

PLEBEIAN

PLEBEIAN

JOURNAL OF THE CLASSICS STUDENTS' UNION
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

VOLUME V

MMXIX

The papers in this volume were presented at CLASSU's Undergraduate Student Conference, *The Assembly of the Plebs V*, on 15 March 2019 in the Department of Classics at the University of Toronto.

PLEBEIAN VOLUME V EDITORIAL BOARD

Published 18 March 2019, Coach House Press, Toronto

Editor-In-Chief Allison Suba

Deputy Editor-In-Chief Erica Ventura

Associate Editors Alexandra Baldwin
Mark Bowen
Laura Harris
Kenneth Kim
Hannah Lank
Nick Pržulj
Marcus Tarantino

Copy Editors Elise Sintim-Aboagye
Leah Schweitzer Gukathanan

CLASSU Presidential Advisors Irum Chorghay
Laura Harris

Production Advisors Willem Crispin-Frei
Dylan Taylor

Cover Design Irum Chorghay
Willem Crispin-Frei
Toby Keymer
Taylor Stark
Dylan Taylor

CONTENTS

<i>Reading Horror in Seneca's Phaedra</i>	1
Jennifer MacPherson	
<i>Bloodstained Immortality: Clytemnestra and Medea's Divisive Reception</i>	11
Hannah McCarthy	
<i>I Contact: Self-Involved Spectatorship in Hellenistic Sculptures of Sleep</i>	20
Hana Nikčević	
<i>Roman Matronae Letting Their Hair Down: Ambiguity in the Female Aesthetics in Ovid's Ars Amatoria</i>	30
Leah Stevens	
<i>Suetonius, Caligula, and the Senatorial Conspiracy of 39 CE</i>	40
Marcus Tarantino	
<i>Terracotta Figurines in the Seleucid Kingdom: Cross-Cultural Interaction Through Art</i>	47
Erica Venturo	
<i>Bridging the Physical and Emotional Divide in Cicero's Letters to Tiro</i>	60
Kenneth Kim	

EDITOR'S NOTE

Is this even the start of a *Plebeian* edition if I don't mention how much work undergraduates do? Let us take a moment to remember all the half-formed ideas, improper citations, and unpolished work that gets submitted because of the sheer volume of writing required. Now, continue reading to see what undergraduates can really do if they put in the time and energy to peer review their work. It is obscure, weirdly specific in some cases, but always well researched and well thought out. Those with backgrounds in archaeology, Roman letter writing, Greek tragedy, philosophy, and art history (among other topics) will find new and exciting ideas that will add to their knowledge. Those picking up this journal with no background will find even more new and wonderful perspectives. We have something for everyone; read on.

This edition of *Plebeian* is particularly exciting because it marks the journal's fifth year anniversary. As a publication, *Plebeian* has quickly grown from an idea into a formal, established way for undergraduates to learn the intricacies of editing and publication. It is a way to display original thoughts and work at a level of publication normally unobtainable in the mess that is undergraduate life. I want to take this moment to thank everyone who has worked so hard on past editions; you have given us an amazing platform to explore the best and most interesting of undergraduate work in Classics at the UofT. Of course, I'd also like to thank all of the writers, associate editors, and copy editors this year, who put in the hours to get us where we are. A special thanks goes to Erica, Laura, and Irum, for the extreme dedication they put into creating this final copy. As well, thank you to the Arts and Science Student Union and the Department of Classics for your moral and financial support, which has, as always, allowed us to distribute *Plebeian* free to everyone.

I've had the honour of working on *Plebeian* for the past three years and it has changed me for the better; I am a stronger writer, a more critical editor, and I can revise papers for nine and a half hours straight if needed. I can only hope that *Plebeian* continues to develop student abilities like it did with mine. I also hope that this year's content inspires you to submit your own work next year, maintaining this platform for many more years to come.

ALLISON SUBA, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

March 2019

Reading Horror in Seneca's *Phaedra*

Jennifer MacPherson

Horror takes center stage in Seneca's *Phaedra*, an explicit and overwhelming presence as the play builds towards a bloody climax. Yet many scholars trying to reconcile Senecan tragedy with his Stoic philosophy have been left puzzled by the inclusion of this horror, and many have condemned it.¹ Segal states that "it has been fashionable to label such accounts grotesque, formless, or tasteless, and to cite them as evidence of the decadence of an era that took pleasure in the carnage of the amphitheaters."² Some scholars believe the horror is completely at odds with Stoic philosophy.³ Others argue it is a way of teaching Stoicism through cautionary tales, and still others suggest it is simply to grab the attention of audiences or fulfill a "perverse Roman blood-thirstiness."⁴ These interpretations neglect to understand the nature of horror. It is grotesque, but it is by no means formless nor tasteless; horror serves a purpose. Gunderson calls Seneca's tragedies "places to explore ideas" and notes that "these experiments represent moments where one sees Seneca himself asking hard questions whose answers by no means presuppose an orthodox Stoic articulation."⁵ I propose that Seneca uses horror as a crucial tool in performing such experiments and that a closer reading of the horror in Senecan tragedy can help us understand how tragedy explores the ideas of Stoicism, and to what end. This paper argues that in *Phaedra*, Seneca employs the mode of horror in his creation of atmosphere, his portrayal of the monster, and his description of Hippolytus' body, through the related concepts of the macabre, the grotesque, and the abject. These occurrences of horror complicate and challenge orthodox Stoicism's absolutist notions about nature, as embodied by Hippolytus, and ultimately suggests that the Stoic value of moderation be applied even to Stoicism itself.

Before analyzing its use in *Phaedra*, we must discuss horror and its relation to Stoicism. Orthodox Stoicism conceived of a natural world ordered by reason, with which one should live in accordance.⁶ This entailed

1 M. J. Mans, "The Macabre in Seneca's Tragedies," *Acta Classica* 27 (1984): 101.

2 Charles Segal, "Senecan Baroque: The Death of Hippolytus in Seneca, Ovid, and Euripides," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 114 (1984): 311.

3 Denis Henry and B. Walker, "Phantasmagoria and Idyll: An Element of Seneca's 'Phaedra'," *Greece & Rome* 13, no. 2 (1966): 224.

4 Mans, "The Macabre in Seneca's Tragedies," 113-114.

5 Erik Gunderson, "The Analytics of Desire," in *The Sublime Seneca: Ethics, Literature, Metaphysics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 105, 107.

6 Gunderson, "The Analytics of Desire," 106-7.

a moderate and rational lifestyle that avoided overwhelming emotion, as Mans explains that “man in the eyes of a Stoic is a rational being and is responsible for his deeds but that his reason can be deranged by uncontrolled emotions.”⁷ Horror would then be considered entirely at odds with this understanding of Stoicism. Indeed, tragedy itself, if we take the Aristotelian concept of catharsis—purging pity and fear—also seems to be at odds with Stoicism and compatible with horror.⁸ Famously, H. P. Lovecraft wrote “The oldest and strongest emotion of mankind is fear, and the oldest and strongest kind of fear is fear of the unknown.”⁹ Lovecraft sees horror as fundamentally connected to “primal emotion” and stresses that horror literature should primarily be judged on the basis of its emotional impact on the audience.¹⁰ This emphasis on emotion is the antithesis of Stoic ideology. Yet, according to Lovecraft, this emotion is old and innate—it is *natural*—and thus, the feared unknown can be considered an irrational presence in the Stoics’ supposedly rational natural world. This complicates a simple binary between horror and Stoicism. In Senecan tragedy, horror and Stoicism are not simple opposites for, as we shall see, nature is intimately tied to the horrors of *Phaedra*.

This is the crucial function of horror: it complicates. The concepts of horror used in this analysis show that horror breeds ambiguity and challenges the norm. Fear often reveals that this norm is an ambiguous unknown. Stephen King posits this, stating that “what [horror is] looking for is the place where you, the viewer or the reader, live at your most primitive level. [The] good horror tale will dance its way to the center of your life and find the secret door to the room you believed no one but you knew of.”¹¹ This, as we shall see, is what happens to Hippolytus, as his extreme Stoicism is stripped down to reveal that it is actually driven by emotion. Likewise, the horror in Senecan tragedy does this to the Stoic audience and muddles their clear views on the principles of Stoicism.

I will first provide an analysis of the occurrences of horror in *Phaedra*, beginning with Seneca’s creation of setting and atmosphere through the macabre. Here, the macabre is taken as a literary mood, focusing on the feelings it evokes in the audience. The macabre is described as what is “connected with death or the sphere of death,” and is all that is dark, dreadful, and ominous.¹² As Mans notes, a key way in which Seneca constructs this macabre atmosphere is through foreshadowing the gruesome end.¹³ For example, the chorus, singing of Hippolytus’ beauty, says “sel-

7 Mans, “The Macabre in Seneca’s Tragedies,” 109.

8 Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. Stephen Halliwell (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), VI.25.

9 Howard Phillips Lovecraft, *Supernatural Horror in Literature* (New York: Ben Abramson, 1945), 12.

10 Lovecraft, *Supernatural Horror in Literature*, 16-17.

11 Stephen King, *Danse Macabre* (New York: Everest House, 1981), 17-18.

12 Mans, “The Macabre in Seneca’s Tragedies,” 101.

13 *Ibid.*, 103.

dom has beauty come to men unpunished.”¹⁴ This does not forecast a happy ending for Hippolytus. The ancient audience was likely familiar with the myth and already knew that Hippolytus would perish. Mans writes, “Surely the constant direct or indirect reference to the horrible closing scene must blunt the feelings of the audience rendering it less sensitive or even immune to shock by the time the scene is eventually reached.”¹⁵ But horror need not shock an audience to be terrifying, and this use of foreshadowing does not “blunt” the emotional effect. Rather, it does quite the opposite. Mans notes that the audience, though aware of Hippolytus’ ultimate demise, does not know how he will die in this version, and says this “ensures a mounting tension.”¹⁶ Taking it a step further, the play’s foreshadowing creates an ever-looming sense of dread, and thus the macabre takes hold of the audience.

This comes to a head when the setting—both physical and atmospheric—is transformed into a macabre landscape. Segal says that Seneca’s elaborate description in his account of Hippolytus’ doomed chariot ride “attempts not merely to tell of fear in the past but to recreate the mood of that fear in the present” by invoking the audience’s “emotional participation”—that is, by instilling the macabre.¹⁷ The messenger describes:

Then all of a sudden the depths of the ocean resounded,
the noise rang up to the sky. No wind blew on the water,
no part of the silent sky had caused the sound;
a tempest of its own had roused the quiet sea [...]
As we stood aghast at the flood, see, all of a sudden
the sea gave a roar, and the cliffs all around were singing.¹⁸

In these lines, all aspects of the natural environment—the ocean, sky, and land—are transformed from natural and familiar to unnatural and eerie, as the usual sounds of nature are overtaken by an unknown.

The macabre is inherently ambiguous. It connects the natural world of the living with the supernatural underworld, and is therefore both natural and unnatural, horrifically real and fantastic at the same time. This is explicit in *Phaedra*: Theseus has returned from the underworld to the land of the living, yet through the intrusion of horror, he “finds the welcome of his native land feels worse than Hell itself.”¹⁹ As the natural world is transformed into the macabre, there is an “unstable shifting be-

¹⁴ Lucius Annaeus Seneca, “Phaedra,” *Seneca: Six Tragedies*, trans. Emily Wilson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 820.

¹⁵ Mans, “The Macabre in Seneca’s Tragedies,” 103.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 103.

¹⁷ Segal, “Senecan Baroque: The Death of Hippolytus in Seneca, Ovid, and Euripides,” 318.

¹⁸ Sen., *Phaedra*, 1007-10, 1025-6.

¹⁹ *Phaedra*, 1147-8.

tween the real and the imaginary," and thus rationality is destabilized.²⁰ The natural world is changed into something other than the rational Stoic concept, and if nature is the basis of Stoic virtue, then this introduction of the macabre likewise complicates Stoicism itself.

Another prominent occurrence of horror in the play is the monster, and here we turn to the grotesque. Adopted from the visual arts, the grotesque centers on imagery that is disgustingly and absurdly abnormal, often deformed and monstrous.²¹ While more visually focused, it is similar to the macabre in that it entails ambiguity and "incongruous medleys of the monstrous and natural."²² However, it is more overtly challenging to the natural, as Harpham explains:

The grotesque must begin with, or contain within it, certain aesthetic conventions which the reader feels are representative of reality as he knows it [but] jeopardize or shatter our conventions by opening onto vertiginous new perspectives characterized by the destruction of logic and regression to the unconscious-madness, hysteria, or nightmare. But this threat depends for its effectiveness on the efficacy of the everyday, the partial fulfillment of our usual expectations.²³

Thus, in order to be grotesque, it must have its base in the normal/natural, and then pervert it. It is this perversion that makes it horrific and threatening to the norm. Seneca's sea monster is then the epitome of the grotesque. Segal notes that in Euripides' version of the Hippolytus myth, the monster is simply a bull.²⁴ Seneca intentionally alters the monster to be grotesque and horrific, as is clear in its description:

It was a bull. How huge he was! His bulk
loomed high as he lifted his blue back from the water;
a green mane flowed from his gigantic head;
his ears were hairy, his eyes flashed multicoloured;
he was the type of animal the sea-born king would own,
lord of a savage herd. At times his eyes
spurt fire, at other times they shine blue light;
his sturdy back was ridged with muscle and his nostrils
flared as he huffed and puffed great draughts of air;
green mosses stuck to his underside and dewlap,

²⁰ Segal, "Senecan Baroque: The Death of Hippolytus in Seneca, Ovid, and Euripides," 317.

²¹ Geoffrey Harpham, "The Grotesque: First Principles," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 34, no. 4 (1976): 461-3.

²² *Ibid.*, 464.

²³ *Ibid.*, 462.

²⁴ Segal, "Senecan Baroque: The Death of Hippolytus in Seneca, Ovid, and Euripides," 317-8.

PLEBEIAN

while his vast flanks were covered with red seaweed.
Finally the monster gathers his huge rear from the water,
dragging his vast and scaly folds of flesh,
like the Leviathan of the distant seas.²⁵

In this description, the bull is clearly threatening, as shown in the prominent diction of size and intimidation, “His bulk loomed high,” “gigantic,” “Leviathan,” and others. Its grotesque nature is also highlighted by the bodily emphasis, as the description breaks down the creature into separate body parts and thereby distorts the audience’s imagined visual, with “scaly folds of flesh” making for a particularly disgusting image.

Most importantly, this sea-bull is both natural and unnatural, as the grotesque requires. The monster comes from the sea, making nature the source of this horror, and is a bull, a familiar animal.²⁶ The description emphasizes that it is covered in vegetation, and is blue and green, colours most commonly associated with nature. Yet at the same time, these natural descriptors are unnatural. Real bulls are, of course, not blue and green, nor are they scaly, nor do they have multicoloured eyes that shoot fire and light. These supernatural elements pervert the familiar image of the bull into a horrific monster. Thus, like the macabre, the grotesque is ambiguously natural and unnatural, which complicates the orthodox Stoic’s simple understanding of nature, and therefore complicates the entirety of Stoicism. But while the macabre transforms, grotesque imagery takes it a step further and perverts nature. It not only destabilizes the real and rational, but threatens or challenges it. It also, according to Harpham’s definition, offers “new perspectives,” not only visually, but also ideologically.²⁷ By perverting Stoic nature, the grotesque compels Stoics to consider new and unusual aspects to their ideology.

Hippolytus’ body is the site of the two most horrific occurrences in the play—its violent destruction and the attempt to reassemble it—and exhibits the complementary ideas of the grotesque and the abject. The grotesque is blatant in the graphic imagery of the body torn apart:

Hippolytus bloodied the countryside: his shattered skull
bounced down the rocks, and thorns tore off his hair;
his beautiful face was ruined by the hard, stone ground.
His unlucky loveliness was lost in all these wounds.
The chariot wheels rolled over his still-twitching limbs.
At last a charred branch from a tree-trunk pierced him
right in the middle of his groin, and held him fast.

²⁵ Sen., *Phaedra*, 1035-48.

²⁶ Sen., *Phaedra*, 1032.

²⁷ Harpham, “The Grotesque: First Principles,” 462.

The horses pause a little way away from their gored master, attached to his wounded body; then all at once they break, making an end of their owner and delay. The thickets cut the half-dead corpse, and thorns with their sharp brambles; parts of the body were stuck to every tree.²⁸

Though it is not actually depicted on stage, this description is profoundly visual in its gore. Furthermore, Hippolytus' beauty – not just the norm but the ideal – is disfigured into something horrifically abnormal. This perversion is highlighted in lines 1095 and 1096, which in the Latin reads “*et ora duras pulchra populatur lapis / peritque multo vulnere infelix decor.*”²⁹ Here Seneca uses chiasmus to juxtapose his beauty (“*ora...pulchra*,” “*decor*”) and his disfigurement (“*populatur lapis*,” “*multo vulnere*”), which Wilson’s translation alters to produce the same effect in English by beginning each line with mention of his beauty (“beautiful face,” “loveliness”) and ending each with his disfigurement (“ruined,” “wounds”).

But this scene goes further: it is not merely grotesque, but abject. Kristeva’s concept of the abject is complex, but fundamentally it is something which “disturbs identity, system, [and] order,” consequently causing a physical reaction of revulsion, and must be rejected.³⁰ Kristeva uses the example of a gross (abject) food and the act of vomiting.³¹ Encounters with the abject, Kristeva claims, disintegrate norms and their meaning, and are thus horrific.³² Looking more closely at the above passage from *Phaedra*, the abject becomes apparent. Much like the monster, Hippolytus is described as body parts, but unlike the monster, these parts no longer make up a whole. His body is literally broken down into body parts, and with it, the meaning that these body parts together constituted. He is no longer a real living person, no longer Hippolytus himself. All that remains are meaningless bloody bits. Additionally, Segal notes that this abjection is seen in the Latin, as the body parts begin as the verbs’ subjects and then become objects.³³ Kristeva claims that the corpse is the “utmost of abjection. [...] It is no longer I who expel, ‘I’ is expelled. [...] It is death infecting life.”³⁴ This becomes even more apparent, as Gunderson crucially observes, in Theseus’ futile attempt to reassemble Hippolytus’ body.³⁵ Theseus questions how the bodily remains could be his son, saying “is this Hippolytus?” and fails to rebuild the body because some parts are missing

28 Sen., *Phaedra*, 1093-1104.

29 Latin text as according to the *Loeb Classical Library* edition.

30 Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, trans. Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 4.

31 Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 3.

32 *Ibid.*, 4.

33 Segal, “Senecan Baroque: The Death of Hippolytus in Seneca, Ovid, and Euripides,” 325.

34 Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 4.

35 Gunderson, “The Analytics of Desire,” 123.

PLEBEIAN

and others he cannot even recognize.³⁶ Hippolytus' abject corpse has been rendered meaningless and lifeless, and it is just as impossible to restore any sense or meaning to it as it is to restore its life. The thing which Theseus rebuilds is a grotesque image that could scarcely be called a body.

It is notable that nature makes Hippolytus' body abject. Nature (the rocks, the thorns, the horses, and the tree branch) destroys it and, strewn across the landscape, it is impossible to collect all the parts and make the body whole again. Hippolytus becomes one with nature, which is the Stoic ideal, but this is horrific, not virtuous. Thus, the very understanding of the foundation of Stoic philosophy is disturbed by abjection. These paired scenes are the most horrific in *Phaedra* because of the abject, for just as they are the culmination of all of the play's horror, the abject is the culmination of the theoretical elements of horror which this analysis has tracked. The macabre changes nature and complicates Stoicism, the grotesque image perverts and challenges it, but the concept of the abject disintegrates the meaning and understanding at the core of Stoic ideology.

