limbs indicate his youth and innocence and create a delicate shadow, softening his figure. Headlam associates the figure of the healthy, pudgy child either with Asclepius himself or with his power, making it an image appropriate for the sanctuary.³⁷ The attribution of the statue, however, is less important than the role that it plays within this particular poetic context.

The goose is a *χηναλώπεκ*, a species described by Herodotus as originating in Egypt and worshiped by the inhabitants along the Nile river.³⁸ The reference to a specific geographical location is a common feature of Hellenistic poetry and can also be seen in the works of Callimachus and Theocritus. For example, in his Prologue to the *Aetia*, Callimachus refers to Thrace (13), Persia (18), and Lycia (22), within ten lines, taking his audience on a geographical tour of the Hellenistic world. In many Hellenistic contexts, references to specific geographical places contain embedded references to poetic authors or genres, as in Theocritus *Idyll* VII, where he uses references to over 30 geographical places within the 155 line poem, and can be used by the Hellenistic poet to situate himself within the physical as well as poetic landscape.³⁹ As Nita Krevans posits, Theocritus uses allusions to geographical places, something she credits specifically to Alexandrian poets, to claim Hesiod, Philetas, Steichorus, Philoxenus and Homer as his artistic

precursors.⁴⁰ In the case of Herodas, the reference to the Egyptian goose allows him, also an Alexandrian poet, to create a parallel between himself and the sculptor, someone also working in the corpus of Alexandrian imagery. Herodas situates the sculpture in the precise landscape and artistic context in which he himself is working. Thus he makes a metapoetic connection



Figure 2
Boy Strangling Goose

between visual and literary arts, forging a bridge between the artist who created the sculpture, who is in reality the poet himself, and the artist who created the *Mimiambos*. In so doing, he creates a further parallel between his audience and his characters, both of whom gaze upon the work of the same

artist, reaffirming the gaze of his characters, which instructs his audience. Further, the introduction of a specifically Egyptian goose creates a sense of immediacy for the audience, since their gaze has been shifted from a created space, invented by the artist, to one which contains objects recognizable in their contemporary world. Thus the imagined space has become one which is able to be permeated by views or memories of contemporary society. Therefore, by instructing the vision of the viewer, the poet uses ekphrasis to direct that gaze back onto contemporary society.

The final image described by Kokkale is the portrait-statue of the woman Batale, daughter of Myttes. This statue was most likely placed in the sanctuary as a votive to Asclepius, created in thanks for the god's assistance with some illness.⁴¹ The introduction of this sculpture group calls attention to the final type of Hellenistic sculpture that will be discussed in this paper, verism. Sculptors working in the veristic tradition often abandoned mythological subjects in order to represent the daily experiences of everyday people. For example, the "Old Woman at the Market" in the Metropolitan Museum reaches out towards the viewer in a feeble attempt to sell us her wares (Figure 3).⁴²

The sculptor rendered every wrinkle on her face, her shifting garment that almost exposes her breast, and her hunched posture in order to immortalize a fleeting moment in the lifelong struggle of a poor elderly woman. Although this sculpture may seem to have been taken from contemporary life, there is no evidence that this woman actually existed and the purpose of this sculpture is not to capture the likeness of a specific person but rather intends to capture a type that would have been recognizable to a contemporary audience.⁴³ Instead of calling to mind images of heroes and mythological narrative, this type of sculpture relied on the audience to supplement a completely different corpus of images, those from their everyday lives. As Graham Zanker argues, these supplemented memories would have endowed this figure with the same amount of *pathos* as that of a dying hero, and thus the supplementation of imagery, in the end, achieves the same goal, namely the evocation of emotion.⁴⁴ An emotional reading of



Figure 3
Old Woman at the Market

a statue like the “Old Woman at the Market,” which forces the viewer to direct their gaze back on their own society with the supplementation of images from their everyday lives, creates a point of emotional connection and reflection through which they can view contemporary society.

When viewing this veristic statue, Kokkale insists that it is like a real woman so much that the statue itself walks (βέβηκεν). This provides an analogy for Herodas himself, since he, as author, creates an imitation of life, in this case, in the form of personae. Just as Hellenistic verism uses detail to create an imitation of images from contemporary society, so, too, does Herodas use characterization and ekphrasis to create a mental, visual, and auditory experience for his audience that reproduced moments from their everyday lives. It is a common trope of Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic ekphrasis to endow sculpted or painted objects with movement and sound. In Homer’s ekphrasis in *Iliad* 18, the figures crafted in relief on the face of the shield are described as moving “ὀρώρει,” (493), whirling “ἐδίνεον” (494) and the flutes and lyres are described as having sound “βοὴν ἔχον” (495). Other Hellenistic authors also adopted this trope. For example, in *Idyll* I, during the ekphrasis of a shepherd’s cup that will be awarded as a prize during a singing competition, Theocritus describes two foxes eyeing the dinner of a young boy [...] ἀμφὶ δέ νιν δὺ’ ἀλώπεκες ἅ μὲν ἄν’ ὄρχως/φοιτῇ [...] “And on both sides of him, two foxes went to and fro among the vines” (48-51). By referencing the movement of his ekphrastic image in a Homeric fashion, Theocritus endows this passage with references to epic in order to contrast the severity of epic with the lightheartedness of his new bucolic genre.⁴⁵ Herodas also endows his sculptures with movement, in the manner of Homer, thus referencing the tradition of ekphrasis that began with Achilles’ shield, but instead of describing the artwork in the authoritative voice of the author as Homer does, Herodas instead places the words in the mouth of Kokkale, emphasizing her importance as the director of the audience’s gaze. By referencing the way Batale walks, an image that Kokkale clearly supplemented from her memory of contemporary society, Kokkale gives the audience a model for their own viewing. Thus, Herodas invites the viewer to supplement images from their own lives, when addressing his poems, just as Kokkale does in the face of contemporary artworks.

In the second ekphrasis (56-70), Kokkale describes a relief of a nude boy and a sacrificial offering of a bull painting in three-quarter perspective:⁴⁶

[...]οὐκ ὀρῆς, φίλη Κυννοῖ;
 οἷ' ἔργα κείν' - ἦν, ταῦτ' ἐρεῖς Ἀθηναίην
 γλύψαι τὰ καλὰ - χαιρέτω δὲ δέσποινα.
 τὸν παῖδα γοῦν τὸν γυμνὸν ἦν κνίσω τοῦτον
 οὐχ ἔλκος ἔξει, Κύννα; πρὸς γὰρ οἱ κεῖνται 60
 αἱ σάρκες οἷα θερμὰ θερμὰ πηδεῦσαι
 ἐν τῇ σανίσκῃ· τῶργυρεῦν δὲ πύραστρον
 οὐκ ἦν ἴδῃσι Μύλλος ἢ Παταικίσκος
 ὁ Λαμπρίωνος, ἐκβαλεῦσι τὰς κούρας
 δοκεῦντες ὄντως ἀργυρεῦν πεποιῆσθαι; 65
 ὁ βοῦς δὲ κῶ ἄγων αὐτοῦ ἢ θ' ὁμαρτεῦσα
 κῶ γρυπὸς οὔτος κῶ ἀνάσιλλος ἄνθρωπος
 οὐχὶ ζόην βλέπουσιν ἡμέρην πάντες;
 εἰ μὴ ἐδόκευν ἂν μέζον ἢ γυνὴ πρήσσειν,
 ἀνηλάλαξ' ἂν, μὴ μ' ὁ βοῦς τι πημήνη· 70
 οὕτω ἐπιλοξοῖ, Κυννί, τῇ ἑτέρῃ κούρῃ.

Do you not see, dear Kynno?
 What sorts of works these ones here are – you would say that Athena
 Carved these beautiful things – hail the mistress.
 If you scratch this naked lad close at hand
 Would he not bleed, Kynno? His warm flesh
 Pulses, throbbing with warmth
 In the picture; if Myllos or Pataikiskos, son of
 Lamprion see the fire tongs, won't they let their eyes drop out
 Because they think that they are made from silver?
 The bull and the one who leads it and the girl who attends
 And the hook-nosed man and the one with bristling hair
 Don't they all have the look of light and life?
 If it did not seem to be more unbecoming for a woman,
 I would have screamed lest the bull do me some harm;
 Since he looks sideways at me, Kynno, with one eye.

Just as in the previous ekphrasis, this one begins with a direction to look, in this case in the form of a question, directing the gaze of both the internal audience, namely Kynno, and the external audience, those listening to or reading Herodas'

Mimiamb. A similar direction of gaze is used by Theocritus in his *Idyll* XV when Gorgo commands her companion Praxinoa to gaze upon the beautiful tapestry: “Πραξινοά, πόταγ’ ὦδε. τὰ ποικίλα πρᾶτον ἄθρησον” (78) “Praxinoa, come here. First gaze upon these embroideries.” As Walter Headlam notes, this direction by the author to look is not a trope inherited from the ekphrastic tradition of epic, since Homer uses an omniscient narrator to describe Achilles’ shield.⁴⁷ He posits instead that Herodas is inspired by “the old Ionic descriptive style of narration”.⁴⁸ It is also possible that it was inherited from the iambic tradition of Hipponax, in which he frequently uses the second person imperative to command the attention of his internal audience members.⁴⁹

Perhaps most intriguing is this form’s connection to epigram, in which the funeral monuments themselves “speak” to passers-by, asking them to stop and mourn the deceased. For example, in Callimachus’ epitaph to his father, he commands the one passing by his grave ὅστις ἐμόν παρά σῆμα φέρεις πόδα “to know both the name of his father and his son.”⁵⁰ This is not a new facet of Hellenistic epigram, but one inherited from Archaic and Classical funeral monuments.⁵¹ Epigram, although initially confined to stone, took on a new meaning in the Hellenistic period, when authors composed them as strictly literary works, divorced completely from their funerary context.⁵² As Katherine Guitzwiler describes it “the monument adorned by the epigram is no longer visually present but [...] must now be reconstructed in the reader’s imagination”⁵³ Thus, the Hellenistic epigram and the Hellenistic ekphrasis take on a similar role, creating a picture in the mind’s eye of the audience, a picture that the audience must supplement with images from memory. Interestingly, as Jackie Murray and Jonathan M. Rowland point out, it is also within literary epigram, because it divorces performance from poetic voice, that poets, both male and female, first attempted to create a female voice that “did not, as its primary function, reinforce the patriarchal culture.”⁵⁴ Murray and Rowland define the attempt on the part of the male author to portray characters with an authentically female voice as “trans-gendered.”⁵⁵ In this *Mimiambos*, Herodas chooses to house his ekphrasis in a conversation between two women, creating an inherently female gaze and female perspective on the artworks that are being

described.⁵⁶ Although Kokkale and Kynno are described by Page DuBois as “silly” and “naïve,”⁵⁷ and although some scholars see them as a negative counter-example for the audience,⁵⁸ the poetic capacity to represent a “trans-gendered” voice indicates that there is a deeper significance in the use of a female perspective in this ekphrasis. The use of the authentic female voice that is unclouded by the weighty influence of past literature and scholarship, allows Herodas to concentrate the thoughts of his characters and therefore the supplemental images of the audience on the contemporary moment. The use of these women, then, does not create a negative example for the audience, but a positive one that reinforces the supplementation of images from everyday life and the direction of gaze onto contemporary Alexandria.

In this passage, as Kynno asserts later in the poem, she is viewing a work by Apelles of Ephesus, a court artist of Alexander the Great, whom Pliny refers to in his *Natural Histories* as working in the late fourth century B.C.E., both for Alexander the Great and Ptolemy I.⁵⁹ Although none of Apelles’ works survive Roman wall paintings thought to be copies of his artwork brought to Rome by Augustus do. Interestingly, Pliny tells us that there were three important works by Apelles in the Asclepeion at Cos, a statue of Aphrodite Anaduomene, a portrait of Antigonos I Monophthalmus who was a general under Alexander the Great and then went on to found the Antigonid dynasty, and another statue of Aphrodite which was unfinished.⁶⁰ Ian Cunningham posits that Herodas is here referring to the painting by Apelles, for which we have no evidence, and not the sculptures that are attested as housed in the Asclepeion, because the setting is not intended to be the sanctuary at Kos.⁶¹ He asserts that Herodas intentionally creates a space which does not actually exist because he is more interested in the characters than the scene they inhabit.⁶² Thus, describing a fictional space, Herodas forces the audience to supplement images not from a unified space, but from their interaction with artistic and ritual spaces. Herodas creates a constructed space which unifies real and fictional space. As Verity Platt argues, this *Mimiambos* takes place in a temple, a ritual sacred space, in which the act of viewing takes on both a scholarly and religious aspect.⁶³ She argues that the temple creates a specific environment, which mitigates the distinction between scholarship and religion.⁶⁴ Thus through the eyes

of Kokkale, the audience becomes aware of this intersection between the scholarly, as represented by the poem itself, and the ritual, supplemented by images from the audience's memory of contemporary temples and sacrifices.

The next statue described by Kokkale is of a nude boy. Using the tactile nature of the statue, Herodas creates a connection between the internal gaze of the viewer of Kynno and Kokkale and the eye of the audience by using the onomatopoetic repetition “θερμὰ θερμὰ” (61). The sound of the repeated word metrically mimics the human heartbeat, both that of Kokkale and Kynno and that of the listener, connecting the audience in a physical and aural way to the words of the poem. Furthermore, the visual repetition of the words on the page recreates what Kokkale is describing, as they expand and contract within the written space just like the chest of the boy as he breathes in and out. The Hellenistic poet Simias in his *Wings*, takes this idea a step further, creating a shaped poem, a *technopaegnon*, which is composed in a physical shape significant to the content of the poem. As Alexandra Pappas claims, the *technopaegnia* manipulates the gaze of the viewer to reshape conceptions of past and present literature and visual art by conflating the acts of reading, hearing, and seeing.⁶⁵

The final image described by Kokkale is a painting of a bull being led to sacrifice. She begins this description by naming two men, Pataikiskos (62), who Walter Headlam describes as “thievish, covetous, unprincipled and dishonest,” and Myllos, whose identification is less certain.⁶⁶ References to thievishness are also found in Theocritus XV, when he describes the streets of Alexandria before the intervention of Ptolemy II. In the poem, Gorgo, praises Ptolemy II for clearing the streets of Alexandria of the thieves who used to plague it.⁶⁷ Herodas similarly praises Ptolemy II in his first *Mimiambos*, although he houses it within the speech of a matchmaker with questionable morals.⁶⁸ The inherent juxtaposition between the thing described and the one describing it is similarly emphasized in *Mimiamb IV*, since Kokkale interprets the gaze of a thief upon an art object in a future more vivid condition “οὐκ ἦν ἴδῃσι Μύλλος ἢ Παταικίσκος/ ὁ Λαμπρίωνος, ἐκβαλεῦσι τὰς κούρας”. Kokkale, here, takes up the role of the Herodas, creating a persona, through which she can interpret art

objects. Because Kokkale diverts the viewer's gaze through the eyes of an absent character, she wraps the ekphrasis in layers of personae. This wrapping forces the viewer/listener to not only supplement visual elements to understand the art objects described to them, but they must also create a character through whom that gaze can be interpreted. Thus, Herodas puts his audience in the position of the poet, creating characters from the vast array of images and memories gathered throughout their lives.

Finally, Kokkale describes the bull, which is so lifelike that it seems to stare right out at her (66-71). The description of the bull as staring out at Kokkale shifts the gaze one last time and the internal viewer becomes the viewed. The bull stares out at Kokkale and the world around her just as the audience observes the *Mimiambos*. Using this shift in gaze, Herodas asks his audience to undergo the same process of reflection and reintroduce supplemented images back into the context they originated from, namely contemporary society. Just as art objects were placed within temples and galleries, places that divorce them from society around them and group them with other objects, so too were these poems performed in a secluded and constructed space. By forcing the viewer to acknowledge their gaze, Herodas brings back into focus the Hellenistic city of Alexandria. Similarly, artists working in the veristic tradition sought to bring something of contemporary society into the constructed spaces that were meant to hold art objects, introducing aspects of everyday life into a space that was traditionally divorced from it and recontextualizing all of the images supplemented by the viewer back into contemporary society. Using direction of gaze, Herodas achieves the same goal and at the end of his ekphrasis, invites the reader to reflect upon all supplemented images as aspects of everyday life.

Visual and literary artists of the Hellenistic period were engaging with the same issues in a diverse and economically-divided city like Alexandria. The dispersal of Greek culture through education and scholarship, made possible by wealthy benefactors like Ptolemy II, created an extremely educated aristocratic class with strong cultural and scholastic ties to Archaic and Classical Greece. At the same time, the economic prosperity of Alexandria allowed lower class merchants and traders to come face-to-

face with Greek monuments. The literary and visual artist was tasked with attempting to bridge the gap created by this cultural disparity and produce artworks applicable to this rapidly evolving world. At the same time, however, it was essential to maintain ties with the cultural history of the Greek past. To accomplish this feat, poets like Herodas used the tropes and vocabulary of the archaic past, in this case, ekphrasis, and presented it to the audience in such a way that audience members were invited to supplement images from everyday life in order to spark reflection on contemporary society. References to specific artworks within poems created a direct connection between the two media, endowing both the sculptor and the poet with the power to cause reflection on modern society, namely to create a new way of viewing in the Hellenistic world, one which integrated both past and contemporary society in the mind of the audience.

NOTES

1 For more on Hellenistic Alexandria see Stephens (2003), Fraser (1972), Samuel (1983) Scheidel (2004), Fantuzzi (2004), and Gutzwiller (2007).

2 Stevens (2003).

3 Fraser (1972).

4 Stephens (2010).

5 Tomlinson (2007).

6 Esposito (2010), Headlam (1922) and Ussher (1985) argue that Herodas lived and worked in Alexandria or Kos; Cunningham (2004) claims that there is no evidence that Herodas should be associated with Ptolemaic Egypt.

7 For more discussion of the religious context of this poem see Headlam (1922).

8 For more on Hellenistic ekphrasis see Faber (1995), Goldhill and Osborne (1994), Goldhill (2007) and Webb (2009).

9 Shadi Bartsch and Jaś Elsner (2007).

10 Sophron Frag 10, discussed below.

11 For a complete discussion of viewing and Ekphrasis in Euripides see Zeitlin (1993).

12 Aescylus *Theoroi*, P. Oxy 2162 frag 78a for more discussion of this fragment see O'Sullivan (2000).

13 *Rhetores Graeci*, Vol. 2, 1854.

14 Zanker (1981), 300.

15 Webb (2009), 20.

- 16 Ibid, 28.
- 17 Goldhill (2007).
- 18 Zanker (2007).
- 19 Becker (1995) and Taplin (1980) speak to the poetic function to the ekphrasis as a poetic device within the Homeric text.
- 20 Zanker (2007).
- 21 Lehmann (1945).
- 22 Pollitt (1986).
- 23 Pasquino Group (Menelaus supporting the body of Patroclus), Roman copy of a 3rd century B.C.E. original, Loggia dei Lanzi, Florence.
- 24 Zanker (2007).
- 25 Ridgeway (1965) 53.
- 26 Headlam (1922).
- 27 Webb (2009) 113.
- 28 Headlam (1922), Goldhill (1994) and DuBois (2007) have similar opinions of Herodas' characters.
- 29 West (1974).
- 30 Hipp. Frag 78 and Herodas iii.
- 31 Zanker (2007), 15.
- 32 Goldhill (2007) 2.
- 33 Pollitt (1986).
- 34 Pliny NH 34.84 "Boethi quamquam argento melioris, infans ex animo anserem strangulat".
- 35 Boy Strangling a Goose, Roman marble copy of a 3rd century B.C.E. original. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.
- 36 Ridgeway (2001). Herzog (1903) also discusses the possible physical models for this statue.
- 37 Headlam (1922). In her 2006 Article, Ridgeway proposes an alternate reading of this statue which asserts that the group represents the infant Dionysus who is strangling an evil spirit as a metaphor for rebirth and triumph over death.
- 38 Hdt.2.72. "ἱρούς δὲ τούτους τοῦ Νείλου φασι εἶναι, καὶ τῶν ὀρνίθων τοὺς χηναλώπεκας." (they say that these things are sacred to the Nile, and also the Egyptian goose among birds).
- 39 Krevans (1983).
- 40 Ibid, 203.
- 41 Headlam (1922).

