PLEBEIAN

PLEBEIAN

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

VOLUME IV

MMXVIII

The papers in this volume were presented at CLASSU's Undergraduate Student Conference, The Assembly of the Plebs IV, on 9 March 2018 in the Department of Classics at the University of Toronto.

Plebeian Volume IV Editorial Board

Published 11 March 2018, Coach House Press, Toronto

Contents

Editor's Note

Publish or perish, so they say, is the watchword for academics; for undergraduates, the thought rarely enters our minds. Essays are functional entities: you write them in a panicked haze, turn them in with a wince, wait anxiously for the mark, then forget everything about it as the next assignment crests over the horizon. Rinse and repeat a hundred times, grab the degree, and let your efforts moulder in boxes at the back of the closet or in the digital recesses of a USB thumbdrive. High turnover and questionable quality is the order of the day for undergraduate papers, an inevitability given the quantity we are asked to produce; but it shouldn't have to always be this way. We can all think of that one paper that you utterly wreck yourself over so you're ready to cry as you hit the final period key, or the one that got its claws into you halfway through writing and wouldn't let go so that you fly over the word limit because you just can't stop finding things to say, or one that emerges from your flickering fingers as if beyond your control like Aphrodite from the foam, fully formed and bearing little resemblance to the poor materials from which it was made; *Plebeian*, at its best, is for *those* papers.

This year's journal features the same wide range of topics that you've come to expect from *Plebeian*—from economic history and literary analysis to archaeology and cultural history—as well as something new, a work of fiction that you will find at the end of this volume. I want to thank all our authors for putting forward their work and diligently revising and polishing it over the last few weeks. A huge thanks also to this year's Editorial Board for their hard work along every step of the way. Special thanks are reserved for Allison, Samantha, and Willem for their advice and support throughout the process of putting this volume together. And lastly, thanks go out to the Arts and Science Students' Union and the Department of Classics for their financial support, which allows this journal to remain free for all students.

Over four years of working on this journal, I have endured the lows of wrestling with an obscure bibliographic reference and worrying about late submissions, and the highs of finding an errant comma in a footnote and seeing a room packed out to hear a paper being presented at our conference. I can look back with pride at an achievement that is truly collective in nature, and one that has become a tradition with a legacy. I couldn't ask for anything more.

Toby Keymer, Editor-in-Chief

March 2018

What Dress Reveals: The Connections between the Fetiales *and Sacrifice to Fides through Ritual Garments*

Laura Harris

Warfare was a constant among the archaic communities of central Italy, which spurred the development of mechanisms for diplomatic negotiation. Among the Latins, and perhaps other peoples, these diplomatic agents, who became known as the *fetiales,* were religious figures. From among them, the *pater patratus,* a man designated as a symbolic father for negotiating on behalf of his country, was chosen.[1] Livy, in Book One of *Ab Urbe Condita,* describes the founding of the *fetiales* and the cult of Fides, which was also linked to diplomacy. This description includes an overview of the ritual clothing of both groups. This ritual clothing can help us analyze the nature of these diplomatic-religious groups, showing that the *fetiales* were essentially an element of the military and can be identified as an institution particular to the Latin people. The sacrifice to Fides, which Numa Pompilius established, was closely linked to the *fetiales*, partially by the groups' dress, and acted as a mnemonic device for them.

Religious figures in the ancient world were almost universally visually marked out from the rest of the community by clothing or ritual items they carried, at least for the duration of the religious duties under their charge. Communities often buried their deceased religious figures with these items or depicted them with said religious figures in funerary art, as these objects symbolized their exalted position in the community. Many ancient Greco-Roman historians and antiquarians were interested in dress, although they tended to be frustratingly vague on details about the actual appearance of the garments.[2] This includes Livy, whose first book contains several passages discussing specialized clothing, the motives for such customs, and their origins, as is appropriate for his interest in "*quae vita, qui mores fuerint*," ("what their lives were like, what the customs were").[3] However, he is largely interested only in the symbolism of the garments, necessitating recourse to material sources for more exact information, which will be discussed later in this paper.

In Book One of *Ab Urbe Condita*, Livy describes the creation, ritual, and dress of the *fetiales* in some detail. He states that Ancus Marcius instituted the college so that the Romans would be able to incorporate

1 Thomas Wiedemann, "The Fetiales: A Reconsideration," *The Classical Quarterly* 36, no. 2 (1986): 487.
2 Varro and Plutarch are good examples of the inclusion of references to dress.
3 Liv. 1.pr.9. All translations are personal, unless otherwise specified.

religious practice into war, as they did in peace.[4] Presumably, the implication is that this would allow the Romans to wage war justly and lawfully. Livy's attribution of the importation to Ancus creates some confusion within the text, since in an earlier episode a priest called *fetialis* uses a similar ritual to negotiate with Alba prior to the fight between the Curiatii and the Horatii.[5] This perhaps indicates that Ancus' contribution constituted an enlargement and formalization of previously established Roman diplomatic practice rather than the introduction of an entirely new ritual. The first ritual that Livy describes is one of treaty-making, wherein the *fetialis* receives authorization from the king, Tullus Hostilius, to make a treaty with the Albans. He is granted it by the token of the *sagmina (*"sacred herbs"), which he then uses to ritually designate the *pater patratus.* The *pater patratus* in turn calls upon Jupiter as a witness to the terms of the treaty before sacrificing a pig using a *silex* ("flint stone").[6] The formulas used are all rendered in archaic language. The *pater patratus* is a figure who takes the role of the *paterfamilias* for the entire community in negotiations with another community, as *patresfamilias* could in disputes between families. Thus, the *pater patratus* had the power to demand restitution for damages his "family" had suffered, and he could hand a dependent over to the other party as payment.[7] The second and more famous ritual is a declaration of war, where the *fetialis* goes to the border of the people with whom there has been a dispute, calls upon Jupiter, states his identity, voices the complaints the Romans have against this people, and announces that they have thirty-three days in which to rectify them to prevent a declaration of war.[8] As he progresses into enemy territory, he repeats this procedure to the first man he meets upon entering the city gates, and again in the forum. Once the thirty-three days have elapsed, the *fetialis*, now calling himself *pater patratus,* consults the king and senate. The *fetialis* reminds them that the demands have not been met and therefore war can be declared. After a vote is held, the *fetialis* takes a "*hastam ferratam aut praeustam sanguineam,"* ("a spear covered in iron or blood-red hardened by burning") and, having formally declared war in the presence of three adult men, throws his spear into the enemy territory.[9] In this ritual, only the consultation with the senate contains archaic language.

Livy's description of the fetial ritual includes a brief note on their dress. He says that they were "*capite velato filo—lanae velamen est,"* ("with his head covered by a fillet—the covering is of wool") and carried a "*hastam ferratam aut praeustam sanguineam,"* as translated above, which the *fe-*

4 Liv. 1.32.
5 Liv. 1.24.
6 Ibid.
7 Wiedemann, "Fetiales," 487.
8 Liv. 1.32.
9 Ibid.

tiales used to declare war.[10] Unfortunately, other authors tend to be even less specific, with Dionysius of Halicarnassus merely calling the whole ensemble "ἐσθῆτι καὶ φορήμασιν ἱεροῖς," ("with sacred clothing and insignia").[11] *Caput velatum* ("the head covered") is a standard feature of Roman (and to some extent Italic) priestly dress,[12] while the spear is the mark of the warrior.

The role of warrior-priest was common for elite Etruscan men, and indeed for later Romans, among whom an upper-class man might commonly be both a general and a priest. In fact, elite male Etruscan burials frequently include grave goods that mark them as both warriors and religious leaders, suggesting that clothing and accessories that first served a military purpose became ritualized as priestly symbols.[13] One such example is the *lituus*, a curved staff, which, due to its distinctive shape, is often used to identify priests in artwork. Originally, however, the *lituus* seems to have been a trumpet, the military significance of which is obvious, while its religious importance can be derived from its find spot in a sacred context.[14] Over time, its religious use must have become ritualized to the point that the original use was forgotten, and the trumpet was substituted with a staff in the same shape.[15] Given the intimate connections between warriors and priests in Etruria and Rome, to the extent that even quite unwarlike religious items were ultimately derived from military equipment, the *fetiales*' role should not be seen as one of peaceful diplomacy: they were a part of the military. The *fetiales*, who, after all, carried actual spears, were likely combatants themselves in early periods.

To return to the first element of the *fetiales*' dress Livy mentions, it is necessary to ask what sort of garments Livy is actually referring to when he says that the *fetiales* were "*capite velato filo—lanae velamen est.*"[16] *Caput velatum* indicates that the *fetiales* drew a fold of their clothing over their heads, as was the regular practice for Romans while performing sacred rituals. While a study of votive heads showed that covering the head during religious practice was known to the Etruscans and other Italic peoples, it was concentrated among the Latins, suggesting that this was a particularly Latin practice in the regal and republican eras.[17] They may have been wearing the *cinctus Gabinus*, a form of the toga that was tied so as to allow greater mobility of the left arm than the ordinary toga, and so had

10 Liv. 1.32.
11 D.H. 2.72.6.
12 Fay Glinister, "Veiled and Unveiled: Uncovering Roman Influence in Hellenistic Italy," *Votives, Places and Rituals in Etruscan Religion,* ed. Margarita Gleba and Hilary Becker (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 197.
13 Larissa Bonfante, "Ritual Dress," in *Votives, Places and Rituals in Etruscan Religion,* ed. Margarita Gleba and Hilary Becker (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 185.
14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
16 Liv. 1. 32.
17 Glinster, "Veiled and Unveiled," 210.

military connotations.[18] Whether or not this style had a military origin, it was adopted for a variety of religious observances which were often associated in some way with war, such as the opening of the doors of the Temple of Janus with a fold of the toga pulled over the head. By historical times, wearing the *cinctus Gabinus* effectively meant the wearer was *capite velato*.[19] The name of this style, *Gabinus,* from the Latin town of Gabii, suggests that the Romans viewed it as adopted from that town and therefore was particularly Latin in style. This Latin origin makes it a particularly apt garment for the *fetiales*, who appear to be a Latin institution.[20] A denarius minted in 16 BCE by C. Antistius Vetus shows a scene of two *capite velato* men wearing the *cinctus Gabinus* holding a piglet over an altar with a legend reading "*FOEDVS P R QVM GABINIS,"* ("a treaty of the Roman People with the People of Gabii")[21] This is strong evidence for the fetiales wearing the cinctus Gabinus. Zollschan's suggestion that these men are wearing the *limus*, a skirt-like apron used for sacrifices, [22] does not seem at all probable from the image. As a general suggestion for the clothing of the *fetiales,* it does not provide a means to cover the head, which Livy clearly specifies.

A gold stater coin from the late third century BCE, however, shows the ritual conclusion of a treaty by two men, the left hand one holding a sword and spear and the right hand one a spear alone. This suggests that the *fetiales* were not always required to wear the *cintus Gabinus*, although they seem to have done so by Livy's day.[23] The right hand man clearly wears military dress, but the exact nature of the left hand figure's clothing is debated.[24] Richardson argues for the *trabea*, essentially a purple or purple striped cloak,[25] wound around his waist and perhaps brought over his shoulder.[26] Zollschan suggests, largely on the basis of evidence from Servius and Vergil, that the *fetiales* or at least the *pater patratus* might have worn the *limus*. [27] While her overall paper has some methodological flaws, the skirt-like *limus* does appear more similar to the garment as it appears on the coin. It should be noted that this coin might show

18 *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities,* ed. William Smith, William Wayte, G. E. Marindin (1890), 1136. See also Bonfante, "Ritual Dress," 185.
19 J. H. Richardson, "The *Pater Patratus* on a Roman Gold Stater: A Reading of 'RRC' Nos. 28/1-2 and 29/1-2," Hermes 136, no. 4 (2008): 423.
20 Wiedemann, "Fetiales," 485.
21 J. H. Richardson, "The Development of the Treaty-Making Rituals of the Romans," *Hermes* 145, no. 3 (2017): 252. See also Linda Zollschan, "The Ritual Garb of the Fetial Priests," *Museum Helveticum* 68, no. 1 (2011): 60.
22 Zollschan, "Ritual Garb," 60.
23 Richardson, "*Pater Patratus*," 415.
24 Ibid., 417.
25 *The World of Roman Costume*, ed. Sebesta and Bonfante, 229.
26 Richardson, "*Pater Patratus*," 415, 417, 421.
27 Zollschan, "Ritual Garb," 57-60.

generic oath-takers rather than a scene actually involving a *fetialis*.[28] Alternately, the necessity for the head covering may depend on the type of ritual they were performing or may have varied through the centuries. That the priestly figure kills the piglet using a sword rather than a *silex* need not disqualify him as a *fetialis*, despite the fact that Livy specifies a *silex* as the weapon. This ignores that the *fetiales* were inherently military and assumes that Livy's Augustan-era account of a supposedly archaic scene is accurate for the third century BCE. Livy wrote in a period when archaizing religion was in fashion and so it is quite possible that the *fetiales* of the third century BCE used a sword, but that those of Livy's day used a *silex* in order to appear authentically ancient and traditional. The denarius of 16 BCE provides more secure evidence for the dress of the *fetiales* under Augustus, who were clearly *capite velato*. That Livy believed that this had been the case from archaic times seems a safe assumption.

The other feature of the *fetiales*' dress that Livy specifies is the *filum*. This is an extremely vague word, simply meaning a thread or fabric of some sort, with a technical meaning of a fillet worn by priests.[29] The *filum* seems to have been worn in conjunction with other priestly headgear, generally the *apex*, as a method of attaching the spike of the *apex* to the hat and/or the hat to the head, never by itself. Thus, Livy's statement that the *fetiales* wear the *filum* suggests that they also wear the *apex*, or something very similar. The *apex* was, like the *cinctus Gabinus*, originally a military garment, its shape originating with an Etruscan helmet.[30] Images of Etruscan priests show them wearing similar hats.[31] If the *fetiales* did indeed wear the *apex*, this would further solidify the theory that the *fetiales* were military personnel. While the spike of the *apex* could perhaps make it difficult for the *fetiales* to cover their heads with their togas, it must have been possible, perhaps by using the *filum* to secure the fabric, since the *apex* was the priestly hat. The final element that Livy mentions is that the veiling (*velamen*) must be made of wool. Livy is not the only writer to discuss the materials from which the *fetiales*' clothing must be made: Servius specifies that the *fetiales* never wear linen due to fears that it would weaken the treaty.[32] Thus, we have ample confirmation that the *fetiales*' veil was woolen, which is unsurprising for the costume of a religious figure with origins in early Latium, where wool was the principal fibre.[33]

It is also necessary to consider Thomas Wiedemann's argument that the *fetiales*' war-declaration ritual was an Augustan invention that historians of his era, primarily Livy, then attributed backwards to archaic

28 Zollschan, "Ritual Garb," 56.
29 All definitions as taken from the Oxford Latin Dictionary.
30 Bonfante, "Ritual Dress," 187.
31 Ibid.
32 Serv. *A*. 12.120.
33 Larissa Bonfante, *Etruscan Dress* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1975), 11.

Rome.[34] In addition to Wiedemann's convincing arguments, I note the parallels between Ancus Marcius, to whom Livy attributes the establishment of the *fetiales,* and Augustus. Livy describes Ancus as "*medium erat in Anco ingenium, et Numae et Romuli memor*," ("a king who was both religious and successful in war"), whose accession was related to his descent from a prior Roman ruler, Numa.[35] Similarly, Augustus presented himself as both victorious over his enemies and deeply concerned with proper religious procedure, listing the number of temples he had built or restored in his *Res Gestae*.[36] Like Livy suggests Ancus did with Numa, Augustus gained power though his relationship to his "predecessor," Julius Caesar. Thus, Ancus is an extremely suitable figure for Livy to attribute an Augustan invention to. This also explains the discrepancy of Tullus Hostilius using a ritual that distinctly belonged to the *fetiales*, since Ancus is a convenient founder-figure, rather than an actual importer of the role. Although it is doubtful that the spear-throwing rite is archaic, *fetiales* do seem to have been involved in diplomatic negotiations from an early date.[37] Indeed, the lack of evidence for the actual ritual and formula as Livy presents them does not exclude that the spear could have been used as a symbol carried by the *fetiales* prior to Augustus.[38] The numismatic evidence mentioned above from the late third century BCE and 16 BCE both show two men engaged in sacrificing a pig, as in Livy's account of Tullus Hostilius' treaty with Alba Longa. If the spear-throwing rite was an Augustan invention, it was well-grounded in earlier custom. Additionally, its exact date of origin has little bearing on the discussion of the *fetiales*' dress in Book One of Livy.[39]

The other diplomacy-related religious ritual whose establishment Livy relates is that of the sacrifices to Fides that Numa Pompilius established. Livy's only description of this *solleme* ("ritual") is the priests' transportation to the site and their clothing. Where the site is located appears to Livy to be too obvious to mention, but it is possible that he is discussing the Temple of Fides on the Capitoline, where Scipio Nasica would later famously hold a senate meeting before the assassination of Tiberius Gracchus.[40] Livy says that Numa "*ad id sacrarium flamines bigis curru arcuato vehi iussit manuque ad digitos usque inuoluta*" ("he ordered that the *flamines* be conveyed to this sanctuary in a covered two-horse chariot and that their hands be covered all the way to the fingers").[41] The *flamines*' accoutrements for this sacrifice show a remarkable emphasis on covering

34 Wiedemann, "Fetiales," 482.
35 Liv. 1.32.
36 Aug. *RG*. 6.37.
37 Wiedemann, "Fetiales," 484.
38 J. H. Richardson, "The Development of the Treaty-Making Rituals," 271.
39 Richardson, "*Pater Patratus*," 415-16.
40 Anna J. Clark, "Nasica and Fides" *The Classical Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (2007): 125.
41 Liv. 1.21.

beyond the *capite velato,* which is not specified here. This can be assumed, as Livy gives no indication that the sacrifice was not carried out according to the *ritus Romanus*. Covered carriages were well known by Livy's time, if not in Numa's, and were used in religious contexts, such as by the Vestal Virgins; the hand coverings, to which Livy attributes more significance, appear to be unique and so are intriguing. "*Manuque ad digitos usque inuoluta"* suggests perhaps a fingerless glove, but such a garment is not documented.[42] The description could also fit long sleeves that cover the hand, or a piece of cloth wrapped around the hand and perhaps the arm. This latter option seems to fit best as it would not be at odds with traditional Roman priestly dress in the way that long sleeves would be, and *involuta* indicates a sense of wrapping.[43]

Livy says that Numa ordered this hand covering to signify that "*fidem tutandam sedemque eius etiam in dexteris sacratam esse"* (*"faith should be guarded and her seat made sacred even in their right hands*").[44] Apparently the covering is a mnemonic device so that the priests remember the importance of the deity and virtue to whom they are sacrificing. Livy also specifies that Fides should be "*in dexteris sacratam,"* which suggests both that the covering is placed on the right hand and that the sacrifice and the mnemonic device are linked to the practice of *dextra data*. *Dextra data,* a handshake, was the Roman method of confirming a treaty or agreement, and as such was an assurance of faith and honesty. If the sacrifices to Fides are bound up with the keeping of agreements, it seems sensible for her cult to place a mnemonic device upon the hand used for confirming such agreements and for this practice to be important for her cult.

