eisodos

Zeitschrift für Literatur und Theorie

2017 (2) Herbst

e i s o d o s – Zeitschrift für Literatur und Theorie

Herausgegeben von Bettina Bohle und Lena Krauss

Erscheinungsort: Berlin

ISSN: 2364-4397

www.eisodos.org

eisodos ist eine *peer-reviewed*, *open-access*, *online*-Zeitschrift für B.A.-, M.A.- und Lehramts-Studierende sowie Doktoranden noch ohne peer-reviewed Publikation. Thematischer Schwerpunkt von **eisodos** sind Fragen der Interpretation von antiker Literatur und des Theorievergleichs.
Eine Übersicht der in **eisodos** verwendeten Abkürzungen griechischer und lateinischer Autornamen und Werktitel findet sich unter folgendem Link: `http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liste_der_Abkürzungen_antiker_Autoren_und_Werktitel`

Das **eisodos**-Titelbild zeigt den Marmorkopf Odysseus' aus der Villa des Tiberius in Sperlonga (`https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/b/b4/Head_Odysseus_MAR_Sperlonga.jpg`).

2017 (2) Herbst

e i s o d o s – Zeitschrift für Literatur und Theorie

2017 (2) Herbst

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Vorwort der Herausgeberinnen

Liebe Leserinnen und Leser von **eisodos**,

fast könnte man meinen, die von drei auf zwei reduzierte Anzahl von Ausgaben der Zeitschrift solle durch einen umso größeren Umfang der Einzelausgaben kompensiert werden: mit dieser Herbstausgabe zu Beginn des neuen Semester legen wir die seitenstärkste Ausgabe von **eisodos** seit Bestehen der Zeitschrift vor. Ganze 64 Seiten und drei Beiträge umfasst die vorliegende Ausgabe. Dazu kommt ein Interview mit dem Musiker und Schriftsteller Xaver Römer und eine Rezension.

Das Interview ist diesmal eher ein Essay: Xaver Römer zieht einen großen, gedanken- und detailreichen Bogen von seinem eigenen Künstlernamen zur Bedeutung des Odysseus, der sich in der Polyphem-Episode als „x", als niemand herausstellt. In den Beiträgen untersucht zunächst Amanda Kubic von der Washington University Anyte von Tegea und Emily Dickinson, die jeweils neue Perspektiven und Werte in das Genre des Epigramms bringen. Elisa Nuria Merisio von der Università Sapienzia Rom stellt die Funktion direkter Rede in zwei von Bacchylides Oden heraus, die eine Aufspaltung des Zuschauer- vom Erzählerwissen mit sich bringt, die an die zeitgleich entstehende Tragödie erinnert. Katharina-Maria Schön von der Universität Wien zeigt, dass Ovid trotz oberflächlicher Enkomiastik auf den Herrscher Augustus immer noch viele subversive Untertöne enthält, gerade in den allegorischen Passagen in seinem Werk. In ihrer Rezension schließlich bespricht Sonia Francisetti Brolin den Sammelband *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature*, der die Anwendung verschiedener Literaturkonzepte in der byzantinischen Literatur des 9.–12. Jh. zum Thema hat.

Zu guter Letzt, wer es noch nicht bemerkt hat: der Untertitel unserer Zeitschrift hat sich dem von der bisherigen Beschränkung auf antike Literatur nun auf Literatur aus allen Zeiten erweiterten thematischen Fokus angepasst. Und so wünschen wir jetzt viel Vergnügen bei der Lektüre der Herbstausgabe von ***eisodos*** – *Zeitschrift für Literatur und Theorie*.

Die Herausgeberinnen
Bettina Bohle
Universität Bonn
Lena Krauss
Universität Zürich
und die Redaktionsassistentin
Helen Neutzler
Ruhr-Universität Bochum

Niemanden überlisten
Odysseus, Namen und magische Algorithmen

Ein Essay von Xaver Römer
Schriftsteller

Warum Xaver Römer?

Sabine Leutheusser-Schnarrenberger und Willy Brandt, Homer und Kratylos, Natalie Portman und Pol Pot: Wen unter diesen Personen, so Sie sie treffen könnten, würden Sie nach der Herkunft ihres Namens fragen? Würden Sie das tun? Kämen Sie überhaupt auf die Idee? Warum bzw. warum nicht?

Die Frage nach meinem Namen wird von Menschen gestellt, die entweder um meinen bürgerlichen Namen wissen oder denen ein bayrischer Name für einen Westfalen spanisch vorkommt. Gewöhnlich umschiffe ich den Themenkomplex so weitläufig wie Odysseus Ithaka, da er auf Eigentlichkeitsvorstellungen abzielt, die ich weder teile noch anderen in ihrer Ansprache an mich aufbürden möchte. Denn das Selbstverständliche, die Anrede, wird ihnen zur psychologischen Hürde. Plötzlich tauchen Frage auf wie: Was ist die mir zustehende Anrede des Anderen? Darf ich ihn beim „eigentlichen“ Namen nennen oder muss ich seinen Entwurf respektieren? Verspricht die bürgerliche Anrede mehr Nähe? Oder welchen Zugriff wähle ich via welchen Namens auf die Person?

Dass ich nun aber doch auf die Frage eingehe, liegt a) an der Möglichkeit, mich in diesem Text an einer glücklichen Irrfahrt zu versuchen, b) an dem Phänomen problematischer Anrede, die gewöhnlich versteckt und unthematisch bleibt, trotzdem sie eine tägliche und fortwährende Hürde darstellt und c) sie in meinem Falle tatsächlich mit Rom zu tun hat.

Benutzt habe ich den Namen zuerst zeitens eines Chansonprogrammes, mit dem ich auf Kleinkünstbühnen aufgetreten bin. Künstlernamen sind in Kleinkunstbühnenkreisen Usus. Der Schritt war also leicht. Für mich war es ohnehin eine Zeit des persönlichen Umbruchs und statt nun den ganzen Ballast, der mit mir und meinem Namen assoziiert war, weiter durch die Lande zu schleppen, schien es mir leichter, einen neuen Entwurf anzulegen. Einen Entwurf auf ein leeres Blatt und ins Nichts. Deswegen der Xaver.

Xaver, so meine damalige Recherche, hat keine Bedeutung, ist eher ein Füllsel oder Anhängsel, in Doppelnamen wie Franz Xaver etwa, klingt gut und besitzt dieses phänomenale X am Anfang. Toll, wenn das eigene Initial zunächst einmal in einem X besteht. Ein X ist doch trotz Alpha und Omega so etwas wie das erste Zeichen und in seiner Bedeu-

tung so eingeschränkt wie ein Knoten im Taschentuch. In einer Welt allseits prasselnder Bedeutungen benimmt sich ein X zunächst zurückhaltend, steht es doch für niemanden und sagt nichts bzw. Nichts. Es ist vielleicht das leerste Zeichen, gleichzeitig aber auch der erste Stellvertreter eines unbestimmten Namens. Man erinnere sich an die Verträge, die Kolonialherren mit Vertretern Kolonialisierter abschlossen, wobei das X der Kolonialisierten als rechtsgültiges Einverständnis in eine für sie weder verständliche noch erschließbare, erst recht nicht via Schrift erschließbare Welt galt.

Mitte/Ende der 90er Jahre beschäftigte ich mich mit einigen Aspekten griechischer Antike. Ich weiß nicht mehr, ob es wirklich der Ausgangspunkt gewesen ist, als solcher ist mir aber Le Corbusiers *Ausblick auf eine Architektur* und seine Beschreibungen der Akropolis in Erinnerung. Die Spannung gekrümmter Achsen, so meine Erinnerung, war mir ein wichtiges Thema. (Das musikalische Pendant zur Achse ist vielleicht der Beat, der Taktschlag. Ein exakter Beat ist trostlos, häufig genug beweisen das computergenerierte Musiken. Erst mit Dehnung und Stauchung des Beats oder mit Unregelmäßigkeiten im Mikrotiming (Das Laid Back im Bossa Nova oder man höre mal auf Charly Watts HiHat in *Fool to cry* der Rolling Stones) entstehen Spannungen – *Groove* im Musikerjargon). Skulpturen waren Thema, die gemeißelten Gewänder der griechischen Klassik, die den Blick auf einen nackten Körper freigaben, dorische Säulen, die das tun, was sie zeigen. Solcherart waren meine erotisch-konstruktiven Gedanken. Statt nach Athen bin ich dann nach Rom gefahren.

In Rom ist alles auf einem Haufen. Rom ist kollosal. Aber wo ist das Leben, fragte der Romstipendiat Paul Nizon, und fokussierte das Unkraut in den Ritzen zwischen Steinen und Betonplatten.

Was mich im Baedeker interessierte, bin ich abgelaufen. Steine, Steine, Skultpuren, Gemälde, der überspannte Bernini, der gewaltige Moses, Steine, Steine, Steine und noch mehr Steine, Colloseum, Kirchen, Steine, Kirchen, Steine, Ausstellung hier, Ausstellung dort, ein zweisamer Abend mit einem italienischen Architekten auf der spanischen Treppe bei strömenden Regen, er sprach kein Englisch, ich kein Italienisch, also wichen wir auf lateinische Brocken aus, unterstützt durch seinen Weinkanister, dann wieder Steine, Kirchen, Museen, Fellinis Via Veneto, die reale Via Veneto, heilige Pforten und so weiter und so fort. Habe ich mich selbst oder hat diese Stadt mich durch den Wolf gedreht?

Wen ich dann für mich entdeckte: Caravaggio. In all diesem monströsen, von Macht und Gewalt erzählendem Rom – das zeitgenössische, eventuell ganz andersartige Rom habe ich nie gesehen – erzählten mir plötzlich – „plötzlich“ ist das treffende Stichwort – Caravaggios Bilder von angefüllten Augenblicken. Augenblicke, gegenwärtige, die vielerlei Aspekte ihrer sie zustande gebracht habenden Geschichte enthielten und die zarte Gefühle von Hoffnung besaßen. Seitdem stelle ich mir die Qualität von Benjamins Jetztzeit wie ein Gemälde Caravaggios vor. Aber das ist nur meine persönliche Geschichte und die ist auch ein wenig pathetisch.

Über diese hier skizzierte Reise, eine Geschichte, die ich mir über Rom erzählen kann, fand später der Römer in meinen Namen.

Vollständig war der von mir damals gewählte Name Xaver Gottschalk Römer, mit Gottschalk als zweitem Vornamen. Mein bürgerlicher Nachname bedeutet in unterschiedlichen Platts entweder Zimmer, wohl eine Kurzform von Zimmermann, oder könnte den Demmer meinen, den Narr also. Beide Deutungen gefallen mir in ihren metaphorischen Möglichkeiten. Der Narr scheint ja dann auch im Gottschalk noch durch. Zwecks Säkularisation und Entexotisierung habe ich den Gottschalk später gestrichen.

Mein bürgerlicher Vorname leitet sich vom römischen Kriegsgott ab. Zu Schulzeiten hatte ich manchmal fünf weitere Kriegsgötter neben mir. Statt nun aber gegeneinander zu Felde zu ziehen und um die Vorherrschaft des Gemeintseins bei Kriegsgottnennung zu kämpfen, gab es allerorts Umbenennungen, teils durch Lehrer und Freunde, teils selbstinitiiert. Einige dieser Umbenennungen haften in manchen Kreisen noch immer an mir, und an diesen Namen wiederum haftet Geschichte.

Von den sechs schulzeitlichen Kriegsgöttern ist, soweit mir bekannt, keiner seinem Namen nachgekommen. Weder waren sie kriegerischer als die Anna Blume zu ihrer Linken, noch göttlicher als der Religionslehrer vor ihrer Nase.

Von einem Hund geträumt zu haben, kann, so Freud, einfach nur bedeuten, von einem Hund geträumt zu haben. Am Ende einer etymologischen Spekulation steht wohl eine etymologische Spekulation. Daß sich über sie eine eigentliche oder wesentliche oder wahre Wortbedeutung finden ließe, sei dahingestellt. Im Dialog *Kratylos* läßt Platon Sokrates sagen: „Auf welche Weise man nun Erkenntnis der Dinge erlernen oder selbst finden soll, das einzusehen sind wir vielleicht nicht genug, ich und du; es genüge uns aber schon, darin übereinzukommen, daß nicht durch die Worte, sondern weit lieber durch sie selbst man sie [die Dinge] erforschen und kennenlernen muß als durch Worte.“

So früh also schon. So früh also schon existiert der Gedanke, daß im Begriff Eigentliches sich nicht ohne weiteres will fassen lassen.

Unzweifelhaft gibt es jedoch Bilder, die man sich von einem Namen macht. Hätte ich ein Kind, ich würde es kaum Martin, Oliver oder Stefanie nennen, denn diese Namen schränkten meine Phantasie für einen Lebensentwurf deutlich ein. Wir besitzen Gefühle für Namen. Die mögen irrational sein, unbedeutend sind sie nicht. Ein Kind wüßte glücklicherweise nichts davon, trotzdem hätte es mit meiner Wahl, durch die die Vorstellungswelten Anderer auf es zurückschlagen, zu leben.

Zurück zum Xaver: In seinem bewußten und hervorstechenden Gesetztsein funktioniert nun ausgerechnet das ursprünglich Intendierte nicht. Ein dem Süddeutschen entnommener Name läßt seinen Gebrauch im Westfälischen als einen gewollten Akt erscheinen. Es zeigt sich die Diskrepanz des Angesprochenen mit dem Akt des Ansprechens, zeigt sich das Auseinanderfallen von im Sprechakt Angezeigtem und dem Akt des Sprechens selbst.

Leere anzusprechen hebt die Bedeutung der Leere auf ein Podest, intentionale Intententionslosigkeit beherbergt ein Paradox.

Warum Beschäftigung mit Antike?

Antike ist uninteressant. Das hat sie mit anderen zeit- und gattungsgeschichtlichen Bezeichnungen wie Barock, Romantik, Erster oder Zweiter Weltkrieg, 50er Jahre, 68er etc. gemein. Interessant sind hingegen spezifische Erzählungen, deren Fragen, Antworten und Rezeption innerhalb einer Arbeit relevant erscheinen. Als solche entpuppten sich mir Odysseus und *Odyssee*, die ich als Figur einer bedeutungsüberschießenden Assoziationsfülle genutzt habe. Daher also die Frage:

Warum Beschäftigung mit Odysseus?

Ich hatte die Arbeit an meinem Gedichtband *Brett für Brett ins Paradies mit Bri:ta* abgeschlossen, ihn Johann Reißer zum inhaltlichen Lektorat gegeben und erwartete seine Anmerkungen, die ich dann im Laufe der nächsten Tage einarbeiten wollte.

Ein Gedicht, *Colossi*, verhandelte abstrakt und metaphorisch Bewegungen auf einer Theaterbühne. In diesem Gedicht bezeichnete ich Odysseus als Metaphernkoloss, der den leeren Tisch stehen lassen solle. Ich dachte an den oft zitierten Odysseus als eine Figur, die eine Vielzahl umfangreicher und wiederholt erzählter und variierter Geschichten bereits mitbringt, wodurch seine bloße Nennung allen verfügbaren Raum ungeniert ausfüllt, ja besser: vollstopft und verrammelt. Kein Platz für leere Tische, weder faktisch noch metaphorisch, stattdessen imaginierte Auftritte und Tänze von Sirenen, Freiern, Kalypso, Skylla und Kirke, Gefährten in Schweinsform und dergleichen mehr in allen Räumen und herausgehoben auf der Theke. Johanns Bemerkung zu dieser Stelle war: zu wenig. Zu wenig, sagte er, und ich dachte, es sei doch schon alles voll.

Mein Gedichtband erschien erst über ein Jahr später als geplant. „Zu wenig“ meinte in diesem Fall „zu indifferent“, eine gemeine Anmerkung, die sich prinzipiell gegenüber allem wiederholen läßt, die prinzipiell alles ins Unrecht setzt. Gut, dass Johann sich so äußerte, anders wäre der jüngste Zyklus des Bandes nicht entstanden, anders klaffte da eine vollgestopfte Leerstelle, drückte da ein industriell gefertigter Sahnepudding aus Zucker, Fett und künstlichen Aromen.

Thematisierung schafft Raum und Zeit. Die Thematisierung einer Sache, einer Person, einer Beziehung erschafft die Zeit, die wir gedanklich mit ihr verbringen. Sicher sind weitere Aspekte für die zeitliche Ausdehnung verantwortlich, die Autorität des Thematisierenden etwa, die Thematisierung selbst aber ist das Initial. Ohne Ansprache der Fluchtbewegungen von Menschen vor was auch immer als Krise, gäbe es eventuell kein Gefühl von Krise – was auch die politischen Folgen andere sein ließe. Ohne Johanns Bemerkung wäre kein Polyphemzyklus entstanden und ohne den Zyklus die Gewichtung innerhalb des Bandes eine andere.

*

1929 gab es Untersuchungen zu dominanten Assoziationen (Primärantworten auf Reizworte eines Assoziationstestes), die 1952 wiederholt wurden. Der überwiegende Teil dominanter Assoziationen (etwa Tisch: Stuhl) blieb stabil, interessant aber ist, dass die Diversität der Antworten abnahm. „Die häufigsten Responses von 1929 sind auch 1952 noch die häufigsten, aber ihre Häufigkeit ist um ein Drittel gestiegen ... individuelle Reaktionen [werden] immer seltener. 1952 sagen fast alle das gleiche“[1]. Verantwortlich machten die Autoren die Ausbreitung von Massenmedien und die Standardisierung der Schulbildung in dem Zeitraum. Das, was einerseits zur größeren Verbreitung von Ideen, Bildung, Nachrichten und dergleichen mehr führte, und in dessem Gefolge Demokratisierung und Chancengleichheit idealerweise auf eine breitere Basis gestellt werden sollten, führte andererseits zur Verringerung dominanter Positionen und damit zur Beschneidung von Perspektiven auf oder Aspekten an einer Sache. Dass Google hinsichtlich dieser Entwicklung die allgemeine Nivellierung beschleunigt, ist wahrscheinlich. Vermutlich liegt ohnehin eine rekursive Schleife vor, wenn das Ergebnis einer Suche in einen Text mündet, der bei einer nachfolgenden Suche dann wiederum berücksichtigt wird.

Eine Möglichkeit, Befragungen zu dominanten Assoziationsmustern heute schnell und einfach zu wiederholen, ist die Suche via eben diesem Beinahemonopolisten Google. Die Ergebnisse sollten zumindest Googles Algorithmen und deren Auswahl aus den prominentesten Webseiten reflektieren. Vielleicht ergäben persönliche Befragungen andere Ergebnisse, mit Sicherheit auch verhandeln die unzähligen Bearbeitungen des Stoffes ein breiteres Spektrum an Aspekten. Doch sucht man nun Odysseus und Odyssee bei Google, so finden sich in den Ergebnissen immer wieder folgende prominente Begriffe: Irrfahrt, Held, Trojanischer Krieg ...

Und die Berliner Zeitung schreibt, Leopold Bloom, die berühmte Adaption Odysseus' im *Ulysses* von James Joyce, teile alle Charaktereigenschaften des listenreichen, vieles erduldenden Odysseus: Er sei klug und umsichtig, immer interessiert und neugierig, dabei zurückhaltend und vorsichtig, er sei selbstbeherrscht, anpassungsfähig und geduldig, treuer Ehemann und zugleich untreuer Liebhaber. (Berliner Zeitung, 24.2.01)

Obige Charakterisierungen und assoziierten Begriffe prägen die Vorstellungswelten, die mit der Nennung Odysseus zuvörderst aufgerufen werden. Diese einerseits leicht unscharfen und stets auch flukturierenden, andererseits aber auch im Kern sehr stabilen semantische Felder können die gesellschaftliche Wirklichkeit einer Rezeption genannt werden.

Gemeinhin sind Odysseus und *Odyssee* Synonyme für die Irrfahrten der Menschen. Mutig irrfahrende Figuren verdienen sich unser Mitleid oder unsere Bewunderung. Und so wurden Odysseus' Geschichten auch immer wieder erzählt, dominant erzählt: Voller Mitleid oder Bewunderung, oder in der Identifikation mit seiner Figur auch als Klage.

[1] Hans Hörmann, *Psychologie der Sprache*, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1977, 77.

Wer aber in Odysseus einzig einen positiv konnotierten Helden erblickt, die *Odyssee* nur als Irrfahrt erzählt, greift auf sie zu wie die Zeugen Jehovas auf die Bibel: wörtlich, fraglos und weitere Schichten außer Acht lassend.

*

In den homerischen Epen sind einige Figuren mit Epitheta versehen. Diese Beiwörter dienten wohl der Charakterisierung einer Person zur schnelleren Erkennbarkeit bei mündlichem Vortrag sowie der Unterstützung der Erinnerung des Vortragenden. Odysseus besitzt mehrere dieser Epitheta: das allbekannte „listig“ etwa und auch das Wort „weitgereist“. Ein drittes, ebenfalls häufiger verwendetes, das aber in den googleschen Ergebnissen selten nur auftaucht, ist der „Städtezerstörer“. Der Städtezerstörer Odysseus.

