

EPIBATERION.

A STUDY OF ANCIENT ARRIVAL POETRY.

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of
the University of Liverpool for the degree of Doctor in
Philosophy by Mark Stephen Haywood.

August 1984.



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby
West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ
www.bl.uk

BEST COPY AVAILABLE.

Epibaterion. A Study of Ancient Arrival Poetry.
Ph.D. Thesis by Mark Stephen Haywood.

ABSTRACT.

This thesis is concerned with ancient arrival poetry. The Introduction raises several issues concerned with the ancient arrival genre or "Epibaterion": the concept of recurrent motifs (topoi), the possible ways in which arrival poetry might have undergone generic composition, the kinds of poetry that may be termed "Epibateric", and the relative importance of Menander Rhetor in this context. Lists of Epibateric examples, topoi and topical references are then given.

Chapters 1 and 2 provide simple generic analyses of some of the more straightforward Epibateria, both of the non-inverse and the inverse kind. Chapter 3 is a defence of particular assignments of poetry to the genre Epibaterion in the face of different generic assignments by other scholars. Chapters 4-10 form the main section of this work and in these chapters examples of probable topical sophistication are discussed. The topoi concerned are praise of the place of arrival, praise of the person met, longing for home, weariness, prayer, divine intervention, emotion, wild animals, death wish and reference to the founder of the place. A particular type of sophistication is topical omission, and significant examples of this are discussed in Chapter 11. The following two chapters deal with the usual ordering of topoi in Epibateria and the generic procedures of inversion, inclusion and deception.

It is concluded in Chapter 14 that the poetic arrival situation was adapted throughout antiquity with the greatest of ingenuity and artistry. Whether the arrival tradition was conditioned culturally, literarily or rhetorically, the arguments for topical variation and innovation given above prove that it is of the greatest importance to analyse the Epibaterion from a generic standpoint. Chapter 14 continues with some statistical results concerning topical usage, and concludes by countering some recent antigeneric criticism.

Quotations have been taken from the Oxford Classical Text series where possible and otherwise (except in certain cases) from the Teubner edition.

CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| PART ONE | |
| Introduction. | 1 |
| Chapter 1. Some non-inverse Epibateria. | 36 |
| Chapter 2. Some inverse Epibateria. | 51 |
| PART TWO | |
| Chapter 3. New Epibateric assignments. | 82 |
| Chapter 4. The place of arrival (B1a). | 110 |
| Chapter 5. Praise of the person met on arrival (B2) and longing for home (B3). | 126 |
| Chapter 6. Sleep and weariness (B4). | 130 |
| Chapter 7. Prayer (B5). | 136 |
| Chapter 8. Divine intervention (B6a) and emotion (B7). | 145 |
| Chapter 9. Wild animals (B9). | 159 |
| Chapter 10. Death wish (B10a, B10b) and the founder of the place (B11). | 166 |
| Chapter 11. Topical omission. | 171 |
| Chapter 12. Topical order. | 183 |
| Chapter 13. Inversion, inclusion and deception. | 189 |
| Chapter 14. Conclusion. | 206 |
| Appendix A. | 221 |
| Appendix B. | 222 |
| Bibliography. | 231 |

PART ONE.

INTRODUCTION.

It is the purpose of this thesis to study the Greek and Latin poetry associated with one of the standard recurring situations treated in ancient literature, namely the arrival scene, and more specifically the arrival scene as experienced from the standpoint of the arriver. The arrival situation is of course a stock one in real life, and just as in real life there are certain similarities between one arrival and another, so in different passages of arrival poetry there will be recurrent motifs or "topoi". This work aims at assessing how such typical motifs as these are adopted and readapted from one piece of arrival poetry to another, throughout antiquity. The method employed will initially be to give a general account of what appear to be fairly normal passages of arrival poetry (Part 1). It is hoped that by analysing such passages an idea will be gained of what sort of topoi are used. Part 2 of this work aims to examine in greater detail the more sophisticated ways in which the arrival situation is treated in ancient poetry. In particular, examples of variation and innovation in the use of topoi will be dealt with. This will enable conclusions to be drawn concerning the actual status of arrival poetry, as a genre, in its literary and cultural context.

The major modern work which sets out and explains fully generic techniques and how they were used in ancient times is "Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry" by F. Cairns (Edinburgh 1972), henceforth referred to as G.C. Cairns deals

with many of the genres which are believed by generic scholars to have been the basis for ancient poetic composition. The aims of this thesis are necessarily far more limited and less generalised, being concerned with one genre only, but the approach will inevitably be similar to that laid down in G.C. I must therefore assume familiarity on the part of the reader with the concepts and terms used in that work (eg. primary elements, *topoi*, inversion, inclusion etc.) and do not intend to explain these at any great length.

In order to examine the genre concerned with the arrival situation, I have seen fit to "set up" the genre on the lines suggested in G.C., rather than for example beginning my analysis of ancient arrival poetry from a neutral standpoint and then attempting to reach theoretical conclusions concerning it. I have initially assumed that such arrival poetry has been composed "generically" and have then assessed the advantages and disadvantages of such a hypothesis. It is important to note that this methodology in no way anticipates or preempts the outcome of the investigation.

What is a genre?

The concept of the "genre" is at first sight a simple one. The factor that determines whether a poem or passage of poetry belongs to a particular supposed genre is the actual situation described in it. It is then possible to carry out comparative analysis of poems belonging to each genre. Such analysis is based on a close understanding of the structure of the genre and the elements (*topoi*) that were usually included in it.

This means that a crucial factor is the nature of this structure and the attitude of the poets towards it. There are several ways of looking at the process of generic structuring and perhaps the best summary of them is given by I.M.LeM. DuQuesnay.¹ He sets up three possible ways in which ancient poetry might have been composed. According to him ancient poetry could be based on one of the following:

- 1) A culturally conditioned expectation based on what was said on a given occasion.
- 2) A more sophisticated expectation of what would be said in literature, based on a knowledge of classical models and a general rhetorical education.
- 3) A completely conscious awareness of an abstract, general, all-purpose formula derived from a specific type of rhetorical education.

It is important to realise that these three alternatives are not intended to be fixed, independent solutions to the generic problem, but rather to mark different levels of a gradation. In other words it may be the case that poetry was not composed in precise accordance with any of these alternatives, but in accordance with a method in a sense "lying between" two of those given above. It can now be seen that the term "genre" is by no means as simple as it at first appears. It does not denote a precise or rigid method of poetic composition. Within the body of this thesis, therefore,

1. I.M.LeM. DuQuesnay (1981) pp.53-61.

the terms "genre" and "generic" are used to denote a method of poetic composition lying somewhere on the scale outlined above. Alternatives 2 and 3 argue an awareness by poets of previous arrival poetry and rhetorical prescriptions. In order to attest sophistication of topoi in an individual case, therefore, we have to assess all arrival poetry written previously. As DuQuesnay says, alternative 1 also stands in need of comparative (or as he calls them, "generic") techniques of analysis, since it is only by looking at literary arrival scenes en masse that we can determine what were the real-life topoi of such scenes in antiquity. As he observes, these may be very different from conventions nowadays. This thesis aims to define the topoi of the ancient arrival situation in just such a way. In Part 2 evidence is then produced for highly sophisticated allusion to and variation of these topoi in particular passages.

Once such sophistication is attested, it will probably remain impossible to determine which of the three alternative methods of composition is actually the case. This is because any topos could be conditioned by real life (1) or literature (2) or prescription (3). So unless a poet is explicitly sophisticating upon a topical usage in previous arrival poetry (eg. in ch.6 Virgil's use of "ancora" recalling a Homeric Epibateric passage), his topical sophistications may still be explained by any of DuQuesnay's alternatives. What is important however is that generic analysis will have cast light upon highly subtle and artistic techniques which might have been inaccessible to other forms of analysis.

Terminology.

For the sake of convenience the term "Epibaterion" will be used throughout to denote arrival poetry of the type to be examined; it should not be supposed that a question is thereby being begged concerning the generic identity of such poetry, since the generic question will be treated in depth during Part 2.

Frequently a character in poetry, and especially in drama, arrives, but what he says has no actual bearing upon the fact of his arrival. Perhaps the clearest example of this is the messenger speech in tragedy. For the purposes of this thesis, speeches of arrival are regarded as being speeches made on arrival whose content has some bearing upon the arrival itself.

The term "Epibaterion" is not however restricted to speeches made on arrival: it may also be used to designate a narrative description (by the poet or by one of his characters) of an arrival. The reason for this is that the narration of the arrival makes use of precisely the same primary and secondary elements as does the speech of arrival. For example, whereas in the speech the arriver might pray, praise the place, speak of animals and so on, in the narration of an arrival, the narrator (often the poet himself) tells us that the arriver prayed, praised the place etc. Once again though, a narrative description which merely states "x arrived" and then goes on to discuss details unrelated to the arrival has not been deemed worthy of study in this work.

Arrival poetry then consists of either 1) speeches made on arrival and concerned with the arrival situation, or 2) significant descriptions of an arrival, or 3) any mixture of speech of arrival and arrival description. An actual arrival of some kind is required if the poetry is to be termed Epibateric.

In an Epibaterion, the arrival involved may be pleasant or unpleasant for the arriver. Those concerned with pleasant arrivals will be described as being "normal" whereas unpleasant arrival situations will be described as "inverse" in this work, and this term will be explained later. Both the "normal" and "inverse" types are found throughout antiquity, ie. from Homer onwards.

Most of this thesis will be concerned with the various techniques of topical innovation used in the Epibaterion. This makes it worthwhile to try to give at the outset a brief general account of the content of both the non-inverse and the inverse types, which will be followed in chs. 1 and 2 by an examination of a number of examples of both types.

The "normal" Epibaterion.

Often when a character is portrayed as arriving in a pleasant place, or at a place at which he is glad to have arrived, he praises it. He will sometimes simply express his joy in a greeting, or may even begin a protracted eulogy of the place. In this latter case, the fertility of the land may be referred to, as well as the abundance of flowers. The arriver may mention how temperate the climate is, or how civilised the people are who inhabit the region. Indeed he may encounter

one of these people and praise him at length. His relationship with the welcomer may become so close that he is offered hospitality. In his joy he might compare the place at which he has just arrived with other places which are not so pleasant, especially the place from which he has just come. For the same reason he might stress how arduous his journey has been, in order to emphasise how relieved he is finally to have arrived. On arrival he will frequently express his joy, either by weeping or by kissing the ground. A religious aspect is seldom absent from such literary arrival scenes, and the arriver will probably address one or more gods. He will first of all thank the deity concerned for bringing him safely to the place; then he might pray that he may be allowed to stay, and that no further hardship might befall him. He may even recall omens or prophecies which predicted his present happy situation. On a small number of occasions, the arriver might even feel that he would now willingly die, so glad is he to have arrived. This motif seems to be a development of the more common death wish which is expressed by people arriving in a more hostile environment.

The "inverse" Epibaterion.

The range of topoi used in inverse Epibateria, that is literary arrival scenes where the arriver reaches an unpleasant place or one which he did not want to reach, is very different. In addition to the simple death wish mentioned above, there may be a lengthy vituperation of the place itself. Its barbarity may be stressed, as well as its ruggedness and lack of

cultivation. The topoi will of course be appropriate to the place itself, in other words an arrival in a wilderness will not make use of the same motifs as an arrival in a seastorm, but several generalisations can still be made about the topoi of the inverse genre as a whole. The arriver may contrast the place to other places which are in some way more pleasant and in this context he may refer specifically to the place from which he has come. Similarly, he may express his longing for his homeland or for his family and the luxuries that he enjoyed at home. On arrival in the hostile environment he will often be exhausted and weary, although weariness is not exclusively associated with the inverse variant of the genre. The arriver will often be cold however, and stand in need of food, clothing and a roof over his head. If he does meet anyone, they may be hostile to him; and even if there is no-one nearby, he will often express his fear that he may be harmed by local people. He will also frequently fear attack from wild animals. These fears may not be unfounded, since it may be specifically mentioned that such creatures do inhabit the locale. As in the case of the pleasant arrival, there will often be an address to the gods. In this case, however, the arriver will rebuke them for having brought about his wretched predicament, and then pray earnestly for a change in his fortunes. If the gods are not specifically blamed, the arriver may simply complain about his bad luck; alternatively he may see himself as in some way paying the penalty for his own sins, in which case he will be afflicted by a sense of guilt.

Menander Rhetor

The only extant rhetorical prescription for the Epibaterion which survives is that of Menander Rhetor.² J. Griffin³ criticises the excessive emphasis placed on ancient rhetorical works in G.C. However, as will be seen, such criticism will be inappropriate in the case of the Epibaterion, since little can be found that is of genuine use in Menander's treatment of this "genre". He deals with the arrival situation at some length,⁴ and prescribes the various elements that should or could be used in a typical speech of arrival.

However his Epibateric prescription presents problems of a major kind for the scholar who investigates extant arrival poetry from the generic angle. These arise from the very nature of the oratory being prescribed. First of all the prescription is for prose speeches of arrival. Perhaps this is not in itself very significant, since as noted in G.C. (Preface), generic techniques are equally applicable to prose as to verse. Furthermore Menander often supports his suggestions for prosaic *topoi* by citing passages of poetry, for example the Homeric phrases cited for use in the Epibaterion at Men. Rh. 391.31-392.9. But it is the nature of the prose that causes the problem: it is designed for a formal, official

2. Menander Rhetor "Περὶ Ἐπιβατηρίων".

3. J. Griffin "Genre and Real Life in Latin Poetry" (Journal of Roman Studies vol. LXXI (1981)).

4. Men. Rh. 377.31-388.15. I use Russell and Wilson's enumeration throughout (D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson (1981)).

speech of arrival. The Epibateria which we have surviving are almost all of a personalised, private nature.⁵ Rarely do we find an arriver coming before an assembled crowd of welcomers to deliver a formal speech, such as is clearly envisaged in Menander's prescription.

It could of course be argued that the generic and topical elements found in the public genre will be very similar to those of the private genre anyway. This is what is implied by DuQuesnay in a passage where he criticises Russell and Wilson,⁶ "Russell and Wilson allege that in the Hellenistic period, such speeches were made only on great state occasions, that "only a royal wedding...rated a formal, rhetorically articulated epithalamios" (p.xxxiii). This, they admit, is conjecture. If such speeches were known, surely any rhetorician worth his salt would have been capable of adapting the form to suit a lesser aristocrat or friend, if the need or desire arose." However in adapting the public to suit the private occasion, it is surely possible, if not probable, that many features will be altered or even lost altogether.

Whether or not this is true of the Epibateria, it is impossible to rely upon a prescription for the formal genre in interpreting arrival poetry of a private nature. The *topoi* with which Menander or any other rhetor deal could well be totally inappropriate in the arrival poetry which we possess.

One might have hoped that Menander's section dealing with

5. See list of examples below.

6. I.M.L.M. DuQuesnay (1981) p.60 ("Menander Rhetor" ed. D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson (Oxford 1981)).

the less formal type of Epibaterion, the "Lalia", would be of greater use.⁷ But this section is very short and only suggests the use of praise of the place of arrival and the governor if he is present (and possibly some kind of "praise of father" though the text is probably corrupt).⁸ Again, the mention of a governor seems to indicate an organised, official occasion. In the poetry dealt with here a governor is never present, so this advice is inappropriate. What we are left with is therefore just praise of the place of arrival, which I have included as *topos Bla* (for my assignments of *topoi*, see below).

DuQuesnay⁹ argues convincingly that in Augustan poetry the addressee of a poem is always an important person and that therefore the poetry is above the common level. It could be reasoned from this that genres which usually involve an addressee will be very much the same whether in their private or public forms, because the private genre is also very important. This however is not true of the Epibaterion: in the extant arrival poetry, addressees rarely appear, so there is great scope for change when the official arrival speech is adapted to suit the more personal situation.

This is not to say however that Menander's advice for the Epibaterion should be completely ignored. In his main section on Epibateria¹⁰ he deals with eight distinct elements or *topoi* which may be included in the speech of arrival. These

7. Men.Rh. 391.29-392.9 and 394.13-29.

8. See Russell and Wilson (1981) ad loc.

9. I.M.Lem. DuQuesnay (1981) n.133.

10. Men.Rh. 377.31-388.15.

can be found listed in G.C. (p.212f.). Some of these topoi are found to resemble topoi which I have designated on the basis of the actual arrival poetry itself; however in most cases the ancient poetry is not easily assimilable into the Menandrian prescription.

There is one further point that should be borne in mind when an attempt is made to make use of the Menandrian prescription. This is the fact that the formula given is designed solely for a speech of arrival. However, as has been shown above, the Epibaterion can not only be taken to refer to a speech, but also to a narrative description of an arrival.

For these reasons, therefore, the prescription of Menander for the Epibaterion has been found in general to be either unsuitable or unreliable for the initial construction of the generic formula in this thesis. Occasionally it does appear useful but far greater reliance has had to be placed upon the extant arrival poetry itself.

The Epibaterion: examples, list of topoi and reference lists.

As noted above, the Epibaterion may take the form either of a speech of arrival or a description of an arrival. A systematic search has therefore been made for such passages throughout the whole of ancient Greek and Latin poetry, beginning with Homer. The latest Latin poet whose poetry has been examined is Claudian, the latest Greek poet, Nonnus. I have not dealt with any late or Christian Latin literature. It is impossible to claim that every single example of the genre has been detected and correctly assigned, but every effort has

been made to ensure that the search has been as comprehensive and accurate as possible. The passages which have been found to be Epibateric are all cited here:

- Homer Iliad III 172-6;V 684-8;XVIII 324-32;XXI 273-83
Odyssey I 48-62;I 180-8;III 286-92;IV 376-81;V 299-312;V 356-64;
V 408-3;V 441-57;V 465-73;VI 119-26;VI 149-85;IX 29-33, 37-8;
IX 34-6;IX 116-151;X 135-43;XI 60-5;XI 405-34;XI 488-91,498-503;
XII 279-93;XIII 187-360;XIV 334-59;XV 486-91;XVI 187-234;XVII
109-41,147-9;XVII 142-6;XXI 207-20
- Stesichorus Fr. 8(Edmonds) 185 (Page)
- Alcaeus Fr. 130.16-39(LP)
- Theognis II 1249-52
- Aeschylus Agamemnon 503-21,539-66;810-3,851-4
Eumenides 916-26,938-48,956-67,976-87,996-1002,1014-20
Suppliants 1-39;135-75;524-40
P.V. 1-2,4-5;88-127;136-44,152-9;197-241;284-92;436-71;561-
88,593-608;645-82;966-7,968-9
- Sophocles O.C. 84-110
Philoctetes 63-84;952-62
- Euripides Hippolytus 822-4;1047-50;1342-88
Alcestis 935-61
I.T. 77-94;203-35
Helen 400-35;528-40
Cyclops 347-55
Andromache 1-5;6-20;135-46
Phoenicians 202-38
- Aristophanes Clouds 299-313
Thesmophoriazusae 1022-55
Frogs 444-59
- Apollonius Rhodius I 953-1011;I 1172-86;II 549-610;IV 1564-70
- Moschus II 131-52
- Nonnus XLVII 315-419
- A.P.V 11;V 235;VI 358;VII 214;VII 273;VII 276;VII 278;VII 283;VII 285;
VII 286;VII 287;VII 288;VII 289;VII 290;VII 291;VII 292;VII 294;
VII 382;VII 383;VII 393;VII 397;VII 404;VII 495;VII 496;VII 497;
VII 498;VII 499;VII 501;VII 510;VII 539;VII 550;VII 551;VII 552;
VII 560;VII 568;VII 636;VII 637;VII 651;VII 652;VII 654;VII 660;
VII 662;VII 665;VII 680;VII 681;VII 682;VII 696;VII 700;VII 706;
VII 715;VII 729;VII 735;VIII 130;VIII 131;IX 7;IX 9;IX 34;IX 36;
IX 41;IX 106;IX 395;IX 451;IX 452;IX 458;X 3;X 21;X 24;XII 157;
XII 167;XIII 12
-
- Plautus Mostellaria 431-7,440-1;994-6
Rudens 184-219;220-8;274-9
Trinummus 820-38
Amphitryo 676-9,681
Stichus 402-9
- Terence H.T. 121-36,138-9;136-7
- Lucretius I 926-30=IV 1-5;III 1065-7;V 222-7
- Catullus XXXI;LXIII 27-73;LXIV 52-75,116-203
- Virgil Aeneid I 81-143;I 157-79;III 270-83;III 509-11;VI 341-71

Horace Odes I 7;II 6;III 27.25-76
 Tibullus I 3.1-56;I 3.57-82;I 3.83-94
 Propertius I 17;III 7
 Ovid¹¹ Heroides X
 A.A I 525-64
 Metamorphoses XI 478-572
 Tristia I 2;I 4;I 5.47-84;II 187-206,573-8;III 2;III 3;III 4.47-78;
 III 8;III 10;III 12;IV 1.45-86;IV 4.55-88;IV 6;IV 8;V 1;V 2;V 4.
 1-2,13-14,49-50;V 4.3-12,15-48;V 7;V 10;V 12
 E.P. I 2.13-100;I 3;I 4;I 8;I 10;II 4;II 7;II 8;II 10;III 1.
 1-30;III 7;IV 7.1-12;IV 10;IV 14
 Seneca H.F. 1138-50
 Medea 207-20
 Agamemnon 1-21;392A-394A;466-578;782-807
 Thyestes 1-23
 Manilius II 49-56
 Silius Italicus XVII 260-7
 Lucan V 561-676
 Martial I 49.1-18;I 49.19-42;VI 43
 Statius Thebaid I 312-89;I 401-7,452-65;VIII 1-20,90-122
 Ausonius VIII 56-103
 Claudian B.G I 504-26

A semicolon separates different Epibateria.

The primary elements of the genre are those features which are necessary for a passage of poetry to be given the generic term "Epibaterion". They in fact define the situation in the poetry as an arrival situation and are as follows:

A1 An arriver.

A2 An arrival.

As regards the generic "formula" which has been set up, this has been derived almost solely from the extant arrival poetry, despite owing a few debts to Menander as mentioned above. The procedure for assigning topoi has simply been to treat as a topos any feature of the poetic situation which

11. Some of the elegies from Ovid Tr. and E.P. listed here deal with events long after Ovid's actual arrival in exile. However they still make use of the topical and generic principles relating to the arrival genre (they "read" like arrival poetry) and so have been treated as Epibateric despite the chronological anomaly.

clearly recurs in several of the known Epibateria. The topoi listed below are the most widely used and the most important of all Epibateric topoi. It is these that will be investigated in chs.4-10, and not the large number of minor topoi some of which will be mentioned in Part One.