Making determinations as to whether the parties of an agreement had remained faithful to it was of course the duty of the *fetiales*. As the interests of the sacrifice to Fides concerning faith in agreements probably covered personal agreements, we have reason to believe that they could also apply to the intercommunity agreements that involved the *fetiales*. Given this, it is tempting to hypothesize that *flamines* of the Fides cult might have been at least some of the same individuals as the *fetiales*. While evidence to show this conclusively is lacking, such an arrangement would shed light on the purpose of the cult and why Roman authors feel such a deep connection between it and the *fetiales*, yet do not explain this link. Judging by the way Livy explains the sacrifices to Fides, they were essentially a mnemonic tool designed to remind worshipers that "*fidem tutandam"* ("faith must be guarded").[45] *Dexteris* in Livy's formula can be taken as a reference to *dextra data*, the shaking of hands which was used to con-

42 Clark, "Nasica and Fides," 125.
43 *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, combined ed. (1982) s.v. "*involuta*."
44 Liv. 1.21.
45 Ibid.

clude treaties, as Livy describes when Aeneas and Latinus make a treaty.[46] Since the *fetiales* were in charge of ensuring that Rome adhered to treaties and determining whether Rome or the other party had broken them, a cult that serves to remind the *fetiales* of the importance of *fides* by having them sacrifice to her in a mnemonic ritual would be sensible. In addition, as a *flamen*, the priest at the ritual would wear the *apex* and cover his head, the same attire I have suggested for the *fetiales*. A priest being *capite velato* might, like many elements of the *fetiales*' clothing, have had military connotations, as Appian says that Nasica's covering of his head before leaving the temple of Fides could be interpreted as representing a helmet.[47] It should be noted that Livy, according to his own chronology, attributes the establishment of the annual sacrifice to Numa, approximately seventy to thirty years prior to Ancus' establishment of the *fetiales*. However, we have already established that Livy shows the actions of the *fetiales* under Tullus while giving no indication that Tullus was establishing a new procedure. Thus, while the placement of the establishment of the cult of Fides prior to that of the *fetiales* could suggest that the latter evolved out of the former, Livy's chronology is not necessarily significant.

From the ritual clothing the *fetiales* and *flamines* of Fides wear, the *fetiales* can be identified as a priesthood deeply linked to the military and supported by the cult of Fides. The sources on treaty-making and the *fetiales* differ with respect to the garments, but this can be attributed to ritual changes over time or perhaps sources depicting different stages of ritual. Livy's description can be assumed to be correct for his own era, but Etruscan sources more contemporary to the period Livy is writing about must be consulted to gain a better understanding of the archaic equivalents and their possible significance in that period. Even if Livy's account only reflects a ritual constructed in his own period, the interest in archaic history in the Augustan era means that Augustan ideas of the *fetiales* are rooted in an understanding of older practices, and so the symbolism of the garments may have resonance in the regal period.

46 Liv. 1.1.
47 App. *BC*. 1.16.

Bibliography

Appian. *Bellorum Civilium Liber Primus*. Edited by Emilio Gabba. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1967.

Bonfante, Larissa. *Etruscan Dress.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1975.

Bonfante, Larissa. "Ritual Dress." In *Votives, Places and Rituals in Etruscan Religion: Studies in Honour of Jean MacIntosh Turfa.* Edited by Margarita Gleba and Hilary Becker. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. Edited by William Smith, William Wayte, and G. E. Marindin. 1890.

Dionysus of Halicarnassus. *Roman Antiquities Vol. I.* Edited by Edward Spelman. Translated by Earnest Cary. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge MA.: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Glinister, Fay. "Veiled and Unveiled: Uncovering Roman Influence in Hellenistic Italy." In *Votives, Places and Rituals in Etruscan Religion: Studies in Honour of Jean MacIntosh Turfa.* Edited by Margarita Gleba and Hilary Becker. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Livy, *Book One.* Edited by J. L. Whiteley and H. E. Gould. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1991.

Res Gestae Divi Augusti. Edited by A. E. Cooley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Richardson, J. H. "The Development of the Treaty-Making Rituals of the Romans," *Hermes* 145, no. 3 (2017): 250-274.

Richardson, J.H. "The 'Pater Patratus' on a Roman Gold Stater: A Reading of 'RRC' Nos. 28/1-2 and 29/1-2." In *Hermes* 136, no. 4 (2008): 415-425.

Servius. *In Vergilii carmina commentarii*. Edited by Georgius Thilo and Hermannus Hagen. Leipzig: Teubner, 1902.

Zollschan, Linda. "The Ritual Garb of the Fetial Priests." In *Museum Helve-*

ticum 68, no. 1 (2011): 47-67.

Wiedemann, Thomas. "The Fetiales: A Reconsideration." In *The Classical Quarterly* 36, no. 2 (1986): 478-490.

The World of Roman Costume. Edited by Judith Lynn Sebesta and Larissa Bonfante. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994.

Art Becomes Nature, and Nature Art: A Close Reading of The Ekphrastic Garden in Book Four of Longus' Daphnis and Chloe

Hannah Lank

Reflecting on *Daphnis and Chloe*, Goethe remarked that "one would do well to read it every year, to be instructed by it again and again, and to receive anew the impression of its great beauty."[1] Indeed, *Daphnis and Chloe* is inventive, entertaining, and complex, largely due to the unique goal of its author to produce not only a literary novel but also an *ekphrasis,* and by doing so, to create a work of art. The novel is a "literary project," a "virtuoso piece";[2] it is an outstanding artistic accomplishment. In this essay, I will offer a close reading of the ekphrastic garden—referred to in this paper as the *paradeisos,* or Dionysius' garden that is tended by Lamon—that opens Book Four. I will argue that this garden is paradigmatic of the interconnectedness of social and erotic maturation, lust and violence, and art and nature. First, in juxtaposition to the earlier description of Philetas' garden, the *paradeisos* suggests the erotic and social maturation of the protagonists; second, it functions as the final embedded narrative, furthering the theme of lust and violence; last, it serves as a symbol for the entire novel itself, as a metanarrative comment on the interplay between art and nature, as well as on the inherent artificiality of narrative.

The first garden presented in *Daphnis and Chloe* is not the *paradeisos* owned by Dionysius that opens Book Four, but rather it is Philetas' private garden at the beginning of Book Two. The gardens are alike in many ways: they contain similar varieties of flora—"roses, hyacinths, and lilies,"[3] and pear and apple trees[4]—and are both the result of human effort, as Dionysius' garden is tended by Lamon,[5] and Philetas describes his garden as something "made with my own hands."[6] However, the gardens are ultimately set in juxtaposition with each other, particularly in the level of artistry found in each: while Philetas' garden is so natural-looking that "if you took away the fence, you'd think you were looking at a grove of trees,"[7] Dionysius' garden is more conspicuously a crafted entity; it is both "the work of nature, but… [also] the work of art."[8] Philetas is proud

1 Paul Turner, introduction to *Daphnis and Chloe,* trans. Paul Turner (London: Penguin, 1989), 16.
2 Christopher Gill, introduction to *Daphnis and Chloe,* trans. Christopher Gill (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 287. All further references will be using this translation of Longus.
3 Longus, 4.2.
4 Ibid., 2.3, 4.2.
5 Ibid., 4.1.
6 Ibid., 2.3.
7 Ibid., 2.3.
8 Ibid., 4.2.

of his ability to create a garden that does not appear to be the handiwork of human effort. He, according to Frazier, has "cultivated the semblance of unadulterated natural beauty in his garden."[9] His garden is simple and in keeping with the pastoral landscape and its corresponding attitude. In contrast, Dionysius' garden, cared for by Lamon, is arranged "in a deliberately complex symbolic pattern";[10] it is suggestive of the corresponding complexity of the urban world, particularly the complexities of love and lust. Longus pays particular attention to the architecture of the flora in the *paradeisos*, noting that "the fruit-bearing trees were on the inside, as though protected by the others. The other trees stood around them like a man-made wall, but these were enclosed in turn by a narrow fence. Everything was divided and separate, with each trunk at some distance from its neighbour."[11] Such organization is obviously crafted by human hands.

The variation in the level of apparent organizational complexity for each garden allows for a comparison between the activities that occur in each. It is in Philetas' garden that Eros is first figured in the novel as a means of teaching Daphnis and Chloe "the first social lessons about love."[12] The simplicity and pastorality of Philetas' garden is in keeping with the introductory love lesson Daphnis and Chloe receive; it will be in the more complex garden—the garden with artistic, urban elements—that the reality of love and sex will become clearer. Philetas tells the pair that the only cure for love is "a kiss and an embrace and lying down together with naked bodies";[13] it is a simplistic and blissfully ignorant lesson that ultimately obscures the inherent violence associated with love and lust, a prominent theme throughout the novel. It is not until later, in Dionysius' garden, that Lampis violently destroys the garden's flowers when he finds out Daphnis will be marrying Chloe instead of him;[14] this violence is symbolic both of the inherent violence associated with lust, while also foreshadowing Chloe's impending defloration, with the flowers serving as a symbol of her virginity. Violence is a complexity that Philetas omits in his benign lesson on love. Dionysius' garden therefore serves as the site for the advanced erotic and social maturation of Daphnis and Chloe. Additionally, "Daphnis' ability to arrange and tend the garden will prove to his master that he is ready for marriage to Chloe";[15] the flower garden

9 Annie E. Frazier, "As You Look Closer You Notice: Ekphrasis in Three Ancient Novels" (honours thesis, New College of Florida, 2008), 38.
10 Ibid., 39.
11 Longus, 4.2.
12 Froma I. Zeitlin, "The Poetics of *Erōs*: Nature, Art, and Imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*," in *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World,* ed. David M. Halperin, John J. Winkler, and Froma I. Zeitlin (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 447.
13 Longus, 2.7.
14 Ibid., 4.7.
15 Angela Holzmeister, "*Ekphrasis* in the Ancient Novel," in *A Companion to the Ancient Novel,* ed. Edmund P. Cueva and Shannon N. Byrne (West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2014), 415.

is not only a symbol of Chloe's sexual maturation, but also of Daphnis'. Daphnis' connection to the garden is reinforced when, after Lampis destroys the flowers, he and his father mourn for both the flowers and "for their own bodies,"[16] fearing Dionysius' impending punishment: "thus it is more than implied that the tender garden represents not only the maiden Chloe but also (and more overtly) the beautiful Daphnis."[17] In this way, Philetas' garden is set in juxtaposition with Dionysius' garden, mirroring the social and sexual maturation of the protagonists and suggesting their impending entry into the complex structure of adult society.[18] That this society is troublesome is not something Longus seeks to obscure; as Jean Alvares states, "Longus accepts some violence and oppression as the necessary if often saddening sacrifice one pays for becoming an adult member of society."[19] This maturation requires leaving the relative simplicity of Philetas' introductory garden behind, and facing the complex, urban, and violent elements contained and implied in Dionysius' garden, the *paradeisos*.

In addition to serving as a juxtaposition to Philetas' simple and natural garden presented earlier in the novel, Dionysius' garden serves as the embodiment of the final embedded narrative. *Daphnis and Chloe* conspicuously contains one embedded narrative in each of its first three books: the myth of the metamorphosis of Pitys in Book One; the myth of Syrinx and the origin of the Panpipes in Book Two; and the myth of Echo in Book Three. Notably, all three involve metamorphoses, Pan, and music as thematic elements. Book Four is conspicuous in its lack of an obvious embedded narrative; however, it is possible to interpret the shrine of Dionysus, located in the centre of the *paradeisos,* as containing all three of the aforementioned themes, and therefore functioning as the fourth and final embedded narrative in the novel.[20] The temple located in the garden is notable because it is the first religious structure presented in the novel; also notable is the location of the temple at the centre of the garden, suggestive of the importance and centrality of myth in nature and art. Longus provides the reader with an ekphrastic description of the temple:

> At the midpoint of the length and breadth of the garden was a temple and altar to Dionysus. Ivy surrounded the altar, and vine shoots surrounded the temple. Inside, the temple had paintings of subjects related to Dionysus: Semele giving birth,

16 Longus, 4.9.
17 Zeitlin, "Poetics of Eros," 447.
18 R.L. Hunter, *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 55.
19 Jean Alvares, "*Daphnis and Chloe:* Innocence and Experience, Archetypes and Art" in *A Companion to the Ancient Novel,* ed. Edmund P. Cueva and Shannon N. Byrne (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014), 28.
20 Carole E. Newlands, "Techne and Tuche in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*," *Pacific Coast Philology* 22, no. ½ (1987): 56.

> Ariadne asleep, Lycurgus in chains, Pentheus being torn apart; there were also Indians being conquered and Etruscans changing shape. Everywhere satyrs were treading the grapes; everywhere bacchants were dancing. And Pan was not forgotten; he sat there too on a rock, playing the Panpipes himself, as though he were providing an accompaniment both for the treaders and the dancers.[21]

It is upon closer examination of the paintings depicted in the temple that the violence of this embedded narrative becomes clear. Importantly, Dionysus is a symbolic figure, one who is representative of many dichotomies, straddling the boundaries "between violence and peace[…] lies and truth, man and woman."[22] In dedicating the temple to Dionysus, Longus is furthering the theme of the interconnectedness of love and violence that he threads throughout the entire novel, notably in the increasing violence of each embedded narrative. This detail foreshadows the reality of the mature social and erotic world Daphnis and Chloe are preparing to enter. However, it is in the paintings on the temple's walls that this theme is emphasized: each of the characters in the paintings embodies a myth that concerns some form of male-induced physical or psychosocial violence against women. The image of Semele giving birth to Dionysus is also the image of her death, as she was destroyed by Zeus' thunderbolts; Ariadne was abandoned by her lover Theseus after helping him defeat the Minotaur, and was later rescued by Dionysus, who also married her; Lycurgus was put in chains after he killed Dionysus' nurse Ambrosia and then proceeded to kill his own wife and children; Pentheus was torn to pieces by his own mother, as punishment by Dionysus, who caused her to be temporarily insane and unaware of what she was doing. The paintings therefore "reveal the sexual violence to women inherent to matrimony and motherhood, compelling […] a characterization of the temple as a structure of recollected and institutionalized violence."[23] In this final ekphrastic embedded narrative, Longus paints a picture of the world Daphnis and especially Chloe are preparing to enter; it is not nearly as benign as the pastoral world they exist in for the entire novel. As Angela Holzmeister notes, "the effect of this *ekphrasis,* then, affects the reading of the entire text: the hyper-alert reader [… is] burdened by the knowledge of the future suffering that lies beyond the felicitous wedding celebration that ends the novel."[24] In this way, Longus encourages the reader to consider the consequences of the text after its conclusion: perhaps it is not as

21 Longus, 4.3.
22 Anton Bierl, "Love, Myth, and Ritual: The Mythic Dimension and Adolescence in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe"* in *A Companion to the Ancient Novel,* ed. Edmund P. Cueva and Shannon N. Byrne (West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2014), 445-446.
23 Holzmeister, "Ekphrasis," 415.
24 Ibid.

simplistic and joyful as a superficial reading of the text would have one believe.

Furthermore, the visual depiction of Pan playing his pipes that concludes the *ekphrasis* of the temple is conspicuous because of the importance of music in the previous three embedded narratives. Notably, it is the only representation of music present in the *paradeisos*: Philetas' garden is inhabited by chirping songbirds,[25] but Dionysius' garden has no such sounds of nature. Because of the prominent role of music throughout the novel, Silvia Montiglio suggests that the absence of music is an important detail: "the music dies when love breaks into one's life and shatters its order. Love, though natural, disturbs the idyllic landscape of the novel."[26] We can further analyze the impact of the absence of music in the *paradeisos* by returning to a comparison with Philetas' garden, which is filled with songbirds and is the site of Eros' appearance, who is described as being songbird-like, having "a voice sweeter than a swallow's, a nightingale's, or a swan's."[27] The description of Philetas' garden "evokes a lyrical mood rather than a detailed layout of form and content. It belongs to Philetas and is not made for the delectation, the viewing, of others."[28] It is therefore suggested that there is something unnatural about the *paradeisos* in its carefully constructed merging of nature and art; although beautiful, it lacks auditory elements, let alone auditory beauty, and is therefore in contrast with Philetas' garden and the former embedded narratives. Indeed, the lack of music in the *paradeisos* emphasizes the impending maturation of Daphnis and Chloe and the end of their simple ignorance; music, so closely intertwined with the bucolic, does not have the same place in the complexity that is urban society: simply put, "city dwellers […] are not musical."[29] Although Daphnis and Chloe are not preparing to leave the countryside, they are preparing to enter into a new world of adulthood, and their "erotic maturation is paralleled by their social maturation."[30] The abrupt end to the musical details of the previous three embedded narratives, in conjunction with the violent elements portrayed in the temple's paintings, signifies the impending maturations of the protagonists.

The ekphrastic garden of Book Four also functions as a metanarrative comment on the interplay between art and nature: it is a symbol for the entire novel itself, a means by which Longus suggests to the reader that he has successfully balanced art and nature and achieved the goal he set out for himself in creating the novel. In the Prologue, Longus notes

25 Longus, 2.3.
26 Silvia Montiglio, "The (Cultural) Harmony of Nature: Music, Love, and Order in *Daphnis and Chloe*," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 142, no. 1 (2012): 135.
27 Longus, 2.5.
28 Zeitlin, "Poetics of Eros," 454.
29 Montiglio, "The (Cultural) Harmony," 134.
30 Alvares, "Daphnis and Chloe," 30.

how he once discovered the most beautiful painting he had ever seen, and how he felt "a yearning to depict the pictures in words" and to thus create "something for mankind to possess and enjoy."[31] *Daphnis and Chloe* is the result of this attempt at *ekphrasis*. However, there is an inevitable gap between the visual—whether a painting or nature itself—and a verbal representation of the visual. In creating the *paradeisos*, explicitly described as both "the work of nature, but [… also] the work of art,"[32] Longus is suggesting that the two modes can be balanced: that he has successfully achieved an *ekphrasis,* and combined the work of nature with the work of art. The garden is a conspicuous "mixture of 'literature' and 'life,'"[33] where Longus is the "master gardener" who creates a garden that is a "work of art" and a "possession to enjoy" which parodies his own opening comment about his novel.[34] The garden is therefore a symbol for the novel itself, a metanarrative comment on the interplay between art and nature and Longus' ability to balance the two in creating this novel.