Vermutlich stammt Odysseus volksetymologisch vom griechischen *odýssomai* ab und meint den Zornigen. Der zornige Odysseus oder einfach nur: der Zornige.

Im 9ten Gesang der *Odyssee* bezeichnet sich Odysseus gegenüber dem Polyphem als Niemand. Dies ist seine List, um den Fängen des Polyphems zu entkommen. Als der geblendete Polyphem seine Inselnachbarn und Mitkyklopen zur Hilfe ruft, antwortet der Polyphem auf ihre Frage, wer ihm ein Leid getan habe, mit: „Niemand, Niemand hat mir ein Leid getan.“ Verständlicherweise verabschieden sich die Kyklopenkollegen daraufhin, wahrscheinlich kopfschüttelnd über einen derartig unsinnigen Hype mitten in der Nacht.

Dass Odysseus sich Niemand nennt, könnte auch ein im Deutschen nicht erkennbares Wortspiel sein. Zu dem Zeitpunkt, als Odysseus dem Polyphem seinen Namen nennt, ist dieser, verführt von Odysseus, längst trunken. Mit schweren Sinnen verhört es sich leicht. So wäre denkbar, dass ein teils verstandener Odyss… dem Polyphem als *outis* (Niemand) zu Ohren kommt[2], ein Versehen, mit dem sich seitens Odysseus gut leben läßt.

Früh in der Erzählung zeigt sich ein in seiner Naturwüchsigkeit brutal anarchistischer Polyphem, der wie aus dem Nichts mehrere Gefährten verschlingt, was Odysseus den Einsatz aller Mittel moralisch legitimiert. Aber war dieser gewaltsame Akt wirklich das Initial? Bereits bei der Anfahrt auf die Inselgruppe der Kyklopen will Odysseus wissen, ob die Inselbewohner gerechte und gottesfürchtige Männer sind. Und er möchte von seinem ihm selbstverständlichen Gastrecht Gebrauch machen. So waren es Odysseus’ Recht und Odysseus’ Götter, die hier die Regel setzten, das war selbstverständlich. Es war Odysseus selbst verständlich. Dort, wo Odysseus stand, war er selbst – ganz tautologisch. Begeht nicht diese Perspektive die erste Penetration, indem sie den eigenen Standpunkt ins Fremde hineinbohrt?

Im weiteren Verlauf der Erzählung verleitet Odysseus den Polyphem zur Trunkenheit, blendet ihn, belügt, täuscht, beraubt ihn und verhöhnt ihn zuletzt. Odysseus, selbsternannter Niemand, unfaßbarer Mister X, agiert regelsetzend, urteilend, strafend, ist also

[2] Den Hinweis auf das mögliche Wortspiel odyss/outis verdankt der Autor dem Band *Niemands Frau* von Barbara Köhler, Frankfurt a. M. 2007.

Legislative, Judikative und Exekutive in Personalunion. Die meist namenlosen Gefährten sind dabei Menschenmaterial, anonyme Verlängerung der Exekutive, verschleißbar.

Ändern wir nun Googles Begriffswolke und streuen einige der obigen Begriffe ein, so ergibt sich folgendes: Held, Zorn, Irrfahrt, Niemand, List, Städtezerstörer, Verführer.

Die Zusammenschau dieser Begriffe intendiert eine andere Geschichte, als die uns gemeinhin bekannte. Will man in der *Odyssee* einen frühen europäischen Gründungsmythos, eine Handlung legitimierende oder wiederholende oder kritisch distanzierende Erzählung erblicken, so stellt sich diese Gründung als eine paternalistisch gewaltvolle und regelgebietende Annexion Fremder dar – fremder Gebiete, fremder Völker, fremder Gedanken –, mit einem städtezerstörenden, zornigen Wüterich namens Niemand als Annektor.

*

Polyphem und Odysseus können als janusköpfige Gestalt oder als zwei Aspekte einer Seele gedacht werden. Sie verkörpern die Dichotomie von Natur und Ordnung, stellen darin ein Verständnis und einen Zugriff auf die Welt dar und ihre Konfrontation mündet in einen Schuldzusammenhang. Spekulativ weit gedacht könnte Odysseus' Blendung des Polyphems auch meinen, die Natur durch einen ordnenden Zugriff ihrer Sehkraft zu berauben – womit leichterdings weitere Erzählungen initiierbar wären.

In der Vorstellung geht der Naturzustand einer Ordnung voran. Natur oder Naturzustand sind aber nur symbolisch vorhanden, konkret festgestellt oder erzeugt werden können sie nicht, und das auf sie verweisende Symbol, z. B. der Begriff *Natur*, ist Teil der *Ordnung*, die *Ordnung* und *Natur* als Widerpart setzt. Anders: Die Ideen von *Natur* und *Ordnung* sind im sie umhüllenden, generierenden und ihnen assoziierten semantischen Feld wenn nicht enge Verwandte so zumindest Nachbarn. Die Vorstellungsgrenzen des Naturbelassenen sind in der Ordnung, die den Begriff benützt, bereits gezogen. Deswegen sind Polyphem und Odysseus ein Verständnis von und ein Zugriff auf Welt.

*

Immer wieder zentral, auch für Spannung und den bei Laune gehalten werden wollenden Leser zentral, stehen die Listen des Odysseus. Listen kennzeichnen vier Merkmale: Vorteilsgewinnung, Feststellung, Strategie und Geheimhaltung. Ihr Motiv ist die Vorteilsgewinnung, analytisch sind sie die Feststellung von Verhältnissen, inhaltlich sind sie die Berechnung einer Strategie und die Strategie bleibt geheim bis sich der gewünschte Effekt einstellt. Als fünftes und sechstes Merkmal stehen bei geglücktem Ausgang der Triumph – eventuell auch Hohn – und die Wertung des Listersinners zum Helden.

Die Feststellung ist dabei eine Liste von Sachverhalten, die Strategie ein auf die Sachverhalte angewandter Algorithmus. Wenn Odysseus und seine Gefährten sich mittels einer List aus den Fängen des Polyphems befreien, könnte dies analytisch auch so beschrieben werden:

Feststellung: Anwesend in der Höhle sind Odysseus, Gefährten, Polyphem, Herde; Stein verschließt Zugang; Polyphem ist geblendet; geöffnet wird der Zugang vom Polyphem nur, um die Herde hinauszulassen.

Strategie: Verstecken von Odysseus und seinen Gefährten unter den Bäuchen der Tiere, wenn diese hinausgetrieben werden. Vertrauen auf die nur oberflächliche Abtastung seiner Herde durch den Polyphem – eine tiefergehende Untersuchung, eine Analyse, widersprüche eben auch der Natur des Naturburschen Polyphem.

Der Zweck einer List ist die Vorteilsgewinnung, also die Überrumpelung eines Gegners, selbstredend gegen dessen Willen. Im sokratischen[3] Sinn ist eine List verwerflich, da ein Gerechter an niemandem Ungerechtigkeiten begehen kann. Der Unterschied zwischen einer sokratischen und einer odysseischen Auseinandersetzung könnte auch so beschrieben werden: Eine sokratische Auseinandersetzung sucht den bei gleichen (und gerechten) Mitteln Stärkeren, ein odysseischer Kampf sucht einen Gewinner bei gleich welchen Mitteln, sokratisch ist die Orientierung aufs Gemeinwohl, odysseisch die aufs Privatwohl.

Listen sind *das* zentrale Element der Programmierung und sofern sie mittels Algorithmen bearbeitet werden, beginnen sie, einer klassischen List zu ähneln. Aktuell bleibt uns der überwiegende Teil ergebnisbestimmender Algorithmen verborgen, Programmierer und Firmen hüten ihre Berechnungen wie ihre Augäpfel. Der Sinn der Geheimhaltung liegt wenn nicht in der Überrumpelung so doch zumindest in der Übertrumpfung eines Mitbewerbers oder Konkurrenten. Odysseische Listen wie auch wettbewerbsorientierte Algorithmen stehen im diametralen Gegensatz zum zeitgenössischen *Open Source*-Gedanken.

*

Berechnungen mittels künstlicher Intelligenz und neuronaler Netze mögen magisch erscheinen, da der Einblick in ihre Funktionsweise fehlt. Computer berechnen selbständig, d.h. es existieren rekursive Methoden, die ihre Ergebnisse untereinander verschalten und in neue Berechnungen, ja selbst in Form neuer Algorithmen, wieder einbeziehen können.

[3] „Sokratisch“ wird hier als Begriff eher spekulativ und der einfacheren Gegenüberstellung halber verwendet. Aber für seine Verwendung sprechen mehrere Punkte:

- Die Frage der Gerechtigkeit, die Odysseus auf die Kyklopen zusegelnd angeblich umtreibt, ist Gegenstand allgemeiner Eröterung in Platons erstem Buch in *Der Staat*. Dort wird explizit formuliert, dass ein Gerechter, will er dem Gerecht-sein entsprechen, einen Ungerechten niemals noch ungerechter werden lassen kann.
- „Somit entpuppt sich unser Gerechter als Dieb? Das hast du wohl von Homer gelernt?“ sagt Platons Sokrates (*Der Staat*, 334a). Platon selbst zieht hier schon die Verbindung zu Homer.
- Spannend am vorangehenden Punkt ist darüberhinaus:
  - Odysseus wie auch Sokrates sind Figuren ihrer Autoren, es gibt also in der Perspektive auf die Erzählperspektive eine Parallele.
  - Platons Sokrates identifiziert Homer mit Odysseus, differenziert also nicht zwischen Autor und Figur und daher auch nicht zwischen Autor- und Figurenintention. Wenn wir selbst nun aber diese Differenzierung hinsichtlich Platon und Sokrates anwenden, was ergibt sich dann?

Menschen speisen zwar die Computer mit Methoden und Daten und lesen und interpretieren die so erzeugten Ergebnisse, einzelne Schritte der Berechnung aber sind nicht mehr nachvollziehbar – sei es bereits wegen der schieren Menge der Rechenschritte und Daten, sei es wegen der Unmöglichkeit, sich ändernde Algorithmen und rekursive Methoden noch zu dokumentieren, bzw. diese Dokumentationen händisch zu lesen. Konkret jedoch sind die Ergebnisse Gewichtungen und diese Gewichtungen sind, nicht sonderlich magisch, Zahlen.

Mathematische Entitäten und sprachlichen Begriffe werden via Übersetzung verbunden. Gleich ob nun die 1 einem Ja oder 0,35725 einem Jeiiinn entspricht, in beiden Fällen herrscht ein assoziativer Sprung und keine dieser Verbindungen ist zwingend. (Das gilt natürlich auch in die umgekehrte Richtung der Übersetzung eines Jas in eine 1.) Zahlen besitzen keine Magie, solange man nicht in das Feld ihrer Bedeutung hinüberhoppelt.

Als magisch bezeichne ich Zustände, in denen wir nicht nur kein Wissen über das Zustandekommen eines Zustandes haben, sondern noch nicht mal mehr eine Methode benennen können, wie man an das Wissen gelangen könnte.

Semantische Felder sind da weitaus magischer, da alles Denken über Sprache in den verflossenen Jahrzehnthunderttausenden uns noch immer nicht die vollständigen Werkzeuge zur Erklärung ihrer Funktionsweise geliefert hat. Dieser unerklärbare Rest, mal größer, mal kleiner, ist ihre Magie.

Bei der Übersetzung von Begriffen in Zahlen geht nun zunächst Magie verloren, da Zahlen ja nicht magisch sind, während bei der Interpretation der wieder rückübersetzten Ergebnisse wieder Magie hinzutritt. Das nun sind bezaubernde Wandlungen.

*

Joris Huysmann wurde nach der Veröffentlichung seines Romans *Gegen den Strich* lange Zeit für einen Experten lateinischer Literatur gehalten, da er im Roman ausführlich lateinische Autoren und deren Werke bespricht. Die entsprechenden Passagen in seinem Roman hatte er aber aus Fachliteratur übernommen. Nicht die lateinischer Literatur, ihre Strömungen, Absichten und Verheißungen waren sein Thema, sondern die Charakterisierung seiner Hauptfigur als eine sich auf diversen Feldern um Expertentum bemühende und Expertentum meisternde. Der Rahmen der äußeren Erzählung des Romans wertet diese Eigenschaft der Hauptfigur eher als Krankheit.

Blickt man nun mit Abstand auf die Polyphemerzählung und bezieht ihre nächsthöhere Erzählebene ein, so zeigt sich ein Odysseus, der Alkinoos seine Geschichte erzählt, um von ihm Unterstützung bei seiner Heimfahrt zu erhalten. Listigkeit erscheint in der homerischen *Odyssee* als positive, bewundernswerte Eigenschaft, die ihren Träger zum unterstützungswerten Helden auszeichnet. Odysseus' Interesse bei der Erzählung einer Geschichte, deren Ausgang ihm bekannt ist, ist also eine ihn ins günstige Licht setzende Handlung. Ob es nun eine List des Odysseus war, sich Niemand zu nennen, oder aber

ein dem Odysseus zupass kommender Hörfehler durch Trunkenheit seitens Polyphems, läßt sich nicht entscheiden. Und dank der Perspektive, die Homer durch die Binnenerzählung des Odysseus setzt, lassen sich Interesse und Sachverhalte in den Geschichten selten trennen.

Schrauben wir nun den Fokus erneut um eine Stufe hinaus, setzen ihn auf den Autor (und überspringen dabei geflissentlich, dass auch das Gespräch zwischen Odysseus und Alkinoos bereits durch die Erzählebene des Göttergesprächs gerahmt ist), so rückt die Intention Homers in den Blick: Was will er zeigen? Was will er festhalten? Eine Geschichte, ein Märchen? Eine metaphorische Erzählung über die Sicht und den Zugriff auf Welt seitens seiner Vorfahren und Zeitgenossen? Soll es Unterhaltungsliteratur sein, ein Lehrstück, eine moralische Geschichte zur Erziehung der Jugend?

Die Gebrüder Grimm sammelten deutsche Volks- und Hausmärchen. Bei der Zusammenstellung ließen sie sich durch Freunde und Bekannte unterstützen, so auch durch die Familie Droste-Hülshoff. Daß der Feder der adeligen und in Annette von Droste-Hülshoff auch literaturerfahrenen Familie rohe und originäre Volksmärchen entsprangen, ist reichlich unwahrscheinlich. Das ein oder andere Märchen ist wohl erst für die Sammlung erdacht worden und ein originäres Produkt des 19ten Jahrhunderts.

Wie viele Homers war Homer? Wie viele Helfer und Zulieferer hatten er oder sie? Welche Geschichten lagen seiner- oder ihrerzeit in der Luft? Vorangehende Fragen werden unter dem Begriff *Homerische Frage* gefaßt. Ausgehend von der modernen Vorstellung, in einer Autorschaft liege immer schon eine Gemeinschaftsarbeit und Mitverantwortung Anderer vor, besitzt die Homerische Frage ein vielfach Verwickeltes: So zerren sowohl in der Entstehung als auch der Rezeption Fragen und Vorstellungen an der Idee des Einzigartigen, Wesentlichen und Identitären.

*

Vielleicht waren die Homers große Psychologen. Jedenfalls geben sie dem Odysseus einen kennzeichnenden Zug mit: Eitelkeit. In seiner Eitelkeit nämlich kann er dann doch nicht anders, als sich zuletzt dem Polyphem erkennen zu geben. Odysseus sagt: „Kyklop! Wofern dich einer der sterblichen Menschen befragen wird nach deines Auges unwürdiger Blendung, so sage, daß Odysseus, der Städtezerstörer, dich blind gemacht hat.“ Für einen wahren Triumph und um die Leistung des Odysseus zu erkennen und anerkennen zu können, darf er dem Polyphem kein Niemand bleiben.

*

Augenscheinlich lassen sich aus der Nennung des Namens Odysseus komplexe Gebilde entfalten. Und so wie ein in den Sand gezeichnetes X möglicherweise verweht, möglicherweise Versuch eines ersten Zeichens ist oder auch die Selbstermächtigung zur Inbesitzname riesiger Gebiete, so reicht die Bedeutung der Figur Niemand von marginal bis ungeheuer.

Seine Thematisierung kann das Initial einer Neubewertung und Umschreibung sein und die Umschreibung, eine Geschichts- und Geschichtenrevision, gewichtet neu. Das Ergebnis ist magisch, sofern semantischen Feldern eben immer mehr Magie anhaftet als Zahlenkolonnen. Aber auch wenn die Analyse Fakten, Thesen und Argumente bemüht, so liegt das angestrebte Ziel doch im Bereich des Gefühls. Es geht um Empathie, es geht um Antipathie, es geht um die Gewichtung von Gefühlen.

Die einfache Antwort auf die Ausgangsfrage 'Warum Odysseus?' lautet: Seine Thematisierung war Zufall. Aber in der Entfaltung seiner Figur zeigte sich ein Kaleidoskop bestechend moderner Themen und diese sind so komplex verschränkt, wie es Aussagen über unsere Umgebung angemessen ist. In einer trumpierend triumphierenden Welt ist Komplexität wieder offen ins Feld zu führen und Gefühle sind bewußt und differenziert zu gestalten, während man ihrer Gewichtung lauscht.

Über Xaver Römer Xaver Römer, geboren 1969, studierte Jazzgitarre in Rotterdam, wohnt in Köln und schreibt Lyrik und Prosa. Xaver Römer hat neben zahlreichen Texten, Essays und Gedichten etwa in *Metonymie* (Berlin 2013), *Westfalen, sonst nichts?* (Köln Aachen 2014), *Schliff* (Köln 2015), ein Hörspiel für Kinder (*Die sprechende Banane*, 2000 für SWR, RB), einen Beitrag auf der Internetseite für Kinder mit den Namen Stimmwerk (`http://wortwusel.net/Stimmwerk/stimmwerk.html`, 2010), einen Poesiefilm (*Ausflug gen Polen*, 2011) und eine Performance mit ca. 25 Mobiltelefonen (*Fährt ein weißes Schiff nach Hongkong*, 2012) veröffentlicht. Seit 2009 treten Julia Trompeter und Xaver Römer mit den sogenannten Sprechduetten auf, bisher sind zwei CDs erschienen (*gnip-gnop*, 2009 und *PaPaPst*, 2011). 2018 werden Sprechduette mit Texten und Bearbeitungen zu Annette von Droste-Hülshoff unter dem Titel *Geschwehle, Droste-Wavelet* im Aisthesis Verlag, Bielefeld erscheinen. Zuletzt erschienen sind von Xaver Römer 2016 der Gedichtband *Brett für Brett ins Paradies mit Bri:ta*; außerdem verfasste er 2017 mehrere Kurzhörspiele für die Sendung *Sein und Streit* im Deutschlandfunk Kultur.

Female Voices and Values in Epigrams of Mourning

Anyte of Tegea and Emily Dickinson

Amanda Kubic
Washington University

Male poets largely dominate the long and complex history of the Western epigram. The Latin poets Martial and Catullus are often cited as the leading epigrammatists from the ancient world, and male authors like Ben Jonson and Oscar Wilde are most closely associated with the genre in later centuries.[1] Yet it can be argued that some of the most innovative writers of epigram were women. During the third century BCE in ancient Greece, epigram developed from its original form as inscription on stone monuments into a formalized, sophisticated genre for literary expression.[2] One of the most understudied writers of these Hellenistic epigrams is also one of the few female poets from ancient Greece whose work survives: Anyte of Tegea. Anyte not only sought to secure a place for epigram among the major literary genres of ancient Greece, but she is also the "first epigrammatist to project a distinct literary persona" by "setting herself, as a woman and an inhabitant of largely rural Arcadia, in opposition to the traditional [male] composer of inscribed epigram."[3] During the nineteenth century in Amherst, Massachusetts, another female poet also re-worked the traditional epigram and introduced a distinct blending of masculine and feminine points of view to the genre: Emily Dickinson. While these two female poets are rather removed from each other in space and time, a comparison of their epigrammatic poetry—particularly those poems that deal with death in war—reveals how both Anyte and Dickinson react to their prominent male poetic predecessors and contemporaries as well as to their socio-historical circumstances by appropriating male, heroic modes of expression and introducing feminine values and perspectives to this traditionally masculine context. Both poets transform the male-authored epigrammatic tradition by elevating typically less-valued female concerns and points of view alongside of or in place of male ones. In doing so, Anyte and Dickinson declare these female values and voices worthy of preservation in the literary tradition.

It is important to keep in mind that the labels "masculine" and "feminine," as discussed here, are socially constructed terms. As Kleinman notes, "gender refers to cultural

[1] A.B. Coiro (2016) 112–113.
[2] See Gutzwiller (1993) 71 on the development of Hellenistic epigram.
[3] Gutzwiller (1993) 72.

expectations for how males and females should behave."[4] Gender is distinct from biological sex, in that it consists of the expectations that go along with "being ascribed to a male or female sex category."[5] None of the values, behaviors, and attitudes associated with masculinity and femininity are inherently gendered, yet patriarchal society has made it so that characteristics like tenderness, compassion, and domesticity are coded as female while heroism, courage, and patriotism are coded as male. In this way, gender is a key feature of organizing social life, as well as a category of inequality, with masculine-coded behaviors and traits being more valued than feminine ones. Because gender is so central to the way one perceives both the world and one's self, it is important when examining literary texts to study the way that gender expectations and categories shape an author's work. For female authors like Anyte and Dickinson, a critical feminist approach that analyzes these authors' relationships to traditional gender oppositions and expectations can help reveal how patriarchal constructions of femininity and masculinity influenced their poetics. This article attempts to implement such an approach.