Seneca does not depict these horrors in order to destroy his own Stoic philosophy, but rather uses their subversiveness to broaden the limits of Stoicism and critically analyze its principles. This is apparent in Hippolytus' character, which is the representative of orthodox Stoicism in the play, and is covertly another occurrence of the grotesque and abject. Hippolytus is initially presented as the Stoic ideal in choosing to be celibate and live in nature away from the corrupting city. He asserts:

There is no life so free, so clean of sin,
so respectful of the ways of old,
as that which leaves the city walls, to be happy in the woods.
Anger, lust, and greed do not set fire to the heart
of the innocent man whose home is on the mountain tops.³⁷

This is taking Stoic ideology to its extreme. Yet, he is not really the Stoic ideal at all. He rejects sex and retreats to the forest not out of Stoic rationality but out of emotion: Hippolytus hates women. He admits "be it reason, nature, or passion which inspires me, / my pleasure is to hate them."³⁸ His seemingly ideal Stoicism is actually a perverse distortion of the philosophy to excuse and conceal his vicious emotions. It is thus a grotesque and abject form of Stoicism.

Theseus says as much, though he does so when speaking of the false rape rather than false virtue:

³⁶ Sen., *Phaedra*, 1249, 1261, 1265-8.

³⁷ *Phaedra*, 483-7.

³⁸ *Phaedra*, 567-8.

How life deceives us! You hid your real feelings,
 you put a pretty face on your base thoughts;
 shame hid your shamelessness, coolness hid your daring,
 duty hid your wickedness. False men profess their truth,
 soft sybarites act tough.³⁹

Hippolytus appears Stoically virtuous, but underneath is actually “shameless”, “wicked”, and “false”. He himself is unaware of this, and insists that his ideals, the “truth” he professes, are truly the right way of life. He is frequently described as stubborn, as “stern, resistant, wild.” Even here, we see a sort of ambiguity because “wild” suggests both natural and irrational.⁴⁰ This absolute certainty that his way is the correct form of virtue, the perfect form of Stoicism, further renders him grotesque. Harpham connects the superficial grotesque image with an inner grotesque character, stating: “victims of obsession particularly lend themselves to grotesque characterization. [The] moment one of the people took one of the truths to himself, called it his truth and tried to live by it, he became a grotesque and the truth he embraced became a falsehood.”⁴¹ Gunderson suggests a similar idea, stating, “Hippolytus claims that his relationship to women is simple, but it is in fact complex precisely because of these claims of simplicity.”⁴² Hippolytus is obsessive in his ‘natural’ lifestyle and in his hatred of women, and it is because he asserts that his way is the only correct form of Stoic virtue, blind to alternative understandings like those of the Nurse (who outlines a philosophy in which pleasure and human society can be part of nature),⁴³ that his Stoicism becomes a grotesque misinterpretation. Thus, Seneca seems to be warning orthodox Stoics of the dangers of claiming simple absolute truths and failing to see other possibilities. Horror forces them to see these other perspectives and the potential failings of their own ideas.

In this, Seneca is actually adhering to another Stoic principle: moderation. This principle is espoused several times in *Phaedra*. For example, the Nurse asserts, “There are two ways to be good. First: want the right things, no straying. / The second is knowing and setting a limit to one’s sins.”⁴⁴ Likewise, the Chorus says “Jupiter is afraid / for heaven and attacks those that lie near it. / The low-slung cottages of peasants / are never shaken so roughly. / His thunder strikes at kings.”⁴⁵ But Seneca, using the complicating element of horror, is suggesting a complicated view of

39 *Phaedra*, 918-22.

40 *Phaedra*, 416.

41 Harpham, “The Grotesque: First Principles,” 465.

42 Gunderson, “The Analytics of Desire,” 116.

43 Sen., *Phaedra*, 435-482.

44 *Phaedra*, 140-1.

45 *Phaedra*, 1136-40.

PLEBEIAN

this moderation principle: moderation even in one's practice of Stoicism, so as not to be blind to other possibilities and become a horrific perversion of a Stoic. Hippolytus, as has been shown, is not moderate, but extreme in his Stoicism, and this, I have argued, is part of what makes his Stoicism a perversion. Seneca himself, according to Pratt, practiced this moderation in some parts of his Stoicism: "At times Seneca criticizes the rigidity of Cynic and Stoic beliefs concerning pain and misfortune. He rejects the Cynic attitude that man must be insensible to feeling. He even expresses dissatisfaction with the 'orthodox' Stoic belief that evil is to be ignored, and refers to his own thinking as more moderate."⁴⁶ He does the same thing in *Phaedra* through the mode of horror. Seneca complicates and challenges Stoicism while still adhering to the Stoic ideology of moderation in order to question and expand the limits of Stoic interpretation.

Scholars who say that the horror in Senecan tragedies is meaningless gore or a simple what-not-to-do are missing the complicating and challenging elements of horror. In *Phaedra*, horror forces the audience to see new perspectives and reveals the hidden facets of ideologies of which the audience, like Hippolytus, may not even be aware. Seneca probes the bounds of Stoic interpretations, while warning against extreme versions of Stoicism that claim absolute truths. Returning to Lovecraft's famous definition of horror—'fear of the unknown'—the horror of Senecan tragedy is terrifying, particularly to orthodox Stoics, because it makes what was thought to be simple and known into something complex and unknown.⁴⁷

46 Norman T. Pratt Jr., "The Stoic Base of Senecan Drama," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 79 (1948): 4-5.

47 Lovecraft, *Supernatural Horror in Literature*, 12.

Bibliography

- Aristotle. *Poetics*. *Loeb Classical Library* 199. Edited and translated by Stephen Halliwell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Gunderson, Erik. "The Analytics of Desire." In *The Sublime Seneca: Ethics, Literature, Metaphysics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Harpham, Geoffrey. "The Grotesque: First Principles." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 34, no. 4 (1976): 461-468.
- Henry, Denis and Walker, B.. "Phantasmagoria and Idyll: An Element of Seneca's 'Phaedra'." *Greece & Rome* 13, no. 2 (1966): 223-239.
- King, Stephen. *Danse Macabre*. New York: Everest House, 1981.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Lovecraft, Howard Phillips. *Supernatural Horror in Literature*. New York: Ben Abramson, 1945.
- Mans, M. J.. "The Macabre in Seneca's Tragedies." *Acta Classica* 27 (1984): 101-119.
- Pratt, Norman T. Jr.. "The Stoic Base of Senecan Drama." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 79 (1948): 1-11.
- Segal, Charles. "Senecan Baroque: The Death of Hippolytus in Seneca, Ovid, and Euripides." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 114 (1984): 311-325.
- Seneca, Lucius Annaeus. *Phaedra*. In *Loeb Classical Library* 62. Edited and translated by John G. Fitch. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- . "Phaedra." In *Seneca: Six Tragedies*. Translated by Emily Wilson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Bloodstained Immortality: Clytemnestra and Medea's Divisive Reception

Hannah McCarthy

Many of the varied and elevated characters found in Greek tragedy have inspired fascination in audiences for thousands of years. The male characters are immortalized for their heroic deeds or deaths, while female characters are considered the catalysts to these tragic events. Clytemnestra from Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, and Medea from Euripides' *Medea* fit very well into this second category. Although the female protagonists in these plays are certainly not portrayed heroically, they possess characteristics often found in men in other Greek stories. In particular, they are angry. This clear deviation from how female characters in tragedy are portrayed is striking and has sparked interest and discussion amongst audiences in antiquity and modernity. Clytemnestra and Medea have immortalized themselves through their unique subversion of some gender roles at the same time as their confirmation to others, and by possessing a sense of rage and justice unlike anything held by other tragic female characters.

To start, the differences from the traditional trope of tragic heroes drew fifth-century Athenian audiences to these women. Mark Griffith explains that Athenian audiences might have enjoyed the satyr choruses in satyr plays more than the more elevated characters found in tragedy because their experiences are much more relatable.

The superior understanding, moral seriousness, and (in the case of male figures) valor of these elite characters command the audience's respect—and usually approval—in contrast to the ignorance, brutishness, and occasional outright lawlessness of the satyrs (and in some cases, of a villain or two as well); and these characters are seen to come from, and return to, positions of honor and authority within a legitimate kind of social structure, once this brief interlude in the wilds is concluded.¹

Although Griffith speaks specifically to the role of satyrs, he refers to tragic villains who belonged in the same category. Athenian audiences had very different experiences than the ones of the epic kings and gods they watched on stage. Griffith argues that this distinction garnered fascination

¹Mark Griffith, *Satyrs, Audience, and the Ends of the Oresteia* (California: University of California Press 2002), 205.

in satyr plays. Even if the satyrs were crude and generally uncivilized, they were closer to earth than heroes. The same argument can be made about Clytemnestra and Medea. Although an Athenian audience would not condone their actions, rage and violence are more familiar concepts than kingship or divinity.

Griffith also writes that “the mixture of attraction and revulsion elicited by the satyr-chorus was especially appealing to repressed elements within the Athenian adult male psyche.”² The intense suffering of fictional characters is not a concept unique to ‘repressed’ Athenians. Horror is a genre beloved by many. As of the release of the eighth film in the *Saw* series in 2017, the franchise has made 873.3 million dollars worldwide.³ Our timeless fascination with pain and death is matched by our desperate hope to not experience such things. By witnessing the events happening to others, audiences find catharsis. The thrill of catharsis is increased by the anticipation of viewing someone else’s pain. Although we do not wish to face Clytemnestra or Medea’s tempers—or their weapons—the violent climaxes of their respective tragedies are exhilarating. We look forward to the death and bloodshed in these tragedies in the same way we want each of *Jigsaw*’s traps to be more complex and bloodier than the ones before. Anticipation is a mental act: we inherently appreciate emotional suffering, even without the physical. One of the most heartbreaking moments in *Medea* is when she suddenly falters in her decision to kill her sons. “My passion has all melted, women, now that I see my children’s shining looks.”⁴ Equal parts charmed and horrified by the way her children smile, Medea nearly loses her resolve. This moment only serves to increase the pain that is to come. Most modern audiences, based on foreshadowing and the story’s fame, know that there is no hope for these two children. But the brief tease that there was nearly a moment for them to escape their fate makes their deaths even more upsetting, and thus more thrilling.

While audiences find the violence compelling, there may be a darker explanation for their fascination. Froma Zeitlin suggests that an Athenian audience might have perceived Clytemnestra and Medea as both “representing the positive values and structures of the house...[and] a subversive threat to male authority as an adversary in a power struggle for control.”⁵ Clytemnestra and Medea are defined by their gender roles and how they deviate from them, such as when they violate the rules of the house. Clytemnestra kept her house well-tended until Agamem-

2 Griffith, *Satyrs*, 2002, 228.

3 Simon Thompson, “Ahead Of ‘Jigsaw,’ The Opening Weekend Box Office Of Every ‘Saw’ Movie Ranked,” <https://www.forbes.com> (October 15, 2017).

4 Euripides, *Medea*, trans. Oliver Taplin, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 2013) 1041-1042.

5 Froma Zeitlin, *Playing the Other: Theater, Theatricality, and the Feminine in Greek Drama* (California: University of California Press 1985), 71-72.

PLEBEIAN

non came home; then she murdered him and claimed his throne.⁶ Medea murdered her sons—Jason’s heirs—before ascending on a divine chariot.⁷ How might we anticipate the reactions of Athenian men in the audience? Perhaps they would begin to doubt their wives and look for signs of unfaithfulness or impiety. Or, they might become increasingly violent towards women in an already misogynistic society. Zeitlin confirms that there was uneasiness towards weaponized femininity, best exemplified by Dionysius’ “effeminacy” in the *Bacchae*, which enabled the female chorus to kill Pentheus.⁸ Perhaps Athenian men were fascinated by these characters because the concept of women with such agency in real life was laughable. It should be noted that many of these scenarios can be applied in a modern audience. It is simply untrue to say that misogyny is absent from the modern world, just like it would be to claim that Aeschylus and Euripides were early feminists. Modern men may watch these plays and share feelings about the protagonists with the men of Athens.

Clytemnestra’s ambition, coupled with the fact that she is a woman, can make her appear problematic to the audience. Due to the audience’s inability to digest her divergence from the typical role of an Athenian woman, the audience either embraces this problematic behaviour or rejects her as something that is “other” in society, like an animal. She kills Agamemnon for sacrificing their daughter, Iphigenia, and is in turn murdered by their son, Orestes. While Clytemnestra is eternally associated with bloodshed, the play gives no indication that Orestes did anything wrong, even though he has also killed a family member out of revenge. Attempts to portray Clytemnestra’s ambition as an excuse to legitimize her death are similarly problematic when compared to the many male characters in Greek tragedy and myth that are driven by ambition. On the other hand, Clytemnestra and Medea are both referred to in matters that strip them of womanhood and associate them with vicious creatures. Cassandra calls Clytemnestra a “woman lioness”⁹ and Jason calls Medea “a lioness not a woman.”¹⁰ Hatred-inspired fascination is not uncommon, and these women are easy to demonize. By comparing them to beasts often associated with violence, these characters are set apart from other women and become something far more unsettling and savage.

The ways in which Clytemnestra and Medea both conform and deviate from their assigned gender roles are extremely important to their individual characters. Both women seem intent on ridding themselves of their womanhood, or at least, relieving themselves of the limitations by which women are perceived. At the beginning of their respective plays,

6 Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, trans. Richmond Lattimore (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013) 1673.

7 Eur., *Med.*, 1404.

8 Zeitlin, *Playing the Other*, 63.

9 Aesch., *Ag.*, 1259.

10 Eur., *Med.*, 1340.

their husbands are absent, and they have wronged their wives somehow. Clytemnestra awaits Agamemnon's return so that she can kill him for sacrificing their daughter, and Medea is faced with the knowledge that Jason has left her, despite all that she had sacrificed for him. The violence that these women inflict upon their families is in retaliation for offences that their family members have committed towards them. Both women commit acts of violence based on family deeds, and to their own family members. According to Zeitlin, these actions have ramifications beyond the men they kill, as they subvert the masculine control of the *oikos*.¹¹ Medea has effectively cut off Jason's familial line, while Clytemnestra has killed the king of her city and family. "No household exists anymore—it's all gone," Medea's Nurse says, when she begins to fear her mistress' wrath.¹² Clytemnestra and Medea pervert the notion of the good woman who waits at home for her husband.

Although they conform to their gender roles in some ways, both characters also possess a conviction that is not granted to most other tragic women. Before Medea seems to make her full decision to kill her children, she had already committed to pursuing a violent course of action, claiming that she will "push [her] daring to its violent end."¹³ Medea is no stranger to violence because she had already murdered Pelias¹⁴ and her brother.¹⁵ Clytemnestra, too, is accused of "lust[ing] for conflict" by Agamemnon because she voices an opinion about the Trojan War that causes him discomfort.¹⁶ War was not a woman's place, and so the Athenian men in the audience may have possessed a similar sense of unease. Like Medea, Clytemnestra expresses frustration at being undermined and underestimated because of her gender. When the chorus protests Agamemnon's usurpation and murder, Clytemnestra snaps at them as if she is angry that they did not previously fear her: "You try me out as if I were a woman and vain; but my heart is not fluttered as I speak before you."¹⁷

It is Clytemnestra's deviation from gender norms that eventually inspires fear. On the other hand, people already fear Medea at the beginning of her play. Creon wishes to banish her upon Jason's marriage to his daughter because he fears her sharp mind, apparently aware of the violent deeds she committed in the past.¹⁸ Medea is well-aware that her mind inspires fear, bitterly claiming that her wit has often caused her strife.¹⁹ Without their strong minds, she and Clytemnestra would not be able to

11 Zeitlin, *Playing the Other*, 72.

12 Eur., *Med.*, 139.

13 *Med.*, 394.

14 *Med.*, 9.

15 *Med.*, 1334.

16 Aesch., *Ag.*, 940.

17 *Ag.*, 1401-1402.

18 Eur., *Med.*, 284-287.

19 Eur., *Med.*, 303.

carry out the deeds they do. Since Aeschylus and Euripides portray these women as having the hearts and stomachs to carry out gruesome tasks, audiences who would expect feminine characters could find them problematic because of the traditionally masculine characteristics they possess.

The strength of the female characters in these tragedies is contrasted by the weakness exemplified in the male characters. This becomes clear in the beginning of *Medea* when the Nurse says that “Rulers have dangerous natures: subjected to little, controlling much, they are not inclined to relent from their passions.”²⁰ There is a sense of ambiguity in this passage, for it is not immediately clear of whom the Nurse is speaking. She is vocalizing her fear for Medea and Jason’s children, and while it would make sense for her to worry that Creon might bring upon them some sort of harm, it was Medea whom she had been speaking of just before. Medea comes from a royal line but she has long since been exiled. There would not be a reason to call her a “ruler,” and yet, the Nurse is also not clearly speaking of Creon. Even in the beginning of the play there is an uncertainty as to who holds true power—but the end, of course, makes it very clear with Medea’s victory. Jason, too, is portrayed as petty and oblivious, accusing Medea of getting angry simply over losing her sex life as he engages in a misogynistic rant on the value—or lack thereof—that women possess. “I say it should have been a possibility for mankind to engender children from some other source, and for the female sex not to exist.”²¹ Medea notes Jason’s uselessness in a moment that is darkly comedic, lamenting to her children that they will not die because of her actions, but because of their “father’s failing” to save them.²² Agamemnon also shows a weakness that greatly contrasts to Clytemnestra’s strength when he shows compassion to Cassandra by asking Clytemnestra to show her kindness. Specifically, Agamemnon argues “The conqueror who uses softly his power is watched benevolently by god from afar, and this slave’s yoke is one no man will wear from choice.”²³ Agamemnon’s statement is naïve because he has killed their daughter, left for ten years, and returned home with a young sex slave. Agamemnon fails to anticipate Clytemnestra’s anger, and his obliviousness allows Clytemnestra to kill him with ease. Zeitlin also notes this juxtaposition:

...one could remark, not without justice, that although all the actors are male in tragedy, we find that within the plays feminized males are countered by masculinized women: for example, Aeschylus’ Clytemnestra of the “man-counseling mind”

²⁰ *Med.*, 119-121.

²¹ *Med.*, 572-574.

²² *Med.*, 1364.

²³ Aesch., *Ag.*, 951-953.

(Agamemnon), [and] Euripides' *Medea*.²⁴

It could be said that these deviations from gender norms endear these characters to women. Many genres of ancient Greek literature feature the deeds of men, while women only participate passively, if at all. Modern audiences would respond positively to Medea's line wherein she claims that she "would rather join the battle rank of shields three times than undergo birth labour once" because of its emotional impact.²⁵ It is genuinely exciting to read about such powerful women—as twisted as they are—in a cathartic way that harkens back to the audience's fascination with violence and blood.

Although Medea and Clytemnestra subvert gender roles, they also often conform to them. The most obvious way they present themselves is in motherhood. Clytemnestra speaks of Iphigenia, whom she calls her "pain grown into love," and Orestes often, since her vengeance is motivated by Iphigenia's death.²⁶ Medea struggles for nearly the whole play with what to do with her children—first she is unsure what will become of them, and once she decides to kill them, she must reconcile her internal objections of motherly love with her children's murders. Jason does not seem to believe that she cares for them,²⁷ but Euripides encourages the audience to doubt the credibility of Jason's accusation, because he cares little for anyone but himself.²⁸ Her justification for the murders reveals the obvious yet twisted love she has for her sons.

Now they are bound to die in any case, and since they must,
it will be me, the one who gave them birth,
who'll be the one to deal them death.²⁹

The statement is made contradictory by its divergence from gender roles. Childbirth is one of the few ways in which Greek women could possess an active role, and Medea juxtaposes this with the act of murder. The children must die so that she can act against Jason, but in this line, Medea is more concerned about their birth. Their births would have had a more personal significance to her than to her husband, for there was very little that was more associated with Greek womanhood than childbirth.

The chorus in *Medea* clearly holds sympathy for Medea and her predicament, despite being fully aware of what she plans to do:

²⁴ Zeitlin, *Playing the Other*, 65.

²⁵ Eur., *Med.*, 250-252.

²⁶ Aesch., *Ag.*, 1417-1418.

²⁷ Eur., *Med.*, 565.

²⁸ *Med.*, 483-485.

²⁹ *Med.*, 1064-1066.