- 42 Old Woman at the Market, 1st century c.e. Roman copy of a 2nd century B.C.E. Hellenistic original, Metropolitan Museum.
- 43 Pollit (1986).
- 44 Zanker (2007).
- 45 Faber (1995)
- 46 Headlam (1922).
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 Ibid, 199.
- 49 For more discussion of direct address in Hipponax, see Acosta-Hughes (2002).
- 50 GP29.
- 51 Bettenworth (2007)
- 52 Gutzwiller (1998).
- 53 Ibid, 7.
- 54 Murray Rowland (2007) 213.
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 This theme will also be explored in my discussion of Theocritus in chapter 3.
- 57 DuBois (2007).
- 58 See note 30.
- 59 Plin.NH.35.36.79-97.
- 60 Plin.NH.35.36.91.
- 61 Cunningham (1966).
- 62 Ibid, 117.
- 63 Platt (2010).
- 64 Ibid.
- 65 Pappas (2012) 218.
- 66 Headlam (1922) 202.
- 67 Theoc.15.46-50. “πολλά τοι ὦ Πτολεμαῖε πεποίηται καλὰ ἔργα, / ἐξ ὧ ἐν ἀθανάτοις ὁ τέκν: οὐδεὶς κακοεργὸς/ δαλεῖται τὸν ἰόντα παρέρπων Αἰγυπτιστί,/ οἷα πρὶν ἐξ ἀπάτας κεκροτημένοι ἄνδρες ἔπαισδον,/ ἀλλάλοις ὁμαλοί, κακὰ παίγνια, πάντες ἐρειοί.”
- 68 Herodas *Mimiamb* I ln26-36.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acosta-Hughes, Benjamin. 2010. "The Prefigured Muse: Rethinking a Few Assumptions on Hellenistic Poetics." *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*. ed. James Clauss and Martine Cuypers. Blackwell Publishing.
- . 2002. *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. University of California Press.
- . 1996. "Hipponax, Callimachus, and the Persona of the Iambographer" *Materiali e discussion per l'analisi dei Testi Classici*. No. 37. pp. 205-116.
- Bartsch, Shadi and Elsner, Jaś. 2007. "Introduction: Eight Ways of Looking at an Ekphrasis." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 102, No. 1. pp. i-vi.
- Becker, Andrew. 1995. *The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Ekphrasis*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Bettenworth, Anja. 2007. "The Mutual Influence of Inscribed and Literary Epigram." *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. ed. Peter Bing and Jon Steffen Bruss. Brill. pp. 49-69.
- Cunningham, Ian. 2004. *Herodas Mimiambi cum Appendice Fragmentorum Mimorum Papyraecorum*. Leipzig.
- . 1966. "Herodas IV." *The Classical Quarterly*. New Series. Vol. 16. No. 1. pp. 113-125.
- DuBois, Page. 2007. "Reading the Writing on the Wall." *Classical Philology*. Vol 102. pp. 45-56.
- Esposito, Elena. 2010. "Herodas and the Mime." *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*. ed. James Clauss and Martine Cuypers. Blackwell Publishing. pp. 266-281.
- Faber, Riemer. 1995. "Vergi; Eclogue 3.37, Theocritus I and Hellenistic Ekphrasis." *The American Journal of Philology*. Vol. 116. No. 3. pp. 411-417.
- Fantuzzi, Marco. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge University Press.

- Fraser, Paul. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Clarendon Press.
- Goldhill, Simon and Osborne, Robin. 1994. *Art and Text in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- Goldhill, Simon. 2007. "What is Ekphrasis For?" *Classical Philology*. Vol. 102. No. 1. pp. 1-19.
- Gutzwiller, Katheryn. 2007. *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature*. Blackwell Publishing.
- . 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. University of California Press.
- Headlam, Walter. 1922. *Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments*. ed. Alfred Knox. Cambridge University Press.
- Herodotus (1927). *Historiae*. Oxford University Press.
- Herzog, Rudolf. 1903. "Das Kind mit der Fuchsgans." *Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes*. Vol. 6. pp. 215-236.
- Hopkinson, Neil. 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Krevans, Nita. 1983. "Geography and the Literary Tradition in Theocritus 7." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. Vol. 113. pp. 201-220.
- Lehmann, Karl. 1945. "The Girl Beneath the Apple Tree." *American Journal of Archaeology*. Vol 49. No. 4. pp. 430-433.
- Murray, Jackie and Rowland, Johnathan M. 2007. "Gendered Voices in Hellenistic Epigram," *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. ed. Peter Bing and Jon Steffen Bruss, Brill.
- O'Sullivan, Patrick. 2000. "Satyr and the Image in Aeschylus' Theoroi." *The Classical Quarterly*. Vol. 50. No. 2. pp. 353-366.
- Pappas, Alexandra. 2012. "The Treachery of Verbal Images: Viewing the Technopaegnia." *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry*. ed. J. Kwapisz, D. Petrain and M. Szmanski. Walter de Gruyter. pp. 199-225.

- Platt, Verity. 2010. "Art History in the Temple," *Arethusa*, Vol. 43, No. 2.
- Pliny the Elder. 1952. *Natural Histories IX Books 33-35*. Harvard University Press.
- Pollitt, Jerome. 1986. *Art in the Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ussher, Robert. 1985. "The Mimic Tradition of 'Character' in Herodas." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*. New Series. Vol. 21. No 3. pp. 45-68.
- Ridgeway, Brunilde. 2001. *Hellenistic Sculpture I: The Styles of ca. 331-200B.C.* The University of Wisconsin Press
- . 2006. "The Boy Strangling the Goose: Genre Figure or Mythological Symbol?" *American Journal of Archaeology*. Vol 110. No. 4. pp. 643-645
- . 1965. "Wounded Figures in Greek Sculpture." *Archaeology*. Vol. 18. No 1. pp. 47-54.
- Samuel, Alan. 1983. *From Athens to Alexandria: Hellenism and Social Goals in Ptolemaic Egypt Volumes 26-28*. Imprimerie Orientaliste.
- Scheidel, Walter. 2004. "Creating a Metropolis: A Comparative Demographic Perspective." *Ancient Alexandria Between Egypt and Greece*. ed. William Harris and Giovanni Ruffini. Brill. pp. 1-31.
- Stephens, Susan. 2003. *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. University of California Berkeley Press.
- . 2010. "Ptolemaic Alexandria." *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*. ed. James Clauss and Martine Cuypers. Blackwell Publishing. pp. 46-62.
- Taplin, Oliver. 1980. "The Shield of Achilles Within the 'Iliad'" *Greece & Rome*. Second Series. Vol. 27. No. 1. pp. 1-21.
- Tomlinson, Richard. 2007. "From Houses to Tenements: Domestic Architecture in Hellenistic Alexandria." *British School at Athens Studies*. Vol. 15. *Building Communities: House Settlement, and Society in the Aegean and Beyond*. pp. 307-311.
- von Spengel, Leonhard. *Rhetores Graeci*. Vol. 2. 1854

- Webb, Ruth. 2009. *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*. Ashgate.
- West, Martin. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. De Gruyter. 1974.
- Zanker, Graham. 1981. "Enargeia in the Ancient Criticism of poetry" *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, Neue Folge, 124 Bd. H. 3.4. pp. 297-311.
- . 2007. *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Zeitlin, Froma. 1993. "The Artful Eye: Vision, Ekphrasis, and Spectacle in Euripidean Drama" *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*. ed. Simon Goldhill and Robin Osborne. Cambridge University Press. pp. 138-196.

THE FEAST POLITIC: THE εἰλαπίνη IN HOMERIC POETRY

BY IAN TEWKSBURY

INTRODUCTION

In short, the paper researches the *eilapinē*, the ‘sumptuous feast,’ in the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* and argues that, *contra* our current understanding of the term, the *eilapinē* is a sacrificial feast, which is in fact portrayed as the locus of heroic *kleos*.

The question is, what kind of feast is taking place? Or, conversely, what kind of feast *should* be taking place? This question is not just ours but Athena’s, who disguised as Mentes, here questions Telemachus:

ἀλλ’ ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπὲ καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον:
τίς δαῖς, τίς δὲ ὄμιλος ὃδ’ ἔπλετο; τίπτε δέ σε χρεώ;
εἰλαπίνη ἢ γάμος; ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἔρανος τάδε γ’ ἐστίν:
ὥς τέ μοι ὑβρίζοντες ὑπερφιάλως δοκέουσι
δαίνυσθαι κατὰ δῶμα. νεμεσσήσαιτό κεν ἀνὴρ
αἴσχεα πόλλ’ ὀρόων, ὅς τις πιτυτός γε μετέλθοι.

Od. 1.224-229

But tell me, and tell me true, what is the meaning of all this feasting, and who are these people? What is it all about? Have you some banquet, or is there a wedding in the family - for no one seems to be bringing any provisions of his own? And the guests - how atrociously they are behaving; what riot they make over the whole house; it is enough to disgust any respectable person who comes near them.¹

Much fruitful work has been produced on the feast as a type scene.² Furthermore, the δαῖς is well understood.³ But research has proved inconclusive on the two most important words in our passage, the εἰλαπίνη

and ἔρανος – especially the former. The latter only appears twice in Homeric poetry (*Od.* 1.226, 11.415). The ἔρανος, according to Cunliffe's *Lexicon*, is a “a feast to which the partakers contributed in shares.”⁴ This view is supported by the scholia (e.g. ἔρανος οὖν λέγεται τὸ ἀπὸ συμβολῆς δεῖπνον). Though its use in Pindar is often translated as feast, I believe it its sense of contribution is primary to its meaning.⁵ Furthermore, ἔρανος can be used by later writers to mean simply a “contribution” (Isoc. 11.1, Thuc. 2.43).⁶ This makes one aspect of Athena's statement clear. The feast, here, is not a meal to which the suitors contribute. Conversely, the εἰλαπίνη has been understood as a feast which is provided by a single donor. Thus Athenaeus in the 2nd century A.D. explains the two terms as oppositional forms of giving: the εἰλαπίνη is a feast in which the preparation and expense is expended by a single donor, the ἔρανος, on the other hand, is contributed by the participants (*Athen.* 8.362a).

Despite Athenaeus' explanation, the εἰλαπίνη is rarely understood in a similar context of division or distribution. Instead, it continues to be read as either a rowdy drinking fest or a general feast whose meaning is undiscoverable. Thus S. Sheratt, in *The Mycenaean Feast*, concludes “its epic derivatives seem to imply no more than generic feasting or reveling in company.”⁷ But, as our passage suggests, the εἰλαπίνη is a type of δαῖς - a feast word derived from the verb δαίομαι, meaning “divide, distribute, apportion.” Therefore, I believe that we should seek to re-contextualize our understanding of εἰλαπίνη in terms of distribution and division. In the process, I believe that we can glean a deeper understanding of εἰλαπίνη in Homeric epic by observing the context (and theme)⁸ in which each Homeric attestation of εἰλαπίνη occurs.

First, I will attempt to explicate the thematic context of the εἰλαπίνη, which will help contextualize the function εἰλαπίνη plays in the Homeric poems. Second, I will analyze the attestations of εἰλαπίνη and its derivatives in three sections: (1) the εἰλαπίνη among heroes; (2) the εἰλαπίνη among the gods; (3) the εἰλαπίνη in the Homeric city. In section (3) I will attempt to reconstruct its role within in the Homeric city. In order to do this, it will be necessary to use later authors to reconstruct a coherent reading of the εἰλαπίνη. These authors have been largely dismissed or ignored, but I believe that the authors who understood the meaning of εἰλαπίνη but for whom

it no longer functioned as traditional diction will provide our most explicit definitions of the word. Therefore, in order to flesh out the role of the εἰλαπίνη in the Homeric city, I will look at the employment of εἰλαπίνη in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius. In conclusion, I will return to our original passage and offer a reading of εἰλαπίνη based on our findings. Utilizing the work of M. Mauss, I will try to explain the feast in terms of the gift culture.⁹ In doing so, I believe the feast can be better understood as, what M. Dietler calls, “part of the an arena for both the highly condensed symbolic representation and the active manipulation of social relations.”¹⁰ Ultimately, this paper hopes to achieve two things: first, to better define the meaning of εἰλαπίνη in Homeric poetry;¹¹ second, to offer a tentative evaluation of the implications our findings could have for the cultural context of the poems.¹²

IN CONTEXT

First, we must attempt to recapture the possible thematic context of the εἰλαπίνη. To begin, let's look at a conventional reading of the following lines:

ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἔρανος τάδε γ' ἐστίν:
ὥς τέ μοι ὑβρίζοντες ὑπερφιάλως δοκέουσι
δαίνυσθαι κατὰ δῶμα.

At the expense of all?
Not that, I think. How arrogant they seem,
These gluttons, making free in your house!¹³

Heubeck et al., in *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, suggest that ὥς τε should be taken as introducing a comparison. This is suggested on the authority of Chantriane, *Grammaire*, ii 325.¹⁴ However, looking at similar formulaic usage provides a simpler explanation. Similar usages imply that ὥς τε, here, like elsewhere, simply introduces a simile. Furthermore, with the personal pronoun in the ethical dative, the simile stresses its relationship to the perception of the speaker (see *Od.* 8.487-491, where the same phrase appears). In fact, a similar expression is also used to refer to Odysseus' perception during his questioning of Penelope, where the phrase stresses the connection between

kingly perception and κλέος (*Od.* 19.106-114). Thus, I think it more likely that the line ὥς τέ μοι ὑβρίζοντες ὑπερφιάλως δοκέουσι refers to the Athena's perception of the event. Above all, it does not imply a comparison with the type of behavior expected at an ἔρανος feast.

Thus, it is not that Athena knows that the feast is not an ἔρανος because the suitors are acting hubristically – *as* those would act at a εἰλαπίνη.¹⁵ Rather, it is that they seem to be *like* ones who act hubristically to Athena. It is this stress on Athena's perception of the hubristic act that signals meaning on the thematic level. This reading is supported by the following lines: νεμεσῆσαιτό κεν ἄνῆρ / αἴσχεα πόλλ' ὀρώων. Therefore, I think the understanding of εἰλαπίνη is situated within the context of the thematic issues of hubris, retribution, and, as we will see, even κλέος. If the emphasis is thematic, I think the passage takes on a different light. We might translate these lines: "Like ones who are acting ungodly do they seem to me (the goddess Athena) to feast in the halls in a manner contrary to civil behavior" – or perhaps, "beyond the natural limit." Further evidence for the thematic dimension of this passage is provided by ὑπερφιάλως. Its adjectival forms are used to describe the Cyclopes (*Od.* 9.106) and the suitors, two paradigms of the inversion of social order. It is also linked directly to paradigmatic theme of return:¹⁶ Aias is denied his νόστος on account of his ὑπερφιάλον behaviour (*Od.* 4.503). This then explains the context of Athena's question. The context is highly charged and thematic. What kind of feast could this be? For there are acts of hubris that are contrary to civil order (Athena's presence would suggest cosmic order).

Therefore, I think the stress is on the optative that follows, "a man would be angry or feel shame who saw these many shameful deeds." Hubristic behavior in this context is not a description of rowdy behavior, but rather a key thematic concept that signifies a threat to social and cosmic order (e.g. see Solon F 4.7-16, Mimnermus F 9.3-4). Thus P. Chantraine defines ὕβρις, "est une terme important pour la pensée morale et juridique des Grecs: Chez Homère; il caractérise la violence brutal; qui viole les règles, et il se trouve déjà clairement opposé à δίκη... L'*hybris* appelle la *nemesis* des dieux."¹⁷ Therefore, the diction in our passage indicates that Telemachus *should* or *must*

seek retribution for the suitors' hubristic behavior. Furthermore, it suggests that Athena is outraged at the inversion of the proper *ειλαπίνη*.

AMONG HEROES

In what context does the *ειλαπίνη* appear among the heroes in the epic? In *Iliad* book 17, we get a glimpse of its function in Troy. We are told:

ἔσκε δ' ἐνὶ Τρώεσσι Ποδῆς υἱὸς Ἡετίωνος
ἀφνειὸς τ' ἀγαθὸς τε: μάλιστα δέ μιν τίεν Ἑκτωρ
δήμου, ἐπεὶ οἱ ἐταῖρος ἦν φίλος εἰλαπιναστῆς:

Il. 17.575-577

Now there was among the Trojans a man named Podes, son of Eetion, who was both rich and valiant. Hektor held him in the highest honor in the district, for he was his comrade and boon companion.¹⁸

At its simplest level to be a *ειλαπίνη* attendant, *ειλαπιναστῆς*, is to receive honor. Here, it is clearly a recognition of the wealth, *ἀφνειός*, and goodness, *ἀγαθός*, of Podes. Furthermore, it is to be honored *greatly*, *μάλιστα*. This, I argue, is irreconcilable with the notion of the *ειλαπίνη* as the feast of hubristic behavior or license. Instead, it is directly associated with honor, order, and kingliness. Furthermore, the verb *τίνω* is significant. What we see clearly in this passage is that it is a great honor to be an invitee of the *ειλαπίνη*. The feast is an honor bestowed on its attendants. And for those who attend, it is an honor and a gift.

In book 10, we get a clearer example of type of honor the *ειλαπίνη* confers. Also, we see that the *ειλαπίνη* is associated with the competitive gift culture of the Homeric poems. Nestor, in an attempt to enlist volunteers, offers the honor of the *ειλαπίνη* as a reward for the successful night raid. Thus, Nestor speaks:

ταῦτά κε πάντα πύθοιτο, καὶ ἄψ εἰς ἡμέας ἔλθοι
ἀσκηθῆς: μέγα κέν οἱ ὑπουράνιον κλέος εἴη

πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, καί οἱ δόσις ἔσσεται ἐσθλή:
 ὅσσοι γὰρ νήεσσιν ἐπικρατέουσιν ἄριστοι
 τῶν πάντων οἱ ἕκαστος δῖν δώσουσι μέλαιναν
 θῆλυν ὑπόρρηνον: τῇ μὲν κτέρας οὐδὲν ὁμοῖον,
 αἰεὶ δ' ἐν δαίτησι καὶ εἰλαπίνῃσι παρέσται.

*Il.*10.204-217

If he could learn all this and come back safely here, his fame [kleos] would be high as heaven in the mouths of all men, and he would be rewarded richly; for the chiefs from all our ships would each of them give him a black ewe with her lamb - which is a present of surpassing value - and he would be asked as a guest to all feasts and clan-gatherings.

The honor referred to in book 17 is directly associated with κλέος. The good, ἐσθλή, gift, δόσις, the reward for heroic achievement, is attendance at the εἰλαπίνῃ. B. Hainsworth in *The Iliad: A Commentary: Volume 3*, rightly recognizes that the εἰλαπίνῃ in this passage is the locus of κλέος. He writes, “Nestor... stresses κλέος and subtly blends the two inducements that he dangles before his volunteers, and even the δόσις turns out to be the prestige of the feast... Partaking in the feast is a vital part of κλέος.”¹⁹ Therefore, the role of the εἰλαπίνῃ among heroes is clearly to bestow honor. However, it confers a very particular type of honor, κλέος – a deeply thematic word that is used in traditional poetic diction to designate the public prestige of epos itself.²⁰

Thus, for heroes the εἰλαπίνῃ is not a general feast, nor is it merely a feast in which one person provides the goods. Instead, it is also a feast that confers honor and functions as the setting for κλέος. W. Leaf found these lines so problematic that he suggested they were interpolated, because he could not understand what the heroes had to gain in attending such a feast.²¹ But, this problem is easily resolved if we understand the deeper meaning of the εἰλαπίνῃ feast. If we realize that Nestor’s offer refers to the εἰλαπίνῃ as a generalized setting for the hero’s κλέος, then the passage makes perfect sense. I believe Nestor refers to a general concept of a feast that exists on a symbolic level. Heroic deeds, like those pursued in the *Doloneia*, will earn a

hero κλέος at the εἰλαπίνη *to come*. There is some notion of this preserved in the rare word, δόσις, which E. Benveniste, tells us refers to a more generalized notion of the gift. Benveniste, in fact discusses these very lines:

A volunteer is needed for a dangerous mission; he is promised a good *dósis*, not a *doron*, because the object itself of the gift does not exist. *Dósis* is a nominal transposition of a verbal form in the present tense or, as here, in the future: “we shall give him, we shall make him a gift.”²²

Furthermore, Theognis preserves this notion of the εἰλαπίνη as a δόσις that serves as the future preservation of κλέος:

θοίνης δὲ καὶ εἰλαπίνησι παρέσση
ἐν πάσαις πολλῶν κείμενος ἐν στόμασιν...
1.239-240

You will be present at all the meals and all the feasts [εἰλαπίνησι],
Remaining on the lips of many...²³

B. Hainsworth also has noted the resonance in language between Theognis and our passage. He even suggests that these formulaic lines suggest that the κλέος “will live forever on the lips of the feasting heroes.”²⁴ Yet, his reading remains literal and obscures the deeper thematic implications of the full passage, in which Theognis associates the εἰλαπίνη directly with the theme of heroic epos. Therefore, Theognis, in a highly formulaic line, directly ties the εἰλαπίνη to the preeminent themes of heroic poetry:

οὐδέποτ' οὐδὲ θανῶν ἀπολεῖς κλέος, ἀλλὰ μελήσεις
ἄφθιτον ἀνθρώποις αἰὲν ἔχων ὄνομα...
1.241-242

Your fame [κλέος] will never perish. Rather you will always
remain, possessing an imperishable name among men...