Anyte has received little attention from scholars, especially in comparison to other female Hellenistic poets like Corinna and Nossis. What particularly merits further study is the way Anyte introduces a feminine voice and emphasizes traditionally female concerns in her epigrams. While Wright (1923) contends that Anyte's verse has "masculine" characteristics and Wilamowitz (1924) claims that Anyte's poems lack "personal" and "womanly" qualities,[6] Banard (1991) maintains that Anyte does more in her poems than simply imitate typical Greek patriarchal values. Even more recent scholars such as Gutzwiller (1993) and Greene (2000) have argued that Anyte's poems do in fact display a uniquely female perspective. This article, focusing specifically on Anyte's epigrams about men who die in war, intends to expand on these investigations of Anyte's deviation from socially constructed masculine values and modes of expression and her elevation of the feminine.

Emily Dickinson, unlike Anyte, has been the subject of a vast amount of critical study. The past three decades have seen an increase in scholarship that examines Dickinson as a woman poet whose work experiments with gender representations and expectations.[7] Most recently, Loeffelholz (2016) examines Dickinson's play with conventional gender norms and her undermining of the constructed categories "man" and "woman". The analysis of Dickinson's poems in this article is greatly indebted to Loeffelholz's work. Yet, despite the broad array of scholarship that exists on Dickinson, a scholarly comparison of Dickinson and Anyte has never been undertaken. Such a comparison is worthwhile for it may lead to a better understanding of how both Anyte and Dickinson revolutionize the genre of

[4] Kleinman (n. d.) 1.
[5] Kleinman (n. d.) 1.
[6] Wright (1923) 328 and Wilamowitz (1924) 136.
[7] Notable examples include Pollak (1984), Bennett (1990), Loeffelholz (1991), Miller (2012), and Loeffelholz (2016).

epigram. As women writers choosing to represent women's voices and values in their poems about death in war, they assert that such perspectives are just as important as men's and merit a place in the male-dominated tradition.

In his book *The Challenge of Comparative Literature* (1993), Claudio Guillén discusses three types of comparison available to literary theorists. One of these is comparison among works from different civilizations with no "genetic contacts" that nevertheless exist under "common sociohistorical conditions." Another is comparison among "genetically independent phenomena" that one may bring together through a theoretical premise.[8] Certainly, third century BCE Arcadia and mid to late nineteenth century Amherst are vastly different civilizations, and the poems of Anyte and Dickinson do not share any obvious "genetic contacts."[9] There are, however, common socio-historical conditions that link Anyte's epigrams about death in the context of war to Dickinson's.

Both Anyte and Dickinson lived in eras where women were excluded from the dominant, male, public and political sphere, and where the violence and turmoil of warfare were part of the fabric of daily life. Anyte's homeland Tegea, a settlement in ancient Arcadia, was constantly at war with the Greek city-state Sparta, which controlled Tegea during the third century. Indeed, throughout the third century and culminating in 222 BCE when it was forced to join the confederation of Greek city-states known as the Achaean League, Tegea suffered a gradual loss of political power.[10] Anyte would have thus lived through continuous political and military upheaval. Dickinson would have likewise experienced political and social unrest in the decades leading up to the American Civil War, as well as the war itself, and its turbulent aftermath.

It is evident looking at popular poems from these and other war-torn periods that such wartime contexts typically breed and esteem traditional masculine, heroic, or epic values, which are then reflected or reinforced in literature. One may look to such poems as Simonides' famous epitaph for those who died at the battle of Thermopylae[11] or Whitman's "Oh Captain! My Captain!" and "Beat! Beat! Drums!" to see the kind of heroic, male, patriotic ethos that pervades the poetry of these periods. It is this ethos that Anyte and Dickinson react to, or rather against. Particularly in their epigrams that have to do with death and mourning in war, these poets introduce a female persona and values culturally coded as female into the traditional world of masculine achievements and principles. To differing degrees, both internalize or appropriate the typical male perception of death and loss. Yet Anyte and Dickinson also frequently disrupt or undermine this male perspective by choosing to focus on the female experience and female world of grief. Such perspectives,

[8] Guillén (1993) 69–70.

[9] It is possible that Dickinson was exposed to some classical epigrams while she attended Amherst Academy from 1840–1847, but it is more likely she inherited the tradition from earlier English poets; see Miller (2012) 28–29.

[10] Roy (2012).

[11] See Campbell (1982) 90–91 for Simonides fragment 531.

while typically not valued or represented in the male tradition, are presented by Anyte and Dickinson as worthy of regard and careful expression.

Gutzwiller and Greene note how Anyte often transforms male-centered discourse and heroic tradition by appropriating masculine language and applying it to more domestic circumstances. This re-working of male tradition through a female perspective is evident in Epigram 4,[12] where the speaker mourns a soldier who has died in battle:

> Youths buried you, oh Chief. Just as children with their mother,
> Pheidias, having perished, you sent them into murky sorrow,
> But the rock that is above you sings this beautiful song
> That you died for your dear fatherland, fighting.[13]

Greene notes that it is "by means of a simile" in lines two and three of the epigram that Anyte "performs a kind of gender inversion that significantly transforms male-centered discourses of public praise for the dead."[14] Anyte compares the dead chief or military captain to a mother, and the youths burying the chief to the mother's children. Through this simile, Anyte shifts the focus of the epigram from the heroic, masculine, and indeed rather Homeric image of the commander fallen in battle to a scene of mourning that, while not inherently feminine, is culturally coded as feminine because of its domesticity. Anyte appropriates the kind of language about collective lament and patriotic glory typically used in funeral orations of the classical period,[15] and through it elevates not just the slain chief, but also the imagined mother who has died, and whom her children now grieve.

The final two lines of Epigram 4 employ an innovative figure of speech, which Geoghegan calls "the bold metaphor of the singing stone."[16] While Geoghegan and other scholars read these lines as a rather orthodox celebration of the chief's manly, heroic death, Greene's analysis seems more correct in that these two lines employ an "ironic twist" to emphasize the "cold," "dead," or "impersonal" character of the singing stone, which is more focused on "abstract glory" than on deeply felt personal suffering.[17] The stone is not moved by the chief's death, just as the chief's fatherland is not moved by his brave sacrifice. The chief, unlike the mother, has no actual children to sing his praises and remember him after he dies. He has only an inanimate, immovable stone. These two lines, rather than reinforcing established Homeric and Greek male values, use the traditional language of patriotism and heroism to undermine these values. Through these

[12] Numbers used for Anyte's poems are from Gow/Page (1965).

[13] Geoghegan (1979): Ἦβα μέν σε, πρόαρχε, ἔσαν· παίδων ἅτε ματρός, / Φειδία, ἐν δνοφερῷ πένθει ἔθου φθίμενος, / ἀλλὰ καλόν τοι ὕπερθεν ἔπος τόδε πέτρος ἀείδει / ὡς ἔθανες πρὸ φίλας μαρνάμενος πατρίδος. All translations are my own.

[14] Greene (2000) 28.

[15] See Holst-Warhaft (1992) 124 for an analysis of classical funeral oration and its differences from laments of the Homeric/archaic period.

[16] Geoghegan (1979) 62.

[17] Greene (2000) 30.

lines as well as through the metaphor in the first elegiac distich, Anyte reveals her poetic perspective to be distinctly more empathetic and critical of war, traits culturally coded as feminine. She appropriates traditional masculine language in her epigrams and inserts her own female point of view into the male-dominated literary tradition upheld by poets like Homer, Simonides, and Anacreon. Anyte in fact offers an "alternative" to this world of masculine battle, death, and glory in her world that is "ruled by feminine sensibilities and rural values."[18]

Emily Dickinson likewise appropriates language typically used by male poets to extol the glory and sacrifice of those who have died in war. Indeed, in her epigrammatic poem "The first We knew of Him was Death," she interrogates the notion propounded both by earlier classical poets and some of her contemporaries that heroic, manly death brings undying glory. She writes:

> The first We knew of Him was Death –
> The second, was Renown –
> Except the first had justified
> The second had not been – [19]

Dickinson composed this poem in 1865, the year that the American Civil war ended. While there is no explicit mention of war in this poem, and no clear indication that Dickinson was thinking of the Civil War when she composed this epigram, nevertheless scholars have argued that many of the poems Dickinson wrote between 1861 and1865 were inspired by the Civil War.[20] Many of these poems have less oblique references to the war, such as "It feels a shame to be Alive" (1863) and "My Portion is Defeat – today" (1863), in which Dickinson considers what it means to be an outsider to the war or a noncombatant, especially when so many young men are sacrificing their lives for the cause. It is thus not implausible to analyze the epigram above against the backdrop of the American Civil War.

"The first We knew of Him was Death," like Anyte's Hellenistic Greek epigram, consists of four lines, and has a rather riddling quality that is characteristic of the genre. In these lines, Dickinson problematizes the connection between "Death" and "Renown." There seem to be two ways to read this connection. The first is that it is only death that justifies the post-mortem renown that this man receives. In other words, if the man had not died, he would not now be renowned. An alternative reading may be that in order for this man to receive post-mortem renown, his death must have been justified in some way. Both of these readings could be applied to a wartime scenario. In the case of the former, it could be the very fact that the man dies, perhaps in battle, fighting heroically for his country, which

[18] Gutzwiller (1993) 89.

[19] All text for Dickinson's poems comes from Franklin (1999).

[20] See Weiss (1984) and Loeffelholz (2016) 91–98 for a discussion of the Civil War's influence on Dickinson.

justifies the honor and glory he receives after death. In the case of the latter reading, it may be that the soldier's death was justified in so far as he died in service to his country. Because of this proper, lawful, patriotic justification for his death, he receives renown. The ambiguity of the lines, coupled with the fractured syntax and Dickinson's characteristic use of the dash for punctuation, make this poem an example of Dickinson's innovation within the genre of epigram. Yet, as with Anyte, is it also Dickinson's appropriation and re-working of male heroic values that differentiate her epigram from the poems of her male poetic predecessors and contemporaries.

Regardless of whether one reads Death as the justification for Renown or as the thing that must be justified, it seems that in this epigram Dickinson criticizes the idea of a man being known and celebrated only after he is dead, and not while he is alive. While this may not be a traditional epigram of mourning, Dickinson does use the event of this unknown and unnamed man's death to pose questions less often asked in the more patriotic, male poetic tradition: is death worth the later renown? Can and should renown only come after death? Loeffelholz argues that in her other poems about the Civil War, such as "It feels a shame to be Alive" and "My Portion is Defeat – Today," Dickinson explores the gap between female civilians such as herself, who experience the war through photos, and the soldiers who have actual, lived experience of the war.[21] It seems that "The first We knew of Him was Death" may also explore what it means to view the war from an outside, female, civilian perspective. Dickinson associates herself with the "We" that is so removed from the context of war that the first thing it knows about a man is his death. Like the cold, impersonal stone of Anyte's Epigram 4, this "We" participates in a cold and abstract glorification of the man, rather than personal, deeply felt grief.

Dickinson's "Go tell it – What a Message" similarly introduces a female perspective into the traditionally male context of war, and elevates that perspective so that it is equal to the male. The poem, which is rather epigrammatic in its length, style, and riddling qualities, is also particularly Dickinsonian in its use of punctuation, phrasing, and the blending of masculine and feminine personas and values. Dickinson writes:

> "Go tell it" – What a Message –
> To whom – is specified –
> Not murmur – not endearment –
> But simply – we obeyed –
> Obeyed – a Lure – a Longing?
> Oh Nature – none of this –
> To Law – said Sweet Thermopylae
> I give my dying Kiss –

[21] Loeffelholz (2016) 92–94.

As Loeffelholz notes, Dickinson likely wrote this poem around 1882 in response to the translation of Simonides' famous epitaph by the British poet and cleric William Lisle Bowles (1792–1850).[22] The opening lines of Bowles' translation read: "Go tell the Spartans, thou who passest by / That here, obedient to their laws, we lie."[23] Dickinson thus draws on Simonides' invocation of the three hundred Spartans who died at the Battle of Thermopylae in 480 BCE when fighting against the Persians, as well as perhaps her own experience of war. While this poem was not written during the years of the American Civil War, and while there is again no clear evidence that the Civil War in particular informed the composition of this piece, it is possible that Dickinson had the Civil War, along with more ancient wars, in the back of her mind as she wrote about the motivations that might compel a man to fight and die for his country.

In her re-working of the Simonides poem, after Dickinson comments on the message directed at the Spartans, "Go tell it," she introduces elements that "the masculine world of martial ethos might be thought to repress: the 'murmur' of protest, a word of 'endearment' to a beloved left behind."[24] Both Loeffelholz and Lionel Trilling, whose 1967 analysis of the poem Loeffelholz cites, read this "murmur" and "endearment" as representative of orthodox feminine values rather than masculine ones. These two words carry connotations of emotional attachment and deep human ties, and are part of the feminine vocabulary for "desire and differentiation" that Dickinson employs throughout the poem.[25] While there is nothing inherently female in emotional attachment or quiet affection, in patriarchal societies like Dickinson's such features are viewed as feminine, and thus contrast with the more masculine vocabulary of the first two lines of the poem. This self-consciously conventional feminine vocabulary continues as Dickinson introduces but then swiftly rejects "Lure" and "Longing" as motivations for the Spartans going to war. These two nouns are placed in direct contrast to the "Law" in the seventh line of the poem. While Lure and Longing again suggest complex, difficult kinds of desire as well as a kind of tenderness that Trilling marks as un-masculine,[26] the "Law" is representative of the stoic codes of heroic masculinity that the Spartans embodied and abided by when they chose to obey their summons to war. The "Law" is what the ideal soldier should be: removed, impartial, steadfast, and unemotional. Yet Dickinson calls these values into question, and seems to suggest that "Lure" and "Longing" may be just as reasonable causes for which one could sacrifice one's life.

This contrast between conventional masculine and feminine perspectives and values reaches its height in the juxtaposition between the "traditionally gendered personifications or principles" of Nature and Thermopylae, otherwise imagined as "the goddess and the

[22] Loeffelholz (2016) 140.
[23] Loeffelholz (2016) 58.
[24] Loeffelholz (2016) 58.
[25] Loeffelholz (2016) 60.
[26] Loeffelholz (2016) 61.

hero."[27] The Spartan warriors ultimately choose the personified, heroic Thermopylae, and reject the female goddess Nature along with her pull of desire, love, and longing. Dickinson finishes the poem by blending the traditionally masculine with the feminine, placing the feminine epithet "Sweet" in front of the masculine personification of Thermopylae, and describing the Spartan's heroic death and "final salute to Law"[28] in terms of a feminine "Kiss." Her final lines thus again evoke "heroic masculine self-sacrifice and dedication to law" in contrast with feminine personal desire.[29]

It is this combination and juxtaposition of masculine and feminine perspectives that connects Dickinson's epigrammatic poetry to Anyte's. Both women, unlike their male predecessors, insert and elevate a female presence and values into male-dominated contexts of mourning, and thus re-work typical male, heroic modes of expression. Dickinson's introduction of the feminine, however, unlike Anyte's, seems to be a self-conscious performance rather than a sincere adoption of these values. Indeed, Loeffelholz claims that "Go tell it" is "both an italicized performance of femininity and a loving reading of masculinity."[30] Loeffelholz argues that with her concise and rather impersonal style of writing in the epigram, Dickinson "lays her own implicit claim to a masculine terseness of style," while using femininity as simply "one mode among other styles available to [her]".[31] While Dickinson's epigram is innovative in its equal presentation of both masculine and feminine values, it differs from Anyte's epigrams in its implicit questioning and distance from both the masculine and feminine. While Anyte embraces an alternative female point of view, Dickinson adopts a perspective that is neither wholly masculine nor feminine, but that perhaps aspires to some "transfiguration beyond gender."[32]

"Go tell it," thus presents an interesting contrast to Anyte's Epigram 4, as Dickinson and Anyte appear to appropriate the masculine and embrace the feminine to differing degrees. It also provides a compelling point of comparison to Anyte's Epigram 21.[33] This poem, which portrays Anyte's characteristic compassion for the dead as well as her unique attention to personal relationships, reads:

This Lydian Earth holds Amyntor, son of Philipp,
Who seized many matters of iron battle with his hands:

[27] Loeffelholz (2016) 59.
[28] Loeffelholz (2016) 59.
[29] Loeffelholz (2016) 63.
[30] Loeffelholz (2016) 64.
[31] Loeffelholz (2016) 60.
[32] Loeffelholz (2016) 70.
[33] While Epigram 21 is attributed to an Antipater of Sidon in Paton (1917), the poem's authorship is doubtful. Aldington (1919) attributes the poem to Anyte and publishes a translation of it in his volume. Gow/Page (1965) also attribute the poem to Anyte, as does Rayor (1991) in her translations of Anyte's epigrams.

Nor did any grievous disease bring him to the house of Night,
But he perished, having held his round shield 'round his comrade.[34]

Like Epigram 4, Epigram 21 showcases Anyte's rural values and female sensibilities, which are contrasted with the bloody, masculine world of war. One can imagine the Lydian Earth holding the body of Amyntor just as a mother or father would embrace a dead child. Like the personified Nature in Dickinson's "Go tell it", the personified Earth in Epigram 21 introduces an element of tenderness that can be coded as feminine and that juxtaposes the harsh, cold "iron battle" in line two. This "battle" represents all that is traditionally masculine, heroic, and epic, similar to Dickinson's "Thermopylae." It is also striking that Anyte identifies Amyntor as "the son of Philipp" at the end of the first line of the epigram. While it was quite common in Greek epic and classical Greek lyric poetry to refer to a man by his patronymic in order to show his heroic lineage, Anyte seems to be appropriating this masculine convention for a somewhat different purpose. Amyntor is not the son of Zeus, or Peleus, or Priam, but an ordinary soldier, the son of an ordinary man. The use of the patronymic, therefore, seems not to point to Amyntor's distinguished heritage, but rather to highlight the son's relationship with his father. The reader is reminded that Amyntor is indeed someone's child, not just an anonymous combatant. Through her depictions of the Earth and this father-son relationship, Anyte thus emphasizes the domestic, personal experience of death and mourning, rather than the impersonal glory and honor characteristic of the male literary tradition.

The second distich continues this focus on domesticity and personal relationships. In line three, Anyte claims it was not a "grievous disease" that led Amyntor into Hades, invoking a more domestic circumstance in which a child would die at home from some sort of fatal illness. Rather than die in his house from a tragic sickness, perhaps in his bed surrounded by his family, Amyntor died in battle, protecting his companion with his shield. He thus sacrifices his life not only for the sake of his city, but also for the sake of his friend. Unlike in Epigram 4, where a chief gives his life for a fatherland that is indifferent to his sacrifice, here in Epigram 21 Amyntor dies in order to protect someone who presumably cared for him while he was alive and will continue to care and grieve for him after his death. By portraying this friendship as the cause of Amyntor's self-sacrifice rather than some abstract idea of patriotism, duty, or, as with Dickinson, "Law", Anyte deviates from the traditional celebration of male heroic values in epigram, placing her poetry and poetic persona in opposition to the poems and personas of men like Simonides and Homer.

By comparing Anyte and Dickinson's epigrammatic poems that treat themes of death and mourning in the context of war, one can see how the two poets differently appropriate

[34] Geoghegan (1979): Λύδιον οὖδας ἔχει τόδ' Ἀμύντορα, παῖδα Φιλίππου, / πολλὰ σιδηρείης χερσὶ θιγόντα μάχης· / οὐδέ μιν ἀλγινόεσσα νόσος δόμον ἄγαγε Νυκτός, / ἀλλ' ὄλετ' ἀμφ' ἑτάρῳ σχὼν κυκλόεσσαν ἴτυν.

the language and principles of the male poetic tradition, and insert their own uniquely feminine perspectives and values into this tradition. It seems that both Anyte and Dickinson recognize their position as women writers within the socially constructed gender binary, and use this status to disrupt and revise the male-dominated epigrammatic tradition. While Anyte transforms patriarchal discourse by offering and embracing an alternative world where elements culturally coded as feminine such as families, personal relationships, and compassion are prioritized, Dickinson blends masculine and feminine perspectives and presents complex, riddling epigrams that in a sense seem to transcend gender, as they do not wholly disavow attitudes and values coded as masculine nor completely adopt those coded as feminine. Through their introduction of these female perspectives, both women significantly contribute to the development of the epigrammatic style. By elevating the domestic, empathetic, and personal in their poems about loss and mourning in war, these poets eschew the notion that all that is worth preserving in epigrammatic tradition is the Homeric and heroic. They broaden the scope of human experience captured by epigram, and unlike their male predecessors and contemporaries claim a space for women and femininity as subjects worthy of attention.

kubic@wustl.edu

About the Author Amanda Kubic is an M. A.-candidate in Classics at Washington University in St. Louis. In May 2016, Amanda graduated from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill with her B.A. in Comparative Literature and Classics, and a minor in Social and Economic Justice. Amanda wrote an undergraduate honors thesis entitled "Women's Relationships in Sappho's poetry," and continues to work on female-authored ancient texts as a graduate student. Some of her other research interests include representations of gender and sexuality in Greek and Latin poetry and the reception of classical texts in the Modernist period of English literature.