The enumeration of topoi follows the procedure used in G.C. and elsewhere. A topos which appears to have more than one independent form may be subdivided, eg. B10a, B10b, B10c. The list of the topoi that have been formulated for the genre Epibaterion is as follows:

- B1a Praise of place of arrival.
- B1b Other places are unpleasant.
- B1c Other places are pleasant.
- B2 Praise of person met on arrival.
- B3 Praise of/longing for homeland in absence (or people/things associated with home).
- B4 Sleep and weariness.
- B5 Prayer.
- B6a God(s) caused this arrival.
- B6b God(s) predicted this arrival.
- B7 Weeping, kissing, etc. (displays of emotion by arriver).
- B8 Narration of events prior to arrival.
- B9 Wild animals mentioned.
- B10a Death is preferable to this.
- B10b Place is so good that arriver would willingly die.
- B10c Arriver would willingly die if given a different status.
- B11 Praise of founder.

There now follows a listing of all occurrences of the topoi

given above in ancient Epibateria. It is laid out under topos headings and for each topos, every occurrence is cited.

BIA PRAISE OF PLACE OF ARRIVAL

Homer *Odyssey* III 287, 288, 290; V 411-2, 415; V 467, 469; VI 120-1, 123-4;
IX 30; IX 116-41; X 141; XII 286-7; XIII 195-6, 201-2, 234-5, 242-3,
347, 349-51; XIV 344, 353; XVII 149

Alcaeus Fr. 130.24(LP)

Theognis II 1251-2

Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 503, 508, 518, 540-1
Eumenides 919-20, 996-1002, 1014-20
Suppliants 4-5, 19-20; 539-40
P.V. 1-2, 4-6; 117; 142-3; 562; 666, 676; 968

Sophocles *Philoctetes* 272

Euripides *Hippolytus* 822
I.T. 94; 218-9
Helen 404-5, 409
Cyclops 348-9
Phoenicians 222, 226, 227, 229-31, 233, 234

Aristophanes *Clouds* 300, 301, 309
Frogs 445, 446, 449, 450
Thesmophoriazousae 1033

Apollonius Rhodius I 954, 989-91, 994-5; II 550, 553, 558, 564-5, 568-9,
571, 574-5, 577, 580-1, 587, 595-6, 598, 601-2, 604-5, 607

Nonnus XLVII 332, 336, 354

A.P. V 235.4, 6; VI 358.3; VII 273.1; VII 278.6; VII 283.1, 3; VII 286.3;
VII 287.2; VII 288.4; VII 291.6; VII 382.1, 4; VII 383.2; VII 397.3,
5-6; VII 404.1-2, 5; VII 496.1, 4, 5; VII 497.6; VII 498.5; VII 499.
3-4; VII 501.2-4; VII 568.6; VII 636.4-5; VII 651.3; VII 680.2; VII
700.1-2; VIII 130.2; VIII 131.5; IX 451.1; IX 458.1-2; X 21.4, 6;
X 24.4; XIII 12.6

Plautus *Mostellaria* 995
Rudens 188, 205-6, 214-5

Terence H.T. 124-131; 136-7

Lucretius I 927-9=IV 2-4

Catullus XXXI 2, 4, 6-10, 11, 12; LXIII 40, 53, 70-1; LXIV 57, 61, 126, 184-7

Virgil *Aeneid* I 81, 105, 108-9; I 162, 163-4, 165-6, 167, 168-9, 171-2, 174,
179; III 274; VI 365

Horace *Odes* I 7.13-4; II 6.10, 13-22; III 27.61-2

Tibullus I 3.3; I 3.60, 62

Propertius I 17.4,10,14,17;III 7.6,19,48,52,61

Ovid Heroides X 22,25-6,49,50,59,109-10,132,136

A.A. I 527

Metamorphoses XI 478-572

Tristia & E.P. PASSIM

Seneca H.F. 1139-40

Medea 208

Agamemnon 3;466-576;783

Manilius II 53

Lucan V 561-676

Martial I 49.4,7,10,15

Statius Thebaid I 313,373-7

Ausonius VIII 56-7,69

Claudian B.G. I 518,519,520,523-4

BIB OTHER PLACES ARE UNPLEASANT

Homer Odyssey V 446,449;XI 489-91;XV 487,489

Aeschylus Suppliants 9-10;141-3=151-3

P.V. 966-7,968-9

Sophocles Philoctetes 271

Euripides Cyclops 347-8,351-2

Apollonius Rhodius II 609-10

A.P. VII 289.4;VII 290.1,5;VII 393.5-6;VII 550.1,4;IX 34.1-6;IX 36.1-6;IX 41.1-2,3-4;IX 106.1-4;IX 458.1

Plautus Mostellaria 431-7

Rudens 218,227

Trinummus 832-9

Lucretius V 222

Virgil Aeneid III 270-3,282-3

Horace Odes II 6.1-4

Tibullus I 3.67-82

Ovid Heroides X 89-92

Tristia I 5.59-60,63,65,67-8,71,73,76;III 2.11-14,15-6;
III 8.1-4;IV1.71-2
E.P. I 3.61-84;IV 10.9-28

Manilius II 50-2

Martial I 49.31-40

Statius Thebaid VIII 15-6

Claudian B.G. I 506,511-5

B1C OTHER PLACES ARE PLEASANT

Homer Iliad XVIII 324-7
Odyssey XII 282,291-2;XIII 204-6

Theognis II 1249

Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae 1030-1,1034-6

Moschus II 132

Nonnus XLVII 321-7,345-9,384-405

A.P. VII 214.1-6;VII 286.3-4;VII 291.7-8;VII 496.1-2;VII 498.7-8;VII
568.3-4;VII 636.1-5;VII 637.3;VII 696.5-6;X 21.3

Catullus LXIV 141,160-3

Horace Odes I 7.1-11

Tibullus I 3.35-48

Ovid Tristia I 2.78-85;III 8.22,42
E.P. I 2.59-60;I 4.23-46;I 8.73-4;II 8.72;II 10.21-9;III 1.3-4,30;
III 7.30;IV 14.7-8

Martial VI 43.1-2,7-8

B2 PRAISE OF PERSON MET ON ARRIVAL

Homer Iliad III 172
Odyssey VI 149-69;XIV 359;XV 489-90

Apollonius Rhodius IV 1564

Plautus Amphitryo 676-9,681

B3 PRAISE OF/LONGING FOR HOMELAND IN ABSENCE(OR PEOPLE/THINGS
ASSOCIATED WITH HOME.

Homer Iliad III 174-5;V 686-8;XVIII 330-2

Odyssey I 49,57-9;IX 34-6;XI 430-2;XI 498-503;XIII 206,212,219

Stesichorus Fr. ~~8.4(Edmonds)~~ 185.4 (Page)

Alcaeus Fr. 130.18-23(LP)

Aeschylus P.V. 665

Euripides I.T. 220,230-1

Helen 402,405,407-8

Andromache 1;8-11;138-9

Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae 1027

Moschus II 131,146-7

Nonnus XLVII 377-80

A.P. VII 510.3-4;VII 552.6,7-8;VII 560.2;VII 660.3-4;VII 662.3;VII 706.
2-3;VII 715.1-2;IX 7.5-6;IX 9.5;IX 395.1-4;X 3.3

Plautus Mostellaria 441

Rudens 216-7

Stichus 406-9

Terence H.T. 137

Lucretius III 1067

Catullus XXXI 7-10;LXIII 50-1,55-6,58-60,64-7;LXIV 132,178-80

Horace Odes III 27.29-32,34-6,42-4,49

Tibullus I 3.5-10

Propertius I 17.19-24;III 7.43-6,49-50,64

Ovid Heroides X 67-74,119

Metamorphoses XI 542-3,544-7,561-7

Tristia I 2.92;I 4.23;I 5.64,66,69-70,81-4;II 188,202,575;III 2.21-
2;III 3.11-2,15-28,32,39-44,53,60-70;III 4.53-74;III 8.1-10;

III 12.1-26;IV 6.19,45-6;IV 8.9-14,27-8,41;V 1.39-40,80;V 4.3-4,
23-48;V 10.3-4,47;V 12.17-8

E.P. I 2.14,48-50,81-2;I 3.29-30,35-7,39-42,84;I 4.43,49-55;I 8.
29-48,65-8;II 4.7-29;II 7.65;II 10.33-50;IV 10.19-20

Seneca H.F. 1149

Medea 209-18,220

Statius Thebaid I 312, 314, 316-22, 369; VIII 111-3, 114-5

B4 SLEEP AND WEARINESS

Homer Odyssey V 453-4, 456-7; V 467-8, 471-2; IX 151; X 143; XI 62;
XII 279-80, 281; XIII 187-8, 281-2; XVI 229

Aeschylus Agamamnon 540
P.V. 139; 237; 565, 581, 586, 594; 645-7

Sophocles O.C. 85, 88, 91
Philoctetes 271-2, 276-7

Euripides Alcestris 938
Helen 420; 533-4
Hippolytus 1377, 1386-7

Apollonius Rhodius I 1174, 1182-4; IV 1569

Nonnus XLVII 320, 321-8, 334-6, 345-9

A.P. VII 278.2, 7-8; VII 286.6; VII 290.3; VII 397.2; VII 498.7; IX 7.6

Lucretius III 1065-6

Catullus XXXI 7-11; LXIII 35-8; LXIV 56, 122, 189

Virgil Aeneid I 123; I 157, 168-9, 173, 178; III 276, 277; III 511; VI 371

Horace Odes II 6.7-8

Tibullus I 3.89

Propertius III 7.69

Ovid Heroides X 5-6, 9, 13, 16, 111, 145
A.A. I 529
Metamorphoses XI 531
Tristia I 4.27; III 3.13, 85; III 8.27; IV 1.47; IV 6.32, 39-41;
IV 8.3-6, 23; V 2.24, 41-2; V 4.2
E.P. I 2.25-6, 41-52; I 4.3, 14; I 10.3-4, 21-4; III 7.28

Seneca Agamemnon 393A
H.F. 1142

Lucan V 621

Martial I 49.35-6; VI 43.10

Statius Thebaid I 331, 339-41, 389; I 403

Ausonius VIII 99-103

B5 PRAYER

Homer Iliad XXI 273-4

Odyssey I 60-2; I [172], 180, 187; V 444-50; XI 423; XIII 213-4,
230-1, 355, 357-8; XVI 223; XXI 210-1

Alcaeus Fr. 130.36-7(LP)

Aeschylus Agamemnon 506, 508, 512-7; 810-3, 854

Eumenides 921-6, 938-47, 959-67, 977-87

Suppliants 1-4, 18, 23-39; 137-53; 524-35, 536

P.V. 88-95; 136-44; 584-5

Sophocles O.C. 84-6, 101-10

Euripides Hippolytus 1363

Cyclops 350-1, 353-5

Moschus II 149-50

Nonnus XLVII 338-44, 344-64

A.P. V 11.1-2; VII 552.9-10; VII 568.7-8; IX 7.3-6; IX 9.3-4; IX 458.1;

X 21.1-8; X 24.1-4; XIII 12.3-4

Plautus Rudens 274-9

Catullus LXIV 171-6, 190-203

Virgil Aeneid III 275, 279; VI 363-71

Horace Odes III 27.50-6

Tibullus I 3.5, 27, 29-32, 33-4, 51-2; I 3.82; I 3.83-8, 93-4

Propertius I 17.4, 18, 25-8; III 7.17-8, 63-4

Ovid Heroides X 133-4

Metamorphoses XI 540-2, 565

Tristia I 2.1-3, 15, 18, 35, 59-62, 69-70, 81, 86, 87-91, 99-106, 109; I 4.
20-1, 25-8; II 201-4, 573-8; III 2.27-30; III 3.31-2; III 8.1-10, 11,
14, 17-22; III 12.45-8, 53-4; IV 1.53; IV 4.87-8; IV 8.30; V 2.17-20,
45-78; V 4.13-4, 49-50

E.P. I 2.63-4, 97-100; I 4.49-58; I 10.41-2; II 8.14, 27-52, 75-6;
III 7.2

Seneca Agamemnon 392A-394A; 497, 510-11, 519-26; 793, 802-7

Thyestes 13-8

Statius Thebaid I 323; VIII 93-4, 97-8, 119-20

B6A GOD(S) CAUSED THIS ARRIVAL

Homer Iliad XVIII 328, 329-30; XXI 275, 276, 281-3
Odyssey I 55, 62; III 286-92; IV 377-8, 380; V 303-5, 312; V 356-9; V
408-10, 423; VI 172-4; IX 30-2, 38; IX 142-3; X 141; XI 61; XI 406-7, 409;
XII 284, 289, 290, 292; XIII 306; XIV 348-9, 357-9; XV 488-9; XVI 207-12,
232, 233; XVII 143-4; XVII 148-9

Alcaeus Fr. 130.17(LP)

Aeschylus Agamemnon 508-10; 811-2, 853
P.V. 92, 96-7, 103-5, 119; 198, 223, 237-8; 292; 568, 577, 596, 600-
1; 649, 650, 652, 654, 660, 667, 669, 672, 677-8, 680, 682

Sophocles O.C. 96-8
Philoctetes 273

Euripides Hippolytus 1344-6, 1349, 1362
Alcestis 939
I.T. 77-8, 79-80; 203-4, 206-7
Helen 403
Phoenicians 211-3

Aristophanes Frogs 454
Thesmophoriazousae 1047, 1048

Apollonius Rhodius I 954, 966-7, 970; I 1186; II 598-603

Moschus II 135, 140, 152

Nonnus XLVII 382

A.P. VII 273.3, 4; VII 287.8; VII 288.2; VII 290.6; VII 291.1; VII 294.3;
VII 397.6; VII 404.4; VII 495.1-2, 5; VII 510.2; VII 539.1-2, 3; VII 550.
3-4; VII 551.1, 3; VII 552.1, 5; VII 560.7, 8; VII 568.1, 3-4; VII 636.6;
VII 637.3; VII 660.3; VII 662.5-6; VII 665.5; VII 681.2-3; VII 682.1-2;
VII 696.3; VII 700.5-6; VII 715.3-6; VII 729.2; VII 735.5; IX 34.3-4;
IX 36.3-4; IX 451.2; IX 452.4; XII 157.1, 3; XII 167.1-4

Plautus Mostellaria 431-7
Rudens 184, 188, 190, 192, 194-7
Stichus 402-3
Trinummus 820-37

Catullus LXIV 71-5, 134

Virgil Aeneid I 81-2, 85-6, 102, 108, 110, 124-43; III 509; VI 341-8, 355, 368-9

Horace Odes II 6.9; III 27.25-6, 45-8, 71-2, 73, 74-5

Tibullus I 3.57-8, 65; I 3.90

Propertius I 17.7,11,19;III 7.13-5,31,32,37,57-9,62,67-70

Ovid Heroides X 95

A.A. I 525-64

Metamorphoses XI 481,502,570-2

Tristia I 2.4-12,15-6,27-30,107-10;I 4.1-2,17;I 5.62,75,76,78,84;

III 2.1,3-4,27-9;III 3.38;III 4.78;III 8.35-6;III 10.11,14,17,

45,51,53;III 12.1-4;IV 1.46,49-52,53-6,62,86;IV 4.69-70,88;

IV 8.15-16,31-2,45-50;V 1.29,36,38,59;V 2.35-6;V 4.4,19-22;V 7.

32;V 10.45-6;V 12.5,6,14,45-6

E.P. I 2.26,61,92;I 4.40,44;I 8.64;I 10.42;II 4.5-6,30;II 7.15-22,

34,41,57-8;II 8.59,75;III 7.17,20,32;IV 10.11,15-6,41-4;IV 47

Seneca Medea 219

Agamemnon 476,479-84,494-5,512,518,528-32,535-7,552,553-5,577-8

Thyestes 1-4

Manilius II 56

Silius Italicus XVII 262-3

Lucan V 569-72,574,592-3,598-612,620-6,653-4,654-6,672

Statius Thebaid I 326-8,371-2;I 401;VIII 9-13,101,108-9,119,120

Ausonius VIII 56-98

Claudian B.G. I 515,526

B6B GODS(S) PREDICTED THIS ARRIVAL

Homer Odyssey V 300-2

Sophocles O.C. 87-93,94-5,102

Euripides Helen 528-39

Alcestis 959-60

A.P. VII 729.1-2

Horace Odes I 7.28-9

Tibullus I 3.11-13,17-20

Ovid Tristia I 2.83;II 197;IV 1.60,73;IV 8.42;V 10.14

E.P. I 4.31

Statius Thebiad [I 395-7]

B7 WEeping, KISSING, ETC. (DISPLAYS OF EMOTION BY AR.)

Homer Iliad III 176

Odyssey I 55; V 420; [V 463]; XIII 198, 226, 250-1, 286, 352-4; XVI
190, 215-20

Aeschylus Ag. 541

Sophocles Philoctetes 278

Euripides I.T. 230

Andromache 141

Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae 1023, 1040-1

Nonnus XLVII 315-9, 412, 419

A.P. VII 700.2; XII 167.2

Lucretius V 226

Catullus LXIII 48; LXIV 131

Virgil Aeneid I 93

Horace Odes III 27.38, 74

Propertius III 7.41, 46, 55

Ovid Heroides X 15-6, 43, 55, 114, 138, 145, 148

A.A I 532, 533, 535

Metamorphoses XI 539

Tristia III 2.19-20; V 1.52, 56; V 4.3-6; V 12.1

E.P. I 2.27; I 4.53

Statius Thebaid I 316; [VII 822]

Ausonius VIII 61, 89

B8 NARRATION OF EVENTS PRIOR TO ARRIVAL

Homer Odyssey I 182-6; VI 170-2, 175; XI 62-5; XI 409-30; XIII 258-86;
XIV 334-59; XVI 227-34; XVII 109-41, 147-9

Aeschylus Agamemnon 555-66

P.V. 199-236; 442-68; 645-75

Euripides Andromache 6-20

Phoenicians 202-25

Helen 400-7

Apollonius Rhodius IV 1566-9

A.P. VII 273.4;VII 287.5-6;VII 294.2;VII 498.1-2;VII 539.2-4;VII 637.1-2

Statius Thebaid VIII 104-10

B9 WILD ANIMALS MENTIONED

Homer Odyssey V 421-2;V 473;IX 118-21,124;XIII 208,246;XVI 216-8

Alcaeus Fr. 130.25(LP)

Aeschylus Agamemnon 562,563

P.V. 108,109,114-6,124-7;582

Sophocles Philoctetes 955-8

Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusa 1028,1033

Apollonius Rhodius I 991,1011

A.P. VII 273.5;VII 276.1-2,6;VII 285.4;VII 286.6;VII 288.3;VII 289.3;
VII 290.5;VII 292.1;VII 294.5-6;VII 397.4;VII 550.2;VII 652.5-6;
VII 654.5-6;VII 662.5;VII 696.1

Plautus Trinummus 835

Lucretius [V 228-34]

Catullus LXIII 33,53-4,72;LXIV 152-3,193

Virgil Aeneid [I 184-194]

Horace Odes III 27.26-7,51-2,55-6

Tibullus I 3.69,71,76

Propertius I 17.2;III 7.8,11,61

Ovid Heroides X 1,8,84-7,96,123

A.A. I 550,559

Metamorphoses XI 510-11,544-5,562-3,566-7

Tristia I 2.56;III 10.43-4,49-50,59;III 12.8-10;IV 1.56,79-80;

IV 8.1;V 1.11-12;V 2.25-6;V 7.46;V 10.19-20,26;V 12.55

E.P. I 2.18;I 3.39-42;II 7.9-12,27-30;III 1.15-6,21-2;IV 10.25-6;

IV 14.13

Seneca Thyestes 10-2

Manilius II 55

Lucan V 620

Martial I 49.14-15;I 49.23-7

Statius Thebaid I 339,377-8,[395],[397];I 453,457-60

Claudian B.G. I 514

BLØA DEATH IS PREFERABLE TO THIS

Homer Iliad III 173-7;XXI 279-80
Odyssey I 59;V 306-10

Aeschylus Suppliants 154-61
P.V. 152-7;582

Euripides Hippolytus 1047;1375-7,1386-8
Alcestis 935-9,960-1

Aristophanes Thesmophoriazuseae 1050-1,1052-5

A.P. VII 383.7-8;VII 715.2-3;IX 41.6

Plautus Rudens 209;220

Catullus LXIV 153

Virgil Aeneid I 94-101;VI 371

Horace Odes III 27.37-8,50,51-2,55-6

Tibullus I 3.4-5,53-6

Propertius I 17.8,11-12

Ovid Heroides X 77-8,82,112

Metamorphoses XI 500,539-40

Tristia III 2.23-6,29-30;III 3.56;III 8.39-40;IV 6.50;V 7.23-4;
V 10.46

E.P. I 2.29-34,57;II 8.65-7;III 7.19-20,27-8,39-40;IV 14.9-12

Seneca Agamemnon 3,12-21;512-6;797-8
Thyestes 4-12

Silius Italalicus XVII 260-7

Lucan V 656-71

BLØB PLACE OF ARRIVAL IS SO GOOD THAT AR. WOULD WILLINGLY DIE

Aeschylus Agamemnon 506-7,539,550

Sophocles O.C. 91,102-3

Aristophanes Frogs 455-9

Horace Odes II 6.22-4

B10C AR. WOULD WILLINGLY DIE IF GIVEN A DIFFERENT STATUS

Homer Iliad V 685-6;XXI 274

A.P. VII 735.5-6

Propertius I 17.19-24

Ovid Heroides X 150

Tristia I 2.52-6;III 3.34-5;V 2.73-6

B11 PRAISE OF FOUNDER

Homer Odyssey XIII 351

Catullus XXXI 13

Horace Odes I 7.13,21-32;II 6.5

Ovid Tristia III 8.3

E.P. I 8.11-14

Claudian B.G. I 518,520

Brackets [] indicate that the topos appears to occur outside the Epibaterion itself.

A semicolon separates examples from different Epibateria.

The following list presents similar information in a different format. Here, the topical content of each Epibaterion is given. Thus for each Epibaterion (listed vertically in abbreviated form) we may read across and see which topoi are used. In this listing, details are not given

of topical references or of the number of times a topos occurs in an Epibaterion. This latter information will be found in Appendix B where the actual topical format of each Epibaterion is given.