Theognis suggests that his poetry will transform Cyrnus into a hero via song and that at the εἰλαπίνη feast his name will live on ἄφθιτον, and the his κλέος will never perish. Returning to our two passages, we can take away three primary facts about the εἰλαπίνη: first, it is a feast that confers great honor

for its invited attendants; second, it is a gift for heroes; and, third, it serves as the locus of κλέος.

AMONG GODS

In book 23, after Achilles propitiates the gods, Iris rushes to the winds to fulfill his prayer. When she arrives she is invited to share in the εἰλαπίνη of the winds:

οἳ μὲν ἄρα Ζεφύροιο δυσάεος ἀθρόοι ἔνδον
εἰλαπίνην δαίνυντο: θέουσα δὲ Ἴρις ἐπέστη
βηλῶ ἐπι λιθέω: τοὶ δ' ὥς ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσι
πάντες ἀνήϊξαν, κάλεόν τέ μιν εἰς ἑ ἕκαστος:
ἦ δ' αὖθ' ἔζεσθαι μὲν ἀνήνατο, εἶπε δὲ μῦθον:
οὐχ ἔδος: εἴμι γὰρ αὖτις ἐπ' Ὀκεανοῖο ῥέεθρα
Αἰθιοπῶν ἐς γαῖαν, ὅθι ῥέζουσ' ἑκατόμβας
ἀθανάτοισι, ἵνα δὴ καὶ ἐγὼ μεταδαίσομαι ἱρώων.

Il. 23.200-207

They were holding high feast in the house of boisterous Zephyros when Iris came running up to the stone threshold of the house and stood there, but as soon as they set eyes on her they all came towards her and each of them called her to him, but Iris would not sit down. “I cannot stay,” she said, “I must go back to the streams of Okeanos and the land of the Ethiopians who are offering hecatombs to the immortals, and I would have my share; but Achilles prays that Boreas and shrill Zephyros will come to him, and he vows them goodly offerings; he would have you blow upon the pyre of Patroklos for whom all the Achaeans are lamenting.”

First, it is interesting to note that the winds εἰλαπίνην δαίνυντο. They feast upon a feast. Perhaps they divide out, δαίνυντο, a εἰλαπίνην. The context reminds us of the important connection between feasting and division. There also appears to be an association between the winds and feasting, preserved in the depiction of Aeolus’ perpetual feasting (*Od.* 10.8-11, 10.61). I think it might be tentatively suggested that the εἰλαπίνη feast is associated with the time in which men feasted with the gods. Perhaps, the εἰλαπίνη among the

winds refers to the perpetual feasting which is now lost among heroes and men. Unfortunately, the attestations are too few to press the point. We can only say with confidence that the *ειλαπίνη* is a feast implying division that can be shared among gods.

One other glimpse of the *ειλαπίνη* among the gods is provided in book 14. Hera, in her attempts to win over Sleep in her bids to trick Zeus, tries to bribe him with gifts. She says:

δῶρα δέ τοι δώσω καλὸν θρόνον ἄφθιτον αἰεὶ
 χρύσειον: Ἥφαιστος δέ κ' ἐμὸς πάϊς ἀμφιγυήεις
 τεύξει' ἀσκήσας, ὑπὸ δὲ θρῆνυν ποσὶν ἦσει,
 τῷ κεν ἐπισχοίης λιπαροῦς πόδας εἰλαπινάζων.

Il. 14.238-241

Close Zeus' keen eyes for me in slumber while I hold him
 clasped in my embrace, and I will give you a beautiful golden
 seat, that can never fall to pieces; my clubfooted son Hephaistos
 shall make it for you, and he shall give it a footstool for you to
 rest your fair feet upon when you are at table.

The verb *ειλαπινάζω* is translated in Fitzgerald “while taking wine.” Again, there is no reason to associate the feasting with wine drinking *per se*. Interestingly, Hera’s bribe is a *θρόνον ἄφθιτον*, which will be used by sleep when he is feasting, *ειλαπινάζων*. What is clear is that when the gods feast they require status goods. Also, there is again a clear attraction between passages in which the *ειλαπίνη* appears and key thematic concepts of *ἄφθιτος* and *κλέος*. These key words cluster in the diction. Unfortunately, it is difficult to expand upon our picture of the *ειλαπίνη* amongst the gods. However, I think we can safely say that whereas the *ειλαπίνη* for heroes and men is a gift that confers *κλέος*, among the gods it is basically a general feast. However, there is reason then to understand the *ειλαπίνη* as a religious feast. The gods’ quotidian is man’s divine; there is *κλέος* to be gained by association.

IN THE CITY

What roles does the feast play in the Homeric city? Again, we are confronted with a paucity of attestations. In the famous shield scene in book 18, we are given only a brief portrayal of its role:

ἐν δὲ δύω ποίησε πόλεις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
καλὰς. ἐν τῇ μὲν ῥα γάμοι τ' ἔσαν εἰλαπῖναι τε,
νύμφας δ' ἐκ θαλάμων δαΐδων ὕπο λαμπομενάων
ἡγίνεον ἀνὰ ἄστῳ, πολὺς δ' ὑμέναιος ὀρώρει:
κοῦροι δ' ὀρχηστῆρες ἐδίνεον, ἐν δ' ἄρα τοῖσιν
αὐλοὶ φόρμιγγές τε βοὴν ἔχον;

Il. 18.490-495

He wrought also two cities, fair to see and busy with the hum of men. In the one were weddings and wedding-feasts, and they were going about the city with brides whom they were escorting by torchlight from their chambers. Loud rose the cry of Hymen, and the youths danced to the music of flute and lyre...

Unfortunately, the passage immediately describes a marriage procession and we are given no definitive description of the εἰλαπῖναι separate from the γάμοι. However, we can infer a few important facts. The εἰλαπῖνη is associated with the city on a semi-ideal level; the εἰλαπῖνη probably involves public ritual and procession; and, lastly, the εἰλαπῖνη is associated with dance and song. At least these must be possible. If not, the γάμοι and εἰλαπῖναι would not be so easily linked.

Apollonius, in fact, describes an εἰλαπῖνη that suits all of these conditions:

αὐτίκα δ' ἄστῳ χοροῖσι καὶ εἰλαπῖνησι γεγῆθει
καπνῶ κνισθέντι περίπλεον· ἔξοχα δ' ἄλλων
ἀθανάτων Ἥρης υἷα κλυτὸν ἦδ' αὐτῇ
Κύπριν ἀοιδῆσιν θυέεσσι τε μιλίσσοντο.

1.857-890

And straightway the city rejoiced with dances and banquets,
being filled with the steam of sacrifice; and above all the
immortals they propitiated with songs and sacrifices the
illustrious son of Hera and Cypris herself.²⁵

At the εἰλαπίνη, here, we see dances that parallel marriage proceedings. In fact the εἰλαπίνη appears in Apollonius as a festival feast in which there is also sacrifice. Fascinatingly, it is also the occasion of song. It is of course possible that Apollonius is entering the debate about a word whose meaning has been lost. Perhaps, it is dangerous to assume that Apollonius is doing more than advancing an Alexandrian argument for a definition of the εἰλαπίνη in a poetic setting. Nonetheless, his use of the word beautifully encompasses the contexts in which we have analyzed the word in the Homeric poems.

Furthermore, the word also appears programmatically in Apollonius' first lines, when Jason first approaches the kingdom of Peleus:

ἴκετο δ' ἐς Περίην αὐτοσχεδὸν ἀντιβολήσων
εἰλαπίνης, ἣν πατρὶ Ποσειδάωνι καὶ ἄλλοις
ῥέζεε θεοῖς, Ἥρης δὲ Πελασγίδος οὐκ ἀλέγιζεν.
1.12-14

And straightway he came to Pelias to share the banquet which
the king was offering to his father Poseidon and the rest of the
gods, though he paid no honour to Pelasgian Hera.

Here, like in the Homeric poems, the εἰλαπίνη appears to be thematically embedded in the poem. However, unlike in the Homeric poems, we are provided with a context which explicates the function of the feast. The εἰλαπίνη is a feast which the king is giving on as a sacrificial occasion for the gods. At this feast, at least for Apollonius, there is sacrifice, there is procession, there is song. Further evidence for this connection between the εἰλαπίνη and song and sacrifice is provided by Plutarch:

ἥδιστα δὲ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἑορταὶ καὶ εἰλαπῖναι πρὸς
ἱεροῖς καὶ μῦσαι καὶ ὀργιασμοὶ καὶ κατευχαὶ θεῶν καὶ
προσκυνήσεις.

De Super. 9

The pleasantest things that men enjoy are festal days and banquets at the temples, initiations and mystic rites, and prayer and adoration of the gods.²⁶

For Plutarch, the connection between the εἰλαπίνη and ἱεροῖς καὶ μῆσεις is explicit. Therefore, the εἰλαπίνη's association with the pleasure of μῦθος can be shown to be traditional. Furthermore, I think it is clear that there is continuity between the traditional poetic conception of εἰλαπίνη and its use in Apollonius. If we return to our passage in book 18, I think it is clear that the εἰλαπίνη is a feast that involves some type of performative song in a sacrificial setting. If we take this in conjunction with our close reading of εἰλαπίνη in book 10, I think it is safe to argue that the εἰλαπίνη in the Homeric city is precisely the type of event that Nestor promises will be the gift for the returning hero. The fact that our later sources suggest that these occasions are sacrificial feasts also accords with our brief discussion of the εἰλαπίνη among the gods. This last association is made explicit in Hesychius, who glosses εἰλαπίνη as “θυσίης” (525). Furthermore, the scholia vetera gloss the εἰλαπίνη in our primary passage, “εὐωχία κοινὴ διὰ θυσιῶν γινομένη.” To return to our primary question of division, the εἰλαπίνη then, in Apollonius and the Homeric poems, is a feast provided as a gift by single donor for a civic audience, which functions as the setting for the performance of heroic κλέος.

CONCLUSION

Let us return to our original passage and our original question, what kind of feast is taking place or should be taking place in book 1. Athenaeus, describing the festival procession of the Parilia, writes:

ἔτυχεν δὲ οὕσα ἑορτὴ τὰ Παρίλια μὲν πάλαι καλουμένη,
νῦν δὲ Ῥωμαῖα, τῇ τῆς πόλεως Τύχῃ ναοῦ καθιδρυμένου
ὑπὸ τοῦ πάντα ἀρίστου καὶ μουσικωτάτου βασιλέως
Ἀδριανοῦ... ὁ οὖν Οὐλπιανὸς “ἄνδρες,” ἔφη, “τί τοῦτο;

εἰλάπιν’ ἢ ἐ γάμος; ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἔρανος τάδε γ’ ἐστίν.

Athen. 8.63

And it happened to be the time of a festival which used formerly to be called the Parilia, but which is now called the Romana, in honour of the temple built to the Fortune of the City, by that most excellent and accomplished sovereign Hadrian. And all the inhabitants of Rome (and all the foreigners sojourning in the city) every year keep that day as a remarkable one. Accordingly, Ulpian said,—My friends, what is this?—

Is it a supper or a marriage feast

For certainly there is no picnic held now. ²⁷

Athenaeus' character, Ulpian, quotes our line and references our very question. However, the context here makes his answer clear. The banqueters have just been interrupted by the festival procession of the Parilia, now "called Romaia" - a festival reorganized under Hadrian in honor of the foundation of Rome. Furthermore, the temple here referenced was dedicated to Venus Felix, the ancestress of the Roman people (Chron. 146; Hieron. a. Abr. 2147). The context is important because in 135 C.E. there still remains a symbolic connection between ruler, temple, goddess, and feast. Ulpian's quotation of Homer is used in reference to the imperial festival procession. It is clearly not an ἔρανος, "a feast to which the partakers contributed in shares." It is, instead a εἰλαπίνη - a sacrificial feast put on by a leader or ruler for the populace, which includes procession and song performance.

In conclusion, I think it is clear that the εἰλαπίνη cannot be read as a rowdy feast, or a drinking feast. Furthermore, it cannot be understood as a general word for feasting in the Homeric poems. On the thematic level, it is clearly associated with deeper poetic concerns of heroic fame. In particular, its usage in book 10 shows that it is best understood as a type of gift that distributes honor within the culture of the poems. Furthermore, its association with the gods and its later use as a type of religious feast clearly implies that the εἰλαπίνη is religious in nature. Despite these findings it is difficult to approximate a gloss in English for a word that carries such unfamiliar connotations. Perhaps, however, it is possible to approximate the meaning of this feast by comparing it with similar conceptions of the feast in other cultures. M. Dietler, in *Feasts: Archaeological and Ethnographic*

Perspectives on Food, Politics, and Power, studies the way “food and drink serve as the media of expression and commensal hospitality constitutes the syntax in the ritual of consumption” in small scale societies.²⁸ In his view, commensal consumption “is a practice, which like the exchange of gifts, serves to establish and reproduce social relations.”²⁹ In his fieldwork in Africa he has identified two types of feasts which very closely approximate our reading of the ἔρανος and εἰλαπίνη. The first he has termed the “Diacritical” feast, which he defines as a form of elite negotiation and quasi-egalitarian self-fashioning in which competing groups contribute to feasts as a form of political negotiation. I think this is analogous to our definition of the ἔρανος, or the meal at which elites negotiate power amongst themselves.³⁰ The second feast Dietler analyses, he terms the “Patron-role feast,” which I believe is analogous to the εἰλαπίνη. Thus, the εἰλαπίνη is a:

formalized use of commensal hospitality to symbolically reiterate and legitimize institutionalized relations of asymmetrical social power... the acceptance of a continually unequal pattern of hospitality symbolically expresses the formalization of unequal relations of status and power and ideologically naturalizes it through repetition of an event that induces sentiments of social debt... this is the principle that lies behind the regular lavish hospitality expected of chiefs and kings in almost all societies where they exist.³¹

Furthermore, it is important to understand the social meaning embedded in the giving of a feast by a single donor to a community. M. Mauss describes precisely the effect this type of “Patron-role” gift would have on a society:

To keep this thing is dangerous, not only because it is illicit to do so, but also because it comes morally, physically and spiritually from a person. Whatever it is, food, possessions, women, children or ritual, it retains a magical and religious hold over the recipient. The thing given is not inert. It is alive and often personified, and strives to bring to its original clan and homeland some equivalent to take its place.³²

I would like to conclude with the suggestion that the εἰλαπίνη feast is a “Patron-role feast” that serves both as a model *of* the state in the Homeric poems and as a model *for* the community who partakes in the poem’s performance.³³ If we return to our original passage with this notion in mind, I think Athena’s concern becomes clearer. The suitors behavior represents the upheaval of the state, the functioning and cosmic order of which is personified by the *proper* εἰλαπίνη feast. The super-objective of the poem from this point forth is to set right the proper functioning of the feast, which will ultimately be brought about by the return of the king, Odysseus. In an inversion of the fate of Agamemnon in book 11, who says he was slaughtered like a ox for an εἰλαπίνη (*Od.* 11.415), the poem ends with the killing of the hubristic feasters. As W. Allen has pointed out, “The key to understanding the relation of the wooers to the entire fabric of the *Odyssey* lies in Aristotle’s remark that, at the close of the epic, the good and the wicked receive their just deserts.”³⁴ This εἰλαπίνη feast then is central to understanding the meaning of the poem. The hubris of the feasters is equated via the εἰλαπίνη to the threatening of the order of the state. The performance such tale would have been a powerful experience for an audience. Like the feast in the poem the εἰλαπίνη, the Patron-role performance feast, would have embodied the necessity of the ruler in the context of a powerful metaphor and symbol that transubstantiated the debt of the gift that cannot be repaid into the communal possession of heroic κλέος – an honor which promised to never fade.

NOTES

1 Homer, *The Odyssey*, trans. Samuel Butler, Reprint edition (Provo, UT: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2011).

2 See Walter Arend, *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer* (Georg Olms Verlag, 1975). William C. Scott, “A Repeated Episode at *Odyssey* 1.125-48,” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 102 (January 1, 1971): 541–51 also discusses this scene. On the feast scene in general in the *Odyssey* see John Miles Foley, *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song* (London: University of California Press, 1993).

3 Gregory Nagy, *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Cornell University Press, 1992). Chapter 11.

4 Richard John Cunliffe, *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*, New edition edition (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1977).

5 See Slater, “contribution to a feast” ἄλγρόν τ’ ἔρανον Πολυδέκτα θῆκε. William G. Slater, ed., *Lexicon to Pindar* (De Gruyter, 2012).

6 E.C. Marchant’s commentary states “ἔρανον—‘contribution’; both the association and the money subscribed to it were termed ἔρανος, which denotes combination for financial purposes of whatever kind.” Thucydides, *Thucydides: Book I*, ed. E. C. Marchant and Thomas Wiedemann (Bristol England: Bristol Classical Press, 1991).

7 James C. Wright, *The Mycenaean Feast* (ASCSA, 2004), 190. formal consumption of huge quantities of food and drink is a feature of many societies, but extracting evidence for feasting from the archaeological record has, until recently, been problematic. This collection of essays investigates the rich evidence for the character of the Mycenaean feast. While much of the evidence discussed comes from the Palace of Nestor near Pylos, the authors also discuss new material from Tsoungiza near Nemea, and from other Bronze Age sites on mainland Greece and Crete. Textual evidence (from Linear B tablets).

8 Here I follow Gregory Nagy’s definition of diction, theme and context: “the mechanics and artistry of a given poem are traditional not only on the level of form – let us call it *diction* – but also on the level of content – let us call it *theme*.” Gregory Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 1. little was written about the relationship between the cult practices and the portrayals of the hero in poetry. The first edition of *The Best of the Achaeans* bridged that gap, raising new questions about what could be known or conjectured about Greek heroes. In this revised edition, which features a new preface by the author, Gregory Nagy reconsiders his conclusions in the light of the subsequent debate and resumes his discussion of the special status of heroes in ancient Greek life and poetry. His book remains an engaging introduction both to the concept of the hero in Hellenic civilization and to the poetic forms through which the hero is defined: the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in particular and archaic Greek poetry in general. Praise for the first edition: “This is a learned, clever, and disturbing book... One is left with the uneasy feeling that curtains have parted in the wind, giving glimpses of unsuspected realities behind the apparently simple face of Greek heroic poetry.” -- M. L. West, *Times Literary Supplement* Gregory Nagy’s book is brilliant, original, and filled with powerful, central, and useful insights. To read it with attention is to experience a radical revision of one’s own view of early Greek poetry and of the primary themes of Greek culture.” -- James Redfield, University of Chicago”,”ISBN”:”9780801860157”,,”shortTitle”:”The best of the Achaeans”,,”language”:”en”,,”author”:[{“family”:”Nagy”,,”given”:”Gregory”}],,”issued”:[{“date-parts”:[{“1999”}]}],,”locator”:”1”}],,”schema”:”https://github.com/citation-style-language/schemaraw/master/csl-citation.json”}.

9 Marcel Mauss and E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans. Ian Cunnison (Mansfield Centre, CT: Martino Fine Books, 2011).

10 Michael Dietler and Brian Hayden, eds., *Feasts: Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Food, Politics, and Power* (Washington, D.C: Smithsonian Books, 2001), 67.

11 There is not the space to expand on the function of εἰλαπίνη. However, I believe that it functions as a metaphor comparable to our “body politic,” and is used to negotiate political values grounded in the Homeric culture of distribution and the gift. This, of course, is not a metaphor in Aristotle’s sense (*Poetics* 1459a6; *Rhetoric* 1450a8). Instead, it functions as a part of what Lakoff and Johnson term “metaphorical structure.” They write, “The most fundamental values in a culture will be coherent with the metaphorical structure of the most fundamental concepts in the culture.” These “values... must form a coherent system with the metaphorical concepts we live by.” The εἰλαπίνη I believe is such a metaphor - what is labeled an “ontological metaphor.” George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 2nd edition (Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 2003), 22.

12A summary of the current perspective of the cultural context of the feast is provided by S. Sherratt: “At a deeper level, Homeric feasting can be said to encapsulate values that are likely to have simultaneously created and confirmed a collective ideology: the values of companionship and commensality, equal sharing and individual esteem, reciprocity and the obligations of hospitality, together with duties owed to the feasting community of which one is a member – and at least the potential for universal inclusion (if not always its actuality)” Wright, *The Mycenaean Feast*. formal consumption of huge quantities of food and drink is a feature of many societies, but extracting evidence for feasting from the archaeological record has, until recently, been problematic. This collection of essays investigates the rich evidence for the character of the Mycenaean feast. While much of the evidence discussed comes from the Palace of Nestor near Pylos, the authors also discuss new material from Tsoungiza near Nemea, and from other Bronze Age sites on mainland Greece and Crete. Textual evidence (from Linear B tablets 188.