PLEBEIAN

And I feel pain with you,
sad mother of the two,
you'll strike your children dead,
all for the marriage bed
your husband has betrayed—
and now he holds in your stead
another as his wife.³⁰

They recognize that her actions are wrong, but they still admit to feeling sorry for her. This critical yet understanding attitude has been adopted by those who genuinely enjoy the character. However, it should be noted that the chorus is made of women. By having them feel blatant sympathy for Medea for much of the play, Euripides may be making a negative statement about the nature of women in general. Even as she begins to shed her inhibitions and collect masculine attributes, Medea does not yet let go of motherly love, her last scrap of womanhood. It is perhaps here that we see Medea at her most complex—not yet a child-murderer, but not quite still a mother.

Although Medea inflicted the worst possible outcome upon her sons, there is little in the text that suggests she does not love them. But she understands men's expectations of motherhood and femininity, and she can exploit this for her own gain. Medea appeals to Creon by using her children to elicit Creon's pity, but this exploitation does not negate her feelings for her sons: "I'm not concerned about myself and exile, but [my sons]—I weep that they're subjected to distress."³¹ Here Medea anticipates how Creon believes she should react—and it works. This self-awareness of gender roles plays upon the audience's own awareness. If Medea had failed to manipulate Creon, the ending of the play would not have been so gruesome. Clytemnestra, too, put on the appearance of a patient wife for her household during the war, a farce that she maintains until Agamemnon's death.³² When she is finally able to shed this disguise, she is disgusted that she ever had to wear it:

How else could I, arming hate against hateful men,
disguised in seeming tenderness, fence high the nets
of ruin beyond overleaping?³³

Zeitlin writes of a similar use of gender roles, when she states that "one [is] on the side of femininity as power and the other [is] on the side of fem-

³⁰ *Med.*, 996-1002.

³¹ *Med.*, 346-347.

³² Aesch., *Ag.*, 605-612.

³³ *Ag.*, 1374-1376.

inity as weakness.”³⁴ The performative actions of Medea and Clytemnestra are so closely aligned with their genuine ones that it is difficult for the other characters—and sometimes the audience—to decipher their exact thoughts.

To return to the role of satyrs in satyr plays, Griffith describes the same fascination with deviance as “a peculiarly strong conscious or unconscious claim on the male Athenian imagination.”³⁵ The satyrs are jarring in their debauchery and mortality when compared to heroes and the divine, just as Clytemnestra and Medea are jarring in their feminine motherhood and masculine anger. Past and present audiences experience an emotional reaction, positive or negative, to all these characters. Much of the reasoning behind the endless fascination felt toward Clytemnestra and Medea comes from the fact that these women are unapologetically angry, violent, and deviate greatly from their expected gender roles. They are controversial characters whose very existence inspires debate. Both characters sought their own forms of glory. Surely, both would be delighted to know that their names remain immortalized.

³⁴ Zeitlin, *Playing the Other*, 64.

³⁵ Griffith, *Satyrs*, 211.

Bibliography

Aeschylus. *Agamemnon*. Translated by Richmond Lattimore. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.

Euripides. *Medea*. Translated by Oliver Taplin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013

Griffith, Mark. "Satyrs, Audience, and the Ends of the Oresteia." California: University of California Press. 2002. 195-258.

Thompson, Simon. "Ahead Of 'Jigsaw,' The Opening Weekend Box Office Of Every 'Saw' Movie Ranked." Forbes. October 26, 2017. Accessed March 16, 2019.

Zeitlin, Froma. "Playing the Other: Theater, Theatricality, and the Feminine in Greek Drama". California: University of California Press. 1985.

I Contact: Self-Involved Spectatorship in Hellenistic Sculptures of Sleep

Hana Nikčević

Classical Greek sculpture (i.e., that produced in approximately the 5th and 4th centuries BCE) tended to focus on perfect, serene physicality. The Hellenistic period (comprising the 3rd to 1st centuries BCE), subsequently, saw Greek sculptors' interests in mathematical and optical exactitude wane. Alongside a shift in philosophy towards the quality of the inner life, towards self-searching and spiritual liberation,¹ sculpture became a medium through which to explore human nature, subjectivity, and interiority.

Being, however, so eminently 'material,' sculpture chose to address interiority by way of its potential for external expression. Gisela Richter states that Hellenistic art in general is characterized by individualization in every aspect: not only is the head a portrait, but the entire body is also an expression of character.² The introduction of sleeping figures is part of this development. Discussed as representing respite or restoration; drunkenness; vulnerability; altered states of being; isolation; or any intersection of these, sleeping figures evidence, fundamentally, a testament to the Hellenistic interest in exploring the interior. This exploration studies the capacity of the interior to constitute 'otherness,' and, further, how another's 'otherness' can be used to promote self-reflexivity. What is at stake in the depiction of a sleeping figure is not simply the interiority of the sculpted figure, but also the inner life and subjectivity of the viewer. This paper will demonstrate not only that sleeping figures stage intrigue in and, ultimately, exclusion from the sculptural subject's interiority, but also that they interrogate the viewer's mental state. The figuration of the sleeping individual's otherness, further, occurs not only through using sleep as a metaphor for physical and psychological distance, but also through the phenomenological experience of observing a sleeping subject. This same phenomenological experience, which we will unravel in relation to Guy Hedreen's 1997 discussion of "involved spectatorship," is what allows for the interrogation and illumination of the viewer's interiority and subjectivity.

Sleep, when it is referenced in ancient texts, can take various forms with various connotations. The sleep of children, for example, is

¹ Peter Green, *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age* (University of California Press, 1993), 53.

² Gisela M. A. Richter, *The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970), 56.

primarily understood as a “sweet” sort of sleep;³ this is sleep of a tranquil, innocent, and restorative nature. Certain instances of sleep in Homer’s *Iliad* and Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* echo that idea of sleep as a positive respite; after a strenuous experience or even quotidian labour, sleep can provide necessary refreshment.⁴ Conversely, sleep can be dangerous. In the *Iliad*, Hera calls upon Hypnos—the personification of sleep—to lull Zeus into slumber such that she might interfere, unnoticed, in the Trojan War. Drunken sleep can likewise take on a nefarious character. In being unnaturally induced, through an activity of irresponsibility or deviance, it signifies self-debilitation; though it tames the prefiguring effects of drunkenness, wine-induced sleep is not so much a restoration as it is a cessation of functioning. Certainly, the ancient Greeks did not uniformly stigmatize drinking,⁵ but the potential negative outcomes of imbibing are plainly understood. In Plato’s *Symposium*, for example, our symposiasts forgo drinking in the service of good conversation and bodily well-being; the point is made more forcefully in the oft-referenced narrative of the Centauroomachy, during which the eponymous centaurs are roused by drink to violence and destruction. Indeed, their drunkenness aids in their characterization as the ‘other.’

A sculptural example of drunken sleep with a negative connotation can be found at the Royal Ontario Museum in the form of a ‘Sleeping Silenus,’ a Roman copy of a Hellenistic original. As befits the Hellenistic period, individualization and otherness are articulated through the intersection of old age and drunkenness. The satyr lies asleep on an amphora fallen on its side, which allows the figure to function as a fountain. Without the addition of water necessitated by the fountain, we might imagine that the satyr has neatly finished the vessel’s contents and, appropriately, overturned the vessel to take a nap. The inclusion of running water, however, highlights the satyr’s drink-induced dysfunctionality—wine, presumably, is precious matter to him, but it has ironically divested him of the ability to keep it safely contained. Here, drunken sleep is portrayed as a hindrance and a danger. While only wine is at stake in this case, the Silenus scene might be referential to more serious cases in epic, such as that of the Cyclops in Homer’s *Odyssey*—Polyphemus is defeated after Odysseus tricks him into a drunken sleep.⁶ It should also be noted that an amphora is a storage vessel: this tells us that the satyr is drinking pure wine, in conventional contrast to the wine-water mixture that communicates moderation and *sophrosyne*, the ideal of self-control. The otherness of

3 Emma J. Stafford, “Aspects of Sleep in Hellenistic Sculpture,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, no.38 (1991): 106.

4 Stafford, “Aspects,” 105.

5 Jacques Jouanna, “Wine and Medicine in Ancient Greece,” in *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen: Selected Papers*, ed. Philip Van Der Eijk, trans. Neil Allies (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012): 173.

6 Stafford, “Aspects,” 105.

the satyr—his variance from the Greek ideal—is emphasized.

Emma Stafford suggests that drunken sleep is a more “adult” and “worldly” repose by comparison to the “sweet” sleep of children (though the taming effect that sleep has upon its sculptural subjects can also be defined as something that renders them childlike). The Sleeping Eros, possibly a Hellenistic bronze original from 250-150 BCE,⁷ portrays its inherently mischievous subject divorced of his typically dangerous nature. While asleep, Eros is as harmless as any mortal infant; his divinity remains intact in the form of his wings and quiver, but these hang and lie at odd angles, pointing to the all-encompassing (and all-nullifying) nature of sleep.⁸ Indeed, as per Richter’s observation regarding the Hellenistic tendency towards expressing character and interiority through the form of the entire body, the effect of tranquility and total unawareness is achieved in the Eros through more than just the face, of which the relaxed flesh is shown skewed by gravity. The soft, heavily draped limbs and wings also exhibit the body’s total submission to gravity, communicating the complete relaxation of the muscles (or, rather, the implication of muscles) in sleep.

The so-called Erinni Ludovisi, likely a late-Hellenic marble original, seems also to depict a case of serene, restorative sleep. It portrays a sleeping woman, whose youthfulness is suggested by the smoothness of her face—this is, perhaps, indicative of that restorative quality of sleep. If the head is that of a maenad,⁹ then this portrayal of sleep is also indicative of vulnerability—maenads, when depicted asleep, are usually shown thus on vases alongside an approaching satyr with presumably lewd intentions and of whom the sleeping woman is unaware.¹⁰ Stafford, however, suggests that this head belongs to a Fury, either asleep on Agamemnon’s tomb or at the temple of Apollo at Delphi; her hair is so textured because it is laden with sweat.¹¹ Alternate readings interpret the Erinni not as sleeping, but as dead: sleep, as a tranquilizing state of being, is often likened to death in literature (as Stafford notes, in the *Iliad*, Homer calls the two states ‘twin brothers’).¹² The analogy is made most famously evident on Euphrosios’ ‘Sarpedon krater’ from c. 510 BCE, upon which Hypnos (sleep) and Thanatos (death) carry off Sarpedon’s body to the underworld.¹³ Additionally, the Sleeping Eros type is a common feature of Hellenistic and Roman child funerary monuments; sleep, perhaps, is a sort of temporary death. It is clear that the connotations of sleep intersect, variously conflating resto-

⁷ *Ibid.*, 114.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 114.

⁹ Margarete Bieber, *The Sculpture of Hellenistic Age* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), 112.

¹⁰ Guy Hedreen, “Silens, Nymphs, and Maenads,” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 114 (1994). It might be noted here that Hedreen would challenge this question of identification further; the ‘sleeping maenad’ is, to him, a nymph; this terminology will be used in the later discussion of involved spectatorship.

¹¹ Stafford, “Aspects,” 107.

¹² *Ibid.*, 116.

¹³ Attic red-figure calyx krater, Cerveteri, Museo Nazionale Cerite (no inv.) (*Add2* 396).

ration; death; vulnerability; and love, lust, or sex.¹⁴

Gisela Richter's 'full-body expression' might cite its most evident manifestation as the so-called Barberini Faun, a marble sculpture of a sleeping satyr dated to the late third or second century BCE.¹⁵ Mental state is expressed through the face, but the "physical disunity" of the body, with all its limbs at odd angles, dynamically complements the tension in the face.¹⁶ The Faun further offers us an example of the extent to which setting is integral to holistic intent; the satyr is shown reclining on rocks, which communicates those crucial characteristics of sleep: sleep is an altered state of consciousness, and this is paralleled by a setting in nature symbolizing a removal from the norm; further, the natural setting emphasizes Dionysian connotations.

Indeed, according to Stafford, sleeping figures are often shown in natural settings.¹⁷ Sleep separates its subject psychologically from rational, human society; the sleeper enters a state of unconsciousness that we conceive of as less inflected by constructed modes of thinking and perceiving. A sleeping individual thus moves 'closer to nature,' psychologically and geographically. The 'nature' of Dionysian revelry is, of course, intimately related. Sleeping characters on Greek vases are often maenads, and, in sleeping sculpture, we see satyrs represented. We might now refer to the Hellenistic bronze Derveni Krater (330-320 BCE), upon which Dionysus (in relief) and a satyr (in the round) assume the same arm-across-head gesture as does the Barberini Faun,¹⁸ and as do the sleeping maenads of vase painting.¹⁹ Dionysian rite is, in all respects, nature-oriented; for example, the god and his retinue sport panther skins, maenads hunt (and consume) animals and wield the fennel stalk-and-pinecone *thyrsos*, and ivy is an integral symbol. Dionysus and nature are also linked to the concept of entering an altered state of consciousness through wine-induced *enthousiasmos*, wherein the drinker is divorced from their usual mental state and filled with that of the god;²⁰ indeed, sleep is conceived on very similar terms, and the state is abundantly represented among the inhabitants of Dionysus's characteristically 'other' domain.

Vulnerability is another crucial effect of sleep. Sleepers are vulnerable because they are passive,²¹ cut off from their surroundings and

14 Stafford, "Aspects," 119.

15 Amanda Herring, "Sexy Beast: The Barberini Faun as an Object of Desire," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 25, no. 1 (January 2016): 32.

16 Sheila McNally, "Ariadne and Others: Images of Sleep in Greek and Early Roman Art," *Classical Antiquity* 4, no. 2 (1985): 173.

17 McNally, "Ariadne," 153.

18 Jean Sorabella, "A Satyr for Midas: The Barberini Faun and Hellenistic Royal Patronage," *Classical Antiquity* 26, no. 2 (2007): 226.

19 McNally, "Ariadne," 153.

20 Peter Bing, "Mystery Rituals, Dionysus," (Lecture, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, October 2017).

21 McNally, "Ariadne," 153.

confined to their own interior life. One's status as a vulnerable sleeper, however, is—unsurprisingly—contingent on gender. Sleeping women are figured as vulnerable to sexual attention or assault: our slumbering maenads are beset by prowling satyrs, and Ariadne, abandoned on Naxos, is sleeping when she is abducted by Dionysus. Sleeping men—Polyphemos, for example—are similarly vulnerable to attack, but the unwelcome action is not of a sexual nature; rather, it usually takes the form of martial attack.²²

Erika Simon states that sleep exists “das fast Unglaubliche glaubhaft zu machen”—to make believable that which would otherwise be nearly unbelievable, as in a vase depiction of the giant Alkyoneus, shown sleeping in order to render less unrealistic the event of Herakles overpowering him.²³ A similar construction might be suggested in terms of sleeping figures at large: in some ways, sleeping figures make accessible that which, otherwise, is physically or visually inaccessible. A sleeping figure allows the viewer to observe without responding with any challenging awareness, discomfort, or disapproval; to a mostly male audience and male artisans, sleeping maenads and the sleeping Ariadne signify their conversion by sleep from inaccessible to accessible. Somewhat paradoxically, psychological distance engenders physical accessibility; as well, the ‘necessity’ of sleep to enable accessibility underscores a default mode of inaccessibility. In depictions of vulnerability, then, the communication of distance remains central.

We might return, now, to the Barberini Faun, which has been interpreted in one way as yet unmentioned: the creature might be overcome by the sound of music, in which case, it is suggested, he is the satyr Marsyas, listening to Athena play the aulos.²⁴ In Melanippides's account, Marsyas comes upon a set of double flutes after Athena discards them; having caught sight of herself while playing the pipes, she is horrified by how the act of blowing disfigures her face. The aulos is, indeed, associated with Dionysian revelry and, simply, mortal drinking—the *auletrides*, the flute girls, are fixtures of the symposium²⁵—but it seems unlikely that the Faun represents Marsyas, as, generally, the aulos does not lull people or satyrs to sleep, but, rather, supports their revelry. If the Faun is simply drunk, then, he represents a comparatively positive state of drunken sleep; if the typical awake-and-drunk state of a satyr is lecherous or aggressive, the state of sleep is a preferable alternative. The Sleeping Eros functions similarly: sleep tames the god, preventing him from leading anyone astray into romantic folly. But the Faun is overtly erotic, the body displayed with

22 Herring, “Sexy Beast,” 44.

23 McNally, “Ariadne,” 155.

24 Ian Jenkins, Celeste Farge, and Victoria Turner, *Defining Beauty: the Body in Ancient Greek Art: Art and Thought in Ancient Greece* (London: British Museum Press, 2015): 188.

25 Sian Lewis, *The Athenian Women: an Iconographic Handbook* (London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2002), 96.

no pretense of modesty; as such, we might interpret his tense countenance as arising from the experience (or enjoyment) of an erotic dream.²⁶ This, then, is harmless eroticism; as with Eros, these figures' conventionally problematic approaches to sex are made acceptable with sleep. Figuring the Faun as sexual object highlights a consideration of psychological and physical eroticism, as well as the attention paid to three-dimensionality; here we have one method of addressing viewer psychology in Hellenistic sculpture: arousal.

But sleep as psychological distance is key, and the examples discussed above attest to how literally should be taken the conflation of psychological distance with geographic distance. The Sleeping Eros, if we place it within the tradition of funerary Erotes, articulates—through the metaphor of sleep—the distance of the deceased. That the dead are psychologically distant is apparent, in that the brain becomes inactive and the body thus unanimated; the dead become physically distant, meanwhile, through cremation and burial, which frequently takes place outside of the city proper. Further, the physical and psychological removal inherent to death are conflated: the soul, or *psyche*, is literally transported, as if on a journey, to the underworld; the Persephone Painter's bell krater image of Persephone ascending from below ground, returning from Hades, communicates that the soul's psychological trip to the underworld is directly linked to the physical descent of burial—and, as we have seen on the Sarpedon krater, Sleep himself is an aide in this journey. Likewise, Dionysus, satyrs, and maenads conflate physical and psychological distance in their imbricated connections to nature (spatial departure) and wine (mental departure)—the Theban royal women flee the city in Euripides's *Bacchae*; the Barberini Faun reclines on rocks; the Derveni krater frames its sleeping figures in vines (simultaneously an index to wine, and an informant to nature). In this vein, we might also consider Euthymides' so-called 'Revellers' amphora of c. 510 BCE, upon which dances a man labelled "Teles." Perhaps this designates him "the far one" in reference to his being drunk.²⁷

Sculpture, however, counts materiality and, thus, immediacy as its most salient features. How, then, can the phenomenological experience of sculpture subvert its axiomatic characteristics? The solution lies in an awareness and manipulation of viewer psychology; specifically, the inverse and complement to that which is articulated by Guy Hedreen in his 1997 paper "Involved Spectatorship in Archaic Greek Art."²⁸ Hedreen takes as his focus the Athenian eye cup—such as, most famously, Exekias's

26 SeungJung Kim, "Lysipos and Hellenistic," (Lecture, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, March 28, 2018).

27 Kim 2019. Attic red-figure amphora, Munich, Antikensammlungen: 2307 (ARV 24.1, ARV² 26.1, 1620, Para 323, Add 75, Add2 156).

28 Guy Hedreen, "Involved Spectatorship in Archaic Greek Art," *Art History* 30 (2007).

signed ‘Dionysus kylix’ of c. 530 BCE—the ocular adornment upon which has conventionally been interpreted as allowing the cup to function as a mask. When tipped in front of the face of an imbibing symposiast, the eyes gaze outwards in place of the symposiast’s now-concealed eyes; understood to represent the faces of satyrs or nymphs, these kylikes-as-masks cast their drinkers/wearers as creatures of Dionysus, announcing to their fellow symposiasts their submission to the effects of wine and bringing into dramatic relief those ever-imblicated motifs: satyrs, wine, drunkenness, change of character, *enthousiasmos*, Dionysus, theatre, masks.