For each Epibaterion, a topos is only counted once, i.e. it is considered either to be present or not.

Column 1: Space=Ep. is not inverse
 X=Ep. is inverse
 A=Ep. is semi-inverse
 B=Ep. is not inverse becoming inverse
 C=Ep. is inverse becoming not inverse

Column 2: R=Ep. is a reported arrival (description)
 S=Ep. is a speech of arrival
 RSRS=Ep. consists of successive R and S

| EPIBATERION | TOPOI USED | 1 | 2 |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|-------|--------------|
| H IL III |2.3.7. . .10A. | . | .X.R |
| V |3. | .10C. | .X.S |
| XVIII | . . .1C. .3. . .6A. | . | .X.S |
| XXI |5.6A.10A. | .10C. | .X.S |
| OD I48 |3. .5.6A. .7. . .10A. | . | .X.R |
| I180 |5. . . .8. | . | .S |
| III | .1A.6A. | . | .X.R |
| IV |6A. | . | .X.S |
| V299 |6A.6B. . . .10A. | . | .X.S |
| V356 |6A. | . | .X.S |
| V408 | .1A.6A. .7. .9. | . | .X.S |
| V441 | . .1B. . . .4.5. | . | .X.RSR |
| V465 | .1A. . . .4. . . .7. .9. | . | .X.S |
| VI119 | .1A. | . | .A.S |
| VI149 |2. . . .6A. . .8. | . | .B.S |
| IX29 | .1A.6A. | . | .X.R |
| IX34 |3. | . | .R |
| IX116 | .1A. . . .4. .6A. . . .9. | . | .C.R |
| X135 | .1A. . . .4. .6A. | . | .X.R |
| XI60 |4. .6A. . .8. | . | .X.R |
| XI405 |3. .5.6A. . .8. | . | .X.R |
| XI488 | . .1B. . .3. | . | .X.R |
| XII | .1A. .1C. .4. .6A. | . | .X.S |
| XIII | .1A. .1C. .3.4.5.6A. .7.8.9. | . | .C.RSRRSRSRS |
| XIV | .1A. . .2. . .6A. . .8. | . | .R |
| XV | . .1B. .2. . .6A. | . | .R |
| XVI |4.5.6A. .7.8.9. | . | .SRSRS |
| XVII109 | .1A.6A. . .8. | . | .R |
| XVII142 |6A. | . | .R |
| XXI |5. | . | .S |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---------|------|-----------------|----------|---------|---------|-----|---------|---|------|--------|
| V10 | .1A. | . | . | .3. | . | .6A.6B. | . | .9.10A. | . | . | .X.S |
| V12 | .1A. | . | . | .3. | . | .6A. | .7. | .9. | . | . | .X.S |
| EP I2 | .1A. | .1C. | .3.4.5.6A. | .7. | .9.10A. | . | . | . | . | . | .X.S |
| I3 | .1A.1B. | . | .3. | . | . | . | . | .9. | . | . | .X.S |
| I4 | .1A. | .1C. | .3.4.5.6A.6B.7. | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | .X.S |
| I8 | .1A. | .1C. | .3. | . | .6A. | . | . | . | . | .11. | .X.S |
| I10 | .1A. | . | . | .4.5.6A. | . | . | . | . | . | . | .X.S |
| II4 | .1A. | . | .3. | . | .6A. | . | . | . | . | . | .X.S |
| II7 | .1A. | . | .3. | . | .6A. | . | . | .9. | . | . | .X.S |
| II8 | .1A. | .1C. | . | .5.6A. | . | . | . | .10A. | . | . | .X.S |
| III0 | .1A. | .1C. | .3. | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | .X.S |
| III1 | .1A. | .1C. | . | . | . | . | . | .9. | . | . | .X.S |
| III7 | .1A. | .1C. | . | .5.6A. | . | . | . | .10A. | . | . | .X.S |
| IV7 | .1A. | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | .X.R |
| IV10 | .1A.1B. | . | .3. | . | .6A. | . | . | .9. | . | . | .X.S |
| IV14 | .1A. | .1C. | . | .6A. | . | . | . | .9.10A. | . | . | .X.S |
| SEN HF | .1A. | . | .3.4. | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | .A.S |
| MED | .1A. | . | .3. | . | .6A. | . | . | . | . | . | .X.S |
| AG 1 | .1A. | . | . | . | . | . | . | .10A. | . | . | .A.S |
| 392A. | . | . | .4.5. | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | .S |
| 466 | .1A. | . | . | .5.6A. | . | . | . | .10A. | . | . | .X.R |
| 782 | .1A. | . | . | .5. | . | . | . | .10A. | . | . | .S |
| THY | . | . | . | .5.6A. | . | . | . | .9. | . | . | .A.S |
| MAN | .1A.1B. | . | . | .6A. | . | . | . | .9. | . | . | .S |
| SIL IT | . | . | . | .6A. | . | . | . | .10A. | . | . | .X.S |
| LUCAN | .1A. | . | .4. | .6A. | . | . | . | .9.10A. | . | . | .X.RSS |
| | | | | | | | | | | | RSR |
| MART I49.1 | .1A. | . | . | . | . | . | . | .9. | . | . | .R |
| 19. | .1B. | . | .4. | . | . | . | . | .9. | . | . | .R |
| IV43 | .1C. | . | .4. | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | .R |
| ST TH I312 | .1A. | . | .3.4.5.6A.6B.7. | .9. | . | . | . | . | . | . | .R |
| I401 | . | . | .4. | .6A.6B. | .9. | . | . | . | . | . | .RS |
| VIII | .1B. | . | .3. | .5.6A. | .7.8. | . | . | . | . | . | .X.RS |
| AUS | .1A. | . | .4. | .6A. | .7. | . | . | . | . | . | .X.R |
| CL | .1A.1B. | . | . | .6A. | . | . | . | .9. | . | .11. | .R |

I shall analyse in chs. 1 and 2 a few passages of arrival poetry which are as near to being "standard" as one can hope for, given that they are the work of sophisticated poets. The passages chosen reflect both the speech of arrival and the arrival description, as well as both the inverse and the non-inverse types. The three examples treated in ch.1 are "normal", the first three dealt with in ch.2 are inverse, and the final example dealt with in ch.2 exhibits characteristics of both kinds. It is hoped that this examination of the two

"standard" types of arrival poem will form a suitable background from which to view the genre Epibaterion in its more sophisticated forms.

Ch.3 attempts to defend various new assignments of poetry to the genre Epibaterion in the face of different treatment by other scholars. Chapters 4-10 deal with most of the Epibateric topoi individually and, by means of an investigation of various possible topical sophistications, set up the evidence for and against a generic theory of composition.

It will be noticed that this thesis, though owing great debts to G.C., does not attempt to follow all the procedures adopted in that work. It has, for example, been impossible here to provide any discussion of "addressee-variation" (G.C. ch.9). The reason for this has in fact already been mentioned above in a different context; it is that an addressee is usually absent in the genre Epibaterion. As regards speaker-variation (G.C. ch.8), occurrences of this constructive principle will only be discussed when relevant to a particular passage, and the device will not be treated in a separate section. The same holds for other features such as Brachylogia and Macrologia (G.C. p.119ff.).

Omission of topoi, however, I have regarded as deserving of a separate investigation (ch.11), since it is a difficult issue which has not been fully analysed to date. A separate section has also been devoted to an attempt to set up an "ordering" of topoi for the genre, and the various ramifications of this are also discussed (ch.12). Chapter 13

deals with the techniques of inversion, inclusion and deception.

CHAPTER 1. SOME NON-INVERSE EPIBATERIA.

SOPHOCLES O.C. 84-110.

A good example of a normal arrival situation may be found at the beginning of Sophocles' "Oedipus Coloneus" where the blind Oedipus and his daughter Antigone reach the grove at Colonus. Neither is sure what place it is in which they have arrived, and Antigone can only conjecture

...πύργοι μὲν οἱ
πόλιν στέγουσιν, ὡς ἀπ' ὀμμάτων, πρόσω·
χῶρος δ' ὄδ' ἱρός, ὡς ἀπεικάζσαι...

14-16

The speech in which these remarks are made is in a broad sense Epibateric, since it contains the girl's first impressions of the place. She remarks upon the presence of laurel, olive and vine, and mentions the song of the nightingale, which can be heard. Finally (19-20) she advises her father to rest his limbs upon an unhewn rock, since he is old and the journey has been long. However, it is only after Oedipus has heard from the Athenian stranger that the grove is sacred to the Eumenides that he realises that he has reached the destined end of his wanderings and can deliver a full arrival speech. This speech begins at 84 with a plea to the Eumenides, addressed as πότνιαι δεινῶπεες, to accept his supplication; he describes at some length the divine predictions that had been made concerning his discovery of this final haven. He reiterates his plea at 106ff. and concludes by emphasising his pitiful state. I quote the speech in full,

ὦ πότνια δεινῶπες, εὔτε νῦν ἔδρας
 πρώτων ἐφ' ὑμῶν τῆσδε γῆς ἔκαμψ' ἐγώ, 85
 Φοίβωι τε κάμοι μὴ γένησθ' ἀγνώμονες,
 ὅς μοι, τὰ πόλλ' ἐκεῖν' ὅτ' ἐξέχρη κακά,
 ταύτην ἔλεξε παῦλαν ἐν χρόνῳ μακρῶι,
 ἐλθόντι χώραν τερμίαν, ὅπου θεῶν
 σεμνῶν ἔδραν λάβοιμι καὶ ξενόσταςιν, 90
 ἐνταῦθα κάμψειν τὸν ταλαίπωρον βίον,
 κέρδη μὲν οἰκίσαντα τοῖς δεδεγμένοις,
 αἴτην δὲ τοῖς πέμψασιν, οἳ μ' ἀπήλασαν·
 σημεῖα δ' ἴξειν τῶνδ' ἐμοὶ παρηγγύα,
 ἢ σεισμόν ἢ βροντὴν τιν' ἢ Διὸς σέλας. 95
 ἔγνωκα μὲν νῦν ὡς με τήνδε τὴν ὁδὸν
 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως οὐ πιστόν ἐξ ὑμῶν πτερόν
 ἐξήγαγ' εἰς τόδ' ἄλσος· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε
 πρώταισιν ὑμῖν ἀντέκυρσ' ὁδοιπορῶν
 νήφων ἀοίνοις, κἀπὶ σεμνὸν ἐξόμην 100
 βᾶθρον τόδ' ἀσκέπαρνον. ἀλλὰ μοι, θεαί,
 βίον κατ' ὀμφὰς τὰς Ἀπόλλωνος δότε
 πέρασιν ἤδη καὶ καταστροφὴν τινα,
 εἰ μὴ δοκῶ τι μειόνως ἔχειν, ἀεὶ
 μόχθοις λατρεύων τοῖς ὑπερτάτοις βροτῶν. 105
 ἴτ', ὦ γλυκεῖαι παῖδες ἀρχαίου Σκότου,
 ἴτ', ὦ μεγίστης Παλλάδος καλούμεναι
 πασῶν Ἀθῆναι τιμιωτάτη πόλις,
 οἰκτίρατ' ἀνδρὸς Οἰδίπου τόδ' ἄθλιον
 εἰδῶλον· οὐ γὰρ δὴ τό γ' ἀρχαῖον δέμας. 110

This then is Oedipus' true speech of arrival at Colonus, including as it does many of the common features to be found in other arrival poetry. It is only after his meeting with the Athenian stranger (33ff.) and his recognition of the significance of the place that Oedipus can utter this speech.

What now follows is a discussion of this speech of Oedipus qua arrival speech. To begin with, a few points will be raised to illustrate how it relates to Antigone's initial description of the place of arrival (14-20); in this and in the subsequent discussion Oedipus' speech will be compared with other passages of arrival poetry by other poets, in order to discover to what extent it makes use of the standard motifs of such poetry.

Several points previously made by Antigone are reflected here by her father: she addressed him as

πάτερ ταλαίπωρ'Οἰδίπους (14) and he similarly refers to his ταλαίπωρον βίον during the prayer (91). The long journey that has gone before, mentioned by Antigone at 20 (μακρὰν γὰρ ὡς γέροντι προῦστάλης ὁδόν) is alluded to in the speech at 96-8. This reference to the previous journey may be compared to the common topos of the ancient arrival poem or Epibaterion, namely the "narration of events prior to the arrival" (B8).¹ A similar motif to this is that of previous hardships undergone by the arriver. At 105 Oedipus mentions the hardships which he has endured at the hands of other men,

μόχθοις λατρεύων τοῖς ὑπερτάτοις βροτῶν.

The topos of labor/ πόνος is discussed in the Rudens section below, where examples are cited from all periods of antiquity.

Antigone had advised Oedipus at 19,

κῶλα κάμψον τοῦδ' ἐπ' ἀξέστου πέτρου.

The unhewn rock is mentioned again by Oedipus at 101 (βάθρον τόδ' ἀσκέπαρνον) and it has been argued that there is a religious significance in it.² As for the advice κάμψον, Oedipus also says (91) that according to the prophecy, in such a place as this he may κάμψειν τὸν ταλαίπωρον βίον. As well as being a metaphor of track racing³ (perhaps in 20 as well as in 91), the common topos of weariness (B4) is hereby

-
1. Many of the examples of topos B8 (Narration of events prior to the arrival) take the form of an account of previous wanderings: see list in Introduction. For the labelling of Epibateric topoi, see Introduction.
 2. s.v. A.D. Fitton-Brown "Oedipus meets the Eumenides" (Liverpool Classical Monthly vol.I no.8 (1976)).
 3. Ed. R.C. Jebb "Sophocles. The plays and fragments" (Cambridge 1928) Pt.2 ad loc.; ed. L.Campbell "Sophocles" (Oxford 1879) vol.I ad loc.

presented.⁴ Burian⁵ has pointed out how Oedipus is transformed during the play from a suppliant figure in need of help to a heroic saviour. At this early stage therefore, despite his relief at having discovered what he believes to be his final resting place, he is not in an entirely happy position. His weariness is also reflected at 88 (ταύτην παύλαν), and 109-10 (τόδ' ἄθλιον/εἴδωλον). It can be seen already, therefore, that many of the motifs used by Oedipus in his speech are in fact standard *topoi* of the ancient poetic *Epibaterion*.

At 92-3 Oedipus speaks of how he will bring joy to his welcomers but trouble to those who banished him. The motif of the welcomer will be discussed below in the section on Plautus' "Rudens"; here however, Oedipus is perhaps unusually referring in τοῖς δεδεγμένοις to the divinities who will accept and protect him as well as to the people of Athens. Indeed both of these are supplicated at the end of the speech:

ἔτ', ὧ γλυκεῖαι παῖδες ἀρχαίου Σκότου,
 ἔτ', ὧ μεγίστης Παλλάδος καλούμεναι
 πασῶν Ἀθῆναι τιμιωτάτη πόλις...

106-8.

As regards those who banished him, Oedipus hereby presents a form of the common longing for home *topos* (B3)⁶: he is so fond of his home city that he now prays that he may bring ἄτην δὲ τοῖς πέμφασιν, οἳ μ' ἀπήλασαν. This antithesis between his welcomers, whom he hopes to benefit, and his banishers, whom he hopes to bring to ruin, forms a powerful

4. For examples see list in Introduction.

5. P. Burian "Suppliant and Saviour: Oedipus at Colonus" (Phoenix vol. XXVIII.4 (1974)).

6. See list in Introduction.

expression of Oedipus' delight in his new found abode. Menander Rhetor, in his section on the Epibaterion,⁷ recommends comparison and contrasts of this kind, as an expression of goodwill towards the place of arrival. Indeed the topos "other places are unpleasant" (Blb) is used frequently in Epibateria of all periods in order to highlight the benefits of the place of arrival.

At 102-3 Oedipus begs the goddesses to allow the oracles of Apollo to take their course,

βίου κατ'ομφᾶς τὰς Ἀπόλλωνος δότε
πέρασιν ἤδη καὶ καταστροφῆν τινα...

This plea for some kind of conclusion to life is an expression of the topical idea "I am so grateful to be here that I would willingly die" (Bl0b). This in turn is a variant on the normal death wish and can be found in other non-inverse Epibateria, though predominantly in Greek ones.⁸ The idea is also implicit in 1.91, and enhances Oedipus' tone of optimism and relief at having reached the end of his wanderings.

In a sense the whole speech takes the form of a prayer to the πότνιαι δεινῶπες. Prayer is one of the most common features of all arrival poetry (B5),⁹ whether inverse or non-inverse. The resumption at 106 of the original plea is particularly striking: Oedipus here addresses the goddesses as γλυκεῖαι παῖδες; they are essentially goddesses of vengeance

7. Men.Rh. Περὶ Ἐπιδεικτικῶν 386.15ff.

8. See list in Introduction. A Latin example could be Hor. Odes II 6.22-4.

9. See list in Introduction.

but he knows through his inner vision¹⁰ that his arrival at this particular place is deeply significant and that they will be favourable towards him.

The religious aspect of the arrival is enhanced when Oedipus speaks of the divine predictions that he received concerning the end of his wanderings,

ὄς <Φοῖβος> μοι, τὰ πόλλ' ἔκειν' ὅτ' ἐξέχρη κακὰ,
ταύτην ἔλεξε παύσαν ἐν χρόνῳ μακρῷ...

87-8

σημεῖα δ' ἤξειν τῶνδ' ἐμοὶ παρηγγύα,
ἢ σεισμόν, ἢ βροντὴν τιν', ἢ Διὸς σέλας.

94-5.

Apollo's prediction is again mentioned in 102, during the second part of Oedipus' prayer (κατ' ὁμφὰς τὰς Ἀπόλλωνος). Divine prediction of an arrival (B6b) is not a particularly common Epibateric topos, but like prayer it can be found at all periods.¹¹ As Jebb¹² notes, in Eur. Phoen. 1705ff. Oedipus says that he has actually been told that he is to die at Colonus; in Sophocles he only has certain signs to follow. In both cases the prediction motif is employed, but here there is a greater suspense in its use. The oratio obliqua used to denote Apollo's words (89-90) is also used effectively.

Oedipus continues his account of the prophecy at 96-8,

ἔγνωκα μὲν νυν, ὥς με τήνδε τὴν ὁδὸν
οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως οὐ πιστὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν πτερὸν
ἐξήγαγ' ἐς τόδ' ἄλσος...

Here though there is a change in the sense: prior to this he

10. For the importance of Oedipus' supernatural powers of vision cf. esp. M.G. Shields "Sight and blindness imagery in the Oedipus Coloneus" (Phoenix vol. XV (1961)).

11. See list in Introduction.

12. R.C. Jebb (1928) ad loc. s.v. 87.

has merely been speaking of the intimations which were to come to him when he had finally arrived at his refuge; here he is saying that he recognises this place as being that very refuge. These lines then convey the idea of a divine causation of the arrival: the $\pi\lambda\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\xi \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu \pi\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\nu$ is the real reason for his having reached Colonus. Divine causation of arrival is the most common of all Epibateric topoi (B6a),¹³ and is found in examples of the genre from all periods.

Oedipus' speech at 84-110 is therefore an Epibaterion in which the arriver is grateful to have reached the end of his long wanderings. Recurrent motifs of the genre are used in an interesting and varied way, although as an arrival the scene is a fairly standard one, but what should be noted most of all is the preponderance of religious themes. Within the prayer as a whole we find more than the usual quantity of references to divine causation and prediction of the arrival. An audience aware of the standard Epibateric type would be conscious of this, since many of the topical ideas which are used here and which were to be used in later times can be traced back as far as Homer.

13. See list in Introduction.

APOLLONIUS RHODIUS I 1172-86.

A second example of "normal" arrival poetry is Apollonius Rhodius I 1172-86 which tells of the arrival of the Argo and her crew in the Cianian land, which is part of Mysia. Like the Sophoclean example, this arrival description contains several thematic features that are recurrent in ancient Epibateria. Whereas Oedipus was to some extent uncertain about the benefits of his place of arrival, and felt obliged to deliver a prayer of propitiation, the Apollonian arrival is more or less happy in tone throughout:

*Ἦμος δ' ἀγρόθεν εἶσι φυτοσκάφος ἢ τις ἀροτρεύς
ἀσπασίως εἰς αὐλιν ἔην, δόρποιο χατίζων,
αὐτοῦ δ' ἐν προμολῇ τετρυμένα γούνατ' ἔκαμψεν
αὐσταλέος κονίησι, περιτριβέας δέ τε χεῖρας 1175
εἰσορόων κακὰ πολλὰ ἔῃ ἠρήσατο γαστρί—
τῆμος ἄρ' οἶγ' ἀφίκοντο Κιανίδος ἤθεα γαίης
ἀμφ' Ἀργανθώνειον ὄρος προχοάς τε Κίλιου.
τοὺς μὲν εὐξείνως Μυσοὶ φιλότῃτι κιόντας
δειδέχατ' ἐνναέται κείνης χθονός, ἧιά τέ σφι 1180
μῆλά τε δευομένοις μέθυ τ' ἄσπετον ἐγγυάλιξαν·
ἐνθα δ' ἔπειθ' οἱ μὲν ξύλα κάγκανα, τοὶ δὲ λεχαίην
φυλλάδα λειμώνων φέρον ἄσπετον ἀμήσαντες
στόρνυσθαι, τοὶ δ' αὐτε πυρήια δινεύεσκον,
οἱ δ' οἶνον κρητῆρσι κέρων πονέοντό τε δαῖτα, 1185
Ἐκβασίω ῥέξαντες ὑπὸ κνέφας Ἀπόλλωνι.*

The first seven lines take the form of a temporal equation (Ἦμος...τῆμος...) to describe the arrival itself. The Argonauts reach land at the time when the gardener or ploughman is going home after his day's work in the field. The words which refer directly to the Argonauts (1177-8) are straightforward, but several features of their arrival are implied by the parallel description of the workman.

First of all he is φυτοσκάφος ἢ τις ἀροτρεύς(1172); his use of the spade or plough clearly reflects the use of oars by

the Argo's crew. He is glad to come home again (1173: ἀσπασίως). Frequently in Epibateria the gladness of an arriver in a good place is simply implied by the context, but we may specifically compare A.P.IX 458 (Anon.) which is a prosopopoeia which takes the form of an Epibateric speech representing "τί ἄν εἴποι Ὀδυσσεύς ἐπιβάς τῆς Ἰθάκης",

χαῖρ' Ἰθάκη* μετ' ἄεθλα, μετ' ἄλγεα πικρὰ θαλάσσης
ἀσπασίως τεδὺν οὐδας ἰκάνομαι...