Bibliography

Aldington (1919): Richard Aldington, "The Poems of Anyte of Tegea", in: *The Poet's Translation Series* (2,2) 1–10.

Banard (1991): Sylvia Banard, "Anyte: Poet of Children and Animals", in: F. De Martino (ed.) *Rose di Pieria*, 165–76.

Bennett (1990): Paula Bennett, *Emily Dickinson: Woman Poet*, Iowa City.

Campbell (1982): David A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, London.

Coiro (2016): A. B. Coiro, "Epigram", in: R. Greene and S. Cushman (eds.) *The Princeton Handbook of Poetic Terms*, 3rd ed., Princeton, New Jersey, 112–114.

Franklin (1999): R. W. Franklin, *The Poems of Emily Dickinson: Reading Edition*, Cambridge.

Gow/Page (1965): A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, Cambridge.

Geoghegan (1979): D. Geoghegan (ed.), *Anyte: The Epigrams*, Rome.

Greene (2000): Ellen Greene, "Playing With Tradition: Gender and Innovation in the Epigrams of Anyte," in: *Helios* (27,1) 15–32.

Guillén (1993): Claudio Guillén, *The Challenge of Comparative Literature*, trans. Cola Franzen, Cambridge.

Gutzwiller (1993): Kathryn J. Gutzwiller, "Anyte's Epigram Book," in *Syllecta Classica* Vol. 4 71–89.

Holst-Warhaft (1992): Gail Holst-Warhaft, *Dangerous Voices: Women's Laments and Greek Literature*, London.

Kleinman (n. d.): Sherryl Kleinman, *Biological Sex and Social Life*, Chapel Hill.

Loeffelholz (1991): Mary Loeffelholz, *Dickinson and the Boundaries of Feminist Theory*, Chicago.

Miller (2012): Cristanne Miller, *Reading in Time: Emily Dickinson in the Nineteenth Century*, Amherst.

Paton (1917): W. R. Paton (ed. and trans.), *Greek Anthology*, Vol. II: Books 7–8, Cambridge.

Pollak (1984): Vivian R. Pollak, *Dickinson: The Anxiety of Gender*, London.

Rayor (1991): Diane J. Rayor, *Sappho's Lyre*, Berkeley.

Roy (2012): James Roy, "Tegea", in: Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow (eds.) *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th ed., Oxford.

Wilamowitz (1924): Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, Berlin.

Wright (1923): F. A. Wright, "The Women Poets of Greece", in: *Fortnightly Review* (113) 322–323.

The function of direct speech in Bacchylides' poetry

The case of ode 5 and ode 18

Elisa Nuria Merisio
Sapienza Università di Roma

The narrative art of Bacchylides of Ceos has already been investigated in several studies and articles[1]. His tendency to insert ample narratives of mythical tales by adding a wealth of details, his taste for vivid descriptions and the liveliness of the scenes bear reminiscence of Stesichorus' poetry[2]. Both poets have been defined as 'epic-like' with regard to their ways of developing mythical contents. One of the most important features in Bacchylides' narrative style is undoubtedly his peculiar use of direct speech. Using *mimesis* instead of pure narrative[3], the poet achieves a greater 'expressivity', meaning the degree of involvement of the speaker[4], with the effect of increasing the *pathos* of the scene, as shown by the despair conveyed by the words of Croesus in ode 3 (ll. 37–47[5]). Direct speech is also designed to make the episodes more lively, as in the speech by Menelaus in ode 15 (ll. 50–63) or in the tense dialogue between Minos and Theseus in ode 17 (ll. 20–80).

This paper is aimed at analysing Bacchylides' narrative choices and the role played by and the effects of direct speech in two poems of his, namely ode 5 and ode 18. These odes are among the best conserved poems in the Bacchylidean *corpus*, and all their features have been deeply investigated[6]. Despite wide differences in terms of genre, content and structure, the use of direct speech makes them comparable. The use of direct speech in these odes allows the poet to achieve narrative effects that would be unthinkable by resorting only to an extradiegetic narrator and to pure narrative. These effects rely on a 'narrative' similar to the one used by drama's authors, by which the primary narrator and the primary narratees, that is the poet and the spectators[7], know more than the characters who are speaking[8]. Actually, the audience knows the *fabula* of the whole narrated myth,

[1] See Gentili (1958); Kirkwood (1966); Segal (1976); Burnett (1985); Calame (1999); Pfeijffer (1999); Rengakos (2000).
[2] Kirkwood (1966) 100; Stern (1970) 300f.
[3] See Genette (1983) 162f., who refers to Pl. *Rep.* 3.392c–395.
[4] See Beck (2009) 142.
[5] All references to the text of Bacchylides' odes follow Maehler's edition (2003).
[6] For ode 5, see Stern (1967); Lefkowitz (1969); Goldhill (1983); Villarubia (1993); Cairns (1997); Antoniono, Cesca (2011). For ode 18, see Wind (1972); Merkelbach (1973); Barron (1980); Vox (1982); Ieranò (1987); Arnauld (2001).
[7] See De Jong (2004) 7f.
[8] See Genette (1983) 188f.

and the poet skilfully exploits this situation to create an effect of dramatic irony[9]. The investigation of narrative structures can therefore help to understand in depth the aims of Bacchylides' poetry and how he achieves them, thereby highlighting his close relation with the authors of fifth-century Attic tragedy.

Ode 5, one of the most famous epinician poems by Bacchylides, was composed to celebrate the victory of Hieron, ruler of Syracuse, in the horse race at the Olympian games of 476 BC. Like all the most elaborate epinician poems, it features a mythical narrative: the meeting of Heracles and Meleager in Hades. It is a minor episode in the saga of Heracles, as it is often the case with the mythical narratives inserted by Bacchylides in his odes. Heracles has descended to the underworld to capture the dog Cerberus, and among the dead's souls he sees the imposing figure of Meleager. Worried by the threatening appearance of Meleager's shadow, Heracles nocks an arrow on to his bowstring; his act causes the reaction of Meleager, who speaks to the living hero, starting a dialogue with him (ll. 79–96):

"υἱὲ Διὸς μεγάλου,
στᾶθί τ᾽ἐν χώρᾳ, γελανώσας τε θυμόν (80)
μὴ ταΰσιον προΐει
τραχὺν ἐκ χειρῶν ὀϊστόν
ψυχαῖσιν ἔπι φθιμένων·
οὔ τοι δέος." ὣς φάτο· θάμβησεν δ᾽ἄναξ
Ἀμφιτρυωνιάδας, (85)
εἶπέν τε· "τίς ἀθανάτων
ἢ βροτῶν τοιοῦτον ἔρνος
θρέψεν ἐν ποίᾳ χθονί;
τίς δ᾽ἔκτανεν; ἦ τάχα καλλίζωνος Ἥρα
κεῖνον ἐφ᾽ἁμετέρᾳ (90)
πέμψει κεφαλᾷ· τὰ δέ που
Παλλάδι ξανθᾷ μέλει."
τὸν δὲ προσέφα Μελέαγρος
δακρυόεις· "χαλεπὸν

θεῶν παρατρέψαι νόον (95)
ἄνδρεσσιν ἐπιχθονίοις. [...]"[10]

[9] The use of the device of dramatic irony in Bacchylides' odes 5 and 18 has been studied by García Romero (2012). He makes however a lexical analysis focused on the ambigous meaning of the words uttered by the characters.

[10] Bacchylides 5.79–96 (p. 18): "«Son of great Zeus, stay thou there and calm thy heart, and launch not vainly from thy hands a brute arrow against a dead man's ghost. There's naught to fear». The princely son of Amphitryon marvelled at his words and said, «What God or man reared such a scion as this, and where? And who slew him? Sure the fair-girdled Hera will soon send the slayer of such an one against me

When Meleager tells him that there is no point in attacking the souls of the dead, Heracles stops in his tracks. He admires the handsome figure in front of him and asks Meleager about his identity, his birth, and finally about the identity of his murderer: he is certain that his enemy Hera will send that one (κεῖνον, line 90) to kill himself too. The answer of Meleager is a long speech opened by the gnomic statement that it is difficult for human beings to change the mind of gods. Looking back with nostalgia on his life on earth, he goes over the events that caused his death: during the battle for the spoils of the Calidonian wild boar, he killed unintentionally two brothers of his mother, thereby arousing the grieving woman's anger. In a fit of rage, she burned the brand to which the life of Meleager was magically connected since his birth[11]. Thus the life of the young hero was extinguished along with the brand burnt by the fire.

The story of Meleager's death arouses the compassion and the tears of Heracles, who utters words of pity, then the dialogue between the two heros is resumed (ll. 160–175):

τᾶδ᾽ ἔφα· "θνατοῖσι μὴ φῦναι φέριστον (160)
μήδ᾽ ἀελίου προσιδεῖν
φέγγος· ἀλλ᾽ οὐ γάρ τίς ἐστιν
πρᾶξις τάδε μυρομένοις·
χρὴ κεῖνο λέγειν ὅτι καὶ μέλλει τελεῖν.
ἦρά τις ἐν μεγάροις (165)
Οἰνῆος ἀρηϊφίλου
ἔστιν ἀδμήτα θυγάτρων,
σοὶ φυὰν ἀλιγκία;
τάν κεν λιπαρὰν ⟨ἐ⟩θέλων θείμαν ἄκοιτιν."
τὸν δὲ μενεπτολέμου (170)
ψυχὰ προσέφα Μελεά-
γρου· "λίπον χλωραύχενα
ἐν δώμασι Δαϊάνειραν,
νῆϊν ἔτι χρυσέας
Κύπριδος θελξιμβρότου."[12] (175)

also—albeit flaxen-haired Pallas, methinks, will look to that». Then answered Meleager weeping, «Hard is it for earthly man to bend the will of a God [...]»." Translation by Edmonds (1980).

[11] For the story of Meleager, mentioned also in Hom. *Il.* 9.529–99, and its various versions see March (1987) 29–46.

[12] Bacchylides 5.160–175 (p. 19): "[. . .] he answered him, «Best were it for mortals never to be born nor ever to look upon the sunlight; but seeing no good cometh of these laments, one should speak of that he is likely to accomplish. Is there, I ask thee, in the palace of warrior Oeneus an unwedded daughter like in beauty unto thee? I would fain make such an one my splendid bride». Whereat the ghost of the stedfast warrior Meleager answered him: «Deïaneira left I at my home with the green of youth upon her sweet neck, unwitting still of the golden enchantress Cypris»." Translation by Edmonds (1980).

After a pessimistic remark about human condition, peculiar to Greek thought[13], Heracles states that mourning is vain, and that one should speak rather of what one intends to achieve. Then he asks Meleager if he has an unmarried sister who resembles him still living in the palace of Oineus: he would like to marry her. The whole mythical episode ends with Meleager's evocation of 'fresh-necked' Deianira, still ignorant of love.

The long narrative about Meleager's death amounts to an explanatory *metadiegesis*[14] in which Meleager becomes an intradiegetic narrator[15]. The use of *metadiegesis* to narrate events preceding the episode that constitutes the primary narrative allows the poet to concentrate a long story in one dramatic moment[16]. The use of direct speech is here clearly aimed at increasing the *pathos* of the related events, even more so since Meleager, besides being a homodiegetic narrator, is the victim too. However, the use of direct speech and dialogue in this ode has an additional effect which is related to Heracles. Just when he assumes that the killer of Meleager is a male warrior and that Hera will send him after himself too, a divergence in the extent of knowledge by the character and by the audience emerges: the latter knows in advance the outcome of the whole story. Meleager's narrative will then give Heracles the information about the murderer of the dead hero, but only the audience could grasp the ominous allusion to Heracles' death contained in his words: both of them are bound to be killed by a woman, Meleager by his mother and Heracles by his bride. This play of dramatic irony reaches its climax at the end of the mythical episode, when Heracles, deeply admiring the dead, expresses his will to marry Meleager's sister: by doing so, he determines his doom unawares[17]. The name of Deianira, Heracles' future bride—and murderer—reverberates significantly in the last lines uttered by the soul of the hero, and keeps the audience in a suspense full of ominous forebodings[18]. Afterwards the ode goes back to the present occasion, and to the celebration of Hieron's victory by emphasizing the role of poetry in praising glorious deeds.

Ode 18 (Θησεύς) corresponds to the fourth dithyramb in the collection of poems contained in Bacchylides' papyrus (*PLitLond* 46). Its formal structure makes it unique: it comprises four strophes with no triadic structure and it consists entirely of a dialogue in direct speech between two characters, the king of Athens, Aegeus, and a group of Athenian citizens, even though their identity is not explicitly stated[19]. Since the dialogue is not introduced by an extradiegetic narrator, the identity of the speakers becomes clear

[13] "θνατοῖσι μὴ φῦναι φέριστον / μήδ' ἀελίου προσιδεῖν φέγγος" (ll. 160–2): "for human beings the best thing is not to be born and not to see the sunlight"; cf. Theogn. 425–8; Soph. *O. C.* 1224–7.

[14] See Genette (1983) 232.

[15] See Genette (1983) 248.

[16] See Pfeijffer (2004) 226f.

[17] The intention of Heracles to marry Meleager's sister seems to be a novelty introduced by Bacchylides in the episode, whereas in Pindar's dithyramb 2 Meleager himself asks Heracles to marry his sister; cf. Maehler (1982) 80ff.

[18] Rengakos (2000) 41.

[19] The real development of the performance is uncertain: the role of Aegeus could have been interpreted by one actor and the other role by a chorus, but the performance might also have been played by two semi-choruses; cf. Ieranò (1987) 89 n. 7.

only through the words they utter. However, the real protagonist *in absentia* is Theseus, on whom the speeches of the characters centre. Although the dithyramb is named after him, his name is never pronounced along the ode. As we shall see, in this poem the poet plays with the issue of his identity.

The classification of this poem in the lyric genre of dithyrambs, like many of Bacchylides' odes that are contained in this section of the papyrus, is not straightforward. As it is the case with almost all Bacchylidean dithyrambs, neither Dionysus nor his cult are mentioned in the ode[20]; moreover, a mimetic structure consisting entirely of a direct speech dialogue does not fall into the general categories of poetry as described by Plato in the relevant well-known passage from the *Republic*, where he actually classified dithyrambic poetry as δι᾽ ἀπαγγελίας αὐτοῦ τοῦ ποιητοῦ ("by means of the recital of the poet himself") that is a kind of narrative wholly performed by means of an extradiegetic narrator[21].

As far as the performance setting is concerned, it can be safely assumed that the dithyramb was addressed to an Athenian audience, but the specific festival in which it was performed is still a matter of controversy[22]. The social, political and cult-related aspects and symbols have been deeply investigated by several scholars[23]. In the following pages attention will be focused on the use of direct speech and on the effects of this narrative choice. The text of ode 18 is quoted below:

Chorus
Βασιλεῦ τᾶν ἱερᾶν Ἀθανᾶν,
τῶν ἀβροβίων ἄναξ Ἰώνων,
τί νέον ἔκλαγε χαλκοκώδων
σάλπιγξ πολεμηΐαν ἀοιδάν;
ἦ τις ἀμετέρας χθονὸς (5)
δυσμενὴς ὅρι᾽ ἀμφιβάλλει
στραταγέτας ἀνήρ;
ἢ λῃσταὶ κακομάχανοι
ποιμένων ἀέκατι μήλων
σεύοντ᾽ ἀγέλας βίᾳ; (10)
ἦ τί τοι κραδίαν ἀμύσσει;
φθέγγευ· δοκέω γὰρ εἴ τινι βροτῶν
ἀλκίμων ἐπικουρίαν
καὶ τὶν ἔμμεναι νέων,
ὦ Πανδίονος υἱὲ καὶ Κρεούσας. (15)

[20] Burnett (1985) 117; for the controversial question of the nature of Bacchylidean dithyrambs, see Zimmermann (1992) 64–116; García Romero (2000) 47–57; Fearn (2007) 163–225.
[21] Pl. *Rep.* 3.394b–c.
[22] See Maehler (2004) 189ff.
[23] See above note 6.

Aegeus

Νέον ἦλθε⟨ν⟩ δολιχὰν ἀμείψας
κᾶρυξ ποσὶν Ἰσθμίαν κέλευθον·
ἄφατα δ᾽ ἔργα λέγει κραταιοῦ
φωτός· τὸν ὑπέρβιόν τ᾽ ἔπεφνεν
Σίνιν, ὃς ἰσχύϊ φέρτατος
θνατῶν ἦν, Κρονίδα Λυταίου
σεισίχθονος τέκος·
σῦν τ᾽ ἀνδροκτόνον ἐν νάπαις
Κρεμ⟨μ⟩υῶνος ἀτάσθαλόν τε
Σκίρωνα κατέκτανεν·
τάν τε Κερκυόνος παλαίστραν
ἔσχεν, Πολυπήμονός τε καρτεράν
σφῦραν ἐξέβαλεν Προκό-
πτας, ἀρείονος τυχών
φωτός. ταῦτα δέδοιχ᾽ ὅπᾳ τελεῖται.

Chorus

Τίνα δ᾽ ἔμμεν πόθεν ἄνδρα τοῦτον
λέγει, τίνα τε στολὰν ἔχοντα;
πότερα σὺν πολεμηΐοις ὅ-
πλοισι στρατιὰν ἄγοντα πολλάν;
ἢ μοῦνον σὺν ὀπάοσιν
στ⟨ε⟩ίχειν ἔμπορον οἷ᾽ ἀλάταν
ἐπ᾽ ἀλλοδαμίαν,
ἰσχυρόν τε καὶ ἄλκιμον
ὥδε καὶ θρασύν, ὅς το⟨σ⟩ούτων
ἀνδρῶν κρατερὸν σθένος
ἔσχεν; ἦ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὁρμᾷ,
δίκας ἀδίκοισιν ὄφρα μήσεται·
οὐ γὰρ ῥᾴδιον αἰὲν ἔρ-
δοντα μὴ ᾽ντυχεῖν κακῷ.
πάντ᾽ ἐν τῷ δολιχῷ χρόνῳ τελεῖται.

Aegeus

Δύο οἱ φῶτε μόνους ἁμαρτεῖν
λέγει, περὶ φαιδίμοισι δ᾽ ὤμοις
ξίφος ἔχειν ⟨ἐλεφαντόκωπον⟩

ξεστοὺς δὲ δύ᾽ ἐν χέρεσσ᾽ ἄκοντας
κηὔτυκτον κυνέαν Λάκαι-
ναν κρατὸς πέρι πυρσοχαίτου·
χιτῶνα πορφύρεον
στέρνοις τ᾽ ἀμφί, καὶ οὔλιον
Θεσσαλὰν χλαμύδ᾽· ὀμμάτων δὲ
στίλβειν ἄπο Λαμνίαν
φοίνισσαν φλόγα· παῖδα δ᾽ ἔμ⟨μ⟩εν
πρώθηβον, ἀρηΐων δ᾽ ἀθυρμάτων
μεμνᾶσθαι πολέμου τε καὶ
χαλκεοκτύπου μάχας·
δίζησθαι δὲ φιλαγλάους Ἀθάνας.[24]

In the first strophe the chorus of Athenians asks Aegeus the reason why a trumpet was blown to sound an alarm[25] and reminds the king of the presence of brave young people ready to defend the community. The identity of the addressee becomes clear thanks to the apostrophe "son of Pandion and Creusa" at the end of the strophe: Pandion was one of the ten eponymous heroes of the Attic 'tribes' and Aegeus' father[26]. In the second strophe Aegeus gives an account of what a messenger has just told him about the deeds of a young warrior, who defeated a lot of the dangerous bandits who overran the territory of the Isthmus. The king sounds very worried about these events. In the third strophe the chorus asks Aegeus if the young warrior travels with few companions or with a whole army. They argue that a god must be driving him on, if he can accomplish such amazing deeds, and they sound confident about the future. In the fourth strophe Aegeus answers that two men go with him, and gives information about the appearance, the clothes and the attitude of the young man. He is heading for the 'splendour-loving' Athens.