But the drinker is not the audience—and the audience is not *just* audience. On the contrary: Hedreen defines the onlooking symposiasts as ‘involved spectators.’ When the kylix directs its painted gaze at the viewer—which role could be filled by any of the other symposiasts—it acknowledges the viewer’s presence, and, as a result, brings the viewer into a relationship with, into the narrative space of, the figure depicted on the mask. Hedreen likens this effect to that of vase depictions of the *gorgoneion*, the mythological defeat of which is effectively rehearsed when the viewer of the image locks eyes with Medusa but remains impervious to her fatal gaze, thus assuming the role of Perseus. Eye contact implicates, and implication characterises. Because the eye cups’ eyes seem to represent the eyes of satyrs or nymphs, Hedreen suggests, the act of drinking from a such a kylix simultaneously casts both a symposiast *and* his fellow revellers in Dionysian roles—for the former, as a mask; for the latter, through ‘viewer positioning.’ In vase depictions, writes Hedreen, silens and nymphs are generally shown looking at other silens or nymphs; the silen’s or nymph’s gaze when it emanates from an eye cup, then, can be analogously interpreted as engaging another silen or nymph, thus defining the viewer as such a creature—indeed, silens and nymphs are “collective identities,” and, in being characteristically plural, always “open to broader membership.”²⁹

Hedreen explains the eye cups’ method of engaging the viewer through positing a comparison with the tactic of “viewer positioning” as deployed in 17th century Dutch painting. With reference to Rembrandt’s *Syndics: The Sampling Officials of the Amsterdam Drapers’ Guild* (1662) and Frans Hals’s *Banquet of the Officers and Junior Officers of the Civic Guard of Saint George* (1616), Hedreen states that the painted figures’ common gaze at a point outside of the pictorial space—to the point, indeed, at which the viewer would be standing if observing the painting from a conventional central viewpoint—acknowledges the viewer and thus collapses the dividing “pictorial space,” allowing the viewer to feel simultaneously as though they are within the narrative space of the painting, as an interlocutor, and within the ‘real space’ outside the painting, as an observ-

²⁹ Guy Hedreen, “Involved Spectatorsip,” 231.

er. In Dutch painting as on Greek cups, eye contact provides perceived acknowledgment of the viewer, which implies—and thus enables—the viewer’s inhabitation of the same narrative space as that of the depiction. Hedreen’s emphasis on eye contact in establishing a relation between two entities is supported by Nancy Worman’s articulation of the eyes and vision in “The Body as Argument: Helen in Four Greek Texts,” wherein she discusses the “subject indeterminacy” that occurs “between lover and beloved in the field of vision”³⁰ in ancient Greek texts—Worman, too, then, locates the eyes as the point through which equivalencies between subject and object are determined.

A sleeping figure, however, radically denies the viewer eye contact. Consequently, a sleeping figure denies the viewer access to its narrative space. The viewer is, thus, denied the possibility of entering into that double consciousness of, firstly, being aware of one’s role as a character in the narrative space of the figure, while, secondly and simultaneously, being aware of being an observer of an object. When eye contact is removed from the equation, the single state of consciousness that the viewer may inhabit is that in which they are aware of being an observer. Further, in denying the viewer eye contact, the sleeping figure also denies the viewer that possibility of equivalency, of identification; while the image of sleep communicates psychological and physical distance and thus Otherness by way of metaphor, the denial of eye contact articulates it phenomenologically. There is no satyr locking eyes with a fellow satyr, here—instead, the sleeping sculpture remains an ‘other,’ against which the viewer must define themselves in *negation*, not by relation. So the sleeping subject interrogates the viewer’s interiority in an entirely new way: it simultaneously (a) asserts the ultimate inaccessibility of *another’s* interiority through the symbolic and phenomenological figuring of distance and (b) requires the viewer to fully inhabit the role of observer through denying them the potential of double consciousness. The result is an intensely heightened awareness of one’s own subjectivity. The introduction of sleeping figures is an evident manifestation, then, of the Hellenistic intrigue in interiority as fundamental—the Hellenistic sculptor deploys his craft as a method of effecting a phenomenological exploration of different, distant psychological states, and, consequently, defining the self in opposition to that ‘other.’

30 Nancy Worman, “The Body as Argument: Helen in Four Greek Texts,” *Classical Antiquity* 16, no. 1 (1997): 167.

Bibliography

- Bieber, Margarete. *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.
- Bing, Peter. "Mystery Rituals, Dionysus." (Lecture, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, October 2017).
- Hedreen, Guy. "Involved Spectatorship in Archaic Greek Art." *Art History* 30 (2007): 217-246.
- . "Silens, Nymphs, and Maenads." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 114 (1994): 47-69.
- Herring, Amanda. "Sexy Beast: The Barberini Faun as an Object of Desire." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 25, no. 1 (2016): 32-61.
- Green, Peter. *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Jenkins, Ian, Celeste Farge, and Victoria Turner. *Defining Beauty: the Body in Ancient Greek Art: Art and Thought in Ancient Greece*. London: British Museum Press, 2015.
- Jouanna, Jacques. "Wine and Medicine in Ancient Greece." In *Greek Medicine from Hippocrates to Galen: Selected Papers*, edited by Philip Van Der Eijk, 173-94. Translated by Neil Allies. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012.
- Kim, SeungJung. "Lysippos and Hellenistic." (Lecture, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, March 28, 2018).
- Lewis, Sian. *The Athenian Woman: an Iconographic Handbook*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2002.
- McNally, Sheila. "Ariadne and Others: Images of Sleep in Greek and Early Roman Art." *Classical Antiquity* 4, no. 2 (1985): 152-92.
- Richter, Gisela M. A. *The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970.
- Ridgway, Brunilde Sismondo. *Fourth-Century Styles in Greek Sculpture*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997.

PLEBEIAN

Sorabella, Jean. "A Satyr for Midas: The Barberini Faun and Hellenistic Royal Patronage." *Classical Antiquity* 26, no. 2 (2007): 219-48.

Stafford, Emma J. "Aspects of Sleep in Hellenistic Sculpture." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, no. 38 (1991): 105-20.

Worman, Nancy. "The Body as Argument: Helen in Four Greek Texts." *Classical Antiquity* 16, no. 1 (1997): 151-203. of Wisconsin Press.

Roman Matronae Letting Their Hair Down: Ambiguity in the Female Aesthetics in Ovid's Ars Amatoria

Leah Stevens

In the third book of the *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid shifts from addressing men to advising women on the topics of love and dating. However, the identity of the women whom he addresses remains ambiguous, and scholarship has largely neglected the language of female aesthetics that Ovid uses in his instruction as a possible source of information for this intended audience. As class and status dictated the conventions of Roman clothing and adornment, its inclusion in literature can convey information regarding a person's social position. Despite this, other than identifying the literary tropes of *vittae tenues* (slender fillets) and *instita longa* (long hem), there has been little scholarship on this topic.¹ A woman's hair served to identify her within her position in society, and thus, the morality expected of her. Thus, in using this class-dictated aesthetic language, Ovid cultivates ambiguity regarding his intended audience through his suggestions of hairstyles associated with both chastity and sensuality in *Ars Amatoria* 3.137-58.²

Ovid indirectly addresses *matronae* multiple times in the *Ars Amatoria*: rather than overtly identifying them in his prescriptions, he instead addresses their clothing with the previously mentioned "slender fillets" and "long hem." These terms refer to the woolen hair ribbons and long dresses that married Roman women wore. Ovid claims that *nec uos, segmenta, require nec quae de Tyrio murice, lana, rubes* (I do not seek you, flounces / nor you, wool, which blushes with Tyrian dye).³ Describing women based on their stereotypical dress is a common convention in Latin literature, with the *matronae* and their ideal moral attributes frequently referred to simply with "*stola* or *stolata* [stola-clad] or *vittae* [hair fillets]," and likewise the sex workers referred to as *togata* [toga-clad].⁴ In reality, the two classes of women were not so easily distinguished by dress, as not all *matronae* wore the *stola*,⁵ and by the Augustan period, a toga was not neces-

1 Ovid, *Ars amatoria*, 1.31-2. All translations are personal unless otherwise specified.

2 Molly Myerowitz Levine, "The Gendered Grammar of Ancient Mediterranean Hair," in *Off with Her Head: The Denial of Women's Identity in Myth, Religion, and Culture*, ed. Howard Eilberg-Schwartz and Wendy Doniger (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 81.

3 Ov., *Ars am.*, 3.169-70.

4 Kelly Olson, "Matrona and Whore: Clothing and Definition in Roman Antiquity," in *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*, ed. Christopher A. Faraone and Laura K. McClure (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press: 2006), 196.

5 Olson, "Matrona and Whore," 190.

sarily an identifier of sex work,⁶ which was perhaps exploited by Ovid in order to cultivate this uncertainty. Nevertheless, Roman writers continued to use the ideal appearance and dress of a *matrona* as a literary shorthand to identify her in literature.⁷ The ambiguity and subversion of traditional attire is made more poignant, as Ovid is blatantly blurring the divide between Roman women's literary identification and their attached moral connotation. This is one method by which Romans established and maintained the division between the chaste, virtuous *matrona* and the whore.⁸

The catalogue of styles begins with the suggestion of *capitis discrimina puri* (parting the hair simply).⁹ In addition to meaning "simply," *purus* also means "pure" or "chaste," which directly invokes the virtues of an ideal Roman *matrona*.¹⁰ Further, not only is the language a reference to matronly virtue, but this style was also famously worn by Livia as depicted on the *Ara Pacis*. Kleiner describes how Livia "parted her hair in the center and wore it brushed back like a fifth-century [...] Greek goddess."¹¹ in her public sculptural representations to portray the ideal Augustan woman. Her dress and attributes were used as propaganda to embody the Emperor's ideology.¹² The allusion is completed by the mythical reference Ovid includes with the hairstyle, claiming that *sic erat ornatis Laodamia comis* (Laodamia adorned her hair that way).¹³ Notable in virtue more than appearance, Laodamia was an archetypal, ideal mythical *matrona*, and thus not a likely source of inspiration for a courtesan.¹⁴ By including a hairstyle famously worn and popularized by Livia, chosen for its simplicity to demonstrate her own modesty, Ovid plainly alludes to a *matrona* in this line, and emphasizes it through his blatant invocation of chaste language and virtuous mythological allusion.¹⁵

Following this, Ovid lists another hairstyle heavily associated with Livia: *exiguum summa nodum sibi fronte relinqui* (a small knot left on the top of her brow).¹⁶ The *nodus* was a simple bun positioned either at the nape of the neck or tip of the forehead. It was worn first by Octavia and

6 *Ibid.*, 194.

7 *Ibid.*, 196.

8 While this is not a word I am comfortable using because of its connotation with sex-shaming and stigmatizing sex work, I feel it best conveys the Roman perspective of sex workers in contrast to the ideal of the *matrona* (cf. Witzke, 2015 for discussion of modern terms for ancient sex work).

9 *Ov.*, *Ars am.*, 3.137.

10 *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. "purus."

11 Kleiner, *Cleopatra and Rome*, (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2005), 259.

12 Kleiner, "Imperial Women as Patrons of the Arts in the Early Empire" in *I, Claudia: Women in Roman Art and Society*. ed. Diana E.E. Kleiner and Susan B. Matheson. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), 35.

13 *Ov.*, *Ars am.*, 3.138.

14 The word "courtesan" in English carries the connotation of high status and power, however in this essay it is used to describe the contracted sex workers of wealthy Roman men for whom the third book of the *Ars Amatoria* was supposedly written, and who did not necessarily have any status or power societally or in their relationships.

15 Kleiner, *Cleopatra and Rome*, 259.

16 *Ov.*, *Ars am.*, 3.139.

may have been seen as a deliberate rejection of extravagance and immorality—particularly that of Cleopatra, who is often depicted with elaborate hairstyles.¹⁷ The style was quickly adopted by Livia, who recognized its simplicity as the perfect image for the ideal Augustan woman,¹⁸ and most famously wore it above her forehead, precisely as Ovid prescribes here.¹⁹ While the impact of the *nodus* had a far reach, being worn by everyone from Livia to slaves alike,²⁰ it still maintained its virtuous connotations, since the tightly braided, rolled, and bound hair was intended to indicate the woman's inner chastity and modesty.²¹ This is echoed throughout Ovidian and post-Ovidian poetry as a literary trope as well, as two other notable figures who are described with the *nodus* are both conspicuously chaste virgins: Atalanta in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*²² and Diana in Statius' *Thebaid*, which exemplifies the far reach of the chastity associated with this style for years afterward.²³ The *nodus* was worn by Livia and Octavia in their public sculptures for over thirty years,²⁴ exhibiting such a similar style that they looked to be twins and were nearly indistinguishable from one another.²⁵ Despite the fact that, after thirty years, this coiffure was likely no longer fashionable, they were still depicted with this style since it had become "so closely intertwined with the notion of the ideal Roman matron and of ardent national pride."²⁶ Considering its lasting legacy in embodying the virtuous *matrona*, it is highly unusual that this style would appear on a list of recommended hairstyles for fashionable courtesans.

Rather than continue in the same vein of hairstyles associated with *matronae*, or hairstyles that would be more suitable for an elaborate Augustan era courtesan, Ovid offers a variety of unbound hairstyles next. These styles have connotations of sensuality and are traditionally worn by young, unmarried maidens. Loose hair, and particularly the act of unbinding the hair, had erotic connotations in Ancient Rome.²⁷ It is curious that Ovid placed his two suggested hairstyles associated with *matronae* just before his suggestions of loosening hair. The sequence could be read as an invitation for Roman women to "let their hair down." This change is also accompanied by a change in address. Instead of directly invoking a specific characteristic of women that should wear the styles, Ovid is now inviting "another," "this," or "that" woman to wear each hairstyle, with-

17 Kleiner, "Imperial Women as Patrons," 37.

18 Kleiner, *Cleopatra and Rome*, 245.

19 Kleiner, "Imperial Women as Patrons," 35.

20 Kleiner, *Cleopatra and Rome*, 245.

21 *Ibid.*, 244.

22 Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 8.319.

23 Statius, *Thebaid*, 2.238.

24 Kleiner, *Cleopatra and Rome*, 247.

25 *Ibid.*, 243.

26 *Ibid.*, 247-8.

27 Charles H. Cosgrove, "A Woman's Unbound Hair in the Greco-Roman World, with Special Reference to the Story of the 'Sinful Woman' in Luke 7:36-50," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124, no. 4 (Winter 2005): 679.

out any specific attributes other than their comeliness.²⁸ While the sensuality is slightly incriminating in its placement and ambiguity, the association with an unmarried girl is even more so. Unmarried Roman girls wore their hair unbound,²⁹ which was especially encouraged prior to marriage, as its beauty would attract the attention of a potential husband.³⁰ Consequently, in the Roman mythological tradition, most sensual scenes include a maiden with unbound hair to signify that she is sexually available.

From Ovid's *Metamorphoses* alone, there are multiple instances of loose-haired maidens who caught the sexual attention of the gods. Before her hair was bound into snakes, Medusa was described as *neque in tota conspectior ulla capillis / pars fuit* (in total no part was more noticed than her hair) and Daphne had *inornatos...capillos* (disheveled hair) while Apollo pursued her.³¹ This placement not only provokes erotic behaviour in a chaste Roman woman, but also encourages a reader to view her as a sexual being. Although Ovid does not directly use the language of a maiden, this allusion casts further doubt towards the identity of his intended audience. The association with sensuality may be expected if Ovid is addressing the courtesans as he claims to do, but invoking the potential sensuality of an unmarried citizen girl certainly is not.

The first of these loose styles described by Ovid is *alterius crines umero iactentur utroque* (another's hair should be tossed over her shoulder on both sides).³² This explanation is significant for both its shift in address with "another" and its mythological reference. While Ovid claims Laodamia wore her hair chastely parted, it is Phoebus Apollo who wears his hair in this style while playing his lyre.³³ Rather than the ideal *matrona*, Ovid invokes the patron god of poetry, who is notable for his amorous attentions towards beautiful maidens, including Daphne and Cassandra, who are universally unsuccessful. This reference alludes to the style's association with unmarried girls and is perhaps also an instance of metapoetics within the *Ars Amatoria*. It may suggest an equivalence between Apollo's divine art and Ovid's own art of love, which he imparts in this poem.³⁴

Ovid immediately follows this with a second mythological reference, encouraging another woman to wear her hair *succinctae religetur more Dianae* (tied back like Diana with her tunic tucked up).³⁵ Hejduk claims that—given Diana's active pursuits—this would be a tightly bound hairstyle.³⁶ However, Smith argues that in Roman art, Diana, in her role

28 Ov., *Ars am.*, 3.143, 145, 146.

29 Cosgrove, "A Woman's Unbound Hair," 681.

30 Myerowitz Levine, "Gendered Grammar," 95-6.

31 Ov., *Met.*, 4.796-7, 1.497.

32 Ov., *Ars am.*, 3.141.

33 Ov., *Ars am.*, 3.142.

34 While this is interesting to note, discussing metapoetics is not within the scope of this essay.

35 Ov., *Ars am.*, 3.143.

36 Hejduk, *The Offence of Love*, 3.143.

as the huntress, generally has her hair partially tied back so some of it still lies loose down her neck.³⁷ This half up, half down hairstyle seems to embody the mutability of the goddess herself: the wearer is neither fully chaste nor sensually loose. Further, the exact words *succinctae Dianae* are echoed from Ovid's *Amores* when he encourages Corinna to *collige* (hitch up) her dress higher like Diana.³⁸ This imagery is clearly meant to be playful and sensual. However, within *Ars Amatoria*, given that Ovid's intended audience is already in question, the allusion becomes suspect. Since Diana is a chaste, unmarried virgin, perhaps Ovid also alludes to other unmarried Roman virgins in this passage and encourages them to pursue pre-marital love affairs. It should be noted that the depiction of Diana as an unattainable beauty is not uncommon in Greek and Roman myth; Actaeon died merely for his glimpse of Diana's body. However, Ovid's previous usage of this exact phrase encourages a reader familiar with his corpus to imagine an illicit scene with a forbidden lover.

In contrast to the chaste Diana, Ovid next invokes Cyllene, the birthplace of Mercury, where he was worshipped as a god of fertility, with his suggestion that hair *ornari testudine Cyllenaea* (be adorned with a Cyllenian tortoise shell).³⁹ Pausanias, a later geographer, included the sanctuary to Mercury on Cyllene in his *Description of Greece*. He described the image of the god worshipped there as "merely the male member upright on the pedestal," which encourages associations with fertility.⁴⁰ Further, he claimed that it was not Cyllene that was inhabited by tortoises, but the neighbouring mountain, Chelydorea.⁴¹ By describing the tortoise shell as Cyllenian, it is possible that Ovid alludes to this sexually associated sanctuary. This would not be fitting for an audience of courtesans since fertility was valued in legitimate wives rather than sex workers. It could also be another use of metapoetics in this passage, as according to myth, the lyre was invented when baby Mercury ripped the innards from a tortoise shell to make an instrument. The tortoise shell in these two instances is used in the production of the user's *ars*, inviting an equivalency between the creation of poetry and a woman's appearance. The description of this hairstyle itself is vague. It is unclear whether hair of the Cyllenian tortoise shell hairstyle was meant to be unfastened or bound. However, the invocation of Mercury's fertility sanctuary creates playful, sensual imagery which complements Ovid's suggestions of looser hairstyles.

Next, Ovid makes use of nautical metaphors when he advises that

37 William Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1870), 376.

38 Ovid, *Amores*, 3.2.26, 31.

39 "Hermes," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Ov., *Ars am.*, 3.147.

40 Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, trans. W. H. S. Jones (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918): 6.26.5.