However, the garden as a metanarrative metaphor extends beyond being an example of the adept way in which Longus combines nature and art. Notably, the *paradeisos* is described as being an active part of its surrounding world: rather than being secluded, it offers a clear view of "the plain… so you could see people grazing their flocks; the sea was visible too, and people sailing past were open to view."[35] It is possible to interpret these temporal attributes in multiple ways: first, the decision to make the garden open to views of the outside world makes it inherently three-dimensional. Longus is aware of how a painting like the one he describes seeing in the Prologue, unlike a sculpture or a garden, is two-dimensional, and therefore "must rely on the world for its depth."[36] In writing a novel that is an *ekphrasis* of the painting, Longus is giving the painting its third dimension, depth, in the form of a narrative story. By opening up the garden to views of time passing around it, he creates a microcosm of what he has done in the novel as a whole: "brought into juxtaposition the two art forms, temporal and spatial."[37]

Furthermore, the aesthetic choice to include views of the world outside the *paradeisos* supersedes its function as positing the juxtaposition of spatial and temporal settings. Indeed, the views are set up in such a way as to appear picturesque and aesthetically refined, suggesting that they are meant to appear as objects, items designed "to be viewed and contem-

31 Longus, Prologue.
32 Ibid., 4.2.
33 Hunter, *Study of Daphnis and Chloe*, 73.
34 David Cheney, "The Garden Ekphrasis: Visual Aspects of the Ancient Novel" (master's thesis, University of Calgary, 1999), 85-86.
35 Longus, 4.3.
36 Joseph Kestner, "Ekphrasis as Frame in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*," *The Classical World* 67, no. 3 (1973-1974): 170.
37 Kestner, 167.

plated."[38] If we consider the aesthetic objectification of the landscape and its inhabitants, it is clear that this is a metanarrative comment on the novel as form: *Daphnis and Chloe* is a consciously crafted work of art and not a representation of reality, even though it gives the superficial appearance of being so. Longus is aware of this inherent artificiality that comes as a result of attempting to depict the multisensory world through narrative. Indeed, the garden itself embodies this same aesthetic objectification. It is a carefully crafted entity, designed not for personal enjoyment—though Lamon and Daphnis tend it, it is not theirs to enjoy—but "rather so that it might be seen to be beautiful in the eyes of the beholders who come to see nature in this sanitized state."[39] In this way, the garden serves as a metaphor for the inherent artificiality of narrative, suggesting that both its appearance and the views it offers of the surrounding world are superficial. Like a novel, the garden and the world visible from it are designed to be possessed and consumed, not to represent reality. As Froma Zeitlin states, the *paradeisos* "represents a monumentality of something that has passed from a living dynamic into a static symbol of art—a *theoria,* something to behold, something to contemplate, something to theorize about."[40] It is therefore clear that the garden is a metanarrative metaphor, a symbol through which Longus suggests to the reader that he has fulfilled the goal he set out for himself in the Prologue: to create a literary masterpiece, "something for mankind to possess and enjoy."[41]

The *paradeisos* that opens Book Four is a sophisticated literary passage integral to the novel as a whole. It is juxtaposed to Philetas' garden, described in Book Two, as a means of emphasizing the erotic and social maturation of both Daphnis and Chloe. The garden, and specifically the temple of Dionysus located at its centre, also serves as the fourth and final embedded narrative, furthering the role of myth in the novel, as well as the theme of the inherent violence involved in full erotic and social maturation, particularly institutionalized violence against women. The garden as a whole is also a symbol for the entire novel itself, functioning as a metanarrative comment on the interplay between art and nature, as well as on the artificiality of narrative. It may be interesting to consider further what it is that Longus is suggesting in using both gardens as metaphors of love and lust: what is the nature of love, if even in its simplest form, it can be represented by a space forged nonetheless by human hands? What are the implications of Daphnis' and Chloe's lessons on love, if their transition from idyllic love results in a harsh confrontation of the reality—notably avoided by Longus—which is painful? The ekphrastic garden is an endlessly interesting detail of *Daphnis and Chloe,* and merely one aspect of a novel that is hyperaware of its artistic being and limitations.

38 Alvares, "Daphnis and Chloe," 32.
39 Zeitlin, "Poetics of Eros," 452.
40 Ibid.
41 Longus, Prologue.

Bibliography

Alvares, Jean. "*Daphnis and Chloe:* Innocence and Experience, Archetypes and Art." In *A Companion to the Ancient Novel,* edited by Edmund P. Cueva and Shannon N. Byrne. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2014.

Bierl, Anton. "Love, Myth, and Ritual: The Mythic Dimension and Adolescence in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe."* In *A Companion to the Ancient Novel,* edited by Edmund P. Cueva and Shannon N. Byrne. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2014.

Cheney, David. "The Garden Ekphrasis: Visual Aspects of the Ancient Novel." Master's thesis, University of Calgary, 1999.

Frazier, Annie E. "As You Look Closer You Notice: Ekphrasis in Three Ancient Novels." Honours thesis, New College of Florida, 2008.

Gill, Christopher. *Introduction to* Daphnis and Chloe. Translated by Christopher Gill. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Holzmeister, Angela. "*Ekphrasis* in the Ancient Novel." In *A Companion to the Ancient Novel,* edited by Edmund P. Cueva and Shannon N. Byrne. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2014.

Hunter, R. L. *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Kestner, Joseph. "Ekphrasis as Frame in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe," The Classical World* 67, no. 3 (1973-1974): 166-171.

Longus. *Daphnis and Chloe.* Translated by Christopher Gill. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Montiglio, Silvia. "The (Cultural) Harmony of Nature: Music, Love, and Order in *Daphnis and Chloe." Transactions of the American Philological Association* 142, no. 1 (2012): 133-156.

Newlands, Carole E. "Techne and Tuche in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*." *Pacific Coast Philology* 22, no. 1/2 (1987): 52-58.

Turner, Paul. Introduction to *Daphnis and Chloe.* Translated by Paul Turner. London: Penguin, 1989.

Zeitlin, Froma I. "The Poetics of *Erōs*: Nature, Art, and Imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*." In *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World,* edited by David M. Halperin, John J. Winkler, and Froma I. Zeitlin. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

The Roman "Barbarians" and Barbaric Romans: The Ostrogothic Kingdom of Italy and the Slow Disappearance of Roman Power in the West

Samuel Minden

When the fall of the Roman Empire has traditionally been discussed, past historians have conjured up images of wild hordes of vicious, rampaging barbarians destroying the pristine cities of the greatest empire in history.[1] In actuality, the story of the disappearance of Roman power is far more complex and tragic than this simplistic narrative.[2] Following the deposition of the last Western Roman Emperor by Odoacer, Italy fell under the rule of the Ostrogoths led by Theodoric the Great, who, in their own manner, attempted to maintain the idea of a Roman West both politically and provincially.[3]

The Ostrogoths first appeared in Italy as an invited invasion that had been sent by Constantinople to deal with a disturbance in the West, a role not unfamiliar to many barbarian tribes during late antiquity.[4] However, once in control, Theodoric and the Ostrogoths took great interest in presenting themselves as part of the continuity of Roman imperial rule through their actions and appearance, enacting laws and overseeing vast building projects for the benefit of the people and the state.[5] Moreover, the campaigns of Theodoric and the writings of his chief scholar Cassiodorus provide evidence of Roman notions of hegemony and empire surviving under Ostrogothic rule.[6] Contemporaneously, the Ostrogoths began phase out the old Roman bureaucracy in favour of a smaller and more personal court of advisors.[7] On a provincial level, the Ostrogoths' maintenance and support of the old Roman infrastructure allowed for daily life to carry on largely as it had.[8] Eventually, the Ostrogoths' presumption of the primacy of their place in society and the superiority of their values led to their segregating Roman society, casting the Romans as subservient to the Goths.[9] Through the writings of the philosopher and politician Boethius, one can

1 James O'Donnell, *The Ruin of the Roman Empire* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2008), 72.
2 Ibid., 72-73.
3 Jonathan J. Arnold, *Theodoric and the Roman Imperial Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 6-7.
4 Peter J. Heather, *Goths and Romans: 332- 489* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 306-308.
5 *The Anonymous Valesianus*, 12.65-7, 69-73. In Maas, 354-355.
6 Cassiodorus, *Variae*, III.3. In Maas, 355.
7 P. S. Barnwell, *Emperors, Prefects, and Kings: The Roman West, 395-565* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 146-147.
8 Cassiodorus, *Variae*, XII.18. In Maas, 19-20.
9 Procopius, *History of the Wars*, 5.2.6-19. In Maas, 356-357.

also see glimpses of corruption and of the exploitation of the common people by the Ostrogoths and their allies.[10]

Ultimately, it was the Ostrogoths' prolonged and bloody war against the armies of the Emperor Justinian that would destroy what remained of Rome's presence in the West.[11] As such, during the long decline of the Western Roman Empire, the Ostrogoths took on many of the old Roman systems of governance in their institutions and in their relationship with their subjects, while simultaneously striving to maintain and spread their Gothic identity and traditions.[12] In the end, it was the mutually destructive actions of the Ostrogoths and the Romans during Justinian's wars of reconquest, rather than the initial Ostrogothic invasions, that resulted in irreversible damage to Roman presence in the West both politically and provincially.[13]

Prior to their conquest of Italy, the Ostrogoths' interactions with the Western Roman Empire was military in nature, both in fighting against the Romans as allies of the Huns and in serving alongside the Romans as *foederati* soldiers.[14] In this way, the Ostrogoths' relations with Rome were not dissimilar from Rome's relationship with other prominent "barbarian" groups that they encountered in the fourth and fifth centuries, whom they fought on the frontier and employed to bolster their defenses.[15] Bryan Ward-Perkins characterizes this simultaneously hostile and accommodating approach to dealing with barbarians as a significant factor contributing to the gradual disintegration of the Western Roman Empire.[16] Rome's tendency to hand over sections of its land to barbarian tribes in exchange for military support and a promise of non-aggression, while sometimes effective, often resulted in barbarian rulers breaking away from Rome to create their own kingdoms.[17] The most notable incident of this kind was with the Visigoths, against whom the Romans had fought several fierce wars and had only achieved peace with by allowing them to settle in Aquitaine and Spain, only to see the Visigoths turn those lands into a new kingdom fully independent from Rome.[18]

In the case of the Ostrogoths, this policy is most prominently on display in Rome's decision to hand over the strategically and militarily important region of Pannonia to the Ostrogoths in 457 CE as a means to

10 Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy*, trans. P.G. Walsh (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 9-10.
11 Torsten Cumberland Jacobsen, *The Gothic War* (Yardley: Westholme Publishing LLC, 2009), 296-298.
12 Peter Heather, *The Restoration of Rome: Barbarian Popes and Imperial Pretenders* (London: Pan Books, 2014), 79-81.
13 O'Donnell, *The Ruin of the Roman Empire*, 262-264.
14 Thomas S. Burns, *A History of the Ostrogoths* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 52-53.
15 Michael Maas, *Readings in Late Antiquity: A Sourcebook, Second Edition* (London: Routledge, 2010), 78-79.
16 Bryan Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome and The End of Civilization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 54-56.
17 Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome and the End of Civilization*, 55-56.
18 Ibid., 54-56.

bring an end to the dispute between the Eastern and Western Empires over the region.[19] Once settled, the Ostrogoths frequently clashed with the Eastern Roman Empire over recognition and resources, but do appear to have provided soldiers for the armies of the Western Roman Empire, implying a less hostile relationship.[20] All of this would change in 488, when the Eastern Roman Emperor Zeno permitted King Theodoric of the Ostrogoths to invade and resettle in Italy, in exchange for overthrowing the barbarian usurper Odoacer.[21] As noted by Paul Barnwell, this decision is largely in keeping with another major theme in late antique Roman-barbarian diplomacy: that of pitting different tribes and leaders against one another as a means to both reclaim territory and to weaken potential rivals without the loss of Roman life.[22] As a result, the initial interactions between the Western Roman Empire and the Ostrogoths can be considered part of the broader history of Rome's complex and often self-destructive relationship with the barbarian tribes immigrating to their land.[23]

Following their conquest of Italy, the Ostrogoths of Theodoric sought to present themselves as the inheritors and preservers of the old Western Roman Empire,[24] while simultaneously altering the conceptions and practices of power and administration in their territory.[25] Throughout their rule, Theodoric and his court relied on the ideology, institutions, and iconography of Rome to maintain their power and to bring peace and order to Italy.[26] According to Jonathan Arnold, this interest in the preservation of Roman society was a result of the fact that the Ostrogoths saw themselves as the "legitimate representatives of imperial power in the West."[27] One method by which Theodoric presented himself as part of the Roman tradition was his self-presentation on coins and in public art, wherein he depicted himself wearing the traditional purple garb and diadem of the Roman Emperor,[28] and labelled himself with the title of *princeps*.[29] This strategic representation is a clear evocation of the Roman Emperors of old, whom Theodoric wished to emulate in his rule.[30]

19 Herwig Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, trans. Thomas J. Dunlap (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 260-261.
20 Ibid., 262-263.
21 Barnwell, *Emperors, Prefects, and Kings*, 135.
22 Ibid.
23 Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome and The End of Civilization*, pg. 54-56.
24 *The Anonymous Valesianus*, 12.65-7, 69-73. In Maas, 354-355.
25 Barnwell, *Emperors, Prefects, and Kings*, 145-146.
26 Heather, *The Restoration of Rome*, 61-63.
27 Arnold, *Theodoric and the Roman Imperial Restoration*, 64.
28 Ward-Perkins has noted in *The Fall of Rome And the End of Civilization* (73) that in spite of all these Roman symbols, the fact that Theodoric is shown with a moustache is a symbol of growing Gothic influences in the court of Theodoric. Arnold has contested this point in *Theodoric and the Roman Imperial Restoration* (114-115), arguing that it is purely aesthetic and should not be treated as a sign of Gothic culture replacing Roman culture.
29 Arnold, *Theodoric and the Roman Imperial Restoration*, 111-113.
30 Ibid.

Theodoric and the Ostrogoths also used the Roman legal tradition as a means to justify their rule and maintain their new "Roman" identity.[31] In its description of Theodoric's entry into Rome, *The Anonymous Valesianus* observes that Theodoric, "at the request of the people […] gave orders that words of the promise he had made to them be inscribed upon a bronze tablet and set up in a public place."[32] In this passage, Theodoric is presented as a just and honest lawgiver with a strong respect for the people of Rome and an interest in supporting their prosperity.[33] Moreover, by emphasizing his communication with the common people, Theodoric sought to re-emphasize the Roman notions of political freedom and a politically active citizenry.[34] Theodoric also sought to revive the old Roman tradition of pragmatic religious tolerance.[35] When asked by the Jewish communities of Genoa and Rome for justice and protection against anti-Semitic attacks led by the Christian majority, Theodoric agreed on the condition that the Jews followed the law and remained loyal subjects to him.[36] A likely reason for this more tolerant approach was that Theodoric, as an Arian Christian, was himself part of a religious minority in Italy, and thus wished to maintain peace and relative harmony between the different religions and sects of his empire.[37] This personally motivated philosophy serves as a contrast to the growing trends towards government-sanctioned persecution and religious homogeneity that were rising in the rest of the Roman world.[38] Through his calculated use of laws and imperial iconography, especially his artful rebranding of the title *princeps*, Theodoric linked himself directly to Rome's golden age and its ideals.[39] Such an appeal to Roman law and tradition appears to have worked in Theodoric's favour, as the Byzantine historian Procopius begrudgingly notes that, "he was truly an emperor as any who have distinguished themselves in this office from the beginning; and love for him among both Goths and Romans grew to be great."[40]

Theodoric further kept the spirit of Rome alive through his attempt to revive the hegemony of the empire in the western Mediterranean.[41] Over the course of his reign, Theodoric launched numerous military and diplomatic expeditions to expand the control and influence of

31 Sean W. D. Lafferty, *Law and Society in the Age of Theodoric the Great: A Study of the Edictum Theodorici* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 29.
32 *The Anonymous Valesianus*, 12.69. In Maas, 354.
33 Ibid., 354-355.
34 Heather, *The Restoration of Rome*, 60.
35 O'Donnell, *The Ruin of the Roman Empire*, 131-133.
36 Ibid., 132-133.
37 Ibid., 113.
38 Ibid., 291.
39 Ibid., 144-146.
40 Procopius, *History of the Wars: Volume III: Books 5-6.15 (Gothic War)*, ed. and trans. H.B. Dewing (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916), 13.
41 Heather, *The Restoration of Rome*, 61.

his kingdom, and by extension, the influence of Rome.[42] Through a combination of diplomacy and political marriages, the Ostrogoths gained control of Visigoth-ruled Spain, whereupon they began to impose their own Romano-Gothic administration over their new subjects.[43] In particular, Thomas S. Burns notes that a major administrative decision carried out by the Ostrogoths in Spain was to revise their system of weights and measurements in order to allow for more equitable trade and tribute.[44] Even in the relationships with the neighbouring kingdoms that Theodoric did not conquer, one is able to see evidence of the Ostrogoths using the threat of Roman military power to maintain peace.[45] In a letter to a coalition of Germano-Gallic kings, Theodoric orders them to represent Ostrogothic interests in Gaul, stating:

> Tell him [King Clovis of the Franks] to halt the war with the Visigoths out of a regard for justice and to have recourse to the law of nations; otherwise, he will suffer the invasion of all for holding the judgment of so many in contempt.[46]

In this passage, Theodoric used rhetorical appeals to military force and justice to portray himself as the *de facto* hegemon of the western Mediterranean world.[47] In this, Theodoric and the Ostrogoths were effectively mimicking and recreating Rome's imperial power in the region, albeit under non-Roman rulers.[48]

In spite of Theodoric's attempts to present himself as the inheritor and preserver of the Western Roman Empire, during his rule there was a gradual shift away from traditional Roman interpretations of authority and administration to ones that were markedly more Germanic.[49] While the Ostrogoths made use of many Roman titles and administrative positions in their rule of Italy, the old Roman bureaucracy had largely vanished in favour of power being centered in the hands of the king and his courtiers.[50] This is also reflective of a larger shift within the post-Roman world, wherein administrative power was now in the hands of military officers chosen for their individual loyalty to the ruler rather than civil servants.[51] Likewise, by placing more power in the hands of royally appointed courtiers and generals, the Ostrogoths effectively removed the old Roman-style

42 Wolfram, *The History of the Goths*, 306-307.
43 Burns, *A History of the Ostrogoths*, 98-99.
44 Ibid., 99.
45 Cassiodorus, *Variae*, III.3. In Maas, 355.
46 Ibid.
47 Ibid.
48 Heather, *The Restoration of Rome*, 78-79.
49 Barnwell, *Emperors, Prefects, and Kings*, 146.
50 Ibid., 150-151.
51 Lafferty, *Law and Society in the Age of Theodoric the Great*, 103-104.

civil service-based aristocracy and senatorial class from any meaningful power.[52] It should also be noted that this shift to a court-based system of rule, in place of senatorial rule, had already begun during the late Roman Empire and was simply being continued by Theodoric and the Ostrogoths.[53] By concentrating more power around the king and court, offices of power that had carried numerous benefits and freedoms began to lose their privileges as they became more accountable to an active monarch.[54] It is important to note that although Theodoric and his successors presented themselves as Roman-style emperors, they never claimed the specific title of emperor, and were referred to as *rex Gothorum*, king of the Goths.[55] By avoiding the imperial title and opting for the "lesser" title of king, the Goths more closely aligned themselves to the new polities and kingdoms created by their fellow Germanic migrants in the old Roman Empire.[56] The Ostrogoths also sought to show their differences and superiority over the old Roman Empire through their written history. Cassiodorus' now lost work on the history of the Goths, for example, claimed a two thousand year history for the Gothic people compared to Rome's "mere" one thousand.[57] By making this boastful claim, the Ostrogoths sought to establish themselves as a civilization of greater authority and antiquity than the Romans.[58] Even though they did seek to present themselves as the inheritors of Rome, the Ostrogoths were equally interested in supplanting Rome as the leading hegemonic power in the Western Mediterranean.[59]

At a provincial level, the Ostrogoths' relationships with the people of Italy were more complex, as they simultaneously encouraged life to continue on as normal[60] while also prioritizing their own needs over those of their new subjects.[61] The *Anonymous Valesianus* recounts that one of the successes of Theodoric's reign was his encouragement to all the people of his empire that they "could carry on [their] business at whatever hour [they] chose, as if it were in daylight."[62] This supportive attitude towards the daily life of the Romans is further reinforced in a letter from Cassiodorus' *Variae* wherein Theodoric not only gives orders for building new infrastructure and repairing the old, but also informs his officers that they must "collect the designated quantities of provisions without plun-

52 O'Donnell, *The Ruin of the Roman Empire*, 134-135.
53 Ibid.
54 Barnwell, *Emperors, Prefects, and Kings: The Roman West, 395-565*, 159.
55 Lafferty, *Law and Society in the Age of Theodoric the Great*, 7.
56 Barnwell, *Emperors, Prefects, and Kings: The Roman West, 395-565*, 136.
57 Heather, *The Restoration of Rome*, 68-69.
58 Edward Peters, *Europe and the Middle Ages, Fourth Edition* (Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education, 2004), 84.
59 Heather, *The Restoration of Rome*, 68-69.
60 *The Anonymous Valesianus*, 12.65-7, 69-73. In Maas, 354-355.
61 Burns, *A History of the Ostrogoths*, 125.
62 *The Anonymous Valesianus*, 12.73. In Maas, 355.