[24] Bacchylides 18 (pp. 21–23): Chorus: "King of holy Athens, lord of the soft-living Ionians, what new thing means the war-song that cries from the brazen-belled clarion? Doth a captain of enemies beset the bounds of our land? or thieves of ill intent drive our herds of sheep perforce in their keepers' despite? or what is it pricks thy heart? Prithee speak; for thou, methinks, if any man, hast aid of valiant youths to thy hand, O son of Pandion and Creüsa." // Aegeus: "A messenger is but now come running, by way of the long road of Isthmus, .with news of the deeds ineffable of a mighty man, who hath slain the huge Sinis that o'erpassed the world in strength, child of the Earth-shaker Lytaean, the son of Cronus, and hath laid low the man-slaying sow in the woods of Cremmyon, aye, and the wicked Sciron, and hath ended the wrestling-place of Cercyon, and Polypemon's strong hammer is dropt from the hand of a Maimer who hath found his match. I fear me how this all shall end." // Chorus: "Who and whence saith he that this man is, and what his equipage? Comes he with a great host under arms, or travelleth alone with his servants like a merchant that wanders abroad, this man so mighty, stout, and valiant, who hath stayed the great strength of so many? Sure a God must speed him for to bring the unjust to justice, for it is no light task to come off ever free of ill. All things end in the long run of time." // Aegeus: "Two alone, he saith, are with him, and there is slung to his bright shoulders a sword of ivory haft, and either hand hath a polished javelin; a well-wrought Spartan bonnet is about his ruddy locks, and a purple shirt around his breast, with a cloack of the frieze of Thessaly; and as for his eyes, there goes a red flash from them as of Lemnian flame; a lad is he first come to manhood, bent on the pastimes of Ares, war and the battle-din of bronze; and his quest is unto splendor-loving Athens." Translation by Edmonds (1980).

[25] A real trumpet might have been blown just before the performance; cf. Maehler (2004) 194.

[26] Maehler (2004) 195.

The ode is structured and the direct speech is used in such a way as to lead the audience to share the anxiety of the characters until the names of the bandits defeated by the young hero are mentioned in the second strophe. From this point onwards, the audience realized that the young man is Theseus, Aegeus' son, who is coming to Athens to be recognized by his father, and can witness Aegeus' fear alternating with the chorus' enthusiasm, both equally ignorant of present and future events. In particular, the sentence uttered by Aegeus (ταῦτα δέδοιχ᾽ ὅπᾳ τελεῖται, l. 30) seemed to convey a deeper meaning: while the fear of forthcoming troubles—the real fear that fills the soul of the king in the poem—sounded groundless, since the event was bound to have a happy outcome as the audience knew only too well, the above sentence took on a more ominous nuance in the light of what will happen afterwards. Actually, Theseus will be the cause of his father's death, even though unintentionally[27]. The words of line 30 are re-echoed by those uttered by the chorus at line 45 (πάντ᾽ ἐν τῷ̃ δολιχῷ̃ χρόνῳ τελεῖται); in the form of a more universal statement, they convey the feeling that future events will surely happen driven by divine justice, from the enthusiastic and positive perspective of the chorus of the Athenians.

The dithyramb ends abruptly—like many Bacchylidean dithyrambs—upon the image of Theseus approaching Athens, so that the young hero is expected to come on the scene at any moment.

In regard to the nature of the scenes in the two odes, two different models might be identified. Ode 5 depicts the meeting between two heroes, a scene typical of the epic genre; in particular, the similarity to the episodes of the meeting between Odysseus and Heracles (*Od.* 11.601 ff.) and of the meeting between Odysseus and Agamemnon (*Od.* 11.385 ff.) during the descent of the former to Hades is striking[28]. Conversely, the situation depicted in ode 18, namely the account of a messenger's speech, as well as the dialogue between a king and an assembled group of people, is typical of the tragic genre[29]; in particular, the scene depicted in the first strophe is very similar to the one in the parodos of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, where the old citizens of Argo question their queen Klytaimestra about a message that has just been sent through fire-signals[30]. The metadiegetic narrative of important events that have already happened or that are happening just as they are narrated, as in ode 18, is a device often used by the tragedians. Actually, it makes possible the performance of scenes that otherwise would be very difficult to stage. Nevertheless, frequently it was a deliberate dramatic choice, since what is heard is sometimes more impressive than what is seen; thus, by using the highly imaginative power of words, a stronger suspense and a deeper tragic sense are conveyed. This effect is quite different from the one achieved by Meleager's speech in ode 5: in this poem the autodiegetic

[27] Burnett (1985) 122f.; Rengakos (2000) 103f.
[28] See Lefkowitz (1969) 63ff.
[29] Cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 302–30 and 353–432; Soph. *OT* 1–77.
[30] Aesch. *Ag.* 83–103, esp. 83–7. Bacchylides might have been influenced by this passage of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* in composing ode 18 given its peculiar structure; cf. Maehler (2004) 193.

narrative of the death's moment by the victim himself is aimed at increasing the *pathos* aroused by the sad event besides adding a new episode to the myth-telling[31].

Although the dialogue-based scenes of odes 5 and 18 differ very much as far as context and situation are concerned, the direct speeches made by Heracles and Aegeus convey a similar form of dramatic irony to the audience. Even statements having a universal value, like the one uttered by Heracles at the end of Meleager's narrative, that are so recurrent in archaic and classical Greek thought, take on new nuances when they are made by characters[32]. In Heracles' case, the tragic sense conveyed by those well-known words (ll. 160–2) is twofold, since Heracles is bringing himself to ruin by his free choice to marry Deianira[33].

The tragic nature that characterizes Bacchylides' poetry is comparable to that of tragedy itself, whose golden age was starting in those years with Aeschylus' dramas. He plays with the contrast between reality and the restricted or misleading knowledge of characters[34], who are often opposed to an omniscient deity before an omniscient audience's eyes. In particular, the doubts and uncertainties of men at the mercy of divine power are expressed similarly in both odes: in ode 5, Heracles expresses his worry that Hera will send Meleager's killer against him—but Pallas will take care of it (ἦ τάχα καλλίζωνος Ἥρα κεῖνον ἐφ᾽ ἁμετέρᾳ / πέμψει κεφαλᾷ· τὰ δέ που Παλλάδι ξανθᾷ μέλει, ll. 89–92); in ode 18 the Athenians' chorus states that the young hero must be driven on by a god in his victorious fight against the evil-doers, since it is not easy for mortal beings to accomplish such an uninterrupted series of deeds without incurring ruin (ἦ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὁρμᾷ, δίκας ἀδίκοισιν ὄφρα μήσεται· / οὐ γὰρ ῥᾴδιον αἰὲν ἔρδοντα μὴ ᾽ντυχεῖν κακῷ, ll. 41–44)[35]. In both cases a god's agency is assumed, but human beings cannot get a clear knowledge of it[36].

Beyond these similarities there is a difference in the kind of tragic situation depicted in the two odes. The tragic aspect of Heracles' ignorance lies in his action—the words ἀλλ᾽οὐ γάρ τίς ἐστιν / πρᾶξις τάδε μυρομένοις· χρὴ κεῖνο λέγειν ὅτι καὶ μέλλει τελεῖν (ll. 162–4) are significant—, that is, in a choice that will unintentionally drive him to death. In the *Theseus* dithyramb, the tragic sense lies in the mere depiction of human blindness and the ambiguity of all wordly events, since in the ode there are not either action or intention, but

[31] See above p. 28.

[32] Kirkwood (1966) 103ff.; Stern (1970) 304f.

[33] As far as the meaning of Heracles' statement in ll. 160–4 is concerned, it is worth mentioning the interpretation given by Senger (2008) 147ff: by assuming that the abrupt end of myth's narrative has the effect of reminding the audience not only of Heracles' tragic death but also of the subsequent hero's apotheosis, Senger suggests a less pessimistic interpretation than the ones followed in this paper. In Senger's opinion, Heracles' words χρὴ κεῖνο λέγειν ὅτι καὶ μέλλει τελεῖν (l. 164) convey a pragmatic feeling: to be born is a fact that cannot be altered and as a consequence men must try to do what they have the power to accomplish while being aware of human limits and frailties.

[34] Cf. Burnett (1985) 116f., where Bacchylidean poetry is compared with Pindaric poetry.

[35] As for line 41, I adopt Maehler's (2003) affirmative interpretation of the particle ᾗ (hence ἦ) and not Slings' interpretation of a disjuntive ἢ (Slings [1990]); cf. Maehler (2004) 199.

[36] The gap between omniscient and limited narrative when the gods are involved is a feature that can be found back in Homer; see Scodel (2009) 421.

just a wait[37]. This divergence between the two odes reverberates in the effect of suspense at the end of the narrative (which in ode 18 corresponds to the end of the poem): whereas in ode 5 the abrupt interruption upon Deianira's name allows the audience to foresee the dramatic events that will happen[38], in ode 18 the final description of Theseus and of his approaching Athens leads the audience to imagine the sudden coming of the hero on the scene, which will definitively dispel the fears of his father.

Finally, it is essential to recall the different occasion and therefore the different aims of the two Bacchylidean odes considered in this paper. The first one is a victory ode: the insertion of the mythical narrative, with its pessimistic and subdued tone, is aimed at offsetting the excitement caused by the sports victory, which is a typical process of epinician poetry. The ominous end of the mythical narrative is then followed by the return to the praise of Hieron, of his victory and of the merits of poetry; however, the preceding mythical narrative casts a shadow on the celebration that takes on a deeper awareness of human destiny.

Conversely, ode 18 is designed to celebrate a civic community in a sort of social rite involving the ephebes[39]. It is a glorification of Athens by celebrating its mythical founder and its youth filled with warlike ardour.

These differences point out Bacchylides' ability to adapt the tragic effect to various situations. This paper was meant to show that in odes 5 and 18 this effect is achieved, first and foremost, thanks to the poet's masterly use of several narrative levels and in particular the narrative mode of *mimesis* adopted by resorting to direct speech. This mode highlights the gap of knowledge between characters on the one hand and the narrator and the audience on the other, thereby creating an effect of dramatic irony that reminds us of the best achievements of Attic tragedy.

elisa.merisio@uniroma1.it

About the Author Elisa Nuria Merisio is a Ph.D. student in Greek and Latin Philology at Sapienza Università di Roma. She is working on a project dealing with metrical funerary inscriptions from Phrygia under the Roman Empire with particular attention to the relationship between Greek *paideia* and local identity. Elisa's previous projects included an examination of myth-telling in Bacchylides' poetry (M.A. Dissertation - Università degli Studi di Siena) and a study of the 'ephemeral' human condition in archaic Greek poetry (B.A. Dissertation - Università degli Studi di Siena).

[37] Burnett (1985) 121ff.
[38] Rengakos (2000) 104f.
[39] Cf. Merkelbach (1973) and Ieranò (1987).

Bibliography

Antoniono, Cesca (2011): Maria Elena Antoniono, Ombretta Cesca, "Sangue che uccide: il committente, il pubblico e il poeta nell'Epinicio V di Bacchilide", in: *Annali online di Ferrara. Lettere* (6,1–2) 319–341.

Arnauld (2001): Dominique Arnauld, "Quand Thésée voyait rouge: à propos du Dithyrambe IV de Bacchylide", in: *Revue des Études grecques* (114) 222–227.

Barron (1980): John P. Barron, "Bakchylides, Theseus, and a Woolly Cloak", in: *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* (27) 1–8.

Beck (2009): Deborah Beck, "Speech Act Types, Conversational Exchange, and the Speech Representational Spectrum in Homer", in: Jonas Grethlein, Antonios Rengakos (Eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, Berlin / New York, 137–151.

Burnett (1985): Anne Pippin Burnett, *The Art of Bacchylides*, Cambridge (Mass.) / London.

Cairns (1997): Douglas L. Cairns, "Form and Meaning in Bacchylides' Fifth Ode", in: *Scholia* (6 n. s.) 34–48.

Calame (1999): Claude Calame, "Tempo del racconto e tempo del rito nella poesia greca: Bacchilide tra mito, storia e culto", in: *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* (62 n. s.) 63–83.

De Jong (2004): Irene J. F. De Jong, "Narratological theory on narrators, narratees, and narratives", in: Irene J. F. de Jong, René Nünlist, Angus Bowie (Eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, Mnemosyne Suppl. 257, 1–10.

Edmonds (1980): J. M. Edmonds, *Lyra Graeca: Being the remains of all the Greek lyric poets from Eumelus to Timotheus excepting Pindar, Vol. 3, edited and translated by ...*, Cambridge (Mass.) / London.

Fearn (2007): David Fearn, *Bacchylides. Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*, Oxford, 163–225.

García Romero (2000): Fernando García Romero, "The Dithyrambs of Bacchylides: Their Position in the Evolution of the Genre", in: Andreas Bagordo, Bernhard Zimmermann (Eds.), *Bakchylides: 100 Jahre nach seiner Wiederentdeckung*, München, 47–57.

García Romero (2012): Fernando García Romero, "Ironía trágica en Baquílides", in: *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios griegos e indoeuropeos* (22) 73–90.

Genette (1983): Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse. An Essay in Method*, Ithaca / New York.

Gentili (1958): Bruno Gentili, *Bacchilide. Studi*, Urbino.

Goldhill (1983): Simon Goldhill, "Narrative Structure in Bacchylides 5", in: *Eranos* (81) 65–81.

Ieranò (1987): Giorgio Ieranò, "Osservazioni sul Teseo di Bacchilide (Dith. 18)", in: *ACME. Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Milano* (40) 87–103.

Kirkwood (1966): Gordon M. Kirkwood, "The Narrative Art of Bacchylides", in: Luitpold Wallach (Ed.), *The Classical Tradition. Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, Ithaca / New York, 98–114.

Lefkowitz (1969): Mary R. Lefkowitz, "Bacchylides' Ode 5: Imitation and Originality", in: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* (73) 45–96.

Maehler (1982): Herwig Maehler, "Die Lieder des Bakchylides. Erster Teil: die Siegeslieder", in: *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 62 (2 Volumes).

Maehler (2003): *Bacchylides, Carmina cum fragmentis, rec. Herwig Maehler*, München, Leipzig ^{3}2003.

Maehler (2004): Herwig Maehler, *Bacchylides. A Selection*, Cambridge.

March (1987): Jennifer R. March, "The Creative Poet", in: *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* Suppl. 49.

Merkelbach (1973): Reinhold Merkelbach, "Der Theseus des Bakchylides (Gedicht für ein attisches Ephebenfest)", in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* (12) 56–62.

Pfeijffer (1999): Ilja L. Pfeijffer, "Bacchylides' Homer, his Tragedy, and his Pindar", in: Ilja L. Pfeijffer, Simon R. Slings (Eds.), *One Hundred Years of Bacchylides*, Amsterdam, 43–60.

Pfeijffer (2004): Ilja L. Pfeijffer, "Pindar and Bacchylides", in: Irene J. F. de Jong, René Nünlist, Angus Bowie (Eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, Mnemosyne Suppl. 257, 213–232.

Rengakos (2000): Antonios Rengakos, "Zu Bakchylides' Erzähltechnik", in: Andreas Bagordo, Bernhard Zimmermann (Eds.), *Bakchylides: 100 Jahre nach seiner Wiederentdeckung*, München, 101–112.

Scodel (2009): Ruth Scodel, "Ignorant Narrators in Greek Tragedy", in: Jonas Grethlein, Antonios Rengakos (Eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, Berlin / New York, 421–447.

Segal (1976): Charles Segal, "Bacchylides Reconsidered: Epithets and the Dynamics of Lyric Narrative", in: *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* (22) 99–130.

Stenger (2008): Jan Stenger, *Poetische Argumentation. Die Funktion der Gnomik in den Epinikien des Bakchylides*, Berlin / New York.

Slings (1990): Simon R. Slings, "Bacchylides XVIII 41-42", in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* (80) 9–10.

Stern (1967): Jacob Stern, "The Imagery of Bacchylides' Ode 5", in: *Greek Roman Byzantine Studies* (8,1) 35–43.

Stern (1970): Jacob Stern, "An Essay on Bacchylidean Criticism", in: William M. Calder, Jacob Stern, *Pindaros und Bakchylides*, Darmstadt, 290–307.

Villarubia (1993): Antonio Villarubia, “Algunas notas sobre los epinicios de Baquílides a propósito de la oda 5,” in: *Habis* (24) 11–18.

Vox (1982): Onofrio Vox, “Il ditirambo XVIII di Bacchilide. Dialogo ed enigma”, in: *Maia* (34) 131–137.

Wind (1972): Robert Wind, “Myth and History in Bacchylides Ode 18”, in: *Hermes* (100) 511–523.

Zimmermann (1992): Bernhard Zimmermann, *Dithyrambos. Geschichte einer Gattung*, Göttingen.

Augustus purpureo bibet ore nectar – Horace's Praise Poetry

A Careful Navigation between Deflected Laudatio and Encomiastic Eulogy

Katharina-Maria Schön
Universität Wien

> Bis heute habe ich an keinem Dichter dasselbe artistische Entzücken gehabt, das mir von Anfang an eine Horazische Ode gab. [...] Dies Mosaik von Worten, wo jedes Wort als Klang, als Ort, als Begriff, nach rechts und links und über das Ganze hin seine Kraft ausströmt, dies minimum in Umfang und Zahl der Zeichen, dies damit erzielte maximum in der Energie der Zeichen – das [a]lles ist [...] vornehm par exellence.[1]

Horace—one name, many associations. Not only has he gone down in history as acrimoniously witty satirist, as originator of versified epistles and as lyricist whose banner is brimming with a range of meticulously crafted odes and epodes, no—his multifaceted poetic œuvre also continues to exert an irresistible appeal on (post)modern recipients, as Nietzsche's *bon mot* illustrates, and can indeed be labelled a *monumentum aere perennius* (*Ode* 3.30.1), as the Roman poet would have wished for. Even though the entirety of Horatian poetry merits incessant reception and discussion in (non-)academic discourses, this article puts one specific feature under the microscope, namely how Horace's relationship to Augustus changes in the transition from the *Roman Odes* to the fourth book of his *Carmina*. While I will concentrate the major part of my analysis on a close reading of four selected poems (*Odes* 3.3, 3.4, 4.5 and 4.6) and their intertextual interactions, I shall first embark on a brief overview of relevant historical events in order to then position the (c)overt political tone, which the Horatian speaker frequently employs in his *Carmina*, both in reference to his literary contemporaries or immediate successors and within a more general framework of (Roman) panegyric[2]. This adumbration of the current state of research shall serve as our springboard to look at the selected Odes from a literary-theoretical

[1] Friedrich Nietzsche, *Götzen-Dämmerung* (in: G. Coli und M. Montinari (Hgg.), *Nietzsche. Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, dritter Band, Berlin 1969, 147).

[2] The Greek term πανήγυρις means *per se* little more than 'popular assembly'. By means of semantic extension, this type of oratory then adopted a dimension tantamount to a *laudatio*. For a thorough treatment of the etymological origins and the Greek and Roman ramifications of the term πανηγυρικός, see Rees (2012) 3–16.

perspective. We will see to what extent Horace employs tropes of civil war, digressions to myth and elements of 'residual narrativity': I borrow this term from Fludernik (2005) 99 who rightly argues that lyric poetry—in addition to its autoreferential quality and its potential for metapoetic elaborations—is 'only' capable of incorporating narrative strands that are residual due to the required textual brevity, which is also true for Horace's poetic tactics. As we shall see shortly, the Roman poet incorporates references to his own fictional autobiography in 'mini-plots'.

He furthermore draws on strategies of 'performativity'[3] and allegorical cues/displacing techniques to either defer direct praise of the emperor or include more explicitly encomiastic moves: Horace's use of allegory should be seen as more than *aliquid stat pro aliquo* (i. e. a one-dimensional form-content equation), more than an attempt of concretizing the unspeakable, i. e. the way Goethe and the Romantics approached allegory, and more than a sign of ontologicalization of linguistic structures, as Walter Benjamin would approach allegory. I am rather inclined to capitalize on Paul de Man's standpoint as a fruitful interpretative basis. He regarded allegory as deeply grounded in temporal contingencies, while displaying recursiveness: allegory, in de Man's terms, activates a figurative level and conflates a desire for literary representation with a thorough rejection to stabilize meaning, thus retaining a high degree of evasiveness[4].

Likewise, allegory for Horace is a strategic rhetorical tool that opens windows into one or more further stories without eclipsing the 'donor story' from the narrative framework; or, to draw on a definition by Harris/Tolmie (2011) 109: "allegory is a discursive mode, a genre, predicated on the duality of analogic operations, chiefly in matters of agency (through personification), space (through topification), and time (through narrative—which in turn activates agency, via character and point of view; and space, via setting)." By creating such space of difference on a topical, temporal and spatial level, Horace obtains several options of perspectivization. As we shall see shortly, allegory serves as a stylistic device for the Roman poet not only to set up a *lieu of mémoire* for generations to come, but also to integrate political statements. It might already be apparent at this point that the aim of this deductive delineation, as sketched above, is to show that Horace manages to avoid writing blatantly propagandistic panegyric in order to secure his poetic freedom and aesthetic independence in an era when literature was supposed to reflect, at least on the surface level, the dominant Augustan ideology.

[3] In order to avoid dilution of this strongly ramified term, I wish to refer readers to Culler's (1997) 96–105 trenchant and concise definition of 'performativity' with regard to poetics, on which my analysis of this literary-theoretical dimension in Horace's *Odes* 3.3, 3.4, 4.5 and 4.6 is based. In a nutshell, "the performative brings to the centre stage a use of language previously considered marginal—an active, world-making use of language, which resembles literary language—and helps us to conceive of literature as act or event." (ibid.) 96.

[4] For a more thorough literary-theoretical discussion of various facets of 'allegory', see Knaller (2002) 83–101; Harris/Tolmie (2011) 109–120.