41 Pausanias, *Description of Greece*, 8.17.5.

“one should maintain her curly hair like the waves of the sea.”⁴² The use of nautical imagery with *fluctus* (waves) and *sinus* (curls) in this unbound style is seen frequently throughout the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*, specifically when Ovid discusses the use of his *ars* in love. *Sinus* has the connotation of “the swelling or bellying of a sail in the wind,” which Ovid also uses to illustrate the urges caused by love. The wind signifies the love that fills the sail to encourage action, and means “one’s embrace,” particularly in sexual situations.⁴³ Ovid advises that to preserve a relationship, *sed non, cui dederas a litore carbasa, uento/ utendum, medio cum potiere freto* (but the wind to which you entrusted your sails when leaving the shore/ should not be used when you have reached open sea).⁴⁴ Conversely, in the *Remedia Amoris*, he advises the precise opposite, *desine luctari; referant tua carbasa uenti, / quaque uocant fluctus, hac tibi remus eat* (let the winds carry your sails back / let your oars lead you to wherever the waves call).⁴⁵ Why does Ovid choose to use this imagery here? Is it purely aesthetic, as it gives the impression of wild, untamed, loose hair billowing in the wind like waves and sails? Or, might Ovid be alluding to the idea that a woman’s hair and beauty is the vehicle of her *ars*? Rather than use the schemes he advises for men, such an interpretation furthers the importance of the hairstyles and beauty tips he lists in the third book of the *Ars Amatoria* as different tactics for women to attract lovers. By emulating a *matrona* or embodying a more sensual style, Ovid’s reader chooses for themselves who they wish to be, and consequently, who they wish to attract.

Ovid’s last assertion that *et neglecta decet multas coma* (even neglected hair is becoming on many) is immediately followed by the mythical exempla of Hercules and Iole, and Theseus and Ariadne.⁴⁶ Both women also appear in Ovid’s *Epistulae Heroides*, wherein Iole is described precisely as not having *incultis...capillis* (unkempt hair).⁴⁷ In this reinterpretation of the myth, perhaps Ovid’s decision to depict her hair as disheveled could signify her status as a marriageable maiden, as seen previously with Daphne and Medusa. Ariadne, on the other hand, is similarly described with *diffusis...capillis* (loose hair) and claims that she *e somno turbida, rupta coma est* (tore her hair, disheveled from sleep).⁴⁸ This allusion invokes the tradition of the Sleeping Ariadne, one of the most well-known figures in Greek and Roman art, which, among other things, signifies a separation from “social order and from rational self-control” and serves to evoke sensual pleasure.⁴⁹ Given that these mythological women were young maidens that

42 Ov., *Ars am.*, 3.148

43 Oxford Latin Dictionary, s.v. “sinus.”

44 Ov., *Ars am.*, 2.337-8.

45 Ovid, *Remedia amoris*, 531-2.

46 Ov., *Ars am.*, 3.153, 3.155-8.

47 Ovid, *Epistulae Heroides*, 9.125.

48 Ov., *Her.*, 10.47, 10.16.

49 Sheila McNally, “Ariadne and Others: Images of Sleep in Greek and Early Roman Art,” *Classical Antiquity*

were seduced or captured by men who were not their husbands, thereby engaging in unlawful relationships, these connotations could encourage these maidens to follow their own urges in love.

The material record of Roman hairstyles, compositing busts, fresco, and hairstyling tools shows a wide variety of styles worn by Roman women in the early Augustan period. Ovid himself asserts this variety in the passage at 3.137-58 with his claim that he could no more count the fashions than he could *nec quot apes Hybla nec quot in Alpe ferae* (neither how many bees there are in Hybla nor beasts in the Alps), and that *adicit ornatus proxima quaeque dies* (each successive day adds more adornments).⁵⁰ Despite this evidence of diversity, the styles he lists are repetitively modest and simple. Ovid makes multiple allusions throughout the third book to more complex styles with his mention of wigs, and hairstyles that require hairdressers to assemble them.⁵¹ In this passage, however, he chooses to prescribe hairstyles associated with the chaste, virtuous *matrona* rather than the fashionable courtesan, including the simply parted hair and the *nodus*.⁵² The fashion at the time was a great contrast to this. It was described as “a ‘globe’ of hair” or a “platform of hair,” and such figures as Cleopatra donned a “striking melon coiffure”.⁵³ The *nodus* was developed directly in opposition to these elaborate styles in order to portray the “modesty and chastity” of Octavia and Livia.⁵⁴ While the sex workers of a higher class were traditionally more ornamented in order to beautify and intrigue, the purpose of the *nodus* was to convey the chaste morals of the ideal Augustan Roman woman.⁵⁵ If these two classes of women were meant to be differentiated by their dress in such a way (in his *Tristia*, Ovid claims he was only addressing the courtesans), it must be asked why he tailors this passage to the language of the *matrona*.⁵⁶ Green argues that, “instead of observing the traditional stereotypes that linked hairstyle, clothing, and use of cosmetics to either sexual purity or sexual promiscuity, Ovid advocates a principle of individual decorum.”⁵⁷ This would not only traverse the line of literary divisions between these two classes of women, but also encourage women to transgress their societal limits in their actions, which was a capital offence under the *Leges Iuliae*.

Following his suggestions of these virtuously connoted hairstyles,

uity 4, no. 2 (1985): 152, 155, 192.

50 Ov., *Ars Am.*, 3.150, 152.

51 *Ibid.*, 3.245, 3.167, 3.239-40.

52 *Ibid.*, 3.137, 3.139.

53 Kelly Olson, *Dress and the Roman Woman: Self-Presentation and Society* (London: Routledge, 2008), 71. Kleiner, *Cleopatra and Rome*, 246.

54 Kleiner, “Imperial Women as Patrons,” 37.

55 Olson, “*Matrona* and Whore,” 194.

56 Ovid, *Tristia*, 2.303-4.

57 Steven J. Green, “Lessons in Love: Fifty Years of Scholarship on the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*,” in *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid’s Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*, ed. Roy Gibson, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 10.

Ovid advises a variety of loose hairstyles, emphasizing that a woman should choose based on aesthetics or personal preference, depending on whether she has a *longa...facies* (oval face) or an *ora rotunda* (round face), rather than her social status.⁵⁸ Ovid creates a dangerous ambiguity in his intended audience by encouraging specific hairstyles and the virtues associated with them based merely on a woman's aesthetic preferences rather than her class. It becomes unclear whether he advises an immoral *matrona* or a chaste courtesan. The former is a capital offense; the latter seeks to transgress the societal position the *Leges Iuliae* dictated for her. Further, if Ovid's female readers choose their appearances based on aesthetics, rather than adhere to the respectable or erotic styles that were socially prescribed, then this subversion creates an anxiety that moral and immoral women would be indistinguishable from one other.⁵⁹ This is an explicit transgression of the literary and cultural distinctions between *matrona* and sex worker in Ancient Rome, cleverly veiled in a seemingly innocuous guide to women's hairstyles.

The ambiguity in Ovid's intended audience of the *Ars Amatoria* has been a topic questioned by scholars from antiquity through to the present day and was likely a factor in the poet's exile. Given the poem's genre of didactic poetry, Ovid's use of literary aesthetic conventions cannot be viewed as insignificant or inconsequential, but as another area in which the *praeceptor* advises his students on the best practices in love, and thus can provide insight into his intended readers. His use of styles at 3.137-58 closely associated with *matronae* and unmarried Roman girls, women whose bodies were regulated by the *Leges Iuliae*, invites uncertainty into his intent. Even if this ambiguity was not deliberate and he was not purposely invoking *matronae*, the text still encourages a lack of distinction between them and sex workers. These two classes were certainly intended to be regarded differently by Roman society and law, which was reflected in their dress and adornment. His encouragement that women choose their indicative adornment based on if *huic decet inflatos laxe iacuisse capillos* (it is becoming for flowing hair to hang down loose" or whether *illa sit astrictis impedienda comis* (she ought to bind her hair tightly) emphasizes that women should decide based on aesthetics and preference, rather than what is socially and morally prescribed to them.⁶⁰ By casting aside symbols of honour and shame, the woman's status is left in a state of metamorphoses: neither regulated *matrona* nor stigmatized whore, she is a woman of her own making, untouched by Augustus' laws.

58 Ovid, *Ars am.*, 3.137, 140.

59 Roy K. Gibson, "Ovid, Augustus, and the Politics of Moderation in *Ars Amatoria* 3," in *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*, ed. Roy Gibson, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 127

60 Ovid, *Ars am.*, 3.145-6.

Bibliography

- Blakely, Sandra.. "Hermes, Kyllene, Samothrace, and the Sea." In *Tracking Hermes, Pursuing Mercury*, edited by John F. Miller and Jenny Strauss Clay, 271-292. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Cosgrove, Charles H.. "A Woman's Unbound Hair in the Greco-Roman World, with Special Reference to the Story of the "Sinful Woman" in Luke 7:36-50." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124, no. 4 (Winter 2005): 675-92.
- Gibson, Roy K.. "Ovid, Augustus, and the Politics of Moderation in *Ars Amatoria* 3." In *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*, edited by Roy Gibson, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock, 121-132. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Green, Steven J.. "Lessons in Love: Fifty Years of Scholarship on the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*." In *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*, edited by Roy Gibson, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock, 1-20. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Kleiner, Diana E. E.. "Semblance and Storytelling in Augustan Rome." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, edited by Karl Galinsky, 197-233. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . *Cleopatra and Rome*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- . "Imperial Women as Patrons of the Arts in the Early Empire." In *I, Claudia: Women in Roman Art and Society*, edited by Diana E.E. Kleiner and Susan B. Matheson, 28-41. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996.
- McGinn, Thomas A. J.. *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- McNally, Sheila. "Ariadne and Others: Images of Sleep in Greek and Early Roman Art." *Classical Antiquity* 4, no. 2 (1985): 152-192.
- Myerowitz Levine, Molly. "The Gendered Grammar of Ancient Mediterranean Hair." In *Off with Her Head: The Denial of Women's Identity in Myth, Religion, and Culture*, edited by Howard Eilberg-Schwartz

PLEBEIAN

- and Wendy Doniger, 76-130. Berkley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Olson, Kelly. *Dress and the Roman Woman: Self-Presentation and Society*. London: Routledge, 2008.
- . “*Matrona and Whore: Clothing and Definition in Roman Antiquity.*” In *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World*, edited by Christopher A. Faraone and Laura K. McClure, 186-204. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press: 2006.
- Ovid. *Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris*. Edited by Edward J. Kenney. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- . *Heroides and Amores*. Translated by Grant Showerman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- . *Metamorphoses*. Edited by Richard J. Tarrant. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- . *The Offence of Love: Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris, and Tristia 2*. Translated by Julia Dyson Hejduk. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2014.
- . *Tristia and Ex Ponto*. Translated by A.L. Wheeler. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Oxford Latin Dictionary. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Pausanias. *Description of Greece*. Translated by W.H.S. Jones. London: William Heinemann, 1918.
- Smith, William. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1870.
- Statius. *Thebaid*. Translated by J.H. Mozley. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928.
- Witzke, Serena S.. “Harlots, Tarts, and Hussies?: A Problem of Terminology for Sex Labor in Roman Comedy.” *Helios* 42, no. 1 (Spring 2015): 7-27.

Suetonius, Caligula, and the Senatorial Conspiracy of 39 CE

Marcus Tarantino

Suetonius' *Life of Caligula* is the most comprehensive literary source that details the emperor's short reign from 37 to 41 CE. His portrayal of Caligula as mad and thoroughly depraved is deeply embedded in modern popular perceptions of the emperor and serves as a template for assessing the "bad emperors" that followed his reign. Modern depictions of Caligula such as the 1979 film *Caligula* and Robert Graves' novel *I Claudius* often mirror his negative characterization in Suetonius' account. Overall, *Caligula's Life* was a process of degeneracy. The young emperor was initially an effective ruler but suddenly transformed in his rule and unleashed his reprehensible nature on Rome. This transition obscures the actions of senators who incurred the emperor's hostility and the humiliation the senatorial class consequently suffered. Instead, it emphasizes Caligula's madness. This is evident upon a further investigation of the senatorial conspiracy of early 39 CE, elaborated upon only by another Roman historian, Cassius Dio.

A third of the way into his account, Suetonius remarks that "the story so far has been of Caligula the emperor, [and that] the rest must be of Caligula the monster."¹ Evidently, Caligula possessed good and bad traits that manifested themselves simultaneously in the earlier 'good' phase of his reign. Here, Caligula demonstrated his modesty and benevolence towards senators and his subjects, though instances of his cruelty were also apparent. Suetonius attempted to delineate a moment in Caligula's reign, when the emperor transitioned from an enlightened and competent administrator to a cruel and arbitrary tyrant.² Considering Suetonius' account, it is true that many of Caligula's commendable deeds or acts fell within the first two years of his reign.³ However, Suetonius notably overlooked the senatorial conspiracy of 39 CE that irreversibly shifted Caligula's relationship with the senate. Following the transition from princeps to monster, the emperor abandoned all modesty and exhibited increasingly erratic behaviour. By Suetonius' recollection, senators were merely victims of the emperor's violent impulses, and their actions did not contribute to his hostility. Consequently, Caligula's hostility towards the senate is interpreted to be unprovoked and thus explained by his sudden descent

1 Suetonius, *The Lives of the Caesars*, trans. Catherine Edwards (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 22.1.

2 Anthony A. Barrett, *Caligula: The Abuse of Power*, 2nd ed (New York: Routledge, 2015), 129.

3 Donna W. Hurley, *An Historical and Historiographical Commentary on Suetonius' Life of C. Caligula* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1993), 83

into madness. In fact, Caligula's assassination by the praetorian guards in 41 CE is the only conspiracy recalled by Suetonius in any detail.

In order to reconstruct the senatorial conspiracy of 39 CE, attention must be turned to the account of Cassius Dio. Much of what is known regarding this conspiracy is found in Dio's *Roman History*. In the early months of 39 CE, Dio notes that "many of the foremost men perished in fulfilment of sentences of condemnation (for not a few of those who had been released from prison were punished for the very reasons that had led to their imprisonment by Tiberius) and many others of less prominence in gladiatorial combats."⁴ Dio includes leaders (*prōtoi*) in these foremost men, a term he used to denote consuls or ex-consuls.⁵ This implies that members of the senate at the highest level were involved in some form of plot against the emperor. Dio does not relate the insults or defamatory remarks of individual senators, which suggests that the crime was wider in its scope: it was a conspiracy. Furthermore, because they were punished for the same crime under Tiberius, it is apparent that these men were guilty of treason.⁶ While Dio does not explicitly refer to a conspiracy, the question arises as to why so many prominent men perished at once.

The purging of many senators in early 39 CE is questionable, however, due to Caligula's generally favourable treatment of the senate up until this point. Prior to this purging, Caligula continued the Augustan practice of constitutional moderation. This practice meant that the emperor would hold the consulship infrequently or for a short span of time in order to facilitate the participation of the senatorial class in the imperial administration.⁷ Both Dio and Suetonius attested to the early resignation of the emperor's "second [consulship, held] from the Kalends of January for thirty days."⁸ As Winterling suggests, Caligula's behaviour was that of "one senator among others."⁹ Previous interactions between Caligula and the senate were peaceful and respectful. The sudden shift in the emperor's behaviour, demonstrated by his punishment of a large portion of the senatorial body, could only be explained by an extreme occurrence. Dio did not explain Caligula's motives in this particular scenario, and this was likely intentional, just as Suetonius neglected the conspiracy as a whole.

Further evidence of a conspiracy is found later in Dio's account when he described a fiery speech addressed to the senate by Caligula. Scholars such as Winterling suspect that it was a response to the senatorial conspiracy of 39 CE.¹⁰ In his speech, Caligula reproached senators for their

⁴ Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, trans. Earnest Cary and Herbert B. Foster (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014), 59.13.3.

⁵ Winterling, *Caligula: A Biography*, 92.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 92.

⁷ Barrett, *Caligula: The Abuse of Power*, 129.

⁸ Suet., *The Lives of the Caesars*, 17.1.

⁹ Winterling, *Caligula: A Biography*, 90.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 93.

criticism of Tiberius, their fickleness in tolerating Sejanus, and their insincerity towards himself.¹¹ In response to his speech, members of the senate expressed their gratitude that “they had not perished like the others.”¹² Evidently, more senators were guilty of the crime of treason but pardoned, in which case, a large-scale senatorial conspiracy is apparent.¹³ Again, Dio never referred to this episode as a conspiracy, but his account provides enough clues to generate a vague conclusion of a conspiracy. Suetonius, however, made no reference to these events in early 39 CE. As such, Suetonius failed to indicate how the actions of senators incurred Caligula’s hostility during his alleged descent into madness.

Caligula’s speech embodied the humiliation suffered by the senate following the discovery of its conspiracy. Upon further investigation, it is apparent why Suetonius may not have wished to include Caligula’s speech in his account. Barrett rightly characterizes Caligula’s speech as the “most momentous” happening in the senate house since the condemnation of Sejanus in 31 CE.¹⁴ According to Dio:

[Caligula] took up [...] the case of each man who [...] lost his life, [in Tiberius’ *maiestas* trials] and [showed] senators [they were] responsible for the death of most of them, and all by their votes of condemnation. The evidence [came from] the very documents [...] he once declared [to burn], [and] he [had them] read [in the senate.] He added: ‘If Tiberius [did] wrong, you ought [to not] have honoured him while he lived, and then [...] turn about now. But it was not Tiberius alone [...] you treated in a fickle manner; Sejanus also you first puffed up with conceit and spoiled, then put him to death. Therefore I, too, ought not to expect [...] decent treatment from you.’¹⁵

Here, Caligula provided an analysis of the senate’s behaviour from the reign of Tiberius to the present. He suggested that senators willingly betrayed one another because they were motivated by their own opportunism and desire to obtain the emperor’s favour, referring to Tiberius and himself. To accomplish this, Caligula had his imperial freedmen refer to the documents he deceitfully preserved, containing the verdicts passed by the senate. These documents, in which senators condemned their colleagues for treason, date back to the reign of Tiberius and function as a

11 Lee Fratantuono, *Caligula: An Unexpected General* (Barnsley, South Yorkshire: Pen & Sword Military, 2018), 53.

12 Cass. Dio, *Roman History*, 59.16.9.

13 Winterling, *Caligula: A Biography*, 93.

14 Barrett, *Caligula: The Abuse of Power*, 131.

15 Cass. Dio, *Roman History*, 59.16.2-4.

PLEBEIAN

reminder of the senate's complicity in its own downfall.¹⁶ Furthermore, Caligula exposed the senate's hypocrisy in its treatment of Tiberius and Sejanus. While they lived, senators eagerly honoured them, but upon their deaths, many senators expressed their hatred with uncharacteristic boldness.¹⁷ Such an account must have humiliated the assembled senators.

Caligula even introduced an imaginary Tiberius, who approved of his accusations towards the senate.¹⁸ Tiberius warned Caligula that "all [senators] hate [him and] pray for [his] death" and that "they will murder [him] if they can." Furthermore, Tiberius suggested that it was wiser for senators to fear Caligula rather than him trying to appease them.¹⁹ While this may be easily misconstrued as Dio's attempt to depict the emperor's madness, this element of the speech revealed a key insight: the falsehood of the Augustan principate. Caligula's speech is unquestionably fictitious, but the sentiment he echoes is historically significant. He reveals that Senators loathed imperial rule and demonstrated a willingness to attack the emperor when an opportunity arose. In the meantime, senators would begrudgingly accept their submission and continue to heap praises upon the emperor.²⁰ In other words, the pretense that the emperor was not an autocrat was unmasked. The principate functioned as a monarchy; Caligula could act as he pleased.²¹ Senators inevitably knew this. Nonetheless, they were humiliated when confronted with its reality.

In Dio's account, the humiliation of senators was reinforced by their action, or inaction, in response to Caligula's speech. Dio stated that the "alarm and dejection [of senators] prevented them from saying a word or transacting any business; but on the next day they associated again and bestowed lavish praise upon [Caligula] as a most sincere and pious ruler... [voting] to offer annual sacrifices to his clemency."²² The senators that were not convicted were powerless; they had no other means of survival than to continue with their duplicitous flattery. The lack of senatorial agency under the principate was apparent, and the artificiality of senatorial prestige was exposed. Senators were revealed as "men ready to be slaves."²³ This notion is a contradiction to the inherently dignified self-conception of senators. Suetonius prioritized a dignified representation of senators; his neglect of this episode is likely intentional. He successfully concealed their humiliation by characterizing the change in Caligula's behaviour towards the senate as Caligula's descent into madness.