dering the peasants."[63] By stressing the importance of respecting the rights and safety of their Italian subjects, as well as maintaining the infrastructure that supported their livelihoods, the Ostrogoths under Theodoric endeared themselves to the people of Italy.[64] In addition, the Ostrogoths' reliance on the old Roman laws as the basis for their government gave the people of Italy the idea that little had changed under their new rulers and that they would be protected by familiar laws, as opposed to being oppressed by foreign laws.[65]

The Ostrogoths' work to present themselves as a continuation of Roman rule for the common people is further seen by their patronage of traditional forms of Roman entertainment, as *The Anonymous Valesianus* observes that during his visit to Rome, Theodoric "exhibited games in the Circus for the Romans."[66] In addition to their support of Roman laws and infrastructure, the Ostrogoths' continuation and patronage of the daily entertainment enjoyed by the masses helped to give the Italian people confidence, like they were still under the protection of a Roman emperor.[67] This provincial sense of unity and Roman continuity can be seen even in the twilight of the Ostrogoths' rule in Italy; at the Byzantine siege of Naples by General Belisarius, Jews, Goths, and Italians fought side by side to the last man in defense of their shared home.[68]

For all of their symbolic support of Roman culture and law, the Ostrogoths' interactions with Rome at a local level ushered in many broad changes within Roman society.[69] While the Ostrogoths were generally benevolent to their new subjects, they were also more than willing to force established Roman families and farmers from their land to make way for new Gothic settlers.[70] The sense of displacement from their homeland experienced by some Romans is echoed in Boethius' *The Consolation of Philosophy*.[71] Early in the text, Boethius, a former advisor in Theodoric's court who had been condemned to death for treason, rails at the injustices inflicted upon the common people of Italy.[72] He states, "When provincials lost their wealth due through looting or through taxation by the state, my grief was no less than that of the victims."[73] To Boethius, the rule of the Ostrogoths[74] was a time of oppression for the masses and an era of degra-

63 Cassiodorus, *Variae*, XII.18. In Maas, 19-20.
64 Arnold, *Theodoric and the Roman Imperial Restoration*, 127-128.
65 Ibid., 127-129.
66 *The Anonymous Valesianus*, 12.67. In Maas, 354.
67 Ibid., 12.65-7, 69-73. In Maas, 354-355.
68 Burns, *A History of the Ostrogoths*, 208.
69 Ibid., 125.
70 Ibid.
71 Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy*, 9.
72 Ibid.
73 Ibid.
74 Boethius had worked for the Ostrogoths, holding the highest offices in court, until he was arrested and executed by them due to accusations of treason. O' Connell, *The Ruin of the Roman Empire*, 115.

dation of all things truly Roman, comparing the tyranny of the Goths to that of the first century CE emperor Caligula.[75] One might find this image of oppression to be incongruous with the laudatory praises heaped onto the rule of Theodoric by the *Anonymous Valesianus*.[76] This can be explained by the fact that the *Anonymous Valesianus* appears to focus more on the Ostrogoths' interactions with the Romans in major urban centres such as Rome, Ravenna, and Verona,[77] while all the cases provided by Boethius in criticism of Theodoric and the Ostrogoths are related to their treatment of rural communities.[78] Moreover, Boethius' circumstances at the time of writing *The Consolations* should also be noted, as it is unlikely that he would have held a positive view of the man who had condemned him to death.[79] However, this does display a disconnect between the Ostrogoths' relationship with the Italians of the city and the Italians of the country, in that they presented themselves as benevolent Roman-esque benefactors in the cities, while simultaneously seizing the countryside for their own people.[80] One possible explanation for this difference in treatment is that the Ostrogoths had more interest in the Italian countryside than the cities as a location for the settlement of their people, in particular their soldiers, as a means of permanently entrenching themselves in Italy and attaining direct control over its resources.[81] In addition, the Ostrogoths relied on the goodwill and support of the Italian cities as a source of revenue for their various endeavours, and as such would not wish to lose this vital fount of wealth.[82]

The notion of displacement found in Romano-Ostrogothic relations can also be seen in the Ostrogoths' dismantling and rearranging of one of Rome's proudest institutions, the army.[83] For much of Roman history, the army and military service was a symbol of Roman dominance and civilization.[84] However, throughout the fourth and fifth centuries, the army had been in a state of severe decline due to the economically crippling costs needed to fund and sustain it.[85] With the Ostrogoths' conquest of Italy, the new rulers appropriated these traditions for their own people while simultaneously excluding the Romans from them.[86] As noted by Burns, a key to the success of the Ostrogoths was their ability to mimic and recreate the old Roman army and its traditions, while ensuring it

75 Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy*, 9-11.
76 *The Anonymous Valesianus*, 12.65-7, 69-73. In Maas, 354-355.
77 Ibid.
78 Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy*, 9.
79 O'Donnell, *The Ruin of the Roman Empire*, 164-166.
80 Burns, *A History of the Ostrogoths*, 124-125.
81 Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 296-297.
82 Ibid., 306.
83 Adrian Goldsworthy, *The Fall of the West: Death of the Roman Superpower* (London: Phoenix, 2009), 375.
84 Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome*, 34.
85 Ibid., 41.
86 Goldsworthy, *The Fall of the West*, 375.

was comprised almost entirely of Goths.[87] A result of this was the general discouragement of native Italians from enlisting in the army, and the Ostrogoths' establishment of a social binary wherein the Goths were the warriors and defenders of the kingdom and the Italians were there to support them from afar.[88] This is not to say that Italians and non-Goths were banned from joining the army or being conscripted, but by and large the idea of military service had become entrenched as being a core feature of Gothic identity rather than Roman identity.[89] The Gothic displacement of Roman military values and the segregation of the local Italians into a civilian role is clearly articulated in Procopius' account of the succession crisis following Theodoric's death, wherein the Gothic aristocracy protests Theodoric's daughter Amalasuntha's attempts to raise her son in Roman fashion.[90] In this dramatic encounter, the nobles argue that a Roman education would be disastrous for the boy and the whole Ostrogothic people because such an education would be "far removed from manliness, and the teachings of old men results for the most part in a cowardly and submissive spirit."[91] By equating Roman virtues and education with cowardice, the Ostrogoths were able to justify their exclusion of Romans from their own army, and in doing so, effectively brought to an end the long history of Roman military might in the West.[92]

Ultimately, the greatest damage to Rome's presence in the West was the Eastern Roman Emperor Justinian's attempt to "liberate" Rome's old territory and the decades of horrific war that ensued.[93] The wars over the supremacy of Italy not only resulted in the destruction of land and infrastructure,[94] but also the concept of a unified Italy and a unified Western Roman Empire.[95] A recurring theme throughout the Byzantine-Gothic Wars was the willingness of both armies to destroy fundamental infrastructure as a means to gain short-term successes at the cost of long-term stability.[96] This is most clearly seen on the Byzantine side of the conflict during the siege of Naples, where the general Belisarius ordered the destruction of the city's aqueduct, with the goal of depriving the city's populace of fresh water.[97] The Goths would later do the same to him during their assault on Rome.[98] Herwig Wolfram observes that this destruction of the aqueducts "profoundly influenced the future of water supply in Rome

87 Burns, *A History of the Ostrogoths*, 200-201.
88 Goldsworthy, *The Fall of the West*, 375.
89 Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 300-301.
90 Procopius, *History of the Wars*, 5.2.6-19. In Maas, 356-357.
91 Ibid., 357.
92 Goldsworthy, *The Fall of the West*, 375.
93 Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome*, 58.
94 Jacobsen, *The Gothic War*, 89-90.
95 Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome*, 58.
96 Jacobsen, *The Gothic War*, 89-90.
97 Ibid., 89.
98 Ibid., 106-107.

and thus the future of the Eternal City."[99] Such actions were devastating in the long run, even if they offered short-term results in battle, as they deprived city dwellers of an accessible source of clean water needed to survive and made the city exceptionally more difficult to defend.[100] In addition, driven by the desire to prove their strength, the Ostrogoths began to tear down city walls as punishment towards cities that had defected to the Byzantines, leaving their citizens defenseless.[101] Actions such as these, in addition to the horrific massacres perpetrated by both sides of the conflict, resulted in the populace of Italy being left defenseless and devastated, as well as susceptible to looming threats such as the plague.[102]

According to Burns, one of the lasting results of the desperate actions taken by the Ostrogoths and Byzantines in order to secure money, provisions, and soldiers for their armies was the complete dismemberment of the old Roman system of taxation and the emergence of localized private wealth.[103] The wars also destroyed any semblance of central authority and unity in Italy, with power fragmenting into the hands of local church authorities and independent regional aristocrats.[104] This created a general sense of destruction and the end of an age, which is reflected in the now cloistered Cassiodorus' *An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings*, where he states "my ardent desires [the pursuit of knowledge and education] could in no way have been fulfilled because of the struggles that seethed and raged excessively in the Italian realm."[105] To Cassiodorus, the devastation of the wars had brought an end to the golden age of peace and stability of Theodoric's rule that had allowed for the freedom and prosperity required for learning.[106] Moreover, it could be argued that Cassiodorus viewed his text as a method by which he could preserve knowledge for future generations so that these ideals would not die, and that there would always be a way for people to learn from them.[107]

The destruction wrought by the Ostrogoths and the Byzantines in their futile struggle over Italy also destroyed the notion of a western imperial power centered on the authority and rule of Italy.[108] Because of the Ostrogoths' need to divert troops to Italy to fight Justinian's armies, their border territories and allies were left alone and vulnerable to foreign attacks, which occurred when the Franks crossed the Alps and ransacked

99 Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, 305.
100 Jacobsen, *The Gothic War*, 106-107.
101 Burns, *A History of the Ostrogoths*, 210-211.
102 Ibid., 209-211.
103 Ibid., 208.
104 O'Donnell, *The Ruin of the Roman Empire*, 268.
105 Cassiodorus, *An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings*, I.1. In Maas, 75.
106 Ibid., 74-75.
107 Cassiodorus, *An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings*, I.1.5-6. In Maas, 75.
108 Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome*, 58.

Northern Italy.[109] This led to the people in and around the Ostrogoths' territories looking to small-scale strongmen and their militias to defend them, rather than relying on the central government for support.[110] Likewise, vassal territories such as Visigothic Spain took advantage of the chaos in Italy to break free from Ostrogothic hegemony and re-establish their old kingdoms.[111] Even after the Byzantines' pyrrhic victory over the Ostrogoths, they were unable to properly re-establish anything resembling the old Roman Empire in the west due to the destabilization and destruction caused by the war they started, and were forced to localize their power around individual cities such as Ravenna.[112] Justinian only made the situation worse when he and his generals invited the Lombard people into Italy, which resulted in the Lombards turning on the Byzantines and starting a new war that brought further destruction to the region.[113] In this manner, the attempted realization of Justinian's dream of recreating and reviving the Western Roman Empire, which had nearly been achieved by the Ostrogoths, only led to further fragmentation and destabilization of the West.[114]

By looking at the Ostrogoths' interaction with the Western Roman Empire and their attempts to imitate it, it is evident that the fall of Rome in the West was a more complex and drawn-out affair than is often presented.[115] Although the Ostrogoths began their history as just another "barbarian" tribe that fought for and against the Romans,[116] upon taking control of Italy they strove to create a sense of familiarity and continuity with the old Western Roman Empire for their new subjects.[117] This was accomplished through the Ostrogoths' calculated use of Roman imperial titles, iconography, laws, and imperial traditions that harkened back to the long-past glory days of Rome.[118] The Ostrogoths also sought to re-establish Roman imperial hegemony in the West through both war and diplomacy, enabling the ideal for a western Rome-centred empire to endure.[119] At the same time, while the Ostrogoths began to alter Roman understandings of governance to fit with their own culture, changing the ideas of government from the principles of Roman government to something more Germanic.[120] On a provincial level, the Ostrogothic rulers gave their Italian subjects a sense of stability and continuity through their preservation

109 O'Donnell, *The Ruin of the Roman Empire*, 260.
110 Ibid., 260-261.
111 Burns, *A History of the Ostrogoths*, 100.
112 O'Donnell, *The Ruin of the Roman Empire*, 267.
113 Ibid., 284.
114 Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome*, 58.
115 O'Donnell, *The Ruin of the Roman Empire*, 72.
116 Barnwell, *Emperors, Prefects, and Kings: The Roman West, 395-565*, 135.
117 Arnold, *Theodoric and the Roman Imperial Restoration*, 127-128.
118 Ibid., 144-146.
119 Burns, *A History of the Ostrogoths*, 98-99.
120 Barnwell, *Emperors, Prefects, and Kings: The Roman West, 395-565*, 150-151.

and support of Roman infrastructure, public works, laws, and entertainment.[121]

On the other hand, the Ostrogoths effectively destroyed the Roman army as an institution by discouraging Italians from the new Gothic-led army and by effectively eliminating the old Roman ideals of martial glory.[122] Ultimately, it would be the vicious war between the Ostrogoths and the Eastern Roman Empire over control of Italy that would cause the destruction of the idea of Roman hegemony in the West.[123] Although both sides saw themselves as the defenders of Rome's legacy, their devastating actions in the war destroyed any semblance of Roman society left in Italy both on a local[124] and an imperial level.[125] When examining the Ostrogoths, it is important to ask; were their actions and laws during their rule of Italy a continuation of Roman tradition, or was it the sign of a polity being built out of the wreckage of the past? As such, although the Ostrogoths spent much of their rule of Italy struggling to preserve and revive Roman power in the West,[126] their mutually destructive war with the Eastern Roman Empire can be seen as the true cause for the death of the Roman Empire as a provincial and ideological entity in the West.[127]

121 *The Anonymous Valesianus*, 12.65-7, 69-73. In Maas, 354-355.
122 Goldsworthy, *The Fall of the West*, 375.
123 Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome*, 58.
124 O'Donnell, *The Ruin of the Roman Empire*, 268.
125 Burns, *A History of the Ostrogoths*, 100.
126 *The Anonymous Valesianus*, 12.65-7, 69-73. In Maas, 354-355.
127 O'Donnell, *The Ruin of the Roman Empire*, 266-268.

Bibliography

Arnold, Jonathan J. *Theodoric and the Roman Imperial Restoration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Barnwell, Paul. S. *Emperor, Prefect, and Kings: The Roman West, 395-565*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Boethius. *The Consolation of Philosophy*. Translated by P.G.Walsh. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Burns, Thomas S. *A History of the Ostrogoths*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Goldsworthy, Adrian. *The Fall of the West: The Death of the Roman Superpower*. London: Phoenix Books, 2009.

Heather, Peter. *Goths and the Romans: 332-489*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Heather, Peter. *The Restoration of Rome: Barbarian Popes and Imperial Pretenders*. London: Pan Books, 2014.

Lafferty, Sean D.W. *Law and Society in The Age of Theodoric the Great: A Study of the Edictum Theodorici*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Jacobsen, Tortsen Cumberland. *The Gothic War*. Yardley: Westholme Publishing LLC, 2009.

Maas, Michael. *Readings in Late Antiquity: A Sourcebook, Second Edition*. London: Routledge, 2010.

O'Donnell, James J. *The Ruin of the Roman Empire*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2008.

Procopius. *History of the Wars Volume III: Books 5-6.15 (Gothic War)*. Translated by H.B. Dewing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916.

Ward-Perkins, Bryan. *The Fall of Rome and The End of Civilization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Wolfram, Herwig. *History of the Goths*. Translated by Thomas J. Dunlap. Berkley: University of California Press, 1988.

The Horror of Seneca's Oedipus

Clifton Tataryn

The explicit use of horror in Seneca's *Oedipus* sets it apart from other tragedies in antiquity. Horror is conventionally defined as a genre that intends to frighten, disgust, or startle its audience by inducing feelings of terror and horror.[1] Another important element of horror often put forward is the presence of a monster or entity which the characters of the story regard as abnormal or a disturbance to the natural order.[2] Compared to other Greco-Roman tragedies, *Oedipus* is notable in that it contains all the features considered essential to the horror genre, and these features are present throughout every point in the play.[3] Indeed, the pervasiveness of elements in *Oedipus* intended to shock, horrify, and even sicken has been criticized for generations.[4] This paper will make note of and elaborate upon instances in *Oedipus* where horror plays a fundamental role. When appropriate, this paper will examine *Oedipus*' similarities and differences with Seneca's other tragedies, as well as works by other ancient authors. Finally, drawing attention to the pervasiveness of horror elements in *Oedipus* will demonstrate that Seneca's chief objective was to elicit fear and disgust in his audience, making this play the earliest piece of western literature which can be considered unambiguously part of the "horror" genre.
To begin, one need not look further than the play's first lines:

> Iam nocte Titan dubius expulsa redit
> et nube maestus squalida exoritur iubar,
> lumenque flamma triste luctifica gerens
> prospiciet avida peste solatas domos,
> stragemque quam nox fecit ostendet dies.
>
> Now, with night expelled, the sun rises reluctantly.
> It shines gloomily, rising amidst a noxious haze.

1 Literary historian J. A. Cuddon defines a horror story as "a piece of fiction in prose of variable length... which shocks or even frightens the reader, or perhaps induces a feeling of repulsion or loathing"; J.A. Cuddon, introduction to *The Penguin Book of Horror Stories* (London: Bloomsbury, 1991), 11.
2 Noel Carroll, *The Philosophy of Horror, or, Paradoxes of the Heart* (New York: Routledge Press, 2003), 16.
3 Seneca, *Oedipus*, in *The Complete Tragedies*, trans. Susanna Braund (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2017), 7.
4 Austin Busch, "Versane Natura Est? Natural and Linguistic Instability in the Extispicium and Self-Blinding of Seneca's Oedipus," *The Classical Journal* 102, no. 3 (2007): 225; Seneca, *Four Tragedies and Octavia*, trans. E.F. Watling (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1966), 207; Clarence W. Mandell, *Our Seneca* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 13.

> Bearing its sad light and grievous flame,
> it looks upon homes gutted by a greedy plague.
> And the light of day reveals the destruction night has wrought. (1-5)

Seneca brings to the forefront a vivid, apocalyptic vision of Thebes. This is an appropriate way to begin a work of horror, as it introduces a major challenge to the main character—it spurs them into action.[5] These opening lines not only establish the dismal mood of the play but also offer the story's first clues to Oedipus' fate and future events in the play and beyond.[6] The presence of "*nocte*" and "*expulse*" in the first line presages Oedipus' later self-blinding and banishment from Thebes,[7] and the idea of the sun hesitating to rise at all is also used by Seneca in *Thyestes* and *Agamemnon*,[8] being considered a conventional omen of disaster.[9] The sun's reluctance is indeed significant, as "*Titan dubius*" expresses not only the dim appearance of the sun, but also the many types of "doubt" in the play. Oedipus feels doubt and fear towards himself as he becomes increasingly worried about why all these misfortunes are happening.[10] Unknown to him but not the audience, his patricidal, incestuous crimes have upturned the entire cosmic order.[11]

Oedipus alludes to his fate as he laments the evils his kingship has brought,[12] and pronounces his lurking fear that he has unknowingly done something to have caused all this:

> infanda timeo: ne mea genitor manu
> perimatur. hoc me Delphicae laurus monent
> aliudque nobis maius indicunt scelus.
> est maius aliquod patre mactato nefas?
> pro misera pietas eloqui fatum pudet,
> thalamos parentis Phoebus et diros toros
> nato minatur impia incestos face.
>
> I fear the unspeakable: my father killed by my own hand.
> The Delphic oracle warned me of this
> and announced another, greater crime.
> Is there any crime greater than patricide?
> O cursed love! I'm ashamed to speak of my fate,
> Apollo threatens a son with his own mother's bed,
> incestuous sheets and an impious bedside torch. (15-21)

5 Carroll, *Horror*, 98-100.
6 Ibid., 99.
7 A.J. Boyle, *Seneca: Oedipus*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 104.
8 Sen. *Thy*. 120; Sen. *Ag*. 908.
9 Boyle, *Oedipus*, 105; see also Luc., 7.1-6.
10 Boyle, *Oedipus*, lvii.
11 Ibid., lviii.
12 Ibid., 108.