13 Homer, *The Iliad: The Fitzgerald Translation*, trans. Robert Fitzgerald (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2004).

14 Alfred Heubeck, Stephanie West, and J. B. Hainsworth, eds., *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey: Volume I: Introduction and Books I-VIII*, Reprint edition (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 104.

15 Heubeck et al. contrast the ἔρπνος with the εἰλαπίνη: “a dinner to which all contribute (cf. iv. 621 ff.), ruled out by the general extravagance and lack of restraint.” Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth, *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey*.

16 Douglas Frame, *Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic*, First Edition edition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978).

17 Pierre Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots* (Paris: Klincksieck, 2000).

18 Homer, *The Iliad*, trans. Samuel Butler, Reprint edition (Stilwell, Kan.: Digireads.com, 2009).

19 G. S. Kirk and Bryan Hainsworth, *The Iliad: A Commentary: Volume 3* (Cambridge University Press, 1993).

20 Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans*. little was written about the relationship between the cult practices and the portrayals of the hero in poetry. The first edition of *The Best of the Achaeans* bridged that gap, raising new questions about what could be known or conjectured about Greek heroes. In this revised edition, which features a new preface by the author, Gregory Nagy reconsiders his conclusions in the light of the subsequent debate and resumes his discussion of the special status of heroes in ancient Greek life and poetry. His book remains an engaging introduction both to the concept of the hero in Hellenic civilization and to the poetic forms through which the hero is defined: the Iliad and Odyssey in particular and archaic Greek poetry in general. Praise for the first edition: “This is a learned, clever, and disturbing book... One is left with the uneasy feeling that curtains have parted in the wind, giving glimpses of unsuspected realities behind the apparently simple face of Greek heroic poetry.” -- M. L. West, Times Literary Supplement Gregory Nagy’s book is brilliant, original, and filled with powerful, central, and useful insights. To read it with attention is to experience a radical revision of one’s own view of early Greek poetry and of the primary themes of Greek culture.” -- James Redfield, University of Chicago,”ISBN”:”9780801860157”,”s hortTitle”:”The best of the Achaeans”,”language”:”en”,”author”:[{”family”:”Nagy”,”given”:”Gregory”}],”issued”:{”date-parts”:[[”1999”]]}],”schema”:”https://github.com/citation-style-language/schema/raw/master/csl-citation.json”} 47.

21 “As for the promised standing invitation, it may be noticed that all the chiefs who are present, with the exception of Meriones and Thrasymachos already share of right in the feasts... These numerous objections seem to indicate that 214 (acc. To Nauck 213) -217 are an interpolation – perhaps from a time when the democratic σίτησις ἐν πρυτανείῳ had become a familiar institution as a reward for public service.” Homer and Walter Leaf, *The Iliad* (Macmillan and Co., limited, 1886).

22 Émile Benveniste and Jean Lallot, *Indo-European Language and Society* (University of Miami Press, 1973). 287.

23 Unless otherwise noted, translation is my own.

24 Kirk and Hainsworth, *The Iliad*.

25 Apollonius Rhodius, *Apollonius Rhodius: Argonautica*, trans. R. C. Seaton, Reprint edition (Cambridge, Mass. u.a.: Loeb Classical Library, 1990).

26 Plutarch, *Plutarch: Moralia, Volume II*, trans. Frank Cole Babbitt (Cambridge, Mass. u.a.: Harvard University Press, 1928).

27 Athenaeus, *Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists, Volume IV, Books 8-10*, trans. Charles Burton Gulick (Cambridge, Mass. u.a.: Loeb Classical Library, 1930).

28 Dietler and Hayden, *Feasts*, 73.

29 Ibid., 74.

30 This model, perhaps, has been too influential in our general understanding of the Homeric feast. This is a view shared by the Paris school and most contemporary work on the Homeric feast. See, Nagy, *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Chapter 11: Poetry and the Ideology of the Polis: The symbolism of Apportioning Meat. Denise Grodzynski, "M. Detienne et J.-P. Vernant. ~~La Cuisine Du Sacrifice En Pays Grec~~, Avec Les Contributions de J.-L. Durand, S. Georgoudi, F. Hartog et J. Svenbro," *Revue de L'histoire Des Religions* 197, no. 2 (1980): 204–9. Nicole Loraux, "La Cité Comme Cuisine et Comme Partage," *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 36, no. 4 (1981): 614–22.

31 Dietler and Hayden, *Feasts*, 75.

32 Mauss and Evans-Pritchard, *The Gift*, 10.

33 Here, I have in mind C. Geertz's conception of the religious symbol. Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (Basic Books, 1973), 93. However, in India, in the city of Mysore, a festival occasion exists that embodies this theoretical notion. According to F. Scialpi, the festival "represented an occasion, at a crucial time of the year, to extoll the figure of the sovereign and solemnly transport his investiture, ordained by the Goddess... in mythical time... into the present. The victorious Goddess legitimized the dynast ruling over Mysore and protected both it and all those under it; the royal family returned the favour, guarding over worship in the temple dedicated to her on the hill... This solidarity represented the ideological foundation of the feast, the fame of which extended, in days gone by, throughout India and even beyond... Today the prince in the old Palace retains the right to celebrate his rites... Admission to take part is granted on a purely private basis to a very limited number of functionaries and collaborators of what used to be the Royal Household and has now become the Prince's private administration." Fabio Scialpi, "The Feast of Dasarā in the City of Mysore," *East and West* 36, no. 1/3 (September 1, 1986): 105–36.

34 Walter Allen Jr., "The Theme of the Suitors in the Odyssey," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 70 (January 1, 1939): 104.1939.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Walter, Jr. "The Theme of the Suitors in the Odyssey." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 70 (January 1, 1939): 104–24. doi:10.2307/283079.

Arend, Walter. *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*. Georg Olms Verlag, 1975.

Athenaeus. *Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists, Volume IV, Books 8-10*. Translated by Charles Burton Gulick. Cambridge, Mass. u.a.: Loeb Classical Library, 1930.

- Benveniste, Émile, and Jean Lallot. *Indo-European Language and Society*. University of Miami Press, 1973.
- Chantraine, Pierre. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque : Histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck, 2000.
- Cunliffe, Richard John. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*. New edition edition. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1977.
- Dietler, Michael, and Brian Hayden, eds. *Feasts: Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Food, Politics, and Power*. Washington, D.C: Smithsonian Books, 2001.
- Foley, John Miles. *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song*. London: University of California Press, 1993.
- Frame, Douglas. *Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic*. First Edition edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. Basic Books, 1973.
- Grodzynski, Denise. “M. Detienne et J.-P. Vernant. ~~La Cuisine Du Sacrifice En Pays Grec~~, Avec Les Contributions de J.-L. Durand, S. Georgoudi, F. Hartog et J. Svenbro.” *Revue de L’histoire Des Religions* 197, no. 2 (1980):204-9.
- Heubeck, Alfred, Stephanie West, and J. B. Hainsworth, eds. *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey: Volume I: Introduction and Books I-VIII*. Reprint edition. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Homer. *The Iliad*. Translated by Samuel Butler. Reprint edition. Stilwell, Kan.: Digireads.com, 2009.
- . *The Iliad: The Fitzgerald Translation*. Translated by Robert Fitzgerald. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2004.
- . *The Odyssey*. Translated by Samuel Butler. Reprint edition. Provo, UT: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2011.
- Homer, and Walter Leaf. *The Iliad*. Macmillan and Co., limited, 1886.

- Grodzynski, Denise. "M. Detienne et J.-P. Vernant. ~~La Cuisine Du Sacrifice En Pays Grec~~, Avec Les Contributions de J.-L. Durand, S. Georgoudi, F. Hartog et J. Svenbro." *Revue de L'histoire Des Religions* 197, no. 2 (1980):204-9.
- Heubeck, Alfred, Stephanie West, and J. B. Hainsworth, eds. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume I: Introduction and Books I-VIII*. Reprint edition. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Homer. *The Iliad*. Translated by Samuel Butler. Reprint edition. Stilwell, Kan.: Digireads.com, 2009.
- . *The Iliad: The Fitzgerald Translation*. Translated by Robert Fitzgerald. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2004.
- . *The Odyssey*. Translated by Samuel Butler. Reprint edition. Provo, UT: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2011.
- Homer, and Walter Leaf. *The Iliad*. Macmillan and Co., limited, 1886.
- Kirk, G. S., and Bryan Hainsworth. *The Iliad: A Commentary: Volume 3*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. 2nd edition. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Loraux, Nicole. "La Cité Comme Cuisine et Comme Partage." *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 36, no. 4 (1981): 614–22. doi:10.3406/ahess.1981.282770.
- Mauss, Marcel, and E. E. Evans-Pritchard. *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Translated by Ian Cunnison. Mansfield Centre, CT: Martino Fine Books, 2011.
- Nagy, Gregory. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Cornell University Press, 1992.
- . *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Plutarch. *Plutarch: Moralia, Volume II*. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. Cambridge, Mass. u.a.: Harvard University Press, 1928.

- Rhodius, Apollonius. *Apollonius Rhodius: Argonautica*. Translated by R. C. Seaton. Reprint edition. Cambridge, Mass. u.a.: Loeb Classical Library, 1990.
- Scialpi, Fabio. "The Feast of Dasarā in the City of Mysore." *East and West* 36, no. 1/3 (September 1, 1986): 105–36.
- Scott, William C. "A Repeated Episode at Odyssey 1.125-48." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 102 (January 1, 1971): 541–51. doi:10.2307/2935955.
- Slater, William G., ed. *Lexicon to Pindar*. De Gruyter, 2012.
- Thucydides. *Thucydides: Book I*. Edited by E. C. Marchant and Thomas Wiedemann. Bristol England: Bristol Classical Press, 1991.
- Wright, James C. *The Mycenaean Feast*. ASCSA, 2004.

A TRANSLATION OF OVID'S AMORES 3.9

BY MARK BODENCHAK

Here I have translated the first 48 lines from book three, poem nine of Ovid's Amores. I have endeavored to both retain the original sense and feeling of the poem, while at the same time constrain the poem into a rhyming meter. However, since I am unfamiliar with the nuances of English meter, I elected to mimic the original elegiac verse by putting the English into a limited number of syllables per line. Each line then alternates between 12 syllables and 10 syllables. This process, in turn, limited the available phrasings for each sentence and provided quite a challenge. This led to the occasional use of a rhyme that may not work in modern English pronunciation. However, the end result is something that I am quite proud of.

Memnona si mater, mater ploravit Achillem,
Et tangunt magnas tristia fata deas,
Flebilis indignos, Elegia, solve capillos!
A, nimis ex vero nunc tibi nomen erit! –
Ille tui vates operis, tua fama, Tibullus
Ardet in extructo, corpus inane, rogo.
Ecce, puer Veneris fert eversamque pharetram
Et fractos arcus et sine luce facem;
Adspice, demissis ut eat miserabilis alis
Pectoraque infesta tundat aperta manu!
Excipiunt lacrimas sparsi per colla capilli,
Oraque singultu concutiente sonant.
Fratris in Aeneae sic illum funere dicunt
Egressum tectis, pulcher Iule, tuis;
Nec minus est confusa Venus moriente Tibullo,
Quam iuveni rupit cum ferus inguen aper.
At sacri vates et divum cura vocamur;
Sunt etiam qui nos numen habere putent.

If Memnon's mother wept, And Achilles' did too,
and touch the great goddess the sad fates do
Now, loosen your cruel hair, Mournful Elegy!
Ah, now only too true will your name be!
A prophet in your art, Tibullus, your glory,
He burns, thrown upon the pyre, a body.
Look, an empty quiver Venus' Cupid carries,
A broken bow, a cold torch he ferries.
Look! Defeated, he goes about with mournful wings
See how his vengeful hand his bare breast stings!
His hair, scattered around the neck, catches wet tears
and wracking sobs from his mouth pain the ears
Thus was he at the funeral of Aeneas
Leaving your house, they say, Ascanius.
Venus was distraught by Tibullus' death no less
Than when the boar caused the youth's groin distress
But we poets are called sacred, and divine cares;
There are those who think we have divine shares

Scilicet omne sacrum mors inportuna profanat,
Omnibus obscuras inicit illa manus!
Quid pater Ismario, quid mater profuit Orpheo?
Carminibus quid victas obstipuisse feras?
Et Linon in silvis idem pater 'aelinon!' altis
Dicitur invita concinuisse lyra.
Adice Maeniden, a quo ceu fonte perenni
Vatum Pieriis ora rigantur aquis –
Hunc quoque summa dies nigro submersit Averno.
Defugiunt avidos carmina sola rogos;
Durant, vatis opus, Troiani fama laboris
Tardaque nocturno tela retexta dolo.
Sic Nemesis longum, sic Delia nomen habebunt,
Altera cura recens, altera primus amor.
Quid vos sacra iuvant? quid nunc Aegyptia prosunt
Sistra? quid in vacuo secubuisse toro?
Cum rapiunt mala fata bonos – ignoscite fasso! –
Sollicitor nullos esse putare deos.
Vive pius – moriere; pius cole sacra – colentem
Mors gravis a templis in cava busta trahet;
Carminibus confide bonis – iacet, ecce, Tibullus:
Vix manet e toto, parva quod urna capit!
Tene, sacer vates, flammae rapuere rogales
Pectoribus pasci nec timere tuis?
Aurea sanctorum potuissent templa deorum
Urere, quae tantum sustinere nefas!
Avertit vultus, Erycis quae possidet arces;
Sunt quoque, qui lacrimas continuisse negant.
Sed tamen hoc melius, quam si Phaeacia tellus
Ignotum vili supposuisset humo.

Death profanes everything sacred, Unexpected,
 For by its black hands, all, are affected!
 And for Orpheus, were parents a benefit?
 Or animals, who by songs lost their wit?
 In the high forest, to Linus, that same father
 cried "Aelion!", with an unwilling lyre.
 And Homer, whence a fountain of the Muses flows
 Immortal, to poets' slaked mouths it goes
 And to bleak Avernus, he sank too, when he tire.
 Poems alone can flee the greedy pyre;
 A poet's work endures, the tale of Trojan toil,
 the slow weave unwoven by nightly spoil.
 Nemesis and Delia will always have a name,
 One, a recent concern, One, a first flame.
 What use are sacred things? What good, an Egyptian
 Rattle? To sleep in an empty cushion?
 When wicked fate takes hold of good men – Forgive me! –
 I fear I don't believe a deity.
 Live pious – you'll die; Devout men fear the divine;
 Heavy Death drags them to graves in good time.
 Trust in good poems – Tibullus, he's dead, Behold:
 He scarcely remains, such scraps the urn holds!
 Remember, prophetic poet, how the flames flew
 To consume your chest, with no fear of you?
 The Olympians' golden temples they could burn,
 Those fires which fuel such atrocious turns!
 She turns away, she who owns the Sicilian keeps;
 And there are those too, who can't help but weep.
 But, this is better, than if some Phaeacian coast
 Lay you, unknown, in dirt cheaper than most.

PHILO'S FLACCUS: A LITERARY DRAMA FOR PEACE

BY ERICH WIEGER

On January 24, 41 C.E., conspirators dispatched the divine Emperor Gaius Caligula to the realm of the dead.¹ When the news reached Alexandria, some of the militant Jews who remembered the gratuitous slaughter their people experienced in the anti-Jewish riots three years previous under Gaius Caligula, took revenge in an ominous revolt.² Claudius became emperor, and faced the prospect of wild fires of Jewish-Greek conflict spreading through Egypt and Syria. Soon thereafter, it appears, an influential Jewish elder of Alexandria named Philo, wrote two dramatic narrations in the service of peace.

Philo of Alexandria (c. 20 B.C.E. - c. 50 C.E.) was an expositor of the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. He wrote theological treatises and biblical commentary using allegorical and philosophical methods of interpretation independent from the rabbinic milieus of Jerusalem and Babylon. He also wrote two narrations, one called *Flaccus*, and the other, *The Embassy to Gaius*. They are the only eyewitness accounts of the anti-Jewish riots of 38 C.E., and of the political efforts of the Jews to dissuade Gaius Caligula from imposing the cult of the emperor upon the Temple in Jerusalem and Jewish synagogues generally. This paper will examine the dating and purpose, the themes, and the dramatic style of *Flaccus*.

Flaccus is Philo's literary accusation of the Roman Governor of Egypt by that name, on the worst of charges, and a record of how divine justice caught up with him. In it he tells the story of a very capable governor, who, fearing he was on Caligula's list of persons to be eliminated, made a deal with local Alexandrian politicians in exchange for their political support, to renounce the Jewish population as alien interlopers in the civic life of Alexandria, and

to abandon them to the mob violence of Greek political factions. Philo then tells the story of how God, it seems, operated through Agrippa the king of the Jews, and emperor Caligula, to punish the governor with exile, and soon thereafter, with a gruesome death. Soon before his demise, Flaccus confesses that God cares for his people and avenges them. I maintain that Philo has constructed, three years after the riots of which he writes, a purposefully theatrical narration, in order to de-legitimize a party in the Jewish community in Alexandria bent on revenge, by teaching that God himself had already defended the Jews and punished their enemies.

Philo's *Flaccus* contains some scenes that are obviously created by him, rather than being records of factual dialogues or monologues. He is eloquent when he expresses his convictions in these scenes through characters he takes control of as if he were a playwright or a puppeteer. They read like scenes of a tragedy, though they are not written for stage performance. They would have been good material for oral performance and communal readings. This essay will explore connections between the intense drama of Philo's imagined scenes and the purpose of the historical account where they are imbedded.

The corpus of Philo's extant theological and biblical treatises is large. Yonge's translation of his collected works is 897 densely packed pages. Philo's grasp of Greek philosophers is impressive. Sandmel counts fifty-four different classical authors whom Philo references accurately.³ Philo adroitly recycles their terms and categories in order to interpret the Scriptures.⁴ Sandmel takes up the question of whom Philo intended as his readership, and finds that it has no provable answer.⁵ Judging from the content of the corpus, Philo probably wrote for Hellenized Jews in his circles in Alexandria (and perhaps for their philosophically inclined Greek friends), to nurture in them a Jewish and biblical awareness that, at the same time, was intellectually at home within Hellenism. On the one hand, he was concerned about Jews abandoning their faith for the larger Hellenistic and Roman world around them; on the other hand, he maintained a large enthusiasm for that world and for Israel's mission in it. As it turned out, it was Christians rather than Jews, who devotedly collected and copied Philo's works—a fascinating outcome he could not have imagined.

Historians who try to reconstruct events analytically sometimes castigate Philo for obscuring the facts. “What then of Philo?” writes Sandra Gambetti in her densely reasoned, forensic reconstruction of the events of 38 C.E., “All that he says is true...The explanations that Philo provides, however, are disputable...The silences found throughout Philo’s writings are serious omissions...”⁶ She then fills in his omissions and corrects his dubious explanations. Reconstructions like hers provide very helpful commentary on Philo’s text. Philo’s act of writing, however, was also a historical event in itself. His dramatic act of creativity and narration still grip the empathetic reader. Philo was moved by events, and he hopes to move his audience, artfully, with an emotionally surging and well-orchestrated stage, toward his theological vision. That theology, in all its drama, was also a call for political peace. It is worth our while to examine that call itself as a historical event.

This paper will consider some selected historiography on Philo. It will claim a different timing and purpose of composition than some major scholars propose. This is not the place to re-attempt a full historical reconstruction of the events that led up to the riots of 38, or that took place between the time of the riots and Philo’s act of writing, which I assert was in the year 41 or soon thereafter. The secondary sources that I review in the historiography have done an excellent job at reconstruction. My aim is to account for the style, emphasis and content of the document, through identifying the correct timing of composition and the probable purposes of the author. Along this line, after reviewing some historiography, the paper will consider high points of *Flaccus*, after which it will note the theatrical or dramatic elements of the work. The concluding remarks will reflect upon how Philo designed his theatrical literary style to support his theological mission, and to address a political emergency.

HISTORIOGRAPHY ON PHILO

Flavius Josephus was not an eyewitness to the events of Philo’s time, as he lived a generation later. He had sources though, as he was an insider in imperial Rome by the time he wrote, around 90 AD. His portrait of Philo is a picture of an erudite man accustomed to elite circles, skilled in philosophy.

He possessed faith in God's justice and power when he was under threat. Josephus' portrait might suggest that Philo was inwardly arrogant in the face of imperial power.⁷ As a member of the establishment, he had every reason to write *Flaccus* in the service of peace. He was a major figure among the Jews of Alexandria in his generation—their chosen interlocutor with Caesar's palace when the emperor's sanity was in question, and when he demanded that Jews not only offer sacrifices on his behalf, but that they offer sacrifices directly to his image.

