Journal of the Classics Students' Union

PLEBEIAN

Volume III MMXVII

PLEBEIAN

PLEBEIAN

Journal of the Classics Students' Union At the University of Toronto

VOLUME III

MMXVII

The papers in this volume were presented at CLASSU's Undergraduate Student Conference, The Assembly of the Plebs III, on 10 March 2017 in the Department of Classics at the University of Toronto.

Plebeian Volume III Editorial Board

Published 11 March 2017, Coach House Press, Toronto

Contents

Editor's Note

Publication is a key component of a career in academia. Yet, due to the volume of undergraduate students at UofT, undergraduate research often overlooked, as students churn out papers and graders mark them in bulk. Because of this, there is frequently minimal comment or consideration once the paper has been written, submitted, and graded. That's where *Plebeian* tries to step in and fill the void of undergraduate voices in Classics, by digging out obscure bytes of information and printing them in a tangible journal. That said, I would like to congratulate you on picking up this copy of *Plebeian* Volume III. On behalf of the 2017 Editorial Board and myself, I hope that you enjoy the papers in this journal. I am pleased with the broad range of topics we have put together for your edification; we have topics literary and historical, Greek and Roman, divine and profane. Over the past seven weeks, our editors and submitters have poured many hours into many revisions and drafts that engage with both primary and secondary sources in a way that mirrors professional academics. To the authors, I would like to thank you for sharing your insightful essays with us and the extra effort undertaken to make them publishable. To the Associate Editors, many thanks for your patience in combing through the dozens of submissions we received and then improving, refining, and polishing the ones presented in this volume, through the generous sponsorship of the Arts and Science Students' Union and the Department of Classics. Allison, Elizabeth, and Samantha are due special thanks for their assistance in the quick preparation of this volume, as is Dylan Taylor, who has added his professional skill in finessing the visual style of *Plebeian*. Lastly, I want to thank Toby Keymer, who has put up with me on many initiatives in Classics over the past seven years and whose insights have been very influential on *Plebeian* not only this year, but since its inception. As my final year of undergrad comes to a close and I have few opportunities remaining to pitch *Plebeian* or CLASSU events, let me finish with one final comment on the perks of getting involved—there is a wonderful community within this Department that will foster not only a love of Classics but wonderful friendships and memories that will grow like a tree through the ages. I'm grateful to everyone who's been a part of this ride and am excited to hear about what comes next.

Ave atque vale,

Willem Crispin-Frei, Editor-in-Chief

March 2017

Evaluating the Religious Spectrum of the Ancient Greek World and the Magic Within It

Sophia Alkhoury

The distinction between magic and religion in the ancient Greek world and the relationship between them have both been long up for debate. Some scholars have been gradually moving away from the distinction posited by J. G. Frazer and his contemporaries between magic and religion, each with its own rigid and immutable classification.[1] Although what are thought of from the modern viewpoint as magic and religion have identifying traits which they generally conformed to in the ancient world, they are not antithetical and often overlap, blurring the boundaries between them. Magic can be placed at one end of a spectrum that extends to normative civic practices; it is one component of the extremely fluid polytheistic religion of Ancient Greece, notable for its ability to accommodate a wide variety of beliefs and practices.

First and foremost is the problem with definitions that one encounters when attempting to study religion and magic in the Ancient Greek world. As H. S. Versnel asserts, "Magic does not exist, nor does religion. What do exist are our definitions of these concepts."[2] In order to study the way in which the ancients interacted with the divine, it is useful to take an etic perspective, imposing terms that may not have been in use in the period of study, but work within the ancient framework and allow for an objective modern discussion of the topic. A major deficit in the modern study of magic and its relationship to religion is the complete lack of consensus in what is denoted by the term "magic". The term "magic" will be used to indicate practices which the ancient Greeks used to communicate with the supernatural in contrast to the normative civic practices at the other end of the religious spectrum. Following Versnel,[3] magic can be defined as a category of secret rites employed by an individual to meet their own

1 Jan N. Bremmer, "The Birth of the Term 'Magic,'" *Zeitschrift fur Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 126 (1999): 11. For the purpose of this paper I shall focus solely on the relationship between magic and religion, leaving out the third category of science.

2 H. S. Versnel, "Some Reflections on the Relationship Magic-Religion," *Numen* 38, Fasc. 2 (1991): 177.

3 Versnel, *Zeitschrift fur Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 126, 178-9.

concrete goals which run counter to those of society; it is characterized by a manipulation of the divine and precision of technique.[4] Magic is often sympathetic in nature; practitioners may perform acts on or say words over an image in order to bring about the desired effect. This conceptualization creates a dichotomy with normative civic practices, such as public processions, sacrifices, and dedications, which focus either on maintaining a good relationship with the divine in a communal context or long term goals for the benefit of society. These rites are supplicatory in nature, and the outcome depends on the goodwill of the gods rather than the skill of the practitioner.[5]

For example, binding spells performed secretly by an individual in order to harm a personal enemy may be contrasted strongly with propitiatory public sacrifices of a ritually pure animal to an Olympic deity.[6] Many ancient practices fit neatly into these categories, but far more include a blend of the traits associated with either end of the spectrum, all of which are included under the broad umbrella of religion, defined as a relationship and habitual communication with the divine. In this paper I will argue that this conceptualization of magic and normative civic practices brings to attention oppositions between the two that should not be used to completely separate them, but to recognize the extent to which certain practices are able to accommodate elements of each. Magic cannot be defined in opposition to religion itself, but to the rites and practices seen as normative within the civic context in their purest form.

The posited distinction between magic and religion is immediately confused when one looks at goal-oriented public festivals such as the Thesmophoria. Communal civic rites were often performed in order to meet a specific purpose. The Thesmophoria was a public rite celebrated in honour of Demeter and attended by women in order to ensure a successful harvest. This concrete, short term goal was achieved in a public context by offering up a piglet to Demeter.[7] As Plato declares through the mouthpiece of Euthyphro, religious rites were often performed for a very practical purpose: "However, I say simply that when one knows how to say and do what is gratifying to the gods, in praying and sacrificing, that is holiness, and such things bring salvation to individual families and to states; and the opposite of what is gratifying to the gods is impious, and that

4 Versnel, *Zeitschrift fur Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 126, 178-9..

5 Ibid.

6 Dorothy Hammond, "Magic: A Problem in Semantics," *American Anthropologist*, New Series 72, no. 2 (1970): 1355.

7 Robert L. Fowler, "Greek Magic, Greek Religion," *Illinois Classical Studies* 20, (1995): 7.

overturns and destroys everything."[8] This passage is particularly potent as "Euthyphro is meant to be the best possible representation of ordinary traditional piety."[9] Such a character recognizing this pragmatic element of religion surely casts doubt upon this aspect of the perceived strict dichotomy of magic and religion.

Much as the Thesmophoria was a public festival enacted to meet a certain end, the Panathenaia was a highly visible and well attended festival in which the ancient cult statue of Athena was presented with a new robe. It is not only in purpose that communal rites often resemble magic, but often in content as well; this public civic festival assured the safety of Athens through the use of sympathetic magic. Frazer first described the sympathetic nature of magic, asserting that:

> If we analyze the principles of thought on which magic is based, they will probably be found to resolve themselves into two: first, that like produces like, or that an effect resembles its cause; and second, that things which have once been in contact with each other continue to act on each other at a distance after the physical contact has been severed. [...] From the first of these principles, namely the Law of Similarity, the magician infers that he can produce any effect he desires merely by imitating it: from the second he infers that whatever he does to a material object will equally effect the person with whom the object was once in contact[...].[10]

In other words, the expected effect of the magical rite mimics the action that was performed in the rite itself. The cult statue of Athena, acting as a magical representation of the goddess, was presented with a new robe, a manifestation of the aegis, so that she may be rendered invulnerable along with her patron city.[11]

An example of the negative or harmful side of sympathetic magic from a civic context may be taken from a fourth-century inscription describing the events surrounding the reenactment of an oath taken by a group of Spartan settlers on the island of Thera in the seventh century BCE. "They invoked curses on those who should break these terms and fail to abide by their oath [...] they modeled wax dolls and burned them as

8 "Pl., *Euthphr*., 14b, in *Plato in Twelve Volumes, Vol. 1*, trans. Harold North Fowler (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966), 53.

9 Fowler, "Greek Magic, Greek Religion,"16.

10 J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 26.

11 Fowler, "Greek Magic, Greek Religion," 8.

they invoked the curse. [...] They prayed that the one who did not abide by these oaths but transgressed them should melt and dissolve just like the dolls."[12] While this rite may seem civic in its social context, it moves towards the magical side of the spectrum when judged by its sympathetic nature; oath breakers are bound to be melted away, mimicking the destruction of the wax figurines. A comparable example in a more magical context can be found on an inscribed sheet of lead from the fourth century BCE. This inscription contains the binding spell with which the practitioner curses his personal enemies: "All these I bind down, I make them disappear, I bury them, I nail them down. At the court and before the judge, when they are to appear and to testify against me, that they cannot appear before a court of justice at all either in words or in deeds."[13] In both cases, a prohibition is laid out upon the transgression of which a punishment will be handed down by the gods in the form of the curse. The rite enacted by the Spartan settlers looks very much like a binding spell often used by individuals to the detriment of their private enemies, a practice undoubtedly rooted in magic, but which is now used in a public context for the good of the new settlement.

Similarly, the nature of mystery cults proves that it is possible for rites endorsed by the state to contain strong elements of what modern scholars might classify as magic. Due to the secrecy of mystery cults and the general success at keeping their practices concealed from non-initiates, little can be said for sure regarding their nature, but they can still be judged to fall in the middle of the magic-civic practice spectrum. While civic officials are well attested as being initiates in mystery cults, especially the Eleusinian and Orphic mysteries, these cults contained many elements which drew them towards the magical side of the spectrum, including their secrecy, quest for direct access to the divine through transmitted knowledge, and initiation rites.[14] Papyri containing instructions for magical rites often call for secrecy, and by extension initiation, in order to take part in the rites in much the same way as the mystery cults did.[15] Once a participant went through the process of initiation, they entered into a privileged relationship with the divine from which they were then able to profit. The epigraphical and literary remains of contemporary initiates attest to the

12 "*SEG* 9-3, lines 40-51," *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, ed. R. Meiggs and D. Lewis (Oxford: Claredon Press, 1969), 6.

13 Fritz Graf, *Magic in the Ancient World*, trans. Franklin Philip (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1994), 112.

14 Ibid., 99.

15 Ibid.

goal-oriented nature of the cults, especially in regards to obtaining preferential treatment in the afterlife. One need only read the Orphic tablets buried with deceased initiates, guiding them through the Underworld to a more blessed existence after death, to glean the purpose-motivated nature of this cult:

> Say, "I am a son of Earth and starry Sky, I am parched with thirst and am dying: but quickly grant me cold water from the Lake of Memory to drink." And they will announce you to the Chthonian King, and they will grant you to drink from the Lake of Memory. And you, too, having drunk, will go along the sacred road on which other glorious initiates and *bacchoi* travel.[16]

Similarly, according to legend the Eleusinian Mysteries were established by Demeter herself in order to offer her followers "sweeter hopes about the end of life and all eternity to those who are initiated" in exchange for participation in her mysteries.[17] The goal-oriented nature of mystery cults subverts the posited opposition, which states this to be a defining feature of magical rites.

The opposition of normative civic rites as public and abstract, and magical rites as private and goal-oriented, is further complicated by the common tradition of offering votives to a deity upon the request or completion of a favour. Although they were set up in public sanctuaries, they were often dedicated by individuals, suggesting a close private relationship between the individual and the divinity. This is especially evident with the offering of votives to divinities associated with healing, in which individuals would dedicate an image of their afflicted body part to the deity. Many of these offerings have been lost throughout the millennia, but records of them survive inscribed on bronze or stone in sanctuaries to commemorate the acts of healing that occurred within. These records attest to the pragmatic nature of the suppliant's visit; they have come with a specific problem and are seeking direct contact with the divinity in order to obtain a cure. An example of such a dedication may be found on an inscription set up at a shrine to Apollo and Asclepius from the fourth century BCE:

---

16 "1 Hipponion," *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife: Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets*, ed. Fritz Graf and S.I. Johnston (London and New York: Routledge, 2007), 5.

17 Isoc., *Paneg*., 28, in *Isocrates with an English Translation in Three Volumes*, trans. George Norlin (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1980), 135.

> Pandarus the Thessalian had marks on his forehead. He slept in the sanctuary and saw a vision. The god appeared to bind his marks with a bandage, ordering him to take off the bandage and dedicate it in the temple when he left the sanctuary. When day came, he stood up, took off the bandage, and saw his forehead free of marks. He dedicated the bandage in the temple; on it were the marks from his forehead.[18]

This inscription commemorates a very intimate relationship between the god and the suppliant: the god comes down to touch the worshipper in his or her dream, and upon this contact the suppliant is cured. No one else is privy to this incredibly personal and private exchange, but the bandage serves as a tangible piece of evidence to advertise the miraculous feat that occurred within the shrine. In addition to proving the goal-orientated nature of certain normative civic acts, these commemorations testify to the privacy of many rites. Although many votives were offered on public occasions, the dedication of many other offerings was strictly private in nature—an exchange between an individual and their divinity.

In addition to secrecy and isolation, a common distinction posited between magic and normative civic practices is the coercion of the petitioned divinity involved in magical rites: "Magic is essentially manipulative. Man is both the initiator and the executor of processes he controls with the aid of knowledge which he has, or is put, at his disposal."[19] While this is surely the case for some spells and rites, it is not representative of all addresses to divinity which may be considered magical. The Greek magical papyri, found in Greco-Roman Egypt and dating from the second century BCE to the fifth CE,[20] contain many spells which give evidence towards the supplicatory nature of magic, laying out formulae with which to initiate communication with the divinity in language reminiscent of that used in prayers.[21] In the words of Versnel: "some expressions of the magical papyri of late antiquity sometimes cannot be distinguished from religious

18 "*SIG*^{3} 1168," *Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404-323 BCE*, ed. P.J. Rhodes and Robin Osborne (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 535.

19 Versnel, *Zeitschrift fur Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 126, 178.

20 "Introduction to the Greek Magical Papyri," *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation Including the Demotic Spells*, ed. Hans Dieter Betz, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986), XLI.

21 Fritz Graf, "Prayer in Magic and Religious Ritual," in *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, ed. Christopher A. Faraone and Birk Obbink (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 188.

confession."[22] These spells are considered magical in that they help individuals professing secret knowledge to obtain concrete ends, but in many cases the words by which they transmit this knowledge are virtually indistinguishable from the prayers spoken in a communal context throughout the city. In a magical prayer addressed to Selene, the practitioner attempts to call her down so that she may do his bidding, but calls her down by means of praising her and using her preferred epithets:

> Come to me, o beloved mistress, Three-faced Selene; kindly hear my sacred chants; night's ornament, young, bringing light to mortals, o child of morn who ride upon fierce bulls, o queen who drive your car on equal course with Helios, who with the triple forms of triple Graces dance in revel with the stars.[23]

The practitioner attempts to win the divinity over to his side by revealing his sacred knowledge; this is the basis for his claim to cultivate a special relationship with them, much like in a mystery cult.[24] Furthermore, magicians often consider themselves to be servants of the divinity, supplicating them so as to receive their good will: "Emphatically I beg, I supplicate, I your servant and enthroned by you."[25] Such language of imploring is rooted firmly in the context of a magical spell, but it is far from coercive. As Graf notes, "It must be repeated that there is no doubt that the sorcerers uttered prayers."[26] The practitioner does not promise a votive offering or remind the divinity of past benevolence as is often the case in prayers, but the need to please them through their choice of language is present in both magical formulae and more normative prayers.

This laudatory wording is in stark contrast to examples of coercion, which were present in some formulae used by magicians, such as that found in a love spell from the magical papyri in which the practitioner attempts to achieve his purpose by threatening Aphrodite: "But, if as goddess you in slowness act, you will not see Adonis rise from Hades, straightaway I'll run and bind him with steel chains."[27] This type of coercion was often used only as a last resort; the practitioner would recourse to forceful manipulation only if the divinity did not arrive quickly enough,

22 Versnel, *Zeitschrift fur Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 126, 179.

23 Betz, *PGM* IV. 2785-95.

24 Graf, *Magic in the Ancient World*, 192.

25 Betz, *PGM* VII. 746-54.

26 Graf, *Magic in the Ancient World*, 216.

27 Betz, *PGM* IV. 2901-4.

if their previous attempts had been unsuccessful, or if the divinity appeared to them in a threatening manner. Such spells often warned against the dangers of coercing a god; supplication and praise was a preferable route.[28]

In another of the oppositions posited by Versnel, he argues that the effectiveness of a magical rite is governed by the attention payed to technique, whereas the outcome of a religious rite relies exclusively on the disposition of the gods:

> Magic is characterized by the attention paid to the technical side of the manipulation, precision of formula and *modus operandi* [...]. In so far as religion, on the other hand, admits of intended effects (prayer for health, votives, private oracles), the results are never dependent upon a professional specialist, though his skills may be required as a mediating factor, nor on the suppliant, but solely and exclusively on the free favour of sovereign gods.[29]

While it is true that specialists are not required to initiate normative religious communication between individuals and divinities, this is not to say that the process of communication may be conducted haphazardly; there is a focus on correctness of action that permeates religious rites. If a sacrifice, for example, is not carried out correctly, it may be refused by the gods. Chaotic sacrifices could become fuel for playwrights; religious rituals conducted in this manner were only fit for the comic stage. Such a reversal of the religious norm was used by Aristophanes in his *Peace*, depicting two buffoonish characters attempting to conduct a sacrifice to the eponymous goddess:

> TRYGAEUS. Look out, slave! This oracle threatens our meat. Quick, pour the libation, and give me some of the [innards].
>
> HIEROCLES. I too will help myself to a bit, if you like.
>
> TRYGAEUS. The libation! The libation!
>
> HIEROCLES. Pour out also for me and give me some of this meat.