He fears precisely what the oracular response warned ("*laurus monent*," 16): namely, the killing of his father by his own hand ("*mea… manu*," 15) and having incestuous relations with his mother ("*thalamos parentis Phoebus et diros toros/nato minatur impia incestos face*," 20-1), crimes which are deemed unspeakable ("*infanda*," 15). He feels shame even recounting such things ("*eloqui fatum pudet*," 19). A deep sense of paranoia and anxiety becomes apparent when he states that he doesn't even trust himself ("*parum ipse fidens mihimet*," 24; "*non credo mihi*," 27). The idea of a paranoid, victimized Oedipus crops up again and again, hinted at earlier when he characterizes himself as an "isolated cliff" ("*rupem… dirimentem*," 8-10) battered by the waves of the vast ocean. This paranoia comes to the forefront as he exclaims that the fates have something in store for him ("*aliquid in nos fata moliri parant*," 28). He states that he must be cursed by Apollo ("*scilicet Phoebi reus*," 34), and is therefore harming the wider world around him ("*fecimus caelum nocens*," 36). This fearful, suspicious attitude towards Apollo stands in stark contrast to Sophocles' Oedipus, who appears to have a good relationship with Apollo.[13] This important difference between the two plays highlights Seneca's Oedipus as psychologically disturbed, a common element throughout the play and the horror genre in general.[14] Even more threatening to Oedipus than the plague is the truth about his crimes, a truth that threatens to destroy his family, the natural order, and, worst of all, his own identity.

Oedipus then transitions from describing his own anxieties to describing the truly upended state of nature in which he now lives. No breeze, nor warm westerly winds (*Zephyri*), come to Thebes, but the humid, plague-bringing southerly winds of the summer do instead (37-40).[15] All vegetation has browned and died, the rivers have dried up ("*deseruit amnes umor atque herbas color*," 41), and blight has struck the fields, the harvest withering upon the stalk (49-51). The faint sun, already mentioned as rising amid a noxious fog, scarcely heralds the day to the sad world; the night sky is starless and shrouded by the same fog, now appearing as a dense black vapor (45-7). A hellish appearance has settled upon mankind ("*obtexit…/inferna facies*," 48-9).[16] Oedipus describes how a sick father and hysteric mother lug their dead sons to the pyres (59-61). This destruction of a family foreshadows that of his own. In this apocalyptic setting, innocent human life is being relentlessly threatened by natural forces. The destruction of families and the upending of the natural order in apocalyptic fashion are common elements of horror and are immediately recognizable in the genre today.[17]

13 Soph., *OT*, 136, 146, 244-5; Boyle, *Oedipus*, 121.
14 Carroll, *Horror*, 43.
15 Ovid, *Met*., 7.554-5; Homer, *Il*. 11.62, 22.30.
16 *inferna facies* stands out, beginning the line (49) and followed by a *caesura*.
17 For 'family horror,' see Carroll, *Horror*, 209; for apocalyptic themes see Carroll, *Horror*, 139.

The beginning of Seneca's *Oedipus* is significantly different from Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*. Seneca's choice of a fearful, anxious Oedipus stands in stark contrast to Sophocles' play, where Oedipus is presented as a caring, pious king, speaking with the children of Thebes and a priest of Zeus.[18] The difference between the two plays' beginnings has raised questions about whether Seneca's version is a tragedy at all.[19] In *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the protagonist is at the height of his prosperity, the falling from which being considered by Aristotle essential to a tragedy—the fall "from good fortune to bad" ("ἐξ εὐτυχίας εἰς δυστυχίαν")[20] being the archetypal tragic plot.[21] On the contrary, Seneca's Oedipus begins the play already in the midst of his misfortunes. Though not at his nadir yet, he experiences no great fall from grace wherein a lofty character is laid low by fate or misfortune. Oedipus is already miserable, becoming more so as the play progresses.

Between the first and second acts, the chorus sings about the appalling state of Thebes and how plague has devastated the once glorious city. Of the Thebans, the chorus says "we fall, ravished by vicious fate" ("*labimur saevo rapiente fato*," 125). They describe how the people have formed long, grim columns, all heading towards their own graves (126-7). The lines halt, however, as the seven gates of Thebes are not wide enough to fit all the people funnelling through them. Dead bodies begin to pile atop one another (131-2). Even the boatman on the river Styx, though tough and strong, is exhausted from constantly ferrying new souls to the underworld (166-70). The chorus describes in detail how the people have died horrible deaths: first their limbs become lethargic, their faces flush, spots appear on their skin, and they come down with fiery fevers; then their eyes bulge with blood, freezing their stares as their bodies waste away. Their ears are constantly ringing, and black gore drips from their noses as their veins give way and burst open (182-90). Their bodies quake with constant screaming. Multitudes flock to the altars, not to pray for salvation but rather for death ("*prostrata iacet turba per aras/oratque mori*," 191-201). This graphic, haunting ode owes much of its detail to previous authors. In the sixth book of his *De rerum natura*, Lucretius describes the effects of plague in great detail.[22] Thucydides also describes the devastation caused by the plague of Athens in his *History of the Peloponnesian War*, a plague that struck the city several times during the fifth century BCE.[23] In *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the first choral song describes the effects of the

18 Soph., *OT*, 1-13.

19 Boyle, *Oedipus*, lvi; N. Palmieri, "Sulla struttura drammatica dell'Edipo di Seneca, Annali della Facoltà di lettere di Siena." *AFLS* 4 (1983): 120.

20 Arist., *Poet*., 1453a17.

21 Aristotle defines the genre in this section, notably adding "…and it must not be due to villainy but to some great flaw…" (*Poet*., 1453a17).

22 Lucr., 6.1145-6, 1158-9, 1167, 1237.

23 Thuc., 2.47-52.

plague afflicting Thebes, but is more hopeful and bears no resemblance to the graphic physiological descriptions that permeate Seneca's version.[24] Furthermore, Seneca's opening choral odes generally have a strong relationship with the preceding act,[25] and so it is only natural that this ode would expand upon the devastation described by Oedipus in the opening act.[26]

The second scene to be examined in this paper is the extispicy, the examination of animal entrails, where Tiresias and Manto attempt to compel Laius' ghost to name its killer. This scene is not only frightening but also reveals much of what will happen to Oedipus and his family.[27] Manto performs the ritual while blind Tiresias asks about the details as they occur. This is an effective way to portray the extispicy to the audience in "real-time," with Tiresias representing the audience, satisfying our desire to know the terrifying details as they unfold. Prior to the sacrifice and examination of the entrails, Manto tosses incense upon the fire and Tiresias asks how the fire behaved (304-7). She says the fire suddenly blazed and then suddenly died ("*Subito refulsit lumine et subito occidit*," 308). Tiresias then inquires about the details of the flame itself, and Manto describes its shifting form and array of colours ("*varios.../…colores*," 315-6) like a rainbow ("*picto… sinu*," 317). This confusion as to the nature of the flame has been seen to parallel the confusion Oedipus feels about his own identity.[28] However, when Manto describes how the flame went out, changing from blood-red to blackness ("*sanguinea rursus; ultima in tenebras abit*.," 320),[29] more obvious omens arise. The flame rises from the altar again, but this time it parts, splitting into two "hostile" flames ("*pugnax ignis in partes duas/discedit et se scindit.../discors favilla*," 321-23). This is clearly a reference to the hostility between Oedipus' sons Eteocles and Polynices—a hostility which evidently continued even after their deaths—as the fire rising from their shared funeral pyre also split in two.[30] Manto then exclaims that what she then sees is terrifying ("*horresco intuens*," 323): the wine turns into blood ("*libata… permutat cruor*," 324) and thick smoke settles around the king's head, especially his face and eyes ("*densus… fumus caput/… vultus sedet*," 325-6). Wine turning to blood is a bad omen in Seneca's tragedies: the same occurs during Atreus' preparations for the "sacrifice" of Thyestes' children, with ill-omened smoke rising from their burning flesh.[31] The

24 Boyle, *Oedipus*, 144.
25 Ibid., 143.
26 Ibid., 143-4.
27 Busch, "Versane Natura Est," 228.
28 Boyle, *Oedipus*, 191.
29 Ibid., 192. No convincing argument has been put forth as to the nature of each colour change, but the central ideas of change, doubt, and uncertainty are obvious. Clear too is the assumption that *sanguinea* represents Laius' and/or Jocasta's death, and *tenebras* Oedipus' future blindness.
30 Boyle, *Oedipus*, 193; Busch, "Versane Natura Est," 228.
31 Sen., *Thy*., 700-1, 772-5.

smoke rising up to Oedipus' eyes has a double meaning: it obviously foreshadows Oedipus' later self-blinding,[32] but it can also refer to his present "blindness," and the ignorance of the truth he seeks.
Manto then sacrifices the bull and heifer. During the sacrifice, however, the bull sees the light of day and shrinks away from it ("*radios fugit*," 339), and requires two blows ("*duos/ictus*," 342-3) to kill, while the heifer willfully seeks the blade ("*ferro semet… induit*," 341). The bull's fear of the light, in addition to being another reference to "blindness," also represents Oedipus' fear of the truth, hinted at by the use of *ortus* ("origin/womb," 339).[33] Jocasta's eventual suicide is alluded to explicitly by the heifer's willful death, but perhaps also more implicitly by the earlier wine-to-blood transformation, as the same preceded Dido's suicide in Virgil's *Aeneid*.[34] When Tiresias asks Manto the manner in which the blood flows from the sacrificial victims, the scene suddenly becomes even more horrifying:

Man. Huius per ipsam qua patet pectus viam
effusus amnis, huius exiguo graves
maculantur ictus imbre; sed versus retro
per ora multus sanguis atque oculos redit.

Man. The blood pours out of the heifer like a river
through the hole in her breast,
the bull's deep wounds are flecked with little droplets.
Now great streams of blood are turning back,
flowing backwards they erupt through the bull's
mouth and eyes. (347-50)

Blood gushes out like a river, but then suddenly stops and begins flowing backwards ("*versus retro*," 349), entering the bull's head through its mouth and eyes ("*per ora… oculos redit*," 350). Tiresias exclaims that this sacrifice is terrifying ("*magnos… terrores cient*," 351), but insists she inspect the entrails. When Manto holds up the *exta* for examination, instead of quivering ("*levi motu*," 353) as they usually do, they shake in her hands violently ("*quatiunt*," 355), and strange blood spews forth from the livid veins ("*prosilit venis cruor*," 355). The heart is diseased and withered ("*cor marcet aegrum*," 356), and the rotting liver spews black bile ("*felle nigro tabidum spumat iecur*," 358). She gives an elaborate description of two protruding bulges on the liver, the "hostile" one having seven veins, signifying Oedipus' two sons and their future civil war (360-65).[35] A great many organs are missing ("*magna pars fibris abest*," 357), and the ones that are present

32 Boyle, *Oedipus*, 193; Busch, "Versane Natura Est," 229.
33 Boyle, *Oedipus*, 195.
34 Ibid., 193; Verg., *Aen*., 4.455.
35 Boyle, *Oedipus*, 199.

are not in their proper places ("*sede nil propria iacet*," 366). The lungs are bloody and on the right side of the chest, while the heart is not on the left side either (368-9). Manto exclaims that nature has been inverted ("*Natura versa est*," 371), a theme already seen to be prevalent in *Oedipus* but also Seneca's other tragedies.[36] Additionally, a horror scene involving an extispicy with deformed, diseased *viscera* would not be complete without those performing it discovering a fetus, and then the victim suddenly reanimating:

> temptantque turpes mobilem trunci gradum,
> et inane surgit corpus ac sacros petit
> cornu ministros; viscera effugiunt manum.
>
> These hacked torsos are trying to get up!
> This gaping corpse is rising, and is lunging at us!
> The entrails are flying out of my hands! (378-80)

Manto discovers a fetus inside the heifer, despite it being unmated ("*conceptus innuptae bovis*," 373), and furthermore it is in a strange location ("*alieno in loco*," 374). This is commonly seen as a reference to the unnatural relationship between Oedipus, Jocasta, and their offspring.[37] Suddenly, with a groan and trembling limbs, the heifer beings to move. In fact, both the heifer and bull come to life again and try to get up ("*temptantque… mobilem… gradum*," 378). One of the gaping bodies rises and lunges violently at Manto and Tiresias as the entrails flee her hands (378-80). This graphic description of an extispicy gone wrong begins to move the play into the realm of body horror, a genre that focusses upon "graphic, unnatural transformation, degeneration or destruction of the body."[38] Themes such as decay, disease, and mutation are prevalent throughout the genre, and are certainly present in this scene. Such a graphic scene could unsettle or even disturb a modern audience, despite the fact that extispicy is no longer practised widely nor its efficacy believed. However, much of the original audience of Seneca's *Oedipus* would have had little doubt as to the power of extispicy. As such, to Seneca's original audience, this scene would have been on their minds as a most frightening possibility the next time they were present for a ritual sacrifice.

The final horrific scene is Oedipus' self-blinding, a visceral and even nauseating scene considerably more graphic than its predecessors.[39] Once he discovers the truth about his father's murder and his incestuous marriage with Jocasta, Oedipus returns to his palace and wishes to die by

36 Braund, *Oedipus*, 7; Boyle, *Oedipus*, 200; *Phoen*. 84-5, 478; *Ag*. 34, *Phaed*. 173.
37 Boyle, *Oedipus*, 201; Busch, "Versane Natura Est," 229.
38 *Collins English Dictionary*, 11th ed. (2011), s.v. "body horror."
39 Boyle, *Oedipus*, 330-1.

various unpleasant means. First he wishes to be stabbed with steel or fire ("*…pectus aut ferro petat/aut fervido… igne*," 927-8), or crushed with a rock ("*saxo domet*," 928), then perhaps his guts torn at by a tigress or bird of prey ("*tigris… saeva visceribus meis/incurret ales*," 930), or even some beasts or rabid dogs ("*feras in me…/…vel rabidos canes*," 931-2). However, he feels that such punishments, while appropriate for killing his father, are not enough for the incestuous relations with his mother (938-51). He decides to tear out his own eyes, a process which Seneca describes in a most graphic fashion: he turns his hands upon his own face ("*manus in ora torsit*," 962), his eyes throbbing as he gouges them out with clawed hands ("*scrutatur… manibus uncis*," 965); his hands then cling inside his eye sockets, tearing at the empty cavities ("*haeret in vacuo…/unguibus lacerat cavos*," 967-8), and "eyeless holes scan the tracts of heaven";[40] finally, he tears off the nerves dangling from his eyeballs ("*quidquid effossis male/dependet oculis rumpit*," 973-4). Even the messenger reporting these events says that Oedipus does all this with "pointless fury and excessive rage" (970). Seneca has a proclivity for graphic messenger speeches, as he uses messengers to report Atreus' cannibalistic feast in *Thyestes*, and also to report Hippolytus' dismemberment in *Phaedra*.[41] Seneca's description of Oedipus' self-blinding is much more horrific than the self-blinding of Sophocles.[42] A major reason for this is the fact that the self-blinding in the Greek play is with the pins of Jocasta's dress, as opposed to his own hands.[43] However, Seneca's use of hands for blinding was certainly not the first in Roman literature, as Hecuba uses her fingers to blind Polymestor and so too was Gryneus blinded in the same manner, both in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.[44] As a whole, according to Boyle, a focus on bloody details is "typical of the treatment of violence" by other imperial Roman authors.[45]

One of the intents of visceral horror is to cause revulsion.[46] Not only is there a lot of viscera and body parts in *Oedipus*, such as graphic descriptions of plague victims, but in several cases they behave unnaturally, having a sort of supernatural quality about them: mutated organs foretell the future, an abnormal fetus epitomizes the main characters, and the slaughtered bull and heifer rise again. These are scenes meant to not only frighten the audience, but to also hint at several well-known aspects of the wider story.[47] Although grotesque imagery involving death, gore, and the reversal of the natural order is not uncommon in Seneca's other plays,[48] in

40 Boyle, *Oedipus*, 71.
41 *Thy.*, 755-75; *Phaed.*, 1093-1114; Boyle, *Oedipus*, 330.
42 Boyle, *Oedipus*, 330.
43 Soph., *OT*, 1268-79.
44 *Met.*, 13.559-64; *Met*., 12.268-70.
45 Boyle, *Oedipus*, 330.
46 Carroll, *Horror*, 50; Busch, "Versane Natura Est," 228-9.
47 Busch, "Versane Natura Est," 230.
48 Braund, *Oedipus*, 6-8.

Oedipus these themes are pervasive and amplified.[49] Thus, it does not seem like a stretch to place *Oedipus* within the scope of today's genre of horror. One of the central aims of horror is to thrust the audience into an analogous emotional state with the story—a state of abnormal, physically-felt agitation.[50] To Seneca and his intended audience, his were not merely isolated works of literature, but symptoms of the late Julio-Claudian age.[51] Seneca lived in a self-consciously dying world that felt the onset of its own dissolution.[52] As such, his audience—an especially religious and superstitious one—was already fearful to begin with.[53] When Seneca grabbed his audience's attention and thrust them into this frightful, disturbing rendition of Oedipus' story, blurring the space between the stage and reality, he made them believe that pieces of the story could be waiting for them just around the corner.[54]

49 Ibid., 7.
50 Carroll, *Horror*, 27.
51 Boyle, *Oedipus*, xxiv-xxv.
52 Ibid.
53 Busch, "Versane Natura Est," 228-9.
54 Carroll, *Horror*, 27-8.

Bibliography

Boyle, A.J., *Seneca Oedipus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Busch, Austin. "Versane Natura Est? Natural and Linguistic Instability in the Extispicium and Self-Blinding of Seneca's Oedipus." *The Classical Journal* 102, no. 3 (2007): 225-267.

Carroll, Noel. *The Philosophy of Horror, or, Paradoxes of the Heart*. New York: Routledge Press, 2003.

Cuddon, J. A. *The Penguin Book of Horror Stories*. London: Bloomsbury, 1991.

Mandell, Clarence W. *Our Seneca*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

Palmieri, N. "Sulla struttura drammatica dell'Edipo di Seneca, Annali della Facoltà di lettere di Siena." *AFLS* 4 (1983): 115-164.

Seneca, *The Complete Tragedies*. Translated by Shadi Bartsch, Susanna Morton Braund, Alex Dressler, Elaine Fantham, and David Konstan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017.

Seneca, *Four Tragedies and Octavia*, translated by E.F. Watling. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1966.

The Archaeology of Late Roman Greece's Imperial Administration

Erica Venturo

After Rome acheived victory in the Third Macedonian War (171-168 BCE) and destroyed Corinth in 146 BCE, the Achaeans became increasingly influential to Roman literature, art, religion, and many other aspects of life. While Greece played a major role in the development of Rome, Roman influence on Greece was slower. Archaeological evidence collected from surveys conducted across mainland Greece and the islands, particularly Antikythera, uncovered a ubiquitous trend of very low artifact counts from the Middle Roman Imperial period with a sharp increase in artifacts dated to the Late Roman period. Furthermore, analysis of imperial policies revealed that this increase occurred after the reforms of the emperors Diocletian and Constantine, who both encouraged investment in the East due to the constant threat of barbarian attacks in the West. Based on the archaeological data and imperial policies implemented at the beginning of the Late Roman period, it is reasonable to conclude that the marked growth of finds from that time period was a response to public policy. Therefore, it is evident that the constant threat of barbarian attacks in the West encouraged the reforms of Diocletian and the establishment of Constantinople as the "New Rome." These reforms in Late Roman Greece's imperial administration directed trade and bureaucrats to the Eastern Roman Empire, increased settlement in Greece, and led to a marked growth in artifacts dated to the Late Roman period.