Later, scholarly Church bishops were careful to collect Philo's works. Herbert Box's introduction to his translation and commentary on *Flaccus*, published in 1939, reviews the statements of Eusebius and John of Damascus as our early sources for the original format of Philo's historical accounts.⁸ They indicate that there was a five-part work called *Aretai* (virtues), which included *The Embassy to Gaius* and other, now lost, material. Significantly, the fifth part must have been the *Palinode* which Philo promises at the end the extant material, but which we do not have. This must have been the story of Gaius' violent death. The whole work was called *Aretai* because it was a treatise on God's virtues. Its thesis was that he was just and faithful to defend the people who serve him—that is to say that divine virtues were at work in the cosmos to avenge wrongs done to the Jews who serve God according to his Law. *Flaccus* was a kind of addendum to this larger five-part work, being a story not of an emperor, but of a governor. It pursued the same thesis that God actively took vengeance upon the destroyers of his people.⁹ Both the longer and the shorter work include a sub-thesis, that the Jews were peaceful and loyal to the house of Augustus, who had endowed them with rights that must not be changed. Box's analysis of the original format of *Aretai* and the shorter addendum, *Flaccus*, compels the reader to conclude that Philo composed both works at the time of the attempt of the new emperor Claudius to pacify militant Jewish elements bent on revenge, and to re-establish the Augustan peace. More recent scholars have failed to note the logic of Box's analysis.

Flaccus attracts the attention of scholars in part because the anti-Jewish violence resembles the pogroms. Joseph Meleze Modrzejewski, in *The Jews*

of *Egypt*, writes that, "...the riots attained the proportions of a veritable pogrom."¹⁰ Dorothy Sly also uses the term pogrom to describe the communal violence.¹¹ Samuel Sandmel, a rabbi and professor, called riots, "the pogroms of 38."¹² Box also in the introduction to his translation published 1939, repeatedly referred to the events as a pogrom.¹³ Sandra Gambetti, however, "...deliberately avoids any words or expressions that in any way connect, explicitly or implicitly, the Alexandrian events of 38 C.E. to later events in modern or contemporary Jewish experience, for which that terminology was created."¹⁴ Her thesis is that there was a legal and political dimension to the riots of 38 C.E. that sets them apart from the later anti-Semitism of Eastern Europe. For her, whether or not there is a continuity of anti-Semitism from Roman to modern times is a separate, unanswered question. Both Alston and Swartz, on the other hand, assume an unbroken line between Greek anti-Jewish hostility and anti-Semitism in our own times.¹⁵ Philo, for his part, shows little effort to identify an ancient version of anti-Semitism. He is writing to persuade his own people to return to their peaceful loyalty to the emperors in Rome as he remembered it, to recognize that God has a special concern for them, and that he has already removed their worst enemies through royal (i.e. King Agrippa) and imperial authority.

Gambetti's book on the Alexandrian riots turns on her observations that Alexandrian laws were modeled after classical Athenian law, and that Jewish privileges in Alexandria were, legalistically, limited to a small section of the quarter called "Delta" in Alexandria. Gaius, she concludes, had given an un-appealable adjudication that Jewish residents outside of that small neighborhood would be considered foreigners and usurpers of civic rights. In that case, it was in accordance with ancient, hitherto unenforced civic laws for the citizens to remove all interlopers by deadly violence.¹⁶ She is interested in ancient legalisms and communal competition, because she seeks to get beyond anachronistic impressions.

Alston, on the other hand, cites archeological evidence to show a high degree of integration of Greek and Jewish burial places, and suggests that the legal argument pursued by some Greek political factions against the Jews was a rhetorical construct, rather than representative of original legal institutions

defining a Jewish neighborhood. He is interested in the violent program of the Greek factions for establishing complete supremacy over civic, sacred, commercial and private spaces on the one hand, and the processes of dispossession, exile and death which first befall the Jews, and then befalls the governor, Flaccus himself in a near mirror image.¹⁷

The secondary literature, like Gambetti's work, generally attempts to reconstruct the events. Dorothy Sly tries to reconstruct the life of the city as whole, and the events of 38 are just a small part of that. She is easier to read, less dogmatic, but far less thorough going than Gambetti. Herbert Box reconstructs events, with somewhat less information in his time, but with more careful judgment about the original structure and correlation between the later events in 41 C.E. and the time of writing. Box charmingly acts as judge and referee, saying which party, the Jews or the Greeks, failed to be neighborly in their various demands from each other (iv-lvi). He should have been there to sort things out. Reconstruction of events in some cases turns out to be a platform for anachronistic attempts to moralize.

Mathew Schwarz attempts to reconstruct what happened in order to explore the roots of modern anti-Semitism. He begins with judging the bias and self-perceived identity of the witness, Philo. Schwarz introduces him by writing, "Modern writers are divided as to the importance of Philo's works."¹⁸ In stark contrast, Harry Austrin Wolfson begins his study of Philo's philosophical work with the assertion that his monotheistic philosophy set the tone for most western philosophical reasoning until the seventeenth century, and that it was revived in the mid twentieth.¹⁹ Schwarz demeans his source too much while failing to empathize with him or to respect the challenges he faced.

Pieter van der Horst does a sophisticated analysis of the composition, themes, and likely audiences and purposes of *Flaccus* in the introduction to his translation and commentary.²⁰ His subtitle, *The First Pogrom*, speaks for itself, though he sees a real disconnect between anti-Semitism and the communal hatred of Alexandrians for their Jewish neighbors. Van der Horst helpfully portrays Philo's composition as a diptych, in which the first half is

a fundamentally factual account of the violence of 38 C.E., but the second half, mirroring the first is historical only in its bare outlines. It resembles, he says, Greek novels, in which the protagonists express in monologues their horrifying fate, their dread and their isolation in the face of death.²¹ The more historical first half is a window on the events, but is written with a pastoral and theological aim to comfort the Jews on the one hand, and on the other, has material in it to explain to a wider audience who the Jews are and how Alexandria as a city is arranged. Van der Horst places the second half of the work in a long line of ancient Greek, Jewish and Christian literature that describes the horrible things that happen to those who fight against a god, gods or the monotheistic God. Philo's goals then, are both to comfort the Jews in times when they suffered violence, telling them that God still cared for them and had avenged them, while informing the Roman authorities that to dispossess and kill the Jews was not only contrary to Roman law, but also was tantamount to fighting against God, and would lead to a horrifying end. Van der Horst describes the genre of *Flaccus* as dramatic-theological-historical — a theodocy and an apologetic work with pastoral purposes to comfort a suffering people.²²

THE DATE AND PURPOSE OF PHILO'S NARRATIVES

Philo, in *Flaccus*, condemns two Alexandrian politicians, Isidorus and Lampo: “troublers of the state, for this is the name, which has, at last, been given to them” (IV, 20). It is not plausible that Philo would lambast Lampo and Isidorus in published writings, if they were still living—they had been powerful in Alexandria, influential in Rome and dangerous to the Jews. If Yonge's translation, “which has, at last, been given to them,” is correct, it suggests an epithet after their executions.²³ Philo, therefore, is not likely to have written *Flaccus* before Gaius' death, but rather, after his successor Claudius had condemned to their deaths Isidorus and Lampo. The two of them, according to a novelistic account of the time, accused the Jewish King Agrippa before Claudius Caesar, of a worldwide Jewish conspiracy to overthrow the state. They claimed that Claudius would implicate himself in that plot if he did not condemn the Jewish king. So, instead, Claudius summarily condemned them to death, and banished their names from official

memory.²⁴ This timing agrees with the larger compositional considerations. The original version of *Aretai*, in the missing *Palinode* section, must have recorded Caligula's demise. Whether *Flaccus* is, as Fox deduced, an addendum that seeks to demonstrate again the theses of *Aretai*, or whether, as van der Horst suggests, *Flaccus* is one of the five parts of *Aretai*, coming just before *Gaius*, then the repeating plot line in these narratives begins with the fall of a great ruler and his injustices to the Jews, and concludes with his destruction. The full work then would be complete after the destruction of both Gaius and Flaccus, as well as after the demise of Isidorus and Lampo, in November 41 C.E.²⁵

A common opinion of recent scholarship is that in *Flaccus* Philo shied away from accusing Gaius Caligula for the killing of the Jews in 38 C.E., because the emperor, who was in fact responsible, was still alive, and so the politic author trained his guns on the dead governor Flaccus instead. Gambetti holds to this timing, like Sly before her.²⁶ Modrzejewski thinks *Flaccus* is a manual for moral edification intended for the next governor, which would place the work in about the same time frame and give it similar political logic.²⁷ He seems to have gotten this theory from the Philonist Goodenough, and van der Horst also gives the thesis credence.²⁸

This cannot be true. Philo does in fact level a terrible broadside on the emperor Gaius himself early on in *Flaccus*. Writing about Tiberius Caesar's tragic choice to follow Macro's advice and favor Gaius to succeed him after death, Philo says:

And Tiberius, being deceived by all these representations, without being aware of what he was doing, left behind him a most irreconcilable enemy, to himself, and his grandson, and his whole family, and to Macro, who was his chief adviser and comforter, and to all mankind...²⁹

Philo had too much to lose to call Gaius an enemy of all mankind, while Gaius lived. Similarly, he writes, "But Caius [Gaius], being a man of an inhuman nature and insatiable in his revenge..." (XXI, 180). An author who

knows that, if he and his family be high in the establishment, is careful not to write and publish it, until the villain is dead. It is safest to say that all Philo's villains were dead when he wrote both of his historical narratives. That places the writing of *Gainus* and *Flaccus* after November 41 C.E. when Cludius sent Lampo and Isodorus to their deaths. Box certainly implies this timing, but does not speculate on a political context or urgent purpose for the literary work.³⁰ Gambetti, Sly, Modrzejewsky and Sandmel fail to reckon with this timing or the political implications of it. Van der Horst remains unsure of the timing, but he thinks that it is possible that Philo was courageous enough to include the aforementioned condemnations of Caligula, while he was alive. He believes that Philo wrote both to comfort the Jews who had suffered bereavement and dispossession, and to inform and warn Romans about the Jews special relationship to the family of Augustus and to God.³¹ Van der Horst does not weigh the passage about Isodorus and Lampo as a factor in dating the work, preferring to translate it differently, nor does he consider how armed Jewish revolt in Alexandria at the commencement of the reign Claudius would compel Philo to frame the past for his community in a way that would promote a return to better days.

Philo's message that God himself looks after the Jews, who formerly had been unarmed, peaceful and loyal friends of the family of Augustus, makes most poignant sense as an effort to de-legitimize the Jewish armed revolt of 41 C.E.. The three-year lapse of time between the eviction and mass murder of the Jews in 38 C.E., and Philo's act of writing in late 41 C.E., explains the tone of *Flaccus*. It does not have a consistent eyewitness texture. Rather Philo weaves together his partially faded, partially vivid, memories of his own community's experiences with theological reflection and dramatic imagination. The time-lapse and the pressing new issues of the day explain the content, composition and the texture of *Flaccus*. Although it finds its place among classical, Jewish and Late Antique tales of wrongs done to gods, to priests and to holy peoples, and of the ruination of those who thus have fought against the Divine, in its own social setting *Flaccus* is something different—a sophisticated dramatic-theological work of selected and imagined communal memories for establishing a rationale for peace in a violent urban setting—and, I think, far more interesting.

EXCERPTS FROM *FLACCUS*

Perhaps someone may say here: “Do you then, my good man, you who have determined to accuse this man, bring no accusation against him, but on the contrary, weave long panegyrics in his honour? Are you not doting and mad? (*Flaccus* II, 6).

Philo begins his accusation against the governor Flaccus by praising his superb professional qualities as an executive administrator of Egypt. His explicit reason for this is simply to prove that Flaccus could have easily prevented the murder of the Jews, but he determined not to do so. Philo's implicit reason appears to be biblical: Flaccus is an example of a man who falls from a high pinnacle of virtue and wisdom into horrifying guilt, like Adam, or Ezekiel's king of Tyre.³² *Flaccus* is a Greek-Biblical tragedy. Philo will create a comparable pattern for Gaius Caligula in *Gaius*—not a fall from real virtue. In Philo's view, that emperor never had any. Rather his story traces Caligula's horrific tumble down from the top of world-control in the empire's golden age, to the abyss of insanity—posturing and dressing up as one god after another, stable only in his demand to be worshiped. Philo wishes to narrate catastrophic falls in both *Gaius* and *Flaccus*.

The plot of *Flaccus* intensifies when Alexandrian politicians, Dionysius, Isidorus and Lampo, approach the governor with a deal, because they know he is afraid. The Emperor Gaius has been killing the governor's political allies one at a time. First, he eliminated the grandson of Tiberius to remove a potential rival; then he forced Flaccus' friend Macro to commit suicide. Flaccus suspects that he also is on Gaius' list. Flaccus needs political support to survive. These three Alexandrians propose a deal: they, as representatives of the City of Alexandria, undertake to advocate for the governor's good reputation with the Emperor, if the governor will renounce the Jewish community of Alexandria, and remove his legal protection from them (IV, 21-23).

The governor begins to favor the mostly Greek citizens of Alexandria in court cases, and ceases the old practice of treating the Jewish residents

as if they were, de-facto, citizens of Alexandria. Legally speaking, they are not.³³ When the Jewish king Agrippa arrives in the city, crowds of Greek Alexandrian men stage public insults, lampooning him among themselves in the gymnasium. They resent the Jewish king. The Romans would not allow Alexandrians to have a royal family or even a city council, though they had repeatedly requested that the right to a council be granted them, and yet the Jews have a king and a communal counsel of elders too. Flaccus knows about the public insults to his royal guest, and does nothing. When those who resent the Jews perceive that the governor no longer protects the Jews' traditional rights in the courts, nor defends the honor of his own royal Jewish guest, they commence a mass action against them:

...the mob...flocking to the theatre the first thing in the morning, having already purchased Flaccus for a miserable price...all cried out, as if at a signal given, to erect images in the synagogues, proposing a most novel and unprecedented violation of the law (VI, 41-42).

And so the horrors begin.

It appears that both the political leaders, who orchestrate the public insults to King Agrippa, and the governor Flaccus, who connives at it, realize that they have insulted a royal personage. Agrippa has just come directly from the imperial palace to Alexandria, on instructions from the Emperor. The Greek factions fear imperial punishment now. Knowing that Gaius has been determined to institutionalize the cult of his image, they initiate a concerted effort to erect images of the emperor-god in the synagogues in order to compensate for their guilt.³⁴ Philo's expression, "as if at a signal given," indicates that there is coordination from above. Flaccus is implicated, "...for a few days afterward he issued a notice in which he called us all foreigners and aliens..." (VIII, 54).

The governor fulfills his promise to the Alexandrian politicians, to renounce the Jews. Crowds of Alexandrians evict Jewish families from their homes; mobs plunder Jewish shops and possessions and engage in orgies of

murder and tearing up the corpses. The governor removes an accustomed but unwritten legal status for many families whose residency is suspect on technical terms. "They drove the Jews entirely out of four quarters, and crammed them all into a very small portion of one" (VIII, 55-6). It is probably early August of 38, during a period of mourning for the recently deceased Drusella, the sister of Calligula.³⁵ Philo never misses an opportunity to point out the loyalty of the Jews to the family of Augustus. They observe the mourning for Drusilla, while Alexandrian citizens create civic chaos, and the governor presides over mob violence.

It appears that Alexandrian citizens resent the very loyalty of the Jews to the house of Augustus of which Philo boasts. The Romans, at the death of Cleopatra, had removed the Greek Alexandrian citizens' authority to run their own city on the one hand, while the Jews not only have maintained their traditional status, but also continue to increase their share of the population of the city.³⁶ The Jewish community has spread and become two-fifths and more of the city.³⁷ These Jews close their shops in observance of Drusella's death, and leave them unattended. The anti-Jewish party now forcefully evacuates the Jews from their homes outside of the small old Jewish neighborhood, which the Greeks claim is their only legitimate civic space. It is in the northeast quarter of the city, called "Delta." If the neighborhood ever was their only proper place, it is far too narrow to contain them now.³⁸ There is standing room only, and the evacuees begin to die from hunger and thirst under the sun. Jewish men venture out to the markets to get food for their families and the mob lynches them there (IX, 63-65). Alexandrian anti-Roman and anti-Jewish anger over-flows in a kind of mass sadism under the summer sun.

The bloody drama of the violence sets the tone for the rest of the account:

...in this way their enemies, who in their savage madness had become transformed into the nature of wild beasts, slew them and thousands of others with all kinds of agony and tortures, and newly invented cruelties, for wherever they met with or caught sight of a Jew, they stoned him, or beat him with sticks...(IX, 66).

The mob burns whole families to death, suffocates others by smoke, dismembers, and drags others through the streets until their bodies are entirely mangled. The governor has Jews tortured and crucified on the sacred festival of the birthday of Augustus, August 31st (X, 81-84).³⁹ Flaccus desecrates both the mourning for Drusella and the holiday marking Augustus' birthday, with exceptional violence.

Philo reaches a climax of his narrative not with the worst of cruelties, but with the most significant political dishonor: Flaccus publicly disgraces the Jewish council of elderly gentlemen. It is obvious to Philo that, first Flaccus' declaration that the Jews were foreigners and aliens, and then, his public demoting of the Jewish elders, put the community's survival at more risk than the mob's wanton murder of thousands of Jews. Philo expects his audience to grasp this intuitively—he gives no explanation for his emphasis. The safety of his people depends on what their legal status is. Flaccus is a true enemy of the Jews, "...for he arrested thirty-eight members of the council of elders, which our savior and benefactor, Augustus elected to manage the affairs of the Jewish nation..."(X, 73). This council exercises judicial and administrative powers, according to Jewish law in their own local community. The Jews have been accustomed to being treated, if not as citizens, as residents with some citizen-like rights, in the courts of law. Now the governor publicly demotes them, to the status of interlopers and of common Egyptians. Since Alexander the Great's conquests, the laws had set Alexandrian citizens and Jews above the native Egyptians. When the courts found an Alexandrian citizen or a Jew guilty, the Alexandrian lictors would scourge them with rods. Another class of executioner with a harsher whip would scourge common Egyptians, in order to enforce their lower position in the political hierarchy. Flaccus publicly demoted the Jewish community in the theater by having their elders flogged with whips like common Egyptian natives. Some died upon exiting the theater, as a result of their wounds (X, 78-9).

This high profile change of legal status under the whip of rougher executioners may shed light on following passage:

In fact, if the Jews had had arms in their houses, would they have submitted to be stripped of above four hundred dwellings, out of which they were turned and forcibly expelled by those who plundered them of all their properties (XI, 94)?

Philo's Alexandria is divided into five "quarters" named after the first five letters of the Greek alphabet.⁴⁰ Two of the five are counted as Jewish quarters, but there are a few Jews scattered over the other three districts of town as well (VIII, 55). Sly puts the population of Jews in Alexandria at that time around 180,000.⁴¹ This degree of violence against an unarmed Jewish populace of that size, beginning in early August and continuing to the end of the month, might easily destroy more than 400 homes, as bad as that is. Is there something limiting the violence, the evacuations and the plundering? Are the targets limited by legal considerations? Why do we not get any sense that Philo's own home is in danger? The evidence points to a calculated, limited—though massively murderous—demotion of the Jewish community.

Philo is not interested in giving a comprehensive political or legal analysis. Rather, his emphasis is upon the fact that the Jews of Alexandria were unarmed, peaceful and loyal subject of the Emperors, and under the watchful eye of God himself. Philo does not intend to do political analysis, but rather to show the actions of the God of Israel to save his unarmed people and to destroy their enemies himself. "But God, as it seems, he who has a care for all human affairs...[was] taking pity on us, and very soon he brought matters onto such a train that Flaccus was disappointed of his hopes" (XII, 102). God sets King Agrippa in motion, to communicate to the Emperor just how loyal the Jews of Alexandria have been, and how the governor has misrepresented the situation in the city to the Emperor.

Philo is careful not to credit a mere human being, though he is King Agrippa, for the deliverance of the Jews. Justice, a property of God—a virtue—is hard at work in the cosmos to turn the tide. "And after these events justice, the constant champion and ally of those who are injured, and the punisher of everything impious, whether it be action or man, began to labour to work his [Flaccus'] overthrow...(XII, 104)." Here "justice" is

the “champion” who defends the injured. Later Philo describes God as the “champion” of the Jews (XX, 170). God works to protect the Jews through the agency of the royal and imperial authorities.

Philo is impressed by the fact that Gaius does not wait for Flaccus to finish his term before calling him to account for his acts as governor. God’s justice is moving fast. Philo writes like a scholarly gentleman who knows he cannot prove what he believes: that God had punished Flaccus through the agency of Gaius not because of a wrong done by Flaccus to Gaius’ mother, nor because of a violation of Drusilla’s day of mourning, nor because of a desecration of the birthday of Augustus, but rather because of the harm he has done to the Jews, God’s people (III, 9). As proof of the improvable, he offers the evidence of uncustomary speed, and poetic timing. At the time of the Jews’ most joyful festival, *Succoth*, at the autumn equinox, they are unable to celebrate because of the heavy grief Flaccus has caused them. Flaccus on the other hand is feasting with friends one night during that week, when Gaius’ officers suddenly show up and arrest him at the dining room table. The speed and surprise of the poetic justice seem unprecedented (XIV, 116; XII, 107).