1-2.

The workman is also hungry (1173 and 1176) and it is consequently implied that the crew is also, a fact borne out by the reference to their feast at 1185 and possibly the mention of the ἥϊα...μηλά at 1180-1 (although these are provisions for the journey ahead). Hunger and lack of food is usually a feature of inverse Epibateria (eg. Soph. Phil. 272-3; Eur. Hel. 420; Plaut. Rud. 208; Lucr. V 223-4); in this case however the hunger of the crew is happily satisfied.

Weariness is another important feature that is mentioned: the workman is tired at 1174 and the Argonauts also prepare for sleep (1182-3). Weariness is a very common topos in all types of arrival poetry,¹⁴ but for τετραυμένα γούνατ' ἔκαμφεν we may specifically compare Soph. O.C. 91 where Oedipus says

ἐνταῦθα κάμψειν τὸν ταλαίπωρον βίον.

More specifically still, the motif of preparing couches for sleep on arrival can be found in Epibateria eg. Hom. Od. IX 151,

14. See list in Introduction.

ἔνθ' ἀποβρέξαντες ἐμείναμεν ἦν δ' ἄν

and Prop. I 20.21-2,

hic manus heroum, placidis ut constitit oris,
mollia composita litora fronde tegit.

The importance of the welcomer in the Epibaterion will be discussed in more detail in the section dealing with the Rudens below. The Apollonian passage presents us with a very simple form of the welcomer topos (1179-80) and the provision of food and drink by the welcomer (1180-1) is a straightforward example of Homeric hospitality.¹⁵

The crew proceed to make a fire at 1182-4 and again we can trace this practice in later Epibateria, eg. Virg. Aen. I 174-6 after the arrival of Aeneas and his crew in Libya,

ac primum silici scintillam excudit Achates
suscepitque ignem foliis atque arida circum
nutrimenta dedit rapuitque in fomite flammam.

The arrival description concludes by mentioning a sacrifice,

Ἐκβασίῳ ῥέξαντες ὑπὸ κνέφας Ἀπόλλωνι.
1186.

Apollo Ekbasios is the god of disembarkation¹⁶ and the topos of divine causation of the arrival¹⁷ is implicit in this reference to the thanksgivings afforded him. We may compare a similar

-
15. Very similar is Ap. Rh. I 968-9 which also occurs in an Epibateric passage.
 16. cf. Apollo Epibaterios: Paus. II 32.2. "Epibaterios" here however means "embarking on a ship" rather than "arriving at land".
 17. For B6a see list in Introduction.

circumstance in another Apollonian Epibaterion, this time after the Argo's arrival in the land of the Doliones,

ἔνθ' οἴγ' Ἐκβασίω βωμὸν θέσαν Ἀπόλλωνι
εἰσάμενοι παρὰ θῆνα, θυηπολίδης τ' ἐμέλοντο.
I 966-7.

These therefore are the detailed parallels in other arrival poetry that can be drawn for the Epibateric topoi of Ap.Rh.I 1172-86. As regards the general structuring of the piece, especially the balance between the farmworker's situation and that of the Argonauts, we may observe a very similar balance in an Epibaterion at Statius Theb.I 339-41. Here Polynices is struggling to reach Argos by night, and the poet tells us

iam pecudes volucresque tacent, iam Somnus avaris
inrepsit curis pronusque ex aethere nutat,
grata laboratae referens obliviam vitae.

As was the case with Apollonius, the sleepiness of another party is indicative of the weariness of the arriver: consequently by means of this temporal balance Statius implies that Polynices is also weary. This fact is stated directly at 387-9,

...hic artus imbri ventoque rigentes
proicit ignotaeque adclinis postibus aulae
invitat tenues ad dura cubilia somnos.

Ap.Rh. I 1172-86 is therefore an interesting example of a normal (ie. non-inverse) arrival description, utilising various suitable topoi in a way appropriate to the scene being described.

of past hardships may alternatively be incorporated into a protracted account of events prior to the arrival. Such accounts (B8)¹⁹ are common in Epibateria of all periods. Another variation which is possible is a link between "past hardships" and the common topos of the general weariness of the arriver (B4).²⁰ This seems to be the case in poem XXXI, where Catullus' weariness is specifically mentioned at 7-11,

o quid solutis est beatius curis,
cum mens onus reponit, ac peregrino
labore fessi venimus larem ad nostrum,
desideratoque acquiescimus lecto?
hoc est quod unum est pro laboribus tantis.

Here then Catullus' past "labor" (curis, onus, labore, laboribus) is interrelated with his tiredness (fessi, desideratoque...lecto). It can be seen then that Catullus has carefully combined several of the Epibateric motifs which are commonly used to express the arriver's previous hardships and consequent exhaustion upon arrival.

Lines 7-10 also convey powerfully the motif of "longing for one's homeland" (B3). This again is a common Epibateric topos, but Catullus' use of it seems to be quite ingenious. In nearly all the Epibateria where it is used, the character has arrived somewhere other than home and longs for his home in absence.²¹ Here, Catullus has already arrived home; so what he does is to use the topos as a kind of general maxim.

Cairns also mentions the topos of safety finally achieved, used in 1.6, as well as Catullus' readaptation of the usual

19. See list in Introduction.

20. See list in Introduction and ch.6.

21. See list in Introduction and ch 5.

motif "I had lost hope of return" into the idea "now that I am back, I can hardly believe it." He cites Hom.Od.XIII356, Aesch.Ag.506-7 and Sen.Ag.392-3 as examples of the original form of this Epibateric topos.

Also referred to is the possible allusion in 13 (Lydiae) to the Etruscan founders of the region. This would then be in accordance with the Epibateric prescription later found in Menander Rhetor²² for mention of the founder of the place of arrival. The "founder" topos (B11)²³ is found in other Epibateria, predominantly Latin ones. The only Greek example that I have been able to trace is the Homeric reference to Mt.Neritus at Od.XIII 351.²⁴ It is striking that both in Cat.XXXI and in this Homeric Epibaterion the "founder" topos should occur in such close proximity to a form of the topos "I had lost hope of return" (Cat.XXXI 6-7, Hom.Od.XIII 356 see above), especially since both topoi are so rare. We may reasonably ask at this point whether Catullus may have been making use of an archaic or Hellenistic Greek lyric source which in turn used the Homeric passage as its model. The Catullan situation is too different from the Homeric for one to suppose direct adaptation, but an intermediary source of some kind may well explain the close juxtaposition of these two rare topoi in Catullus, which is also found in the Homeric passage.

General eulogy of Sirmio is to be found throughout the

22. Men.Rh. Περὶ Ἐπιβατηρικῶν 382.24ff.; 393.9f.

23. See list in Introduction.

24. See ch.2 for this example of B11.

poem and can be classified undertopos Bla.²⁵ Particularly noticeable however is the personification of the place throughout.²⁶ Finally, there may be a hint of the common prayer topos (B5)²⁷ in 1.4 where the poet says

quam te libenter quamque laetus in viso.

"Laetus libens" is a standard formula used in religious contexts by people in some way humbling themselves before a god.²⁸ This being so, Catullus may here be doing more than simply personifying Sirmio: surely it is possible, in view of the commonness of prayer in Epibateria of all periods, that he is here in some way setting Sirmio on a divine pedestal. Neptune has been mentioned immediately before (3) as being associated with Sirmio, and the phrase "libenter...laetus" seems to emphasise this association: Catullus is regarding his home as sharing in the divinity of the god, and in addressing that home he is therefore enabling himself to make use of yet another Epibateric topos.

25. See list in Introduction.

26. F.Cairns (1974) p.11f.

27. See list in Introduction.

28. cf. Livy 23.7.11; Prud. Cath. 4.67; and esp. Plaut. Trin. 821. In this latter case, Charmides is himself delivering an Epibateric speech of thanks to Neptune for bringing him to land.

και νῦν τάλας ναναγὸς ἀπολέσας φίλους
 ἐξέπεσον ἐς γῆν τήνδε· ναῦς δὲ πρὸς πέτρας
 πολλοὺς ἀριθμοὺς ἄγνυται ναναγίων. 410
 τρόπις δ' ἐλείφθη ποικίλων ἄρμωσμάτων,
 ἐφ' ἧς ἐσώθη μάλιστα ἀνεπίστῳ τύχῃ
 Ἑλένη τε, Τροίας ἦν ἀποσπάσας ἔχω.
 ὄνομα δὲ χώρας ἦτις ἦδε καὶ λεῶς
 οὐκ οἶδ'· ὄχλον γὰρ ἐσπεσεῖν ἠσχυνόμην 415
 ὡσθ' ἰστορῆσαι τὰς ἐμὰς δυσχλαινίας,
 κρύπτων ὑπ' αἰδοῦς τὰς τύχας. ὅταν δ' ἀνήρ
 πράξει κακῶς ὑψηλός, εἰς ἀηθίαν
 πίπτει κακίῳ τοῦ πάλαι δυσδαίμονος.
 χρεῖα δὲ τείρει μ'· οὔτε γὰρ σίτος πάρα 420
 οὔτ' ἀμφὶ χρῶτ' ἐσθῆτες· αὐτὰ δ' εἰκάσαι
 πάρεστι ναὸς ἐκβόλοις ἃ ἀμπίσχομαι.
 πέπλους δὲ τοὺς πρὶν λαμπρά τ' ἀμφιβλήματα
 χλιδὰς τε πόντος ἤρπασ'· ἐν δ' ἄντρον μυχοῖς
 κρύψας γυναῖκα τὴν κακῶν πάντων ἐμοὶ 425
 ἄρξασαν ἤκω τούς γε περιλελειμμένους
 φίλων φυλάσσειν τὰμ' ἀναγκάσας λέχη.
 μόνος δὲ νοστῶ, τοῖς ἐκεῖ ζητῶν φίλοις
 τὰ πρόσφορ' ἦν πως ἐξερευνήσας λάβω.
 ἰδὼν δὲ δῶμα περιφερὲς θριγκοῖς τόδε 430
 πύλας τε σεμνὰς ἀνδρὸς ὄλβιου τινός,
 προσῆλθον· ἐλπὶς δ' ἔκ γε πλουσίων δόμων
 λαβεῖν τι ναύταις· ἐκ δὲ μὴ ἐχόντων βίον,
 οὐδ' εἰ θέλοιεν ὠφελεῖν, ἔχοιεν ἄν.
 ὦή· 435

The very first lines contain reference to the king's
 previous wanderings after the sack of Troy (τλήμων ἄλῶμαι
 χρόνον ὅσονπερ Ἰλίου/πύργους ἔπερσα). There is surely
 intended here an implicit parallel with the wanderings of
 Odysseus. Indeed the words used by Menelaus could equally well
 have been spoken by the other hero, and closely reflect the
 terms used of Odysseus in the opening of the "Odyssey",

Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὅς μάλα πολλὰ
 πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε·

I 1-2.

There is in Menelaus' words the same pomposity in the idea of
 one man being responsible for the entire victory. Other
 parallels may be found in Menelaus' account. He has reached
 land by clinging to the keel of his ship (411-3); Odysseus
 reached Phaeacia on the remnants of his own ship after the

terrible storm.² At 428 Menelaus says *μόνος δὲ νοστῶ*. By this he means that he has come forward alone after leaving the others safe in the cave. However the unintended idea "I am the only one to reach home" is again highly reminiscent of Odysseus' situation. Odysseus is always concerned about securing his *νόστος*, in the true sense of "homecoming". Menelaus' words do indeed make his predicament sound a great deal worse than it really is: he uses language appropriate to the desperate Odyssean situation to describe something totally different and far less unpleasant. The idea of solitary arrival can be found in other Epibateria as well,³ but on this occasion it is used merely to denote Menelaus' solitary arrival as it were "on stage", not his solitary escape from the sea.

Menelaus says at 408 that he has arrived *ἀπολέσας φίλους*. Of course Odysseus himself arrived home after losing his companions, as we know from the very beginning of the "Odyssey" (Od.I 6ff.). Loss of friends may be found in other poetic arrival situations also, notably Euripidean ones: Iphigenia laments her status in Tauris at I.T.203-35 and describes herself at 220 as

ἄγαμος ἄτεκνος, ἀπολις ἄφιλος.

At And.138-9 the chorus remind Andromache, newly arrived as a captive in Greece,

-
2. cf. esp. (in Epibateria) Hom.Od.V 357,363-4. Also, of Palinurus in a similar Epibateric predicament, Virg.Aen. 349ff.
 3. eg. Soph.Phil.263,267,954; Plaut.Rud.201,205. See section below on Rudens.

...ἔνθ' οὐ φίλων τιν' εἰσορᾷς
σῶν...

What is ridiculous about Menelaus' claim is that it is essentially untrue: we learn later in the speech that Helen, or at least the ghost whom he believes to be Helen, is with him (413) as are some of his own crew (426-7). At 427 the crew are specifically referred to as friends (φίλων), thus negating the force of the original topical complaint at 408.

A further interesting issue raised in the speech, and one which again reflects upon Menelaus' vanity, is that of his status as a king. At 415ff. he says that he is too embarrassed to mix with the common people since it would be beneath his dignity. Clearly his predicament cannot be very unpleasant since he is even above asking for help. There is a hint in these lines of the topos of the welcomer or welcoming party, which will be discussed in the section on the *Rudens*. The concept of the rank of the arriver and the importance of his status can be traced later in Plautus' *Trinummus* where Charmides thanks Neptune for bringing him safe to land, saying

....scis ordine, ut aequomst, tractare homines...
830.

Menelaus goes on to express the opinion "when a high-ranking man suffers misfortune, it is harder for him to bear than for a man of low status who has become inured to it." As will be seen below, Palaestra, washed up on the beach in Plautus' *Rudens*, feels the weight of her calamities because she

has been good.⁴ Menelaus' attitude by comparison is far more conceited and pompous: it stresses not his moral rectitude but merely his lofty status as a reason for his despair.

The lack of food and of clothes of the arriver will be referred to in the Rudens section below, and both are to be found in Menelaus' speech (416, 420ff.). However his complaint about clothing is merely another illustration of his own haughtiness. He says specifically at 421 that he has no clothes, and this is a typical theme of the inverse genre. But what he seems to mean is "I have nothing to wear that I would call "clothes"." For he goes on to explain that he does have some rags to wear, but he has lost the πέπλους, λαμπρά...ἀμφιβλήματα and χλιδάς that he is used to. Again the situation is initially made out to be far worse than it really is and the king's vanity is thereby emphasised.

There are other typical features in the speech as well, such as the ignorance of the place of arrival (414-5), the longing for home of the arriver (402, 405, 407) and the desolation and rockiness of the place (404, 409). All of these will be discussed in the section dealing with the Epibateria in the Rudens, as well as the idea of divine causation of the arrival, either by gods or by fate (B6a). Both of these concepts are present in Menelaus' speech: he seems to blame

4. Rud.189ff.

both gods and fate at 402-3,

κάς πάτραν χρήζων μολεῖν
οὐκ ἀξιοῦμαι τοῦδε πρὸς θεῶν τυχεῖν.

Fortune unusually seems to favour him at 412 where he mentions the ἀνελπίστος τύχη of getting to land at all.⁵ However his τύχαι are described in more appropriately adverse terms later on (417).

The topoi of the inverse Epibaterion are used with great skill by Euripides in this speech to convey the apparent desperation of the Spartan king. He says all the appropriate things for an arriver who has seemingly lost everything and turns up unwillingly in a wretched and unknown place. Frequent indications are given of his vanity and self-pity, either by mere exaggeration of ideas or by ridiculous association with the plight of Odysseus. It is only by understanding the parallels in other works, especially in passages of arrival poetry, that the speech can be fully appreciated and the character of the speaker fully recognised.

5. cf. the Epibateria of Charmides at Plaut. Trin. 820ff. and of Theopropides at Most. 431ff. In both a god is thanked for the safe arrival from the sea.

algor, error, pavor, me omnia tenent. 215
 haec parentes mei hau sciti' miseri
 me nunc miseram esse ita uti sum: 216a
 leibera ego prognata fui maxime, nequiquam fui.
 nunc qui minu' servio quasi serva forem nata?
 necque quicquam umquam illis profuit, qui me sibi
 eduxerunt.

AMP. Quid mihi meliust, quid magis in remst, quam a corpore
 vitam ut secludam? 220
 ita male vivo atque ita mihi multae in pectore sunt
 curae exanimales.
 ita res se habent: vitae hau parco, perdidisti spem qua me
 oblectabam.
 omnia iam circumcursavi atque omnibu' latebris perreptavi
 quaerere conservam, voce, oculis, auribus ut
 pervestigarem.
 neque eam usquam invenio neque quo eam neque qua quaeram
 consultumst, 225
 neque quem rogitem responsorem quemquam interea convenio,
 neque magi' solae terrae solae sunt quam haec loca atque
 hae regiones;
 neque, si vivit, eam viva umquam quin inveniam desistam.

After these speeches have been delivered the two girls overhear each other and trace each other's voices until they are finally reunited; the priestess Ptolemocratia then appears and asks them questions. A subsequent passage, 11.274-9, is very much connected with the two original arrival speeches, and in it Palaestra voices a plea to the priestess whom they have just met:

PAL. Nunc tibi amplectimur genua egentes opum 275
 quae in locis nesciis nescia spe sumus,
 ut tuo recipias tecto servesque nos
 miseriarumque te ambarum uti misereat,
 quibus nec locust ullus nec spes parata,
 neque hoc amplius [quam] quod vides nobis quicquamst.

Although these words are given to Palaestra alone, they represent the plea of both girls as the plural verbs and subjects indicate (amplectimur, egentes, sumus, nos, miseriarumque....ambarum, quibus, nobis). As will be shown

below, prayer and plea are a recurrent feature of arrival speeches, especially inverse ones, and 274-9 seems therefore to continue the two girls' arrival speeches, although it is separated from them by the dramatic events mentioned above.

Some features of the arrival speeches of Palaestra and Ampelisca are comparable with those of other pieces of arrival poetry. Some of these pieces deal with situations very similar to that of the two girls (viz. arrival from the sea on the shore). These are as follows: Hom.Od.V 465-73; Soph.Phil.263-84; Eur.Hel.400-35; Plaut.Most.431-7,440-1; Trin.820-38; Lucr.V 222-7; Prop.I 17. Any other passages that are referred to in this account of thematic elements will be from other kinds of Epibaterion concerned with other kinds of arrival.

Palaestra begins her lament with the claim that one's own fate is invariably worse than other people's, and she hereby presents to the audience a form of the most common of all Epibateric topoi: the concept of supernatural or divine causation of the arrival. The reference is initially to her "fortuna" but she goes on to blame the gods for what has happened,

[satin] hoc deo complacitumst...

187

and again later,

nam hoc mi sat laborist laborem hunc potiri,
si erga parentem aut deos me impiavi;
sed id si parate curavi ut caverem,
tum hoc mi indecore, inique, immodeste
dati' di;

191-5.

There may also be intended in the use of "partem" (190) an idea of "my lot" or "fate". The topos of divine causation of the arrival is very frequently used in Epibateria of all kinds and in inverse Epibateria the gods are naturally blamed. To look first of all at those Epibateria whose actual situation is similar to that of Palaestra, we can see that rebuke of particular gods in such a situation goes back to Homer. Odysseus, within sight of land after his shipwreck, exclaims

ὦ μοι, ἐπεὶ δὴ γαῖαν ἀελπέα δῶκεν ἰδέσθαι
 Ζεὺς, καὶ δὴ τόδε λαῖμα διατμήξας ἐτέλεσσα,
 ἔκβασις οὐ πη φαίνεθ' ἄλος πολοῖο θύραζε.
 Od.V 408-10.

and later in the same speech he puts the blame on Poseidon,

οἶδα γὰρ ὡς μοι ὀδῶέυσται κλυτὸς ἐννοσίγαιος.
 423.

Menelaus, cast up from the sea in Egypt blames the gods generally for his previous wanderings, at Eur.Hel.402-3,

κἄς πάτραν χρήζων μολεῖν
 οὐκ ἀξιούμαι τοῦδε πρὸς θεῶν τυχεῖν.

It is in fact possible to find the topos elsewhere in the Plautine corpus itself, notably in *Mostellaria* and *Trinummus*. At *Most.*431ff. Theopropides arrives on land from the sea but instead of complaining in the manner of Palaestra or Ampelisca he rejoices that he is still alive and thanks Neptune for saving his life,

Habeo, Neptune, gratiam magnam tibi,
 quam meo amisisti abs te vix vivam domum.
 431-2.

Very similar is Charmides' gratitude to Neptune for the same reason in *Trinummus*. I quote only the opening of his eulogy to the god,

and her ignorance of where she is is brought out again at at 210ff. She makes the same point to the priestess at 275 (in *locis nesciis*).

Ignorance of one's whereabouts in a situation like this can be found also at Eur.Hel.414-5 where Menelaus on the Egyptian shore says

ὄνομα δὲ χώρας, ἥτις ἦδε καὶ λεῶς,
οὐκ οἶδ'...

Palaestra expresses the idea that her plight is made all the worse by her innocence of any sin: if she had been impious to gods or parent then this "labor" (202) would be easier to bear. Similar references to past hardships (though not in arrival poetry which describes situations such as Palaestra's) may be found in Epibateria at Hom.Od.VI 175; XXI 207; Aesch.Ag.511; Cat.XXXI 7,9; Hor.Odes I 7.17-21; II 6.7-8. In all of these the idea is "I have endured a great deal, now I arrive here."

As regards her certainty that she is free of any guilt, we may compare Europa's remarks in the Epibaterion at Hor.Odes III 27. At first Europa is not sure whether she has committed a sin to deserve such a wretched predicament,

....levis una mors est
virginum culpa. vigilansne ploro
turpe commissum, an vitiis carentem
ludit imago...?

37-40

Later however she says

impudens liqui patrios Penatis,
impudens Orcum moror....

49-50.

This provides a good contrast with Palaestra's speech, in which it is not her guilt that makes the arrival so unpleasant, but her very lack of it. Unlike Europa, Palaestra is more concerned about the religious side of things: the gods are unfair if she must suffer this after doing no wrong. Palaestra is sure of her piety both to parents and gods (192) whereas Europa only mentions her impiety towards the "patrios Penatis".

Palaestra complains that she is alone (*sola*) on two occasions (201, 205). The second time, she links it with a comment that the place is also lonely (205: *ita hic sola solis locis...*). Ampelisca later picks up the idea that the place is lonely,

neque magi' solae terrae solae sunt quam haec loca atque
[hae regiones;
227.