To start, intensive surveys across mainland Greece and the island of Antikythera revealed a pattern of periodic low and high settlement throughout Roman occupation, and that the shift from low settlement during the Middle Roman period to high settlement during the Late Roman period was a particularly noticeable increase. Specifically, David Pettegrew's records from the Eastern Korinthia Archaeological Survey showed that 573 surveyed units contained Late Roman pottery, while only 193 units contained Middle Roman pottery.[1] Further, 1,707 Late Roman pottery sherds were collected, while only 329 identifiable Middle Roman pottery sherds were recorded.[2] Of the samples collected, the Middle Roman pottery was composed of mainly utilitarian vessels that lacked the

1 David Pettegrew, "Regional Survey and the Boom-and-Bust Countryside: Re-Reading the Archaeological Evidence for Episodic Abandonment in the Late Roman Corinthia," *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 14, no. 2 (2010): 219.
2 Ibid.

distinctive designs of the predominantly Palestinian and Aegean trade amphorae found on the Eastern Korinthia survey. This comprised 63% of all Late Roman assemblage.[3] Aside from trade amphorae, the Eastern Korinthia survey recorded that Roman fine ware imports increased exponentially from three Candarli and African Red Slip wares in the Middle Roman period to seventy-one Phocaean Red Slip Ware and ARS sherds in the Late Roman period.[4] Nevertheless, comparable counts of Middle Roman and Late Roman rims, bases, handles, kitchen, and fine wares found on the Eastern Korinthia survey indicated that there was continuous Roman occupation in Eastern Korinthia, but that the Late Roman period ushered in a renewed age of above-average settlement. Overall, the archaeological record of the Eastern Korinthia Archaeological Survey exemplified a sharp rise in finds from the Late Roman period.

In addition to the Eastern Korinthia survey, intensive surveys conducted on the Southern Argolid, Methana, Nemea, and Pylos all had low levels of artifacts from 100 BCE to 300 CE, and then a marked increase in finds from 300 CE to 700 CE.[5] These surveys also recorded a prevalence of large estates associated with Late Roman occupation. In particular, the Nemea Valley Archaeological Project and the Pylos Regional Archaeological Project had high concentrations of sites in the range of 1.1-5.0 hectares and no sites smaller than 0.30 hectares, with two of the sites from the Nemea Valley project and one site from the Pylos Regional Project definitively confirmed as Late Roman villas.[6] It is evident from the finds of red slipped ware, worked stone, coarse and plain wares, pottery, and tile from these large sites that these were agricultural villas. In fact, it was believed that the Pylos Regional Project villa had a quarry, salt pan, and a fish pond as part of its agricultural industries. Likewise, this predominance of Roman villas was also evident on the opposite coast of Greece. Specifically, a survey in Methana classified two *villae rusticae.* One of these villas was in a remote location and had remains of an olive press and costly farm tools, but lacked many fine wares, which indicates tenant-run farms under the control of an elite who owned the villa.[7] Thus, the archaeological evidence from intense surveys in Methana, Pylos, Nemea, and on the Southern Argolid displayed noticeable growth in artifacts from 300 to 700 CE compared to the earlier period of settlement. This growth in artifact numbers indicates that settlement was concentrated in large estates in Pylos and Methana due to the Roman elite's investment in agricultural cultivation in the remote Greek countryside.

3 Pettegrew, "Regional Survey," 219.
4 Ibid., 220-221.
5 Ibid., 216.
6 Cynthia Kosso, *The Archaeology of Public Policy in Late Roman Greece, British Archaeological Reports International Series 1126* (Oxford: Basingstoke Press, 2003), 40.
7 Kosso, *Archaeology of Public Policy*, 44.

A comparison of mainland to island surveys found that this pattern of low and high settlement indicates a shift across the entire province of Achaea and the Aegean. An intensive survey on Antikythera similar to the Eastern Korinthia project found that most of the Roman pottery assemblage dates to the Late Roman period. Of the samples collected, there was a predominance in Phocaean Red Slip sherds in the Late Roman period (58.2%), while only 18.8% of Late Roman pottery was African Red Slip.[8] In fact, the survey found that African Red Slip, which was produced in northern Tunisia and was very common in the Western Roman Empire, was gradually replaced with Phocaean Red Slip Ware starting in the fourth century. In fact, except for in Argos and Crete, Phocaean Red Slip Ware became the most common fine ware throughout Late Roman Greece. Additionally, like in Eastern Korinthia, transport amphorae comprised a majority (42-59%) of all Late Roman assemblage, but in contrast to Eastern Korinthia, Antikythera had far less Late Roman Amphora I than Late Roman Amphorae II. The African Late Roman amphorae common to other parts of the Aegean were found in very low numbers, and Italian amphorae were not clearly identified at all.[9] Finally, while coarse ware was an important part of mainland surveys, it comprised only 31-37% of the all Antikytheran Roman assemblage, which was less than the mainland assemblages.[10] Therefore, based on the material evidence from Eastern Korinthia, Nemea, Pylos, Methana, and Antikythera, it is evident that even though the mainland samples differ in type and in quantity from the island assemblage, the increase in finds from Middle Roman to Late Roman Greece was a province wide phenomenon.

Aside from the material evidence, it is easy to see that, after analyzing imperial administrative policy, this influx of Late Roman pottery was a result of new investment in the Eastern Roman Empire, particularly through the reforms of Diocletian and Constantine. Diocletian came to power in 284 CE after a period of political turmoil with over fifty emperors in almost fifty years.[11] While Roman generals fought amongst themselves to rule Rome, barbarian tribes that were settled close to the northern borders crossed into poorly defended Roman territory and disrupted trade routes and rural communities. Consequently, cities from 200 to 500 CE built fortification walls around their borders using ancient *spolia* to quickly strengthen existing and less extensive city defenses.[12]

Diocletian realized that walls would not be sufficient to deal with

8 A. Quercia et al, "Roman Pottery from an Intensive Survey of Antikythera, Greece," *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 106 (November 2011): 55.

9 Quercia, "Intensive Survey of Antikythera," 58.

10 Ibid., 60.

11 Susan Alcock, *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 19.

12 Bintliff, John, *The Complete Archaeology of Greece: From Hunter-Gatherers to the 20th Century AD* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2012), 252.

the growing barbarian threat and, with the rise of the Sasanians in the East, he instituted a tetrarchic system to address the Roman Empire's security issues. In the tetrarchy, Diocletian divided the Roman Empire formally into four areas and chose to rule the Eastern Roman Empire (the quadrant closest to the Sasanians) because he saw the challenges of the third century crisis and the barbarian attacks in the Western Roman Empire as a precursor to its decline and recognized the potential of the East. Accordingly, Diocletian established administrative reforms that led to the flourishing of the Eastern Roman Empire. Diocletian established 101 new provinces, each divided into twelve to fifteen *dioces,* in which each province had a governor who would answer to the vicars of the *dioces*.[13] Diocletian's bureaucratic reforms established an imperial court in each province. Consequently, territories in Greece that used to be primarily residential began to fill with Roman villas built by elites from the Western Roman Empire in order to be closer to the newly established imperial courts. As Bintliff explains, "the explosion of rural sites in Greece and other parts of the Eastern Empire from the 4th century on arose, to a significant extent, as commercial estates to service these needs [of the elite]."[14]

Constantine then continued this investment in the Eastern Roman Empire when he established Constantinople, the "New Rome" of the empire. Once Constantinople was established as the imperial capital in 330 CE, Constantine created a new axis of trade and intra-connectedness within the Roman Empire in the East.[15] As new senatorial and elite families moved to Constantinople because of the emperor's reforms concerning desired luxury goods, Constantinople became a new trade center. This directed trade to the East, which established new trade centers and routes along the coasts and expanded old trading hubs such as Athens and Corinth. As Bintliff explains, "the new focus of Constantinople at the head of the Aegean Sea, converted Greece, hitherto a sleepy backwater with low external imports and exports, into the heart of the empire."[16] Therefore, the reforms of Diocletian and Constantine in response to the deteriorating Western Roman Empire brought new investment to Achaea, as new imperial courts and the establishment of Constantinople as the "New Rome" and Greece as the "New Italy" made Greece the new center of political, economic, and societal activity in the Roman Empire.

Based on the archaeological evidence and the imperial policies implemented at the start of the Late Roman period, it is fair to make preliminary conclusions that the imperial administration led to increased settlement in Achaea and resulted in the noticeable growth of pottery from Late Roman Greece. For instance, the findings from Eastern Korinthia,

13 Alcock, *Graecia Capta*, 22.
14 Bintliff, *Complete Archaeology of Greece*, 352.
15 Quercia, "Intensive Survey of Antikythera," 64.
16 Bintliff, *Complete Archaeology of Greece*, 352.

when analysed in the context of the founding of Constantinople, demonstrate that East Korinthia experienced increased vitality, wealth, and regional connections to the broader Mediterranean society because of new trade routes. These trade routes were established across Greece for ships to carry goods from the West, the former seat of power in the Roman Empire, to Constantinople and the East, the new center of imperial power.[17] In fact, the lack of imported fine wares and amphorae in the Middle Roman rural landscape exemplifies the previous isolation local Greek economies endured when the Roman Empire was centered in the West, while the perceptible increase in quantity of Late Roman assemblage most likely represents the influx of trade sparked by the development of new trade markets after Constantinople became the "New Rome."

The difference in amphorae types recorded on Antikythera compared to mainland surveys also reflects the different economic functions the Greek mainland and the islands served in the Late Roman period. After Diocletian reorganized the bureaucratic system, elites moved to Greek lands which were previously unused, as is determined based on very low counts of material evidence from the Middle Roman period in these areas, to be close to imperial courts. As a result, the mainland became the center for large commercial estates.[18] These elites developed their own olive oil, cereal, and other agricultural industries (as is shown through the villa estates in Methana, Nemea, and Pylos). Each of these has remains of costly farm equipment and infrastructure to develop agricultural industries because their owners wanted to capitalize on the growing local markets that emerged with the influx of settlers in the Greek countryside, as well as on the new trade routes established after Diocletian and Constantine encouraged investment in the Eastern Roman Empire.[19]

In contrast, the material evidence found on Antikythera exemplifies the important role the Greek islands played in shipping routes that emerged after Constantinople was founded. The lack of roof tiles and identifiable storage jars found on Antikythera, as well as its isolated position from the major centers of Achaea, confirms that the island relied on a trade economy, which led to different material evidence compared to mainland pottery assemblages. For instance, African Red Slip wares were prevalent in South Aegean surveys such as Argos, Athens, and Corinth, which suggests that these were major shipping centers for African Red Slip wares from the West towards Constantinople; meanwhile, the lack of evidence of African Red Slip on Antikythera implied that Antikythera was a major center during the Late Roman period for different trading routes compared to mainland Greece.[20] To reinforce this argument, the preva-

17 Quercia, "Intensive Survey of Antikythera," 63.
18 Kosso, *Archaeology of Public Policy*, 58.
19 Ibid., 35.
20 Quercia, "Intensive Survey of Antikythera," 61.

lence of Late Roman II amphorae as opposed to Late Roman I amphorae (which was distributed predominantly through the Mediterranean, Black Sea, and Aegean during Late Rome), Phocaean Red Slip Ware, Palestinian wares, and Egyptian wares further suggest that Antikythera was fitted into a wider system of trade routes established after Constantinople had been founded.[21]

Scholarship surrounding Late Roman Greece has widely accepted that imperial policies by Diocletian and Constantine led to the observable rise in finds from Middle Roman to Late Roman Greece. Nevertheless, Pettegrew argues that there was a bias towards highly identifiable body sherds when analyzing survey results, since Eastern Korinthia recorded 49 rims, 33 bases, and 111 handles from the Middle Roman period compared to 322 rims, 37 bases, and 110 handles from the Late Roman period.[22] He suggests that there was not a large increase in artifacts dated to Late Roman Greece, but rather continuous Roman settlement throughout Greece's history. However, East Korinthia was always an important city centre regardless of the period of Roman occupation, which is the reason that Eastern Korinthia found more comparable pottery assemblage and settlement patterns from the Middle Roman to Late Roman periods.

Jones argues that Late Roman imperial taxation policies led to increased rural settlement in Greece and resulted in more archaeological finds dated to Late Roman Greece. Jones states that Diocletian changed taxation in cash (*annona*) to taxation in kind and removed urban plebeians from important taxes because approximately ninety percent of the empire's revenue from Roman citizens came from agricultural populations.[23] Jones argues that Diocletian's tax reforms allowed rural communities to invest in new economic strategies because they no longer needed to produce more to meet the *annona*. Instead, these reforms increased rural settlement to cultivate formerly marginal lands to make a profit from trading their surplus of agricultural goods. Jones's argument also relies on bureaucratic reforms by Diocletian and the establishment of Constantinople, which reinforces that, ultimately, the public policies presented by Diocletian and Constantine led to increased settlement in Greece and a prominent increase in Late Roman finds compared to Middle Roman Greece.

Moreover, Garnsey and Saller argue that there was an appreciable rise in Late Roman finds because, in the Late Roman period, Achaea's role was to provide cash for soldiers and officials, and this required direct imperial intervention to restructure Greece's rural organization to meet military and official needs by establishing a "second army" of producers.[24] Garnsey and Saller state that, due to the movement of local government

21 Quercia, "Intensive Survey of Antikythera,"63.
22 Pettegrew, "Regional Survey," 219.
23 Kosso, *Archaeology of Public Policy*, 18.
24 Alcock, *Graecia Capta*, 222.

officials to the countryside and the growing pressures of Late Roman taxation, this bureaucratic restructuring led to increased settlement in Late Roman Greece.[25] Similarly to Jones, Garnsey and Saller's theory is based on bureaucratic reforms by Diocletian and the establishment of Constantinople, which emphasizes that the public policies presented by Diocletian and Constantine led to increased settlement in Greece and a notable increase in finds from Late Roman Greece compared to Middle Roman Greece.

Therefore, it is evident from the archaeological evidence that the imperial policies of Diocletian and Constantine encouraged settlement and economic investment in Late Roman Greece, which created a striking growth in archaeological finds from the Late Roman period after very low counts from the Middle Roman period. This pattern of low to high settlement from Middle Roman to Late Roman was documented across mainland Greece in East Korinthia, Nemea, Pylos, and Methana, as well as on the Greek islands, represented in an Antikytheran survey. Imperial policies showed that after the barbarian attacks at the northern frontiers of the Western Roman Empire, Diocletian and Constantine encouraged settlement in the East, which created a commercial estate society and new trade routes in Achaea. Overall, it is fitting that the province that was a foundation of Roman culture and society later became the foundation of political and economic life in the Roman Empire when the West began to decline and the East began to rise.

25 Alcock, *Graecia Capta*, 222.

Bibliography

Alcock, Susan. *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Bintliff, John. *The Complete Archaeology of Greece: From Hunter-Gatherers to the 20th Century AD.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2012.

Humphries, Mark. "From Usurper to Emperor: The Politics of Legitimation in the Age of Constantine." *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1, no. 1 (2008): 82-100.

Kosso, Cynthia. *The Archaeology of Public Policy in Late Roman Greece.* Oxford: Archeopress, 2003.

Pettegrew, David. "Regional Survey and the Boom-and-Bust Countryside: Re-Reading the Abandonment in the Late Roman Corinthia." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 14, no. 2 (2010): 215-229.

Quercia, A., A. Johnston, A. Bevan, J. Conolly, and A. Tsaravopoulos. "Roman Pottery from an Intensive Survey of Antikythera, Greece." *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 106 (November 2011): 47-98.

Shortfall in the Ptolemaic Revenue: Economic Policy as a Political Necessity

Andrew White

The Ptolemaic period (305-30 BCE) in Egypt was, in many respects, an informal continuation of the Saite and Persian (650-332 BCE) systems of governance.[1] However, there was a primary political difference between the Ptolemaic and the preceding Saite and Persian systems: in contrast to the previous satrap system of tribute, the Ptolemies re-established a centralized Pharaonic-style dynasty to legitimize their rule of Egypt.[2] The economic centralization of Ptolemaic Egypt, however, owed much to the Saite and Persian periods.[3] The Ptolemies largely adopted the Persian tributary economy, with a few significant alterations to the economic system. The main changes implemented during the Ptolemaic period were economic intensification and monetization. During the initial period under Ptolemy I Soter (305-282 BCE) and Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-46 BCE), the economy saw an intensification in agrarian production, royal banks, and royal granaries.[4] The foundation of new urban centres and the reclamation of new arable land in the Fayum region indicate that the early Ptolemaic period under the first two Ptolemies experienced aggregate economic growth.[5] Further, the increased farming of wheat, which would have initially resulted from the land reclamation (at least in some regions), would have resulted in an increase in agricultural productivity.[6] However, where the Persians had utilized as light a hand as possible in terms of taxation and rent to keep the local populations peaceable during their rule, the Ptolemies sought to maximize royal revenues and tie important constituent groups to their regime to gain legitimacy. Whether the Ptolemaic attempt was successful is a different story.

In this paper, I will argue that the Ptolemaic regime sought political legitimacy by altering an inherited tributary economic system regarding land tenure, taxation, and agricultural production. These modifications may have led to a decrease in royal revenue, but they were crucial

1 Joseph G. Manning, "Hellenistic Egypt," in The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World, ed. Walter Scheidel, Ian Morris, and Richard P. Saller (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
2 Ibid.
3 Sitta von Reden and Walter Scheidel, *The Ancient Economy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002), 161.
4 Manning, "*Hellenistic Egypt,*", 435.
5 Ibid., 435-436.
6 Ibid.

in legitimizing the Ptolemy regime. In Section I, I will define the measurements and terms used in the relevant documents. In Section II, I will examine the formation of rent, land taxes, and land tenures in Ptolemaic Egypt, and how they led to a decrease in revenues. In Section III, I will examine the system of taxation and collection, as well as the increased bureaucracy found in the early Ptolemaic reign, and how this diminished the royal revenue. In Section IV, I will examine grain production and land use in Ptolemaic Egypt, and how this led to decreased productivity. Finally, I will argue that all of the decreases in royal revenue were the result of necessary political changes to legitimize the Ptolemaic regime.