28 Graf, *Magic in the Ancient World*, 194.

29 Versnel, *Numen* 38, 179.

> TRYGAEUS. No, the blessed gods won't allow it yet; let us drink; and as for you, get you gone, for that's their will.[30]

This scene ends with Hierocles, the oracle-monger, fleeing the disturbance he has caused by his attempt to get a free meal from this sacrifice, but due to the nature of comedy there is no real retribution from the gods, only a minor beating from Trygaeus. Outside of the comic world, a historical inscription from the third century CE illustrates the importance of exactness in religious ritual, even stating that a religious specialist should be present to ensure that the rite is carried out in a manner which will please the gods:

> That the *prutanis* shall light a fire on all the altars and burn incense and sacred aromatic herbs, offering to the gods on the customary days sacrifices numbering 365 in all, of which 190 shall be with the heart taken out and the thighs removed, and 175 shall be entirely dedicated, all this from his own resources. The public *hierophant* shall guide and instruct him on each point as to what is customary for the gods.[31]

Many magical elements emerge in this very normative religious context of a public sacrifice, including the sacred knowledge of the religious specialist as to what is pleasing to the gods, as well as an emphasis laid on the precision of technique. The need for special sacred items such as incense and aromatic herbs to be used in the rite is not unlike the call for specific ingredients in the magical papyri, such as the "sulfur and seed of Nile rushes" to be burned "as incense to the moon."[32] Both categories of rites are aided and made more effective by learned techniques, as well as paraphernalia endowed with supernatural significance. While the result of the normative civic sacrifice is indeed dependent on the gods' will, they will certainly be better disposed to those who carry out their rites according to the strict prescripts of tradition.

---

30 Ar., *Peace*, 1102-7, in *The Complete Greek Drama, Vol. 2*, trans. Eugene O'Neill, Jr. (New York: Random House, 1938), 712. "Innards" is misspelled as "inwards" in the translation quoted.

31 Simon Price, "*LSCG Supp*. 121; *Inschriften von Ephesos* 10," *Religions of the Ancient Greeks* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 177.

32 Betz, *PGM* VII. 490.

Despite Versnel's tendency to create too strong a divide between our modern concepts of magic and religion, he does indeed recognize that:

> Just like religions, 'magical' practices or expressions may share some though not all family resemblances. This means that we may accept a 'broad, polythetic or prototypical' definition of magic, based on a "common sense" collection of features, which may or may not, according to convention and experience, largely correspond to the items listed in the first part of this introduction: instrumental, manipulative, mechanical, non-personal, coercive, with short-term, concrete and often individual goals etc [...].[33]

One must be careful in labeling rites and attempts at communicating with the divine as either exclusively magical or exclusively religiously normative. Most ways of interacting with the supernatural included a striking blend of both categories, creating a spectrum which can be definitively placed under the fluid and overarching title of religion in the ancient Greek world.

33 Versnel, *Numen* 38, 186.

Bibliography

Aristophanes. *Peace. The Complete Greek Drama, Vol. 2*. Translated by Eugene O'Neill, Jr. New York: Random House, 1938.

Bremmer, Jan N. "The Birth of the Term 'Magic.'" *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 126 (1999): 1-12.

Fowler, Robert L. "Greek Magic, Greek Religion." *Illinois Classical Studies* 20, (1995): 1-22.

Frazer, J. G. *The Golden Bough*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Graf, Fritz. *Magic in the Ancient World*. Translated by Franklin Philip. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Graf, Fritz. "Prayer in Magic and Religious Ritual," in *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*. Edited by Christopher A. Faraone and Birk Obbink, 188-213. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Greek Historical Inscriptions: 404-323 BCE. Edited by P.J. Rhodes and Robin Osborne. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation Including the Demotic Spells. Edited by Hans Dieter Betz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Hammond, Dorothy. "Magic: A Problem in Semantics." *American Anthropologist,* New Series 72, no. 2 (1970): 1349-1356.

Isocrates. *Isocrates with an English Translation in Three Volumes*. Translated by George Norlin. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Plato. *Plato in Twelve Volumes, Vol. 1*. Translated by Harold North Fowler. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Price, Simon. *Religions of the Ancient Greeks*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Ritual Texts for the Afterlife: Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets. Edited by Fritz Graf and S. I. Johnston. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions. Edited by R. Meiggs and D. Lewis. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Versnel, H. S. "Some Reflections on the Relationship Magic-Religion." *Numen* 38, Fasc. 2 (1991): 177-197.

Classical Reception in Contemporary Canadian Theatre: Violence and Resilience in If We Were Birds *by Erin Shields*

Leora Bromberg

In encompassing some commonly seen yet uniquely Greek mythological motifs, from murdering and eating one's own kin to transforming into birds, the ancient Greek myth of Philomela, Procne, and Tereus stands out as one laced with tragedy and trauma. This myth has proven to offer a certain intriguing adaptability in contemporary art and literature, as seen in the award-winning play *If We Were Birds* by Canadian playwright Erin Shields. In this unique adaptation, Shields blurs the ancient and modern worlds by weaving inspiration from the true testimonials of women who survived contemporary twentieth-century conflicts into Philomela's ancient myth. Through Shields' interpretation, the myth of Philomela becomes a lens through which to analyze abuse and rape in its recurrent function as a weapon of war throughout human history. This use of the past as a tool for illuminating the present and moving modern audiences is common to much of Shields' work, and is similarly embraced by other contemporary artists such as playwright Timberlake Wertenbaker, who defines myth as "the oblique image of an unwanted truth, reverberating through time."[1] This ability to transcend time and space and confront different audiences with relatable truths seems to be inherent in the very nature of mythology. In finding resonance between Ovid's account of the tragic ancient Greek myth of Philomela and contemporary conflicts and through emphasizing the importance of re-telling traumatic stories, Shields' *If We Were Birds* expands a story of horrific revenge to include reconciling. A closer analysis of the characters, the staging decisions, and the imagery of birds in this play reveals the ways in which Shields confronts her audience with one of the most uncomfortable of human truths, one which resonates all the way back through time to the original ancient myth: the drive and capacity of human violence.

Erin Shields is a Canadian playwright and founding member of Groundwater Productions, through which she wrote and further developed *If We Were Birds*, first performed in 2010. A year later, the play was awarded the Governor General's Literary Award for Drama. Generally,

1 Timberlake Wertenbaker, *Plays 1: The Love of the Nightingale* (London: Faber & Faber, 1996), 19.

Shields' interpretation of the myth of Philomela, Procne and Tereus follows Ovid's account in *Metamorphoses*, which survives as the most complete extant version of the myth.[2] However, Shields' adaptation not only preserves and retells this ancient myth, but also serves to connect it to the modern world by intertwining Philomela's tragic story with contemporary survival testimonials, as voiced by the members of the chorus. In presenting a chorus that speaks up and consists of more diverse voices, Shields diverges from the archetypical slave-women chorus common to ancient Greek tragedy, which traditionally tended to be presented as more silent and unified. Instead, Shields diversifies the voices of her chorus by basing their characters on the experiences of real women who survived recent traumatic conflicts, noted before the play, including Nanking (1937), Berlin (1945), Bangladesh (1971), Bosnia-Herzegovina (1992-1995) and Rwanda (1994).[3] In Shields' retelling of Philomela's legend, these women are finally given a platform through which they are able to share their stories and relieve the weight of their traumatic and unforgettable experiences. This contributes to Shields' overarching aim of emphasizing the importance of storytelling in the process of healing after trauma, evident as she has Philomela open the play by sharing and reflecting on her own experience of abuse, surrounded by the chorus who act to support her.[4] To avoid distracting from the central story arch of Philomela's retrospective story, Shields does not specify which conflict testimonial each chorus member is inspired by. Instead, she presents their experiences vaguely, allowing them to overlap and intermingle. This ambiguity itself works to draw further attention to how the disturbing violence present in much of ancient myth is all too readily accepted and overlooked by modern audiences, and how rape is still used as a weapon of war to this day. The role of Shields' chorus also works to offer storytelling as perhaps the only feasible solution to moving on from such trauma.

Although Shields' play is a modern production, in responding to an ancient myth it inevitably draws from various ancient and modern influences. In following Ovid's version, Shields tells the story of Procne's sudden arranged marriage to victorious warrior king Tereus of Thrace, and later his rape and abuse of her beloved younger sister Philomela. His actions eventually result in Procne's murder of her and Tereus' own son Itys, whom she and Philomela cook and feed to Tereus, before all three characters, suspended in their grief and rage, are finally transformed into birds.

2 David Fitzpatrick, "Sophocles' 'Tereus,'" *The Classical Quarterly* 51 (2001): 90.

3 Erin Shields, *If We Were Birds* (Toronto: Playwrights Canada Press, 2011), 1.

4 Ibid., 3-5.

The species of bird into which each character in this myth is transformed seems to be a matter of debate among ancient writers.[5] In his own account, Ovid does not specify their species, perhaps showing his awareness of the disagreement among previous writers on this detail.[6] In primarily drawing from Ovid's account, Shields also never specifies the types of birds her characters become. By consequence, this symbolic detail seems to become less relevant to her play than it may have been in ancient tragedies on this myth, such as Sophocles' *Tereus*.[7] Such ancient works, including the tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides, served as the accounts from which Ovid himself received, as a Roman, retaining motifs and influences that in turn appear in Shields' play. For instance, this is evident in how Procne's overwhelming desire to punish her husband, and her hesitation in killing her son, closely mirror the tragic dilemma faced by Medea in Euripides' *Medea*.[8] Likewise, the potential influence of Euripides' *Bacchae* is apparent when, in order to rescue Philomela, Procne must sneak out of the palace in disguise by joining a Bacchic ritual.[9] Understanding that Shields' play is a mosaic of all these different influences will help to better grasp the ways in which she actually borrows or diverges from these sources to present her own interpretation and modern message on the timelessness of violence and trauma.

A closer look at some of the themes and characters in *If We Were Birds* further illuminates Shields' attempt to reproduce and draw from motifs common to Greek tragedy, while also conveying her message of the capacity of human violence and negligence. Take for instance the prevalent theme of denial, which emphasizes the interesting role that negligence can assume in the cycle of violence. Shields does this by giving the chorus of slave women a more prominent voice than is typical of ancient Greek cho ruses. Throughout the play, the chorus emerges from the sidelines to actually speak up about their experiences and challenge the main characters, to whom they usually seem quite invisible. Shields' chorus therefore largely functions to challenge the ignorance of the main characters. In general, the

5 Apollodorus, *Library,* trans. Sir James George Frazer (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1921), 3.14.

6 Ovid, *Metamorphoses* VI, trans. Edward J Kenney and A. D. Melville (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), xxiii.

7 Fitzpatrick, "Sophocles' 'Tereus,'" 100.

8 Euripides, *Medea,* 1028-1081, in *Medea and Other Plays*, trans. James Morwood (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

9 Daniel Curley, "Ovid, Met. 6.640: A Dialogue between Mother and Son," *The Classical Quarterly* 47 (1997): 320.

themes of denial and ignorance are apparent from the very beginning of the play, such as when sheltered and innocent Philomela ignores the slave women's warnings of Tereus' brutality and untrustworthiness. Philomela disregards their warnings despite clear physical evidence of abuse, as to King Pandion, the slave women appear to be "bleeding" and "miserable," and "a bit […]. used."[10] Instead, Philomela tries to rationalize that the slave women could not possibly be innocent and must have done something to deserve this suffering as punishment from the gods. Although Philomela cannot imagine, and therefore rejects, the pain and abuse that the slave women claim to have suffered, she does so from the sheltered and innocent perspective of a child.

On the other hand, the remaining characters in this play stand by violence from a place of greater awareness, and even help to perpetuate it by failing to take responsibility for their own complicity. For instance, towards the climax of the play, Procne cannot believe that Tereus would cross the line between family and war by raping her sister. Procne is barely able to articulate her shock as she says, "I didn't know. I knew he needed… I knew he had to…"[11] Here Shields demonstrates that Procne, in her passive awareness of her husband's urges, plays a violent role even before she turns to murdering her own son, simply by remaining a bystander to, and thus indirectly supporting Tereus' violence. Shields paints Pandion in a similarly violent light, since he willingly hands over both of his supposedly beloved daughters to a notoriously cruel warrior, and then proceeds to drink and neglect his royal duties.[12] In doing so, Shields diverges from Ovid who does not place much focus on Pandion's reaction. Finally, Shields even has Tereus deny his own capacity for cruelty when, while raping Philomela, he tries to justify his behaviour by claiming, "it's my blood, not me."[13] This characterization of Tereus as helplessly and innately cruel is apparent in ancient sources as well. Ovid describes Tereus' lust as "inborn" and typical of "Thracian villainy."[14] According to the translator's notes, the Thracians had a reputation in ancient Greece for their sinful tendencies towards polygamy and violence.[15] Likewise, in his observations of a statue of Pandion on the Acropolis, Pausanias notes that Tereus' be-

10 Shields, *If We Were Birds*, 18-19.

11 Ibid., 67.

12 Ibid., 60.

13 Ibid., 52.

14 Ovid, trans. Kenney and Melville, *Metamorphoses* VI, 135.

15 Ovid, trans. Kenney and Melville, *Metamorphoses* VI, 135.

haviour "[transgressed] Greek customs."[16] Despite this cultural characterization of Tereus being inherent evil, Ovid ultimately presents Procne as exceeding Tereus' cruelty as she "cannot hide her cruel joy […]. bursting to announce her deed."[17] Evidently, whether by Shields' or Ovid's account, even the initially innocent Philomela and Procne eventually prove their capacity for highly disturbing and sacrilegious violence when they tear Itys apart and cook him into a feast for Tereus. Itys falls victim to this violence even though he is their very own blood. As Shields' puts it, blood itself does not "distinguish between love and war."[18] Blood and pain can be caused by experiences of violence or love alike. To reflect this duality of blood, Shields presents love, marriage and the loss of virginity as initially innocent and joyous, but gradually shifts the depiction to show that sexuality can be corrupt and violent like death and war. By weaving these themes of corruption and doubt throughout the text, Shields diverges from Ovid's account, shifting the blame away from the sisters to hold each character responsible, regardless of any initial innocence, and attach them in some way to the violent action.

Especially as a modern play, it is interesting to consider the impact of staging on the presentation of violence and trauma in *If We Were Birds*. In Greek tragedy, violent action tends to happen offstage, being revealed to the audience in some way thereafter, often through reports from other characters like messengers or heralds. Otherwise, the aftermath of the violence may be revealed, such as at the end of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* when the doors of the palace are swung open to reveal Clytemnestra standing over the dead bodies of Agamemnon and Cassandra.[19] Shields, on the other hand, emotionally confronts her modern audience by intentionally bringing violence front and center on stage: Philomela's rape and her tongue being cut out, the sisters tearing apart and cooking Itys' body, and even the characters' physical transformations into birds, are just some of many unusual moments that need to be represented onstage. In writing her dramatic adaptation of this myth, Shields had to decide how she wanted to present these explicit and often disturbing moments on stage while still maintaining a serious tone and message for her play. In a scholarly interview with Tom Ue, Shields explains that her play presents

16 Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, trans. W.H.S. Jones and H.A. Ormerod (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1918), 1.5.

17 Ovid, trans. Kenney and Melville, *Metamorphoses* VI, 141.

18 Shields, *If We Were Birds*, 41.

19 Aeschylus, *Aeschylus II: The Orestia* 3rd ed., ed. Mark Giffith and Glenn W. Most (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013), 68.

scenes of abuse through more symbolic and theatrical means. For example, Itys is not played by a child-actor or doll, but instead represented by a white sheet, through which blood seeps when Procne stabs it. In the rape scene, Tereus never actually touches Philomela. In both of these examples, Shields has "words themselves" commit the murder or the rape.[20] Here, Shields seems to be conveying a message that even the very ability to speak brings with it the ability to hate. Evidently, even at the level of staging decisions, Shields considers methods to show the audience just how human and easy violence can be.

Through movement, posture, and self-composure made evident through stage directions, Shields works to draw further attention to violence by contrasting it with representations of the loss of innocence in the play. Take, for instance, how Shields plays with distinct changes in posture and body language as a response to traumatic events. This is clear from the very beginning of the play, when Philomela describes how she and Procne would play freely as young girls and could "run as fast, jump as high, yell as loud as the boys."[21] This description of the capabilities of the young and optimistic body contrasts with the movements of the chorus that immediately follow, as indicated in the stage directions which read, "*the Chorus shudders, shivers and cowers*."[22] This is further evident in the "used" appearance of the chorus of slave women and even their individual, yet simultaneously dehumanizing, names, which include "The Young One," "The Pregnant One," "The Bleeding One" and "The One with Dwindling Dignity."[23] By presenting violence in a confrontational manner, Shields is in fact not unlike Ovid. In drawing from the work of great tragedians like Sophocles in his own telling of Philomela's legend, Ovid's work shifts the genre of this story from dramatic tragedy to epic poetry, which by consequence shifts the reception of the story, from a genre which is meant to be viewed, to one that is meant to be read.[24] Therefore, in order to express emotions that would have been clear on stage but internalized differently when reading, Ovid had to bring violence into the limelight in his own telling of this myth.[25] In this way, Ovid's text actually seems to help anticipate and lay the groundwork for a more confrontational dramatic adaptation for Philomela's story, like that of Shields.