In literary arrivals of this kind, reference to the loneliness of the arriver and place of arrival are a recurrent feature. Philoctetes in his Epibateric speech twice refers to himself as ἔρημον (Soph.Phil.263, 267).

What is interesting in Palaestra's case is that she combines the quality of the place with that of her own person (205: *sola solis locis*). This practice may also be found in other Epibateria. At Cat.LXIV.61 Ariadne is described as "saxea" and the rockiness of the terrain is also referred to at 126 (*praeruptos...montes*). Again in Ov.Her.X (clearly modelled on Cat.LXIV) Ariadne says

quamque lapis sedes, tam lapis ipsa fui.
50.

In both of these cases the idea is "the place is x, and so is the arriver".

Palaestra has clearly lost all hope, a fact which is emphasised by her on four occasions (204, 209, 275 and 278, the latter two in her plea to Ptolemaia). Ampelisca also feels the hopelessness of the situation (222). There are various forms that the motif of hope may take in Epibateria.

The concept "I had lost all hope but now I am at last back" can be seen at Hom.Od.XIII 356, Aesch.Ag.506-7 and Sen.Ag.392-3. At Cat.XXXI 5-6 the poet varies the motif to "even though I am back I can hardly believe it."⁸ These forms of the motif are however subtle in comparison with the pure hopelessness of Palaestra and Ampelisca.

Four more thematic elements in Palaestra's speech are reference to rocks (206), the noise of the sea (206), her lack of clothes (207) and of food (208). She later mentions her lack of clothing and food to Ptolemaia at 279. The idea of rockiness is a very common motif in all inverse Epibateria, no matter where the place of arrival may be; however in Epibateria similar to this (involving people left on the shore after being at sea) it is notably present at Soph.Phil.270 and Eur.Hel.409.

The noise of the sea is mentioned in an Epibateria at Hom.Od.XIII 220 where Odysseus wanders by the πολυφλοίσβοιο

8. This observation and the previous references are given at F.Cairns (1974) p.14.

θαλάσσης of Ithaca.

Lack of food is a feature of Epibateria such as Palaestra's and can be found at Soph.Phil.272-3 and Eur.Hel.420.

The coldness and wildness of the place of arrival are also Epibateric topoi. Palaestra uses the verb "algor" at 215 and notes how uncultivated her surroundings are at 214. Odysseus says how cold he is on arrival at the mouth of the river in Phaeacia at Hom.Od.V 469.

The lack of cultivation or civilisation in the place of arrival in inverse Epibateria is quite common as well, notably in Ov.Tr. and E.P. where the poet repeatedly complains about the barbarity of his place of exile.

Various other features of the girls' speeches in the Rudens are topical as well. Palaestra's rather vague death wish (209) is considerably reinforced by Ampelisca at 220.⁹ Palaestra's thoughts of home at 216-216a are very much connected with her previous remarks about her innocence of impiety towards her parents.¹⁰ The whole of Palaestra's speech to the priestess (274-9) is a standard plea,¹¹ using a standard supplication theme.¹² Ampelisca looks around the place at 223-5 and again this is thematic.¹³ All these features are

9. For the death wish (B10a) see list in Introduction.

10. For thoughts on and longing for homeland (B3) see list in Introduction.

11. For prayer and plea (B5) see list in Introduction.

12. cf. Hom.Od.VI 149;XIII 230ff.

13. cf. 1.215 ("error"). Also Hom.Od.VI 126;Soph.Phil.280-1.

recurrent themes in ancient arrival poetry and seem to be used in a fairly normal fashion here.

At 206a Palaestra observes

neque quisquam homo mi obviam venit.

and her desire to see another person on the shore is reiterated at 211-12,

saltem aliquem velim qui mihi ex his locis
aut viam aut semitam monstret....

Ampelisca also shares this desire,

...neque quem rogitem responsorem quemquam interea
[convenio.
226.

The Proshonetikon or speech of welcome is a well recognised literary travel genre, and one which balances the speech of arrival (Epibaterion).¹⁴ These remarks of Palaestra and Ampelisca therefore are clearly intended as a reference to the idea of a welcomer. It is true that many Epibateria do not involve a welcomer at all, but no topos can be expected to be used in all examples of a genre. Welcomers do occur in Epibateria at Hom.Od.I 180-8; XVI 187-234; Ap.Rh.I 1179-80; I 961ff. and of course in all Proshonetika both a welcomer and an arrival (of another party) are necessary. Nevertheless, specific mention that there is no welcomer seems to be unique in ancient arrival poetry.

The humour of the passages from the Rudens seems to lie very largely in their sheer complexity. Recurrent motifs or

14. See G.C. p.20ff.

topoi of the inverse genre are elaborately combined so that there is scarcely anything within the speeches that is not in some way generically typical. Features which in literary predecessors appear sparingly and with a view to particular effects are used to excess by the two girls. Often these features overlap: Palaestra's concern about her piety is embraced by the usual thoughts upon the homeland; notions of hopelessness are assimilated into the death wish; the several topical features on the address to the priestess all constitute a typical plea. Such humour as this has a great deal in common with the paratragic style used elsewhere in the play, perhaps most notably by Ptolemocratia herself at 268-9,

*nempe equo ligneo per vias caerulas
estis vectae?...*

ut foret amenti nomen in ore tuum. 20
 si iam deficiam, suppressaque lingua palato
 vix instillato restituenda mero,
 nuntiet huc aliquis dominam venisse, resurgam,
 spesque tui nobis causa vigoris erit.
 ergo ego sum dubius vitae, tu forsitan istic 25
 iucundum nostri nescia tempus agis?
 non agis, adfirmo. liquet hoc, carrissima, nobis,
 tempus agi sine me non nisi triste tibi.
 si tamen implevit mea sors, quos debuit, annos,
 et mihi vivendi tam cito finis adest, 30
 quantum erat, o magni, morituro parcere, divi,
 ut saltem patria contumularer humo?
 vel poena in tempus mortis dilata fuisset,
 vel praecepisset mors properata fugam.
 integer hanc potui nuper bene reddere lucem; 35
 exul ut occiderem, nunc mihi vita data est.
 tam procul ignotis igitur moriemur in oris,
 et fient ipso tristia fata loco;
 nec mea consueto languescent corpora lecto,
 depositum nec me qui fleat, ullus erit; 40
 nec dominae lacrimis in nostra cadentibus ora
 accedant animae tempora parva meae;
 nec mandata dabo, nec cum clamore supremo
 labentes oculos condet amica manus;
 sed sine funeribus caput hoc, sine honore sepulcri 45
 indeploratum barbara terra teget!
 ecquid, ubi audieris, tota turbabere mente,
 et feries pavida pectora fida manu?
 ecquid, in has frustra tendens tua bracchia partes,
 clamabis miseri nomen inane viri? 50
 parce tamen lacerare genas, nec scinde capillos:
 non tibi nunc primum, lux mea, raptus ero.
 cum patriam amisi, tunc me periisse putato:
 et prior et gravior mors fuit illa mihi.
 nunc, si forte potes—sed non potes, optima coniunx— 55
 finitis gaude tot mihi morte malis.
 quod potes, extenua forti mala corde ferendo,
 ad quae iam pridem non rude pectus habes.
 atque utinam pereant animae cum corpore nostrae,
 effugiatque avidos pars mihi ulla rogos! 60
 nam si morte carens vacua volat altus in aura
 spiritus, et Samii sunt rata dicta senis,
 inter Sarmaticas Romana vagabitur umbras,
 perque feros manes hospita semper erit.
 ossa tamen facito parva referantur in urna: 65
 sic ego non etiam mortuus exul ero.
 non vetat hoc quisquam: fratrem Thebana peremptum
 supposuit tumulo rege vetante soror.
 atque ea cum foliis et amome pulvere misce,
 inque suburbano condita pone solo; 70
 quosque legat versus oculo properante viator,
 grandidus in tituli marmore caede notis:
 HIC EGO QUI IACEO TENERORUM LUSOR AMORUM
 INGENIO PERII NASO POETA MEO

AT TIBI QUI TRANSIS NE SIT GRAVE QUISQUIS AMASTI 75
 DICERE NASONIS MOLLITER OSSA CUBENT.
 hoc satis in titulo est. etenim maiora libelli
 et diuturna magis sunt monimenta mihi,
 quos ego confido, quamvis nocuere, daturus
 nomen et auctori tempora longa suo. 80
 tu tamen extincto feralia munera semper
 deque tuis lacrimis umida sarta dato.
 quamvis in cineres corpus mutaverit ignis,
 sentiet officium maesta favilla pium.
 scribere plura libet: sed vox mihi fessa loquendo 85
 dictandi vires siccaque lingua negat.
 accipe supremo dictum mihi forsitan ore,
 quod, tibi qui mittit, non habet ipse, "vale."

The following analysis of Tr.III 3 has made considerable use of the commentary by G.Luck,¹⁶ although for generic purposes the intention here is to compare the poem mainly with other examples of arrival poetry. Perhaps the most important example of similar arrival poetry is Tibullus I 3 where the poet is similarly ill in exile. Luck discusses the various thematic similarities between the two poems (burial without relations present, grave inscription, resignation to death, etc.) as well as some differences (Ovid hopes his soul will die, Tibullus anticipates afterlife; Ovid is generally pessimistic, Tibullus optimistic).

To look in more detail at the Ovidian poem, the third line contains no less than three recurrent features of the inverse Epibaterion, namely the illness of the arriver, the remoteness of the place of arrival and its unfamiliarity to the arriver. Ovid's illness is alluded to in this piece at 2ff. and, by ring composition, at 88. Tibullus, stranded in Phaeacia, also complains that he is not well,

16. G.Luck "P. Ovidius Naso. Tristia" (Heidelberg 1977) vol.II.

me tenet ignotis aegrum Phaeacia terris
I3.3

and indeed the term "ignotus" is used, as in Ovid, of the place of arrival. Sophocles' Philoctetes is also ill on arrival in Lemnos.¹⁷ At 21-4 Ovid says that he would recover if only his wife would appear; the concept of illness and partial recovery is the theme of E.P.I 3, also and Epibaterion.

Tib.I 3.3 has been mentioned as a parallel to Ovid's ignorance of his whereabouts; we may also compare Hom.Od.XIII 188, 200ff., 233ff.; Eur.Hel.414-5; I.T.94; Plaut.Rud.187, 210ff., 275 and Prop.I 17.17 where the same idea is expressed.

Ovid reiterates the thought in 1.3 that Tomis is remote (extremus) at 1.13 and at E.P.I 3.49, and the same idea is present at Alcaeus Fr.130.24 (LP) where the poet is similarly in exile,

φεύγων ἐσχατίαισ'...

There are several other features in III 3 which bear comparison with other Epibateric material and which appear in a fairly straightforward topical form. The image of the poet lying in the place (5, 13) is also expressed at E.P.I 3.49. The unpleasantness of the sky, water and land (7-8) is also to be found at Tr.III 8.23 and IV 8.25-6. The lack of a good home (9) is reflected at Tr.V 10.29-30 and the lack of food (also in 9) has been discussed in the section on the Rudens. The slowness of the passage of time (11-12) is reiterated at Tr.V 10.5-6 and

17. Soph.Phil.265-7,281-2.

the lack of any friend who might help (12) has been dealt with elsewhere.¹⁸ Weariness is another Epibateric topos (B4)¹⁹ and occurs at 13, 85-6 and mention of the arriver's unhappy fate (B6a)²⁰ is at 38.

Ovid imagines at 48-9 his wife beating her breasts and stretching out her hands to her husband in yearning. These actions are attributed here to a party other than the arriver; elsewhere in Epibateria they are performed by the arriver, eg. at Ov.Her.X 145-6 where Ariadne, deserted on Naxos, cries

Has tibi plangendo lugubria pectora lassas
infelix tendo trans freta longa manus.

Perhaps the most interesting, and certainly the most complex generic theme of Tr.III 3 is the use of topoi concerned with death. Nagel²¹ has discussed at some length the idea of exile as a kind of death in Ovid's exile poetry. Tr.III 3 uses a variety of Epibateric topoi associated with death in order to emphasise the despair of the poet.

At 29ff. Ovid expresses a wish to be at least buried in his own land. This is an expression of the common inverse topos of longing for one's homeland (B3).²² The particular idea expressed here can also be found in Epibateria at Prop.I

18. See the section on Euripides' "Helen".

19. See list in Introduction for examples of B4.

20. See list in Introduction For examples of B6a.

21. B.R.Nagel (1980) p.22ff.

22. Other occurrences of B3 in Tr.III 3 are at 11-12, 15ff., 39, 53.

17.8, 11-12, 19-24 and Tib.I 3.5-8.²³ Ovid however uses a plea to the gods (*divi*) in order to secure his wish, thus involving another important topos (B5).²⁴

At 37ff. however he has apparently resigned himself to the fact that he will die in this foreign land; this thought can be found also at E.P.I 4.43-4. He also imagines his ghost haunting the place (61-2) and this idea is also expressed at Tr.V 7.23-4, as well as at Her.X 121 where Ariadne says

spiritus infelix peregrinas ibit in auras...?

The grave inscription which Ovid visualises at 73-6 can be compared with that imagined by Tibullus in Phaeacia at Tib.I 3.55-6. Finally, Ovid voices the topical theme of the death wish (B10a),²⁵ or at least the idea that death would be better than this exile, at first indirectly (33-4, 53), then openly (56).

It can be seen from this analysis that Tr.III 3 is built on complex web of topical ideas and recurrent motifs of the inverse Epibaterion. Far from being a purely spontaneous and emotional lament, it is generically very complex. Indeed the generic subtleties and relationships themselves, if properly understood, enhance the pessimistic mood of the piece.

23. cf. Ov.Her.X 122.

24. See list in Introduction for examples of B5.

25. See list in Introduction for examples of B10a.

HOMER OD.XIII 187-360.

Homer Od.XIII 187-360 tells of the final arrival of Odysseus in Ithaca after his long wanderings. This passage is a fairly lengthy Epibaterion which takes the form of alternating arrival speech and arrival description. Odysseus wakes up in Ithaca and initially fails to recognise it as being his homeland since Athene has disguised the landscape. He meets the goddess who has adopted the appearance of a young man, and after showing a great deal of doubt and mistrust he is finally convinced that he is home.

~~ἐπεισάτω~~ ~~περὶ βαμύν~~ ὁ δ' ἔγρετο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς
εὐδῶν ἐν γαίῃ πατρῴῃ, οὐδέ μιν ἔγνω,
ἦδη δὴν ἀπεών· περὶ γὰρ θεὸς ἠέρα χεῖε
Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη, κούρη Διός, ὄφρα μιν αὐτὸν 190
ἄγνωστον τεύξειεν ἕκαστά τε μυθήσαιο,
μή μιν πρὶν ἄλοχος γνοίῃ ἀστοί τε φίλοι τε,
πρὶν πάσαν μνηστήρας ὑπερβασίην ἀποτίσαι.
τοῦνεκ' ἄρ' ἄλλοειδέα φανέσκετο πάντα ἀνακτι,
ἀτραπιτοὶ τε διηνεκέες λιμένες τε πάνορμοι 195
πέτραι τ' ἠλίβατοι καὶ δένδρεα τηλεθάοντα.
στή δ' ἄρ' ἀναΐζας καὶ ῥ' ἔσιδε πατρίδα γαίαν·
οἰμωξέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα καὶ ὦ πεπλήγετο μηρῶ
χερσὶ καταπρηνέσσ', ὀλοφυρόμενος δ' ἔπος ἤυδα·
" ὦ μοι ἐγὼ, τέων αὐτε βροτῶν ἐς γαίαν ἰκάνω; 200
ἦ ῥ' οἷ γ' ὑβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι,
ἦε φιλόξενοι καὶ σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεοῦδής;
πῆ δὴ χρήματα πολλὰ φέρω τάδε; πῆ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς
πλάζομαι; αἶθ' ὄφελον μείναι παρὰ Φαιήκεσσι
αὐτοῦ· ἐγὼ δέ κεν ἄλλον ὑπερμενέων βασιλῆων 205
ἐξικόμην, ὅς κέν μ' ἐφίλει καὶ ἔπεμπε νέεσθαι.
νῦν δ' οὐτ' ἄρ' πῆ θέσθαι ἐπίσταμαι, οὐδὲ μὲν αὐτοῦ
καλλείψω, μή πῶς μοι ἔλωρ ἄλλοισι γένηται.
ὦ πόποι, οὐκ ἄρα πάντα νοήμονες οὐδὲ δίκαιοι
ἦσαν Φαιήκων ἠγῆτορες ἠδὲ μέδοντες, 210
οἷ μ' εἰς ἄλλην γαίαν ἀπήγαγον· ἦ τέ μ' ἔφαντο
ἄξειω εἰς Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον, οὐδ' ἐτέλεσαν·
Ζεὺς σφεας τίσαιο ἱκετήσιος, ὅς τε καὶ ἄλλους
ἀνθρώπους ἐφορᾷ καὶ τίννται ὅς τις ἀμάρτη.
ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ τὰ χρήματ' ἀριθμήσω καὶ ἴδωμαι, 215
μή τί μοι οἴχωνται κοίλης ἐπὶ νηὸς ἄγοντες."
Ἄς εἰπὼν τρίποδας περικαλλέας ἠδὲ λέβητας
ἠρίθμει καὶ χρυσὸν ὑφαντά τε εἴματα καλά.
τῶν μὲν ἄρ' οὐ τι πύθει· ὁ δ' οὐδύρετο πατρίδα γαίαν

ἐρπύζων παρὶ θύρα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης, 220
 πόλλ' ὀλοφνυρόμενος. σχεοῦθεν δέ οἱ ἦλθεν Ἀθήνη,
 ἀνδρὶ ἄεμας εἰκυῖα γέφυ, ἐπιβώτορι μῆλων,
 παιναπάλω, οἷοί τε ἀνάκτων παῖδες ἔασι,
 οἴπτυχοι ἄμφ' ὤμοισιν ἔχουσ' εὐεργέα λώπηι·
 ποσσὶ δ' ὑπὸ λιπαροῖσι πέδιλ' ἔχε, χερσὶ δ' ἄκοιτα 225
 τὴν δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς γήθησεν ἰδῶν καὶ ἐναρτίως ἦλθε,
 καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
 “ὦ φίλ', ἐπεὶ σε πρῶτα κичάνω τῶδ' ἐνὶ χώρῳ,
 χαίρῃ τε καὶ μὴ μοί τι κακῶ νόφ' ἀντιβολήσῃς,
 ἀλλὰ σάω μὲν ταῦτα, σάω δ' ἐμέ· σοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ γε 230
 εὐχομαι ὥς τε θεῶ καὶ σευ φίλα γούναθ' ἰκάνω.
 καὶ μοι τοῦτ' ἀγόρευσον ἐτήτυμοι, ὕφρ' ἐὺ εἰδῶ·
 τίς γῆ, τίς δῆμος, τίνας ἀνέρες ἐγγεγάασιν;
 ἦ ποῦ τις νήσων εὐδείελος ἦέ τις ἀκτὴ
 κεῖθ' ἀλλ' κεκλιμένη ἐριβώλακος ἠπειροῖο;” 235
 Τὸν δ' αὐτὴ προσέειπε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη·
 “ἠγήπιός εἰς, ὦ ξεῖν', ἢ τηλόθεν εἰλήλουθας,
 εἰ δὴ τήνδε τε γαῖαν ἀνείρῃς. οὐδέ τι λίην
 οὕτω νῶνυμός ἐστιν· ἴσασι δέ μιν μάλα πολλοί,
 ἡμὲν ὅσοι ραῖουσι πρὸς ἠῶ τ' ἠέλιόν τε, 240
 ἠδ' ὅσοι μετόπισθε ποτὶ ζόφοι ἠερόεντα.
 ἦ τοι μὲν τριχεῖα καὶ οὐχ' ἰππήλατός ἐστιν,
 οὐδὲ λίην λυπρῆ, ἀτὰρ οὐδ' εὐρέια τέτυκται.
 ἐν μὲν γάρ οἱ σίτος ἀθέσφατος, ἐν δέ τε οἶνος
 γίνεταί· αἰεὶ δ' ὄμβρος ἔχει τεθαλυῖά τ' ἔέρση· 245
 αἰγίβοτος δ' ἀγαθὴ καὶ βούβοτος· ἔστι μὲν ὕλη
 παιτοίη, ἐν δ' ἄρδμοὶ ἐπηεταροὶ παρέασι.
 τῶ τοι, ξεῖν', Ἰθάκης γε καὶ ἐς Τροίην ὄνομ' ἔκει,
 τὴν περ τηλοῦ φασὶν Ἀχαιῖδος ἔμμεναι αἴης.”
 ὣς φάτο, γήθησεν δὲ πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, 250
 χαίρων ἢ γαίῃ πατρῴῃ, ὥς οἱ ἔειπε
 Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη, κούρη Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο·
 καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
 οὐδ' ὅ γ' ἀληθέα εἶπε, πάλιν δ' ὅ γε λάζετο μῦθον,
 αἰεὶ ἐνὶ στήθεσσι νόον πολυκερδέα νωμῶν 255
 “πυρθανόμην Ἰθάκης γε καὶ ἐν Κρήτῃ εὐρείῃ,
 τηλοῦ ὑπὲρ πόντου· νῦν δ' εἰλήλουθα καὶ αὐτὸς
 χρήμασι σὺν τοῖσδεσσι· λιπῶν δ' ἔτι παισὶ τῶσαῦτα
 φεύγω, ἐπεὶ φίλον νῆα κατέκτανον Ἰδομενῆος,
 Ὀρσίλοχον πόδας ὠκύν, ὃς ἐν Κρήτῃ εὐρείῃ 260
 ἀνέρας ἀλφηστὰς νῆα ταχέεσσι πόδεσσιν,
 οὐνεκά με στερέσαι τῆς ληΐδος ἤθελε πάσης
 Τρωιάδος, τῆς εἶνεκ' ἐγὼ πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῶ,
 ἀνδρῶν τε ποτόλους ἀλεγυνά τε κύματα πείρων,
 οὐνεκ' ἄρ' οὐχ' ᾗ πατρὶ χαριζόμενος θεράπηνον 265
 δῆμψ' ἐνὶ Τρώων, ἀλλ' ἄλλων ἄρχον ἑταίρων.
 τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ κατιόντα βάλον χαλκήρεϊ δουρὶ
 ἀγρόθεν, ἐγγὺς ὁδοῖο λοχησάμενος σὺν ἑταίρω·
 νύξ δὲ μάλα δνοφερὴ κάτεχ' οὐρανόν, οὐδέ τις ἡμέας
 ἀνθρώπων ἐνόησε, λάθον δὲ ἔ θυμὸν ἀπούρας. 270
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τὸν γε κατέκτανον ὀξεί χαλκῶ,
 αὐτίκ' ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νῆα κίων Φοῖνικας ἀγανούς
 ἐλλισάμην, καὶ σφιν μενοεικέα ληΐδα δῶκα·