Recall that Suetonius depicted Caligula's reign in two phases: an

16 Winterling, *Caligula: A Biography*, 97.

17 *Ibid.*, 98.

18 Barrett, *Caligula: The Abuse of Power*, 131.

19 Cass. Dio, *Roman History*, 59.16.5-6.

20 Winterling, *Caligula: A Biography*, 99.

21 *Ibid.*, 99.

22 Cass. Dio, *Roman History*, 59.16.9-10.

23 Barrett, *Caligula: The Abuse of Power*, 132.

earlier 'good' phase and a later 'bad' phase. The emperor's descent into madness marks his transition from the first to the second phase, which Suetonius demonstrates through many episodes that are persistent throughout the 'bad' phase of Caligula's reign. The most famous involves Caligula's horse, Incitatus:

[He] used to send his soldiers, the day before circus games, to demand silence in the surrounding area, apart from the marble table, the ebony manger, the purple blankets and the gem-studded collar, he also give [Incitatus] a house and a household of slaves and furniture, so that guests he invited in his name might be entertained in a more refined manner. It is said that he meant to make [Incitatus] consul.²⁴

The context of this episode may be easily misinterpreted given Suetonius' character-oriented narrative. Consequently, it is difficult to connect this episode to political events in Suetonius' account. This episode is emblematic of modern depictions of Caligula's madness. It is also recalled by Dio in striking similarity.²⁵ While Dio's depiction may also be interpreted literally to reflect Caligula's madness, the chronological orientation of his account reveals the episode's true context. Dio includes this episode almost immediately after Caligula purged the 'foremost men', in which case, the episode's connection to the conspiracy of early 39 CE is evident.²⁶

One must first investigate scholarly interpretations of this episode to better understand how it was misconstrued by Suetonius and Dio to reflect the emperor's madness. Many agree that this episode is a literal interpretation of Caligula's sarcasm taken out of context. Willrich suggests that this was simply a joke targeted at the competence of the consuls: Caligula had the power to appoint his horse consul since many asses had already achieved the consulship.²⁷ Alternatively, Winterling suggests this was a joke aimed to satirize the lives of senators. Caligula equipped his horse with an extravagant dwelling that resembled senatorial households, where ruinous banquets of a competitive nature often occurred. He designated his horse for the consulship, the most significant office in the career of an aristocrat.²⁸ Winterling argues that Caligula exposed the reality that aristocrats' careers depended on his goodwill. The implication is that Caligula could appoint whomever he pleased to be consul, even his horse.²⁹ Evidently, this is an episode of Caligula's sarcasm intended to

24 Suet., *The Lives of the Caesars*, 55.3.

25 Cass. Dio, *Roman History*, 59.14.7.

26 Winterling, *Caligula: A Biography*, 103.

27 David Woods, "Caligula, Incitatus, and the Consulship," *Classical Quarterly* 64, no. 2 (2014): 777.

28 Winterling, *Caligula: A Biography*, 103.

29 *Ibid.*, 104.

humiliate senators, rather than an instance his insanity.

Suetonius placed this episode towards the end of his narrative, which considerably alters its context from Dio's account. The first instance of Caligula's madness, following Suetonius' transition from princeps to monster, was the emperor's claim to divinity, an absurdity from the perspective of any elite Roman.³⁰ At face value, the episode of Incitatus is equally absurd and Suetonius' placement of it shortly before Caligula's assassination is likely intentional. While Suetonius indicated that Caligula's intention to make Incitatus consul is speculative, the preceding information he recalls—the concessions given to Incitatus—influences the reader to accept this absurdity at face value.³¹ By Suetonius' construction, the episode represented the climax of a series of episodes that recalled Caligula's madness. It is inaccurately depicted as a last straw of sorts for those who assassinate him. Without Dio's account to compare the order of these events, it is virtually impossible to extract the true context of this episode.

The episode involving Incitatus affirms that Suetonius emphasized Caligula's madness to conceal the humiliation senators suffered. This is not to suggest that Suetonius fails to depict Caligula's humiliation of senators in other scenarios. What changes with this episode, however, is the context of senatorial humiliation. In other episodes, senators are humiliated because they are forced to partake in activities that are unfitting for their station. This is ultimately conceived of as a reflection of Caligula's poor mental state, and it reveals nothing regarding the imbalance of power between senators and the emperor. If the connection between this episode and the conspiracy of 39 CE is understood, this truth is exposed. It is unsurprising then that authors such as Suetonius attempted to alter the context of this episode, and instead insist on Caligula's madness.

The senatorial conspiracy of 39 CE marked an important transition in the reign of Caligula. The absence of this conspiracy in Suetonius' account conceals the senatorial actions that incurred the emperor's hostility, and the humiliation senators suffered as a consequence. While Suetonius recalls the 'good' and 'bad' phases of Caligula's reign, he omits the roles of senators that affected the emperor's transition from princeps to monster. Evidence of this conspiracy is only found through Dio's reconstruction of events. While the specific circumstances and scope of the conspiracy remain unclear, senatorial participation is evident. Suetonius, however, emphasized Caligula's descent into madness as the primary cause for this transition. His treatment of the episode involving Incitatus, which in and of itself was a consequence of the conspiracy, effectively demonstrated his goal to obscure the conspiracy.

³⁰ Suet., *The Lives of the Caesars*, 22.2.

³¹ Hurley, *An Historical and Historiographical Commentary*, 196-197.

Bibliography

- Adams, Geoff W.. "Suetonius and his treatment of the Emperor Domitian's favourable accomplishment." *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia* 6, no. 3 (2005): 1-15.
- Barrett, Anthony A.. *Caligula: The Abuse of Power*. New York: Routledge, 2015.
- Dio Cassius. *Roman History*. Translated by Earnest Cary and Herbert B. Foster. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Fomin, Andriy. "Speeches in Dio Cassius." In *Cassius Dio: Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician*, edited by Jesper Majbom Madsen and Carsten Lange. 217-237. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2016.
- Fratantuono, Lee. *Caligula: An Unexpected General*. Barnsley, South Yorkshire: Pen & Sword Military, 2018.
- Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus, 69-122. *The Lives of the Caesars*. Translated by Catherine Edwards. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Hurley, Donna W. *An Historical and Historiographical Commentary on Suetonius' Life of C. Caligula*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Winterling, Aloys. *Caligula: A Biography*. Translated by Deborah Lucas Schneider, Glenn W. Most, and Paul Psosinos. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2011.
- Woods, David. "Caligula, Incitatus, and the Consulship." *Classical Quarterly* 64, no. 2 (2014): 772-777.

Terracotta Figurines in the Seleucid Kingdom: Cross-Cultural Interaction through Art

Erica Venturo

The Hellenistic world is characterized by change and the expansion of Greek culture across the peripheries of the Mediterranean and the Near East. The Diadochi of Alexander's kingdom, who successfully held or gained territory from Alexander's expansive kingdom, continued to pursue a top-down approach to the political and cultural integration of foreign Greek populations into established local communities on the peripheries of the Hellenistic world. Seleucus I, the ruler of the Seleucid kingdom, which comprised most of the Near East at its height, followed this approach of top-down cultural and political rule with the foundation of Seleucia, Antioch, Apamea, and Laodicea. Seleucus founded these cities, part of the Syrian tetrapolis, to establish Antioch as a political centre, Apamea as a military centre, and the harbours of Seleucia and Laodicea as commercial centres. The Seleucid kingdom's most successful illustration of Greek culture occurred across Mesopotamia in grass roots movements between native Mesopotamians and newly-settled Greek merchants.¹ This integration also occurred on a small-scale between lower and middle class levels. Merchants engaged in an artistic and ultimately cultural dialogue through the development of new production techniques, styles, subjects, and contexts of miniature terracotta figurines based on traditional Greek and Mesopotamian figurine production practices.

The transformation of these female terracotta figurines and the depiction of typically Greek activities of musicians and dancers transmitted Greek culture. It is evident that the cross-cultural interaction of Greek and Mesopotamian peoples expressed in these miniature terracotta figurines reflects the greater trend of Greek influence on local Mesopotamians, in which Greeks introduced foreign production techniques, subject matter, and contexts of these figurines to established Mesopotamian institutions. This subtle integration of Greek cultural ideals through art made it easier for local Mesopotamians to accept the role of the foreign Greek political administration. These figurines were discovered mainly in Seleucid Uruk, but there were also caches of these artifacts found in Seleucia-on-the-Tigris and Nippur. These discoveries further the notion that this cross-cultural integration was not an isolated incident in Seleucid Uruk, but rather

¹ Susan Alcock, *Centre and Periphery in the Hellenistic World*, ed. Per Bilde, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Lise Hannestad, Jan Zahle, and Klavs Randsborg (Aarhus University: Aarhus University Press, 1994), 240.

a cross-cultural dialogue at a local level across the Seleucid kingdom.

A map of Seleucid Uruk by Finkbeiner shows that most of the stratified material was excavated in 1991 in areas U/V 18 and J/K 17/18 of the city plan, or from two tumuli at Frehat en-Nufegi, located approximately 3 km north of Uruk.² Most of this assemblage was found in domestic deposits and graves. It contained 183 female figurines and 20 figurine fragments (mostly detached heads) listed in the Kettu Karvonen-Kannas catalogue (now housed in the British Museum).³ Van Buren described this large assemblage of miniature terracotta figurines as an indication of “a wave of Hellenistic influence,” especially since there was a sharp decline in distinctive terracotta types during the Achaemenid period.⁴ Foremost, a dominant portion of this assemblage is composed of female terracotta figurines. In fact, the integration of Greek beliefs and characteristics into formerly culturally monolithic Mesopotamian *lamassu* and *sedu* figurines is especially relevant to this cross-cultural dialogue because these figurines serve as a mirror for Mesopotamian women’s identity and role in society. As these figurines incorporate Greek style, dress, and deities into their design, we can also see this reflected culturally as Mesopotamian women began to adopt a cultural identity that was a hybrid between Mesopotamian and Greek beliefs and characteristics.

In the Seleucid period, five terracotta types emerged, exemplified in the female figurines discovered at Seleucid Uruk. These new figurine types were a result of the amalgamation of centuries of entrenched traditional figurine designs, manufactures, and uses of Greek and Babylonian production practices. For instance, pre-Hellenistic Neo-Babylonian terracotta figurines have religious contexts as anthropomorphic beings that represent an individual’s personal god (‘a benevolent *sedu* (male)’ or goddess (‘*lamassu* (female)’).⁵ These figurines thus have an exclusively domestic use to protect individuals in the household.⁶ They were manufactured only in single mould because they were meant to be replaced often and did not need to be durable.⁷ There are four main traditional Mesopotamian female terracotta figurine types: frontal, nude standing women with hands supporting or below their breasts, wearing a necklace, bracelets, and anklets; frontal, nude standing women holding a child at their breast; seated, clothed women with a child (which is a rare find in assemblages

² Refer to figure 1 in the ‘Bibliography of Material Culture.’

³ Stephanie M. Langin-Hooper, “Social Networks and Cross-Cultural Interaction: A New Interpretation of the Female Terracotta Figurines of Hellenistic Babylon,” *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 26, no. 2 (2007): 148.

⁴ C.A. Petrie, “Seleucid Uruk: An Analysis of Ceramic Distribution,” *Iraq* 64 (2002): 90.

⁵ Langin-Hooper, “Social Networks and Cross-Cultural Interaction,” 147. The *lamassu* figurines in this case are not to be confused with the more traditional *lamassu*, large winged bull statues. These figurines are simply representations of a female deity.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 147.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 147.

from Uruk); and frontal, nude standing women with arms at their side.⁸

Greek terracotta figurines had a religious context which was highly publicized and state centric. Specifically, these figurines were tied to both temple and shrine-based religious practices, but they are also found in graves.⁹ They are characterized as ‘Tanagra’ type figurines because they show dynamic poses of young women dancing or moving. Tanagra figurines are also double moulded, a manufacturing technique created by the Greeks which was meant to make the figurines more durable (for constant handling in temple or shrine-based worship).¹⁰ The subject matter of these female Greek terracotta figurines is either predominantly mortal women with at least their lower body clothed, or figurines of naked goddesses.¹¹ Based on the standard characteristics of traditional Mesopotamian and Greek female terracotta figurines, the creation of five distinctively Hellenistic female figurine types as a hybrid of Greek and Mesopotamian qualities exemplifies the adoption of Greek culture in Mesopotamia.

The first type of Hellenistic Babylonian female terracotta figurine is the traditional Mesopotamian style. Figurines of this category follow the general pattern of naked, standing women with a frontal view consistent with Mesopotamian *lamassu* figurines.¹² The three main poses of this type are the accumulation of the traditional Babylonian poses: both hands supporting their breasts, one hand supporting their breast, or their arms at their sides. Despite this type’s name, Greek influences appear in the make and the style of these figurines. These figurines emphasize the anatomical features of the females, just as former Greek Tanagra figurines emphasize the bodily movements of young Greek girls and women, and they are either made in single mould or in the distinctively Greek double mould.¹³

This combination of Greek and Babylonian features described above is exemplified in BM92215, which combines the Greek double mould with the traditional Babylonian pose of a frontal naked woman clutching her breasts.¹⁴ The double mould allows for the figurine to be formed in the round, a typical stylistic choice of Greek Hellenistic sculptors to give intricate detail to the subject’s physical features. In BM92215, the double mould emphasizes the posterior of the female subject and provides a clear inscription of the pubic triangle. Aesthetically, this figurine features a crown common in Babylonian terracotta figurines, with an elaborately detailed braided hairstyle on both the front and the back of the head indicative of Greek Tanagra figurines.¹⁵ Figurines of this type

8 Ibid., 147.

9 Ibid., 147.

10 Ibid., 147.

11 Ibid., 147.

12 Ibid., 149.

13 Ibid., 149.

14 Refer to figure 2 in ‘Bibliography of Material Culture.’

15 Langin-Hooper, “Social Networks and Cross-Cultural Interaction,” 149.

made in double moulds are meant to be thick-walled, vertically stable and durable, which suggests that the artist designed BM92215 and other figurines of this type to be durable in order to endure repeated handling in its context, such as temple or shrine-based worship.¹⁶ This is a particularly Greek context for such a traditional Babylonian terracotta figurine style to be placed. The durability of BM92215 could also suggest it was meant to stand alone in a domestic shrine. The variety of possible contexts for BM92215 not only combines the context of *lamassu* and 'Tanagra' figurines, but also exemplifies the artistic dialogue between Greek and Mesopotamian figurine manufacturers. This becomes a larger cross-cultural dialogue of Greek and Babylonian practices and ways of life to introduce Greek style (such as Greek hairstyles), religious practices (of shrine-based worship), and scientific inquiries concerning the human body (as shown through the emphasis of anatomical features) into Babylonian households.

The second terracotta figurine type is the Persian style, which features naked women in standing positions with only the top part of her arms finished. This type follows the Greek tradition of the exaggeration of anatomical features, evident in the heightened difference in length between the figurine's narrow waist and wide hips.¹⁷ Nevertheless, the narrow waist and wide hips are also present in Babylonian terracotta figurines, which further emphasizes a syncretism between Greek and Babylonian artistic style, and by extension, cultural style. Aesthetically, this type lacks any sort of crown or head covering, featuring a variety of hairstyles instead.¹⁸ It relies on the Greek double mould production but has thin, delicate walls. This implies that such figurines were used for display purposes, likely in domestic shrines, since figurines of this type are predominantly discovered in domestic contexts.¹⁹ The sawed-off arms on these artifacts are the most interesting aspect of this type because there is evidence in assemblages in Uruk that the sculptors separately attached moulded arms with unfired clay or string.²⁰ They would most likely fix these arms in a pose angled in front of the woman to represent a mortal person offering sacrifices to a god, which is important because this is a Greek usage of figurine in a particularly Babylonian, domestic context.²¹

These Greek and Babylonian features in the second figurine type are reflected in BM94344. Although this figurine pose is typically Babylonian, it also features distinctively Greek production techniques: it is double moulded, the typical dynamic nature of Tanagra figurines through the arm movements, and depicts a mortal girl offering sacrifice, a typical

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 149.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 150.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 151.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 151.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 150.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 150.

Greek activity of religious shrine-based worship.²² This combination of Greek and Babylonian elements introduces Greek practices of religious worship to local Babylonian peoples. The introduction of these terracotta figurine types in Mesopotamian households influences Mesopotamian practices of religious worship, as well as locals' beliefs of ideal hairstyles and body types through the figurine's Greek style of exaggerated anatomical proportions. The hairstyle, though, is a three-pointed headdress, which was exclusively a local invention of Seleucia and Babylon.²³ Consequently, this cross-cultural dialogue would logically lead to a gradual acceptance of Greek ideals of religious worship (such as shrine-based worship over traditional Babylonian personal gods and goddesses), ideal physical appearance and hair types (with the focus on anatomical features on terracotta figurines), and ways of life. This cross-cultural interaction exemplifies that local Babylonians and Greek settlers are clearly engaged in more than just a personal preference of functional and aesthetic choices in their terracotta figurines. Rather, they are a part of a process of creating a new, multicultural tradition and material culture specific to the Seleucid world that could not be achieved through the top-down policies of Seleucus. These new multicultural traditions were only possible through a dialogue between individuals in the lower echelons of the Seleucid society, who were on mutual footing and thus more able to learn from each other.

The third type of female terracotta figurine is called Western because it contains many distinctive Greek Tanagra figurine traits. For instance, figurines of this type are in the pose of a draped, standing woman which contrasts the traditional Babylonian pose of frontal standing nude woman. The relaxed, contrapposto pose was indicative of Greek style, and the production technique of single and double moulds ensured the durability and vertical stability of these figurines in constant usage in their context, which was most likely in a domestic shrine.²⁴ An example of this type of female terracotta figurine would be BM1876.²⁵ To start, BM1876's pose is a combination of Babylonian and Greek styles, as it combines western contrapposto pose with a typically Mesopotamian arm position, as one of her hands is held over her chest. Aesthetically, the figurine is in a traditional Greek style, since she is heavily draped in fabric and has a low headdress over her hair, characteristic of Greek Tanagra figurines. Despite the heavy Greek influence, BM1876 was made in a single mould production, which incorporates Babylonian elements into this predominantly Greek style figurine type. This influx of Mesopotamian production techniques and details of Babylonian hand positions shows that even when a type is predominantly Greek in appearance, subject matter, and context (personal

²² Refer to figure 3 in 'Bibliography of Material Culture.'

²³ Langin-Hooper, "Social Networks and Cross-Cultural Interaction," 159.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 151.

²⁵ Refer to figure 4 in 'Bibliography of Material Culture.'

worship, as BM1876 is found in a domestic context), there is still cross-cultural dialogue with local Mesopotamians through the use of Mesopotamian production techniques and style (the intricate details of the arms over her chest). This artistic interaction reinforces that local Babylonian populations adopt Greek culture on a lower level of the social hierarchy through an artistic dialogue with fellow terracotta figurine manufacturers of equal social standing.

The fourth Hellenistic terracotta figurine type is New Variation, which emphasizes in its name the variation in standard Greek poses and dress in new roles for these terracotta figurine types.²⁶ This pose is traditionally male, but in this context, the figurines are all females who recline on their left side.²⁷ This figurine features the Greek production technique of the double mould to be durable enough to withstand frequent handling. It also features distinctly Greek subject matter, since these male reclining figures in Greek art represent Dionysus. They were also found in distinctly Greek contexts, as many were used in funeral ceremonies, or were meant to be placed in graves, as indicated by their discovery locations in archaeological assemblages.²⁸ The assemblage of female reclining figurines from Uruk feature a combination of Mesopotamian and Greek aesthetics, from nude to fully clothed, and that clothing is often a combination of Greek and Babylonian styles.²⁹

An example of this figurine type is BM91784.³⁰ BM91784 is double moulded with thick, durable walls and features the aesthetic characteristics of a Greek Tanagra figurine with its braided hair and clothing indicative of the Greek style. This figurine would have also had a terracotta couch as an accessory for the female figurine to rest upon; this pose is very reminiscent of Dionysus, a canonically Greek deity. This image of a reclining figure on a couch—one that was originally a male pose—is also very reminiscent of the symposium, a distinctively Greek practice of drinking and partying. In BM91784, this practice is transformed into the imagery of Hellenistic Seleucid female terracotta figurine art. The figurine's focus on Greek activity (invoked in the image of the reclining woman), hair and clothing style, production technique, and use of a Greek deity as the subject (which would neither have been worshipped nor represented in Mesopotamian art prior to the Seleucid rule) is all found in a very Mesopotamian context, the household. Thus, this diffusion of Greek religious beliefs and Greek style into traditional Mesopotamian practices of figurine production emphasizes the cross-cultural interaction that leads Babylonian peoples in the lower echelons of Seleucid society to adopt Greek religious

²⁶ Langin-Hooper, "Social Networks and Cross-Cultural Interaction," 148.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 152.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 152.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 152.