20 Tom Ue, "Gender, violence, and history in *If We Were Birds*: an interview with Erin Shields," *Journal of Gender Studies* 22 (2013): 101.

21 Shields, *If We Were Birds*, 4.

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid., 2, 19.

24 Fitzpatrick, "Sophocles' 'Tereus,'" 92.

25 Curley, "Ovid, Met., 6.640: A Dialogue between Mother and Son," 320.

Shields' use of the imagery and symbolism of birds in the myth also contribute to the play's messages about violence and freedom from trauma. Besides the ending, when the characters describe their transformation into birds, and the very title of Shields' play, references to birds are woven throughout the performance. In fact, as survivors of trauma themselves, the Chorus constantly shifts between human and bird forms, as evident in stage directions such as "*the slave women morph back into birds.*"[26] In an attempt to express their individual, yet shared, traumatic experiences of rape, the chorus members reflect that when "pounded into earth and muck and slime," they would look up and think "if we were birds we could fly up, away from this wrenching pain […] away from what will be left of ourselves when he's done."[27] Here Shields imagines women enduring rape as looking up to the expansive sky and dreaming of escape and freedom through flight. In her interview with Ue, Shields notes that "trauma does transform [...] a part of the self will always fly above."[28] Here Shields suggests that trauma, in being both physically and mentally transformative, can cause victims to feel detached from their body and sense of self, flying outside of themselves as opposed to living in the present moment. In other words, this terrible out-of-body experience becomes ever-present and haunting. From this perspective, birds in this play become more of a symbol of torment than of freedom and release. This tension between whether birds represent a good or evil omen is evident in ancient myth and culture. Even on the level of language, the ancient Greek and Latin words for "bird" and "omen" are etymologically related.[29] Likewise, in ancient myth, birds tend to be represented as screeching nuisances, such as the Sirens or Harpies. Ovid, and Shields in drawing from his account, both make references to the predatory nature of birds. For instance, the owl is, "a dangerous sign of foreboding" which perches over and haunts the fury-made wedding bed of Procne and Tereus.[30] In fact, in her interpretation of the physical transformation into birds as the opposite of freedom and escape, Shields very much takes after Ovid. To Ovid, as seen throughout the *Metamorphoses*, a human mind trapped in an animal's uncomfortably small and silent body was the worst possible fate and punishment from the gods.[31] In the epilogue of her play, Shields similarly questions the free-

26 Shields, *If We Were Birds*, 28.

27 Ibid., 55.

28 Ue, "Gender, violence, and history in *If We Were Birds*: an interview with Erin Shields," 100.

29 Ovid, trans. Kenney and Melville, *Metamorphoses* VI, 134.

30 Shields, *If We Were Birds*, 33.

31 Ue, "Gender, violence, and history in *If We Were Birds*: an interview with Erin Shields," 100.

dom of becoming a bird as a viable escape from trauma when the Chorus says "we're always reliving the pain," being "ever hunting, ever hunted," only able to release or express their pain in squawks and twitches.[32] Despite this overwhelming pain and horror associated with transforming into birds, Shields imagines that the characters are strong and still "continue to fly."[33] Shields even extends this message beyond the play when she writes "*we* continue to fly."[34] Here, the playwright is able to convey her argument that the survivors and witnesses that make up the real modern world share this same strength. In this way, Shields extends and redeploys the symbolism of birds in the legend of Philomela to show that the lasting and ever-present pain that arises in response to trauma is very real, and yet survivors are still able to emerge from their experiences with strength and resilience.

At the end of the play, before the characters describe their transformation into birds, Shields has them all scream until they lose their breath and are finally suspended in their grief.[35] At this moment, the characters are overwhelmed by the unbearable weight of their own traumatic experiences, and arguably by the reoccurrence of similarly horrific events throughout human history. In imagining the overwhelming nature of trauma, as expressed through this necessary release of extended screaming, Shields seems to be questioning how the world can move forward from trauma at all. In tackling difficult questions of human resilience and capacity for violence, Shields calls attention to how patterns of violence and suffering have come to repeat over and over throughout history, as if no lessons have been learned since antiquity. In this way, Shields' *If We Were Birds* serves as an interesting example of a work of reception, as it bridges the ancient and modern worlds to find resonance and relevance for ancient tales in modern contexts. While drawing largely from Ovid's account, Shields still tends to question and diverge from ancient sources in her re-telling and reimagining of Philomela's story. This divergence is seen even on the level of staging, where Shields demonstrates, through symbolic means, just how easy violence can feel and how deeply it can haunt a victim, noticeable even on a physical level. However, the value of storytelling when emerging from traumatic experiences, arguably Shields' most important message, is expressed in the role of the chorus and through allowing Philomela to tell her own story. Through these means, Shields suggests that

32 Shields, *If We Were Birds*, 77.

33 Ibid.

34 Ibid.

35 Ibid., 76.

the only way to make trauma at all possible to overcome and move on from is to tell the story over and over, allowing others to bear witness. This message even lends some attention to the significance of the medium within which Shields chooses to work. Choosing to tell these stories onstage suggests the power and importance of theatre itself as a medium of storytelling and story re-telling, dating from today all the way back to the ancient world. Consequently, Philomela's myth retains its relevance not as a universal story, but rather as one that can be retold and adapted in new ways.

Bibliography

Aeschylus. *Aeschylus II: The Orestia* 3rd ed. Edited by Mark Giffith and Glenn W. Most. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013.

Apollodorus. *Library* 3.14. Translated by Sir James George Frazer. Cambridge:Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1921. Retrieved from Perseus Digital Library: http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0022:text=Library:book=3:chapter=14&highlight=philomela.

Curley, Daniel. "Ovid, Met. 6.640: A Dialogue between Mother and Son." *The Classical Quarterly* 47 (1997): 320-322.

Euripides. *Medea and Other Plays*. Translated by James Morwood. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Fitzpatrick, David. "Sophocles' 'Tereus." *The Classical Quarterly* 51 (2001): 90-101.

Ovid, *Metamorphoses* Book VI. Translated by Edward J Kenney and A. D. Melville. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986: 134-142.

Pausanias. *Description of Greece 1.5*. Translated by W. H. S. Jones and H. A. Ormerod. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; Lon don: William Heinemann Ltd., 1918. Retrieved from Perseus Digital Library http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0160:book=1:chapter=5&highlight=philomela.

Shields, Erin. *If We Were Birds*. Toronto: Playwrights Canada Press, 2011.

Ue, Tom. "Gender, violence, and history in *If We Were Birds*: an interview with Erin Shields." *Journal of Gender Studies* 22 (2013): 97-103.

Wertenbaker, Timberlake. *Plays 1: The Love of the Nightingale*. London: Faber & Faber, 1996.

Barbarian or Greek Murder? Medea's Gift of Clothing and Identity in Euripides' Medea

Laura Harris

In Euripides' *Medea*, the robe and headband which the barbarian sorceress Medea sends as a gift of supplication to Glauce the Corinthian princess are some of the few props for which the text explicitly calls. While these items appear onstage only once, they are far more important than such a brief appearance suggests. Medea is conventionally presented as wearing distinctively barbarian clothing, yet her gift of clothing is so ambiguously described that it is possible the gift could be presented onstage as either Greek or barbarian. Euripides' ambiguous descriptions of the garments' beauty, when combined with evidence from vase paintings, make a Greek presentation likely; this, however, is contradicted by the fact that his imprecise descriptions are similar to his other depictions of barbarity and the clothing's origins make a barbarian presentation probable. In either case, focus on the costume choices can nuance Medea's and Glauce's complex relationships both with each other and with their society beyond what is provided by the text alone. The former style of the garment characterizes Medea as not only a witch, but also as a barbarian able to expropriate Greek culture, while the latter portrays Glauce as a Greek desiring barbarian independence.

Clothing is a powerful symbol for presenting one's identity. This is particularly true in theatre, where the audience is keenly aware that each aspect of the performance and production has been consciously chosen for an effect. Particularly in the *Medea*, a play so concerned with ethnic and civic identity, costuming is an important way of distinguishing between these identities. The robes and headdress which Medea sends to Glauce are rich and beautiful,[1] but it is possible that they are garments such as any upper class Greek woman might have worn. The terminology used, however, is too imprecise to be certain about their culture of origin. While Medea calls the dress a *πέπλος*, a word simply meaning "any woven cloth,"[2] and the headdress a *πλόκος* or a "wreath,"[3] the chorus calls the latter an

1 Euripides, *Medea*, 26, accessed via Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994, Perseus Digital Library.

2 LSJ s.v. *πέπλος* 2.

3 LSJ s.v *πλόκος* 2; Euripides, *Medea*, 786, 950.

ἀναδέσμη or a "band for a woman's hair."[4] The text's ambiguity makes it possible that the garments were in fact not eastern, but Greek.

Thus, a barbarian woman, who is the antithesis of a well-behaved Greek woman, gives clothing whose production the Greeks strongly associated with Greek womanhood.[5] Since the *Medea* is an Athenian play, this paper will focus on the customs of Athenian women. They were kept inside, not given much education, and expected to be submissive, obedient, and extremely modest.[6] This extreme seclusion and suppression of women became a mark of upper-class respectability and privilege.[7] As a princess, this is the life and behaviour that Glauce would be expected to live. Indeed, she is presented as a perfect example of this ideal Athenian woman, seeing as she does not appear or speak, and is reported to be obedient both to her father and husband. Medea, on the other hand, is active, vocal, and has no male protector, and is thus the antithesis of the ideal woman.

The garments might also be foreign because Euripides gives them very high aesthetic value, calling them "delicate," "golden," and having "loveliness and divine brightness."[8] The Greeks considered themselves, their art, and their culture superior to all the surrounding cultures, and so it seems surprising that Euripides would give such extravagant praise to non-Greek clothing. As noted above, Glauce conforms to the behaviour of a well brought-up Greek girl. Thus, it would be surprising that she would be willing to put on a garment that she would view as barbarian and therefore ugly. Euripides' Medea is much too clever and much too determined to exact her revenge to risk that her gift be rejected by giving one that the recipient would disdain.[9] In this way, it is logical that she would disguise her murderous apparel as an ordinary, and therefore harmless, piece of Greek women's clothing. Showing a seemingly innocent Greek-style dress and wreath in the scene when Medea sends her children to Glauce would later add considerable surprise and dramatic power to the messenger's speech announcing Glauce's death.

4 LSJ s.v. *ἀναδέσμη* 1.

5 Sue Blundell, *Women in Classical Athens*. (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1998), 66-67.

6 Ibid., 10-11, 62.

7 Ibid., 73.

8 Euripides, "Medea" in *Medea and Other Plays,* trans. James Morwood. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 785-6, 982.

9 Eur., *Med.*, 678, 1237-1241.

Since the production details of the City Dionysia performances do not survive, it is impossible to know what the costume design was. What visual evidence does survive, however, is in the form of vases depicting scenes from the story of Medea, specifically the Euripidean version where Medea kills her children before flying away. These vases are mostly from Magna Graecia and approximately date to a century after the debut of Euripides' play in 431 BCE,[10] but several examples appear theatrical and are likely modelled after either local productions or reports of Athenian productions.[11] Even if they were modelled after local productions, it is possible that those productions were inspired by Athenian originals. No matter the exact circumstances of their production, these vases demonstrate how Greeks depicted Medea and so can be used as useful evidence for tragic productions. Many of these vases show Medea in a distinctively barbarian costume. These include a volute krater painted with various scenes from the tale. The central scene is an old man standing in a non-descript, temple-like building looking upset over a young woman who is slumped over on a throne.[12] Presumably, this is Creon discovering Glauce's death. This surviving image of the murderous garments, possibly inspired by theatrical performances, is the best indication of the Greek view of this scene and its costuming. Here, Glauce's dress is simply draped fabric and a necklace without anything that would mark it as non-Greek, and in fact looks very similar to those of other Greek women on the vase. This vase, therefore, shows Medea giving Glauce a Greek-style gift, which she uses to appropriate Greek culture and manipulate her identity as a barbarian woman against the Greek and male identity dominating Corinth.

Euripides portrays Medea as definitively barbarian by giving her the opposite attributes to those of an ideal Greek woman—yet Medea gives Greek garments to Glauce, a prominent sign of Greek womanhood. This is all the more remarkable because, as mentioned earlier, the play heavily emphasizes their beauty and craftsmanship. Medea has obtained, from her barbarian family, Greek-style clothing so beautiful that it tempts a princess, who surely has many beautiful and rich objects. In this way,

10 "A Chronology of Euripidean Work and Times" In *Medea and Other Plays*, ed. and trans. James Morwood. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008): 5.

11 C. W. Marshall, "Subsequent Medeas: Tragedies' Next Audiences." Lecture, Northrop Frye Centre Annual Lecture, Toronto, Canada, 6 October 2016.

12 Underworld Painter, *Munich 3296 (Vase)*. Apulian Red Figure. ca. 330 BCE - ca. 310 BCE. (Antikensammlungen, Munich).

seemingly safe, beautiful Greek objects become associated with a dangerous barbarian sorceress who refuses to comply with the wishes of the men around her.[13] Even worse, her pseudo-Greek clothes are even better than the Greek garments of the Corinthians themselves. Through her gift of clothing, Medea becomes even more menacing by threatening ideas of Greek superiority: she becomes a barbarian who can adopt Greek culture and then perform it better than the Greeks themselves. For the Athenian audience, the suggestion that their superiority was not absolute, but could be imitated and improved upon by a barbarian would be terrifying.

Medea's gift of the clothing, then, continues the portrayal of her capability to use the traits associated with the dominant elements of her society to manipulate her own marginalized identity as both a woman and a foreigner. From the beginning of the play, Medea is characterized as a defiant and wronged woman, whom the nurse compares to an unbending "rock or a wave of the sea,"[14] a common comparison denoting stubbornness in Greek poetry, because she has been "dishonoured" by Jason.[15] She is not at all submissive and utterly unlike the Greek ideal of a modest, quiet woman, as she calls curses down upon Jason and his new bride, saying "may I one day see him and his bride pounded to nothing, house and all."[16] However, while talking to Jason just before she gives the gifts to the children whom she sends as suppliants to Glauce, Medea acts with stereotypical feminine passivity and foolishness. She shows that while she rejects a woman's socially approved role, she fully understands it and is able to play the part when it is to her advantage. Yet, at the same time, she acts as a man concerned about political strategies and the establishment of a dynasty, displaying a convergence of masculine and feminine attributes which is typical of the characterization of barbarians in Greek tragedy.[17] She says, "it is most advantageous to us in marrying a princess and producing brothers for my children," but she models this political man on Jason, whom she calls "a man who is no man."[18] Thus, he too is drawn into Medea's manipulation of both the conceptions of masculinity and femininity, and also Greek and barbarian identities and modes of behaviour.

13 Eur., *Med.*, 395-397, 465-475.

14 Deborah Boedeker, "Becoming Medea: Assimilation in Euripides." In *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art,* ed. James J. Clauss and Sarah Iles Johnston, 127-148. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 129-130.

15 Eur., *Med.*, 30, 21.

16 Ibid., 20-22, 160-165.

17 Edith Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 209-10.

18 Eur., *Med.*, 877-879, 467.

This manipulation of gender roles continues as Medea sends the children away with the gifts. Here she takes on a powerful male role, such as a warrior or ruler, by performing the actions of a powerful man and calling her children out, announcing a treaty or truce, and having the children take their father's right hand.[19] Contradicting her manly behaviour, however, she gives a gift of fabric, of clothing, which was not only considered a feminine concern, but the creation of which was one of the key feminine duties. Through her gift, Medea is seen to manipulate the gender roles Corinthian society expects, continuing her characterization as a dangerous barbarian due to this non-conformity to the Greek values for women.

By giving the Greek clothing, Medea adds another aspect to this manipulation of identities. She stands on stage, dressed distinctively as a barbarian,[20] and acting in a masculine manner while being a woman, and sending Greek gifts. By acting as a submissive Greek woman while talking to Jason but as a strong Greek leader when talking to her children, and also giving dangerous, foreign gifts disguised as Greek presents, Medea flaunts her barbarous threat to Greek propriety and order in front of the audience. And yet she conceals it from her fellow characters, managing to be simultaneously both Greek and barbarian, and thus reveals her ability to manipulate people so that they allow her what she requires to achieve her goals to the audience. Onstage, only the chorus understands that Medea's innocence is an act and that murder will follow.

Due to the ambiguity of Euripides' descriptions of the clothes, however, it is also possible that they were clothing is, in fact, distinctively not Greek. This costuming choice would considerably simplify Medea's characterization and make her more consistently barbarian and lessen the quasi-Greekness that is disturbing to the audience; yet this would not make the play as a whole any less troubling to Athenians. Instead, Glauce, supposedly a well-behaved, well-raised Greek girl, accepts a foreign gift. She eagerly dresses herself in it and, by taking on the symbols of a barbarian, she herself partially becomes one, as in theatre where costume is symbolic of core identity,[21] putting on a foreign dress is essentially no different from becoming a barbarian. Because they have seen the garment,

19 Deborah Boedeker, "Becoming Medea: Assimilation in Euripides." In *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art*, ed. James J. Clauss and Sarah Iles Johnston, 127-148. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 135.