τοὺς μ' ἐκέλευετα Ἡύλοιοε καταστῆσαι καὶ ἐφέσσαι
 ἢ εἰς Ἥλιωα οἶαι, ὅθι κρατέουσιν Ἑπειοί. 275
 ἀλλ' ἢ τοὶ σφεας κείθεν ἀπώγατο ἰς ἀρέμοιο
 πόλλ' ἀεκαζομένους, οὐδ' ἤθελον ἐξαπατῆσαι.
 κείθεν δὲ πλαγχθέντες ἰκάρομεν εἰθάδε ρυκτός.
 σπουδῇ δ' ἐς λιμένα προερέσσαμεν, οὐδέ τις ἡμῖν
 ὄρπον μῆστις ἔην, μάλα περ χατέουσιν ἐλέσθαι, 280
 ἀλλ' αὐτως ἀποβάντες ἐκείμεθα νηὸς ἀπαρτες.
 εἶθ' ἐμὲ μὲν γλυκὺς ὕπνος ἐπήλυθε κεκμηῶτα,
 οἱ δὲ χρήματ' ἐμὰ γλαφυρῆς ἐκ νηὸς ἐλόντες
 κάρθεσσι, ἐρθα περ αἰτὸς ἐπὶ φραμάθουσιν ἐκείμην.
 οἱ δ' ἐς Σιδωῶνιν εἰ τοιομένην ἀναβάντες 285
 οἴχοιτ'· αἰτὰρ ἐγὼ λιπύμην ἀκαχήμενος ἦτορ.
 Ὡς φῦτο, μείλιχτερ ἰὲ θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη,
 χειρὶ τέ μιν κατέρεξε· σέμας δ' ἦκτο γυναικὶ
 καλῇ τε μεγάλῃ τε καὶ ἀγλαῖα ἔργα ἰοιῶν·
 καὶ μιν φωνήσασ' ἔπεα πτερόειτα προσηύδα· 290
 Ἔκερδαλέος κ' εἴη καὶ ἐπίκλοπος ὣς σε παρέλθοι
 εἰ πάντεσσι δόλοισι, καὶ εἰ θεὸς ἀντιάσειε.
 σχέτλιε, ποικιλομήτα, οὐλῶν ἄτ', οὐκ ἄρ' ἐμελλες,
 οὐδ' ἐν σῆι περ ἔωρ γαίῃ, λήξειν ἀπατάων
 μύθων τε κλοπίων, οἳ τοι πεδόθεν φίλοι εἰσίν. 295
 ἀλλ' ἄγε, μηκέτι ταῦτα λεγώμεθα, εἰδότες ἄμφω
 κέρδε', ἐπεὶ σὺ μὲν ἔσσι βροτῶν ὄχ' ἄριστος ἀπάντων·
 βουλῇ καὶ μύθοισιν, ἐγὼ δ' ἐν πᾶσι θεαῖσι
 μήτι τε κλέομαι καὶ κέρδεσιν· οὐδὲ σὺ γ' ἔγνωσ
 Παλλάδ' Ἀθηναίην, κούρην Διός, ἣ τέ τοι αἰεὶ 300
 ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισι παρίσταμαι ἠδὲ φυλάσσω,
 καὶ δέ σε Φαιήκεσσι φίλων πάντεσσιν ἔθηκα.
 γίν' αὖ δεῦρ' ἰκόμην, ἵνα τοι σὺν μῆτιν ὑφήνω
 χρήματά τε κρύψω, ὅσα τοι Φαιήκες ἀγαυοὶ
 ὤπασαι οἴκαδ' ἰοίτι ἐμῇ βουλῇ τε γόφ' τε, 305
 εἶπω θ' ὅσσα τοι αἴσα δόμοις ἐνὶ πωητοῖσι
 κήδε' ἀνασχέσθαι· σὺν δὲ τετλάμεται καὶ ἀνάγκη,
 μηδέ τφ ἐκφάσθαι μήτ' ἀνδρῶν μήτε γυναικῶν,
 πάντων, οὐνεκ' ἄρ' ἦλθες ἀλώμενος, ἀλλὰ σιωπῇ
 πάσχωε ἄλγεα πολλά, βίας ὑποδέγμενος ἀνδρῶν." 310
 Τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
 Ἄργαλέον σε, θεά, γνῶναι βροτῶ ἀντιάσαντι,
 καὶ μάλ' ἐπισταμένω· σὲ γὰρ αὐτὴν παιτὶ εἰσκεις.
 τοῦτο δ' ἐγὼν εὖ οἶδ', ὅτι μοι πάρος ἠπίη ἦσθα,
 ἦος ἐνὶ Τροίῃ πολεμίζομεν νῆες Ἀχαιῶν. 315
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Πριάμοιο πόλιν διεπέρσαμεν αἰπὴν,
 βῆμεν δ' ἐν νήεσσι, θεὸς δ' ἐκέδασσεν Ἀχαιοὺς,
 οὐ σέ γ' ἔπειτα ἴδον, κούρην Διός, οὐδ' ἐνόησα
 νηὸς ἐμῆς ἐπιβᾶσαν, ὅπως τί μοι ἄλγος ἀλάλκοις.
 ἀλλ' αἰεὶ φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἔχων δεδαϊγμένον ἦτορ 320
 ἠλώμην, ἦός με θεοὶ κακόητος ἔλυσαν·
 πρὶν γ' ὅτε Φαιήκων ἀνδρῶν ἐν πίοιι δῆμω
 θάρσυνάς τε ἔπεσσι καὶ ἐς πόλιν ἤγαγες αὐτή.
 νῦν δέ σε πρὸς πατρός γουνάζομαι—οὐ γὰρ οἴω
 ἦκεω εἰς Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον, ἀλλὰ τιν' ἄλλην 325
 γαίαν ἀναστρέφομαι· σὲ δὲ κερτομέουσα οἴω
 ταῦτ' ἀγορευόμεναι, ἵν' ἐμὰς φρένας ἠπεροπέυσης—
 εἰπέ μοι εἰ ἐτεόν γε φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἰκάνω."

Τὸν δ' ἠμείβετ' ἔπειτα θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη·
 Ἄει τοι τοιοῦτον ἐνὶ στήθεσσι ρύημα· 330
 τῷ σε καὶ οὐ δύναμαι προλιπεῖν δύστηνον εἶντα,
 οὐνεκ' ἐπητής ἔσσι καὶ ἀγχίνους καὶ ἐχέφρων.

ἀσπασίως γάρ κ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ ἀλαλήμενος ἐλθὼν
 ἔειπ' ἐνὶ μεγάροις ἰδέειω παῖδάς τ' ἄλοχόν τε·
 σοὶ δ' οὐ πω φίλον ἐστὶ δαήμεναι οὐδὲ πυθέσθαι, 335
 πρὶν γ' ἔτι σῆς ἀλόχου πειρήσεται, ἣ τέ τοι αὐτῶς
 ἦσται ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν, οὔζυραὶ δέ οἱ αἰεὶ
 φθίνουσιν νύκτες τε καὶ ἡμέματα δάκρυ χεοῦσῃ.
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὸ μὲν οὐ ποτ' ἀπίστεον, ἀλλ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ
 ἦδ' ὅ τ' ἰοστήσεις ὀλέσας ἄπο πάντας ἐταίρους· 340
 ἀλλὰ τοι οὐκ ἐθέλησα Πηλοιδάωνι μάχεσθαι
 πατροκασιγνήτῳ, ὅς τοι κότοιο ἐνθετο θυμῷ,
 χωόμενος ὅτι οἱ υἱὸν φίλον ἐξαλάωσας.
 ἀλλ' ἄγε τοι δείξω Ἰθάκης ἔδος, ὅφρα πεποιθήης.
 Φόρκυρος μὲν ὄδ' ἐστὶ λιμῆρ', ἀλίωιο γέροιστος, 345
 ἦδε δ' ἐπὶ κρατὸς λιμένος ταινύφυλλος ἐλαίη·
 ἀγχόθι δ' αὐτῆς ἄντρον ἐπήρατον ἠεροειδές,
 ἱρὸν νυμφάων αἰ ἠηιάδες καλέονται·
 τοῦτο δέ τοι σπέος εὐρὸν κατηρεφές, ἔνθα σὺ πολλὰς
 ἔρδεσκες νύμφησι τεληέσσας ἑκατόμβας· 350
 τοῦτο δὲ Νήριτόν ἐστιν ὄρος καταειμένον ὕλην."
 ὣς εἰπούσα θεὰ σκέδασ' ἠέρα, εἵσατο δὲ χθώνι·
 γήθησέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
 χαίρων ἢ γαίῃ, κύσε δὲ ζεῖδωρον ἄρουραν.
 αὐτίκα δὲ νύμφης ἠρήσατο χεῖρας ἀρασχών· 355
 "νύμφαι ἠηιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς, οὐ ποτ' ἐγὼ γε
 ὄψεσθ' ὑμῖν ἐφάμην· νῦν δ' εὐχολῆς ἀγαυῆσι
 χαίρετ'· ἀτὰρ καὶ δῶρα διδώσομεν, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ,
 αἰ κεν ἔῃ πρόφρων με Διὸς θυγάτηρ ἀγελεύῃ
 αὐτόν τε ζῶειν καὶ μοι φίλον υἱὸν ἀέξῃ." 360

When this passage is examined in terms of Epibateric topoi it can be seen to display features both of the inverse and non-inverse genre. Essentially what is happening is that while Odysseus still has doubts about where he is, it is not clear whether the genre is inverse or not, but after he is finally persuaded that he is in Ithaca, the Epibaterion reads like a standard encomiastic Epibaterion. The topos of description of the place (Bla) illustrates this well. At 195–6 the paths and harbours denote civilisation whereas the rocks are a generically ugly feature.²⁶ At 201–2 Odysseus himself wonders whether he is near savages or civilised people. He asks Athene

26. See section on Rudens and ch.4.

at 234-5 whether this place is τις νήσων εὐδείελος or an ἀκτὴ. εὐδείελος is a standard epithet of Ithaca (cf. 212, 325) whereas ἀκτὴ again possibly contains the idea of ruggedness, so these two possibilities again express the optimistic and pessimistic sides of the hero's doubts. Athene tells Odysseus about the land at 242ff. and again unpleasant aspects (τρηχεῖα/οὐχ ἰπήλατος/οὐδ'εὐρετα) are juxtaposed with pleasant (οὐδὲ λίην λυπρή, 244ff.). It is clear then that this section makes use of thematic features of both the inverse and the non-inverse genre. Athene's later description of the place (345ff.) is however fully laudatory.

Other topoi also illustrate how the speech develops from being vituperative to encomiastic. References to the arriver's expressions of emotion (B7) can be found at 198-9, 219, 221 and 286 where he is full of despair, but also at 226, 250-1 and 353-4 where he rejoices that he is at last safe. These last three references to Odysseus' joy, each one more powerful than the last, are in effect what Menander Rhetor himself recommends as being appropriate to the encomiastic Epibaterion.²⁷ Expression of emotion, often in the form of kissing or weeping, is a very common Epibateric topos.²⁸

The topos of longing for homeland (B3) is discussed in the

27. See Men.Rh.391.31ff. (on the Epibateric Lalia) which suggests use of κύσε δὲ ζείδωρον ἄρουραν (=XIII 354) and χαίρων ἢ γαίῃ πατρῶν (almost = XIII 251 and similar to XIII 354).

28. See list in Introduction.

section on the Rudens. Occurrences of it can be found here at 206, 211-2 and 219 and of course they are especially ironic since the arriver is already unwittingly in his homeland.²⁹

Prayer (B5) is another topos discussed elsewhere³⁰ and three forms of it occur in the Homeric passage. At 213-4 Odysseus hopes that Zeus will punish the crew who brought him; at 230ff. he supplicates the disguised goddess and ironically uses language suitable to a prayer to a real god;³¹ at 355ff. he utters a kind of prayer or vow to the local nymphs.³² These three types of prayer or plea illustrate the change of mood as the piece progresses.

Some of the other recognised topoi in the passage which can be referred to summarily are weariness (B4) at 187-8 and 281;³³ the concept "another place would be better" (Blc) at 204-6; the narration of events prior to the arrival (B8), this time a fabrication, at 258ff.; and the reference to animals (B9) at 246.³⁴ The concepts of lack of food (279-80), ignorance of one's whereabouts (188, 200ff., 233ff.) and the noise of the sea (220) are mentioned in the Rudens section. Also in that section is discussed the idea "I never thought I

29. See ch.5.

30. See sections on Sophocles O.C. and Plautus Rudens above.

31. For the idea of supplication cf. Hom.Od.VI 149;Plaut.Rud. 274ff.

32. See ch.7.

33. See section on Rudens.

34. See list in Introduction for examples of Blc,B8 and B9.

would come home again" (Od.XIII 356-7), the welcoming party (in this case, Athene) and the loneliness of the arriver (340).

There may be a reference to the founder of the place in the mention of Mt.Neriton at 351. Menander prescribes a short praise of the founder for encomiastic Epibateria.³⁵ Neritus may have been a mountain god and the grandfather of the first king of Ithaca.³⁶ Although specific praise of a founder is not found in ancient poetic Epibateria, there are references to founders in Latin arrival poetry.³⁷ Od.XIII 351 may be a unique occurrence in a Greek poetic Epibaterion of a form of the topos recognised and prescribed by Menander.

At 333ff. Athene remarks that Odysseus' behaviour is very unusual,

ἀσπασίως γάρ κ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ ἀλαλήμενος ἔλθων
ἴετ' ἐνὶ μεγάροις ἰδέειν παῖδας τ' ἀλοχόν τε·
333-4.

The idea of the gladness of the arriver has been mentioned in the section on Apollonius; here the idea is in effect turned on its head. Athene goes on to say (336-8) that Penelope has been pining for him for a long time. The emotion of the arriver's relations is another Epibateric feature found elsewhere, notably at Plaut.Stich.406-7 where Epignomus on return home exclaims

35. Men.Rh.383.9-10.

36. See ed. W.B.Stanford (1954) s.v. Od.XVII 207ff.

37. See list in Introduction.

olim quos abiens adfeci aegrimonia,
eos nunc laetantis faciam adventu meo.

This Homeric passage then not only takes the form of alternated arrival speech and arrival description, but also contains elements appropriate to the inverse and normal genre. An audience aware of the distinction between inverse and normal Epibateric topoi would be able to appreciate fully Odysseus' gradual change of attitude, from initial despair and hostility to final rejoicing in his homeland. Although this last passage to be discussed is the earliest chronologically, it can be seen that it still makes good use of a large number of the motifs to be found in later arrival poetry.

PART TWO.

CHAPTER 3. NEW EPIBATERIC ASSIGNMENTS.

This chapter is concerned with those passages, here regarded as Epibateria, which have been given different generic classifications by others. The passages will be looked at individually and in chronological order (as will normally be the case in subsequent chapters) and in each case their Epibateric identity will be defended. In most cases this will necessarily involve amendment of, if not disagreement with, the views expressed by Cairns; the reason for this is simply that his is the only detailed account of the genre.

Hom.II.V 684-8.

At II.V 684-8 Sarpedon is lying injured on the battlefield and he begs Hector to save his life. As this speech is short, I quote it in full,

Πριαμίδη, μῆ δὴ με ἔλωρ Δαναοῖσιν ἑάσης
κεῖσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπάμυνον· ἔπειτά με καὶ λίποι αἰῶν
ἐν πόλει ὑμετέρῃ, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλον ἔγωγε
νοστήσας οἰκόνδε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν
εὐφρανέειν ἀλοχόν τε φίλην καὶ νήπιον υἷόν.

As may be seen from the list in the Introduction, I have assigned this speech to the genre Epibaterion since it involves the "arrival" of a man in a new predicament. The passage has however already been interpreted in a generic manner by B. Fenik¹ who describes it as a speech appropriate to a death-scene. The main problem to which he draws attention is that

1. B.Fenik (1968) p.69 and (1974) pp.52-3.

even though this scene resembles the other great death-scenes in the Iliad (of Sarpedon himself at XVI 492ff., of Patroclus at XVI 844ff. and of Hector at XXII 338ff.) at this point Sarpedon is not in fact about to die. For this reason Fenik sees the death-scene as inappropriate and therefore possibly interpolated: "a typical death scene seems therefore to have been inserted where it does not belong."

But to what extent is this a typical death-scene? Fenik himself seems to set before us a very poor case. The only topoi that he can find in this speech which are common to the other death-scenes cited above are (i) that the wounded man speaks, and (ii) that he shows concern for what will happen to his body. These are very weak grounds for supposing that there was ever intended here a typical scene of the same generic type as that used for the deaths of the other heroes. Wounded men are very likely to speak anyway, whether they are about to die or not, and it is probable that they will anticipate death and show concern for their bodily remains. Fenik's premise that this is a death-scene is therefore very weak, and so, consequently, is his conclusion that it is to be regarded as being out of place.

It seems far more appropriate to regard it as an example of the Epibaterion, and so to make the usual generic and topical comparison of it with other Epibateria. The arrival, as already observed, is that of Sarpedon in this miserable predicament. In his speech to Hector, it will be found that two Epibateric topoi are used (see crossreference listing in Introduction). These are B10c, a death wish expressed on the

condition that the speaker be granted a new status first,

...ἐπειτά με καὶ λίτοι αἰῶν
ἐν ὅλῳι ὑμετέρῃ...

685-6

and B3, Sarpedon's yearning for home,

...ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλον ἔγωγε
νοστήσας οἶκονδε φίλῃν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν
εὐφρανέειν ἄλοχον τε φίλῃν καὶ νήπιον υἱόν.
686-8.

We may compare other similar Epibateric situations in the Iliad, for example Il.XVIII 324-32 where Achilles, lamenting the death of Patroclus, realises that he too has reached the end of his life's journey on the battlefield at Troy,

ἄμφω γὰρ πέπρωται ὁμοίην γαῖαν ἐρεῦσαι
αὐτοῦ ἐνὶ Τροίῃ...

329-30.

He then laments his lost home in a manner similar to that of Sarpedon,

...οὐδ' ἐμὲ νοστήσαντα
δέξεται ἐν μεγάροισι γέρων ἱππηλάτα Πηλεὺς
οὐδὲ θέτις μήτηρ...

330-2

In the Epibaterion at Il.XXI 273-83 Achilles is struggling in the river Scamander. At 273-4 he voices a conditional death wish which is very similar to that which Sarpedon expresses,

Ζεῦ πάτερ, ὡς οὐ τίς με θεῶν ἐλεεινὸν ὑπέστη
ἐκ ποταμοῦ σαῶσαι· ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τι πάθοιμι.

As Leaf² notes, "τι πάθοιμι seems to be used in the familiar Attic sense, "perish"." The idea then, as with Sarpedon, is that if only he is saved from this predicament he would willingly die.

2. W.Leaf (1888) ad loc.

It seems far preferable therefore to regard Sarpedon's speech as an Epibaterion, and one which makes good use of the topoi available, than as a typical death speech, which must necessarily be hopelessly inappropriate. The lack of other evidence for interpolation does not make Fenik's case any stronger and an Epibateric assignment here seems a far better solution.

Hom.Od.XVI 187-234.

The ἀναγνώρισις between Odysseus and Telemachus at Od.XVI 187-234 has been dealt with generically in G.C.,³ where it is treated as a Proshonetikon. That is to say it is a passage whose main motif is the "welcome". I reproduce here the topoi of the genre which Cairns assigns in this passage, and I use his numbering:

- (i) Topos 4 (Demonstrations of affection by Wel. and sometimes by Arr.): 11.190-1, 213-20.
- (ii) Topos 6 (Divine assistance to Arr.): 11.237-8 (misprint for 11.232-3).
- (iii) Topos 8 (Dangers undergone by Arr.): 1.189.
- (iv) Topos 13 (Narrations of Arr.): 11.226-32.

It is indeed possible to find these topoi in the passage, but what is not so clear is who is intended as the welcomer and who the arriver. A close analysis of the above topical references will reveal that some of them treat Telemachus as Arr. and Odysseus as Wel., some treat them in reverse roles: Topoi treating Tel. as Arr. and Od. as Wel.:

3. G.C. p.21ff.

(i) Topos 4 (possibly). This topos involves demonstrations of affection by the welcomer and sometimes by the arriver. 11.190-1 speak of the weeping of Odysseus and 11.213-20 mention both men weeping. Cairns therefore possibly intends 190-1 to refer to the emotion of the welcomer (Odysseus) and 213-20 to refer to the emotion of both the welcomer (Odysseus) and the arriver (Telemachus).

(ii) Topos 8. The motif of this topos is that of "dangers undergone by the arriver." Since 1.189 is associated with this topos, Telemachus must be regarded as the arriver here since it is his past dangers that are mentioned,

πάσχεις ἄλγεα πολλά...

Had Cairns intended Telemachus as the welcomer at this point, this line would have been noted as a case of his Topos 10, "sufferings of Wel. because of absence of Arr." The absence of 1.189 in Topos 10 therefore reinforces the view that Telemachus is here regarded as the arriver.

(iii) The absence of 11.207-12 in Topos 6 implies that Odysseus is not here seen as the arriver. Topos 6 concerns divine assistance given to the arriver and 11.207-12 deal with Athene's aid to Odysseus, so the fact that these lines are not assigned to this topos must mean that Odysseus is not here the arriver.

Topoi treating Od. as Arr. and Tel. as Wel.:

(i) Topos 4 (possibly). If the reverse of (i) above were the case, ie. that 11.190-1 (Odysseus' tears) are a case of "affection....sometimes by Arr."; and 11.213-20 (tears of Telemachus and Odysseus) are a case of "affection by Wel.

and....by Arr." respectively, then Odysseus should be seen as the arriver, Telemachus as the welcomer.

(ii) Topos 6. 11.232-3 speak of Athene's assistance to Odysseus, and since Cairns cites this as a case of "divine assistance to the arriver", Odysseus must here be the arriver.