Before plunging into the complex network of the Horatian lyrical *corpus*, the fact should be addressed that the first collection of *Odes* (1–3) was published in 23 BC, whereas book four was only made available to the Roman public in 13 BC. This temporal gap is accompanied not only by a change in historical circumstances, but also a shift in Horace's as well as Augustus' position, which is one of the reasons to account for the alteration in tone and style in *Carm.* 4.5 and 4.6. When the first collection of *Odes* was published, Horace was still aspiring to reach the poetic zenith and could only cement his status as a self-styled lyricist after the successful performance of the *Carmen saeculare* in 17 BC[5]. Augustus also experienced a gain in *auctoritas* in this decennium: having stepped down from the consulship in 23 BC, he adopted the *tribunicia potestas* to compensate for the loss of this highest office[6], thus maintaining political influence without being attributed the formal power[7].

In this period of the so-called second Augustan settlement the emperor received several other special grants, such as the *ius primae relationis*, i. e. the right of speaking first at a Senate meeting, the *cura annonae* to care for Rome's grain supply, which cushioned his patronage over the commons, and the *imperium maius proconsulare*, i. e. the right to govern his own provinces and armies as well as to interfere in any other governor's province when he deemed it necessary. In addition, his famous marriage legislation was codified in the *Lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus* in 18 BC to substantiate the idea of a moral renewal by promoting marriage as well as childbearing and to impose various penalties on those who lived in a state of celibacy after a certain age[8].

Many scholarly hairs have been split over the question to which extent Horace and his contemporaries incorporated appreciative and/or skeptical allusions to the outlined historical proceedings in their works. Even though I am on board with the general suppositions presented by the *two-voices*-theory of the Harvard school, I argue that Vergil—other than Horace—incorporates more apparent regime-supportive remarks in his *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* that mirror Augustan aspirations to effectuate moral and political renewal. To give one example, Vergil uses the epic hexameter to cast Aeneas as a mythic foil for the emperor, while celebrating him as the bringer of a new Golden Age (*aurea condet saecula*) and a hero whose origin can be traced back to the gods (*divi genus*) in *Aen.* 6.792–793. Ovid's stance to the *princeps*, by contrast, was diametrically opposed. His inclination to play with fire in his sassy and frequently subversive literary incarnations, most significantly the *Amores*, the *Ars Amatoria* and the *Metamorphoses*, earned him his exile in

[5] The primary mission of the *Carmen saeculare* was to convey appropriate *mores* to the Roman society. The fact that the hymn was not only commissioned by Augustus, but also inscribed (and presumably published) lets Putnam (2000) 109 rightly assume that it was used for instructional purposes after the occasion at which it was performed.

[6] Le Glay et al. (2009) 217 point out that after 23 BC, Augustus only held the office twice, in 5 BC and 2 BC, to preside over the introduction of his adopted sons into public life.

[7] Lowrie (1997) 326.

[8] Le Glay et al. (2009) 217; Edwards (1993) 37.

a remote region of the Black Sea. He wallows in remorse and futilely tries to talk the *princeps* into reconsidering this gambit when he implies that he has carried his jokes too far in his well-known aphorism *carmen et error* (*Trist.* 2.207). Moreover, Ovid comes down handsomely in one panegyric passage of his *Epistulae ex Ponto* (4.8.43–54) in which—as Schindler (2009) 23 observes—the lyrical *persona* offers his services to Germanicus, a member of Rome's ruling house. The exiled poet promises to honor the military achievements and thus to confer eternity upon his addressee by conserving his deeds in verses that were resistent to the ravages of time. Yet, all of Ovid's attempts to appease Augustus, his successor Tiberius and their imperial entourage with backpedaling praise poetry remained in vain. No such notion of despair pervades Horace's panegyric passages, even though the permanent meandering between the two poles of pro- and anti-Augustan standpoints was also high on his agenda.

When browsing through the secondary literature, it becomes apparent that this approach to our poet has not always complied with the scholarly *communis opinio*: Friedrich Engels (1882), for instance, had a relatively undifferentiated take on the Horace-Augustus-relationship, and denounced our Roman poet as a 'philistine' (*Biedermanne*) who would 'suck up' to the (future) emperor at any occasion that availed itself[9], there is now broad scholarly consensus on the following key fact:

> "Ein Augustus-Bild ohne Einwände gegen den Princeps gibt es nicht. Oft konzentrierten sich die Bedenken freilich auf Entscheidungen und Handlungen des jungen Octavianus, auf seine Rolle bei den Proscriptionen, beim Massaker von Perusia und dergleichen."[10]

While it might be tempting and an easy fix to tar all the Horatian *Odes* with the same brush, as Engels did, we lose more than we win by embarking on this one-dimensional interpretative stance which categorizes the Horatian œuvre as blatantly uncritical 'Augustus-bootlicking', to put it polemically. Not only does this approach deviate from the current *communis opinio* on the *Odes*[11], it also eclipses two crucial content dimensions: (1) the Roman poet's genuine concern to propagate a certain set of morally approvable values that harken back to the early days of the unblemished Roman Republic; and (2) Horace's metaliterary and philosophically-inclined reflections on his own accomplishments as well as on human life on an abstract level.

To classify Horace as a political puppeteer and a mere mouthpiece of Augustus would thus be a serious *faux pas*. Instead, I plead the case for Horace as a tightrope-walker who

[9] Engels casts this harsh verdict on the Roman poet in a letter to his friend Marx, recorded in Lifschitz (1949) 297.

[10] Schmidt (1985) 144.

[11] Lyne (1995), Lowrie (1997), Oliensis (1998), Johnson (2004) and Rees (2012) offer a multi-faceted approach towards the different layers of regime-supportive or -critical tones that can be detected in the Horatian *Odes*.

had a unique card up his sleeve: occasionally, he withdrew to his "sympotic persona", as Johnson (2004) 42 trenchantly labelled it, and to the unpolitical-erotic realm in his *Odes* that can be pitted against the hegemonic imperative to praise the *princeps*. This tactic—which is not devoid of a political message—found an echo in Tibullus: the major part of his poems can be classified as 'apolitical', as Schmidt (1985) 142 shows. Furthermore, Zarecki (2010) 249 rightly remarks that Horace sometimes escaped verbal straight-jacketing and direct emperor panegyric by another strategy: he referred to historically remarkable events that would prepare the mention of Octavian/Augustus and retracted in the last second by positioning another addressee, for instance his literary patron Maecenas or his poet-friend Vergil, in the center of the corresponding *Odes* (1.1, 1.3, 4.11, 4.12).

Nevertheless, we should not be ignorant towards the fact that the Roman poet employs certain explicitly encomiastic strategies in some of his *Odes* that, on the one hand, forge a bridge back to his Greek predecessor Pindar whom he casts as a model worthy of emulation in *Ode* 4.2[12]; on the other hand, Horace's panegyric tactics can be accommodated within a more general literary-theoretical framework due to a certain range of structural elements that are characteristic of the panegyric genre[13] as well as their inclusion of epideictic features[14], including (1) an explanation of the moving causes for the panegyric in the proem, (2) the use of stylistic devices such as *amplificatio* (αὔξησις) or *comparatio* (σύγκρισις) of the addressee with mythic *exempla*, (3) metaphors, allegories, semantic clusters or complex cola, and (4) references to the *laudandus* with regard both to his accomplishments in war (πράξεις κατὰ πόλεμον) and his way of acting in times of peace (πράξεις κατ᾽εἰρήνην)[15]. Moreover, Horace makes use of hymns, to be specific the so-called ὕμνος κλητικός which Menander Rhetor (Περὶ Ἐπιδεικτικῶν, 424.4–6) classified as being tied to a particular situation which encapsulates the address of an absent ruler from a distance and an exhortation for his return[16].

Instead of grandiloquent epic praise, however, "Horatian panegyric depends on an invitation to community."[17] The poet indeed leaves his personal trademark on the *Odes* by recurring to the original function of the πανηγυρικὸς λόγος as a communal speech act (see footnote 1) and by steering a middle course. As we shall see shortly, he sometimes

[12] Horace draws on an elaborate simile by paralleling the Pindaric style with a rushing stream or a soaring swan (*cycnum*, V. 25) while his own poetic *persona* finds an analogy in the bee, plucking thyme on the banks of the well-watered river Tibur (V. 29–32). For a more thorough treatment of the relationship between Horace and Pindar, see Bitto (2012).

[13] Morton Braund (1998) 56–58 provides a recommendable and concise overview of the earliest theoretical considerations related to the (proto-)panegyric genre, as recorded in Isocrates and Menander Rhetor.

[14] Bittner (1962) 18 outlines how the Romans (e.g. Cicero, *Inv.* 2.115 or 2.48) translated the technical term ἐπιδεικτικὸν γένος (which goes back to Aristotle) to *genus demonstrativum* in their theoretical treatises on rhetoric and poetry.

[15] This enumeration is indebted to Menander Rhetor whose treatise Περὶ Ἐπιδεικτικῶν (368–398) was precedent-setting for a first comprehensive theoretical approximation to panegyric as a literary genre. For further details, see Schindler (2009) 15–58 who provides an ample account of the genesis and reconfiguration of the panegyric 'genre'.

[16] Du Quesnay (1995) 151.

[17] Johnson (2004) xix.

opts for a *recusatio* and thus signals that a "true *encomium* of the *princeps* lies outside the capabilities of Horace's lyric *persona*."[18] Finally, the Roman poet draws on another stylistic cue that is typical of the panegyric genre, i. e. its *Sittenspiegel*-function[19]: he charges his encomiastic articulations with critical remarks. In other words, he sets out an ideal to which the emperor should live up in reality. Horace thus intermingles protreptic with eulogy and conveys an injunction to decent rulership in the guise of praise.

Inhowfar these theoretical features play out on a concrete textual level shall now be demonstrated in a close reading of selected *Odes* from the third and fourth book. Let us begin by extrapolating some details of the above-mentioned ideological shift from 23–13 BC that surrounded the Augustan *persona*. The *Roman Odes*, especially 3.3 and 3.4, illuminatingly testify to this shift. By inserting little hints, Horace seems to suggest that these two poems can be read as a unity: not only does he call upon his muse at the end of 3.3 (*Musa*, line 70) and at the beginning of 3.4 (*Calliope*, line 2), he also establishes a link between these two *Carmina* on a lexical level by using two verbs in the imperative mode (*desine*, *Ode* 3.3.70 and *descende*, *Ode* 3.4.1) and by associating his source of inspiration with lofty poetry, circumscribed as *sermones* (*Ode* 3.3.71) and *melos* (*Ode* 3.4.2).

In the mentioned poems Horace assumes, as Santirocco (1986) 112–114 observes, a lofty vatic and almost Pindaric stance to address the nation's youth (*virginibus puerisque canto*, *Ode* 3.1.4) and to include moral exhortations that are densely interwoven with allusions to contemporary political events, such as Augustus' disbanding of troops and the settlement of veterans after the civil wars (*militia simul fessas cohortes addidit oppidis*, *Ode* 3.4.37–38). In addition, the *Roman Odes* generally resonate with a criticism of flaws such as *avaritia, luxuria*, aristocratic ostentation and rivalries based on *ambitio*, thus being generally in line with the official Augustan ideology without being overtly patriotic: The famous gnome *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* (*Ode* 3.2.13) is often quoted to underpin the assumption that Horace's *Roman Odes* represent Augustan propaganda straightforwardly; however, within its context this *sententia* does not fully embrace a praise of warfare since it is related to the personal sacrifice that the desire to earn glory in battle entails.

When including references to the *princeps* in the *Roman Odes*, Horace draws on a descriptive register and sometimes even marginalizes the emperor-figure to a certain extent, thus deflecting direct praise[20]. Augustus' explicit mention is limited to two references in the third and fourth poem of the cycle: in *Carm.* 3.4 he is represented as being refreshed by the muse in the Pierian grottos (lines 37–40) while the poet imagines him in the company of two demigods, Hercules and Pollux, during a banquet in heaven in *Ode* 3.3 (lines 9–12):

[18] Zarecki (2010) 245.
[19] Morton Braund (1998) 53.
[20] Lowrie (1997) 238.

Hac arte Pollux et vagus Hercules
enisus arces attigit igneas,
quos inter Augustus recumbens
purpureo bibet ore nectar.[21]

Although Horace seemingly embraces the idea of the emperor as a divine being, the future tense (*bibet*, line 12) implies that the poet refers to a posthumous deification, thus insinuating that the emperor's immortality is contingent rather than certain[22]. This reading as well as the fact that the *princeps* is never made the direct addressee in any of the *Roman Odes* stands in stark contrast to Oliensis' (1998) 127 assumption that "Augustus is too strong a center of gravity. Once introduced into a poem, he will tend to wrap it into a shape that represents his own supreme authority." Admittedly, this claim is more valid for the fourth collection of *Odes* in which the emperor-figure is elevated to a position of heigthened prominence. In *Carm.* 3.3 and 3.4, however, Horace accomplishes a disavowal of praise poetry by drawing on a number of rhetorical devices to divert attention from Augustus or even cast doubt on the legitimacy of his unrestrained sovereignty with three strategies:

First, Horace fragments the narrative by digressing to his fictional autobiography. To begin with, the poet discloses some details about his infancy and early adulthood in *Ode* 3.4 in the cloak of his lyrical *persona*. He mentions having been covered with bay and myrtle by wood-doves when he went astray as a child on the slopes of Mount Vultur. He seems to intentionally parallel his biography with Pindar's who, as legend holds it, was not only fed with honey, but also laid in bay and myrtle, as Nisbet/Rudd (2004) 54 and West (2002) 46 remark[23]. The Horatian *persona* then goes on to mention his ignominious flight at the battle of Philippi where he fought on the side of the Republicans (!), his close escape from death when he was almost fatally hit by a falling tree, and his survival of a shipwreck near Sicily (lines 25–28). In this respect, I agree with Oliensis (1998) 227, who supposes that this uniquely Horatian autobiographical fallacy significantly contributes to the creation of his lyric ego. In other words: the lyrical *persona* reserves altogether five stanzas in *Ode* 3.4 for recollecting personal experiences and expressing hope to venture beyond the limits of the Roman world, a statement which is conveyed in terms of conceptual geography, implying—just as in *Odes* 2.20 and 3.30—that the poet's œuvre is "coextensive with the Roman empire in time and space"[24].

[21] "By such arts did Pollux and far-travelled Hercules / prevail and reach the citadels of fire, / and between them Augustus will recline / and drink the nectar with his purple lips." Translation by West (2002).

[22] Santirocco (1986) 121.

[23] For the Pindaric form of hymnic praise as an important stylistic model for Horace, see Lefèvre (1993) 282–284.

[24] Lowrie (1997) 75.

Second, the *Roman Odes* under scrutiny resonate with Republican echoes that seem to offer a juxtaposed alternative to the threat of a tyrannical monarchy or the dominion of the commons, thus addressing a *caveat* that a good ruler should take at face value:

> Iustum et tenacem propositi virum
> non civium ardor prava iubentium,
> non vultus instantis tyranni
> mente quatit solida neque Auster.[25]

This opening of *Ode* 3.3 (lines 1–4) appears to praise Stoic qualities, *virtus* and *iustitia*, which ought to be displayed in turmoil. Although I largely agree with Syndikus' (1973) analysis of *Carm.* 3.3, I doubt that he is right in denying the political significance of these verses:

> "Man würde den horazischen Versen, in denen die Wut des aufgebrachten Pöbels geschildert wird und dann der drohende Blick des Tyrannen, in dem Leben oder Tod steht, gewiß Unrecht tun, wollte man ihnen eine politische Bedeutung unterlegen."[26]

Not only does Horace draw on subtle links to connect this poem to *Ode* 1.22 which opens with a portrayal of a Stoic *sapiens*, alluding to Cato the Younger, the embodiment of Republicanism, but he was presumably also well aware of the fact that *iustitia* was a big political buzzword in his day. In addition to *clementia*, *pietas* and *virtus* it was one of the four cardinal virtues depicted on the *clipeum virtutis*, a golden shield presented by the senate and the people of Rome in 27 B. C. to Augustus whose powers had already been consolidated at this time. Undeniably, *iustitia* was a central concept for Cicero, one of the most fervent advocates of the Republican model. He situates it, as Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 39 observe, both at the heart of his moral philosophy and includes it in his treatises on political theory (*Off.* 1.20, *Rep.* 3.8) and mentions other cardinal virtues as well: *fortitudo, temperantia/continentia*, and *prudentia/sapientia*. Indisputably, these qualities were still looming in the background as a desirable ideal for an emperor in the Augustan period. In light of these inter- and intratextual parallels and contemporary references to political events, the beginning of *Carm.* 3.3 might possibly be read as premonition to the emperor not to utterly relinquish the idea of Republicanism while striving for autocracy.

Third, Horace glances at civil war, pacification, imperial expansion and particularly Augustus' entanglement in them under the cover of myth. In *Ode* 3.3, we find a succinct reference to the deification of Romulus: Commager (1962) 212 argues the case for Romulus as being construed as an Augustan *alter ego* in *Ode* 3.3 which then allows Horace to

[25] "The just man who holds fast to his resolve / is not shaken in the firmness of his mind by the passion / of citizens demanding some injustice / or by the threatening tyrant's frown, not by the wind of the south." Translation by West (2002).

[26] Syndikus (1973) 38.

celebrate the emperor as a second founder of the city and provisionally grant him divinity. Indeed, there is evidence to support the claim that the mythical *exemplum* can be interpreted as a foil for the *princeps*. However, the fact that the first foundation of Rome was an illicit one based on fratricide does not necessarily cast a positive light on Augustus. Furthermore, as Suetonius (*Aug.* § 7) tells us, the emperor himself refused to accept the honorific title "Romulus" due to its association with the regal period in the early days of Roman history, which would not only conflict with his ethos of being merely a *primus inter pares*, but also parallel his autocratic rule in Republican guise with royalty, thus putting it at risk of being violently rejected by his subjects. How are we thus supposed to read the reference to Romulus in *Ode* 3.3?

I support Seager's (1993) 32 view who argues that the mention of Rome's founding father serves as a springboard for the poet to insert an extensive speech by Juno. We learn that the once-hostile goddess grants empire to the Romans on two conditions: she voices the claim that they have to turn away from greed and lust for gold and instead adopt the blameless desire of viewing uninhabitable zones of the earth out of intellectual curiosity in order to legitimately extend their boundaries to the farthest regions (lines 45–56). Furthermore, Juno implies that Rome has to be severed from its destructive Phrygian origins and that Phoebus must not attempt to erect the ill-omened walls again:

> Ter si resurgat murus aëneus
> auctore Phoebo, ter pereat meis
> excisus Argivis, ter uxor
> capta virum puerosque ploret.[27]

In these lines (65–68) of *Carm.* 3.3 the authorial *persona*, in the guise of Juno, seems to criticize the lure of economic imperialism as well as the moral corruption symbolized by the orientalist features of Troy. A reading of the *fatalis incestusque iudex* and his *mulier peregrina* (lines 19–20) as Antony and Cleopatra who can be seen as an embodiment of the perverted licentiousness of the East further substantiates this interpretation. Moreover, if one deems the exegesis of Phoebus as an analogy to Augustus valid, this mythic excursus could be considered a subtle warning for the *princeps* not to fall prey to the enumerated deviations: Miller (2009) 15–18, too, highlights that Apollo was an important image for the crafting of Octavian's public *persona* as early as in the 30s. Not only did the *princeps* elevate him to one of his patron gods and dedicate a temple on the Palatine to him, he also emphasized the analogy between himself and the divine figure on numerous occasions. Suetonius (*Aug.* § 70) tells us that the emperor appeared in the dress of Phoebus during the "Banquet of the Twelve Gods" to intentionally communicate a certain self-image.

[27] "Were the bronze wall to rise again three times, / and Apollo build it, three times my Greeks / would cut it down, three times the captive wife / would weep for her husband and her sons." Translation by West (2002).

Nevertheless, the figure of Apollo is surrounded by the shadow of a certain ambivalence as he is not only the god of the Muses and of poetic inspiration, but also a bellicose god and an avenger of human hubris. This double configuration of Apollo is relevant as a foil for Augustus, as I will try to demonstrate shortly in my interpretation of *Ode* 4.6.