20 Underworld Painter. *Munich 3296 (Vase).* Apulian Red Figure. ca. 330 BCE - ca. 310 BCE. (Antikensammlungen, Munich).

21 Froma I. Zeitlin, "Playing the Other: Theater, Theatricality, and the Feminine in Greek Drama," *Representations*, 11 (1985): 64.

the audience would imagine a woman who looks like a barbarian when the messenger describes Glauce putting it on. In fact, the messenger says that Glauce was "utterly thrilled by the gifts" and greatly admired her image in them, "[looking at herself] in a shining mirror," and "[admiring] the way the robe fell."[22] Thus, being like, or at least looking like the barbarian Medea is attractive to Glauce.[23]

In many ways, it is actually more logical for the garments to be foreign, since Medea explicitly says that they are objects which "the father of my father, gave to his children."[24] Medea's origins in Colchis, a strange, far-off land of legend and quests are emphasized along with her ancestry from Aeëtes and Helios. In fact, the *Medea* begins with the nurse recalling Medea's distant origins and the long voyage Jason took to get to Colchis and the one in reverse that they both took to Corinth.[25] Throughout the rest of the play, the characters repeatedly reference Medea's foreignness. For Medea to have brought Greek garments, which she inherited from her foreign ancestors from her foreign homeland is nonsensical. From their mythological provenance, then, there is a convincing case that the garments may be foreign.

In her study, *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy,* Bacon notes that unlike Aeschylus and Sophocles, Euripides is not interested in the specifics of how barbarians differ from Greeks, but only in their symbolic foreignness, and thus does not concentrate on the details of the differences of barbarian dress, custom, geography, *et cetera*.[26] She notes that Euripides instead focuses on the luxury of foreign garments,[27] which is exactly the circumstance in the *Medea,* such as when the wreath is described as *χρυσήλατον*—"of beaten gold."[28] The characters repeatedly describe the gifts as "golden," "delicate," and "finely woven," all indicative of luxury and splendor, which following from Bacon is enough in Euripides to characterize the garments as decidedly non-Greek.[29] Hall agrees that "delicate" is a word particularly associated with barbarity in Greek tragedy when it is accompanied by other indications of barbarism, as it certainly

22 Eur., *Med.,* 1165, 1161, 1166-67.

23 J. H. Oliver, "Mater Amissa: The Lost Amazon in Seneca's Phaedra" (Unpublished Paper, CLA5023, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, 2013), 12.

24 Ibid., 953-4.

25 Ibid., 1-11.

26 Helen H. Bacon, *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998), 165, 168.

27 Ibid., 122.

28 LSJ s.v. *χρυσήλατος*, Eur., *Med.*, 786.

29 Ibid., 785-6, 1159.

is in the *Medea.*[30] Greeks typically saw barbarians and their accoutrements as dangerous and transgressive, and this is heightened in the stage setting where symbolism is far more prominent than in day-to-day life. Yet Glauce accepts and immediately puts on a barbarian gift from a woman who is not only a barbarian, but also her husband's abandoned first wife.

Thus, the question is why would Glauce want the clothing? The most straightforward reading is that which is in line with female stereotypes, namely, she simply desires rich and beautiful things, but this seems oddly shallow for an author who creates psychologically complex characters, such as Phaedra and Pentheus. Examining how Glauce fits into the city as a whole can help to create a more nuanced picture of her. Glauce is presented as the opposite of Medea; she is the girl who obeys her father (unlike Medea who abandoned her birth family) and marries the man she was instructed to, while Medea left Colchis with Jason, against her father's wishes.[31] She is entirely controlled by her father. Yet the other women of Corinth, as represented by the chorus of Corinthian women, who, like Glauce, were born and raised in Corinth, are deeply aware of how restrictive their society is for women. Somewhat unusually for Greek tragedy, the chorus is of women, not of old men, which results in a play that is dominated by female voices supporting Medea. They say that Medea is a "victim of injustice," that she "will be right to exact vengeance from [her] husband."[32] They respond to Medea's threats against Jason by saying they "shall be celebrated/honour is coming to the female sex" and most powerfully, they tell Medea when at her lowest point:

Alas, alas, you pitiable woman.
Wretched in your sufferings.
Wherever can you turn?
Where can you find a host to welcome you,
What home, what country
To shield you from disaster?
For the god has brought you, Medea,
To an overwhelming sea of woes.[33]

30 Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian,* 127.

31 Eur., *Med.,* 31-33, 288-289.

32 Ibid., 208, 267-8.

33 Ibid., 414-415, 358-363.

These words would not sound out of place from Medea herself. If all these women, presumably Glauce's neighbours and friends, have this knowledge and distress about their place in society, how can she so completely ready to accept submission to her father? Through her barbarity and her herbal and magical lore, Medea has agency to influence the world she lives in, the people around her, and potential independence from the narrow confines of a Corinthian woman's life, which is realized when she flies off at the end of the play. Confused gender roles make up a key part of barbarity to the Greeks, which gives Medea the ability to pursue her own desires and revenge like a man; barbarity in this play amounts to freedom from the confining gender roles of Greek society.[34] Barbaric opposition to patriarchy imbues the gifts she gives to Jason's new bride, as much as the poison that Glauce is unaware of does. Glauce's eager acceptance of the gifts onto her own body demonstrates that barbarity and the power and independence of a barbarian woman as embodied in the garments has a degree of desirability to a Greek woman.[35] In some sense, then, Glauce wants to become Medea, hoping that her power will transfer onto the wearer of the clothing.

Glauce, of course, has another reason to wish to be like or become Medea: her new husband Jason married her for political expediency, but he seems to have married Medea for love. This is plausible, since he took her back to Corinth with him, even though he could have "forgotten" her on a remote island just as Theseus did with Ariadne, once she had outlived her use. Perhaps Glauce hoped that if she were dressed like Medea, and therefore took on some of her essence, Jason might love her too. This is not the only example of a poisoned robe being used as a love charm in Greek tragedy. In Sophocles' *Women of Trachis*, Deianeira attempts to use a robe imbued with Nessus' blood and hydra poison to regain Hercules' love due to her jealously over his foreign mistress, Iole.[36] However, the robe kills Heracles instead, clinging to him and "tearing at his bones."[37] Given the *Women of Trachis* precedent, Glauce's interpretation of Medea's gift as a love charm might be available to the audience for consideration.

Medea and Glauce not only have a close connection due to their desires for both Jason and barbarian independence, displayed in their inter actions over the gift, but they are also connected by the chorus and by lit-

34 Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian*, 125, 130.

35 Oliver, "Mater Amissa," 11.

36 Sophocles, "Women of Trachis" in *Sophocles II: Antigone, Women of Trachis, Philoctetes, Oedipus at Colonus*, trans. Hugh Lloyd-Jones. (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 569-577.

37 Ibid., 767-770.

erary history. First, the chorus has an affiliation with Medea through their sympathy for her situation as a woman abandoned by her husband and the conventions of Greek tragedy, which dictate that the chorus generally supports the lead character.[38] As Corinthians, however, they also would have a civic identity-based affiliation with Glauce. Both figures are closely associated with this mass of Corinthian women, and are thereby uneasily associated with each other because of this. Second, an earlier poet, Eumelus, from around 740 BCE, whose works only survive in summaries by Pausinas, wrote in his *Corinthiaca* that Aeëtes, Helios' son, was the king of Corinth, but left it to go to Colchis.[39] This gives Medea Corinthian, not barbarian origins, identifying her even more closely with Glauce. In fact, in Eumelus' version, Medea plays the role that Glauce plays here—namely that of the princess whom Jason marries to legitimize his rule.[40] At least some of the audience must have been aware of this older tradition, and so they would be more likely to see the connections between Medea of the *Corinthiaca* and Glauce of the *Medea*. This literary history also gives Medea more reason to murder Glauce, who is usurping Medea's role as Jason's wife and her older role as princess of Corinth and a political bride. Thus, even if Medea's gift is barbarian, she inescapably retains an element of Greekness.

In the *Medea*, Euripides describes the garments Medea gives Glauce in such ambiguous terms that they could be either Greek or barbarian. When their beauty is combined with the Greeks' opinion of their cultural superiority and a depiction of Glauce's death on an Apulian vase, this amounts to good evidence for a Greek depiction. Such a depiction would allow Medea to use it to manipulate and blur identities, as is typical of barbarians in Greek tragedy, while she manipulates the people around her. Because the garments may be foreign, the portrayal of Glauce as an ideal Greek girl is complicated, due to their status as Medea's family heirlooms and their description as delicate and luxurious. Glauce's actions, namely wearing the garments despite their perception as dangerous items, suggest that, like the other women in the play, she wants both freedom and power, and therefore wants to become like Medea who has some measure of both. This desire is increased by the possibility that the dress can serve as a

38 Graham Ley, *The Theatricality of Greek Tragedy* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press 2007), 199.
39 Fritz Graft, "Medea, the Enchantress from Afar: Remarks on a Well-Known Myth." In *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art*, edited by James J. Clauss and Sarah Iles Johnston (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 34. "Eumelus" In *Oxford Classical Dictionary, 4th ed.*, ed. Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 547.
40 Ibid., 34.

love charm by making Jason see her as Medea, whom he seemingly loved. Connections between Medea and Glauce, therefore, are not surprising seeing that the chorus identifies with both of them, and the role swap from the earlier versions, in which Medea occupied Glauce's role as the Corinthian princess. Thus, considering the staging of ancient productions opens up unusual ways of analyzing the play, as well as being informative for modern productions of ancient tragedy.

Bibliography

Bacon, Helen H. *Barbarians in Greek Tragedy.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Blundell, Sue. *Women in Classical Athens.* London: Bristol University Press, 1998.

Boedeker, Deborah. "Becoming Medea: Assimilation in Euripides." In *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art,* edited by James J. Clauss and Sarah Iles Johnston, 127-148. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Euripides, *Medea.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994, Perseus Digital Library. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0113%3Acard%3D1

Euripides, "Medea." In *Medea and Other Plays,* translated by James Mor wood. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Graft, Fritz. "Medea, the Enchantress from Afar: Remarks on a Well-Known Myth." In *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Phi losophy, and Art,* edited by James J. Clauss and Sarah Iles John ston, 21-43. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Hall, Edith. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Ley, Graham. *The Theatricality of Greek Tragedy.* Chicago, University of Chi cago Press, 2007.

Liddell, H. G., and Scott, R. *A Greek-English Lexicon,* edited by Henry Stu art Jones. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Marshall, C. W. "Subsequent Medeas: Tragedies' Next Audiences." Lec ture. Northrop Frye Centre Annual Lecture, Toronto, Canada. Oc tober 6, 2016.

Oliver, J. H. "Mater amissa: The Lost Amazon in Seneca's *Phaedra*." Un published Paper, CLA5023, University of Toronto, Toronto, Cana da, 2013.

Oxford Classical Dictionary, Fourth Edition. Edited by Simon Hornblow er, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow. Oxford: Oxford Uni versity Press, 2012.

Sophocles. "Women of Trachis" in *Sophocles II: Antigone, Women of Trachis, Philoctetes, Oedipus at Colonus,* translated by Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Underworld Painter. *Munich 3296 (Vase).* Apulian Red Figure. ca. 330 BCE - ca. 310 BCE. Antikensammlungen, Munich. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/artifact?name=Munich+3296&object=Vase

Zeitlin, Froma I. "Playing the Other: Theater, Theatricality, and the Femi nine in Greek Drama." *Representations*, no. 11 (1985): 63-94.

Sophism and the Irrational in Euripides' Cyclops

Andrew Mayo

The Polyphemus of Euripides' *Cyclops*[1] presents a strange juxtaposition: he is at once the expounder of decadent sophistic ideas and an exemplary savage, ignorant even of such fundamentals as wine. In this essay, I deal with several interpretative problems around the character of Polyphemus and argue that this play, in the figure of the cyclops, offers a critique of certain strains of fifth-century Greek thought.

I do not mean "sophistic" in the strictest sense of the word, namely in reference to those early teachers of higher education who offered (often at a handsome price) their instruction in argumentation and rhetoric to the young aristocrats of fifth century Athens, and were received with great enthusiasm, though with more than a little suspicion as well. From this arose an anxiety regarding those who might use the new learning to deceive or, what is worse, to put what is abhorrent in the dress of what is true. Rather than these itinerant educators in particular I mean more broadly the intellectual movement that was fostered by them and flourished alongside them, a movement with which, in the plays of Aristophanes, the native Athenian Socrates and the tragedian Euripides are associated, despite failing to qualify as "sophists" according to the narrowest definition. From the sophists came an influence and an anxiety too wide to respect narrow definitions. One consequence of all this, for many Athenians, seems to have been a vague sense and a keen fear that what was once commonly understood regarding truth and goodness was suddenly up in the air: it is with this anxiety that Euripides sets the stage for his cyclops Polyphemus.

The influence of the sophists has been detected in Euripides' Polyphemus since at least Schmid in the nineteenth century, who connects him with sophists such as the rather ill-understood (at least as historical figures) Thrasymachus and Callicles.[2] While there is certainly reason to doubt that Euripides intended an association with some sophist in particular, it does not necessarily follow that there is no sophistic influ-

1 Euripides, *Euripides: Cyclops*, ed. by Richard Seaford (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984). All further verse citations of the *Cyclops* are from Seaford's edition.

2 Wilhelm Schmid, "Kritisches und Exegetisches zu Euripides' Kyklops," *Philologus* 55 (1896): 57.

ence on the character or the play.[3] The most obvious reason to think of Polyphemus as a sophistic character is his speech to Odysseus arguing that "wealth is the god for the wise" (vv. 316-346). It is worth noting that prior to the beginning of Polyphemus' speech the audience would have had no indication the character of the cyclops was substantially different from the Homeric version, and that all previous descriptions of him play it straight, as it were. The pronouncement of line 316 must have made a strong and astonishing impression. His claim that he is a god descended from gods (v. 231) is not in itself terribly surprising, given the prominence of Polyphemus' descent from Poseidon in the Odyssean account, though of course this claim takes on new significance when his nigh atheistic disregard for the gods becomes clear later in the play. There is probably a hint of the later revelation in Silenus' description of the cyclops as *ἀνόσιος* (unholy) (v. 26), but this need not have suggested anything more than the inhospitable cannibal the audience would have presumed him to be.

Ussher has cast doubt on the notion that there is anything sophistic about Euripides' Polyphemus, and understood the sentiment of this speech as being the simple code of a savage,[4] though this reading seems improbable to me: I know of no case in Greek literature where the worship or esteem of wealth, *πλοῦτος* (wealth), is associated with the primitive and solitary. For instance, in Homer wealth is associated with the more virtuous members of society, being valued in large part because *τιμή* (honour) is its concomitant,[5] which is to say because of its social significance, and in Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, commerce and the acts of buying and selling are portrayed in comic fashion as decadently urbane by Dicaeopolis.[6] What is associated with the idea of "wealth" necessarily excludes the lonesome savage living in a cave, and therefore there must be something else at work here, sophistic influence being a compelling explanation.[7] The dramatic placement of the word *πλοῦτος* in the first verse of the

3 C. W. Marshall, "The Sophisticated Cyclops," In *Satyr Drama: Tragedy at Play*, ed. G. W. M. Harrison (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2005), 114.

4 Robert G. Ussher, *Euripides: Cyclops* (Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo & Bizzarri, 1978), 187.

5 Gilbert Murray, *Rise of the Greek Epic* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), 89.

6 Aristophanes, *Acharnians*., vv. 33-36, in Aristophanes, *Comoediae*, ed. by Frederick W. Hall and William M. Geldart (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907).

7 Marshall, in writing about the "sophisticated cyclops," mentions with approval the claim that in Polyphemus there is something of a tyrant: "To see in Polyphemus an exaggeration of core features of a *τύραννος* is one way the play resonates particularly with recent history;" in Marshall's view the tyrannical and sophistic sides of the character are complementary ways of engaging with "the intellectual world of Athens" and need not be seen as exclusive of each other (Marshall, "Sophisticated Cyclops," 104).

cyclops' first proper speech encourages us to see something at variance with the Homeric character, and if this is read simply as the expression of his "primitive code" the speech loses much of its impact, especially considering that shock for the sake of provoking thought is a marked trait of both the sophists and Euripidean drama.[8] Nevertheless Ussher is correct in saying that Polyphemus is unmistakably primitive, and that it would seem a contradiction for him to be both primitive and sophistic, a paradox I shall return to later.

Polyphemus' speech is preceded by one given by Odysseus arguing against the devouring of him and his crew. In the context of Greek drama, an *agon* is a contest of words between two characters in the form of usually two paired speeches representing sharply distinguished points of view. The term is most often applied to tragedy, especially the tragedies of Euripides, but has also been used in connection with the *Cyclops*, which is of a different genre, the satyr play. The question of whether this pair of speeches is best considered an *agon* is of some importance, since the form, which appears at least thirteen times in Euripides,[9] seems to have been strongly influenced by the political and intellectual life of Periclean Athens. This contest of words was informed by both the broader Greek inclination towards competition, be it in athletics, poetry, democratic politics, or litigation, and also the particularly sophistic fondness for contests of argument. Allan describes the sophists as "like the tragic poets and their actors, performers in a competitive culture",[10] and Guthrie in particular connects sophistic competitiveness with the agonstic quality of Euripidean drama.[11] The form also allowed for the expression of two ideas with equal weight, and therefore for the expression of philosophical conflict over and above the conflict entailed by the narrative. The use of explicit terminology such as *ἀγών* or *ἅμιλλα* (contest), and the cognate verbs *ἀγωνίζομαι* and *ἁμιλλάομαι* (to contend), in or concerning seven of the relevant speeches in Euripides would appear to confirm that the playwright was aware of the *agon* as a distinct dramatic tool.[12] Lloyd argues that this pair of speeches[13] should not be considered an *agon*, but rather

8 William Allan, "Euripides and the Sophists: Society and the Theatre of War," *Illinois Classical Studies* 24/25 (1999-2000): 155.