(iii) Topos 13. 11.226-32 form the narration by Odysseus and since Cairns cites this as a case of "narration of arriver", Odysseus must again be regarded as the arriver.

These arguments may seem clinical and indigestible in their present form, but it is absolutely vital to be as clear and precise as possible when dealing with generic and topical assignments. The points above show that according to Cairns' analysis of this section of Book XVI, Odysseus and Telemachus seem to swap roles at some point. A schema will clarify the issue:

| LINE | ARRIVER | WELCOMER | TOPOS (As in Cairns) |
|--------|---------|----------|----------------------|
| 189 | Tel | Od | 8 |
| 190-1 | Od/Tel | Od/Tel | 4 |
| 207-12 | Tel | Od | 6 |
| 213-20 | Od/Tel | Od/Tel | 4 |
| <hr/> | | | |
| 226-32 | Od | Tel | 13 |
| 232-3 | Od | Tel | 6 |

As can be seen here, as the passage progresses, the roles of Odysseus and Telemachus qua Arr. and Wel. become somewhat blurred. At 11.190-1 and 213-20 it is not clear from Cairns' analysis which is the arriver and which is the welcomer. We could however trace Telemachus as Arr. up to, say, 1.225 (the

dotted line) after which Odysseus becomes Arr. This swapping of roles at 1.225 is probably what is intended in G.C. (of course, both men could in a sense be arrivers or welcomers because both have recently returned to Ithaca after their travels).

If indeed Telemachus is Arr. up to 1.225 (and Odysseus therefore Wel.) and then Odysseus becomes Arr. (and Telemachus Wel.) then the passage as a whole cannot be one Prosphonetikon: the primary elements specified for the genre in G.C. stipulate that only one arriver and one welcomer is allowed for any one Prosphonetikon. It would be possible to adopt the view therefore that there are here two Prosphonetika, the first running from 11.187-224 and involving Telemachus as Arr., the second running from 11.225-234 and involving Odysseus as Arr. We can, however, regard the whole ἀναγνώρισις (11.187-234) as one Epibaterion where Odysseus arrives home. The topoi that are then assigned (following my enumeration) are as follows:

B4: 1.229.

B6a: 11.207-12, 232.233.

B7: 11.190-1, 215-20.

B8: 11.227-34.

B9: 11.216-8.

Does this assignment as one Epibaterion have any advantage over the notion of two Prosphonetika? As far as the topoi are concerned, the answer to this must be negative: three of the topoi are common to both interpretations (divine intervention, emotion of the arriver and narrations of the arriver).

"Dangers undergone by Arr." is the only topos found in the two Proshphonetika not found in the Epibaterion; B4 and B9 are the only Epibateric topoi not found in the two Proshphonetika. There is very little difference therefore, topically speaking, between the two interpretations. However the main advantage of the Epibaterion is this: it completely removes the necessity of switching the roles of Odysseus and his son. Such a changeover at, say, 1.225 is not so much as hinted at in the text and seems totally pointless. In fact Odysseus cannot be said to be doing any welcoming at all.

It would perhaps be possible to compromise with Cairns and argue that 11.187-234 do involve one Proshphonetikon in which the arriver throughout is Odysseus. Proshphonic topoi would then have to be reassigned. I here set up the topical format of the ἀναγνώσις as one such Proshphonetikon and as one Epibaterion, for the sake of comparison (topoi of the Epibaterion follow my enumeration; those of the Proshphonetikon follow Cairns'):

Od.XVI 187-234

AS PROSHPHONETIKON

| TOPOS | LINE |
|-------|------------------|
| 4 | 190-1, 213-20 |
| 6 | 207-12, 232, 233 |
| 13 | 227-34 |
| 1 | 206, 233 |
| 5 | 206 |
| 8 | 205 |
| 10 | 189 |

AS EPIBATERION

| TOPOS | LINE |
|-------|------------------|
| B7 | 190-1, 215-20 |
| B6a | 207-12, 232, 233 |
| B8 | 227-34 |
| B4 | 229 |
| B9 | 216-8 |

Again, on a topical basis there is little to decide between the two interpretations. Some of the topoi are common or nearly common. It is therefore necessary to consider the

actual situation involved, to ask the question "is this scene one of arrival or of welcome?" Perhaps it is both, but the emphasis is surely placed on Odysseus. He speaks twenty-three lines whereas his son only speaks ten. Furthermore, I feel that it is not really a welcome at all until Telemachus realises who his interlocutor is and breaks down at 1.213. Several Proshonetic topoi do, admittedly, occur before this point and perhaps they cleverly pave the way for a full welcome later on, but if Cairns' primary element A4 is correct ("The welcome of Arr. by Wel.") as it must be for a Proshonetikon, then surely we cannot allow the lines before 1.213 to be part of this genre, as no welcome occurs in them. Our conclusion must therefore be that XVI 187-234 should be regarded as one Epibaterion rather than as one Proshonetikon or two Proshonetika.

Cat.LXIII 27-73.

The speech of Attis on arrival on Ida at Catullus LXIII 50-73 is a good example of a speech of arrival. A discussion of it can be found in G.C.⁴ However, as has been explained above,⁵ Epibateria may take the form not only of a speech of arrival but as a description of an arrival. For this reason, because the previous description of Attis' arrival (before he speaks) is generically and topically suitable, I have chosen to regard the Epibaterion as running from 11.27-73, thereby

4. G.C. p.62ff.

5. cf. Introduction.

therefore enables us to see what may be a very subtle generic transition in the middle of this ode.

The rest of this discussion of III 27 will take the form of a reassessment of the tone of the ode. Throughout this section, comparisons will be drawn between Horace's treatment of the Europa story, and that of Moschus (poem II 131-52), which is the only other extant Epibaterion of Europa. For a comparative-topical schema of Hor. Odes III 27.25-76 and Moschus II 131-52 see ch.11.

Cairns gives a fairly detailed account of the Horatian Epibaterion in G.C., and his main argument is that Europa is deliberately reticent and muted in her rebukes of Jupiter and Crete in order to make for a smooth transition into her final reconciliation with the god. I however believe that a generic analysis of the Epibaterion shows Europa to be about as hostile as possible, and the Epibaterion itself to be about as inverse as possible. The reconciliation with Jupiter, consequently, far from being smoothly foreshadowed and easily attainable, is I believe a sudden and deliberately abrupt contrast. Again it is very important to deal with Cairns' arguments individually in order to justify my own generic interpretation of this part of the ode. For the sake of convenience his arguments have been listed in three groups. To show that Europa is not as hostile as she could have been, he cites

- A(i) Her reticence about her native land.
- (ii) Absence of a notion of her being buried at home.
- (iii) Absence of blame of or prayer to the gods.
- (iv) Europa's fantasy that Crete is a desert (when the reader

knows otherwise).

Cairns argues that the transition to the reconciliation is made easy and so all these features are "already annulled or easily annullable." He says that this explains

B(i) Little mention of Europa's former home, "only a mention of picking flowers."

(ii) "No cogent attack on Crete or direct description of it as a wilderness."

(iii) No thoughts of burial at home.

(iv) No attack on hostile gods.

(v) No prayer.

He then treats as being "meaningless",

C(i) Her censure of the bull.

(ii) Her impiety towards her father.

(iii) Her thoughts of suicide.

An attempt is now made to answer all these points and argue for a very hostile, inverse Epibaterion with a remarkably abrupt change of tone at 1.66 where Venus appears. My arguments will be based entirely on a generic and topical interpretation of the Epibaterion, and they will be grouped under topical headings. Cairns' arguments will be referred to by the enumeration used above.

B3 (Longing for home).

Cairns' arguments A(i),A(ii),B(i) and B(iii) all imply that Europa's longing for home cannot be strongly felt. It is true admittedly that Europa does not emphasise her loss of burial at home (A(ii),B(iii)), but this is only one of the forms that

topos B3 may take, and it is not a very common one at that.⁹ Europa however is most upset about her past status and the home she has lost,

....pater, o relictum
filiae nomen, pietasque
34-5

....meliusne fluctus
ire per longos fuit, an recentis
carpere flores?
42-4

impudens liqui patrios Penatis.
49

We should compare the relative absence of such emotions in the parallel Epibaterion by Moschus.¹⁰ The only lines in Moschus II which could conceivably be regarded as cases of B3 are

ἢ δ' ὅτε δὴ γαίης ἀπὸ πατρίδος ἦεν ἄνευθεν
131

and ὦμοι ἐγὼ μέγα δὴ τι δυσάμμορος, ἢ ῥά τε δῶμα
πατρὸς ἀποπρολιποῦσα...
146-7.

Neither of these is particularly emotional when compared with Europa's longing for her homeland in ode III 27. Cairns' arguments A(i) and B(i) are therefore simply not the case.

B6a (Gods caused the arrival).

I believe that the role of Jupiter has been misinterpreted in arguments A(iii), B(iv), B(v) and C(i). They imply that

9. Examples do occur at Prop. I 17.19-24, Ov. Tr. III 3.32, 65-70 etc.

10. E. Fraenkel (1957) p.194ff. shows how light and trivial is Moschus' account of the Europa myth in comparison with Ode III 27. He says of Moschus' version generally (p.196), "Here we have pure rococo."

Europa does not show open hostility to the god who caused her arrival in Crete. But she rebukes the bull openly,

si quis infamem mihi nunc iuvenicum
dedat iratae, lacerare ferro et
frangere enitar modo multum amati
cornua monstri.

45-8

and her attitude is echoed by Horace himself at 11.25-6 (doloso /...tauro). The fact that Europa does not yet know that the bull is a god is irrelevant: the reader realises this to be the case, and would therefore recognise an occurrence of topos B6a presented in a very hostile form.

Again we may compare Moschus II where B6a does appear, but in a very bland form,

πῆ με φέρεις θεόταυρε;
135

ἦ ἄρα τις θεός ἐσοι· θεοῖς γ' ἐπεικνότα βέζεις.
140
οὐκ ἄθεεϊ γὰρ ταῦτα διέρχομαι ὑγρὰ κέλευθα.
152.

Compared with this, occurrences of B6a are very prominent in *Inde* III 27 and consequently her rebuke of Jupiter is highly conspicuous.

B5 (Prayer).

The topos of prayer also provides an answer to those arguments which suppose Europa's hostility to Jupiter to be underplayed. A(iii) and B(v) state that Europa utters no prayer. However there is an important prayer at 11.50-6,

....o deorum
si quis haec audis, utinam inter errem
nuda leones!

antequam turpis macies decentis

occupet malas teneraeque sucus
defluat praedae, speciosa quaero
pascere tigris.

This prayer is very powerful indeed in generic terms since it succeeds in conflating three topoi simultaneously: B5 (the prayer itself), B9 (a mention of wild animals) and BlØa (a death-wish). Such conflation as this amounts to topical Brachylogia.¹¹ So to say that prayer in ode III 27 is unimportant or non-existent is surely most unfair. In Moschus II, by contrast, only a weak prayer occurs,

ἀλλὰ σύ μοι μεδέων πολιῆς ἀλός Ἐννοσίγαιε
ἴλαος ἀντιάσειας...

149-50.

Bla (Hostility towards the place of arrival).

Arguments A(iv) and B(ii) suppose Europa's belief that Crete is a wilderness to be unimportant and underplayed. But the topos is presented in fact quite strongly: mention of a tree (l.58) and rocks (ll.61-2) are all Horace needs to present the concept of the place as a wilderness (see ch.4 below for the forms that topos Bla may take). This therefore is her attack on Crete. In Moschus, by contrast, no such attack occurs at all.

BlØa (Death-wish).

Europa's death-wish is regarded as "meaningless" by Cairns (C(iii)), and consequently as easy to anull. It is surely more true to say that her wish for death is a powerful feature of her speech, a feature which is employed repeatedly,

11. cf. G.C. p.120ff.

....levis una mors est
virginum culpae....
37-8

impudens Orcum moror....
50.

ll.50-6 are quoted above as an unusual conflation of Bl0a with B5 and B9. The idea of a death-wish in this Epibaterion is therefore very powerful, and we may yet again compare Moschus II where no such death-wish occurs at all.

The only remaining argument that should be answered is C(ii), namely that Europa's impiety can be easily annulled by her final reconciliation with Jupiter. Europa however stresses her sin and guilt throughout and this makes for a very abrupt transition when Venus appears.

I have argued above that far from being underplayed, the Epibaterion of Europa in ode III 27 is very much generically strengthened (by the use of topoi) in its hostility and inversion. For an explanation of why Moschus II is relatively so weak, see ch.11 below. I conclude with a few further points which support the argument that the first part of Europa's Epibaterion is intended as a complete and utter contrast to the reconciliation section at l.66ff.

(i) The appearance of Venus seems deliberately abrupt as it occurs half-way through the very line in which Europa's speech ends,

....barbarae paelex." ' aderat querenti
perfidum ridens Venus....
66-7

(ii) There is a strong contrast between Europa's original threat to the bull,

si quis infamem mihi nunc iuvenum
dedat iratae, lacerare ferro et
frangere enitar modo multum amati
cornua monstri.

45-8

and Venus' joking reiteration of it near the end of the ode,

cum tibi invisus laceranda reddet
cornua taurus.

71-2

(iii) In a similar manner, hostile descriptions of the bull before Venus' arrival (11.25-6 doloso/...tauro; 11.45-8 quoted above) contrast very heavily with what is said of the god by Venus herself,

uxor invicti Iovis esse nescis

73

....bene ferre magnam
disce fortunam....

74-5.

(iv) Europa seems to be shedding tears during her speech (1.38 vigilansne ploro...?) and again this is contrasted with Venus' sympathetic encouragement later on (1.74 mitte singultus).

(v) All the other topoi which are used before Venus arrives to evoke Europa's wretched despair (B1a, B3, B5, B9, B10a) are suddenly totally absent afterwards.

Tib.I 3.

The primary elements for the Epibaterion as specified in the Introduction are not only based on what is natural for any arrival situation, but they also follow the procedure laid down for the genres Proshonetikon¹² and Syntaktikon.¹³ Following

12. G.C. p.21ff.

13. I.M.Lem.DuQuesnay (1981) p.63ff.

Cairns' notation, element A1 for the Proshonetikon is given as "the person arriving", A4 as "the welcome of the arriver by the welcomer." In the case of the Syntaktikon or speech of departure, DuQuesnay gives as element A1 "a speaker who is leaving" and as A3, "a place from which the speaker is leaving." These stipulations are set out in accordance with the situation which is itself the basis of the genre. It is clear from them that a Proshonetikon can only deal with one arrival (a fact which was used in the discussion of Hom.Od.XVI 187-234 above) and a Syntaktikon can only deal with one departure. Clearly then, in the name of consistency an Epibaterion should be concerned with only one arrival.

Tib.I 3 is discussed by Cairns as an Epibaterion, but it will be noted that there are three separate arrivals involved in it. Tibullus is himself the arriver in each case, but there are three separate places of arrival discussed in the elegy: Phaeacia (11.1-56), Elysium (11.57-82) and Tibullus' home (11.83-94). Each of these sections should therefore be seen as a separate Epibaterion, and the elegy as a whole must be regarded as consisting of three "included" Epibateria.

I hope to show in this section that a full appreciation of the structure and tone of the elegy can only be achieved by examining it generically on the basis of this tripartite division. Various attempts have been made in the past to discover the true structure of the poem,¹⁴ and the following

14. esp. R.Hanslik "Tibulls Elegie I 3" (Forschungen zur Römischen Literatur ed. W.Wimmel (Wiesbaden 1970)).

discussion adopts a topical interpretation. As in the case of Hor. Odes III 27 above, each topos will be taken in turn and its occurrences in the three Epibateria of I 3 will be examined.

It will be obvious to anyone making even the most cursory examination of the elegy that the mood changes during the course of it. In its simplest terms, Tibullus is depressed to begin with but very optimistic at the end. However it may appear that the transition from one extreme to the other is not made gradually or smoothly. For example, the poet appears more optimistic during his reflections on the Golden Age (11.35-48) but after this he reverts to thoughts of death (11.53-6); he seems hopeful during his vision of entry into Elysium (11.57-66) but after this he describes the gloomy terrors of Tartarus.

So ostensibly the transition from pessimism at the beginning to optimism at the end is haphazard and uneven. I hope to show here that a generic analysis involving all the relevant topoi reveals the transition to be perfectly gradual and smooth through the three Epibateria, and moreover that this structuring can only be appreciated through just such a generic analysis. A schema will be provided at the end to illustrate the arguments used.

Bla/Blb/Blc.

Topos Bla¹⁵ can be found in both of the first two

15. See ch.4 for the various forms which topos Bla may take.

Epibateria in I 3; in the first it is presented in its inverse, hostile form to evoke the unpleasantness of Phaeacia,

me tenet ignotis aegrum Phaeacia terris

3

whereas in the second it is used to describe the joys of Elysium in its normal, laudatory form,

dulce sonent tenui gutture carmen aves;
fert casiam non culta seges tososque per agros
floret odoratis terra benigna rosis

60-2.

When an examination is made of Blb and Blc it will be seen that the Golden Age and Tartarus passages mentioned earlier, far from temporarily reversing the change in mood of the elegy, enable it to develop even further. Blb and Blc are often used (though this is by no means always the case) to give an implicit idea of the place of arrival, by contrast. For example, Blb may be used to show somewhere else as unpleasant in order to imply that the place of arrival itself is pleasant, and vice-versa for Blc. This is what is happening in I 3. The poet seems to be using this common generic practice to give a further impression of the quality of the two places of arrival in the first and second Epibateria. 11.35-48 describe the benefits of the past Golden Age when there was no trading by sea, farming or war. This is an example of Blc. Tibullus is implicitly censuring his present predicament, his arrival in Phaeacia which has been caused by the foreign travel that was so absent in the Golden Age. Hence, the description of the

Golden Age serves to enhance Tibullus' vitriolic attitude towards Phaeacia.

The passage describing Tartarus (11.67-82) lies within the second Epibaterion where the envisaged place of arrival is Elysium. The Tartarus section may be seen as an example of topos B1b and in contrast to the ugliness of Tartarus, Elysium seems all the more attractive. The ghastliness of Tartarus seems deliberately intensified by the usage of topos B9 in describing creatures there (1.69 *feros pro crinibus angues*; 1.71 *serpentum Cerberus ore*; 1.76 *assiduas atro viscere pascit aves*). B9 is only used in this Epibaterion of the three, and so intensifies the unpleasantness of Tartarus.

Connections have been drawn between the Golden Age and Elysium.¹⁶ This may constitute a powerful link between the first two Epibateria of the elegy (see below), but it is felt here that it is of greater importance to recognise the tripartite division of the poem as a whole. It can be clearly seen then that the Golden Age passage lies within the first Epibaterion. For this reason it can act as topos B1c and cause Phaeacia to appear unpleasant. The Tartarus passage lies within the second Epibaterion and so it can act as topos B1b, thus causing Elysium to seem all the more pleasant. Without the division of I 3 into three separate Epibateria the ordering of these passages appears arbitrary.

16. esp. F.Cairns (1979) p.46ff.

the first Epibaterion, and its sudden appearance here in an appropriately reversed form would be all the more striking to a reader who could recognise such generic and topical sophistication.

B6a.

Divine causation of the arrival occurs in both the second Epibaterion,

sed me, quod facilis tenero sum semper amori,
ipsa Venus campos ducet in Elysios.
57-8

and in the third,

sed videar caelo missus adesse tibi.
90.

At first sight both these passages seem to share a similar degree of optimism; however, soon after 11.57-8, in the second Epibaterion, the poet goes on to mention death,

illic est cuicumque rapax Mors venit amanti,
et gerit insigni myrtea sarta coma.
65-6.

Tibullus' vision of his arrival in Elysium escorted by Venus is therefore in a sense darkened by the idea that most people are brought there by "rapax Mors". This in fact reflects the reference to death in the first Epibaterion (11.4-8, 53-6) which were far more prominent. Another factor which makes the divine intervention of the third Epibaterion (1.90) seem more joyous than that of the second (11.57-8) is the use of the verb: Venus is merely going to lead the poet. The verb "ducet" is evocative of the sedate dignity appropriate to the goddess; but at 1.90 "caelo missus" is expressive of far more vigour and enthusiasm.

B6b.

The topos of divine prediction of the arrival also serves to illustrate a gradual change of tone throughout the three Epibateria. It can be found (as was the case with B1c and B3) only in the first Epibaterion,

illa sacras pueri sortes ter sustulit: illi
rettulit e trinis omina certa puer.
cuncta dabant reditus....

11-13,

aut ego sum causatus aves aut omina dira
Saturnive sacram me tenuisse diem.
o quotiens ingressus iter mihi trista dixi
offensum in porta signa dedisse pedem!
17-20.

It is possible to see a subtle pattern once these lines have been isolated as examples of B6b. 11.11-13 deal with real omens which augur well but turn out to be untrue; 11.17-20 deal with made-up omens which augur badly but turn out to be true. Both sides of this symmetrical balance are in a sense unfortunate for Tibullus and are linked with his despair at being in Phaeacia. Such evocations of despair by means of B6b are then absent in the second and third Epibateria.

A schema of references will illustrate the arguments used above:-

| EP: | 1-56 | 57-82 | 83-94 |
|-------|-------------|------------|-------|
| (B)1a | 1.3 | 60-2 | |
| 1b | | 67-82 | |
| 1c | 35-48 | | |
| 3 | 5-10 | | |
| 4 | | | 85-90 |
| 6a | | 57-8, 65 | 90 |
| 6b | 11-3, 17-20 | | |
| 9 | | 69, 71, 76 | |

The only other topoi occurring in I 3 are that of prayer (B5) and the death wish (B10a) but they do not seem to be easily assimilable into the trend argued here.

It is also enlightening to make use of a method that has been applied to Tibullan poetry by O. Skutsch.¹⁷ He has investigated the occurrence of "datria", which is the sequence of a dactylic, trochaic and iambic word to constitute the second half of the pentameter. He has found that in elegy I 3, the first 29 couplets contain 8 examples of datria (27.6%), the remaining 18 couplets containing 14 examples (77%). He concludes from this and other examples that the more datria was used, the more "smooth, relaxed and pleasing" is the poetry. We can in fact test the three Epibateria here assigned for their respective quantities of datria:

Ep.1 (11.1-56=28 couplets): 7 datria (25%).

Ep.2 (11.57-82=13 "): 10 " (76.92%).

Ep.3 (11.83-94=6 "): 4 " (66.67%).