³⁰ Refer to figure 5 in 'Bibliography of Material Culture.'

beliefs, forms of worship, and ways of life in their own homes.

The final Hellenistic female terracotta figurine type is called the Primitive style, and consists of females holding infants. While this type is not found in Uruk, an example has been discovered in Borsippa. BM5179 follows the traditional Babylonian *lamassu* pose of a naked frontal woman standing with her arms raised to hold her child, one of the four main stances of *lamassu* figurines. BM5179 also follows standard Mesopotamian production techniques of the single mould.³¹ Nevertheless, this figurine features the elaborate braided hairstyle indicative of Greek 'Tanagra' and adds dynamic movement to the figurine with intricate detail to emphasize that the woman is in the process of holding the baby, rather than frozen in her stance. BM5179 and other figurines of this type are found in domestic contexts—a traditionally Mesopotamian context for these terracotta figurines. Thus, the Greek style and dynamic movement of BM5179 placed in a particularly Mesopotamian context might have led women to see these figurines as mirror to themselves. These figurines paint women as mothers and caretakers, thereby enforcing the belief that it was their priority to raise children. Women even adopted Greek elements of dress and hair based on these figurine's Greek hairstyle.

Furthermore, while terracotta figurines discovered in Seleucia-on-the-Tigris and Nippur differ in subject matter from the female terracotta figurines of Seleucid Uruk, they still exemplify the gradual integration of Greek beliefs and characteristics into Mesopotamian art that occurred across the Seleucid kingdom. The gradual integration of Mediterranean beliefs into the way of life of those Mesopotamians that own these terracotta figurines is not an isolated incident in Uruk. This was a cultural phenomenon operating at a local level in virtually all urban and commercial centers throughout the Seleucid Kingdom, as opposed to a top-down, ruler-oriented imposition of Greek culture. This is especially evident in terracotta figurines that focus on Greek theatricality and artistic subject matter to further promote Greek ways of life to the Mesopotamian owners of these figurines.

One such example of Greek theatricality represented in Mesopotamian art was KM15632. KM15632 is a terracotta figurine that depicts a male performer dancing and holding a nondescript musical instrument.³² Most terracotta figurines discovered in Seleucia-on-the-Tigris (such as KM15632) depict Greek activities, which helped local Mesopotamians integrate Greek values and customs into their daily routine. Most of the Greek activities depicted were associated with the Greek god Apollo, who happened to be "the dynastic god who proclaims the protection of the Seleucids [and was] the god who at Seleucia [where these figurines are

31 Refer to figure 6 in 'Bibliography of Material Culture.'

32 Refer to figure 7 in 'Bibliography of Material Culture.'

found] bears the epithet of Komaios."³³ Seleucus erected a temple of Apollo and a theatre in Seleucia, which not only reinforced the sociopolitical link between the Seleucids and Apollo, but also established two Greek poleis in Mesopotamian communities, creating essential civic centres of Greek culture and life.³⁴ In the framework of the additive polytheistic religious system in Mesopotamia, Mesopotamians were open to introducing new gods to their religious worship and adopting new forms of veneration with new religious objects.³⁵ Thus, Mesopotamians introduced terracotta figurines, which would have previously been employed in domestic, personal use in pre-Hellenistic times, into typically Greek religious contexts as votive offerings in temples and shrine-based worship. This development occurred as Mesopotamians gradually adopted various elements of Greek culture, religious beliefs, and Greek deities (like Apollo) into their lives. This religious framework would explain the discovery of terracotta figurines in Seleucia-on-the-Tigris in religious contexts like temples, such as the temple built by Seleucus for Apollo, where KM15632 was found.

As the god of music and the creator of the lyre, it is evident that the subject matter of KM15632 was meant to not only reinforce the omnipresence of Apollo in the Seleucid kingdom, but also to portray Greek style, religious beliefs, and pastimes, like music and dancing, to Mesopotamians who had not previously interacted with Greek culture. Specifically, KM15632 was created with the standard Greek double mould production technique, and showcases the distinctly Greek activity of playing music. His appearance, however, featured a mixture of a Greek and Mesopotamian qualities; the wreath upon his head was common in Greek tradition (and a possible allusion to the music contests of the Greek world), the pointed beard was distinctly Mesopotamian, while his clothing was neither Greek or Mesopotamian in style.³⁶ This neutral appearance allowed the owner to identify as the performer, and the string that connects to the figurines' movable legs encourages the owner to choreograph their own musical performance with a dance.³⁷ Figurines of this style were either toys that represented actual Hellenistic musical and acting troupes who performed in places where these figurines were made, such as the theatre Seleucus built, or ritual objects to increase Mesopotamian worship for the Greek god Apollo, which reinforced the link between Apollo and the royal family.³⁸ This cross-cultural dialogue not only led to the integration of Greek dress, appearance, and activities associated with Apollo's divine

33 Alcock, *Centre and Periphery in the Hellenistic World*, 244.

34 *Ibid.*, 244.

35 Jorg Rupke, "Hellenistic and Roman Empires and Euro-Mediterranean Religion," *Journal of Religion in Europe* 3 (2010): 208.

36 Stephanie M. Langin-Hooper, "Fascination with the Tiny: Social Negotiation through Miniatures in Hellenistic Babylonia," *World Archaeology* 47 no. 1 (2015): 65.

37 Langin-Hooper, "Fascination with the Tiny," 65.

38 *Ibid.*, 65.

realm in previously culturally monolithic communities in Mesopotamia, but the interactive nature of KM15632 also encouraged the user to experiment with performing, and by extension, encouraged the user to adopt aspects of Greek identity.

There are also many terracotta figurines of soldiers riding horses, such as KM14496.³⁹ As KM14496 shows, these figurines were predominantly Greek in production and made in the double mould technique. This technique provided durability, an appropriate concern given the fact these figurines were often found in domestic contexts where children played with them. They were also found in votive contexts like graves of children and men, which applies to KM14496, since it was found between two graves buried under the floor of a residential space.⁴⁰ These figurines were predominantly Greek in style, as the horse riders are dressed in a *chamlyls*, typical Greek attire, though there were also instances where these figurines integrated the Mesopotamian skirted tunic. KM14496's round shield with his right fist close to his thigh reinforces a hybrid of Mesopotamian and Greek elements through the combination of military garments and styles. On the surface, this seems like simply another instance of the gradual integration of Greek culture and style into local Mesopotamian communities, but the dynamic nature of the figurine, which depicted the rider as he came down off of his horse and featured a hole in the rider's right hand to allow the owner to add a weapon and fight vicariously through the figurine, encouraged local Mesopotamians to assume the Greek identity of a soldier rather than a performer in this case.

For men who were buried with these figurines as votive offerings (a context of Greek Tanagra figurines), these figurines symbolized their personal service in the military and were physical embodiments of apotropaic protection, much like the Mesopotamian *sedu* figurines in pre-Hellenistic times. Further, the miniature nature of the battle gave men an illusion of power over the conflicts that ravaged the Seleucid kingdom during the Hellenistic age, whether it was associated with other dynasts, like the Syrian Wars between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies of Egypt, or the bloody succession wars within the Seleucid dynasty. With the continuous state of war in Hellenistic Seleucia, the miniscule scale of the battle of these figurines and the lack of consequences for the battle served as a form of solace for the people and communities plagued by conflict.

Moreover, the adoption of Greek customs and identities by local Mesopotamians in the lower echelons of the Seleucid political hierarchy is also evident in the terracotta assemblage of Seleucid Nippur. Although there are three figurines of New Variation style in the Nippur collection, there have been many debates on whether these figurines were from

³⁹ Refer to figure 8 in 'Bibliography of Material Culture.'

⁴⁰ Langin-Hooper, "Fascination with the Tiny," 70.

Babylonia. Thus, while these figurines reinforce the widespread cultural phenomenon of cross-cultural integration of Greek and Mesopotamians through art, it is uncertain if they are relevant to the analysis of Nippur's terracotta figurine assemblage. It is certain though that the Nippur collection contains a large portion of figurines of couples embracing. Specifically, PM9450 is one example of a general motif in these figurines of the awkward union of two lovers' faces.⁴¹ The messy combination of the two lovers' faces is meant to invoke the imagery of the Greek gods Eros and Psyche. Rupke states that "religion is seen as being embedded in social and political structures and practices, which usually tend to be centered locally."⁴² This quotation elucidates that the integration of Greek customs and religious figures, as shown through the subjects of Eros and Psyche, into local Mesopotamian culture occurs not through top-down royal decrees to worship these figures, but through local artistic dialogue between Greek and Mesopotamian terracotta figurine makers. Further, Langin-Hooper hypothesizes that the subjects of PM9450 serve as "props to identify, as well as simplify, the social role depicted—to make the portrayal of... 'spouse' clearly recognizable, and, essentialized."⁴³ Hence, PM9450's small size and mix of Greek and Mesopotamian qualities creates a relationship of intimacy and serves as a mirror for the user. Thus, it is the relationship between the figures, rather than the identities of the figures themselves, that is important to the user, since the user supplies their identity to the figurine. This association with the figurine by the user reinforces the movement of 'individualization' in the Hellenistic world, which focuses on the individual person as the point of experience, agency, and interdependence between various religions (including religious figures like Eros and Psyche) and society (with the introduction of Greek customs).⁴⁴ Hence, individual viewers of PM9450 see their own ideal relationship between the lovers, and it becomes a point of agency for them to culturally transition away from Mesopotamian ideals into a hybridized Greek and Mesopotamian culture.

Overall, based on the terracotta figurine assemblages at Uruk, Seleucia-on-the-Tigris, and Nippur, it is evident that these figurines "provide visual cues about acceptable and available roles within society—educating the viewer about the social space allowed to them."⁴⁵ In their cross-cultural environment, these contexts and spaces alter according to changes in cultural norms as well as the integration of Greek customs and beliefs in Mesopotamian communities. The social space for women was the home, since the female terracotta figurines are found primarily in domestic con-

41 Refer to figure 9 in 'Bibliography of Material Culture.'

42 Rupke, "Hellenistic and Roman Empires and Euro-Mediterranean Religion," 201.

43 Langin-Hooper, "Fascination with the Tiny," 73.

44 Rogke, "Hellenistic and Roman Empires and Euro-Mediterranean Religion," 205.

45 Langin-Hooper, "Fascination with the Tiny," 74.

texts and depict an idealized role as a mother and wife. The ideal role for male children was to participate in Greek social and civic life through attendance at theatre performances, the practice of music, and preparation to become a soldier. Men already had a military role as soldiers, and so terracotta figurines of cavalry officers reinforced their role in society as protectors of their homes and the state. Most importantly, all Mesopotamians shared the common space of the temple to worship Apollo as protector of the Seleucids. This effectively demonstrates that the cycle of local integration of Greek customs through art—to accept Greek ideals and rule by the Seleucids—began on a local level through the mutual dialogue and agency of both Mesopotamian and Greek peoples. Consequently, this led to the development of new cultural identities of Mesopotamian peoples. As the objects encouraged certain behaviours and ways of life of the users, they forged new personal identities of locals. Accordingly, locals created more terracotta figurines to reinforce these new identities and integrate Greek practices into their social norms.⁴⁶

Therefore, from the terracotta assemblages of Seleucid Uruk, Seleucia-on-the-Tigris, and Nippur, it is evident that the most effective way for local Mesopotamians to accept Greek ideals was not a top-down approach to impose institutions that forced interactions between local Mesopotamians and wealthy Greek elites. Rather, the most effective way to introduce Greek social norms in Mesopotamian communities was through the creation of an environment that facilitated cross-cultural interaction where locals could willingly engage in an artistic dialogue with people in the lower echelons of society and interpret Greek art for themselves. This was fostered through an intimate connection with terracotta figurines that linked the social and political transformation of rule by the Seleucid kingdom to the personal transformation of local Mesopotamians. Female terracotta figurines acted as mirrors for Mesopotamian women; figurines of performers and cavalry officers were mirrors for children's future roles in the Seleucid kingdom, and figurines of cavalry officers reminded men of their duty to the state. Overall, these terracotta figurines personify the Hellenistic age itself as a period of immense change politically, socially, and culturally; Greek culture collided with established eastern traditions to create a hybrid of societal and cultural norms reflective of the people of Mesopotamia and the local reception of Greek ideals into their daily lives.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 74.

Bibliography of Material Culture

Figure 1. Plan showing excavated structures and fortification walls, north at the top (after Finkbeiner 1991a: Tafel 29).

Figure 2. Type 1 female figurine, front view. Double moulded. Height: 38cm. British Museum, BM 80-6-17-1713=92215. Photograph adapted from Karvonen Kannas 1995. Right photograph by author, courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum.

Figure 3. Type 2 female figurine, front view. Double moulded. Height: 27cm. British Museum, BM 1901-7-13-1900=94344. Photograph adapted from Karvonen-Kannas 1995.

Figure 4. Type 3 female figurine, front and side views. Single moulded. Height: 14 cm. British Museum, BM 81-11-3-1876. Photographs by author, courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum.

Figure 5. Type 4 reclining female figurine, front view. Double moulded. Height: 10.5 cm. British Museum, BM 76-11-17-2399=91784. Photograph adapted from Karvonen-Kannas 1995.

Figure 6. Mother and child figurine, terracotta, Neo-Babylonian, Borsippa. British Museum, BM B82-3-23-5179. Photograph by author; edited by Jerry Langin-Hooper.

Figure 7. Puppet-like figurine, terracotta, Hellenistic, Seleucia-on-the-Tigris. Height: 8.2 cm. Museum location and number: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, KM 15632. Photograph edited by Jerry Langin-Hooper.

Figure 8. Cavalry (armed horse-rider) figurine, terracotta, Hellenistic, Seleucia-on-the-Tigris. Height: 6cm. Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, KM 14496. Photograph by author; edited by Jerry Langin-Hooper.

Figure 9. Embracing couple figurine, terracotta, Hellenistic, Nippur. Height: 9.3cm. University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PM 9450. Photograph by author; edited by Jerry Langin-Hooper.

Bibliography

- Alcock, Susan E. *Center and Periphery in the Hellenistic World*. Edited by Per Bilde, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Lise Hannestad, Jan Zahle, and Klavs Randsborg. Aarhus University: Aarhus University Press, 1994.
- Armstrong, James A. "Uruk." In *The Oxford Companion to Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Bilde, Per, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Lise Hannestad, Jan Zahle, and Klavs Randsborg. *Center and Periphery in the Hellenistic World*. Aarhus University: Aarhus University Press, 1996.
- Kosmin, Paul J.. *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Langin-Hooper, Stephanie M.. "Fascination with the Tiny: Social Negotiation through Miniatures in Hellenistic Babylonia." *World Archaeology* 47, no. 1 (2015): 60-79.
- . "Mammonymy, Maternal-Line Names, and Cultural Identification: Clues from the Onomasticon of Hellenistic Uruk." *The Journal of the American Oriental Society* 134, no. 2 (2014): 185-202.
- . "Seleucid-Parthian Figurines from Babylon in the Nippur Collection: Implications of Misattribution and Re-evaluating the Corpus." *Iraq* 78 (2016): 49-77.
- . "Social Networks and Cross-Cultural Interaction: A New Interpretation of the Female Terracotta Figurines of Hellenistic Babylon." *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 26, no. 2 (2007): 145-165.
- Petrie, C.A.. "Seleucid Uruk: An Analysis of Ceramic Distribution." *Iraq* 64 (2002): 85-123.
- Rupke, Jorg. Hellenistic and Roman Empires and Euro-Mediterranean Religion." *Journal of Religion in Europe* 3 (2010): 197-214.

Bridging the Physical and Emotional Divide in Cicero's Letters to Tiro

Kenneth Kim

The sixteenth and last book of Cicero's *Letters to Friends* begins with seven letters made remarkable by their chronological order and singular focus on Tiro's absence due to his ill health.¹ Scholarship has given satisfactory but supplemental answers as to when and where Cicero and Tiro wrote. After Tiro had been manumitted in 53 BCE, the duo travelled from Athens to Rome in 50 when Tiro took ill and remained at Patrae for seven months.² However, the prominent position of these seven letters in the *Letters'* compilation asks us to reconsider why this separation was important to the collator, Cicero, and Tiro. The scholarship repeats the claim that Tiro, Cicero's beloved freedman, assistant, and friend, worked himself sick because of his love for his patron.³ When we set aside our preconceptions of how Cicero and Tiro ought to feel towards each other based on Roman social norms and the traditional view of their relationship, the Cicero who emerges in these letters, unsatisfied with ill health as the cause for Tiro's absence, shows how Cicero prioritizes Tiro's closeness to him over his recovery.

If one defamiliarizes oneself from Cicero and Tiro's friendship and looks to the context of these letters alone, the distance of time and space between Cicero and Tiro continues to widen. While Cicero sails to Rome, Tiro remains ill at Patrae. This distance is combined with uncertainty about whether a letter would arrive or return correctly through ancient correspondence, and whether Tiro's condition would improve with ancient medicine. When Tiro does not answer Cicero's letters either through physical travel or literary response, however, the emotional distance between Cicero and Tiro also widens.

Cicero never asks outright how Tiro feels, a question with double meaning since it could refer both to his physical condition and how he feels about his relationship to Cicero. Tiro also never replies to the unasked question. We encounter instead a Cicero who is concerned with his own feelings. In one instance, he begins a letter by writing *non queo ad te nec libet scribere quo animo sim adfectus* (I cannot and I do not want to

1 The letters are sent over the span of one week, the last three sent on the same day. There are more letters related to Tiro's illness, but their order is jumbled. For chronology, see Marcus Tullius Cicero and Shackleton Bailey D. R., *Epistulae Ad Familiares* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 462-464, 486-487. The translations to English are my own.

2 William C. McDermott, "M. Cicero and M. Tiro," *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 21, no. 2 (1972), 260.

3 McDermott, "M. Cicero and M. Tiro," 261.

write what feelings I was affected by).⁴ We can unpack that *animus* (feeling) by comparing what has been done to Cicero to what Cicero is able to do about it. Just as Cicero physically leaves Tiro, he worries that Tiro has left him emotionally. Tiro's inaction in response to Cicero's request to join him becomes an action of subtle rejection. If this rejection is an unexpected response within the hierarchy between client and patron, or freedman and ex-master, Cicero must clarify whether there has been a shift in his relationship with Tiro. When he claims that he cannot write about how this makes him feel, he invites us in the same sentence to question his claim. Cicero is sometimes vulnerable or cajoling, and at other times condescending or vindictive—but always consistent. When one breaks down his repetitive and emphatic Latin into the building-blocks of word choice, syntax, and characterisation, all layers return the reader to the same conclusion: Tiro himself should choose to return to Cicero.

It is telling how Cicero begins his first letter, not by asking after Tiro or his ill health, but with a confession of his own weakness:

paulo facilius putavi posse me ferre desiderium tui, sed plane non fero et, quamquam magni ad honorem nostrum interest quam primum ad urbem me venire, tamen peccasse mihi videor qui a te discesserim.