9 Michael Lloyd, *The Agon in Euripides* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 3.

10 Allan, "Euripides and the Sophists," 146.

11 William K. C. Guthrie, *The Fifth-Century Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 43.

12 Lloyd, *Agon in Euripides*, 4-5.

13 Seaford (*Cyclops*, ad loc.) identifies vv. 285-346 as constituting an *agon*, excluding vv. 347-355.

a supplication scene.[14] He is surely correct to identify it as a supplication scene, as "ἱκετεύομεν [we beseech you]" (v. 287) makes plain, but to reject the scene as an *agon* on this account requires the acceptance of Lloyd's exclusive distinction between *agon*, supplication, and *epideixis* [declamation]: supplication scenes, he says, are similar in form but different in content from *agones*.[15] The lack of contentiousness, it seems, is what distinguishes the supplication scene from the *agon*. However, this scene is not without contention: Polyphemus' speech is clearly one of blunt confutation, while Odysseus' is not speaking purely from a position of humble submission, but one of reproach: "*ψέγομεν ἐλευθέρως* [we reproach you frankly]" (v. 287). In this case to uphold a sharp distinction between categories of speech seems arbitrary. Furthermore, the opposing worldviews presented in the two speeches create a conflict of ideas for which the dramatic *agon* is naturally well suited.

The arguments of Odysseus are broadly traditional, hanging on ideas of piety, patriotism, and hospitality, though on account of its conciliatory tone and formal structure it might be seen as the more rhetorically sophisticated of the two speeches, and it is probably for this reason that Silenus describes it as *κομψός* (over-clever) (v. 315). Polyphemus seems to regard everything other than his own creed as specious and over-pretty argument (v. 317), though this does not include only Odysseus' speechmaking but also law and religion in general, and expresses his radical rejection of *nomos* [law or custom] human and divine. The cyclops emphasizes his rational self-sufficiency in relation to nature and propounds in an extreme form the primacy of *physis* (nature) over *nomos*. Dodds summarizes the "extreme *Physis* school" thus: "[they] provided human weakness with a fashionable excuse by declaring that the passions were 'natural' and therefore right, morality a convention and therefore a shackle to be cast off".[16] Polyphemus' enumeration of the various ways he provides for his own well-being by *physis* rather than by piety, law, or custom (vv. 320-333) situates his argument on one side of the debate regarding *nomos* and *physis* which loomed large for the thinkers of fifth-century Athens.[17]

14 Lloyd, *Agon in Euripides*, 9.

15 Ibid., 8.

16 Eric R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951), 187.

17 Guthrie, *Fifth-Century Enlightenment*, 55-131. He discusses the role of *nomos* and *physis* in fifth-century thought, the greater prominence given to them by writers in this period compared to earlier writers, and the new sense that *nomos* and *physis* are exclusive of each other: "what existed 'by *nomos*' was not 'by *physis*' and *vice versa*" (55).

The cyclops's direct, assertive style and disregard for rhetorical niceties are reminiscent of the manner of Thrasymachus in Book I of Plato's *Republic*,[18] and while it is perilous to presume Plato's portrait was a faithful one, at the least it probably drew on an image or stereotype of the sophist who argues for nature over law and self-assertion over piety. It is not difficult to imagine how such thought might come to be associated with an untoward and aggressive sort of thinker. Polyphemus, in his rationalistic attitude of power-worship, has an analogue in the Eteocles of *Phoenissae*, of whom Schmid considers him a caricature.[19] This sort of character, namely the shocking and repulsive rationalist whose cool analysis leads to the rejection of law rather than the perfection of it, [20] is the inverse of Mastronarde's "optimistic rationalists" in Euripides, such as Theseus in the *Supplices*, Jocasta in the *Phoenissae*, and Orestes in the *Orestes* and Tiresias in the *Bacchae*, of whom he writes: "they are what I would call 'optimistic rationalists': they believe that the world is orderly and comprehensible and that there are elements in that order which have been fashioned for the good of man."[21] These characters are perhaps to be associated with sophists such as Protagoras, who grounded *nomos* in *physis* and saw the invention of law as the amelioration of man. Guthrie describes Protagoras as resolving the *nomos-physis* antithesis on these grounds: "men's nature (physical weakness) would have brought them to destruction without political organization; therefore laws are an ordinance of 'nature.'"[22]

A similar paradox to that of the savage and lawless yet sophisticated Polyphemus is found in the depiction of Dionysus and his cult in the *Bacchae*:[23] the new Bacchic religion is presented simultaneously as a wild cult bound to nature and as the giver and upholder of *nomos*. More broadly, the Bacchic religion in that play encompasses both law and the irrational in nature and society. Conacher describes the components of this dual identity, mentioning both the "wildness of the god's cult" and that the chorus of the *Bacchae* "claim that *their* way is the way the *nomoi* from time

18 Plato, *Republic*. Edited and translated by Chris Emlyn-Jones and William Preddy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013).

19 Schmid, "Kritisches und Exegetisches," 57.

20 Such a figure we also find in the character of Jason in the Medea: see Donald J. Mastronarde, "The Optimistic Rationalist in Euripides: Theseus, Jocasta, Tiresias," in *Greek Tragedy and Its Legacy: Essays Presented to Desmond Conacher*, ed. Cropp, M. et al. (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1986), 202.

21 Mastronarde, "The Optimistic Rationalist in Euripides," 202.

22 Guthrie, *Fifth-Century Enlightenment*, 72.

23 Euripides, *Euripides: Bacchae*, ed. by Eric R. Dodds (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960). All further verse citations of the *Bacchae* are from Dodds's edition.

immemorial dictate".[24] Dodds describes the Dionysian religion of the play as "the recognition of a "Beyond" which is outside our moral categories and inaccessible to our reason".[25]

Besides the original Homeric narrative centred on Odysseus, there are two other narratives running through the *Cyclops*, one which hinges upon the satyrs, and another which hinges upon the cyclops himself. From the perspective of Polyphemus, the play can be read along much the same lines as the *Bacchae* can, as a narrative of the introduction of Dionysus to lands which aforetime knew him not, and the subsequent punishment of those who meant to reject him, namely Polyphemus and Pentheus. Polyphemus and Pentheus even have similar reactions of incomprehension to the new god (v. 521 and vv. 219-220 respectively). In this version of the narrative, Dionysus, a god of law and of the irrational, conquers the lawless rationalist Polyphemus. Contrariwise, if Silenus and the satyrs are given chief consideration, the play can be read as a salvation narrative of sorts.

The *Cyclops* begins with Silenus apostrophizing Dionysus and reminding him of how he succoured the god in the gigantomachy (vv. 5-9) and set out by sea with his sons, the satyrs, to deliver him from the hands of pirates (vv. 10-14). If there is a purpose behind this, it must be to remind Dionysus of his debt to the satyrs as his servants. In the epode of the first choral song, the satyrs sing querulously of the god's absence, both by name and in his several manifestations of dance, revelry, kettle-drum music, and wine (vv. 63-65). Ussher points out the similarities of language and detail between this and verses from the *Bacchae*, which underscores the common ground of the two plays, and also the appropriateness of these verses as solemn religious language.[26] The mention of springs flowing with water (v. 66) and the description of the drops of wine as "*χλωρός* [pale-green or fresh]" (v. 67), a word which would more aptly describe fresh vegetation, perhaps recall other aspects of the god which relate him to all of watery nature, *ὑγρὰ φύσις*, a phrase Dodds quotes from Plutarch.[27] They ask Dionysus where he is going (vv. 74-75), implicitly saying "where are you going, if not here to help us", and deplore the iniquity that they, servants of the god, should serve the cyclops (vv. 76-81). The sum of all this is that Silenus and the satyrs are calling upon Dionysus to aid them. Since Od

24 Desmond J. Conacher, *Euripides and the Sophists* (London: Duckworth, 1998), 100.

25 Dodds, *Greeks and the Irrational*, 187.

26 Ussher, *Cyclops*, ad loc.

27 Eric R. Dodds, *Euripides: Bacchae* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), xii.

ysseus comes bearing wine and shows it to Silenus forthwith (v. 139), his advent can be understood as an answer to Silenus' prayer. In the blinding scene, we find the Odysseus and Silenus narratives side by side: prior to the act of thrusting the brand into the monster's eye Odysseus invokes the circumstantially relevant gods Hephaestus as lord of Aetna (v. 599) and Hypnos (v. 601), since Polyphemus lies sleeping, while the satyrs call upon the wine (v. 616) and once more reminisce of Dionysus (vv. 620-624). One effect of the coincidence of these three narratives is to diminish the role of Odysseus, traditionally thought of as a cunning and self-willed hero, and subordinate his agency to that of Dionysus. As Schmid observes,[28] Odysseus is in fact presented as more obstinately heroic in this play than in Homer, being quite willing to die for his reputation rather than escape with his life (vv. 198-202), and accordingly less thoroughly *πολυμήχανος* (much-devising) than in Homeric myth. Both the Silenus and Polyphemus narratives encroach upon the core Odysseus story and have as their culmination the triumph of Dionysus. Dionysus entails the breakdown of the exclusive distinction between *physis* and *nomos*, as indeed should be the case, considering that prior to the fifth-century these terms were not as a rule felt to be antithetical,[29] and that Dionysus belongs to an older manner of thinking.

Both the repugnant rationalism which Polyphemus represents, and the triumph of irrational *nomos* over rational *physis* which Dionysus' overcoming of the cyclops implies, suggest a line of criticism against certain strains of sophistic thought. On the one hand the play seems to run counter to the Protagorean idea of rational progress, and on the other to the assumption, imputed to Thrasymachus and Callicles, that nature alone, oriented on power and wealth and amounting to a rejection of *nomos*, is the proper grounds for justice. The difference between the Protagorean *nomos* and the Bacchic *nomos*, which is present in the *Bacchae* and, I argue, governs the action of Euripides' *Cyclops*, is not the resolution of the *nomos-physis* antithesis by founding law in nature, which both seem to do, but that the former reconciles them on the basis of reason, the latter on unreason.

28 Schmid, "Kritisches und Exegetisches," 55.

29 Guthrie, *Fifth-Century Enlightenment*, 55.

Bibliography

Allan, William. "Euripides and the Sophists: Society and the Theatre of War." *Illinois Classical Studies* 24/25 (1999-2000): 145-156.

Aristophanes. *Comoediae*. Edited by Frederick W. Hall and William M. Geldart. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.

Conacher, Desmond J. *Euripides and the Sophists*. London: Duckworth, 1998.

Dodds, Eric R. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951.

Euripides. *Euripides: Bacchae*. Edited with commentary by Eric R. Dodds. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Euripides. *Euripides: Cyclops*. Edited with commentary by Richard Sea ford. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Guthrie, William K. C. *The Fifth-Century Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Lloyd, Michael. *The Agon in Euripides*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Marshall, C. W. "The Sophisticated Cyclops." In *Satyr Drama: Tragedy at Play*, edited by George W. M. Harrison, 103-117. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2005.

Mastronarde, Donald J. "The Optimistic Rationalist in Euripides: The seus, Jocasta, Tiresias." In *Greek Tragedy and Its Legacy: Essays Presented to Desmond Conacher*, edited by Martin Cropp, Elaine Fan tham, and S. E. Scully, 201-211. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1986.

Murray, Gilbert. *Rise of the Greek Epic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.

Plato. *Republic*. Edited and translated by Chris Emlyn-Jones and William Preddy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Schmid, Wilhelm. "Kritisches und Exegetisches zu Euripides' Kyklops." *Philologus* 55 (1896):46-61.

Ussher, Robert G. *Euripides: Cyclops*. Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo e Bizzarri, 1978.

Romana simplicitate loqui: *Latin Profanity and Power*

Samantha Mazzilli

Imitating the style of the Latin epigrammatists such as Catullus and Martial, Lord Byron, the British Romantic poet, often emulated the profane Latin vocabulary common in the Romans' works. However, calling William Wordsworth "Turdsworth" does not quite reach the same level of profanity.[1] The Classical Latin of Martial and Catullus and the Vulgar Latin spoken by the common people are connected through the prolific use of obscene language. Martial himself referred to this strong word choice as *Romana simplicitas*, or Roman frankness.[2] Epigram and graffiti are literary styles most inherently Roman in sexual or profane subject matter, brevity, and, of course, word choice–all of which will be established as crucial facets of *Romanitas*. By means of vulgar and obscene connotations, the use of *Romana simplicitas* asserts personal authority in the spheres of authorship, social structure, religion, and sexuality. It allows those employing it to subvert imposed roles in gender and class structure, affirm one's standing with the divine, and establish poetic prestige.

Martial 11.20 is a quintessential example of the use of vulgarity in the genre of epigram, as it uses obscene language in a way that is both oblique and self-referential through the voice of Augustus:

> Read six verses of Caesar Augustus,
> You ill-tempered one who reads Latin words,
> "Because Antony is fucking [*futuit*] or has fucked Glaphrya,
> Fulvia decides this punishment for me, that I also fuck her.
> That I fuck Fulvia? What if Manius should beg me
> That I fuck him in the asshole [*pedicem*], should I do it? I do not think so, if I am wise.
> 'Either fuck me or let us fight,' she said. What about the fact that Life is dearer to me than my penis? Let the war trumpets sound!"

1 Itsuyo Higashinaka, "Byron's Indebtedness to Martial and Catullus," *The Byron Journal* 39.1 (2011): 51.
2 Martial, *Epigrams*, 11.20.

> Evidently you exonerate my witty little books, Augustus,
> Which you know speak with Roman frankness [*Romana simplicitate*].[3]

Martial, writing in the first century CE, quotes a colourful passage by Augustus here in an attempt to justify his use of *Romana simplicitas*.[4] In this example, while it is Martial publishing the obscene words, they are not his own but rather in the voice of one of more exalted status.[5] This presents a taste of some of the vocabulary common in epigram: such as the verbs *futuo* (to fuck), *pedico* (to fuck in the asshole), and *irrumo* (to face-fuck), which form a trio of words known as Priapic vocabulary.[6] These words gain power in profanity because of their connection to sexual dominance, a very masculine and Roman trait. I will expand upon the significance of these words tied to Priapus and the sphere of religion below. Martial is facetiously raising Augustus as a way to justify his own colourful language–in this way, he is both using the influence of the *princeps* to justify his own authority as a poet as well as to affirm his use of similar language elsewhere. The fact that Martial felt the need to justify his vocabulary in such a way establishes the idea that such language was indeed looked upon in a critical way, especially in the medium of poetry.

This custom of word choice is also visible in the poetry of Catullus, a first-century BCE poet.[7] Arguably the most famous example of *Romana simplicitas* can be found in the opening line of Catullus 16, an aggressive verse in which Catullus is self-referential regarding the obscenity of his own works:

> I will fuck you in the asshole and face-fuck you [*irrumabo*],
> Submissive Aurelius and catamite Furius,
> You who think that, because my poems
> Are delicate, I am unchaste.
> For it is suitable that a chaste poet

3 Personal translation, original text from Sheila K. Dickinson and Judith P. Hallett, *A Roman Women Reader* (Mundelein, Illinois: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 2015): 20.

4 Epigram is extant through Martial's publication, as per Peter Howell, *Martial*, (London: Bloomsbury, 2009): 43.

5 More examples of Martial's obscenity can be found in *Epigrams* 6.36, 3.87, and 10.90, among (many) others.

6 Melissa Mohr, *Holy Sh*t: A Brief History of Swearing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013): 18.

7 Dickinson and Hallet, *A Roman Women Reader*, 83, 106.

Himself is pious, but it is not necessary for his poems.
And it follows that these have wit and charm,
If they are delicate and unchaste,
And are able to incite itching,
I do not speak of a boy, but these hairy men
Who are not able to move hard genitals.
You, because you read my many thousands of kisses,
Do you think that I am a bad man?
I will fuck you in the asshole and face-fuck you.[8]

Catullus uses language similar to Martial's as a means to defend himself in the face of criticism regarding such vulgarity. Neither Catullus nor Martial seeks to apologize for their profanity, but rather use their rhetorical skill to make a farce of criticism. The fact that these poets feel the need to write such self-referential works is characteristic of the nature of their profession, reliant on patronage and thus dependent on reputation.[9] It is comedic that this minute form of apology–and in his case more of a defence than an explanation for his actions–could have kept Catullus in good standing with his decorous, upper class *patrones*. Much like Martial 11.20, profane language is both the reason for and response to such criticism. Martial went on to publish three more books of collected epigrams after his eleventh.[10] Either he wrote and published these purely for his own benefit and the benefit of his patron, or he did so as his works were in demand by a wider audience–assuming the latter, this obscene language had no negative bearing on his career.