The dispossessed Jews of Alexandria can hardly believe the news. They offer praise all night long for the divine suggestion that the tide has begun to turn:

And when they had spent the whole night in hymns and songs, they poured out through the gates at the earliest dawn, and hastened to the nearest point of the shore, for they had been deprived of their usual places for prayer, and standing in a clear and open space, they cried out, “O most mighty King of all mortal and immortal beings, we have come to offer thanks unto thee, to invoke earth and sea, and the air of heaven, and all the parts of the universe, and the whole world in which alone we dwell, being driven out by men and robbed of everything else in the world, and being deprived of our city, and of all the buildings both private and public within the city, and being made houseless and homeless by the treachery of our governor, the only men in the world who

are so treated. You suggest to us favourable hopes of the setting straight of what is left to us, beginning to consent to our prayers, in as much as you have on a sudden thrown down the common enemy of our nation, the author and cause of all our calamities, exulting in pride, and trusting that he would gain credit by such means...(XIV, 122-4).

The scene is a beautiful portrayal of communal relief after horrific stresses. It comes in the fourteenth out of a total of 21 chapters. If this were a play, it would make an excellent high point of joy, just before an intermission. Was Philo there in that all-night service of hymns and praise, or on the shore at dawn? Or did he imagine what must have been said and then write the script for his characters? The synagogues were defiled by images of Caesar, which may, conceivably, have forced the whole Jewish community to use the shoreline for morning and evening prayers. Philo could have been among them, but the account does not have a convincing level of detail to give us the impression that the author is claiming to have been there. The prayer is written as if it would be said not by all the Jews of Alexandria, but by the survivors of the 400 families who were dispossessed. It is Philo's script for the positive emotional high point in his literary drama of the events—events he had only experienced in a degree of privileged insulation. What we read in this prayer is Philo's own understanding of the events and of God's work to reverse them, put into the mouths of these dispossessed pilgrims. The praise service expresses a fundamental theme in Philo's theology: hope.⁴²

Philo uses the prayer of the relieved Jews to echo Augustus' dominion over land and sea. He makes them invoke the earth and the waters while they cry out praise to the King of all, upon shore line (XII, 104; XIV, 123). Again Philo accuses Flaccus of filling, "all the elements of the universe with his impieties" (XV, 126). The governor pollutes God's cosmos and Augustus' dominions; but when God removes Flaccus, the Jews are liberated into the free air of their Divine King. The city is no longer theirs, and yet they are free. So Philo is not a new Thucydides looking for tight chains of historical cause and effect, but rather a theologian, a philosopher and an imaginative mystic, making transcendent sense out of a disaster and a partial recovery.

He asserts Israel's ideal identity. The true Jewish people are those who, being harmless and loyal residents, are pilgrims, belonging to the cosmos on a different level, praising God who intervenes for them.

Philo tells the tale of God's actions to reverse the fortunes of Flaccus. Not only does the cosmos that Flaccus pollutes take revenge on him with storms on his voyage back to Rome, but also his erstwhile allies from Alexandria are waiting for him in Rome, to accuse him before Caesar (XV, 125). Isidorus and Lampo betray him. Philo elaborates on this because he admires "the that power who presides over all freemen's affairs, namely, justice...(XVIII, 146). By "freemen" he seems to refer to his thesis that Flaccus' earlier virtues as an administrator prove that he was free to do right by the Jews. He has betrayed them willingly; now divine justice, prevailing over evil men, impels his debased allies to betray him to Caesar. Flaccus, an extremely wealthy imperial official, suffers dispossession and exile.

Philo's dramatic character Flaccus now becomes his puppet for declaring God's justice in his own case. The author gives him memorable lines to recite. This former governor of all Egypt arrives on the island to which he is exiled: "What a change is this! In the middle of the day, as if an eclipse had come upon me, night has overshadowed my life. What shall I say of this little islet (XIX, 159)?" Then the governor speaks in Platonic terms about the nature of reality and illusion. Philo, like a playwright, uses the now deceased governor to appeal to the privileged among his readers:

But now, was not all this a vision rather than reality? and was I asleep, and was this prosperity which I then beheld a dream—phantoms marching through empty space, fictions of the soul, which perhaps registered non-existent things as though they had a being? Doubtless I have been deceived. These things were but a shadow and no real things, imitations of reality and not a real truth, which makes falsehood evident; for as after we have awakened we find none of those things which appeared to us in our dreams, but all such things have fled in a body and disappeared, so too, all that brilliant prosperity which I formerly enjoyed has now been extinguished in the briefest moment of time (XIX, 164-5).

Philo's fundamental understanding of God was, in contrast to the illusory world, "that which really exists."⁴³ Flaccus has missed the Real Being. His precipitous double fall, first from virtue to treachery, then from wealth and power to exile, serves to show how a privileged soul might miss Divine Reality. On his islet, he is the dark shadow of the dispossessed but God-praising Jews on their shoreline. Perhaps Philo, in rehearsing the sudden losses of Flaccus, is implicitly impressing another, less philosophical, message to his peers—wealthy, well connected Jewish elites—that they had better awake to how much they too could lose, and how fast they could lose it should the Jewish rebellions of Alexandria continue.

For Philo, the Divine Reality, Real Being, was not uncommitted to the world. God was actively concerned with all human affairs, especially with the nation of the Jews to whom he had revealed his Law. Philo was emphatically not a philosophical Deist. He held to the faith of the Hebrew prophets, regardless of how philosophical his style was. So he makes his Flaccus confess the correct understanding of God for all who are willing to be corrected:

O King of gods and men! you are not, then, indifferent to the Jewish nation, nor are the assertions which they relate with respect to your providence false; but those men who say that that people has not you for their champion and defender, are far from a correct opinion. I am an evident proof of this; for all the frantic designs which I conceived against the Jews, I now suffer myself (XX, 170).

Flaccus proclaims the author's thesis about the meaning of his fall and his death. Philo, after describing how Gaius sends executioners to the exiled governor describes at some length how they manage to kill him. How should a fallen mass murderer like Flaccus die, if God himself takes vengeance on the enemies of the Jews? "Such was the end of Flaccus, who suffered thus, being made the most manifest evidence that the nation of the Jews is not left destitute of the providential assistance of God" (XXI, 191).

Modern writers disapprove Philo's effort to detail the despair and death of Flaccus. Modrzejewski calls it "all-too-lavish detail."⁴⁴ Sly writes, "Philo continues to turn his account of Flaccus' last days into a morality tale, in which the wretched man confesses his crimes to the god of the Jews."⁴⁵ She suggests that Philo's hyperbole that the executioners inflicted on Flaccus as many wounds as he had inflicted on the Jews is probably not to be taken literally.⁴⁶ Indeed. Sandmel, referring to an earlier scholar's disapproval of Philo on this point, admits that Philo's tone is vindictive, but wonders if the scholar was unable, in 1941, to empathize with the sufferings of the Jews of Alexandria. Philo and his readers would have been profoundly relieved by the destruction of the governor who was a primary cause of the death of so many loved ones.⁴⁷ They would judge modern abhorrence of divine revenge to be both alien and perverted. If, as I assert, the timing of this narrative account helps us to identify its political purpose, then Philo is imagining in hyperbolic detail, the vengeance of God upon Flaccus in order disarm those in the Jewish community who, now three years later, have begun to take their own revenge. He makes the dead governor to suffer, in literary drama as a literary sacrifice, far more than any human could have suffered, in an attempt to satisfy the aggrieved survivors, and to dissuade them from civil war.

THE THEATER AND PHILO'S DRAMATICS

The theater dominates Philo's *Flaccus*. Alston examines the Alexandrian Greeks' effort, as documented in Philo's narrative, to establish unambiguous supremacy over civic space—even over Jewish sacred and private space. The Greeks began their insults against the Jewish king in exclusively Greek space, the Gymnasium, but then move their operations out into the more common political, social, dramatic and competitive space, the theater.⁴⁸ The theme of the theater though, is more than a high point of civic space in the drama of the events. Alston notes Dio Chrysostom's comment in *Oratio* 32.41, that the Alexandrians were "obsessed with theatrical displays," and adds that Egyptians and Jews as well as Greeks shared this orientation.⁴⁹ There was, in late Roman times, a parallel between the seating arrangements in the synagogues and the seating arrangements in the theaters, in the hierarchical seating of socio-economic groups.⁵⁰ Philo makes the theater a central theme

in *Flaccus*, both explicitly and implicitly. It is not only the central civic and political space, but even more so, it is suggestive of the cosmic drama of his people, and of the tragedy of the governor. He indicates the theatrical nature of his account by describing the inter-play between his characters as if they were actors on a stage:

...like actors in a theatre, they drew him over wholly to their side; and so the governor became a subject, and the subjects became the governor...treating him like a mute person on the stage, as one who was only, by way of making up the show, inscribed with the title of authority...(IV, 19, 20). ...and when like actors in theatrical spectacles, he had received all the insignia of royal authority...(VI, 38). ...and those who did these things, mimicked the sufferers, like people employed in the representation of theatrical farces...(IX, 72).

The violence against the Jews does not reach its climax with the crucifixions, but on the stage of the theater:

But after Flaccus had broken through every right, and trampled upon every principle of justice, and had left no portion of the Jews free from the extreme severity of his designing malice, in the boundlessness of his wickedness he contrived a monstrous and unprecedented attack upon them, being ever an inventor of new acts of iniquity, and arranged a splendid procession to send through the middle of the market-place a body of old men prisoners [elders of the council of the Alexandrian Jewish community], with their hands bound, some with thongs and others with iron chains, whom he led in this plight into the theatre, a most miserable spectacle, and one wholly unsuited to the times...(X, 73-4).

Just as the violence against the Jews began in the theater (see above in the comments about, VI, 41), so it winds down to a despicable ending in the same spot. The Greek factions drag Jewesses onto the stage, publicly insult them, and force them to eat pork there, or else suffer public torture (XI, 96). The inception, the climax and the ugly end of the riot story are all acted out on the same stage.

If the emotional high point of the whole account is the Jews on the seashore offering praise to God, in chapter XIV, then the psychological abyss is this unmistakably theatrical description of the inner terrors experienced by Philo's character Flaccus:

And he was continually giving way to dread and to apprehension, and shaking with fear in every limb and every portion of his body, and his whole soul was trembling with terror and quivering with palpitation and agitation, as if nothing in the world could possibly be a comfort to the man now that he was deprived of all favourable hopes...(XX, 176).

Flaccus final despair serves a theme in the corpus of Philo's works: the necessity of hope for the soul that believes God and lives well. Flaccus is damned—God has removed all hope for him. Philo, to communicate this, makes his character gesticulate larger than life expressions on a literary stage. The author crafts this composition to create an emotional impact upon the Jewish community at a time when they were debating whether to continue to seek revenge. Would they give up their vendetta if they knew how God had already made their enemy to suffer for his crimes against them? It was worth a try.

THE DRAMATIC AND THE THEOLOGICAL PHILO

To depict God in history, personally committed to the ups and downs of his people and to reversing the wicked acts of his enemies, requires a literature of intense drama. Philo may disdain the theater, but it is central to his vision of the public sphere. He is obviously fascinated with it as a source of comparisons to illustrate his narrations. The stage provides the central location of his story line of the suffering Jews. He himself writes accounts filled with dramatic effects and stormy emotion, in imitation of the larger than life gesticulations of actors on the stage. Philo demonstrates a bombastic flare, whether he writes historical records, imagined streams of consciousness in his characters, painful memories of blood and mangled bodies, or pronouncements of philosophy and theology by his villains or

his saints. His immersion in the Bible would support his instincts for a dramatic vision of life. The books of Esther and of Job look like they might have been composed for dramatic performance or dramatic readings. There is nothing stoic about the cries and praises of the Psalms, nor about the Lamentations of Jeremiah. Philo was devoted to being a bridge between two cultures, teaching the Jewish Bible to Hellenized Jews and their Greek friends, in Greek categories of discourse. The theater was a center of Greek Alexandrian life. One genre of Greek drama was, as Indians say of some Bollywood productions today, 'theologicals,' or stories of gods and humans in the romantic dramas of existence. Theatrically colored narratives of the drama of God and human beings, was a fitting genre for Philo to pursue his larger mission: to make Hellenism and Bible converge.

The difficulty with theory that Philo is writing *Flaccus* during the times of armed Jewish revolt, or during a respite after them, with a hope to forestall any further violence, is that he never explicitly says that this is his purpose, nor that it is even one of his purposes. On the other hand, as noted above, Sandmel says that it is characteristic of Philo's works that the author does not mention his intended readership, or his purposes for them, explicitly. Philo also, given the details with which he explains Jewish customs and Alexandria's arrangement into five neighborhoods, intends to reach a readership beyond his own community. Peace needs to be established both locally in Alexandria, and on an Empire-wide basis. On this larger scale, it would not be politic, and might be inflammatory for Philo to rehearse the armed violence some in his own community were engaged in against the Greeks. The diplomatic sensitivity of his role as an interlocutor between the Jews, Romans and Greeks may account for the oblique approach of *Flaccus* to the problem of armed Jewish revolt.

When Philo, according to the scenario I deem most probable, was faced with the challenge of providing the narrative of the past that would pacify the urge for revenge in his community, he created a literary stage and produced his drama. In it, the holy people are saved, and they are singing praises to God on the seashore. God is there, still caring for the Jews of Alexandria. Philo reminds them through literary drama, who they are, ideally:

the peaceful and loyal friends of the house of Augustus, who ruled land and sea, and more so, the people of God who created and governs earth and seas, and saves them from their enemies, through orchestrating constituted authority on their behalf. The treacherous mass-murdering governor suffers awfully, satisfyingly, and is gone to hopeless perdition. Flaccus' execution, hyperbolically elaborated by Philo, becomes something beyond the literary type of the hubristic man who fought Deity and incurred wrath, but is also a kind of literary-dramatic sacrifice—a propitiation—to appease the communal longing for revenge in Philo's urban minority neighborhoods. He expects that his neighbors, when they hear the reading performed, will make the inference they need to make: it is time to extinguish the fires of human vengeance, and go back to being who they really are, because God's vengeance has done its work.

Philo's literary act may well represent a wider effort by Jewish elites in the Roman Empire to stem the rising tide of restlessness and aggressive religious nationalism in their own communities. The peace party failed, and their failure brought catastrophes for the Jewish people in the Empire in 70 AD. Philo's efforts in 41 C.E. to avoid this trajectory open up a window to us. Through it we see the possibility of a better future that he believed to be within reach. Through this window the reader can imagine how contingent the future for the Jews of the Roman Empire was. Hellenistic Judaism, centered as it was in Alexandria, might, possibly, have had an entirely different trajectory if Philo's efforts had prevailed.

NOTES

1 Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt*, 173.

2 Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt*, 183.

3 Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 15.

4 Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 15.

5 Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 14.

6 Sandra Gambetti, *The Alexandrian Riots of 38*, 250.

7 Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII, VIII, 1.

- 8 Box, *In Flaccum*, xxxiii.
- 9 Box, *In Flaccum*, xxxvii-viii.
- 10 Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt*, 21.
- 11 Sly, *Philo's Alexandria*, 174-6.
- 12 Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 12.
- 13 Box, *In Flaccum*.
- 14 Gambetti, *The Alexandrian Riots*, 11.
- 15 Alston, "In Flaccum'," *Greece and Rome*; Schwartz, "Greek and Jew," *Judaism*.
- 16 Gambetti, *The Alexandrian Riots*, 10-11.
- 17 Alston, "In Flaccum'."
- 18 Schwarz, "Greek and Jew," 206.
- 19 Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations*, vii.
- 20 Van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus*.
- 21 Van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus*, 6, 11, 15.
- 22 Van der Horst, 1, 2, 11, 12.
- 23 Van der Horst is not satisfied with former translations and suggests another alternative, 111-12.
- 24 Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt*, 175-183.
- 25 Van der Horst gives a succinct time line of events from the first riots to the execution of Lampo and Isidorus, 9, 10.
- 26 Gambetti, 250; Sly, 159.
- 27 Modrzejewski, 166.
- 28 Van der Horst, 15, 16.
- 29 All quotes from *Flaccus* identified hereafter by book number and section number, are from *The Works of Philo*. Translated by C. D. Yonge. New Updated Edition. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993. Pages 725-741. III, 13
- 30 Box, xlviii-lv, lxi.
- 31 Van der Horst, 4.
- 32 Ezekiel 28:1-10 for the king of Tyre. Another example of the pattern is Ezekiel 16 for the fall of Israel and Judah at the time of their kings.
- 33 Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 7-9.
- 34 Gambetti, *The Alexandrian Riots*, 169-70. She demonstrates that Gaius had initiated his cult as early as 38 CE.

35 Gambetti, *The Alexandrian Riots*, 157-9.

36 Box, "Introduction," *In Flaccum*, xiii-xxx. Also see Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt*, 162. He stresses the inferior status of the Jews in Alexandria under Roman rule, in that they paid the full pole tax unlike Greek Alexandrian citizens.

37 Gambetti, *The Alexandrian Riots*, 249; Sly, *Philo's Alexandria*, 45-46.

38 Gambetti, *The Alexandrian Riots*, 248.

39 Gambetti, *The Alexandrian Riots*, 203.

40 If the expected readers were Alexandrian Jews, or a new governor, this information would be superfluous. If Philo envisioned a wider circulation among the Hellenistic and Egyptian Jewish Diaspora, the information would be needed.

41 Dorothy Sly, *Philo's Alexandria*, (New York: Routledge, 1996), 46.

42 Williamson, *Philo*, 26-7.

43 Williamson, *Philo*, 40-1.

44 Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt*, 172.

45 Sly, *Philo's Alexandria*, 176.

46 Sly, *Philo's Alexandria*, 176.

47 Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria*, 43.

48 Alston, "In Flaccum'," 167-9

49 Alston, "In Flaccum'," 169

50 Alston, "In Flaccum'," 174

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alston, Richard. "In Flaccum?: Ethnicity and Social Space in Roman Alexandria." *Greece and Rome*, Vol. 44, No. 2 (Oct., 1997), pp. 165-175.

Box, Herbert. "Introduction," in *Philo of Alexandria. In Flaccum*, trans. & ed. by Herbert Flox. New York: Oxford University Press: 1939

Gambetti, Sandra. *The Alexandrian Riots of 38 C.E. and the Persecution of the Jews: A Historical Reconstruction*. Boston: Brill, 2009.

Josephus, Flavius. *Antiquities of the Jews in Josephus: Complete Works*. Translated by William Whiston. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1960.

- Modrzejewski, Joseph Meleze. *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian*. Translated by Robert Cornman. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press: 1995.
- Philo of Alexandria. *In Flaccum*. Translated and edited by Herbert Flox. New York: Oxford University Press: 1939.
- Philo of Axexandria. *Flaccus*, in *The Works of Philo*. Translated by C. D. Yonge. New Updated Edition. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993. Pages 725-741.
- Philo of Axexandria. *On the Embassy to Gaius: The First Part of the Treatise On Virtues*, in *The Works of Philo*. Translated by C. D. Yonge. New Updated Edition. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993. Pages 756-790.
- Sandmel, Samuel. *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Schwartz, Matthew B. "Greek and Jew: Philo and the Alexandrian Riots of 38-41 CE." *Judaism*. Spring 2000, Vol 49 Issue 2, p 206. 11 pages.
- Sly, Dorothy. *Philo's Alexandria*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Van der Horst, Pieter Willem, *Philo's Flaccus: The First Pogrom: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Leiden and Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2003.
- Williamson, Ronald. *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Philo*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Wolfson, Harry Austryn. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1962.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. "Did Agrippa Write a Letter to Gaius Caligula?" *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series. Vol 56, No. 1 (July 1965). pp. 22-31.