I. Clarification of Measures and Terms

The vast majority of information about the Ptolemaic period economy is derived from documents related to taxation. As such, much of the terminology of the documents is unfamiliar. The *aroura* was the most commonly used measurement of land in Ptolemaic Egypt. It had a side and width length of 52.5m. The *aroura* was generally measured in units as a square. One ancient *aroura* equates to 2,756 square meters (one square kilometer is therefore equivalent to 363 *arouras*).[7]

The *artaba* was the most commonly used measurement of volume and weight, specifically for measures of grain and agricultural produce. One Ptolemaic *artaba* is equivalent to 38.808 litres. Because the *artaba* was primarily used to measure grain, the weight of one *artaba* of wheat, equivalent to 30.28 kilograms, was also commonly used as a reference for an *artaba;* thus, the majority of *artaba* in analysis of receipts refer to an equivalent measure in value to wheat.[8]

The *drachma* was a common unit of currency, which had a Ptolemaic-specific standard. This Ptolemaic currency was first minted during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus. The heavy Athenian weight standard was commonly used until Ptolemy I Soter abandoned it in favour of a lighter Phoenician *drachma*.[9] The weight of one Ptolemaic silver *drachma*, equivalent to six *obols*, appears to have stayed relatively stable throughout Ptolemaic rule, weighing approximately 3.55 metric grams of silver.[10]
Further, the documents outline various positions within the Ptolemaic system of governance. For example, Ptolemaic Egypt introduced a military composed of nearly entirely mercenaries. These soldiers then settled on the land, which tied the military to the Ptolemies. These mercenary

7 Roger S. Bagnall, "Practical Help: Chronology, Geography, Measures, Currency, Names, Prosopography, and Technical Vocabulary," in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 185.
8 Ibid., 187.
9 Ibid., 190.
10 Ibid., 189.

settlers were called *cleruchs*.[11]

In terms of economic and civil administration, Ptolemaic Egypt was divided into three levels of governance: the village (*kome*), the district (*topos*), and the province (*nomos*).[12] Each of these distinct tiers had an official administrator associated with them to enforce Ptolemaic rule: the *komarch*, *toparch*, and *nomarch,* respectively.[13] Each of these administrators answered to the *dioiketes*, who was the financial administrator of the entire Ptolemaic kingdom. The *dioiketes* would also employ *oikonomoi*, administrators who would travel between the three tiers of governance to ensure that each was performing its economic duties.[14]

II. Rents, Land Taxes, and Land Tenures

Rents and land tenures were central to the Ptolemaic economy and made up much of the annual royal wealth.[15] There were several taxes and rental fees associated with either leasing land or acquiring private property, which, if you were not a soldier, was a costly endeavour. There was a principal tax on all grain-bearing land, which was collected in kind if the land you were cultivating produced grain.[16] There were also taxes on the land itself, namely an additional flat tax called the *eparourion*, which was assessed on the size of the plot and the condition of the soil.[17]

In Ptolemaic Egypt, there were four central groupings of land holdings: the royal land, cleruchic estates and gift estates, private land holdings, and temple lands.[18] Depending on the region of Egypt, the proportions of land ownership varied drastically. Recently analyzed evidence confirms the widespread private holding of land in the South of Egypt during the Ptolemaic period.[19] Private lands were not only a large initial investment, but also a longer-term investment, as taxation on private lands appears to have been near-comparable to the royal land in the Fayum, another region of Egypt.[20]

In their attempt to re-establish a Pharaonic dynasty, the Ptolemies were forced to uphold political structures which were derived from Pharaonic periods in Egypt's history. The Ptolemies continued to preserve and even increase the estates of temples located in Upper and Middle Egypt.[21] Thus, the temples of Upper and Middle Egypt controlled a significant por-

11 F. W. Walbank, *The Hellenistic World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 109.
12 Walbank, *The Hellenistic World,* 101-122.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
15 Manning, "*Hellenistic Egypt,"*, 443.
16 Ibid., 455.
17 Ibid., 456.
18 Andrew Monson, *Agriculture and Taxation in Early Ptolemaic Egypt* (Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH, 2012), 9.
19 Manning, "*Hellenistic Egypt,"*, 443.
20 Ibid.
21 Monson, *Agriculture and Taxation,* 9.

tion of the total arable land. For example, the Temple of Horus at Edfu, a single temple in the *nomos*, reported a total landholding of 13,209 *arouras*, of which 9,181 were in the Edfu Nome, a province in the Thebaid. This represents approximately sixteen to eighteen per cent of the total fertile land located in the nome in c. 216-5 BCE.[22] Thus, Pharaonic institutions remained in areas of long-term dense population and the strength of the temples was more powerful there than in newly established areas, since they controlled greater amounts of land.

Accordingly, in Lower Egypt there was much less continuity in the strength of temples, as the areas were historically less densely populated.[23] Nevertheless, the creation of two new urban centres, Alexandria and Ptolemais, and the reclamation of new arable land in the Fayum, led to an increase in population. In these areas, specifically the Fayum, the Ptolemies attempted to maintain the control of this land for economic purposes.[24] Rather than empowering temples to organize the cultivation of the newly reclaimed land, Ptolemy I Soter and Ptolemy II Philadelphus turned to Greek estate managers and *cleruch*s as parts of a growing bureaucracy.[25]

The creation of massive gift estates (*dorea*), a practice which was common in the Saite and Persian periods of occupation, enabled the Ptolemies to develop vast tracts of newly reclaimed land in the Fayum. This opened a new source of revenue that required little economic investment on the part of the Ptolemies.[26] Gift estates were large parcels of land which the Ptolemies gave to powerful and wealthy bureaucrats. While such estates created new streams of income for the Ptolemies, which were to revert to royal land after the tenure of the managers and could thus be later rented once reclaimed, much of the incentive for productivity was left to the managers.[27] Therefore, the focus was not on ensuring the stable extraction of wealth, but on maximizing the wealth extracted for the managers themselves during their tenures. Further, such large gift estates, such as the 10,000-*aroura* estate of Apollonios, were often experimental and had areas of cultivation that failed, resulting in crop produce reductions and loss of capital.[28] Finally, the onus of tax collection was left to the estate managers, creating another level of administration and therefore another level for corruption. For example, a letter dated to 256 BCE from the foreman of a group of stone-cutters argued their maltreatment by the same Apollonius, who also happened to be the *dioiketes*:

22 Monson, *Agriculture and Taxation,* 9.
23 Ibid., 8-10.
24 Roger S. Bagnall, and Dominic Rathbone, ed., *Egypt from Alexander to the Early Christians: An Archaeological and Historical Guide* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2004), 15.
25 Monson, *Agriculture and Taxation,* 10.
26 Manning, "*Hellenistic Egypt,"*, 453.
27 Ibid., 454.
28 Monson, *Agriculture and Taxation,* 10.

> We are being wronged by Apollonios the super-intendent, who has set us to work on the hard stone, not dividing it between us and the others, while he has assigned his own men the soft stone. As it is, we are being ruined by wearing out the edges of our tools. We beg you, so that we may obtain our rights, to measure out how much extra hard stone we have cut, so that it may be imposed in addition on the 140 quarry-men and we may not be oppressed.[29]

The self-interest of the administrative parties led to corruption, as they preferred their own workers or land to maximize their profits.

In the newly reclaimed lands such as the Fayum, the Ptolemies attempted to tie the *cleruchs'* loyalty to themselves by giving estates for military service.[30] This policy led to a sizeable portion of the total arable land being controlled by *cleruchs*. The *cleruchs* were divided into three categories of land tenure, dependant on their service in the military: cavalry acquired 100-*aroura* estates, and infantry acquired either 25- or 30-*aroura* estates.[31] From the remaining evidence it appears that the number of cavalry soldiers settled in the Fayum was much higher relative to infantry.[32] Clarysse and Thompson suppose from documentary evidence that there were approximately 1,068 cavalry settlers in the Fayum. Further, Clarysse and Thompson argue that if each of these cavalry settlers were to acquire the 100-*aroura* estates they were supposed to, then in total they would possess approximately 106,800 *arouras*.[33] With the information that the likely number of infantry soldiers was less than that of the cavalry, along with the lower likely estate size, they posit that the infantry estates could hardly account for more that 10,000-30,000 *arouras*.[34] This means that with a probable total arable land amount in the Fayum of 1,350 kilometers square (371,000 *arouras*), almost one third was cleruchic land.[35] Analysis of land tenure documents from Kerkeosiris, a village in the Fayum, appear to corroborate the argument given by Clarysse and Thompson, with cleruchic land around thirty-four per cent and royal land totaling around fifty-two per cent.[36] This sample indicates that in such rural areas as the Fayum, in which the early Ptolemies promoted economic stimulus by improving infrastructure, around two-sixths of the land was cleruchic land, almost four-sixths was royal land, and less than one-sixth (less than sixteen per

29 Roger S. Bagnall and Peter Derow, ed., *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 169 SB XVIII 13881.
30 Manning, "*Hellenistic Egypt,"* 453.
31 Ibid.
32 Monson, *Agriculture and Taxation,* 11.
33 Ibid.
34 Ibid.
35 Ibid.
36 Ibid., 12.

cent) was temple land.[37]

The importance of the Ptolemaic royal treasury maintaining such agricultural land was extremely high, mainly due to the rents and fees levied against them. The total tax burden on royal land, including various small fees for grain transportation and repayment of the seed loans given by the royal treasuries, approached half of the land's annual production.[38] For comparison, in the Saite period (664-525 BC) the rents for land were assessed as a percentage of the yield on the land, and the average was around one third of the annual production.[39] Thus, there was a drastic increase in the rent and tax on land during the Ptolemaic period. Further, documents dating to the third century BCE in Ptolemaic Egypt generally suggest that it was more common to lease than to purchase land.[40] Even in new lands, such as in the Fayum, where *cleruchs* were given plots of land, the Greek preference for urban living often prompted them to lease their lands.[41] This preference to leases likely created a disincentive to develop the land beyond the necessary level, as one could only hope to rent for as much as the cheapest royal land lease, which likely led to sub-optimal productivity.[42]

The Ptolemies made attempts to influence the leasing of lands, since owners did not wish to cultivate them themselves. Namely, there was a flat tax collected on grain, which was being levied on all cleruchic and temple land outside the Thebaid.[43] The tax, which was known as the *artabieia*, was assessed at the rate of 0.5, 1, or 2 *artabas* of grain per *aroura*, and the tax was required whether the land was cultivated or not.[44] Therefore, it incentivized the leasing of the land to avoid a deficit, since the better the productivity of the soil, the higher the tax. This was a sizeable portion of the produce from a piece of land, so failing to lease could be costly.

For a contextual point as to the amount of the tax, a document from Pharaonic Egypt discusses the assessed value of land, stating that each *aroura* (of a slightly smaller size, around 2741 meters square) would produce around 5 *khar* of grain.[45] The *khar* equals around 34 kilograms, meaning a total agricultural product weight of 170 kilograms of grain produced per *aroura*.[46] This weight would equate to around 5.6 *artabas*. This means that dependent on the value of the assessed land, the cleruchic es-

37 Monson, *Agriculture and Taxation,* 12.
38 Manning, "*Hellenistic Egypt,"*, 457.
39 Ibid., 455.
40 Ibid., 452.
41 Ibid.
42 Ibid.
43 Ibid., 457.
44 Ibid.
45 Christopher Eyre, *Use of Documents in Pharaonic Egypt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 181.
46 Ibid.

tate or temple estate would have to pay a flat tax at either ten per cent, eighteen per cent or thirty-six per cent of the total grain possible to produce per *aroura*.[47] Indeed, the taxes imposed on the military peasants of all groups were sometimes so heavy, and the land which they had been given being no more than reclaimed waste land, that they could be forced to give up their allotments.[48]

III. Individual Taxes, Tax Collection, and the Bureaucracy

The Ptolemies inherited a tributary economic system in which, in theory, the state was the household (*oikos*) of the king.[49] In the administration of the Ptolemaic monarchy, bureaucracy managed the various levels of governance more and more over time.[50] With the increased size of arable land, new rural settlements, and new urban centres in the third century BCE, there also came an ever-expanding system of liturgies with which to ensure the receipt of state revenues.[51] Thus, keeping the state as the household of the king required a growing administration that had to be paid for mainly with tax revenue.

The main tax of the Ptolemaic economy was the salt-tax, which is first documented in the twenty-second year (264-3 BCE) of Ptolemy II Philadelphus.[52] The Ptolemaic salt-tax functioned as a poll tax which made it possible to shift from a labour tax, a common practice of tax in physical labour maintaining the irrigation systems, to a monetary tax, where the clear majority was paid in the newly fabricated Ptolemaic coinage.[53] Evidence indicates that the tax was an innovation of this period and may have replaced the pre-existing yoke-tax, a capitation tax on males only.[54] What is significant about the salt-tax is that it is a capitation, or head tax, on both males and females, but at differing rates.[55] There were two important factors which made such a head-tax feasible: first, the monetization of the economic system, which allowed for a more readily set, more easily transportable, form of taxation; second, its intimate tie to the census record. In the initial stages of this tax, there were very few exemptions to the tax.[56] All adults, both male and female, were liable to this tax. Census records show that beyond just humans, any livestock associated with a household was also liable for taxation.[57] Both humans and animals needed

47 Manning, "*Hellenistic Egypt,*", 457.
48 Max Weber, *The Agrarian Sociology of Ancient Civilizations* (London: Humanities Press, 1976), 237.
49 Manning, "*Hellenistic Egypt,*", 446.
50 Weber, *The Agrarian Sociology*, 228.
51 Ibid., 225.
52 Willy Clarysse and Dorothy Thompson, *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 39.
53 Ibid., 42.
54 Ibid., 39.
55 Ibid., 44.
56 Ibid., 45.
57 Ibid., 43.

salt, and the Ptolemies made sure to tax them both for the product.

The rates at which the salt-tax were levied decreased over time. From papyrological evidence, we see three distinct phases of the rate of the salt-tax during the third century BCE.[58] In the initial stage, rate A (263-54 BCE), the rate is one *drachma* three *obols* for males, and one *drachma* for females.[59] In the second stage, rate B (254-31 BCE), the rate drops to one *drachma* for males, and *three* obols for females.[60] In the third and final stage with known documented evidence, rate C (243-17 BCE) reaches its lowest documented amounts; the tax is officially four *obols* for males and 1.5 *obols* for females. In actuality, the salt-tax was three *obols*, but the one *obol* surcharge of the *obolos* was amalgamated into the figure, such that it was no longer collected separately.[61]

Rate:	Time Period:	Male Tax Amount:	Female Tax Amount:
A	263-54 BCE	One *drachma*, three *obols*	One *drachma*
B	254-31 BCE	One *drachma*	Three *obols*
C	243-17 BCE	Four *obols*	One and a half *obols*

We can see that in rate A, the females are taxed at two-thirds of the rate of males, but for all subsequent rates they are taxed at one-half their male counter parts.

A likely cause for the diminishing salt-tax rate is the increasing difficulty on the part of the crown in collecting these taxes. On an average daily wage of an *obol*, one and a half *drachmas* (nine *obols*) as the annual A rate for males represents over a week of work for the individual.[62] With the addition of the female six *obols*—if the person is married—a total of fifteen obols is reached, which may represent the wages of half a working month. As the economy centered around agriculture and the annual flooding, the average peasant likely did not work for the full year but only during the on-seasons, with partial work on infrastructure during the non-agricultural seasons. To ensure that taxes could be paid without reducing the population to destitution, an attempt was made to collect the salt-tax incrementally over a period of six months.[63] Adversely, this decision created more time during which such taxes could fall through the cracks if not closely regulated.

Along with the decreasing rates, there was an equivalent increase

58 Clarysse, *Counting the People*, 43.
59 Ibid.
60 Ibid., 45.
61 Ibid.
62 Ibid., 46.
63 Ibid., 82-85.

in the number of exemptions. For example, during the B rate (254-31 BCE), the decrease is evident only in certain portions of the population for the first decade, mainly the *cleruchs* and those who acquired the tax title of Hellenes.[64] The title of Hellenes was not, however, tied to ethnicity, but was rather an indication of importance in the Ptolemaic state, and was mainly reserved for administrative positions.[65] Such exemptions over time, with decreases in certain taxes and evidence for others being completely omitted, were likely a means of creating loyalty to the Ptolemies within these groups.

During the third century BCE, we see the emergence of a two-part system of tax collection, centered around the tax-collector (*logeutes*) and the tax-farmer (*telones*).[66] The actual division of labour between the two was never formally codified, but the distinction between the two was based upon wealth. The tax-collector had the task of collecting the taxes imposed upon them by the state, due to their wealth, as a service to the Ptolemies. This is known as a liturgical system of tax-collection.[67] An auction would then usually occur in which tax-farmers would bid for the ability to assist in the collecting of taxes and be paid for their services. However, whatever shortfall should arise in the process of collecting taxes was to be paid by the tax-collector themselves.[68] With the creation of tax farmers, the state was guaranteed the payment of a fixed sum of money, and so the ability to balance its budget.[69] The issue with such a system of tax collection, where the collector is neither directly funded by the state nor monitored in the collection process, is that they tend to be either too heavy-handed or too light-handed in their collection. For example, a papyrological document in the form of a letter with instructions from the *dioiketes* to an *oikonomos* written in the late third century BCE (c. 209 BCE) specifically discusses the matter of embezzlement or theft of wealth from the people:

> (Honesty and security) Take particular care that no peculation or any other wrong takes place. For everyone resident in the country must clearly understand and believe that all acts of this kind have been stopped and that they are freed from the bad conditions of the past, no one having a right to do what he likes, but everything being managed in the best way; you will thus make the countryside secure and (will increase) the revenue in no small measure.[70]

64 Clarysse, *Counting the People*, 47.
65 Ibid.
66 Ibid., 74-5.
67 Weber, *The Agrarian Sociology*, 225.
68 Ibid.
69 Ibid.
70 P. Tebt III 703. In Bagnall, *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation*, 165-8.

As can be seen, peculation, or the embezzling of wealth, is specifically discussed as a point of duty to the *oikonomos*.

However, as the liturgical system was placed upon the wealthiest in a region, any shortfall could be extremely detrimental. A record of tax collection from Herakleides, a tax region in the Fayum sometime between 243-17 BCE, indicates the extent to which shortfall could occur.[71] By the end of the six-month tax period, the tax-collectors from the region had only collected around 53.6 per cent of the total tax.[72] This means that 46.4 per cent had to be paid by the tax-collectors, the specific amounts and collectors identified on the verso of the document.[73] While some of the sums were paid, more were written off for those tax-collectors who had fled the area, those no longer alive, those unable to pay, or for a tax-fugitive already under arrest.

In such a case, not only did those liable to the liturgy attempt to avoid being the tax-collector to avert possible detriment to themselves, but there was also a drain on the royal treasury. The Ptolemaic economic system, and the monetization of it, was centered around the collection of taxes, whether they be land taxes or individual taxes. While actual collection rates are unrecorded, surviving evidence indicates that the in-payment rates to the royal banks were low.[74]

With each level of bureaucracy, further possibilities for corruption arose and caused a drain on the royal economy. For example, consider this petition sent to the *dioiketes* in 151 BCE pertaining to a *komarch*'s extortion racket:

> Because I am wronged greatly and chased from my home village, I have fled to you to receive help. For in the 27th year, when I had been appointed by Mesthasythmis as *dekanos* (head of a group of ten, but apparently head of all cultivators in this case.) of royal cultivators in the village, and he made a substantial paralogeia (unauthorized extra collection) each year from the same cultivators of ½ artaba of wheat per *aroura* and 90 *drachmas* of bronze, from which he was amassing it to be stolen.[75]
>
> During this period, 90 *drachmas* of bronze is roughly equivalent to just over a third of an *artaba* of wheat, so the total extorted value was approximately an *artaba* of wheat per *aroura*, which was a substantial portion of the annual crop.[76]

The increasing number of tax exemptions, decreasing rate of tax collection, and increasingly corruptible bureaucracy managing the whole affair

71 Clarysse, *Counting the People*, 83-4.
72 Ibid.
73 Ibid.
74 Ibid.
75 SB XX 14708. In Bagnall, *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation*, 158.
76 Ibid.

led inevitably to a decrease in the total royal revenue during the third century BCE in Ptolemaic Egypt.

IV.Grain Production

The main crops in ancient pre-Ptolemaic Egypt were barley, which was sown on drier land, and emmer and flax, which were sown on the wettest land; grain crops took up about half of the available fields and produced one crop per year.[77] The fertility of the soil allowed grain to be planted in the basins two out of five years on average.[78] Theoretically, if allowing for a rotation of the agricultural production on fields, the soils would have replenished nutrient levels after three years of usage for pasturage, or being left fallow. However, any higher level of agricultural intensification beyond this level would eventually lead to drastic reduction in soil nutrient levels, decreasing production rates.