The form of Latin graffiti developed in part from the styles of Latin epigraphy, primarily the lyrical, satirical nature of short inscriptions.[11] Martial himself spoke of such graffiti as its own literary form, as translated by Milnor: he suggests that one "look for 'a shop, with doorposts on both sides covered with writing so that you can quickly read through all the poets.'"[12] Surviving examples of Roman graffiti, such as the copious amounts found in Pompeii, are often as saturated with *Romana simplicitas*, using their fair share of the "big ten" of Latin vulgarity.[13] For exam-

8 Personal translation.

9 Amy Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humour* (New York Oxford University Press, 1992), 38.

10 Ibid., 38.

11 Kristina Milnor, *Graffiti and the Literary Landscape in Roman Pompeii* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014): 62.

12 Ibid., 79.

13 Mohr, *Holy Sh*t*, 17. Mohr lists, to make up this "big ten:" "*cunnus, futuo, mentula, verpa, landica, culus,*

ple, as translated in Mohr, "Corus licks cunt," "I came here and fucked, then went home," and "Fortunatus, you sweet soul, you total fucker."[14] The vulgar Latin displayed in graffiti is the voice of the people and their colloquialisms, in contrast to the loftier Classical Latin more prevalent in literature such as epic.[15] When the lifestyle of an author was reliant on popularity and patronage, the writing of graffiti put a literary voice back into the hands of an anonymized vulgar class, creating a space for people outside the sphere of upper-class men to speak.[16] Vulgarity in graffiti was also a way to enforce social habitus by way of the language of the vulgar common folk. Graffiti along city roads attempted to curb public defecation, spelling out "*cacator, cave malum*," which translates to "shitter, beware evil."[17] While *caco,* the verb from which *cacator* stems, was of roughly the same level of vulgarity as the common verb "to shit," it was certainly not considered proper vocabulary.[18] Graffiti allowed for a mingling of the private self and the public sphere; vulgar language in this medium gives authority to potentially silenced groups in the public sphere.

Women are among these silenced groups given a voice through graffiti and the use of vulgar language. Due to their brevity and often imperative, first, or third-person nature,[19] it is difficult to give any individual graffito a definitive gender. In the specific example of one graffito reading "*fututa sum hic*" ("I was fucked here"), Levin-Richardson has argued for the case that the *ego* behind the *sum* could likely be female, hence the use of the feminine participle *fututa*.[20] This would suggest female authority gained through an invocation of typically masculine subject matter–the inherent masculinity of much of the language we have looked at thus far is clear. In a modern graffito of similar content, one might expect this female voice to be active, as in, "I fucked here." While the act described does not convey such a modern sense of personal sexual authority, this specific example is important simply because, again, it is coming from a female (or feminine) first-person voice. We see a Roman woman speaking frankly about a sexual encounter of her own, in a way that does not convey regret

pedico, caco, irrumo, and *fello*."

14 Mohr, *Holy Sh*t*, 20-21, 25.

15 Ibid., 53.

16 Alan M. Forster, Samantha Vettese-Forster, and John Borland, "Evaluating the cultural significance of historic graffiti," *Structural Survey* 30.1 (2012): 62.

17 Milnor, *Graffiti*, 54.

18 Mohr, *Holy Sh*t*, 22.

19 Don L. F. Nilsen, "The Grammar of Graffiti," *American Speech* 55.3 (1980): 236-237.

20 Sarah Levin-Richardson, "Fututa sum hic: Female Subjectivity and Agency in Pompeian Sexual Graffiti," *Classical Journal* 108.3 (2013): 328.

or shame. This is not the only example of a female voice in Roman graffiti: for example, "Adimetus got me pregnant."[21] While this example is certainly worded differently, again, it involves a woman speaking boldly about her sex life in a public sphere. Graffiti, here, allows marginalized groups to take part in such vulgar language for their own authoritative gain under the cover of this public yet anonymous space.

The use of profanity can also garner religious authority, piety being a key aspect of the Roman psyche. Obscene language is in many ways tied to religion and the divine, as is evident in the modern denotation of "curse words" or even certain phrases themselves, using "God" or "Holy" for added potency.[22] Some form of this is present in Classical Latin, although on a much more decorous level in the form of "*di immortales*" ("gods above") and other religious exclamations,[23] and even more so into Late Antiquity and early Christianity, when Christian writers Iamblichus and Arnobius attempt, in their writing, to mimic the obscene stylings of Martial and Catullus.[24] For example, Mark Masterson raises a portion of Iamblichus' *Mysteries* where he discusses erect penises as symbols of divine creation, as obscene as it may appear, perhaps seeking to adopt such colourful language and imagery to add potency to his speech.[25] In his introduction to Book I, Martial says that his poems are to be read by those "*qui solent spectare Florales*" ("who watch the Floralia"), referring to the *ludi Florales*, a religious festival frequented mainly by plebeians.[26] In this festival, behaviour generally shunned by the public, such as prostitution, is put on display in a religious context, much like Martial's strong vocabulary is in his poetry.[27] Lactantius describes the nature of the festival as follows:

> For besides licentiousness of words, in which all lewdness is poured forth, women are also stripped of their garments at the demand of the people, and then perform the office of mimeplayers, and are detained in the sight of the people with indecent gestures, even to the satiating unchaste eyes.

21 *CIL* 4.10231, as per Brian K. Harvey, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome: A Sourcebook* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2016): 148.

22 Mohr, *Holy Sh*t*, 55.

23 For example, see Cicero's *Philippics*, II.14.

24 Mark Masterson, "Authoritative Obscenity in Iamblichus and Arnobius," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 22.3 (2014): 375.

25 *Myst*. 1.11/38.11-39.3, as per Masterson, "Authoritative Obscenity," 382.

26 Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus*, 47.

27 Ibid.

Thus, by invoking those present at the *ludi Florales*, Martial uses the festival itself as a sort of obscene derogatory term, fully blending the religious and the profane in language. We have already seen the potency that religious terminology gives to speech, which is why it is so often connected to obscenity. Martial employs it in a way similar to his use of Augustus' voice as explored above; rather than simply speaking frankly, his poetry is made more powerful through the existing potency of the festival, which, when made obscene, adds a new sphere of authority on top of the religious.

As mentioned above, the god Priapus shows the connection between religion and profanity. Priapus, god of fertility and masculinity, was said to be pleased by the use of obscene words—Priapic vocabulary—thereby providing a platform for such vulgar speech.[28] His sexual nature is also one explanation for the sexuality evoked in vulgar language, a subject abundant in epigram as well as graffiti. As it appears so frequently in epigram and graffiti, the use of sexual language allows these works to appeal to anyone and everyone. To go further, we can say that the nature of Priapus links spheres of virility in obscenity to religion, invoking one's own sexual prowess as well as invoking the divine. This Roman obsession with sexual dominance explains the power behind words such as *futuo*, *pedico*, and *irrumo*, and also the insulting nature of any words denoting the opposite of these, such as the sexual passivity of oral or anal sex.[29] When an author describes the performance of these actions, he or she has authority; when these actions are done to them, they are submissive and weak.

This sexual authority is one of many ways the use of vulgar language is used as a platform for expressing one's own inherent *Romanitas* through such *Romana simplicitas*. Obscene language often refers to sexual acts; when it evokes religion, it is done so as to please the gods; and it establishes one's presence in any social setting. One of the most common figures of both the sexual and religious authority garnered through obscenity is Priapus, who, by being the patron of virility, represents some of the most important parts of Roman life: procreation and power. The proliferation of *Romana simplicitas* in culture as well as language created for itself a permanent role in spoken language, assigning different spheres of authority to Latin writers, from respected figures like Martial and Catullus to the lowest anonymous graffiti artist.

28 Mohr, *Holy Sh*t*, 18.

29 Ibid., 33, 36.

Bibliography

Dickinson, Sheila K. and Judith P. Hallett. *A Roman Women Reader.* Mundelein, Illinois: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 2015.

Forster, Alan M., Samantha Vettese-Forster, and John Borland. "Evaluat ing the Cultural Significance of Historic Graffiti," *Structural Survey* 30.1 (2012): 43-64. Accessed March 21, 2016.

Harvey, Brian K. *Daily Life in Ancient Rome: A Sourcebook*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2016.

Higashinaka, Itsuyo. "Byron's Indebtedness to Martial and Catullus," *The Byron Journal* 39.1 (2011): 45-53, accessed February 16, 2016.

Howell, Peter. *Martial*. London: Bloomsbury, 2009.

Lactantius, *Institutiones Divinae* I.20, from *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol.7, trans. William Fletcher. Edited by Alexander Roberts, James Don aldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1886).

Levin-Richardson, Sarah. "Fututa sum hic: Female Subjectivity and Agency in Pompeian Sexual Graffiti," *Classical Journal* 108.3 (2013): 319-345. Accessed March 20, 2016.

Masterson, Mark. "Authoritative Obscenity in Iamblichus and Arnobus," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 22.3 (2014): 373-398. Accessed February 16, 2016.

Mohr, Melissa. *Holy Sh*t: A Brief History of Swearing*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Nilsen, Don L. F. "The Grammar of Graffiti," *American Speech* 55.3 (1980): 234-239. Accessed March 23, 2016.

Orizaga, Rhiannon Ysabel-Marie. "Self-Presentation and Identity in the Roman Empire, ca. 30 BCE to 225 CE," *Portland State University Disertations and Theses*, 2013.

(A)rising in the East: The Case for a Palmyrene Sol Invictus

Jeffrey E. Schulman

This paper addresses the Emperor Aurelian's (r. 270-275 CE) introduction at Rome in 274 of Deus Sol Invictus. Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholars generally considered this event part of what they considered a pattern of eastern solar worship.[1] In recent decades, a new scholarly consensus, which considers their view characterized by prejudice about the period and the Ancient Near East,[2] has contradicted them. G. H. Halsberghe,[3] S. Hijmans,[4] and A. Watson[5] lay out this new approach. All three view the god introduced in 274 as conforming to traditional Roman practice; they also conclude that Sol Invictus was not an eastern import from Aurelian's Palmyrene campaigns but rather was inspired by either traditional Roman religion[6] or Aurelian himself.[7] Yet they wrongly associate a lack of liturgical similarity with a lack of inspiration. Halsberghe, Hijmans, and Watson choose to disregard important historic, epigraphic, and numismatic evidence, which almost certainly proves the cult instituted in 274 was inspired by Aurelian's second capture of Palmyra. This occurred amid important events in the Roman East.

Palmyra's empire and its Gallic counterpart in the West had split off from the traditional Roman state amidst the plagues, barbarian invasions, and instability which characterized the latter third century. Aurelian, a former military officer from the Balkans, reconquered both the Palmyrene and Gallic empires over his five-year reign while implementing extensive civil reforms. Among these was introducing the cult of Sol Invictus to Rome in 274. Solar worship had existed at Rome.[8] Most recently, however,

1 Alaric Watson, *Aurelian and the Third Century* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 189.

2 S. E. Hijmans, *Sol: The Sun in the Art and Religions of Rome* (Groningen: PhD Thesis, 2009), Chapter 1, 1.

3 Gaston H. Halsberghe, *The Cult of Sol Invictus* (Leiden: Brill, 1972).

4 S. E. Hijmans, *The Sun*.

5 Alaric, Watson, *Aurelian*.

6 S. E. Hijmans, *The Sun*, 6.

7 Gaston H. Halsberghe, *Sol*, 136.

8 S. E. Hijmans, *The Sun*, 2.

the emperor Elagabalus (r. 218-222) had offensively propagated the cult of the quasi-solar El-Gabal from his native Emesa, the city at which Aurelian had also defeated the Palmyrenes. Aurelian's own cult far better fit traditional Roman mores[9] yet we must still inquire as to its origins, beginning with coinage.

Watson observes that, while Aurelian had always shown Sol Invictus on his coinage, substantial empire-wide change, in which Sol replaces Jupiter, began in early summer 273 in the mints at Antioch and in the Danube provinces. By mid-summer, this had spread to Italy.[10] This timing almost surely demonstrates that Aurelian, the only man powerful enough to give such an order, acted while he was in the east. We know that in spring 273 Aurelian had arrived at Antioch en route to quell a revolt at Palmyra.[11] Following this, he put down a pro-Palmyrene revolt in Egypt before returning to Rome, likely in early 274.[12] Given his extremely rapid march towards Palmyra, it is most likely that he gave the order either in the Levant or in Egypt almost immediately after the second Palmyrene campaign. Considering that Aurelian waited until late 273, or 274, when he was back in the Latin west, to begin his great monetary reform,[13] it seems likely that he hastily added Sol Invictus to much of the coinage in 273 in response to immediate circumstances. In 273, those circumstances consisted of the sack of Palmyra.

What at Palmyra might have motivated Aurelian's sudden promotion of Sol Invictus? A major caveat is necessary here. Attempting this in the case of an emperor like Aurelian, who ruled in the mid-third century, and whose entire life has had to be tenuously reconstructed from limited and questionable source material, would be completely irresponsible. Yet our purpose here is not to establish whether Aurelian was personally inspired by events in the east, but rather whether circumstances occurring there would have influenced imperial policy. Furthermore, simply demonstrating a plausible account would be enough to call into question our modern sources, who are largely unanimous in rejecting Palmyrene inspiration for Deus Sol Invictus.[14]

9 S. E. Hijmans, *The Sun*, 10, 135. Also, Watson, *Aurelian*, 194.

10 Watson, *Aurelian*, 189.

11 Ibid., 81.

12 Ibid., 93.

13 Ibid., 128-129.

14 Watson leaves doubt "[Sol's origins] must remain unresolved" Watson, *Aurelian*, 196. The others, Halsberghe, *Sol*, 136 and Hijmans, *The Sun*, 11, are very firm indeed.

Specifically, there is one piece of epigraphic evidence that merits our at tention. After Aurelian's second capture of the Palmyra, which would thereafter become largely impoverished,[15] one of the chief priests of Baal, Septimius Haddudan, was honoured in a brand new inscription which commemorated the aid he rendered to Aurelian.[16] This would certainly seem to offer an explanation to the passage in the *Historia Augusta*, where-in Aurelian is said to have restored the temple of Baal at Palmyra after its destruction by his troops.[17] Gratitude towards this particular god or his priest for aid in recapturing the city not only explains this action, but also fits the idea of divine intervention in a more sensible way than that in the *Historia Augusta* regarding the battle of Emesa.[18] That story, which recounts the 272 battle in which Aurelian defeat the Palmyrenes, is far too similar to that of Constantine at the Milvian Bridge, among other famous cases, for our comfort. It also contradicts the numismatic evidence, which indicates that Aurelian began his more aggressive solar policy only after his second Palmyrene campaign in 273. A new religious story would have provided a convenient opportunity for stabilizing and strengthening Aurelian's rule; Aurelian had a history of seizing particular moments to implement major policy changes, ones that would take effect empire-wide.[19] The principal reason scholars have discounted the association between Baal of Palmyra and Aurelian's own Deus Sol Invictus is that Baal was not a sun god in Near Eastern cosmology.[20] Yet it is hard to see why this would have troubled Aurelian: Baal, a Jupiter figure,[21] was associated closely with other deities in the Palmyrene Pantheon[22] in a way that must have already been relatively confusing to an outsider. Aurelian had long been a devotee of the sun god—if not from his mother,[23] then from his childhood

15 Watson, *Aurelian*, 82.

16 Michel Galikowski, "Inscriptions de Palmyre", *Syria* (Paris: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie de Beyrouth, 1971), 420.

17 SHA, *Aurel*., 1.31.

18 Ibid., 25.3.

19 Aurelian's suppression of the mint workers revolt at Rome in 271 directly led to his undertaking monetary reforms in the same year, preceding larger action in 274; this was the same pattern as for Sol (Watson, *Aurelian*, 128). The same sudden policy changes can be seen in the withdrawal from Dacia (Ibid., 55) and the ordering of the construction of the Aurelian Walls at Rome immediately after he had defeated the Iuthungi who had threatened the city (Ibid., 143).

20 Hijmans, *The Sun*, 12.

21 Watson, *Aurelian*, 189.

22 Ibid., 196-197.

23 Halsberghe, *Sol*, 130.

in the Balkans[24] and career in the army, as this deity was especially prominent in both places.[25] Thus, a pious devotee of Sol Invictus encountered incredible success in the part of the empire already associated with solar worship. This may well have culminated in aid from the chief god of an eastern city, who was already in a position of superiority over the local sun and moon gods. Surely it would not have been hard for Aurelian to either overlook or ignore local theological distinctions in assuming the agency of the supreme solar deity with whom he had been raised.

Nor need we puzzle ourselves over the lack of similarity between the cult established at Rome in 274 and Palmyrene religious practice. We know modern scholars concur that Aurelian's Roman cult was already cleansed and Romanized to the greatest possible extent in an attempt to appeal to the local population, particularly considering Elagabalus' mistake fifty years earlier in introducing unpopular eastern rituals.[26] Given that Aurelian had no intention of spreading any eastern, localized, or especially Palmyrene trappings in his new empire-wide cult, looking for similarities in religious practice or doctrine will not help us. He wanted a Palmyrene god, not a Palmyrene religious program.