In the same vein, the Gigantomachy in *Odes* 3.4 lends itself for an allegorical reading although the poet slightly changes his tactics. Horace attributes to Augustus an elevating epithet (*Caesarem altum*, line 37) and emphasizes his attempt to end the civil wars (*finire quaerentem labores*, line 39); yet he only affords a small space to the mortal *laudandus* and abruptly turns to myth, showing how the Titans and other monsters were defeated by the gods. The onset of this episode (lines 45–48) is described as a cataclysmic battle fought by a universal conqueror:

> Qui terram inertem, qui mare temperat
> ventosum et urbes regnaque tristia,
> divosque mortalesque turmas
> imperio regit unus aequo.[28]

The indeterminacy resulting from a delayed designation of Jupiter whose name is only inserted in the next stanza (line 49) suggests an indirect merging of his identity with the emperor-figure[29] although there remains a carefully constructed vagueness to the association. Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 55 interpret the Gigantomachy as a trope of civil war, i. e. a conflict between order and anarchy, between legitimate forces of restraint (*vim temperatam*, line 66) and violent disorder (*vis consili expers*, line 65), a dichotomy that bears a certain symbolic relevance in the political imaginary. Given the contemporary subtext of the *Roman Odes*, which were probably written in the aftermath of the battle of Actium (31 B. C.), the opposing parties in the Gigantomachy could serve as allegorical foils for Antony and Octavian, the latter representing the order-bringing forces of Olympus, the former being cast as a configuration of mythological sinners such as Gyges (line 69), Orion (line 71), Tityos (line 77) and Pirithous (line 79). Since the offences of the last three figures are described as being explicitly sexual, they might allude, though obliquely, to the abominable and frivolous libertinism that was commonly associated with Antony. The emperor himself seems to bear traits of both, the shining Jovian example and Apollo whose

[28] "[He] governs dull earth and windy ocean, / [he] rules alone with just authority / the gloomy cities and kingdom of the dead, / the gods, and the armies of men." Translation by West (2002), partially adapted.

[29] Nisbet/Rudd (2004) 42 trenchantly argue that this parallelization is prepared by a subtle cue in *Carm.* 3.3 when Augustus is described as drinking nectar in the company of Hercules and Pollux while having a purple-stained face or mouth (*purpureo ore*, line 12). This could be regarded as an allusion to the Roman *triumphator* who in the course of the victory procession would cover his face with red paint in order to be the embodiment of Jupiter for one day the face of whose cult statue on the Capitoline Hill was supposedly painted red on festival days. While I am in line with this exegesis, I want to refer interested readers to Eidinow (2000) 463–471 who provides a comprehensive list of interpretative options that the line *purpureo bibet ore nectar* has given rise to.

bow rests on his shoulders, always prepared for future combats (line 60). By implication, this can also be said of Augustus who, having displayed his military prowess in the battle of Actium, is prepared for subsequent disturbances[30].

Whether or not the modern reader decides to embrace this allegorical interpretation, the fact should not be veiled that *Ode* 3.4 ends in the underworld, which, on a larger scale, is typical of the "deferential downwardness"[31] that characterizes the *Roman Odes* cycle[32]. Horace tactfully evades the panegyric mode by using a defensive rhetoric and by asserting his poetic autonomy. Not only does he expand on his fictional autobiography, he also places a *recusatio* at the end of *Ode* 3.3 (lines 69–72) to justify his role as a self-styled lyricist:

> Non hoc iocosae conveniet lyrae:
> quo, Musa, tendis? desine pervicax
> referre sermones deorum et
> magna modis tenuare parvis.[33]

The forth collection of *Odes*, by contrast, strikes a thoroughly different chord because Horace redirects his lyric to perform a more morally colored social function while gradually abandoning displacing techniques that were supposed to keep direct praise at distance; this, in turn, has aesthetic implications that lead to a renegotiation of the poet's role in relation to the *princeps*[34]. *Odes* 4.5 and 4.6 are symptomatic for this paradigm shift.

Especially *Carm.* 4.5 is often condemned to be a bombastic panegyric as the poetic voice yearns for Augustus' triumphant homecoming from a military campaign in Gaul. However, Horace still employs certain techniques to avoid writing a flat-footed eulogy, although the poem is in general permeated by a more reverential tone than the *Roman Odes*:

> Divis orte bonis, optume Romulae
> custos gentis, abes iam nimium diu;
> maturum reditum pollicitus patrum
> sancto concilio redi.
>
> Lucem redde tuae, dux bone, patriae:
> instar veris enim vultus ubi tuus

[30] Nisbet / Rudd (2004) 56; Miller (2002) 123.
[31] Oliensis (1998) 133.
[32] Bowditch (2001) 108.
[33] "This will not suit my cheerful lyre. / Where are you going, my wilful Muse? Stop / retailing the talk of gods and reducing / great matters to small measures." Translation by West (2002).
[34] Lowrie (1997) 326–327.

adfulsit populo, gratior it dies
et soles melius nitent.[35]

In these eight opening lines Horace draws on a grandiloquent and at times archaizing register[36]: in addition to addressing the *princeps* directly in an encomiastic epithet—he is born of heavenly gods (*divis orte bonis*, line 1) –, he frequently repeats the pronoun of the second person (*tu/te*), a feature that is normally reserved for ancient hymns to gods, to prepare and facilitate the parallelization of Augustus with a divinity (*te ... deum*, line 32). Moreover, *Ode* 4.5 abounds in light metaphors that are geared towards a praise of the emperor-figure: the second stanza, for instance, starts with the request that he should bring back the light to his home country (*lucem redde ... patriae*, line 5); yet there remains a slight discursive reservation since the direct address of Augustus is withheld, so he might best be classified as an absent presence in the poem, whose bright rising is awaited by the Romans.

In general, the authorial *persona* of *Ode* 4.5 cherishes the settlement that has been brought about under the emperor; Horace systematically ticks off the ideological checkpoints of Augustus' political, moral and religious renewal in three stanzas (lines 17–28), envisioning a golden age: the countryside is safe and productive, the sea is pacified, law and order are in place, marital fidelity is appropriately appreciated, the now no longer imminent threat of a foreign enemy, the Parthians, corrects the former imbalance of civil war and internal strife[37]. Aesthetic, moral, and territorial integrity seem to map onto one another in the lines 17–24:

tutus bos etenim rura perambulat,
nutrit rura Ceres almaque Faustitas,
pacatum volitant per mare navitae;
culpari metuit fides,

nullis polluitur casta domus stupris,
mos et lex maculosum edomuit nefas,
laudantur simili prole puerperae,
culpam peona premit comes.[38]

[35] "Sprung from gracious gods, finest warden of the race / of Romulus, you are absent now too long. / Return, since you promised a timely return / to the sacred council of the fathers. // Noble leader, render again your brilliance to your fatherland. / For when your countenance, like spring, has beamed / upon your people, the day courses more pleasantly, / and suns better their gleam." Translation by Putnam (1986).

[36] According to Thomas (2012) 152 the opening stanza can be read as an allusion to a passage in Ennius (quoted in Cicero's *Rep.* 1.64) that treats the longing of the people for the deceased Romulus. This intertextual reference would explain Horace's use of the obsolete version *optume* (*Ode* 4.5.1) instead of the more classical *optime*.

[37] Lowrie (1997) 337.

[38] "For the cow saunters safely through the fields, / the fields Ceres and nourishing Well-being sustain, / sailors sweep through a sea at peace, / Faith fears to suffer blame, // chaste homes are befouled by no

Augustus' unquestionable control over the country is echoed in these two technically perfect, carefully crafted stanzas: Horace's style is characterized by a "lucid parataxis", as Oliensis (1998) 117 labeled it, i. e. end-stopped stanzas, self-contained lines and a predominantly simple syntax, in order to mirror the exhortation to chastity and piety, the key tenets of the emperor's marriage legislation, on a formal level.

The rejuvenation of the state owing to Augustus is the central message of *Ode* 4.5. It is therefore probably no coincidence that the speaker highlights the importance of the emperor's presence, who is himself turned into a symbol of youth for Rome's vitality and flourishing in an extended simile. In a virtual *prosopopoeia*, the fatherland is represented as longing for its leader (*quaerit patria Caesarem*, line 15), just as a mother yearns for her son (*ut mater iuvenem*, line 9) who ventured out into the world to deliberately expose himself to dangers[39]. By drawing on this stylistic device, i. e. the personification of the fatherland, Horace shrewdly sublimates the invocation and thus not only charges it with emotional intensity, but envelops it in a cushion of 'performativity'. In other words: the poetic *persona* transcends the semantic and constative level of meaning creation. He employs a rhetorical operation that animates the main character, Augustus, and brings into being the social reality surrounding him.

Not only the already mentioned notion of parenthood and the densely fabricated system of patronage, but also the performative dimension are crucial for the ending of both *Carm.* 4.5 and 4.6. The lyric ego cedes his lofty vatic stance that was characteristic of the *Roman Odes* and imagines himself as a symposiast in lines 37–40 of *Carm.* 4.5, being part of the undifferentiated rustic folk in the countryside while singing a hymn (within the actual hymn!) in praise of their patron, the *princeps*:

> 'Longas o utinam, dux bone, ferias
> praestes Hesperiae' dicimus integro
> sicci mane die, dicimus uvidi,
> cum sol Oceano subest.[40]

By embedding the eulogy and quoting the actual words that were presumably uttered during the communal country feast, Horace not only accomplishes a merging of the private and the public sphere, thus attempting to construct a group identity, he also offers a reassurance of the permanence of his own honorific song, thus presenting both, "a special *laudatio* of the emperor and a gentle *recusatio*, true to the love of privacy and of freedom for self-reflection which the countryside so often symbolizes in Horace's poetry", as Putnam (1986) 114 rightly remarks.

stain, / custom and law have tamed blotched evil, / women in childbirth are praised for likeness to their offspring, / punishment presses hard on blame." Translation by Putnam (1986).

[39] Thomas (2012) 151.

[40] "'Noble leader, please grant long holidays to Hesperia,' / this is our prayer, sober in the morning, when the day / is whole, this is our prayer, mellow, / when the sun sinks into the Ocean." Translation by Putnam (1986).

Likewise, the speaker abandons his distinct poetic voice at the end of *Ode* 4.6 and puts the *encomium* into the mouth of somebody else. Interestingly, we see a renunciation of explicit Augustus-panegyric and instead a turn to the poet himself who refers to his own achievement, the *Carmen saeculare*, in a self-congratulatory tone in the following *sphragis* (lines 41–44):

> Nupta iam dices 'ego dis amicum,
> saeculo festas referente luces,
> reddidi carmen docilis modorum
> vatis Horati.'[41]

Within the narrative context of the poem, these words are uttered by a female chorister who is imagined as having participated in the actual performance of the saecular hymn, a situation that is (re)activated in the readers' memory through the *Ode*. The speaker envisions the woman's lifetime as moving towards the responsibility of marriage and, by implication, childbearing (*nupta*, line 41), thus faintly echoing the propriety of the Augustan marriage legislation. Yet, the reference to the emperor's reforms fades from the spotlight in favor of Horace's contemplation of the creation and communication of his centennial hymn which, when performed, will continue to recreate the imaginative ceremony of art and music and thus grant immortality to the poet[42].

These metapoetic reflections are preceded by an extended mythic narrative in which the god Apollo is central. The description of his character is more ramified than in *Odes* 3.3 and 3.4 where the focus was on his role as a pacifier in times of military (and political) turmoil. Furthermore, in *Ode* 4.6 his divinity "links the ruler and poet in a powerful juggernaut of imperial imaging," as Johnson (2004) 57 observes. Horace elaborates on a dual configuration of Apollo: the first half of the hymn is dedicated to his role as a punisher of human hubris, embodied by Niobe and Tityos, as well as a defeater of Achilles who could symbolize the blind brutality of a warrior greedy for slaughter; the second half depicts Apollo as a god of the Muses and of poetic inspiration.

It is noteworthy that *Odes* 4.5 and 4.6 display carefully crafted verbal and metaphorical links: *Carm.* 4.5 opens with referring to Augustus as being born of heavenly gods (*divis orte bonis*, line 1); the subsequent poem establishes a close lexical connection by addressing Apollo as god (*dive*, line 1). In addition, the complimentary equation of Augustus and Apollo is achieved by Horace's use of light-metaphors, as Putnam (1986) 117 observes. In *Carm.* 4.5 the speaker desires the emperor's return, for it will enhance the sun's gleam (*soles melius nitent*, line 8); strikingly, the lucidity of the imagery is carried over to the neighboring hymn in which Apollo—notwithstanding his delayed naming—is addressed

[41] "Now when married you will boast: 'As the age was restoring / days of celebration, I myself performed again a song / friendly to the gods, I, instructed in the modes / of the bard, Horace.'" Translation by Putnam (1986).

[42] Putnam (1986) 122–123.

as Phoebus, i. e. in his function as a light-bringing sun-god, thus providing an apt mythic foil for Augustus[43].

Compared to the *Roman Odes*, the dual function of the myth and its allegorical interpretation hints at a remarkable shift in the poet's attitude towards the *princeps*. On the one hand, he stresses his qualities as an avenger which seems to be in line with the official position of the *Res Gestae* where Augustus highlights his lawful vengeance for the assassination of his adoptive father:

> Qui parentem meum interfecerunt, eos in exilium expuli iudiciis legitimis ultus eorum facinus, et postea bellum inferentis rei publicae vici bis acie.[44]

On the other hand, Horace apparently evokes Augustus' function as a patron of the poets in analogy to Apollo by emphatically repeating his name twice in lines 29–30 of *Ode* 4.6:

> Spiritum Phoebus mihi, Phoebus artem
> carminis nomenque dedit poetae.[45]

As demonstrated above, the poet clearly makes use of the malleable domain of myth which is very manipulable to contemporary political circumstances. The figures can be made to mean what they ought to in a given context, but meaning also escapes the attempt to contain it and evokes different chains of associations in different recipients. Just as Apollo could be regarded as a commendable likeness for Augustus (and vice versa as the analogy works in both ways), it is also possible to interpret his prominent role as an expression of the poet's reservation towards the *princeps*. Although Apollo's martial weaponry eventually gives way to the lyre in *Ode* 4.6, the fact should not be obscured that he slaughters Niobe's children (*proles Niobea*, line 1), who have to expiate their mother's crime, and hunts down Achilles whose martial preeminence is amply documented in the second stanza—but Achilles' role in *Ode* 4.6 is not uncontested. Although the poet reserves considerable space to expand on the demigod's *aretalogy*, he is also potrayed as bloodthirsty slaughterer who does not recoil from hunting down infants incapable of speech or babies in their mothers' wombs (*nescios fari pueros ... matris in alvo*, lines 18–20), thus proving worthy of Apollo's vendetta. In symbolic terms this human sacrifice can be seen as a general perversion of the socio-moral order to which Augustus put an end.

Let us now focus on another detail that is indicative of Horace's formal craftsmanship: In a powerful simile Achilles is described as being cut down like a pine tree with a

[43] Thomas (2012) 164.

[44] *Res Gestae* 2.10–12: "I drove into exile the murderers of my father, avenging their crime through tribunals established by law; and afterwards, when they made war on the republic, I twice defeated them in battle." Translation by Brunt/Moore (1967).

[45] "Phoebus granted me breath, Phoebus the art of song and the repute of [a] poet." Translation by Putnam (1986).

blade (*mordaci velut icta ferro pinus*, *Ode* 4.6.9). It can barely be a coincidence that the Roman poet uses exactly the same phrasing to describe the fatherland stricken by loyalty when yearning for Augustus' return in the preceding poem (*desideriis icta fidelibus patria quaerit Caesarem*, *Ode* 4.5.15–16). In drawing a parallel between Apollo's deeds and the emperor's, Horace could thus conjure up the image of the ferocious Octavian who, as Suetonius tells us (*Aug.* § 15), would subdue the masses and stop at nothing to accomplish his aims, especially in the early days of his career:

> In plurimos animadvertit, orare veniam vel excusare se conantibus una voce occurrens, moriendum esse.[46]

Although I am not advocating an anti-Augustan reading of *Odes* 4.5 and 4.6, I want to challenge the notion that the fourth book of Horace's *Carmina* can be summed up as patent emperor-panegyric which the poet has oftentimes been accused of and criticized for. Rather, I approve of the following view which concisely encapsulates the Horatian multifacetedness:

> "Horace constructs his panegyric to admit disputes (*dubia*) and conflicting viewpoints [...] reveal[ing] the complex interactions among the *laudandus*, *laudator*, and the evaluations of the audience. By implication the Augustan ideology to which the praise poet supposedly reacts cannot be the sole possession of any one authority but is subject to the volatile climate of communal interpretation, the outcome of which cannot be predicted."[47]

Stepping on the shoulders of this analytical body without being soaked in by the alluring and omnipresent vortex of literary-theoretical deconstruction, I wish to emphasize several points in conclusion. Let us begin by summarizing the most important shifts from *Odes* 3.3. and 3.4. to 4.5 and 4.6 as they are representative for the general transformation in Horace's attitude towards the *princeps*. Instead of consistently denouncing ills and the lax morality that caused the breakdown of Republican institutions, the fourth collection of *Odes* resonates with a sense of settlement which reflects the well-established position of both Horace and Augustus at the time of their publication. In addition, *Odes* 4.5 and 4.6 convey a spirit of political renewal and restoration under the protectorate of the *princeps*. Rather than including rhetorical strategies to circumvent direct praise of the emperor, e.g. avoidance of explicit address of Augustus or digressions to the poet's fictional autobiography, Horace switches to the generic form of hymn to extol the *princeps* more overtly, though sometimes perfunctorily. In spite of the fact that the Roman emperor is not even once named directly in *Ode* 4.6 (which is why we have to rely on the contingent

[46] "He turned against a multitude of people, opposing those who begged for mercy or those who tried to find an excuse with one steadfast voice, that they ought to die." My own translation.

[47] Johnson (2004) 61.

identification of Apollo/Augustus), the poet clearly affords more space to his imperial *laudandus* in the fourth book of his *Carmina* than in the *Roman Odes*. This move goes hand in hand with a gradual retreat of his own distinct poetic voice. Therefore, I subscribe to Lowrie's (1997) 351 reading that the "removal of the poet as an ego and the eclipse of any lyric not exclusively devoted to its social function" is symptomatic of the fourth book of *Odes*. No longer does the poet prophetically pillory Rome's *status quo* in the direct aftermath of the battle of Actium, but the Horatian *persona* sometimes seems to merge with the broader populace to join in the hymn of praise. The high level of immediacy and 'performativity' via the embedding of other voices (the rustic folk in 4.5, the female chorister in 4.6) contributes to the portrayal of a social reality that transcends the purely constative/textual dimension: while retaining a significant amount of generic instability through the incorporation of selective hymnic features, Horace carefully fleshes out the intended panegyric[48].

In addition to this encomiastic element, Horace keeps exploiting the domain of myth as a form of allegory both in the *Roman Odes* and in *Carm.* 4.5 and 4.6 to connect it with incisive contemporary events. He thus introduces an additional layer of 'residual narrativity' channelled through a mythic outlet. By employing this literary strategy, he shrewdly avoids making it perfectly transparent which role is inhabited by Octavian/Augustus in the political imaginary. Consequently, the Roman poet manages to escape the hegemonic imperative to unscrupulously herald the imperial propaganda of the day. Finally, Horace often inserts metapoetic comments—especially in the fourth collection of his *Carmina*—to refer to himself or, more precisely, his literary accomplishments in a more subtle way than in the first compilation of *Odes* 1–3. Despite focussing on the emperor and his reforms on the surface level in 4.5 and 4.6, he still achieves to allude to his wish for poetic immortality, to the aesthetic qualities of his polymorphous literary œuvre and, above all, to the fact that the artistic and the political realm are equally important in the age of the Pax Augusta.

kathi.schoen1@gmail.com

About the Author Katharina-Maria Schön studierte an der Universität Wien die Sprachen Latein und Englisch auf Lehramt (2011–2017). Stark geprägt wurde sie durch ihr

[48] The letter to Augustus (*Epist.* 2.1) chimes in with this (cautiously) eulogistic tone and adds to the textual *corpus* that classical scholars have darted for to extrapolate details of Horace's relationship with the emperor. Even though the opening lines of the above-cited letter clearly display explicit reverence for the emperor (*praesenti tibi maturos largimur honores*, line 15), Horace does not fail to adhere to his credo of epic *recusatio* in the end: the Roman poet not only forges a bridge to his debut collection, the *sermones* (line 250), which he characterizes in a typically Horatian understatement as low-key poetry, crawling above the soil (*repentes per humum*, line 251; cf. also *Sat.* 2.6.17 where he classifies the *sermones* as being inspired by the down-to-earth Muse: *quid prius illustrem satiris musaque pedestri?*), he also remains true to himself by perpetuating his disawoval of unabated Augustus-praise: *sed neque parvum carmen maiestas recipit tua, nec meus audet rem temptare pudor quam vires ferre recusent* (*Epist.* 2.1.257–259). For a more thorough examination of Horace's *Epistles* II, see Brink (1982).

Auslandssemester an der University of Chicago (2015). Aktuell ist sie als AHS-Lehrerin am BG/BRG Purkersdorf tätig, davor war sie an der Universität Wien als Tutorin für die Lehrveranstaltungen „Language Analysis“, „Grammar in Use“ und „Römische Metrik“ am Department of English and American Studies sowie am Institut für Klassische Philologie, Mittel- und Neulatein angestellt. Ihre philologischen Forschungsinteressen konzentrieren sich auf die Schnittstellen von Literatur, politischer Philosophie und Ideologiekritik (primär in der Goldenen und Silbernen Latinität), sowie Intertextualität im Werk augusteischer Dichter und deren Rezeption in späteren Epochen.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Brunt, P. A.; Moore, J. M. (Ed.) 1967, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti. The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*, Oxford.

Edwards, C. (Ed.) 2008, *Suetonius. Lives of the Caesars*, Oxford.