INVESTIGATING VICTUALS: A HISTORIOGRAPHICAL LOOK AT FOOD IN PRIMARY SOURCES FROM LATE ANTIQUITY

BY TY ROBINSON

In this postmodern epoch much attention has been paid to the construction and deconstruction of historical concepts. The world of the past has been viewed through near innumerable lenses now, though never through one as intensely focused on food as is deserving. In large part, the attempts to turn a critical eye on food in history have been insufficient and superficial, especially in regard to sources from late antiquity. Scholars of the ancient world have continually ignored what is right under their noses. They rest content with food's use as an indicator of virtue or of "otherness," happy with an oversimplification that ignores the numerous other ways it can be read. Personal and national virtue were illustrated through its use, but beyond this, representations of food can be semiological, as in the case of food crises, which were rarely about shortage of a commodity, but an expression of collective fear and anxiety related to other concerns. Depictions of food shortage, famine, and food riots all need to be reevaluated. In her book, *The Loaded Table*, Emily Gowers wrote "the significance of food in its literary representations lies in its simple existence and in a bundle of metaphorical associations, a capacity to evoke a whole world of wider experience."¹ Food was used as a portent of things to come, as a way to comment on an emperor's general efficacy, or as a means of belittling someone the author disliked. As an identifier of "other" food demonstrates the character of the Germanic tribes, the Huns, and the Persians. The "otherness" found in foreign adversaries is utilized as a mirror to reflect something positive or negative about Rome. In short, it is my desire to assert that food is a useful category of analysis and one worth investigating in greater depth.

My approach to this will be largely historiographic with my own analysis interspersed. It will begin with an overview of what actually constituted

“famine” in the ancient world based on the work of Peter Garnsey and Geoffrey Rickman, two of the preeminent scholars of the food supply in antiquity, combined with the David Nirenberg’s research on the semiotic properties of communal violence. From this it can be reasonably argued that, while the food supply might have been painted as the reason for civil discord, it was rarely the central cause for it, and that other factors were always at play.

Following that my paper will investigate uses of food by several ancient authors, with an emphasis on individuals from the Late Antique period, as they have been particularly marginalized by popular scholarship. Suetonius and Tacitus will be the lone sources from the Classical period taken into consideration, and only briefly. The other sources examined will include; Zosimus, whose *New History* was the first to address the fall of Rome; Jordanes’ *Getica*, the earliest surviving history of the Goths; Eusebius, who was the archbishop of Caesarea and early church historian and polemicist; Procopius, a sixth century historian whose *Secret History* lambasted the emperor Justinian and his wife Theodora; and finally Ammianus Marcellinus’ *Res Gestae*, which, over the course of thirty-one books covered the history of Rome from roughly 100 C.E. to the period just before his death around 400 C.E. At risk of committing a similar injustice to gustatory concerns as previous scholarship has done, the first four authors will only be given cursory examinations. I have done this for two reasons. First, a close reading of multiple ancient authors would require pages not afforded here. Second, Ammianus Marcellinus, was the gourmand of his contemporaries. No author from late antiquity spilled as much ink on food as he did. His eminence among ancient authors has been undeservedly diminished over time, no doubt contributing to the paucity of research on his unusually complex application of victuals. By taking all of this into account, my goal is to highlight the lack of significant scholarship applied to the numerous ways in which food was utilized by ancient authors, and to demonstrate that an investigation of food in history can be of great value. Though it is not likely to change the facts of history as we know them, it can engage historians in ways that have been previously ignored, forcing them to look beyond commonly held assumptions and to interact with the past in a new way.

In the book *Famine and the Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World* Peter Garnsey says that famine needs to be well defined and that the evidence used to attest to food shortages is not without its own interpretational limits. "Food crises are not always serious," writes Garnsey, "but famine is catastrophe."² People die in famine, and do so in large numbers. In a food shortage, prices go up and people go hungry, but they are not dying for lack of sustenance. Garnsey states that famines were rare, but subsistence crises falling short of famine were common. The fear of famine was common; the reality of it was not.

Adding another layer of complexity is the means by which scholars demonstrate food shortages. In some instances they are merely inferred by an extra donation from the emperor. In 28 B.C.E. Augustus gave out four times the usual grain allowance. This is read by some as an indication of a food shortage, while others argue it was Augustus trying to gather support for himself.³ Food riots are not uncommon events in ancient texts, but given that people were almost never driven to the point of starvation, and that we cannot always correctly assess the presence of food shortages, the instances of food riot must also be questioned. Garnsey says that peaceful protest was much more common than riots, and that mass protest was allowed by the emperor at times because it posed no real political threat, took place in a controlled environment, and seldom spilled over into violence.⁴

A story from Suetonius' life of Claudius helps to illustrate the point. On a summer day in 51 C.E. the emperor was strolling through the city with a small detachment of praetorian guards. A crowd gathered around the emperor when suddenly, food began to get thrown at him. The crowd became more and more aggressive, and the amount of food being hurled at him continued to grow. It was only by sneaking into his palace by way of a side entrance that Claudius was able to escape the angry mob.⁵ Suetonius' account of the event reads almost comically. It is yet another foible in the long string of them that was Claudius' life. Tacitus also recorded the event, though with a more sober tone.⁶ Food shortages during the reign of Claudius are well attested, especially in 51 C.E.⁷ Writing in the fourth century Eusebius marked the time of Claudius as the fulfillment of a biblical prophecy in which famine

would descend on the whole world.⁸ It is equally well attested that Claudius took an uncommon interest in the Roman grain supply.⁹ Food was obviously on everyone's minds. What is not clear is the extent to which food was really the issue. After all, do starving people really throw away food?

A supposedly famished horde of people pelting Claudius with food that could otherwise be utilized for nourishment simply does not make sense. Considering this, we need to look for other means by which public discontent was expressed through food riots and crises, and ask if they were actually a response to some other concern. This calls to mind the work of David Nirenberg, whose *Communities of Violence* shows that ritualized violence in a community can serve as a release valve which alleviates pressure and prevents larger acts of cataclysmic violence from happening. Additionally, Nirenberg asserts that this type of violence is rarely a simple reaction to one obvious thing. In most cases the object of a community's ire is a semiotic representation of the thing which actually incited them. All this considered, any representation of food crisis or food riots in primary sources must be reconsidered.

If famine, food shortage, and food riots can be re-cast as symbols for larger collective anxieties about Rome, the same can be said for the control of food and its supply, which affected the public's perception of the emperor.¹⁰ Zosimus mentions that Constantine provided grain rations for Constantinople after he moved the capitol there. This puts Constantine in a positive light, administratively, but it is easily forgotten when he also says "in plain terms, Constantine was the origin and the beginning of the present destruction of the empire."¹¹ Of Theodosius, Zosimus says that "he introduced such an expense to the royal table that, because of the quantity and lavishness of the food, vast legions of cooks, cupbearers, and other servants were established."¹² The result Zosimus attributes to all this spending was the sale of military appointments, something that would greatly impact the future of the Roman military. He demonstrates the army's degrading efficacy and waning virtue with several examples. Roman soldiers let a man they were supposed to arrest escape after eating and drinking their fill at a feast prepared by the wanted man.¹³ Others meet a food-borne demise when Theodosius rewards

victorious soldiers with a celebratory meal; overcome by food and drink they fall asleep and are slaughtered by barbarians shortly after.¹⁴ Zosimus also makes the claim that Julian was raised to the purple by drunken troops with cups still in hand.¹⁵ This is not the Roman military machine of the past. It is a besotted rabble running Rome into the ground.

Every ancient author seemed to have one or two men he loved to revile with insults. Zosimus targeted Constantine and Theodosius. For Eusebius, those two seem to be Maxentius and Maximin. The author cites a “lack of essential food” the likes of which Rome has never known, as the result of Maxentius’ sexual depravities.¹⁶ He blames a famine, along with an outbreak of disease and war on Maximian’s “loud boasting against the Diety,” and spares no gory details about the things to which starving people resort.¹⁷ Maximian engaged in drunken orgies and issued commands while intoxicated, only to repeal them the following day. His self-indulgence and wanton behavior also rubbed off on the army, according to Eusebius, making them soft and greedy.

Jordanes’ *Getica* is, for obvious reasons, looked at more for its commentary about the Goths than the Romans, but Book 27 has a particular culinary focus that can be read as an attack on diminishing Roman virtues. It begins not long after the Goths crossed the Danube in 376 C.E. As famine (or is it food shortage?) threatened Germanic refugees, the Roman generals sought to line their pockets by selling them sheep, ox and meat from less desirable animals like dogs, at severely inflated prices. Prices were so high that German slaves were being traded for bread, and children were being sold into slavery when their parents could no longer feed them. The next section of Book 27 sees Lupicinus, one of the same generals responsible for the high food prices, invite the Goth leader Fritigern to a feast where he intends to assassinate him. Fritigern and his men realize they are being plotted against and “immediately took arms to kill the generals Lupicinus and Maximus. Thus that day put an end to the famine of the Goths and safety of the Romans, for the Goths no longer as strangers and pilgrims, but as citizens and lords, began to rule the inhabitants and to hold in their own right all the northern country as far as the Danube.”¹⁸ This is significant. The exorbitant sums Romans charge

for food, and the attempt on a dinner guest's life are both strong indicators of an ebb in Roman virtue. More importantly, Jordanes says a direct result of such iniquity was the loss of control over part of the Danube.

Procopius focused so much outrage on Justinian that he needed a whole book to adequately express himself. In *Secret Histories* the emperor and his wife Theodora are cast as nothing less than demons, and food figures prominently in their depiction. Justinian's administrative capabilities are lampooned by way of the grain supply. The emperor drove prices up while selling rotten grain, and taxed the sale of bread which put a strain on many of the people who already had trouble affording it. The tax from bread sales put a strain on bakers who began filling their loaves with shells and dust in order to stretch their grain supply and pay the higher taxes.¹⁹ Book XII is titled "Proving That Justinian and Theodora Were Actually Fiends in Human Forms" and Procopius also relies heavily on food to demonstrate this. Proof of Justinian being a fiend in human form is proffered by way of his appetite. "Indeed," Procopius writes, "How was this man likely to be anything but an evil spirit, who never knew honest satiety of drink or food or sleep, but only tasting at random from the meals that were set before him."²⁰ Elsewhere he notes the way Justinian acted as though eating were a duty imposed on him by nature and had no more interest in it than a courier takes in delivering a letter, often going two days without food, save for water and a few wild herbs. If a good emperor is one who ate frugally, and a gluttonous one a bad emperor, one who doesn't eat must not be human at all, but a demon.

Before delving into the historiographical focal point of the current study, Ammianus Marcellinus needs to have his reputation overhauled. His standing as a lame duck who rode the coattails of other historians is one that seems to be undeserving. He is capable of engaging all the dense rhetoric and complexity we expect from the great authors of antiquity. Den Hengst cites a hidden anti-Christian polemic in Ammianus' digression on Egypt.²¹ He is not alone in this. Michael Kulikowski also charges Ammianus with a "coded" polemic against Constantinople in Book 31.²² Peter O'Brien cites a reference to the *Aeneid* in Book 22. Charles Fornara asserts that "Ammianus' imitation of the texts of Sallust, Livy and Tacitus is close and purposeful, and it

testifies to his deep familiarity with the Latin literary tradition.”²³ Roger Pack points out that there are numerous “affinities with the epideictic literature of the Greeks,” adding yet another layer of complexity.²⁴ Gavin Kelly’s *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian* argues for a more sophisticated Ammianus than is typically allowed, making a literary reading of the author his primary investigation. Kelly asserts that not only does Ammianus share the sophistication found in other classic works, but that he is more creatively unique than his contemporaries. It is also clear that not only does he know the work of Juvenal, as is evident by its mention in the text, but that he has also engaged in some level of satire over the course of his narrative.²⁵ Roger Rees finds no less than thirty instances where the language and subject matter of Ammianus and Juvenal line up and writes “this accumulation of parallels in style, content, victim and lexis indicates a thorough and conscious employment of *The Satires* in the composition of Ammianus’s Roman digressions.”²⁶ David Rohrbacher agrees, citing E. A. Thompson when he calls the Roman digressions “Juvenalian.”²⁷ Though den Hengst has rejected Rees’ claim, saying “here again one looks in vain for lexical agreement and the only conclusion can be that several abuses denounced by Ammianus were also criticized by Juvenal, which is not surprising,” he still notes several instances where the author has employed satire quite gamely.²⁸ From all this we can adduce that Ammianus is even more worthy of a close reading than has been previously established. Not only has food been overlooked in this case, but the author underestimated.

Ammianus uses food in numerous ways. Overindulgence and gluttony are glaring examples of the moral decay Ammianus so often laments, as is mismanagement of the food supply. The ability, or lack thereof, to provision the city calls into question the character of the person responsible for it, and by extension, the character of the city, of the emperor, and the empire as a whole. Save for Constantius’ visit to the former capitol, every time Rome figures in the book, it is portrayed as suffering food shortages, often as a result of an ineffectual or unpopular urban prefect.

The first mention of food comes in the form of a wine shortage in Rome in 354 C.E. Orfius, the urban prefect, who, despite being “shrewd”

and “having a thorough knowledge of the law” is lacking the education and polish expected of a man in his position. The result of his incompetence was a series of riots by a population who had grown accustomed to greedily consuming wine.²⁹ This information comes at the beginning of a lengthy passage wherein Amianthus described Rome’s deterioration. It is the first of two large digressions he makes, both of which center on Rome’s sorry condition. Even shorter passages that are not part of his two larger Roman digressions briefly shift their focus to the City to mention food shortages. John Matthews points out that Ammianus himself invites his readers to wonder why every time he mentions Rome there is nothing to speak of but riots and taverns and similar sordid subjects.³⁰ Daniel den Hengst also notes that both of what are referred to as Ammianus’ “Roman digressions” start with the sketches of the urban prefect, and he briefly mentions a wine shortage cited in the text, but food is never considered as fully as it should be.³¹ It is left as merely an indicator of virtue, nothing more. In a footnote to his 1953 article, “The Roman Digressions of Amianus Marcellinus,” Roger Pack wonders if official sale and control of wine was made such an issue due to competing Christian and pagan factions, offering that such an assumption would serve to explain the strong emphasis which Ammianus places on the matter.³² A single sixty year old footnote seems to be the only work in which representations of food crisis is looked upon as something beyond its surface representation, a fact which illustrates the dearth of scholarship devoted to the matter.

In 355 C.E. another wine shortage under the new urban prefect Leontius can only be quelled by his singling out and killing of the leader of the mob.³³ In 359 C.E., when inclement weather hindered the arrival of the city’s grain supply, the urban prefect Tertullus was threatened with violence on numerous occasions. Fearing he was in mortal danger, Tertullus appeared before a crowd offering up his two young sons. Tearfully entreating for his life he cried, “These are your fellow-citizens, who will share your fate unless our affairs take a happier turn. So if you think that by their destruction you can avert disaster they are at your disposal.”³⁴ His appeal to the crowd worked, sparing the lives of his children and likely his own. Other government officials were not so lucky. Ammianus tells us about Theophilus, governor of Syria in 354 C.E., who was beaten and then torn to pieces by a hungry mob.

That blame for the food shortage actually lay with Caesar Gallus, who made no arrangements to have grain supplied from nearby provinces, was of no consequence. Considered together, the instances mentioned above underscore the fact that the urban prefect is merely a scapegoat (not only in Ammianus' writing, but also for those who participated in some form of civil unrest) for larger problems. Blame for lack of food, especially as it is depicted in Rome, is not only an indictment of the urban prefect, but of the emperor and the corrupt state of the empire.

Even when the urban prefect is not painted as inept, the measures he takes regarding food and gluttonous living are feckless in the face of the city's morally bankrupt inhabitants. Ammianus uses this as a chance to shine a light on excesses of the public at large. In 369 C.E. the urban prefect Ampelius tried to enact a series of measures similar to the sumptuary laws of earlier centuries. He barred taverns from opening before mid-morning, forbade cook shops from displaying meat before a certain hour, and even put restrictions on the boiling of water or the chewing of food in public. Peter Garnsey quotes from an unpublished 1994 article by J. Goddard: "The role of food in moral discourse in Greece and Rome was of little relevance to ordinary people, and was not intended to be."³⁵ The public might not have cared about their role in the moral discourse about food, but that had not prevented them from being used as a tool in its execution. Ampelius was himself a pleasure seeker and therefore unable to enforce these laws, because the vices to which most people had succumbed were incurable.³⁶ Yet again Ammianus has highlighted the moral decay which, though not at the center of his book, is located in Rome, the ideological and moral center of the empire. The urban prefect, a representative of the emperor, cannot himself be a pleasure seeker and expect to stem the tide of luxury and consumption that has over taken the population. Ammianus laments that most Romans are addicted to gluttony, adding that they stand about staring at piles of meat in cook-shops, bemoaning unaccepted dinner invitations as a mortal insult; they employ people to weigh and measure the animals served at feasts, and catalog their findings so that other diners might marvel at the beast's unheard of size.³⁷ All of this goes against the values upon which Rome was founded, creating an environment where "triumphs in battle were replaced by triumphs

at the table,” and where the kitchen had become the object of keener attention than was proper. This lapse in moderation and virtue had affected not only civilians, but even extended to the military. Such excess contributed to the softening of the army whose “cups were heavier than their swords,” and who’d taken to singing music-hall songs instead of their traditional chants.³⁸

Further evidence of the overarching societal breakdown of which Ammianus is weary is demonstrated in the taking of prisoners and killing of guests at banquets. In 374 C.E., Pap, the king of Armenia, was invited to a banquet where his safety was guaranteed. After being placed in the seat of honor, given wine and the best cut of meat, the king was run through with a spear, meeting an ignominious end. For Ammianus, this was a serious breach of custom and propriety, two things the author held in high regard. “By this act of treachery, simple credulity was wickedly abused. Under the very eyes of the god who protects guests, and at a banquet whose sanctity would be respected even by the dwellers by the Black sea.” He longed for a time when the idea of killing a guest was so forbidden that Fabricius Luscinus, a Roman soldier, sent word to the Greek king Pyrrhus that he was in danger of being poisoned at a feast. “Such was the sanctity,” Ammianus wrote, “which in those gold old times attached to the convivial table even of an enemy.”³⁹ Betrayal of trust and hospitality, and the disposal of an enemy through such duplicity was the mark of a barbarian, not a proper Roman.

This use of festal activity to draw a parallel between barbarians and Romans is one of the ways Ammianus uses food as an indicator of “otherness” as did many writers from antiquity. Where Ammianus is unique is that rather than simply using victuals to create relationships of opposition that highlight the difference between Romans and everyone else, he uses those oppositions to further illustrate the waning virtue of Rome. He describes the difficulties in counting the dead after the siege of Amida in 359 C.E., due of the fact that after four days the Roman corpses had decomposed so much as to be unrecognizable rotting pieces of flesh. On the other hand, those of the Persians did not putrefy, owing to their frugal diet and the dry heat of their homeland.⁴⁰ The frugal diet of the Persians, the same kind that used to be valued so highly in Rome, was sustaining them, even in death. Ammianus

spent much time in the east and was familiar with the Persian diet. This was an opportunity to note how their adherence to moderate eating and living carried on at a time when Rome was perceptibly rotting away.

Indeed, food features heavily throughout Ammianus, especially in his two Roman digressions, yet few scholars have ever turned a food-centered gaze on his work long enough to complete a thorough analysis. In regard to food, Den Hengst dismisses it when he asserts that Ammianus is “clearly embarrassed by the trivial nature of the information he is going to present.”⁴¹ Den Hengst’s invocation of the author’s sense of shame when he writes about food is typical of the attitude which has been handed down from antiquity to present day. To record the pleasures of taste was considered to be simplistic and trivial. Matters of the body were secondary to those of the mind. The Stoic philosopher Epictetus sums up the feeling of most writers in saying that, “It is a mark of want of intellect, to spend much time in things related to the body; as to be immoderate in exercise, in eating and drinking, and in the discharge of other animal functions. These things should be done incidentally and our main strength be applied to our reason.”⁴² This prevailing notion lasted throughout antiquity, a fact that makes any study of food in antiquity limited. Save for the works of satirists like Juvenal, Martial and Petronius, and the food laden text left by both Plinys, the culinary world was not a matter that many Roman writers felt was worthy of their time. It is no wonder “we only think of Roman food as baroque and nauseating because that is the impression that these writers chose to leave posterity.”⁴³ The Roman food that is called to mind by most modern viewers comes from the skewed version of reality left to us by a few satirists. I disagree with den Hengst’s conclusion that Ammianus is ashamed of the comestible excess he recorded. Ammianus felt shame in the way modern Americans feel a twinge of collective embarrassment when a reality television star becomes more well known than the President, but Ammianus relishes the chance to detail Roman gluttony in much the same way a satirist would, and chose to return to the subject on more than one occasion. His history is no less complete without the Roman digressions, yet he included them, alongside numerous other polemics, in his text. What den Hengst calls embarrassment

is indignation. The city of Rome is a symbol for the greed and indulgence overtaking the empire, and the medium through which this is expressed was often food.