At this point, it is necessary to raise a particular issue largely ignored by most scholars. What does it mean for one god in pagan antiquity to be equivalent to another god? There is, in short, no reliable answer to this question, nor is there any standard that marks equivalence, nor does close association need to encompass equivalence so much as shared traits. One or two ancient authors need only mistakenly associate two gods for modern scholars to treat the deities as similar. At the other extreme, it has been the purpose of innumerable scholarly works to establish differences among very similar gods. Regarding this issue, then, we are, to a troubling degree, concerning ourselves with semantics. Even the most skeptical observer would not deny that Aurelian`s experience in the east played some sort of role in establishing his religious policy. In that regard, our differences are more a matter of inquiring what it means for Aurelian to have adopted a Palmyrene deity. Yet Halsberghe[27] and Hijmans[28] do not mention any such ambiguity but state with absolute certainty that Deus Sol Invictus is not Palmyrene. Watson is less sure whether Aurelian's god is

24 Hijmans, *The Sun*, 131.

25 Ibid., 139.

26 Halsberghe, *Sol*, 136.

27 Ibid.

28 Hijmans, *The Sun*, 11.

Palmyrene, but also treats the matter as a definitive issue.[29] Thus, in some ways, this paper is as much an attempt to modify our language as it is to understand fact.

Yet the issue of cult statues only further heightens this need for ambiguity. Zosimus relates that Aurelian erected statues of Baal and Helios in his temple of Sol on the Campus Agrippae, a neighbourhood in north-central Rome.[30] This is generally thought to include a statue of Baal taken from Palmyra.[31] Hijmans takes this as evidence against associations between Deus Sol Invictus and Palmyrene Baal on the basis that Baal was god of a "defeated city" and his statue was "proof" of Aurelian's victory over Palmyra.[32] Yet we know the Romans had never possessed any qualms about worshipping the gods of defeated foes; consider Juno of Veii, borne to Rome upon the capture of that city in 396 BCE. Furthermore, if we take Septimius Haddudan's inscription, it would seem that Aurelian had much the same reason to be thankful as Camillus. Indeed, Watson says that he finds the whole affair suggestive of the ritual of *evocatio*, the traditional Roman practice of "calling out" a god to Rome from their native city.[33] While an *evocatio* must obviously remain unproven, it would certainly appear unlikely and impious for a cult statue in a prominent position, a position shared with undefeated Helios, to be equated with mere spoils stored in the temple. Indeed, the relationship of these statues may be instructive. The passage in Zosimus[34] does not make clear whether these two were the cult statues of the temple or merely flanking a single, greater, statue of Sol himself. In the former case, it would be impossible to ignore the association of Baal and Sol; worshipping a statue from Palmyra would be fairly definitive proof. Yet even in the latter case there are potential associations. We would have a statue of the Roman sun god, Sol, flanked by statues of the Greek sun god, Helios,[35] and a statue of the Palmyrene god Baal. Thus, the message is fairly clear: Baal and Helios are other cultures' manifestations of the Roman sun god Deus Sol Invictus. What other role could Baal have? How many Romans, Aurelian included, would be concerned by the theology of the Near East when the temple's associations were so clear? Highly educated Romans would be aware of a long-standing Roman tradition of adapting foreign cults to suit Roman

29 Watson, *Aurelian*, 195-196.

30 Zosimus, *Historia Nova*, 1.30.

31 Halsberghe, *Sol*, 142; Hijmans, *The Sun*, 1.12; Watson, *Aurelian*, 195, with doubt.

32 Hijmans, The Sun, 12.

33 Watson, *Aurelian*, 194.

34 Ibid.

35 Sol and Helios had been equated in mythology for a long time.

mores and doctrines. Quite simply, a Roman general conquering an eastern city was expected to bring back cultural artefacts, including that city's chief god, appropriately Romanize him, and give him some credit for the victory.[36] In the case of a soldier-emperor fighting in the Levant, this god would have been expected to be solar.[37] Thus Aurelian and other Romans would have naturally assumed the solarity of the god who helped them.

These overriding considerations also explain Aurelian's vision of a prophecy at the battle of Emesa. It is natural that the *Historia Augusta* would associate the story of Aurelian's aid from a Near Eastern quasi-solar deity with his most important battle, one that he fought at the home of the same solar deity Elagabalus had earlier brought to Rome. Indeed, we cannot expect the author of the *Historia Augusta* to have considered the numismatic evidence, dating to 273, with the same rigor as Watson. Thus, Emesene origins for Aurelian's Sol can be safely discarded.

By simply examining the evidence, considering the chaos Aurelian and his contemporaries experienced, we can get a good idea of what took place. At Rome, as it occurred around the time of his triumph, the new cult of Sol would have been associated with Aurelian's eastern victories in general but particularly his greatest at Emesa. Aurelian himself came to the decision to further promote Sol immediately after crushing the revolt at Palmyra, as coins from early that summer show. Given his possible reconstruction of the temple there, some sort of help from a local priest of Baal, and adoption of Baal's statue at Rome, it is likely he had some reason to associate his victory of 273 with Baal-Sol. With the eastern inspiration for promoting Sol on his coinage and his probable association of Baal with Helios in the new temple of Sol, it is likely he intended for some sort of solarity to be assumed in reference to Baal.

Our recent scholars' main handicap seems to be their assumption that Aurelian and the Roman people thought like modern Classicists versed in Near Eastern cosmology. Hijmans complains that nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholars formed their idea of Aurelian's Sol as Middle

36 In antiquity, respected figures were often, though not always, exempted from retribution inflicted on their compatriots; consider the case of Antenor at Troy.

37 Hijmans, *The Sun*, 13-14, criticizes modern scholars for minimizing the role of the sun in perceived "pure" Roman religion and assuming that solar worship had eastern origins. Yet, surely, they did not pick up this link between a cult they perceived as proto-monotheistic and eastern corruption from Modern or Mediaeval history. Eastern decadence, Roman purity, etc. were all stereotypes found in antiquity.

Eastern from a pro-western "racist imperialist" mindset.[38] He does not stop to consider that Aurelian and the Romans also possessed a pro-western racist imperialist mindset. At that time, the Palmyrenes had more serious concerns than a misunderstanding of their deity, as did Aurelian. It is almost that Aurelian either cynically or thoughtlessly combined the Palmyrene god Baal with solar associations, and then established a cult of a properly Romanized Sol which was loosely influenced by his conception of a Palmyrene god. The inauthenticity of Aurelian's Sol would not have troubled the few who knew better. Aurelian had established his sun cult. Indeed, I believe this scholarly substitution of a modern mindset for an ancient one helps to explain confusion over the role and status within the Roman pantheon intended for Aurelian's Deus Sol Invictus.

Bibliography

Galikowski, Michel. "Inscriptions de Palmyre." In *Syria*. Paris: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie de Beyrouth, 1971.

Halsberghe, Gaston H. *The Cult of Sol Invictus*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.

Hijmans, S. E. "Sol: The Sun in the Art and Religions of Rome." DPhil Diss., University of Groningen. 2009.

"Vita Aureliani." *Historia Augusta: Volume III*. Edited by David Magie. Cambridge MA: Loeb Classical Library, 1932.

Watson, Alaric. *Aurelian and the Third Century*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Zosimus. *New History*. London: Green and Chaplin, 1814.

38 Hijmans, *The Sun*, 28.

"I Don't Know How to Greek": The Background and Social Context of P.Col. *4 66*

Seán Stewart

"In the Archive of Zenon, we always look for something other than Zenon."[1] This is one of the hardest facts when studying the archive, for as a result, most references to the archive in secondary sources, especially those published after about 1950, are passing at best, with information cherry-picked to serve whatever point the writer is trying to make. This paper is also guilty of not giving Zenon the attention he deserves, as it focuses on the specific issue of bias against non-Greeks. We will not come to any particular conclusions about bigotry towards non-Greeks, but rather we shall see exactly how one person responded to what he perceived to be a bias against himself, with this letter being a unique piece of evidence.

This paper will focus on one particular document, *P.Col.* 4 66,[2] in a study on how one non-Greek saw himself in a Greek world. Because the document is unique in that the author describes his own personal experience of bigotry directed against himself, unlike any other known contemporary document, it is worthwhile to examine its context and content for insight into how non-Greeks saw themselves in a Greek-dominated world. This paper will focus on the names which occur in the letter, the particular meanings of three words used in the letter and their use in the archive as a whole, and the context of how the letter itself might have been composed and written.

Some time before 255 BCE, a certain individual–we do not know his name–wrote a letter to his employer, Zenon, complaining that he was being mistreated by two of Zenon's agents. This letter survives almost completely intact, with the unfortunate exception of the writer's name. Because, as he himself says, he is not a Greek, this name would have been

1 Claude Orrieux, *Les Papyrus de Zénon: L'horizon d'un Grec en Egypte au IIIe Siècle Avant J.C.* (Paris: Macula, 1983), 15.

2 As I will be referring frequently to the text of *P.Col.* 4 66 itself, and the problems which the original Greek presents, a copy of the text with a facing translation follows the bibliography of this paper on page 69-70. The text is as in *P.Col.* 4 66, accessible through papyri.info. The translation is largely my own, but is based in part on that from the original publication. I have omitted the footnotes.

very useful in discovering exactly how he might have identified himself ethnically.[3] Because of its length and completeness, this letter makes an excellent focus point for our inquiry into social status, especially as concerns non-Greeks, in the Zenon archive.

The Writer's Name and Origin

As this man is a "barbarian", as he says, knowing his name would presumably give us some clue as to his ethnicity. In the original publication, Westermann suggested that he was perhaps an Arab, based on his connection with camels.[4] But this is pure conjecture–and possibly also based on early-twentieth century stereotypes about Arabs and camels–and there are non-Arabs, including a Nikaios (Greek) and a Simon (Jewish), working with camels in the Zenon Archive.[5] While we may express doubt that the writer was an Arab, he was probably not an Egyptian for two reasons. First, camels were not widely used in Egypt at the time,[6] and those that were there were probably not being driven by Egyptians. Second, and perhaps more speculatively, an Egyptian, accustomed to drinking beer, would not appreciate that the wine, which our writer was receiving from Jason, was plonk, and therefore not worth as much as a decent vintage.[7]

On the whole, I am inclined to suggest that the man is of Semitic origin,[8] and that he was possibly an Aramaic speaker, on the grounds that, when he was wronged by Krotos, he fled into Syria, an area where Aramaic was the *lingua franca*.

We cannot know for sure what this man's ethnicity was, except that he was not a Greek. Even if we did have his name, onomastics is not always a fair indicator of a person's ethnicity, especially in Ptolemaic Egypt, where

3 We do at least know that he was a man, both because his occupation, whatever it was precisely, is not likely to have been carried out by a woman, and because he genders himself in ll. 1-2 ("*ἔρρωμαι δὲ καὶ αὐτός*").

4 *P.Col* 4 66 p.16. Durand is tempted to suggest that, with Δ being the third letter, his name may begin in *Αβδ* or *Αυδ*, if he is of Semitic origin. Xavier Durand, *Des Grecs en Palestine au IIIe Siècle Avant Jésus-Christ: Le Dossier Syrien des Archives de Zénon de Caunos, 261-252* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1997), 245.

5 Durand, *Des Grecs en Palestine*, 248.

6 Michael Ivanovitch Rostovtzeff, *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C.: A Study in Economic History* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1922), 110.

7 Orrieux, *Les Papyrus de Zénon*, 133.

8 This is also Durand's speculation. He is tempted to suggest that, if he is a Semite, the name begins with *Αβδ* or *Αυδ*. There is only one other name matching this in the archive, *Ἀβδήμουν* (P.Ryl. 4 554), but this is certainly not the same person (Durand, *Des Grecs en Palestine*, 245).

there are examples of people having both an Egyptian and a Greek name.[9] We must be satisfied knowing only that he is not a Greek, and work from there.

Krotos and Jason

If we cannot know the writer's name, we do at least know the names of the two targets of his ire: Krotos and Jason. These names are clearly Greek, an important point for our discussion of Greek bigotry towards non-Greeks (see below).

Krotos is fairly well attested as an agent of Zenon's, appearing in sixteen documents in the archive. There is little else to say about him, except that on the one occasion where we have a complaint of his concerning a worker (in this case a Greek), he presents himself as a fairly reasonable man.[10]

Jason is much more well known, appearing in no fewer than forty-five documents. He was a very close associate of Zenon's and may even have been related to him; he was, at least, a Carian.[11] We have no information on him before 257-6, when Maron mentions him along with Panakestor. We do not have any reply that Jason–or Krotos–might have made to answer to the accusation in our present letter. We do, however, have an example of Jason having difficulty with another non-Greek.[12]

Petobastis, an Egyptian, has withdrawn his services, not giving the labourers their pay nor the animals their fodder, the implication being that he cannot because he is not being supplied by his superiors. The labourers complain to Jason and two others, who cannot pay them because they are entirely lacking in resources. Jason sends them away, "giving each of them a trifle"[13].

This letter and another,[14] also from Jason, show that, around 248-7, the estate was in bad shape financially. In terms of the timing this has nothing to do with our anonymous writer's complaint, but it does show how Ja

9 Although for the third century BCE, names are usually a fairly reliable indicator: Claude Orrieux, *Zénon de Caunos, Parépidèmos, et le Destin Grec* (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1985), 57-9.

10 PSI 5 500.8-9.

11 Rostovzteff, *A Large Estate in Egypt*, 87, 159 note 112.

12 P.Lond. 7 2006.

13 P.Lond. 7 2006.10.

14 P.Lond. 7 2008.

son reacts to this sort of situation, as he does not fulfill their salaries, just as our anonymous writer complains of in the document in question: the "trifle" which he gives them is reminiscent of the *ὄξος* (plonk) of *P.Col*. 4 66. Perhaps, then, Jason had a legitimate complaint with our letter writer, which the latter naturally does not mention as it would weaken his case. Or perhaps Jason was not equipped to pay the writer properly and tried to fob him off.

The Text: Three Words of Significance

We will now discuss the meaning and occurrence in the archive as a whole of three words: *ἑλληνίζω*, *λιμός*, and *καταγιγνώσκω*.

Ἑλληνίζω occurs only this once in the entire archive. In fact, no other roots in *ἑλλην-* occur at all, anywhere in the archive.[15] This means that nowhere else in the archive does anyone talk directly about Greeks or being Greek. This letter is, therefore, unique for its time: no one else writes in racially charged terms, or uses ethnicity to explain poor treatment.

Ἑλληνίζω, however, is interesting not just for its uniqueness. The exact meaning of the verb here has been the subject of some intense debate. The original editors translated it as "act like a Greek," while Bagnall and Derow translated it as "speak Greek."[16] The LSJ gives both of these definitions, with the latter being mostly classical, with one reference to Posidippus. The second definition in LSJ fits the original translation: "make Greek, Hellenize, assume an Hellenic form."[17] The dictionary most up to date on recent scholarship is *DGE*,[18] which gives a more fulsome definition and cites papyri, inscriptions, and postclassical work more than LSJ. It gives no fewer than nine definitions, but it does cite *P.Col*. 4, 66 under one of these, giving us the meaning "speak Greek correctly."[19]

Both definitions create new and interesting problems for the context of the letter. If the writer cannot *speak* Greek, then clearly he did not write the letter himself, but had access to someone else who could translate for him. If he could speak Greek, however, then he must mean that he appears

15 Pestman et al., *A Guide to the Zenon Archive*, 632. This letter also contains the only occurrence of *βάρβαρος*.

16 Roger S. Bagnall and Peter Derow. *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation*. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 231.

17 LSJ s.v. *ἑλληνίζω*.

18 David M. Schaps, *Handbook for Classical Research* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 75.

19 DGE s.v. *ἑλληνίζω*. The dictionary is in Spanish, so English readers may need a dictionary handy.

to be a barbarian to others not because of his language, but because of his customs. (In the Hellenistic world, there is no need for the two to be mutually exclusive, as it was a *lingua franca*, although it was never adopted widely as a mother tongue.)[20] Indeed, it is extremely unlikely that he could be an employee of Zenon's, moving from place to place and working with different people, if he did not have a language in common with them, a language which is most likely to have been Greek. In this case we have an instance of bigotry against someone because he is a foreigner, not because he cannot speak Greek.

Therefore, I lean towards the latter definition, that he was not Greek in his mannerisms, and perhaps he was not entirely fluent in the language. I suspect that this is what DGE is getting at when they define *ἑλληνίζω* as "to speak Greek correctly", although they do seem to be looking for a compromise between the two positions. Because of the vagueness in meaning, and despite my own position, I have chosen to translate the word as "to Greek". This is, to be sure, a colloquialism in English, but it does communicate the vagueness of the original while not biasing the reader to any particular interpretation.

Our next two words will not require meddling in definitions,[21] and we will instead focus on their use in the archive as a whole. *Λιμός* means "hunger" or "famine"[22] and occurs eight times in the archive. This is rare enough to be worthy of mention. It is used in a very similar context in three other documents,[23] one of which even involves non-Greeks concerning their mistreatment: one concerns swine dying of hunger for lack of fodder,[24] in another the writer is concerned not about himself but about a friend,[25] and the last concerns visitors to the Fayyum who are seeking to make sure that they are well supplied.[26] *Λιμός*, then, occurs only rarely, but when it does occur it is frequently in a similar situation–people are not being supplied with the necessities of life–although it does have a certain hyperbolic tone when occurring in petitions, such as we have in *P.Col*. 4 66. For this reason, we may see the word as rather formulaic in the sense

20 Arietta Papaconstantinou, "Why did Coptic Fail where Aramaic Succeeded? Linguistic Developments in Egypt and the Near East After the Arab Conquest," in *Multilingualism in the Greco-Roman Worlds*, ed. Alex Mullen and Patrick James (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 59.

21 This is fortunate, as DGE only goes as far as *ἔξανος* at the moment.

22 LSJ s.v. *λιμός*.

23 P.Cair.Zen. 2 59160, 59291; PSI 4 399.

24 P.Lond. 7 2007.

25 P.Cair.Zen. 4 59278.

26 PSI 4 419.

that, as rarely as it is used, it emphasizes the distress of the writer to elicit a more favourable response from Zenon.