Fink, G. (Ed.) 2002, *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Oden und Epoden*, Düsseldorf/Zürich.

Geymonat, M. (Ed.) 19733, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Turin.

McClatchy J. D. (Ed.) 2002, *Horace: The Odes. New Translations by Contemporary Poets*, Princeton/Oxford.

Russell, D. A. (Ed.) 1981, *Menander Rhetor*, Oxford.

Willige, W.; Holzberg, N. (Ed.) 2005[4], *Publius Ovidius Naso. Briefe aus der Verbannung. Tristia. Epistulae ex Ponto*, Düsseldorf/Zürich.

Secondary Literature

Bittner (1962): F. Bittner, *Studien zum Herrscherlob in der mittellateinischen Dichtung* (Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Philosophischen Fakultät der Julius-Maximilians-Universität zu Würzburg), Volkach.

Bitto (2012): G. Bitto, *Lyrik als Philologie. Zur Rezeption hellenistischer Pindarkommentierung in den Oden des Horaz. Mit einer rhetorisch-literaturkritischen Analyse der Pindar-Scholien*, Rahden, Westfahlen.

Bowditch (2001): P. L. Bowditch, *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.

Brink (1982): C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry: Epistles Book II: The Letters to Augustus and Florus*, London, New York, Cambridge.

Commager (1962): S. Commager, *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*, New Haven.

Culler (1997): J. Culler, *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford.

Davis (1999): G. Davis, "Carmina/Iambi: The Literary-Generic Dimension of Horace's *Integer vitae* (C. 1, 22)", in: William S. Anderson (Ed.), *Why Horace? A Collection of Interpretations*, Wauconda, 51–62.

Du Quesnay (1995): I. M. le M. du Quesnay, "Horace, Odes 4.5: Pro Reditu Imperatoris Caesaris Divi Filii Augusti", in: S. J. Harrison (Ed.), *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*, Oxford, 128–187.

Edwards (1993): C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge.

Eck (2007): W. Eck, *The Age of Augustus* (2nd Ed.), Oxford.

Eidinow (2000): J. S. C. Eidinow, "Purpureo Bibet Ore Nectar: A Reconsideration", in: *The Classical Quarterly* 50 (2) 463–471.

Fludernik (2005): M. Fludernik, "Allegory, Metaphor, Scene and Expression. The Example of English Medieval and Early Modern Lyric Poetry", in: E. Müller-Zettelmann and M. Rubik (Ed.), *Theory Into Poetry: New Approaches to the Lyric*, Amsterdam, New York, 99–124.

Harris/Tolmie (2011): R. A. Harris; S. Tolmie, "Cognitive Allegory: An Introduction", in: *Metaphor and Symbol* 26/109–120.

Johnson (2004): T. S. Johnson, *A Symposion of Praise. Horace Returns to Lyric in Odes IV*, Wisconsin.

Knaller (2002): S. Knaller, "A Theory of Allegory beyond Walter Benjamin and Paul de Man; with Some Remarks on Allegory and Memory", in: *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory* 77 (2) 83–101.

Lefèvre (1993): E. Lefèvre, *Horaz. Dichter im augusteischen Rom*, München.

Le Glay et al. (2009): M. Le Glay; J.-L. Voisin; Y. Le Bohec; D. Cherry; D. G. Kyle; E. Manolaraki, *A History of Rome* (4th Ed.), Chichester/West Sussex.

Lifschitz (1949): M. Lifschitz, Karl Marx-Friedrich Engels. *Über Kunst und Literatur*, Berlin.

Lowrie (1997): M. Lowrie, *Horace's Narrative Odes*, Oxford.

Lyne (1995): R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Horace. Behind the Public Poetry*, New Haven/London.

Miller (2002): J. F. Miller, "Experiencing Intertextuality in Horace, Odes 3.4", in: Michael Paschalis (Ed.), *Pastoral Palimpsests: Essays in the Reception of Theocritus and Virgil*, Herakleion, 119–127.

Miller (2009): J. F. Miller, *Apollo, Augustus and the Poets*, Cambridge, New York.

Morton Braund (1998): S. Morton Braund, "Praise and Protreptic in Early Imperial Panegyric: Cicero, Seneca, Pliny", in: Mary Whitby (Ed.), *The Propaganda of Power. The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Leiden, Boston, Köln, 53–76.

Nisbet/Rudd (2004): R. Nisbet; N. Rudd, *A Commentary on Horace*, Odes, Book III, Oxford.

Oliensis (1998): E. Oliensis, *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*, Cambridge.

Putnam (1986): M. C. J. Putnam, *Artifices of Eternity. Horace's Fourth Book of Odes*, Ithaca, London.

Putnam (2000): M. C. J. Putnam, *Horace's Carmen Saeculare. Ritual Magic and the Poet's Art*, New Haven, London.

Rees (2012): R. Rees, "The Modern History of Latin Panegyric", in: Roger Rees (Ed.), *Latin Panegyric*, Oxford, 3–48.

Santirocco (1986): M. S. Santirocco, *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes*, Chapel Hill, London.

Schindler (2009): C. Schindler, *Per Carmina Laudes. Untersuchungen zur spätantiken Verspanegyrik von Claudian bis Coripp*, Berlin, New York.

Schmidt (1985): E. G. Schmidt, "Der politische, der unpolitische und der ganze Horaz", in: *Klio* 67 (1) 139–157.

Seager (1993): R. Seager, "Horace and Augustus, Poetry and Policy", in: Niall Rudd (Ed.), *Horace 2000: A Celebration: Essays for the Bimilennium*, Ann Arbor, 23–40.

Syndikus (1973): H. P. Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz. Eine Interpretation der Oden. Band II: Drittes und viertes Buch*, Darmstadt.

Thomas (2012): R. F. Thomas, *Horace. Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*, Cambridge.

West (2002): D. West, *Horace Odes III: Dulce Periculum*, Oxford.

Zarecki (2010): J. P. Zarecki, "A Duet of Praise: Horace, Vergil and the Subject of Canemus in Carm. 4.15.32", in: *The Classical Association of the Middle West and South* 105 (3) 245–262.

Book Review

A. Pizzone, The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature: Modes, Functions, and Identities, *Boston, Berlin 2014*

Sonia Francisetti Brolin
Sapienza Università di Roma

Byzantine studies have recently developed some topics of Classical Philology, by expanding approaches and interpretations of literary criticism. In particular, this book is a miscellany about the construction of authorial personae and about the strategies of authorial self-production[1]; it aims, as stated in Pizzone's introduction (3–18), to investigate authorship in Middle Byzantine literature, collecting essays which illuminate literary production, author, self, historical context, and social situation. The collection, giving some new interpretative perspectives in the debate about the death of the author, analyses a range of 9th–12th century Byzantine works. It is organized in three parts:

1. Modes: how a literary work is presented by an authorial choice in order to speak with a specific audience or reader;

2. Functions: how an author intends his work to be understood in his time, place and socio-cultural context;

3. Identities: how a personification or an identity of the author, as agent, compiler or producer of his text, is identifiable through his stylistic and performative use of the language.

The first section is opened by Papaioannou (21–40), whose intention is to present a set of Byzantine ideas of authorship, analyzing lives and personal sensibilities, social networks and traditions, dominant ideologies, disorderly practices, cultural possibilities, and material limitations. With a focus on the middle Byzantine period, the essay is organized in three sections:

1. the author-centered traditions of Byzantine rhetoric and manuscript practice and their emphasis on author's signature and voice;

2. the author-less tradition;

[1] Concerning the same topic in the Classical Literature, see Condello (2011), Marmodoro/Hill (2013).

3. the link between the author-centered practice of rhetoric and the anonymous tradition of story-telling.

A help for readers in search of a tool in order to understand the indeterminacy of authorial practice can be found in Bernard's paper (41–60), which tries to comprehend Byzantine conceptions of authorship by reading texts that describe authorial techniques. The scholar takes the mid-11th century as a case study, where we can investigate authorship as a social act with a mental grid and a lexical analysis[2], focusing on the moral concerns that pervade Byzantine discourse about authorship and rhetoric[3]. Beginning from Michael Psellos' and John Mauropous' works, Bernard demonstrates the polyphony in the relationship between the statements on authorship and the practice of authorship. He offers a complex essay about the ethical tension between the discourse of modesty and the discourse of display.

The polyphony in the question of authorship is also evident in Tocci (61–75), who examines Michael Psellos' *Historia Syntomos*, a brief chronicle from Romulus to Basil II, written with a didactic scope: Psellos wants to offer a picture of the ideal emperor for the intellectual guidance of Michael VII Doukas. Tocci underlines how Psellos appropriated the tradition of the chronicle in a peculiar way; indeed chronicle writers do not speak in their voice, while the direct use of the authorial voice is a narrative signpost in the *Historia Syntomos*, where Psellos reveals his authorial persona: he acts as a history teacher. In order to reach his didactic goal, as the essay shows, Psellos combines historic narrative with the tradition of *apophtegmata* (aphorisms), of which there are three examples. We can understand their use in the author's literary program, which is a mix, since Psellos interferes at time, with authorship, while other times he hides himself, in line with the tradition of chronicles which are generally anonymous.

To understand the instability of the concept of authorship, it is useful to read Lauxtermann's paper (77–86), which begins with a beautiful quotation from Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (1807–1882), a poet who was dominated by the concept of divine inspiration. His words would have been incomprehensible to the Byzantines. In fact, their poets knew well what they were doing, because they had internalized their literary models; so writing poems was not a question of inspiration, but perspiration and work of *labor limae*. However this appropriation and rewriting of preexisting works can equal authorship, as we can see in two penitential prayers in the Harvard Psalter. From these texts Lauxtermann argues that Gregory the Monk is both the author and not the author of the work in question. In addition, the scholar offers an useful appendix, where we can read the edition of the catanyctic verses in ms. Harvard Houghton 3, ff. 111^r–112^r.

[2] Bernard's lexical analysis shows his intellectual roots in the studies of the Frankfurt School, for which you can see van Dijk (2001), Fairclough/Mulderrig/Wodak (2011).

[3] Concerning this, see Kustas (1973) 31; Papaioannou (2013) 132–140.

For appreciating the virtues of multiple authorship, Toth (87–102) tries to examine Byzantine authorial poetics, analyzing a particular case study: the *Book of the Philosopher Syntipas*, a middle Byzantine translation from Syriac which offers a vivid self-referential writing. The multiple authorial processes of this work are present both in the *Prologos* and in the plot itself, which is a "frame-story".[4] As a result of exchange between different cultures, the *Book of the Philosopher Syntipas* requires a discussion about the concept of authorship. We have to consider the author, the translator, the scribe, the patron and the narrator in their roles as story-tellers and educators, writers and skilled craftsmen, who controlled the production and the transmission of their work. Therefore, the essay demonstrates the origins of this work as a meta-authorial book, which presents a distributive and disguised authorship.

The second part, on Functions, starts with Krueger's excellent contribution (105–117), which examines differences in treatment of the same parable (Prodigal Son) by different canonists. The scholar underlines how the first person voice facilitates the author's subjectivity in following to the biblical story. For example, Romanos the Melodist, in the 6th century, insists on the moral value of the Father's forgiveness, while Andrew of Crete, in the 8th century, focuses on the transformative power of penitence, when somebody is a sinful man. The concept of sin also dominates in Joseph's Kānon (9th century), where we can find an emphasis on the Prodigal Son and on the overlap between this biblical character and the poet, who says "I have sinned." His poem, which offers a narrow repertoire of penitential self-expressions, is a good case study to observe the combination of levels of authorship.

During the 9th and 10th centuries some aristocratic lineages gained power and came closer to the imperial throne. Links between writers and this new aristocracy is the topic of Andriollo's paper (119–138), which studies the traces of these new groups in aristocratic-inspired literature in 10th century Byzantium. Her essay aims to understand the role and the position of an intellectual, contextualizing John Gēometrēs' production against the background of contemporary historiography and fiction. This poet composed for Nicēphoros Phōkas, for John I Tzimiskēs and for Basil Lakapēnos. In particular, he appreciated Nicēphoros Phōkas, but he did not hesitate to write in order to honor his successor and murderer. Andriollo highlights the instability of the time; in fact, in this unstable context court intellectuals tried to define their position, supporting always the strongest faction, in order to have a long and successful career. Therefore, John Gēometrēs gave voice to the military ideology and warrior culture of the new class, turning it to a dignified literary product, which did not offer possibilities of self-assertiveness.

Spingou's contribution (139–153) speaks about anonymous poets, whose works, written between 1050 and 1200, are included in the *Anthologia Marciana*. This book, known as manuscript *Marcianus Greacus* 524, is an anthology of poems from the 11th and 12th cen-

[4] About this, see Perry (1959); Maltese (1993).

turies and it hands down Theodore Prodromos' and Michael Psellos' texts. The redactor, who copied for his personal use, did not arrange the poems on the basis of specific criteria. The essay tries to give some possible explanations for the anonymity of the poems and Spingou concludes that the scribe decided not to record the names of the authors. Indeed, the works are presented anonymously to illuminate the donor's and patron's position at the expense of the author's role. The link between poets, artists, donors and patrons is the interesting topic of Spingou's conclusions, which can offer a new line of research.

Beginning from Samuel Johnson's[5] and Nigel Wilson's[6] prejudicial definitions of the word "lexicographer", Kenens (155–170) writes to show that the scholiasts were not drudges and that, on the contrary, they made considered decisions when they selected, adapted and presented the information. She examines the texts of three authors, who have excerpted the so-called Library, an handbook of Greek mythology dated roughly from the 1st to 3rd centuries CE: the older *scholia* to Plato, written by an anonymous author, Ps. Zēnobios' collection of Greek proverbs and Tzetzēs' commentary on Lykophrōn's *Alexandra*. She compares these works, in order to underline how each author was not a drudge, but had a personal attitude and a specific authorial purpose, which illuminated him when he chose excerpts.

Personal attitudes are also a topic in Mullett (171–198), who wrote the longest paper of the collection. While new studies read authorship in terms of ideological, technological and social processes, she sees authorship as linked with the product of an author in a text. This approach can help us understand the literary culture of the 12th century. She uses three monastic works: The *Life of Cyril Phileōtēs* by Nicholas Kataskepēnos, the *Diēgēsis merikē* and the *Testament* of Neophytos the Recluse. By examining these texts with a lexical and philological attention, she demonstrates a new authorial self-awareness and self-confidence; this is underlined by an increased number of attributed monastic works rather than anonymous monastic books.

The third part, Identities, is opened by Bourbouhakis' paper (201–224), which begins with this question: what can we learn about an author by reading his or her texts? The search for authors has an ironic quality, when rhetoric covers individuality and authentic self-expression, as in Byzantine literature. Studying the relation between identities and purposes, the essay analyses a work where authorship itself is the subject: Michael Chōniatēs' *A reply to those who accuse him of spurning exhibition*. This text is a response by an intellectual to the criticism leveled against him by those who cannot understand his refusal to exhibit his rhetorical competence, but the arguments are very rhetorical. Bourbouhakis then demonstrates how the author's mask, constructed for a particular intention, is more important than individual identity. Indeed, the post-romantic poet is identifiable

[5] See Johnson (1755) 1195.
[6] See Wilson (2007) 39.

by the contents of his text, while the Byzantine rhetorician adjusted his authorial voice as circumstances required.

Individual identity is also the topic in Pizzone's contribution (225–243), which examines the *Prolog* of Nikēphoros Basilakēs, in order to reflect on the strategies of self-presentation at play in mid-late 12th century Byzantium. She offers both a discussion about author's adoption of anonymity and a reflection on the historic context[7]. Indeed, the *Prologue* is an example of a mix of the discourse of modesty and the discourse of display, which are combined in support of authorial strategies. Anonymity does not mean that the author is unknown, but that the author does not reclaim his authorship, because Nikēphoros Basilakēs is caught between the need to assert his identity and the dangers of becoming accountable for his ideas, which could be a risk for his career.

Riehle (245–262) starts with the conclusions of Laiou[8]: texts written by women, or texts in the writing of which women had an important role, can be used in order to get the parameters of the female mentality. This is the basis for a new question: can we use women's works in order to understand the female identity? Then, starting from the concept of subjective identity, the essay demonstrates that gendered identities are not only reflected in texts written by women, but that authorial practices are also important to establish how these identities are associated. Riehle presents a focus on female authorial practices in liturgical poetry from the early 9th century to the late 12th century. In particular, an interesting contrast to the precedent liturgical poetry, dominated by the theme of the female sex's redemption from the power of sin, can be found in the literary production of women in the Komnenian era. Anna Komnēnē's texts testify to a growing self-awareness of the author, who inscribes herself into her texts and publicizes specific representations of herself. This surprising self-awareness can be observed in an important genre of this period: *Typica*. Returning to the opening question, the paper underlines that we have to speak of female identities, which are correlated with the choice of a certain genre and with the social-culture context.

Anna Komnēnē's voice is also the subject of Neville's essay (263–274). In fact, Princess Anna Komnēnē, who is the only female historian before the modern era, is an unusual example of Byzantine authorship. Anna's self-presentation as a poor woman who tells a story of pain can be part of an authorial strategy in order to handle the difficulties of self-disclosure and self-aggrandizement inherent in Byzantine discourses about authorship. So, when we read the *Alexiad*, we find a complex mixture, because Anna shows her status as a devoted daughter, but she does not want readers to think that she exaggerates her father's acts. By assimilating herself into the category of the good daughter, Anna is not only modest, but also so honest that she has to speak as an objective historian.

[7] In particular, Pizzone, in contrast to Garzya (1969), says that the *Prologue* shows some traces of the controversy with Eustathios of Dyrrachion and Sōtērichos Panteugenos.

[8] See Laiou (1985). About women's writing in Byzantium, see also Maltese (2006).

Finally, Jonhson's excellent *Afterword* (277–294) offers a review of all the essays, in order to look beyond Byzantium and to underline common features of authorship at this time in both East and West. Since Johnson is an Anglicist, he used for comparison texts from Medieval England. The essay is organized in five paragraphs:

1. authorship and agency, where literature and subjectivity are correlated;
2. authorship and anonymity, about the balance between anonymity and self-awareness, which is also visible in western monastic works;
3. authorship, identity, self and community, where we can find a historical approach;
4. authorship and gender: strategies of women writing, in which it is underlined that there is not a figure like Anna Komnēnē in the western tradition;
5. authorship over time, where Jonhson demonstrates how the trajectory evidenced in Pizzone's introduction can be seen in some western writers too.

As it is possible to note reading my brief summary, this miscellany is a great volume, because it presents an interesting and promising approach, which surpasses the research on the author's name in post-structuralist terms. The book is particularly useful to students for starting to study the complex issue of authorship, because all the papers argue their ideas exhaustively, without omitting arguments that are fundamental to understand. In addition, the *General index* (329–338) and the *Index of authors and texts* (339–351) are a support to the readers who want to deepen a specific topic.

sonia.francisettibrolin@uniroma1.it

About the author Sonia Francisetti Brolin, graduated at the University of Turin, defended her Ph.D Thesis at the Sapienza University of Rome in 2016. Her research is focused on Greek and Roman tragedy, with particular attention to Euripides' and Accius' fragmentary plays and the respective similarities and differences of Greek and Roman drama.

Bibliography

Condello (2011): F. Condello, "Forme della 'funzione autore' in Grecia antica", in: *Eikasmos* Vol. 22, 495–524.

van Dijk (2001): T. A. van Dijk, "Critical Discourse Analysis", in: D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton (ed.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Oxford, 352–371.

Fairclough/Mulderrig/Wodak (2011): N. Fairclough, J. Mulderrig, R. Wodak, "Critical Discourse Analysis", in: T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse Studies. A multidisciplinary Introduction*, London, 357–378.

Garzya (1969): A. Garzya, "Intorno al prologo di Niceforo Basilace", in: *JÖB* (18) 57–71.

Johnson (1755): S. Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language, in Which the Words are Deduced from Their Originals, and Illustrated in Their Different Significations by Examples from the Best Writers. To which are Prefixed, a History of the Language, and an English Grammar*, Vol. 2, London.

Kustas (1973): L. Kustas, *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric*, Thessaloniki.

Laiou (1985): A. E. Laiou, "Observations on the life and ideology of Byzantine women", in: *BF* (9) 59–102.

Maltese (1993): E. V. Maltese, *Il libro di Sindbad. Novelle persiane medievali, dalla versione bizantina di Michele Andreopoulos*, Torino.

Maltese (2006): E. V. Maltese, "Donne e letteratura a Bisanzio: per una storia della cultura femminile", in: E. V. Maltese (ed.), *Dimensioni bizantine. Donne, angeli e demoni nel Medioevo greco*, Torino (nuova edizione accresciuta), 105–127.

Marmodoro/Hill (2013): A. Marmodoro, J. Hill, *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity*, Oxford.

Papaioannou (2013): S. Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos: Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium*, Cambridge, New York.

Perry (1959): B. E. Perry, "The Origin of the Book of Sindbad", in: *Fabula* (3) 1–94.

Wilson (2007): N. Wilson, "Scholiasts and Commentators", in: *GRBS* (47) 39–70.