I thought I could suffer this longing for you more easily, but clearly I can't, and although it matters greatly to my triumph that I come to Rome as soon as possible, I still seem to myself to have transgressed because I have departed from you.⁵

Cicero's *desiderium* (longing) to see Tiro has a negative emotional valence in line with his *magna sollicitudo* (great worry) and his *maxima voluptas* (greatest desire).⁶ Conversely, Tiro staying behind has become apathetic and official. Cicero describes his absence with Roman legal terms such as *voluntas* (choice), *consilium* (decision), or *sententia* (judgment) in rapid succession within the same letter.⁷ This juxtaposition between emotion and reason between Cicero and Tiro, when personal justifications bleed into impersonal constructions and vocabulary, sets the tone of these letters.⁸ Tiro's grammatical role as the objective genitive of Cicero's longing, or as the passive person away from whom Cicero actively leaves, is contaminated by the emotional valence of his *voluntas* without *voluptas*.

Cicero also describes this discordance through the passive voice in the letters that follow as he becomes increasingly anxious while waiting

⁴ Cic., *Fam.*, 16.2.1.

⁵ *Fam.*, 16.1.1.

⁶ *Fam.*, 16.8.1, 16.2.1.

⁷ *Fam.*, 16.1.4, 16.1.6, 16.1.7.

⁸ Kaster, "Fifty Ways to Feel your *Pudor*," *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*, 28-65.

for a response.⁹ The next day Tiro has still written nothing, and Cicero writes, *ego valde suspenso animo exspecto* (I myself am waiting with feelings really in suspense).¹⁰ When he finally receives a letter from Tiro on the third day, this too evokes an emotional response in Cicero. He writes *varie sum adfectus tuis litteris, valde priore pagina perturbatus, paulum altera recreatus*. (I was affected by your letter in different ways: I was seriously shaken by the first page, then a little relieved by the other).¹¹ To Cicero's three letters thus far, Tiro has sent only one in response, which leads Cicero to send three more. Within these letters, Cicero places himself in a powerless position, blaming himself and his emotion-filled passivity even as he actively sails to Rome. The height of this disconnect between perception and reality converts Tiro's convalescence into the guilty action that plagues Cicero. He takes this so far as to, in the first sentence of the first letter, blame Tiro's stay in Patrae as the cause of some unspecified transgression.¹²

We can also find an emotional reading within the different definitions of *valeo*, *convalesce*, *confirmo*, and *firmo*, when Cicero employs all of them interchangeably for 'to get better' as if for the sake of stylistic variety alone.¹³ *Convalesco* seems the least ambiguous, and therefore Cicero employs it the least: it appears only as a gerund to describe why Tiro may need to stay behind or what the object of Tiro's *diligentia*, a derivation of *diligere* (to care), should be. He writes: "if you think you need to stay at Patrae for recovery's sake" (*convalescendi causa*) and "by now, why should I exhort you to apply your whole care towards recovering? (*ad convalescendum*)."¹⁴ *Valeo* is more interesting because it functions as the formulaic 'goodbye, farewell' at the end of each letter, as well as the direct command, 'fare well.' As Tiro's lack of response becomes increasingly difficult to ignore by his own third letter, Cicero repeats *vale* too often and too emphatically to simply be generic. It becomes almost minatory in its double entendre: *vale, mi Tiro, vale, vale et salve. Lepta tibi salutem dicit et omnes. Vale*, (Farewell, my dear Tiro, farewell, farewell and hello [be healthy]. Lepta and everyone else send their regards [good health]. Farewell).¹⁵ *Firmo* and the intensified *confirmo* are the most interesting because of their ambiguity, as 'to make firm or fast' can refer to both physical health and to the mental qualities of resolution, courage, fidelity, and credibility. This ambiguity of

9 *Ibid.*, 29. "I experience *pudor* when I see myself being seen as discredited, when the value that I or others grant that self is not what I would have it be." Here Kaster almost intersects with the weakening and passive voice of Cicero's "I seem to myself to have sinned. (*pecasse mihi videor*, 16.1.1)"

10 *Cic., Fam.*, 16.3.1.

11 *Fam.*, 16.4.1.

12 *Fam.*, 16.1.4. Tiro had remained behind *quia tua voluntas ea videbatur esse ut prorsus nisi confirmato corpore nolles navigare* (because your will seemed to be that you obviously did not want to sail until after your body had gathered strength).

13 Forms of the verb *valeo* occur 27 times in these letters; cf. *confirmo* (8), *firmo* (4), *convalesco* (2).

14 *Fam.*, 16.1.2, 16.9.3.

15 *Fam.*, 16.4.4.

firmitas forms the dilemma that the transgressive, passive portrayal of Cicero presents to the rightful, active portrayal of Tiro on whether he should endeavour to recover his physical health or the health of his relationship.

The first step Cicero takes to encourage Tiro to prioritize the health of their relationship is by syntactically connecting *firmitas* and *con-firmitas* to expressions of love.¹⁶ Cicero presents this as a dichotomy: Tiro must *diligenter* (carefully) and *diligentissime* (most carefully) attend to the *diligentia* (care) of his health, or *diligat* (care) for Cicero: he must esteem and value them both.¹⁷ However, Tiro physically cannot fulfill both cares at the same time. Cicero relies on syntax to create a scale on which Tiro must weigh his care for Cicero against his concern for his own body. He then tilts this balance by transforming the comparison between emotions into a comparison between emotion and duty.

First, Tiro must understand how much he is loved. To that end, Cicero demands that Tiro observe a correlative: *sic habeto, mi Tiro, neminem esse qui me amet quin idem te amet* (thus consider, my dear Tiro, that there is no one who loves me who does not love you in the same way).¹⁸ Cicero repeats the same sentiment again in simpler form a month later saying *nemo nos amat qui non te diligit* (no one loves me who does not care for you).¹⁹ However, he is not the only one loving, nor is Tiro the only one being loved. Once Cicero arrives at Thyreum, he claims that *Xenomenes hospes tam te diligit quam si vixerit tecum* (the host Xenomenes loves you as much as if he has lived with you).²⁰ The quaestor Mescinius also *teque, ut mihi visus est, diligit* (seems to me to care for you).²¹ After all, *nihil potest illo fieri humanius, nihil nostril amantius* (nothing can be made more civil than that man, nothing that demonstrates more concern for me).²² Even when Tiro is separated from these men who would love him, Cicero arraigns them before him in these letters. Not journeying forth would risk breaking the reciprocity of affection.

Tiro must then repeatedly choose between his health and those whom Cicero claims love him. Cicero blatantly urges Tiro to choose the former writing *quantum me diligis tantum fac ut valeas, vel quantum te a meis diligis* (as much as you love me, make that much effort to be well; or as much as you know that you are loved by me).²³ In addition to these correlatives, he employs the condition that if Tiro loves him, then he must take care of himself. *Tu si nos omnis amas et praecipue me, magistrum tuum, con-*

16 Forms of the verb *diligo* appear sixteen times, ignoring the adverbial and noun forms of *diligenter* or *diligentia*, and *amo* nine times within these letters.

17 Cic., *Fam.*, 16.5.2, 16.4.3, 16.9.4.

18 *Fam.*, 16.4.4.

19 *Fam.*, 16.7.1.

20 *Fam.*, 16.5.1.

21 *Fam.*, 16.4.3, 16.5.2.

22 *Fam.*, 16.4.3, 16.5.2.

23 *Fam.*, 16.2.1.

firma te (if you love us all and especially me, your teacher, then strengthen yourself), he writes; or, *facies, si me diligis, ut cottidie sit Acastus in portu* (you will make sure, if you love me, that Acastus is in the port every day [to deliver me your letters]).²⁴ Here again in these correlatives and conditionals is the ambiguity of *confirmo*. The commanding nature of these apodoses in the imperative mood mirrors the barrage of *vale* at the end of each letter, as well as in his exhortation, *omnia depone, corpori servi* (place everything aside; be a slave to your body).²⁵ *Servo* here seems like a cruel joke to the ex-slave Tiro, but Cicero makes the same joke again with *libero*.²⁶ By placing the choice of health within the zone of slave-like behaviour, Cicero renders it a non-choice for a man who is no longer a slave.

Cicero then compares the choice to Tiro's duties as a freedman and a client. *De tuis innumerabilibus in me officiis erit hoc gratissimum* (regarding your countless duties to me, this will be the most gratifying), Cicero writes.²⁷ He then enumerates the innumerable: *innumerabilia tua sunt in me officia, domestica, forensia, urbana, provincialia, in re privata, in publica, in studiis, in litteris nostris: omnia viceris si, ut spero, te validum videro* (your duties to me are countless: in matters domestic, foreign, Roman, provincial, in business private and public, in studies, in our letters; all of these you will have overcome if, as I hope, I will see you healthy).²⁸ The superlative description of *gratissimum officium* also exaggerates how Tiro no longer assists in any of his normal duties with his absence. When Cicero asks Tiro to help him by helping himself, Tiro contradicts himself and hurts Cicero. In the correlational or conditional scale of health weighed against friendship, status as a freedman, and previous duties rendered, Cicero suggests that Tiro lean towards the latter three.

In addition to the emotion present in his word choice and syntax, Cicero encourages Tiro to compare himself to the other minor 'characters' Asclapo, Lyso, Curius, and Mescinius.²⁹ Asclapo the doctor and Lyso the host represent what Cicero disagrees with, yet he tells Tiro that he has handled them *accurate* (with great care).³⁰ Cicero prescribes Tiro a differ-

24 *Fam.*, 16.3.1, 16.5.1. Note in 16.10.2 the *magistrum tuum* as part of the same teacher-student register as, *nostra ad diem dicta fiet; docui enim te fides* ἔτιμον (our promises will happen on that day [you return], because I have taught you the definition of faith).

25 *Fam.*, 16.4.4.

26 Cicero makes the same joke with *libero* twice. In 16.9.2 "[Your letter] really lifted me from my anxiety. If only it could have liberated [me] (*liberassent*) from everything!" And in 16.15.1 "I am with great worry about your health; if you liberate me from this (*qua si me liberaris*), I will liberate you from every worry. (*ego te omnia cura liberabo*)."

27 *Fam.*, 16.1.3.

28 *Fam.*, 16.4.3.

29 Mario is mentioned by name six times; in comparison, the host Lyso is mentioned five times, the doctor Curio four times, the quaestor Mescinius twice, and Tiro's doctor Asclapo once.

30 But still, to that man [Asclapo] I wrote with great care, and to Lyso too. (*sed tamen et ad illum scripsi accurate et ad Lysonem*, 16.4.1)" We should not forget that Cicero seems to have written back and forth to all four of these characters, while Tiro has only written him once in the same week.

ent doctor and better treatment, since Asclapo has erred *ius enim dandum tibi non fuit κακοστόμαχος esses* (because broth should not have been given to you because you have a stomach-ache).³¹ He must also find Tiro a better host while he recovers because Lyso is negligent. He demonstrates this negligence when he writes *primum quia omnes Graeci, deinde quod, cum a me litteras accepisset, mihi nullas remisit* (first because all Greeks are, then because, although he had received letters from me, he sent none back).³² On the other hand, Curius the doctor and Mescinius the quaestor possess positive traits; the former is *suavissimum hominem et summi officii summaeque humanitatis* (the sweetest man and one of the greatest duty and civility).³³ Here, Cicero invites us to understand a new layer of subtext. Tiro seems to have ‘liberated’ himself with Lyso (which resembles the Greek λύω, ‘I free’), even while he should have been ‘taking care’ of himself with Curius (which is reminiscent of *curo*, ‘I take care of’). Even Tiro’s illness has a double meaning, since *ius* (broth) has made Tiro κακοστόμαχος (upset his stomach), while *ius* (law or duty) has made him wrongly upset as a servant in Rome (cf. *cacus, stomachor*). The representations of Asclapo and Lyso compared to Curius and Mescinius, or Greek compared to Roman, dichotomize Greek *negligentia* (negligence) and Roman *humanitas* (civility).

But Tiro seems to prefer Asclapo and Lyso. He writes as much to Cicero since Cicero observes that *eum tu laudas; tu igitur quid faciendum sit iudicabis* (you praise him [Lyso]; then consequently, you will judge what ought to be done (*sed eum tu laudas; tu igitur quid faciendum sit iudicabis*)).³⁴ Asclapo however treats Tiro for several months until Cicero mentions his diagnosis again in 16.9.2. If Tiro does not seek out Curius or Mescinius and instead relies on Asclapo and Lyso, that reflects poorly on Cicero. Cicero wields the shared, non-citizen status of a Greek doctor and a Greek freedman, and the tardiness of their replies is a pointed and disapproving observation on Tiro’s agency, since not acting according to Cicero’s wishes also means acting against them.³⁵ This problem festers for a month until Cicero complains that *symphoniam Lysonis vellem vitasses, ne in quartam hebdomada incideres; sed quoniam pudori tuo maluisti obsequi quam valetudini, reliqua cura* (I would want you to have avoided Lyso’s dinner party so that you would not have suffered a seven-day fever for the fourth time; but since you preferred to obey your propriety than your health, take care of the rest).³⁶ There is something *impudicus* (improper) in both the suggestion

³¹ *Fam.*, 16.4.1.

³² *Fam.*, 16.4.2.

³³ *Fam.*, 16.4.2.

³⁴ *Fam.*, 16.4.2.

³⁵ Cicero’s disapproval bridges the divide between ‘envy’ (*phthonos*-script *invidia*) and ‘righteous indignation’ (*nemesis*-script *invidia*). See more in Robert A. Kaster, *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 87.

³⁶ *Cic., Fam.*, 16.9.3.

that Tiro has disobeyed Cicero and the implication that Cicero must address this disobedience. Cicero must therefore reframe this discussion as it reflects on a positive quality of Tiro, *pudor*, just as he previously raised Tiro's absence into a rational, legalistic register.³⁷

The final piece of the puzzle is the slave Mario, who is ever present in the background of these letters. Cicero writes, *Marionem ad te eo misi ut aut tecum ad me quam primum veniret, aut, si tu morarere, statim ad me rediret* (I sent Mario to you so that he might either come to me with you as soon as possible, or, if you delay, that he might return to me at once).³⁸ Mario cannot physically drag back Tiro as a runaway, but serves as a physical representation of Cicero's expectation of a response. Mario then stays with Tiro for the next three days, during which Cicero sends an additional two letters that report where he is expecting Tiro's response, by either his presence or his letters.³⁹ Mario finally returns to Cicero by the fourth day of Tiro's absence with a single letter, to which Cicero responds with three of his own. His disappointment in these is palpable. *Volebam ad te Marionem remittere quem, cum meliuscule tibi esset, ad me mitteres; sed cogitavi unas litteras Marionem adferre posse, me autem crebras exspectare*. (I wanted to send Mario to you again, because if you have gotten just a little bit better, you might send him to me; but I can't help notice that Mario could only bring me a single letter, although I was expecting more).⁴⁰ The freedman Tiro no longer shares the same status as Mario, nor should he, like Mario must, obey Cicero's every command, yet Cicero juxtaposes one against the other.

When all three layers of emotional language—lexical, syntactical, and characteristic—are taken together, we can understand that Tiro's absence from Cicero has become strained and unusual in the same manner that Cicero's description of it is also strained and unusual. The structures between patron and client, master and slave, and teacher and student are jeopardized by Tiro's limited responses to Cicero's letters. However, this is not to say that Tiro has done anything more than negotiate his relationship with Cicero through absence and a thriftiness of response. Many details are elided when one expects these letters to fit neatly into a definition of 'love' that ignores the power difference between Cicero and Tiro. Further, it is impossible to conclude that the two hate or fear each other by straying too far into the direction of 'not love.'⁴¹ Moreover, similar comparative expressions of love arise in other contexts of requests and friendship in *Cicero's Letters*. For example, he requests as an ex-Pompeian to his Caesarian

³⁷ Kaster, *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*, 28-65.

³⁸ Cic., *Fam.*, 16.1.3.

³⁹ "At Leucas, I thought that I would have received either you yourself or your letters from Mario. (*Leucade aut te ipsum aut tuas litteras a Marionem putabam accepturum*, 16.2.5)". "I expect you first, of course, after that Mario with your letters. (*expect primum te scilicet, deinde Marionem cum tuis litteris*, 16.3.2)."

⁴⁰ Cic., *Fam.*, 16.5.1-2.

⁴¹ Sedgwick, "Between Men." in *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016), 696-712.

PLEBEIAN

son-in-law Dolabella, *si me tantum amas quantum certe amas* (if you love me as much as you certainly love me).⁴² Ambiguous Latin expressions of love frame ambiguous relationships in a manner deserving as much attention as the questions of who or when or where.

⁴² Cic., *Fam.*, 9.13.4.

Bibliography

Cicero. *Epistulae ad Familiares*, vol. 1. Edited by D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

—. *The Letters to His Friends*, vol. 3. Edited and translated by W. Glynn Williams. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Kaster, Robert A. *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

McDermott, William C. "M. Cicero and M. Tiro" in *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 21, no. 2, (1972): 259-286.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. "Between Men" in *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press (2016): 696-712.

ABOUT OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Kenneth Kim is a Third Year Woodsworth College student majoring in Classics, with minors in Literature and Critical Theory and Sexual Diversity Studies. His main academic interest is the expression of emotions and the human body in Latin literature, whenever he can catch a break from his cage match with Hansen and Quinn's *Greek: An Intensive Course*.

Jennifer MacPherson is a Third Year Victoria College student majoring in Classical Civilizations and minoring in English and Latin. She hopes to continue her study of Classics in graduate school in the future. Her main areas of interest are ancient women and sexuality, as well as Roman social history. She has recently developed a passion for the ancient theatre, and will recommend Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* to just about anyone she meets. Jennifer's love of Classics is rivaled only by her love of cinema, coffee, and baking cookies.

Hannah McCarthy is a Third Year New College student majoring in Classical Civilizations with minors in Drama and English. Her primary academic interests include Greek tragedy and the politics of the late Roman Republic and Julio-Claudian Empire. When not adamantly insisting that Medea did nothing wrong, Hannah can be found talking about *Star Wars*, listening to endless amounts of podcasts, or at your local pop culture convention.

Hana Nikčević is a Fourth Year student completing a Specialist in Art History. Her interests include women and gender in the ancient world, Bronze Age Mediterranean archaeology, and historical conceptions of landscape and nature. In September, Hana will begin an MA in Art History at McGill University, where her research will focus on recent and contemporary ecological art with a feminist perspective. In the meantime, she is looking for someone to teach her Ancient Greek over their lunch break.

Leah Stephens is a Fourth Year Victoria College student completing a double major in Latin and Classical Civilization and minoring in Renaissance Studies. She hopes to pursue graduate work in Latin philology studying the intersection of gender studies and material culture in the poetry of Ovid. In her spare time, she can occasionally be found dabbling in textual criticism.

Marcus Tarantino is a Fourth Year New College student pursuing a double major in Classical Civilization and History. His academic and personal interests include Roman political history during the Late Republic and the Early Imperial Age, royal women in Greco-Roman antiquity, and ancient numismatics. In the summer, Marcus enjoys travelling to Europe, visiting many of its premier museums and historical sites.

Erica Venturo is a Fourth Year St. Michael's College student pursuing a major in Classical Civilization and a double minor in History and Political Science. She is particularly interested in Middle Roman Imperial history, and the study of archaeological and epigraphic evidence to contextualize Roman history. Aside from studying Classics in school, Erica has worked on the Western Argolid Regional Survey in Greece and is a senior staff member of the Villa of the Antonines excavation in Rome. In her limited spare time, Erica enjoys 1000 piece jigsaw puzzles while watching episodes of *The Office* and *Letterkenny*.

Call for Submissions: Plebeian Volume VI

If you would like to be published in the next edition of Plebeian, submit your paper to classu.plebeian@gmail.com in January 2020.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS



Classics
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



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 *Assembly of the Plebs V*, an undergraduate student conference, held in the Department of Classics at the University of Toronto on 15 March 2019. The Editorial Board would like to give their sincere 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 fifth volume of *Plebeian* was launched at CLASSU's end-of-term social, CLASSU's *Long-Awaited Spring Spectacular 5 U IV* on 28 March 2019.

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.