Our last word to consider is *καταγιγνώσκω*. This word is often found in the legal sense of "charging" someone with a crime, and is sometimes used in a perjorative sense, as we have in *P.Col*. 4 66, to mean "despise someone". The meaning is not in doubt here. However, in the archive it is used even more rarely than *λιμός*, with only six instances. All but three of these are not significant because the documents in which they occur are so badly damaged that the exact meaning is not always clear. In the remaining three examples, we have *P.Col*. 4 66, a letter from Panakestor in which he asks Zenon not to think less of him,[27] and once being used in a legal sense.[28] Again, the exact tone of this word is unique in the Zenon archive to *P.Col*. 4 66, where it clearly indicates the contempt of Jason and Krotos for the writer.

We have, then, three words, all of which are crucial to the meaning of the passage, and two of which are being used uniquely in the archive. These words do not just make the letter itself unique, but they also allow us to see how an oppressed individual expressed his oppression in his own words.

The Composition of the Letter

We must now investigate the question hinted at above concerning whether or not the author actually wrote the letter himself. We cannot answer this question for sure, but any suggestion must rest in part on the meaning of *ἑλληνίζω*. If we take my interpretation–that this verb means "to behave like a Greek" as opposed to "to speak Greek"–then it is entirely possible that the complainant actually wrote the text itself.[29] If he did not speak Greek, on the other hand, then it follows that someone else interpreted and wrote the letter for him. In this case, however, he must not be as destitute as he claims, for he clearly had access to a Greek-speaking and writing friend, or he had the means to hire someone to do it for him.

27 PSI 5 502.

28 P.Ryl. 4 563. The three less certain examples previously mentioned may also fit into this category.

29 Indeed, I fear that I have biased the reader to this interpretation by referring to the sender as a writer throughout this essay.

Whoever did write it, he was not a scribe, for the lettering is not particularly good[30] and the Greek is somewhat repetitive. Yet it is not bad. There are very few, if any, spelling mistakes,[31] indeed far fewer than we might find on documents written by native Greek speakers. Additionally, the petition more or less adheres to the ἔντευξις style which occurs frequently in the archive. For example, the writer wishes Zenon well, a standard greeting, and says "I too am well", even though this clearly is not the case, for otherwise he would not be writing the petition in the first place. Rather, he is adhering to a style which is frequent in letters of many different matters. More in line with our expectations for this genre of letter, there is ll. 19-20: "I beg you therefore, if it seems good to you." The second clause here was added above the line; evidently the writer forgot it and added it later to make his letter better fit the recipient's expectations. The person who wrote this, then, was not a scribe, and may not have been the author himself, but he was aware of the formula and had an excellent command of the language.

There is one more point to make about the letter's composition: how did the letter reach its recipient? There was hardly a postal service in the Ptolemaic kingdom, so the writer had to find someone who would bring it to Zenon for him. If he was still with Jason at the time, as he implies, it is possible that he sent the letter along with other correspondence on its way to Zenon. But this begs the question of how he could have slipped the letter in with Jason, or someone close to him, being unaware of its contents. More likely, this man is not as disadvantaged as he claims, and he had at least some meagre resources of his own. He clearly was able to get food from somewhere, the first time because he was able to flee into Syria (l. 11), while we do not know how he sustained himself when Jason did not pay him for nine months (ll. 15-17).

30 Bagnall and Derow, *The Hellenistic Period*, 230.

31 How one interprets spelling mistakes depends on one's opinion of nonstandard, but not necessarily wrong, spellings or of assimilation, such as ἐκέλευέμ με at ll. 7-8. Such things occur in documents written by Greeks, and on inscriptions dating back to the classical period.

Greek Bias, the Writer's Social Status, and the Result

If the Greeks were biased towards the writer–and they certainly were, if we take him at his word–it was not because of racism as we understand it: there is no evidence for bias against or in favour of people on the basis of skin colour in the ancient world.[32] Rather, it was on the basis of perceived cultural norms, and the extent to which a person adhered to or deviated from those norms. Krotos and Jason, and perhaps Zenon, felt scorn for the author because he did not conform to their expectations of Greekness. The author is clearly a social inferior but he, or the person he hired to write the letter, had a more than passable command of the Greek language, and he felt that he was entitled to better wine than *ὄξος* along with olive oil, which he was not receiving. Olive oil and wine, especially in combination, are very Greek. Perhaps he was trying to Hellenize but had not quite yet succeeded, hence Krotos and Jason's scorn for him and his own frustration at not getting what he felt he deserved.

While we have no trace of a counter-argument from Jason nor a reply from Zenon, we can make a suggestion as to what happened next: probably nothing. Zenon himself may never even have cared about the letter.

Conclusion

P.Col. 4 66 is a unique example of a petition from the Zenon archive. It is our only example of a non-Greek–whatever ethnicity he may have been–protesting about Greek overbearance in his own terms. The author uses consistently strong language, and language that is in fact unique in the archive in words such as *ἑλληνίζω*, *λιμός*, and *καταγιγνώσκω*. The letter itself is well composed, and if the complainant and writer are one and the same, then he was also reasonably multilingual. He was even trying to conform to Greek cultural norms, wishing for the good wine and olive oil which he was not receiving; yet he was not a Greek, and it seems that he could not escape this fact. Krotos, Jason, and Zenon all felt some measure of scorn towards him. Perhaps he was not living up to cultural or professional obligations; he would certainly not admit to this as it would not help his case, but he does claim to have done no wrong by Zenon.

32 Denise Eileen McCoskey, "Race Before 'Whiteness': Studying Identity in Ptolemaic Egypt." *Critical Sociology* 28 (2002): 32; Frank M. Snowden, *Blacks in Antiquity: Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman Experience* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1970), 218.

Regardless, we cannot help but be struck by the pity which the writer evokes in his reader. While there are other documents, especially administrative ones, from the Zenon archive and elsewhere which show how the Greeks dominated their subjects, this letter is our best insight into personal racism (if we can use the term) in the early Ptolemaic period, and is an excellent example of the effect of Greek colonialism on non-Greek populations.

List of Abbreviations

DGE: Diccionario Griego-Español. http://dge.cchs.csic.es/

LSJ: Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Sir Henry Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, ninth edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

P.Cair.Zen.: Edgar, C. C. ed. *Zenon Papyri*. Catalogue Général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée de Caire, 1925-40.

P.Col.: Westermann, William Linn, Elizabeth Sayre Hasenoehrl, Clinton Walker Keyes, and Herbert J. Liebesny ed. *Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century B.C. Dealing with Palestine and Egypt*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934-40.

P.L.Bat. 20: Pestman, P. W. *Greek and Demotic Texts from the Zenon Archive*, Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava 20, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980.

P.Lond.: Skeat, T. C. ed. *The Zenon Archive*. Greek Papyri in the British Museum, VII. London: British Museum for the British Library Board, 1974.

P.Ryl.: Roberts, C. H. and E. G. Turner ed. *Volume IV, Documents of the Ptolemaic, Roman, and Byzantine Periods*. Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library IV. Manchester: Sherrat and Hughes, 1952.

PSI: Vitelli, G. et al. ed. *Papiri Greci e Latini.* Pubblicazioni della Società per la Ricerca dei Papiri Ggreci e Latini in Egitto. Florence: Tipografia Enrico Ariani, 1917.

Bibliography

Bagnall, Roger S., and Peter Derow. *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.

Bingen, Jean, and Roger S. Bagnall. *Hellenistic Egypt: Monarchy, Society, Economy, Culture*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

Durand, Xavier. *Des Grecs en Palestine au IIIe Siècle Avant Jésus-Christ: le Dossier Syrien des Archives de Zénon de Caunos, 261-252*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1997.

McCoskey, Denise Eileen. "Race Before 'Whiteness': Studying Identity in Ptolemaic Egypt." *Critical Sociology* 28 (2002): 13-39.

Orrieux, Claude. *Les Papyrus de Zénon: L'horizon d'un Grec en Egypte au IIIe Siècle Avant J. C.* Paris: Macula, 1983.

Orrieux, Claude. *Zénon de Caunos, Parépidèmos, et le Destin Grec*. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1985.

Papaconstantinou, Arietta. "Why did Coptic Fail where Aramaic Succeeded? Linguistic developments in Egypt and the Near East after the Arab Conquest." In *Multilingualism in the Greco-Roman Worlds*, edited by Alex Mullen and Patrick James, 58-76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Pestman, P. W. et al. *A guide to the Zenon archive (P.L. Bat. 21)*. Leiden: Brill, 1981.

Rostovtzeff, Michael Ivanovitch. *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century BC: A Study in Economic History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1922.

Schaps, David M. *Handbook for Classical Research*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Snowden, Frank M. *Blacks in Antiquity: Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman Experience*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1970.

Original Greek Text of *P.Col.* 4 66

r

. . ḍ. . . . Ζήνωνι χαίρειν. καλῶς ṗοιεῖς εἰ ἔρρωσαι. ἔρρωμαι δὲ καὶ αὐτός. ἐπίστασαι ὡς̣ κατέλιπές με ἐν Συρίαι μετὰ̣ Κρότου καὶ ἐποίουν πάντα τὰ προσταṣṣόμενα τὰ κατὰ<ς> καμήλους καὶ ἤμην σο[ι] ἀνέγκλητ[ο]ς. σοῦ δὲ προστάξα̣ντός̣ μοι ὀ̣ψ̣ώ̣ν̣ι̣ο̣ν̣ δ̣ι̣δ̣ό̣ν̣α̣ι̣ ἃ̣ σὺ συνέταξας οὐ\κ/ \ἐ/δίδου μοι οὐθὲν. ἐπεὶ δὴ πολλάκ[ι]ς μου δεομένου διδόναι μοι ἃ σὺ συνέταξας οὐκ ἐδίδου μοι οὐθὲν Κρότος, ἀλλ’ ἐκέλευέμ με ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι, χρόνον μὲν οὖν πολὺν ἐκαρτέρουν σε προσδεχόμενος, ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐνδεὴς ἤμην καὶ οὐθὲν ἠδυνάμην οὐθαμόθεν πορίζειν, ἠναγκάσθην̣ ἀ̣ποτ̣ρ̣έχειν εἰς Συρίαν ἵνα μὴ τῶι λιμῶι παραπόλωμ̣αι. ἔγραψα οὖν σοι ἵνα εἰδῆις ὅτι Κρότος αἴτιος. σοῦ δὲ πάλι̣ν̣ με ἀποστείλαντος εἰς Φιλαδέλφειαν πρὸς Ἰάσονα καὶ ποιοῦντός μου πάντα τὰ προστα\σ/σόμενα, ἃ σύ μοι συνέταξας οὐθέν μοι διδωι ἤδη μηνῶν ἐννέα \τὸ ἔλαιον/ οὐ δὲ σῖτον ἀλλὰ παρ̣ὰ̣ δίμηνον ὅταν καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια ποδῶ̣τ̣α̣ι̣. ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ θέρος καὶ χειμῶνα ἐν τῶι πόνωι γίνομαι. ὁ δέ μοι συντάσσει ὄξος λαμβάνειν εἰς̣ ὀ̣ψ̣ώνιον. ἀλλὰ κατεγνώκασίμ μου ὅτι εἰμὶ βάρβαρος. δέομαι οὖν σου \εἴ σοι δοκεῖ/ συντάξαι αὐτοῖς ὅπως τὰ ὀφειλόμενα κομίσωμαι καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ εὐτάκτωσίν μοι ἵνα μὴ τῶι λιμῶι παραπόλωμαι ὅτι οὐκ ἐπίστ̣αμαι ἑλληνίζειν. σὺ ο\ὖ/ν καλῶς ἂν ποιήσαις ἐπιστροφήν μου ποιησάμενος. ἐγὼ δὲ εὔχομαι πᾶσι τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τῶι δαίμονι τοῦ βασιλέως σε ὑγιαίνειν̣ καὶ ἐλθεῖν τὸ τάχος πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὅπως αὐτὸς ἰδῆις ὅτι ἀνέγκλητός εἰμι. ἔρρωσο.

v

Ζήνωνι

English Translation of *P.Col.* 4 66

- - d - - - - to Zenon, greetings. You do well if you keep your health. I too am well. You know that you left me in Syria with Krotos and I did everything that was ordered in concerning the camels and I did no wrong by you. When you sent an order to give me pay, he gave me nothing of what you ordered. When, although I asked repeatedly that he give me what you ordered, Krotos gave me nothing, but kept telling me to begone, I held out a long time waiting for you; but when I was in want of necessities and could get nothing anywhere, I was compelled to run away into Syria so that I might not perish of hunger. So I wrote you that you might know that Krotos was the cause of it. When you sent me again to Philadelphia[1] to Jason, though I do everything that is ordered, for nine months now he gives nothing of what you ordered for me, neither oil nor grain, except at two month periods when he also pays the clothing (allowances). And I am in difficulty in both summer and winter. And he orders me to accept plonk for a salary. Well, they have treated me with scorn because I am a barbarian. I beg you therefore, if it seems good to you, to give them orders that I am to obtain what is owing and that in future they pay me in full, in order so that I may not perish of hunger because I don't know how to Greek. You, therefore, kindly cause a change in attitude toward me. I pray to all the gods and to the guardian divinity of the King that you remain well and come to us soon so that you may yourself see that I am blameless. Farewell.

verso: To Zenon

1 Pestman et al. clearly imply that they believe this to be Philadelphia in Syria, not the Philadelphia in the Fayyum, although this does not fit with the chronology of Zenon's career, and Jason is never attested in Syria. P.W. Pestman et al., *A Guide to the Zenon Archive (P.L. Bat. 21)* (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 264.

About Our Contributors

Sophia Alkhoury is a Fourth Year student at University College, double majoring in Classics and Classical Civilization. Her main areas of interest lie in Augustan and Early Imperial Latin literature, various aspects of Roman social dynamics, and polytheism in the ancient Graeco-Roman world. She can often be found with a coffee in one hand and a Latin dictionary in the other, but on the rare occasion that she puts down her textbook, she can be found practicing her mediocre calligraphy or at any one of Toronto's live music venues.

Leora Bromberg is a Third Year at University College majoring in Book and Media Studies and minoring in Classical Civilization and French as a Second Language. Within Classics she is most intrigued by the translation and reception of ancient myth, literature, and theatre. When she is not reading ancient poetry or McLuhan, she is singing along to her favourite music and taking on new crafts, such as embroidery.

Laura Harris fell in love with Classics when she started taking Latin in Grade Eight. She is now a Second Year Victoria College student doing a double major in Classics and Classical Civilization and is particularly interested in ancient drama, women in antiquity, social history, and ancient literature and poetry, but she can get excited about pretty much anything in the Classical world. Over the summer she participated in an archaeological dig at Roccagloriosa, Italy. When not translating Latin or Greek, Laura can be found learning ballet and historical dance, working at E. J. Pratt library, or raising foster kittens.

Andrew Mayo is a Fourth Year St. Michael's College student intending to graduate this year with a major in Classics and minors in Mediaeval Studies and English, and then to pursue a Master's degree in Classics at UofT. In addition to Classical literature he has an interest in Mediaeval Latin literature and English literature from Beowulf to Milton.

Samantha Mazzilli is a Third Year Victoria College student, doing a Classical Civilization major with minors in Latin as well as Literature and Critical Theory. Her academic interests lie in Latin profanity, of course, in addition to Bronze Age art and Classical Reception. Beyond the Classical world, she is most interested in post-colonial literature and the history of TV comedy. In her free time, or time spent procrastinating, she enjoys contemplating how much coffee is too much, getting aggressive over Trivial Pursuit, and quoting *Saturday Night Live* sketches.

Jeffrey E. Schulman is a Fourth Year student at Trinity College studying Classics, who anticipates that he will receive his BA this spring. In his spare time he enjoys cheering for his hometown Boston Red Sox and consuming ungodly quantities of coffee and tea.

Seán Stewart is a Fourth Year student at New College, enrolled in a double major in Classics and Classical Civilization. His interests lie in Late Antique history and historiography, papyrology, and epigraphy. He looks forward to continuing his education at the University of Toronto next year as a Master's student in Classics, and plans to pursue a doctorate after that. When not working, you will find him playing video games (the more Romans the better), obsessing about his next PC build, and checking out far too many books from the library.

Acknowledgements

Plebeian is the journal of the undergraduate Classics Students' Union (CLASSU) at the University of Toronto. This volume's papers were presented at CLASSU's Undergraduate Student Conference, The Assembly of the Plebs III, in the Department of Classics at the University of Toronto on 10 March 2017. The Editorial Board would like to give their thanks for the financial and moral support of the Arts and Science Students' Union and the Department of Classics. Thanks are also due to John DeJesus of Coach House Press for his help in publishing this volume. The third volume of *Plebeian* was launched at CLASSU's end-of-term social, CLASSU's Long-Awaited Spring Spectacular 4 U II on 30 March 2017.

Why *Plebeian*?

Undergraduate students are often seen as an anonymous crowd, a mass of bodies, numbers on an administrator's computer screen, and are thus frequently overlooked when it comes to original ideas and research. Like the plebs of Ancient Rome and *hoi polloi* of Greece, we are many; nevertheless, we remain a vibrant community of explorers, thinkers, pioneers. This journal is so named in an attempt to reclaim this word of disdain for our own. Here, we proudly display our undergraduate research to those who might otherwise let it pass by, unnoticed.