In the initial period of Ptolemaic rule, during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, there is evidence for the introduction of a sowing schedule, a means of delineating what percentage of the arable land was to be used for which agricultural produce.[79] The introduction of this document has been argued to be a means to create a more reliable projection of the grain produced in any one year, by which the Ptolemies could balance their expenditures.[80] Determining the revenue of grain rents owed to the king was likely the main purpose of the sowing schedule, the registering of land, and the census. This is because the grain rents were set prior to the agricultural year based on the estimated production value of the land. Whatever the case may be, it was central to the Ptolemaic royal economy during the third century BCE: "You must regard it as one of your most indispensable duties to see that the *nome* be sown with the kinds of crops prescribed by the sowing schedule."[81]

Prior to the growing season each year, it was possible to gauge the inundation level of the Nile and estimate the level of nutrient enrichment and the quality of the soil for crop production for the following growing period. This allowed the bureaucracy to compile the sowing schedule. Starting with general instructions relayed from the central government, the schedule was first drafted at the village level, and would then progress up through the district, then the *nome*, and finally would be revised and redistributed from Alexandria.[82]

During the third century BCE, we see a drastic intensification in the production of grain as a percentage of the total useable land. Docu-

77 Manning, "*Hellenistic Egypt,"*, 439.
78 Ibid., 440.
79 Monson, *Agriculture and Taxation,* 28.
80 Ibid., 28.
81 P. Tebt III 703. In Bagnall, *The Hellenistic Period: historical sources in translation,* 165-8.
82 Monson, *Agriculture and Taxation*, 18-22.

ments of the census and sowing schedule found for the Arsinoite Nome, which contains the Fayum, indicate that in 235 BCE, out of all the arable land used for cultivation, ninety per cent was used for grain of some form, generally wheat (seventy-four per cent). This is not to say ninety per cent of all arable land was used for grain, but that ninety per cent of that arable land which was cultivated produced grain. These percentages appear to be rather steady, as documents of the rents by crops on royal land in the Hermopolite Nome for the second century BCE show similar rates, with eighty-eight per cent being dedicated to grain production.[83]

Further analysis of rent categories in Ta-any, a town in the Arsinoite Nome, outline the total arable land located there and for what it was used. In the receipt of rent categories, a total of 2,182 *arouras* of arable land—approximately six square kilometers—were demarcated as crown land for rent. Of that 2,182 *arouras* total, only 313 *arouras* were rented for pasturage.[84] That means that approximately 1,869 *arouras* were used for cultivation and would thus be subject to the sowing schedule. If the categorization of the village of Ta-any holds as a sample of Ptolemaic crown land constitution, then it appears that approximately eighty-five per cent of crown lands were used for cultivation. This means that grain production on all the royal land held by the Ptolemies could be as high as seventy-six per cent, one and a half times higher than the amount found during the pre-Ptolemaic periods. This degree of intensification of grain production would have strained the soil's nutrient levels beyond the point that could be replenished by the alluvial flooding of the Nile. Such a schedule appears to have been solely implemented for the royal land in Egypt.

Attempts to control and maneuver the Nile floods to maintain such high levels of alluvial nutrient enrichment led, in some cases, to adverse effects on the soil nutrients. In the late second century BCE in Kerkeosiris, the previously discussed town in the Fayum, over thirty-five per cent of the royal land in the town had fallen out of cultivation due to salinization or insufficient drainage.[85] Due to the lack of incentive for the landholders to ameliorate lands that were little more than desolate wasteland, there was little to no increase in the productivity of land overall. Further, little technological initiative was taken in the fields of agriculture. Those advancements that did exist were employed only sparsely, so there was little increase in agricultural productivity from this source.[86] With the over-production of nutrient-depleting crops like grains and little incentive to increase the productivity of the land, agricultural output inevitably decreased from its initial high during the reigns of the first two Ptolemies.

83 Monson, *Agriculture and Taxation*, 18-22.
84 Ibid., 21.
85 Ibid., 22.
86 Ibid.

V. Conclusion

The Ptolemaic attempt to re-establish a Pharaonic style of dynasty forced them to maintain an old land tenure regime in the Thebaid, where the right to convey land historically existed. The Ptolemies' desire to maximize revenues while minimizing expenditures led to the granting of land to important new constituents in the form of cleruchic estates and gift estates. Further, the desire to reduce payroll expenditures while maintaining a large tax-economy necessitated the use of non-regulated agents to collect taxes based on a liturgical system whereby the shortfall of collection fell upon the tax-collector. However, all these factors in tandem inevitably led to a reduction in the state's revenue.

The maintenance of private land, and the increasing land tenure given to the long-standing temples in the Thebaid, meant the crown owned less land. While increases to royal land were initially made from the reclamation of the Fayum and the building of new urban centers, it could not balance the non-royal land tenure in the Thebaid. In economies based on agricultural productivity and taxation of the land and produce, ownership of land is the principle basis of wealth and status.

The establishment of cleruchic estates and gift estates to wealthy and important figures allowed for the structuring of newly reclaimed land in the Fayum and tied the loyalty of the mercenary troops to the land and the Ptolemies. However, the experimental nature of the gift estates, and the urban lifestyle of the mainly Greek *cleruchs*, meant that there was an increasing trend developing in the third century BCE of land lease as opposed to land purchase. This trend caused a decrease in agricultural productivity and a decrease in the wealth being directed to land improvement. Over-production on deteriorating land inevitably led to its reversion to wasteland in originally man-made regions such as Kerkeosiris.

Finally, the use of a liturgical system of taxation, and the increasing bureaucratic size to manage such taxation, increased the wealth and standing of those in the Ptolemaic administration. The decreasing tax rates and the exemptions to taxes made to differing groups of powerful constituents, such as the *cleruchs*, the temples and the bureaucracy, ensured that they were tied to the interests of the Ptolemies. However, racketeering and a decrease in the ability of tax-collectors to ensure the total collection led to a drain in Ptolemaic revenues. Funds intended for the royal banks were either expropriated mid-way through the process or were never collected at all. However, each of these decreases in the total revenues of the Ptolemies followed from the political necessity of seeking legitimacy for a new regime through the maintenance of old institutions, and loyalty from the bureaucracy and army.

Bibliography

Bagnall, Roger S. "Practical Help: Chronology, Geography, Measures, Currency, Names, Prosopography, and Technical Vocabulary." In *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, edited by Roger S. Bagnall, 179-196. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Bagnall, Roger S., and Dominic Rathbone, ed. *Egypt from Alexander to the Early Christians: An Archaeological and Historical Guide.* Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2004.

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

Clarysse, Willy, and Dorothy Thompson. *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Eyre, Christopher. *Use of Documents in Pharaonic Egypt.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Manning, Joseph G. "Hellenistic Egypt." In The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World, edited by Walter Scheidel, Ian Morris, and Richard P. Saller, 434-59. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Monson, Andrew. *Agriculture and Taxation in Early Ptolemaic Egypt.* Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, 2012.

von Reden, Sitta, and Walter Scheidel. *The Ancient Economy.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002.

Walbank, F. W. "Ptolemaic Egypt." In *The Hellenistic World*, 100-122. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Letter from Philomela to King Pandion

Leora Bromberg

This is a fictional letter inspired by Ovid's story of Philomela, Procne, and Tereus in the *Metamorphoses*. In this account of the myth, Ovid 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. As Tereus' actions come to light, the sisters are prompted to murder Procne and Tereus' baby son Itys, whom they subsequently cook and feed to Tereus. Finally, all three characters, suspended in their grief and rage, are transformed into birds. The structure of the following text is further inspired by Ovid's *Heroides*, a collection of fifteen elegiac epistolary poems written from the perspective of distressed ancient Greek mythological heroines, addressed to a male mythological character in their story who has wronged or betrayed them.[1] Among many others, Ovid adopts the perspective of Penelope, having her write to her long-absent husband Odysseus; Deianira writes to Hercules; and Medea writes to Jason. The letter below plays with various generic conventions of epistolary fiction and aims to emulate a more modern and feminist response to Ovid's own attempts. Given the characters' metamorphoses into birds, this letter features frequent bird references and puns. As a survivor of rape and abuse by Tereus, I imagined Philomela as unable to mention his name in this letter. Instead, Tereus is referred to simply as "he" or other, more demeaning terms like "hatred-driven," "villainous," or through references to his Thracian nationality. In order to serve as a stark contrast to her sheltered and innocent childhood, the tone of this letter is meant to seem mature, grave and serious. Like Margaret Atwood's Penelope in *The Penelopiad*,[2] I imagined Philomela as timeless and all-knowing, transcending the framework of her ancient story to show her knowledge of the tradition of ancient Greek mythology and its reception over time, even to this day.

Father,

By now I wonder if you've forgotten me. At the very least, I'm sure you would no longer recognize me. I have wondered this a lot lately while flying over our home, so high above the gardens in which Procne and I raced as little girls, and the great libraries where we listened to the stories

1 Ovid, *Heroides, Amores*, trans. Grant Showerman (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914).
2 Atwood, *The Penelopiad* (Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf Canada, 2005).

of heroes who had embarked on journeys and adventures to beautiful and far away lands. But Father, while those distant memories bring me great comfort, there is another, entirely separate past which won't let go of me. It grabs hold of me, weighing me down as if my wings are clipped and I can't take off. No matter how much I shudder and twitch, I can't shake out of its grasp. I weave through dark and heavy clouds, but drained of colour, I blend right in. Up here, you wouldn't be able to spot me. Have you been searching for me? Do you count the birds in the sky and measure their distance from your lonely palace? Why look for something you don't want to see? There's nothing left of me to see, and nothing left for you to say. I understand. For I too have been left speechless.[3]

Do you remember how Procne and I would whisper and giggle, fluttering about the palace? She was my best friend, my only friend. My everything. Now I am no more than a collection of Procnes, shattered and fragmented. We shared everything with one another. We would skip from hall to hall, playing make-believe games and telling each other secrets. We dressed up and pretended it was our wedding nights, imagining the love we thought we deserved as princesses. It's what all little girls dreamed of, and for some reason, they still do. For when that day finally came for Procne, it was nothing like we imagined. You sent her away, married her off to that warrior, and I was left in my make-believe world, all alone. The echoes of our laughter in the halls were exchanged for hollow, ringing silence. Procne cooperated, she smiled, she put on a show. She wanted to be a good daughter to you and to do well for our kingdom. I reminded her of our make-believe games, that this vile transaction was not her great love story. She put on a brave face and assured me that she would find the love and make it her own. She would *do it for Father*. As much as I insisted, she told me I simply wouldn't understand. And that is how, in a matter of moments, my sister became a gift, handed off without being sure that we would ever see her again. When I could no longer remember her face anymore and I begged you to send me to see her again, I should have been begging you to bring her back, to fix your mistake.[4] He tore out my tongue, but you managed to tear away something even more important.

At first, when I was alone, somewhere deep in the Thracian woods, I still believed in the natural order of the world. I had faith that the gods would see me, I told him they would make this right and they would punish him. I told him to get his hands off of me. I told him I was his *sister*, I told him![5] Even then, he wouldn't hear me. He scraped out everything I was from

3 Ovid, *Metamorphoses Book IV*, trans. Edward J Kenney and A. D. Melville (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 138. Tereus cut out Philomela's tongue.

4 Ibid., 136: Philomela begs Pandion to let her go with Tereus to visit Procne.

5 Ibid., 137: Philomela calls out Tereus for his crimes against her and her family.

the inside out. That villainous Thracian[6] used me until I was empty, so that when I tried to pick myself up off the splintering floor of my wooden cage, I crumbled. I screamed for help, over and over. I called for Procne and I called for you, Father. I called your name.[7] Where were you? I called for the gods too, only to realize that he was one of them, descended from Mars.[8] When suffering in such agony, the question is not 'where are the gods?', but rather, 'where is humanity?' Nobody came. Even when his sword could not stand my noise anymore, my tongue still screamed as it twitched on the floor.[9]

I mourned for myself, hated myself, hurt myself. I felt shame for myself and for you, Father. His touch left Greece on my wings, and I writhed and suffocated beneath the indelible imprint of his violent hands until the shame became all I could see, all that I was.[10] With these stains, how could I ever have returned to you? You wouldn't be able to recognize me or nurture me as your own anymore. I needed to feel something that wasn't caused by him, that was not disgusting. So I pinched my body, covering myself in bruises. I was blue and green and yellow. I tore out my hair.[11] I threw myself into the cabin walls. I wept and wailed for hours straight. I begged him to kill me.[12]

Father, I hope you were never like him. I hope that all fathers and brothers and husbands are not like him. Our home is filled with towers built of wisdom, literature and knowledge, and yet, you never taught me what I really needed to know. You never told me how deeply a man might conceal his true intentions.[13] You didn't teach Procne either, sending her instead into the unknown, a war prize, not so unlike your slaves back home. You never told me how any of our slaves came to us or why they were so beaten down. I always believed they deserved it. They say that when he saw me again, he thought I was as beautiful as a nymph.[14] Why would you treat a nymph, such an enchanting creature, so terribly? Instead of love, he burned with lust, that terrible fire, already fondling me in his thoughts under the roof of your own palace.[15] Don't you remember how the deceiving tears streamed down his face? He never hurt Procne… did he ever even love her?

6 Ovid, *Met*., 135: Describes Tereus' "Thracian villainy".
7 Ibid., Philomela was "calling and calling to her father, calling to her sister, calling, even more, to the heavens above".
8 Ibid., 134.
9 Ibid., 138: Snake analogy describes Philomela's disconnected tongue.
10 Philomela here refers to the 'grease'iness of Greek myth in its treatment of women
11 Ibid., 137: Philomela "tore her tumbled hair, and like a mourner bruised her arms, and cried".
12 Ibid., 138.
13 Ibid., 135: "so deep men's true advantage lies concealed".
14 Ibid., 135: The mature Philomela's beauty is described as that of a nymph's.
15 Ibid., 136: "already in his thoughts he fondled her".

With whatever piece of Procne that remained with me, I decided to reach her. I wove a tapestry that would dance out my story before her eyes. When she finally saw it, she too lost her tongue. She burned with all the rage I felt.[16] Nobody can come between sisters. By sharing my story, the distance between us shrank, until my frenetic sister was suddenly crystal clear before me, real and tangible once again. She held me, but instead of rocking me back and forth, she shook me to my senses. She saved me. But was that it? Was I supposed to rejoice in my freedom and stitch myself back together and back into this family? Even then, the gods did nothing. So we had to take matters into our own hands. Now they blame us, claiming that we exceeded even his cruelty, for he would never take the life of his own blood like she did. Others will even say that she and I found cruel joy in what we did, but I saw her hesitate with my own eyes.[17] Ultimately, Procne understood her motherhood as extending beyond this single child and this single time, so in a fury we tore the baby apart, as if defeathering a bird. This was an act of duty, not one of joy.

For this, your daughters go down in history. In punishment for our crime, we are shrunk down to uncomfortable proportions, stuck in these speechless bodies. I watched my own feet split into talons, felt my shoulders crack backwards, my nose and mouth curve and point sharply, feathers bursting through my skin, all over my body. I got my wish of being reduced, to disappear into my nothingness, but I am still trapped. This new form is not so different from my wooden cage in Thrace.

They still write about us. But over the ages, they get Procne and I confused. Some make Procne out to be a silent swallow, and tongueless me to sing the nightingale's sweet songs.[18] Sometimes I visit you, Father. I soar over the kingdom and look in on your sad life. I see you drinking away and aging like you are just as empty as I was. You've lost control of everything you built up.

I know that what we did was not innocent, but it was not evil either. They paint us as disgusting, morbid. They even call us a myth, as if my story is false and meaningless. There was no other option, don't you understand? We had to protect other girls, so that they would never feel what I felt. So that fathers like you wouldn't feel pain from another Thracian boy. We

16 Ovid, *Met.*, 139: When Procne opens the tapestry "her tongue could find no speech to match her anger."
17 Ibid., 141: Procne is described as unable to "hide her cruel joy" and Philomela as wanting her tongue to "express her joy in words that matched her happiness." This hesitation references Medea's in accounts such as Euripides' *Medea*.
18 Apollodorus, *Library*, trans. Sir James George Frazer (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1921), 3.14.

loved Itys so much that we couldn't watch his tiny fingers turn cruel. We couldn't watch him grow into a warrior like his hate-driven father, who would view the world from fiery eyes and pluck women by the handful like daisies, leaving them to rot after one sweet sniff. War and hatred was in his blood. And so it was his blood, instead of the blood of cities and nations, that we took. Is what we did really worse than what he did to Procne, to me, to you? To all the women he must have encountered abroad?

I may be songless, but I will not be silent. I won't sit aimlessly on the side of my own story and apologize for misbehaving or for disappointing you, Father. I won't say I miss you, won't lament the love or the marriage I will never savor. Instead, I will make noise. I will screech and squawk. I will not let my story go unheard or forgotten.

All you owe me is to never forget me,

- Your swallow

Bibliography

Atwood, Margaret. *The Penelopiad*. Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf Canada, 2005.

Apollodorus. *The Library*. Translated by Sir James George Frazer. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1921.

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

Ovid. *Heroides. Amores*. Translated by Grant Showerman. Revised by G. P. Goold. Loeb Classical Library 41. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

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

About Our Contributors

Leora Bromberg is a Fourth Year at University College, majoring in Book and Media Studies and minoring in Classical Civilization and French as a Second Language. This fall, she will be pursuing a Master of Information and a Master of Museum Studies through UofT's Faculty of Information. Within the realm of 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 like flower pressing and embroidery.

Laura Harris fell in love with Classics when she started taking Latin in Grade Eight. She is now a Third Year Victoria College student doing a double major in Classics and Classical Civilization and is particularly interested in women in antiquity, Roman social history, and ancient poetry and drama, but she can get excited about pretty much anything in the classical world. She also enjoys spending her summers on archaeological digs. 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.

Hannah Lank is a Third Year Trinity College student, doing an English major with minors in Classical Civilization and Physiology. She is particularly interested in ancient Greek art, including theatre, sculpture, and literature. When not studying these things as a Classics student, you can find her enjoying them in the modern world—latte in hand—and thinking about how much she'd love to go to Greece one day (grad trip, anyone?!).

Sam Minden is a Fourth Year Trinity College student currently working on a specialist degree in East Asian Studies and a minor in History. Sam has been a lover of history for as long as they can remember, from the time they wished to be an Egyptian pharaoh (in spite of being Jewish) to now. Although Sam's main academic focus is on Chinese history, philosophy,

and literature from the classical to the Early Modern eras, their interest in history as a whole is as passionate as it is eclectic, with their interests including Sassanid Persia, Joseon Korea, Medieval Wales, and the Carolingian Renaissance. Sam's primary interest in study is examining the circular influence that philosophy, history, and culture have on one another. When not studying Mandarin or analyzing the complexities of Confucian philosophy, Sam can be found poring over Early Modern Chinese novels while drinking copious amounts of tea.

Clifton Tataryn is a Fourth Year student at New College, double majoring in Classics and Linguistics. His main areas of interest lie in Late Antiquity and the evolution of Latin into Early Western Romance. He looks forward to continuing his education at the University of Toronto as a Master's student in two years. When he's not working, he spends time with his son Hadrian and his family in Niagara-on-the-Lake.

Erica Venturo is a Third Year student at St. Michael's College pursuing a major in Classical Civilization and a double minor in History and Political Science. Her academic interests lie in Imperial politics, and the numismatic and epigraphic evidence from the middle Imperial period. In the summer, Erica can be found on some sort of archaeological project, having been a part of the Western Argolid Regional Survey in 2016, the Villa of the Antonines excavation in 2017, and further fieldwork this summer. In her free time, or in the time she should be doing homework, she enjoys being overly competitive in Uno, watching reruns of *The Office*, and getting overly invested in *The Bachelor*.

Andrew White is a Fourth Year student at Victoria College majoring in Classical Civilizations and Philosophy, who anticipates his BA this spring. His main areas of interest in classical history are agricultural innovations, military innovations, and their correlative and causal relation to social structures in the early Greek and Roman worlds. When Andrew is not busy reading about Greek imperialism, he enjoys baking bread and gardening.

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 IV, in the Department of Classics at the University of Toronto on 9 March 2018. 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. This fourth volume of *Plebeian* was launched at CLASSU's end-of-term social, CLASSU's Long-Awaited Spring Spectacular 4 U III on 29 March 2018.

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.