The bulk of Ammianus' work centers on two emperors: Julian and Constantius. Julian, the darling of Ammianus' story, is represented, at least superficially, in the traditional way. The author praises Julian for his "sparing use of food and sleep, a habit which he adhered to obstinately both at home and in the field. In time of peace the frugality of his regimen and of his table excited the wonder of the good judges."⁴⁴ On campaign he ate sparingly, often taking his meals standing up in the manner of a common soldier. Ammianus wrote that Julian was able to move swiftly on the march because he was "inured to hardships" and "able to make do with a scanty supply of ordinary food."⁴⁵ One of his reforms after the death of Constantius was to dismiss the palace cooks whom he thought were paid too much and for whom he had no need.⁴⁶ Indeed, the picture we are given of Julian through his personal relationship with food is that of a model emperor. However, if we look elsewhere, food's appearance in the text can be read in a less positive way.

Ammianus also used food as a portent of things to come. When the future emperor Jovian was tasked with transporting the body of the deceased emperor Constantius back to Constantinople, he was given samples of the soldier's rations along the way, an honor usually reserved for the emperor. Ammianus states explicitly this was a sign of Jovian's pending imperial power.⁴⁷ Knowing this, it is reasonable to look for other instances in the text where food was used to foreshadow future events.

An example is found in Ammianus' treatment of some of Julian's actions as emperor. What begins as a seemingly positive description of Julian's administrative capabilities subtly belies the hubris that will one day be his undoing. His initial attention to civil reforms did not keep him from maintaining the army, ensuring they never lacked the necessary clothing and food. The emperor's portrayal here remains one of balance and traditional values until, that is, the eve of his Persian invasion. At this time "without any

adequate reason and simply to gain popularity, he engaged in the regulation of the price of commodities, a course whose injudicious adoption sometimes results in want and famine.”⁴⁸ Indeed, this created a rift between Julian and the grain speculators of Antioch where Julian was residing before the invasion. They cried foul at Julian’s price fixing, emphatic that what he asked of them was not possible. The irony here, as Peter Garnsey points out, is that had it not been for the presence of Julian’s massive army in and around the city, food supplies and prices wouldn’t have been a problem at all.⁴⁹

Ammianus’ characterization of Julian’s actions as being without reason and for no other motivation than to gain popularity is equally well utilized to describe his impending Persian campaign. Throughout the course of his Persian war, Julian continued to display feelings of self-importance and a tendency towards unnecessary action which started with his price fixing in Antioch. Along the way he repeatedly ignored the advice of his generals; he gave up food carrying carts in order to move soldiers; he forded rivers and then burned the boats needed to return to the other side; he dismissed his advisors recommendations to abandon the campaign more than once. On two occasions the emperor narrowly avoided being killed while out reconnoitering the area near his camp, a hazardous chore that could have been easily delegated to a lower ranking officer had Julian not been so intent on elevating himself in the eyes of his followers.

Against the advice and better judgement of nearly everyone involved, Julian chased the ghost of Alexander the Great across Persia, until a spear through the leg ended his journey. By this time food was already scarce, but in the aftermath of his death, starvation and want became the norm. The army’s retreat to the west was characterized by lack of food and drink, and it was only the slaughter of pack animals that kept them from being “reduced to the necessity of feeding on human flesh.”⁵⁰ Ammianus’ use of unnecessary price fixing, and the famine it can yield as a portent of the future, was fulfilled in the form of an unnecessary war which brought famine to its unlucky Roman players.

Constantius’ relationship to food is depicted in a uncharacteristically favorable way. Though he is the emperor Ammianus loves to hate (and we are

told that he was capable of cruelty matching that of Caligula or Commodus), at the table Constantius seems to have been rather traditional, boring even. “His style of living was frugal and temperate, and he ate and drank only in moderation; in consequence his health was so robust that he was rarely unwell.”⁵¹ This is a curiously charitable light for Ammianus to shed on Constantius, who appears to be the picture of moderation as reflected by his diet. Shortly after this passage, when listing Constantius’ other traits, among them that he was very chaste and refrained from wiping his nose or spitting in public, Ammianus wrote “never in his life tasted fruit,” a fact that is as hard to believe as its inclusion in the text is curious.⁵² Its removal from the previous description of Constantius’ eating habits, and a seemingly willful attachment to another list of his virtues calls attention to the line and makes it ripe for analysis.

THE FRUIT DIGRESSION

Nary a line of text from Ammianus has gone without scrutiny, yet somehow little attention has been given to Constantius’ fruit abstention, and no satisfactory conclusion about it has been reached. R. M. Fraker suggests Constantius’ forbearance of fruit was mentioned in one of Ammianus’ thirteen lost books.⁵³ J. den Boeft and company read it along traditional symbolic lines, asserting that excessive consumption of fruit would have been a sign of gluttony (though they say nothing about flat out rejection of it), even postulating an allergy or other medical condition that prevented his eating fruit.⁵⁴ Most recently David Rohrbacher tackled the subject. He claims that Ammianus, a staunch anti-Christian, conflated Constantius’ Arianism with Manichaeism. In doing so, he projected the Manichean prohibition of fruit consumption on to Constantius as a way to denigrate the emperor’s religious beliefs in one final hidden insult. Rohrbacher’s argument is clever, but it is based on numerous debatable textual connections. Furthermore, it relies on a certain amount of bungling on Ammianus’ part and presumes Ammianus to be a bad historian. In light of the paucity of investigation into the matter, and the loose toehold on which previous conclusions rest, other options should be explored.

Ammianus did not like Constantius. His distaste for the emperor was partially religious, but also based on a judgment of his merits. Ammianus made it clear that Constantius was an inept leader and only capable of victory against internal foes. In campaigns against foreign enemies, Julian was obviously superior.⁵⁵ Fruit is foreign, exotic. The majority of the fruit Romans enjoyed were native to far-off lands. They moved east to west, trickling across the Mediterranean from Asia and Egypt. Except the apple. The apple is native to Italy. In fact, apples were the only fruit Romans recognized with its own name. All other fruits were referred to by the addition of geographic adjectives. Gibbon wrote “when Romans had tasted the richer flavor of the apricot, the peach, the pomegranate, the citron, and the orange, they contented themselves with applying to all these new fruits the common denomination of apple, discriminating them from each other only by the additional epithet of their country.”⁵⁶ Fruit not only came from exotic, foreign lands, but it was categorized accordingly. Its very name was a reflection of its origin outside of Rome. We needn’t look for any other representations of fruit as being exotic. Its nature as such is built into the very language used to identify it.

What is it to eat something, if not to conquer it? To completely destroy and transform it through digestion into something universally reviled. When Ammianus wrote that Constantius never in his life tasted fruit, he was highlighting the fact that Constantius never tasted a significant victory against a foreign army. The line comes at the end of a summation of his good qualities and immediately precedes his less desirable traits. Its placement is no accident. What better way to bridge the two halves of his personality than with a line that can bear out multiple interpretations? It follows a classical tradition of depicting temperance and moderation through food, but its curious location, and its use as a transition between the lighter and darker halves of the emperor’s disposition give it a deeper meaning: one that is supposed to be biting, and that, if read correctly, is a direct attack on Constantius. While this theory is not an unassailable one, it certainly holds as much weight as those which rely on things that might have been written in non-existent volumes, on completely speculative food allergies, or hazy textual interpretations that require a level of incompetence on Ammianus’ part.

Whatever the case, this illustrates that focusing on food in a close reading of even the most picked through sources can yield meaningful interaction with the text, if not new results altogether. Scholars of antiquity have long relished the chance to detail the many ways that culinary excess played a role in the Rome's decline and fall. The tales of hedonistic consumption, of self-induced vomiting in order to continue eating, and of the general immoderation that characterized the period abound. If food did indeed have such a pivotal role in Rome's undoing, one would think that its every mention would be scrutinized to the point of exhaustion. Yet as I have demonstrated, food as a category of analysis in primary sources from antiquity has been grossly simplified. To assert that food is merely used to show a persons virtue or as marker of "otherness" is reductive in the extreme. Within that framework and beyond, representations of food can evoke a wide variety of things and have been used by ancient authors to comment on the world they inhabited in ways that have been either ignored or dismissed. The surface has only been scratched, but there is hope that work like this will whet the appetites of other scholars to take up the cause, and to put food in its rightful place at the academic table.

NOTES

1 Gowers, Emily. *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993), 5.

2 Garnsey, Peter. *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses and Crisis*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 6.

3 Ibid., 218.

4 Ibid., 30, 242.

5 Suetonius, *Claudius*, 30.

6 Tacitus, *Annals*, 12.43.1.

7 See Tacitus, *Annals*, 12. 43.1 and 11.4.2. Suetonius, *Claudius*, 8.2 and 30. See also, Rickman, Geoffrey. *The Corn Supply of Ancient Rome*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), 1, 76, 90, 155

8 Eusebius, *The History of the Church*. 2, 8.1-8.2.

9 Suetonius, *Claudius*, 18-20. See also Rickman, (1988), 75-76.

10 Potter, D.S. and D.J. Mattingly eds. *Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire*. (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999), 5.

11 Zosimus, *New History* 2.34, 2.32.

12 Ibid., 4.28.

- 13 Zosimus, 4.5.2.
- 14 Ibid., 4.49.
- 15 Ibid., 3.9.
- 16 Eusebius, 8, 14.11.
- 17 Ibid., 9, 8.3.
- 18 Jordanes, 27, 138.
- 19 Procopius, 22 and 26.
- 20 Ibid., 22.
- 21 Den Hengst, Daniel. *Emperors and Historiography: Collected Essays on the Literature of the Roman Empire*. Eds. D. W. P. Burgersdijk and J. A. Van Waarden. (Boston: Brill, 2010), 248.
- 22 Kulikowski, Michael. "Coded Polemic in Ammianus Book 31 and the Date and Place of Its Completion." in *The Journal of Roman Studies*, V.1.102, (2012), p. 79-102.
- 23 Fornara, Charles W. "Studies in Ammianus Marcellinus: II: Ammianus' Knowledge and Use of Greek and Latin Literature." in *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 41, H. 4 (1992), 420-438.
- 24 Pack, (1953), 184.
- 25 G. Kelly *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- 26 Rees, Roger. "Ammianus Satiricus." in *The Late Roman World and Its Historian: Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*. Jan Willeem Drijvers and David Hunt ed. (New York: Routledge, 1999), 150.
- 27 Rohrbacher, David. *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 55, No. 1 (May, 2005), 323-326.
- 28 den Hengst, (2010), 282.
- 29 Ammianus 14, 6.1.
- 30 Ibid., 14.6.2 and Matthews, John. *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 12.
- 31 Den Hengst, Daniel. *Emperors and Historiography: Collected Essays on the Literature of the Roman Empire*. Eds. D. W. P. Burgersdijk and J. A. Van Waarden. (Boston: Brill, 2010), 275.
- 32 Pack, Roger. "The Roman Digressions of Amianus Marcellinus." in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 84 (1953), 187.
- 33 Ammianus, 15, 7.2.
- 34 Ibid., 19, 10.2.
- 35 Garnsey, Peter. *Food and Society in Classical Antiquity*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 10.
- 36 Ammianus, 28, 4.4-4.5.
- 37 Ammianus, 28, 4.31.4.17, 4.12.
- 38 Ibid., BK 22, 4. See also Woods, David. "Strategius and the 'Manichaeans.'" in *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 51, No.1 (2001), 255-264. He claims these songs are actually Christian religious services and their inclusion by Ammianus is an attack on Christianity.
- 39 Ammianus, 30, 1.19.

- 40 Ammianus, 19, 9.8.
- 41 den Hengst, (2010), 275-276.
- 42 16 Epictetus, *Enchiridion*, 41.
- 43 Gowers, (1993), 1.
- 44 Ammianus, 25, 4.4.
- 45 Ammianus, 21, 9.
- 46 Ibid., 22, 4.2.
- 47 Ammianus, 21, 16.21.
- 48 Ibid., 22, 7.6 and 22, 14.
- 49 Garnsey, (1988), 247.
- 50 Ammianus, 25, 8.15.
- 51 Ammianus, 21, 16.1.
- 52 Ibid., 21, 16.7.
- 53 Frakes, R. M. "Ammianus Marcellinus XXI.16.7: A Re-examination." in *Hermes*, Vol.122 (1994), 253-6.
- 54 Den Boeft, J., D. Den Hengst, and H. C.Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXI* (Groningen,1991).
- 55 For more on Ammianus' portrayal of Constantius as only good in domestic disputes, see Whitby, Michael. "Images of Constantius." in *The Late Roman World and Its Historian: Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*. Jan Wiilem Drijvers and David Hunt ed. (New York: Routledge, 1999), 81-82.
- 56 Gibbon, Edward. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. (Penguin Books, 2000), 58.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aldrete, Greg S. and David J. Mattingly. "Feeding the City: The Organization, Operation, and Scale of the Supply System for Rome." in *Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire*. Eds. D.S. Potter and D.J. Mattingly. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999.
- Apicius. *Cooking and Dining in Imperial Rome*. Trans. Joseph Dommers Vehling. Chicago: W.M. Hill, 1936.
- Brown, Peter. *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350-550 AD*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2012.
- Cameron, Averil. *The Later Roman Empire A.D. 284-430*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

- . *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity A.D. 395-600*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Den Boeft, J., D. Den Hengst, and H. C. Teitler, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXI*. Groningen, 1991.
- Den Hengst, Daniel. *Emperors and Historiography: Collected Essays on the Literature of the Roman Empire*. Eds. D. W. P. Burgersdijk and J. A. Van Waarden. Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Douglas, Mary. "Deciphering a Meal." In *Food and Culture: A Reader*. Ed. Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterik. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Dupont, Florence. "The Grammar of Roman Dining." In *Food: A Culinary History From Antiquity to Present*. Ed. Jean-Louis Flandrin and Massimo Montanari. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Eusebius. *The History of the Church From Christ to Constantine*. G. A. Williamson, trans. London: Penguin Books, 1965.
- Fornara, Charles W. "Studies in Ammianus Marcellinus: II: Ammianus' Knowledge and Use of Greek and Latin Literature." in *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 41, H. 4 (1992), p. 420-438.
- Frakes, R. M. "Ammianus Marcellinus XXI.16.7: A Re-examination." in *Hermes*, Vol. 122 (1994), 253-6.
- Garnsey, Peter. *Food and Society in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- . *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses and Crisis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- . *Citites, Peasants and Food in Classical Antiquity: Essays in Social and Economic History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Gibbon, Edward. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Penguin Books, 2000.

- Gowers, Emily. *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.
- Grainger, Sally. "The Myth of Apicius." *Gastronomica: The Journal of Food and Culture*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Spring 2007), pp. 71-77.
- Huntington, Ellsworth. "Climatic Change and Agricultural Exhaustion as Elements in the Fall of Rome." in *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol.31, No. 2 (Feb., 1917), 173-208.
- Kaegi, Walter Jr. *Byzantium and the Decline of Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Kelly, G. *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Kulikowski, Michael. "Coded Polemic in Ammianus Book 31 and the Date and Place of Its Completion." in *The Journal of Roman Studies*, V.1.102, (2012), p. 79-102.
- Matthews, John. *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Nirenberg, David. *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- O'Brien, Peter. "An Unnoticed Reminiscence of 'Aeneid' 10.5.17 at Ammianus Marcellinus 22.12.6." in *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 60, Fasc. 4 (2007), p.662-668.
- Pack, Roger. "The Roman Digressions of Amianus Marcellinus." in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 84 (1953), p.181-189.
- Potter, D.S. and D.J. Mattingly eds. *Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1999.
- Procopius. *Secret Histories*. Trans. Richard Atwater. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1961.

- Rees, Roger. "Ammianus Satiricus." in *The Late Roman World and Its Historian: Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*. Jan Willems Drijvers and David Hunt ed. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Rickman, Geoffrey. *The Corn Supply of Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- Rohrbacher, David. *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 55, No. 1 (May, 2005), 323-326.
- . "The Sources for the Lost Books of Ammianus Marcellinus." in *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 55, H. 1 (2006), pp. 106-124.
- Seager, Robin. *Ammianus Macellinus: Seven Studies in His Language and Thought*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1986.
- Smith, Rowland. "Telling Tales: Ammianus' Narrative of the Persian Expedition of Julian." in *The Late Roman World and Its Historian: Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*. Jan Willems Drijvers and David Hunt ed. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Tacitus. *Annals*. Trans. A.J. Woodman. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 2004.
- Thompson E. A. *The Huns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- . "The Historical Method of Ammianus Marcellinus." in *Hermathena*, No. 59 (May, 1942), p. 44-66.
- Wilkins, John. "Land and Sea: Italy and the Mediterranean in the Roman Discourse of Dining." In *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 124, No. 3, Special Issue Roman Dining.
- Whitby, Michael. "Images of Constantius." in *The Late Roman World and Its Historian: Interpreting Ammianus Marcellinus*. Jan Willems Drijvers and David Hunt ed. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Woods, David. "Strategius and the 'Manichaeans.'" in *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 51, No.1 (2001), 255-264.

TO THE POSEIDONIANS

BY KEVIN HUNTER

I produced this translation for the “Forster, Durrell, and Cavafy” course in the Department of Modern Greek Studies. The original poem was written in 1906 by Constantine P. Cavafy, a Greek living in Alexandria, Egypt. The poem includes both an epigraph in ancient Greek by Athenaeus (adapted from Deipnosophists Book 14.31, 632a) as well as the main poem in modern Greek by Cavafy. In my translation, I attempt to follow the original text closely and keep the same construction and force, where possible, in order to provide the English reader with an experience that is as close as possible to that of a Greek reader.

ΠΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΙΑΤΑΙ - Κ.Π. ΚΑΒΑΦΗΣ

Ποσειδωνιάταις τοις εν τῷ Τυρρηνικῷ κόλπῳ το μεν εξ αρχῆς
Ἑλλῆσιν οὐσιν εκβαρβαρώσθαι Τυρρηνοῖς ἢ Ρωμαίοις γεγονόσι
καὶ τήν τε φωνήν μεταβεληκέναι, τὰ τε πολλὰ των επιτηδευμάτων,
ἀγινει δε μίαν τινα αυτοῦς των εορτῶν των Ελλήνων
ἐτι καὶ νυν, εν η συνιόντες αναμιμνήσκονται των αρχαίων
ονομάτων τε καὶ νομίμων, απολοφυράμενοι προς ἀλλήλους
καὶ δακρύσαντες ἀπέρχονται.

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ

Την γλῶσσα την ελληνική οι Ποσειδωνιάται
εξέχασαν τόσους αἰῶνας ανακατευμένοι
με Τυρρηνοῦς, καὶ με Λατίνους, κι ἄλλους ξένους.
Το μόνο που τους ἔμενε προγονικό
ἦταν μια ελληνική γιορτή, με τελετές ωραίες,
με λύρες καὶ με αυλοῦς, με αγῶνας καὶ στεφάνους.
Κ’ εἶχαν συνήθειο προς το τέλος της γιορτῆς
τα παλαιὰ τους ἔθιμα να διηγούνται,
καὶ τα ελληνικά ονόματα να ξαναλένε,
που μόλις πια τα καταλάμβαναν ολίγοι.
Καὶ πάντα μελαγχολικά τελείων’ η γιορτή τους.
Γιατί θυμούνταν που κι αυτοί ἦσαν Ἕλληνες —
Ἰταλιτῶν ἓναν καιρό κι αυτοί·
καὶ τώρα πῶς ἐξέπεσαν, πῶς ἐγίναν,
να ζουν καὶ να ομιλοῦν βαρβαρικά
βγαλμένοι — ω συμφορά! — ἀπ’ τον Ελληνισμό.

POSEIDONIANS - C.P. CAVAFY

To the Poseidonians who live in the Tyrrhenian Gulf, and although from the beginning are Greeks, they have become barbarous like Tyrrhenians or Romans, and have even changed their language and many of their customs, yet they preserve just one of their Greek festivals even now, in which they gather and recall to memory their ancient names and customs and after weeping and bewailing loudly to each other, they retire.

ATHENAEUS

The Greek language, the Poseidonians forgot after so many generations mixing with Tyrrhenians, and with Latins, and other foreigners. The only thing that remained of their ancestors, was a Greek festival, with fantastic rites, with lyres and with flutes, with contests and wreath crowns. And they had the habit towards the end of the festival to tell stories about their ancient customs and to recall their Greek names which just a few understood anymore. And always in melancholy their festival ended. Because they remembered that even they were Greeks - that once, long ago, even they were Greek-Italians, and now how they have fallen, how they've become, to live and speak like Barbarians, far removed - O Calamity! - from Hellenism.

FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT *PITHOS*

You can find information about submitting to *Pithos* and digital copies of our past volumes online at:
<http://classics.sfsu.edu/classics-students-association>

For further inquiries, please e-mail us at:
pithos.sfsu@gmail.com

TO BE ADDED TO THE CLASSICS STUDENTS ASSOCIATION MAILING LIST

Forward the following information:
name, address, telephone (optional) and e-mail
 to the e-mail address: **csa.sfsu@gmail.com**,

All inquiries may also be sent via post to:
 Classics Students Association
 Care of the Department of Classics
 San Francisco State University
 1600 Holloway Avenue
 San Francisco, CA 94132