If we follow Skutsch's interpretation of this, as seems fair to do, then the results here given would seem to support the change of tone discussed above: the first Epibaterion has little datria and is the least pleasant and relaxed of the three; the second is more happy and optimistic and shows a very high percentage of datria; the third Epibaterion in fact shows less datria than the second, and perhaps this is because although being joyful in tone, it is not at all "relaxed" but

17. O. Skutsch "A note on the Tibullan pentameter" (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies no.19 (1972)).

rather very excited. However the third Epibaterion is too short for a fair assessment.

Another factor which might indicate the gradual change of mood during I 3 is the fact that the second and third Epibateria concern arrivals which have not yet occurred, but are only envisaged. Cairns¹⁸ has discussed genres set in the future with reference to Horace Odes III 13, "Horace liked this particular device of substituting future for present because it introduced an air of anticipation and excitement into examples of common genres." The same seems to be true here: this air of anticipation is especially suitable for the optimistic tone of the second and third Epibateria in elegy I 3. The first Epibaterion is pessimistic and is consequently not set in the future.

Now that this interpretation of I 3 has been made in the light of topoi used, metrical features and the concept of future Epibateria, a few final remarks may be made on the basis of observations made by Cairns.¹⁹ He links the concept of the Golden Age with that of Elysium, and this would in fact form a connection between the first and second of the Epibateria assigned here. Another feature linking these two Epibateria is the dominant theme of death throughout both, which has also been noted by Cairns. Finally he observes that Tibullus has linked separate verse paragraphs by using a similar idea on each side of the division between them at 11.81-2 where we read

18. F.Cairns "Horace Odes III,13 and III,23" (*L'Antiquité Classique* vol.XLVI (1977)) p.524.

19. F.Cairns (1979) pp.46ff.,171,175,193.

of a man who violates the poet's love, and 11.83-4 where Tibullus speaks of Delia's faithfulness. This not only serves to link separate verse paragraphs, but acts as a suitable bridge between the second and third Epibateria. Cairns says that the final description of Tibullus' arrival home (11.83-94) is "probably also epibateric". As will be clear from the above discussion, this passage is here regarded as an entirely separate Epibaterion, as are 11.1-56 and 57-82 also; furthermore it is only through an awareness of the generic ramifications of this tripartite structure that a true understanding of the elegy can be achieved.

CHAPTER 4. THE PLACE OF ARRIVAL (Bla).

This chapter is concerned with the topos "praise of the place of arrival" (Bla) which, in inverse Epibateria, becomes vituperation of the place. The discussion begins with one form that the topos can take in the inverse genre, that is mention of the ruggedness or rockiness of the place.

Rockiness is frequently found in ancient poetic arrival descriptions as an attribute of an uncongenial place of arrival. Prometheus in Aesch.P.V. finds himself bound to the rocky crag, and the ruggedness of the terrain is highly suitable to the tone of the passages concerned with his arrival and plight there,

(ΚΡΑΤΟΣ): ...τόνδε πρὸς πέτραις
ὕψηλοκρήμνοις τὸν λεωργὸν ὀχμάσαι
4-5

(ΠΡ): ...ἑσίδεσθ' οἴψ' δεσμῶ
προσπορπατὸς τῆσδε φάραγγος
σκοπέλοις ἐν ἄκροις
φρουρὰν ἄζηλον ὀχήσω.
141-4.

Cairns (G.C. p.61) has described how a storm at sea can be regarded as a kind of arrival when described in ancient poetry, because "the same vocabulary could be used of being severely damaged by a storm at sea, but not sunk, and of being cast up shipwrecked on land." The passage being discussed is the description of Odysseus in a seastorm at Hom. Od.V 299-312, and Cairns describes this as an Epibaterion. The storm however continues, and at 411-2 Odysseus laments, using the idea of rockiness,

ἔκτισθεν μὲν γὰρ πάγοι ὀξέες, ἀμφὶ δὲ κύμα
βέβρυχεν ῥοθιον, λισσὴ δ' ἀναδέδρομε πέτρη...

Latin inverse Epibateria also make use of the theme, eg. during Plaut. Rud. 185-219 (the speech of Palaestra discussed in ch.2) where we read

hic saxa sunt, hic mare sonat...
206

Again, ruggedness seems highly appropriate to the general tone of the piece. Many more Epibateria use the motif, both in Greek and Latin poetry.¹

Not all references to rocks in Epibateria are straightforward however, and some seem almost to constitute deliberate variations on the theme. Virg. Aen.I 81-143 is the description of the seastorm which brought Aeneas and his crew to Africa. It may be regarded as Epibateric for the same reason as was Hom. Od.V 299-312 (see above). At one point in the description a remarkably idiomatic phrase is used,

...insequitur cumulo praeruptus aquae mons.
105

The line itself is unusual in having a monosyllabic final word, and this throws the line into heterodyne, even in the last foot. More important however is the phrase "aquae mons", which Macrobius² found to be a notable usage: "et illa quam pulchra sunt: "aquae mons"..."

A similar Epibaterion, again a description of people enduring a storm at sea, can be found at Ov. Met.XI 478-572. The hero in trouble here is Ceyx, the king of Trachis. Again

1. eg. Hom.Od. IX 30; Soph.Phil.272; Nonn.XLVII 336; A.P.VII 273.1;286.3;700.1-2;Prop.III 7.61;Hor.Odes III 27.61-2.
2. Macr.Sat.VI 6.7.

the analogy of sea and mountain can be found,

ipsa quoque his agitur vicibus Trachinia puppis,
et nunc sublimis veluti de vertice montis
despicere in valles imumque Acheronta videtur.

502-4

and later on in the same Epibaterion another variation of this simile occurs,

....spoliisque animosa superstes
unda, velu victrix, sinuataque despicit undas
nec levius, quam siquis Athon Pindumve revulsos
sede sua totos in apertum everterit aequor,
praecipitata cadit, pariterque at pondere et ictu
mergit in ima ratem....

552-7.

These two Ovidian passages clearly balance each other verbally (imum / ima; de vertice montis / Athon Pindumve; despiciere / despicit). But with regard to the topos of ruggedness they seem to take the variation upon the motif even further than Virgil's "aquae mons": in 502-4 the ship is said to be riding on the crest of a wave which is like a mountain peak; at 552-7 the waves are said to be as turbulent as if two mountains had been physically cast into the sea.

Other Epibateric storm descriptions in Latin use the analogy of wave-mountain, for example Ov. Tr.I 2 where the poet describes the storm which blew up on his way into exile,

me miserum, quanti montes volvuntur aquarum.

19

and again at Tr.I 4.7-8

monte nec inferior prorae puppique recurvae
insilit et pictos verberat unda deos.

Book V of Lucan contains a famous storm description in which Caesar is attempting to make the crossing from Greece to Italy.

At 638-40 we read

quantum Leucadio placidus de vertice pontus
despicitur, tantum nautae videre trementes
fluctibus e summis praeceps mare...

The language used here seems to suggest that one model which has been used is Ov. Met. XI 503-4 quoted above.

The same metaphor can be found in Greek Epibateria dealing with seastorms, eg. Hom. Od. III 286-92³ which tells of Menelaus' plight on his voyage home from Troy,

κύματα τε τροφόμεντα κελώρια, ἴσα ὄρεσσιν.
290.

Apollonius Rhodius also compares sea to the mountain in his description of the turmoil as the Argo attempts to pass the Symplegades,

καί σφισιν ἀπροφάτως ἀνέδου μέγα κύμα πάροιθεν
κυρτόν, ἀποτμήγι σκοπιῇ ἴσον...
II 580-1.

It would be possible simply to regard these passages as containing interesting metaphors and poetic language. However in the light of the common use of the rockiness topos in inverse Epibateria, we can say that these examples could be attempts at sophistication of the normal topical tradition.

As will be shown again and again in these chapters, a sophisticated form of a topos is usually "supported" by occurrences of the same topos in direct form. The two analogies of wave to rock in Ov. Met. XI can be said to support one another since both occur in the same Epibaterion (Met. XI 478-572). The allusion at Ovid Met. XI 503 (veluti de vertice montis) may in fact be supported in the previous line, by the

3. See ch. 8 and also my paper "Word play between θέω/θεός and θεός in Homer" (Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar '83). A copy of this paper is appended to this thesis.

close proximity of the word "Trachinia". τραχύς means "rugged" and is an appropriate idea to juxtapose with the sea-mountain simile. In actual fact the adjective τραχύς is itself used in many inverse Greek Epibateria to convey the motif of rock which is so common in topos Bla.⁴

The vituperative quality of the subtle mention of rocks at Hom.Od.III 290 is perhaps foreshadowed by the bitterly descriptive phrase earlier in the same Epibaterion:

...στυγερὴν ὄδον (288).

Rocks are constantly mentioned in the Apollonian Epibaterion (11.550,553,558,564-5,568-9,571,574-5,577,587,595-6,598,601,604-6). The allusive reference to the waves as mountains occurs in the middle of these direct references (11.580-1) and furthermore is almost exactly half-way through the Epibaterion itself which runs from 11.549-610.

It seems therefore possible that these examples of poetic analogy may constitute a sophisticated form of the rock motif used so frequently in Greek and Latin Epibateria. If this is so, then perhaps R.G.Austin⁵ is unfair to criticise its occurrence at Ov.Tr.I 2.19 (quoted above) on the grounds that it is bland in comparison with Aen.I 105. Both may in fact be more subtly devised than has hitherto been recognised. But perhaps the most interesting case is Met.XI where Ovid seems first of all (502-4) to be illustrating the wave-mountain analogy in its normal form, but later (552-7) he envisages

4. eg. Hom.Od.XIII 242; Ap.Rh.II 550,568; A.P.VII 271.3;382.1; 651.1;665.7;XIII 12.6.

5. R.G.Austin (1971) ad loc. s.v. Aen.I 105.

mountains actually being cast into the water, as a further development of the theme.

The storm at Virg. Aen. I 81-143 has been treated above as an Epibaterion. There is however a much more obvious passage of arrival poetry immediately subsequent to this, at 157-79. This tells of the arrival of Aeneas and his crew on the coast of Africa, worn out by the storm. It is well known that in this passage Virgil combines description of pleasant local features with that of the more hostile and menacing aspects of the environment. The effect of the latter is enhanced by the frequent mention of rocks (162-3 *vastae rupes geminique.../... scopuli*; 166 *scopulis pendentibus*; 167 *vivoque... saxo*; 174 *silici*; 179 *saxo*). All these references convey the idea that the terrain is rugged and possibly harsh. The reference to flint in 174 serves primarily to account for the fire which the crew light,

ac primum silici scintillam excudit Achates

but it is also evocative of the kind of place in which the crew find themselves. Virgil however may be doing more than this in this line: Servius⁶ notes

ACHATES] adlusit ad nomen, nam achates species lapidis est: bene ergo ipsum dicit ignem excuisse. unde etiam Achaten eius comitem dixit. lectum est enim in naturali historia Plinii, quod si quis hunc lapidem in anulo habuerit, gratiosior est.

Servius elsewhere gives the possible derivation of "Achates"

6. Servius ad loc. s.v. Virg. Aen. I 174.

from ἄχος,⁷ but the occurrence of the name at 174 is very appropriate, being the name of a stone. Servius' observation enables us to see the reference to Achates at this point as an important device in conveying the idea of the place itself: Virgil is reinforcing, by subtle means, our impression of how hard and rugged the coastline is. Furthermore, the effect of this would be felt all the more if we were intended to recognise the idea of rockiness as a common topos in the ancient arrival situation.

Another word which is of interest, and which can be found in the Epibaterion in Apollonius II, is ὀκρυόεις. He describes how the crew breathed a sigh of relief after surviving the terrors of the clashing rocks,

οἱ δὲ που ὀκρυόεντος ἀνέπνεον ἔρτι φόβοιο...
607.

There seems to have been confusion in ancient times between ὀκρυόεις (=κρυόεις "cold") and ὄκρις ("rock").⁸ What seems to have happened is that a new form ὀκριόεις (rocky) was formed from ὄκρις, and that because of its similar sound an "o" was sometimes prefixed to κρυόεις. Chantraine⁹ says concerning the new ὀκρυόεις "il est possible que ὀκριόεις ait aidé à la création de la forme nouvelle."

There does certainly seem to have been a definite link felt between the forms ὀκρυόεις and ὀκριόεις, almost to the extent of imputing an idea of rockiness to ὀκρυόεις which simply

7. s.v. Aen. I 312.

8. H. Stephanus (1841) s.v. ὀκρία.

9. P. Chantraine (1974) s.v. ὀκρυόεις.

means "cold". This is probably because, as noted above, *ὄκρυόεις* was phonetically developed on the basis of the parallel formation of *ὄκριόεις*.

The only other certain use of *ὄκρυόεις* in Apollonius is at II 737, where the icy cave of Hades is described,

...αὐτῆ,
πηγυλῖς, ὄκρυόεντος ἀναπνεύουσα μυχοῖο
συνεχές, ἀργινδέεσσαν ἀεὶ περιτέτροφε πάχνην.
736-8.

The rocks of the cave and its environs are mentioned several times shortly before this (II.729,730-1,736). So it may be that as well as meaning simply "chilly", *ὄκρυόεντος* here also has connotations of ruggedness appropriate to the terrain being described.

If we return to the passage dealing with the clashing rocks, the phrase *ὄκρυόεντος...φόβοιο* (607) may well have overtones of rockiness (through its pseudo-connection with *ὄκριόεις*). This is made all the more likely by the abundant direct references to rocks in the passage (see above). If the topos of rocks were expected and recognised as belonging to the generic arrival tradition, these connotations would be felt all the more strongly.

Ov.Her.X is an Epibateric speech delivered by Ariadne who finds herself deserted on Naxos. At 48-50 she says,

qualis ab Ogygio concita Baccha deo
aut mare prospiciens in saxo frigida sedi,
quamque lapis sedes, tam lapis ipse fui.

The equation of the condition of the arriver with the condition of the place is common in Epibateria, and has been mentioned in

ch.2: examples can be found at A.P.VII 404 (Zonas of Sardis) and VII 496 (Simonides); in these epigrams the arriver (a corpse) and the place of arrival are both cold (see Appendix A for an account of how funerary poetry (Epikedia) can also be Epibateric). At Plaut.Rud. 205 Palaestra complains that she is "sola solis locis", again comparing her own condition with that of the place.

What Ovid may be doing in Her.X is adapting the common topos of rockiness to express Ariadne's similar condition: she is like a rock. One source for Her.X seems to have been Cat.LXIV,¹⁰ part of which again is an Epibaterion concerned with Ariadne on Naxos. Catullus says at 60-1,

quem procul ex alga maestis Minois ocellis
saxea ut effigies bacchantis, prospicit...

The topical idea of stoniness is again conveyed in "saxea" and we know from elsewhere in the poem that Naxos was rugged (126 praeruptos...montes). However this description of Ariadne seems to be more of a poetic ἔκφρασις than an attempt to allude to rockiness.

In both the Catullan and the Ovidian Epibateria the idea of coldness is conveyed (Cat.LXIV 131 frigidulos...singultus; Ov.Her.X 32 frigidior glacie...fui, 49 frigida). In Ovid it is because Ariadne is cold that she is like a stone (Her.X 49-50). Here therefore we see employed the well known association of frigidus/rigidus¹¹ and Ovid succeeds in combining effectively

10. cf. A.Palmer (1898) p.373; H.Jakobson (1974) p.213ff.

11. A.Walde (1910) s.v. rigeo; A.Ernout and A.Meillet (1939) s.v. rigeo.

the motif of rockiness with that of coldness.

To return to the more generalised forms of praise or hostility associated with topos Bla, a possibly interesting form occurs in the Epibaterion at Hom.Od.X 135-43. Here Odysseus relates to the Phaeacians his arrival in the land of Circe. The actual arrival is described in ll.140-1,

ἔνθα δ' ἐπ' ἄκτῆς νηὶ κατηγαγόμεσθα σιωπῆ
ναύλοχον ἐς λιμένα...

ναύλοχος here means "giving safe harbourage" but the derivation from the verb ναυλοχέω, which can mean "to lie in wait for" or "to ambush", must be remembered. The adjective is used only once elsewhere in Homer, to describe the ambush laid by the suitors for Telemachus,

...λιμένες δ' ἔνι ναύλοχοι αὐτῆ
ἀμφίδυμοι τῆ τόν γε μένον λοχόωντες ἄχαιοί.
Od.IV 846-7.

Again ναύλοχοι is ostensibly innocent in tone, but its close proximity to the related word λοχόωντες lends menacing overtones to it. Homer is clearly exploiting both senses of ναύλοχοι here, and the ugly connotations of the word are probably intended to be felt at X 141 also. Such connotations would be felt all the more strongly if the reader were aware of the topical nature of hostility towards the place of arrival in the inverse arrival situation.

It has sometimes been found that an Epibateric sophistication concerns more than one topos. In cases such as this, the sophistication has been discussed in the chapter concerning the topos which is most prominent in the

sophistication. However the use of "sinister" and "laevus" in Ovid Tr. and E.P. constitutes a possible sophistication of both Bla and B6b, and both of these topoi are equally concerned. I have nevertheless chosen to discuss this issue here rather than in ch 8. Consequently any references to omens etc. in Tr. and E.P. which should, strictly speaking, be dealt with in the latter chapter, will be treated here.

It has been noted that Ovid in Tr. and E.P. occasionally indulges in word play on the adjectives meaning "left".¹² "Sinister" and "laevus" also share the meaning "ill-omened" and Ovid exploited the double meaning when describing his exile on the left hand side of the Black Sea. There are six occasions in the Epibateria in Tr. and E.P. where the ambiguity is used,

- (i) obligor, ut tangam laevi fera litora Ponti;
Tr.I 2.83
- (ii) hactenus Euxini pars est Romana sinistri.
Tr.II 197
- (iii) dum miser Euxini litora laeva peto.
Tr.IV 1.60
- (iv) vita procul patria peragenda sub axe Boreo,
qua maris Euxini terra sinistra iacet.
Tr.IV 8.41-2
- (v) quem tenet Euxini mendax cognomine litus,
et Scythici vere terra sinistra freti.
Tr.V 10.13-14
- (vi) iunctior Haemonia est Ponto, quam Roma, Sinistro.
E.P.I 4.31.

The etymology of εὐξεινος (Euxine) is well known as being a euphemism for ἄξεινος, and example (v) above illustrates this

12. cf. J.T.Bakker (1946) ad loc s.v. Tr.V 10.14; A.L.Wheeler (1924) Introduction p.xxvii.

well. By incorporating a pun on the fact that he inhabits the left-hand (ie. ill-omened) side of the Black Sea, Ovid succeeds in emphasising his hostility towards the place. It is therefore a subtle way of stressing a particular attitude. Furthermore, it utilises known topoi of the Epibaterion: first, the attitude of hostility as a whole is a topical feature (Bla) of the inverse genre; secondly, punning on "sinistra/laeva" is evocative of the topical idea of divine prediction (B6b), in that the place is "ill-starred" for the poet.

If the passages quoted above are regarded as being allusive topical occurrences, then they may be found to be supported in their respective Epibateria by more direct occurrences of the relevant topoi. Straightforward examples of Bla (Ovid's hostility towards Tomis and its environs) are too numerous to list; B6b occurs in direct form several times in the Epibateria where the "sinistra/laeva" word play is found.¹³

The final possible allusion to topos Bla to be discussed in this chapter is found in the Epibaterion at Claudian "De Bello Gildonico" I 504-26. Here the poet tells of the arrival in Sardinia of the fleet from Italy on its way to put down the rebellion of Gildo in North Africa (397/8 A.D.). At the end of the Epibaterion the whole fleet under Mascezel has put in at Caralis (mod. Cagliari, in Southern Sardinia). The poet has already described how they avoided the dangers of Corsica and

13. Tr. I 2.4-12, 15-6, 27-30, 107-10; IV 8.15-6, 31-2, 45-50; V 10.45-6; E.P. I 4.40, 44.

the rocky Northern half of Sardinia. He says that before converging on Caralis in the South, the fleet split in two:

pars adit antiqua ductos Carthagine Sulcos;
partem litoreo complectitur Olbia muro.

518-9.

What is strange here is that Olbia (mod. Terranova) lies in N.E. Sardinia, Sulci (mod. S.Antioco) in the S.W., West of Caralis. Either then the whole fleet sailed down the Eastern coastline and the part that had sailed on to Sulci had to return the long distance to Caralis, which seems absurd, or else the two halves of the fleet sailed down either side of the island, which again appears pointless. Gibbon¹⁴ assumes the former of these alternatives to be true, but Claudian is far from clear. What makes the issue even more confused is that Claudian has already vituperated Northern Sardinia in 11.511-5 for its rocks, storms and pestilential winds. He says that the ships avoided this area and gave it a wide berth,

quos ubi luctatis procul effugere carinis,
516.

In the next breath he tells how part of the fleet put in at Olbia, which is itself in Northern Sardinia! Our conclusion must, I feel, be that Claudian really had no idea of the geography of the island. None of the other sources dealing with this event mentions either Olbia or Sulci.¹⁵ So why does Claudian?

We know that Claudian had a full knowledge of Greek and may even have been a native speaker. I believe that he is here

14. "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" ch.29.

15. Other accounts are at Orosius VII 36; Zosimus V 11.

sacrificing geographical and historical accuracy for the sake of a sophistication of the Epibateric topos Bla. "Sulci" means in Latin "furrows" and "Olbia" (ὄλβιος) "blessed". The Greek adjective ὄλβιος combines the idea of material wealth with connotations of happiness and blessedness;¹⁶ in this respect it is cognate with the Latin "dives". Taken in conjunction with the significant name "Sulci" the idea that is conveyed is that of prosperous fertility: this is the exact quality that Claudian attributes to Sardinia as a whole,

dives ager frugum....
509.

This line is itself spoken in praise of the island, and constitutes Bla in its normal form; I believe that "dives" is reflected later in "Olbia", "ager frugum" in "Sulci" and that the reference to the two ports therefore implicitly enhances the topical description of Sardinia. For the association between prosperity and fertility, and more specifically between the soil and ὄλβος, we may compare the opening line of Hom. Ep.VII (Vit. Herod. 249),

πότνια γῆ, πάνδωρε δότειρα μελίφρονος ὄλβου...

We know that Claudian's geographical knowledge could at times be poor, even when dealing with recent events. Cameron¹⁷ observes that he makes a bad error concerning the distance of the Elbe from the Rhine at Stil.I 225f.; and that he wrongly states that the Cherusci live by the former river, at IV Cons.

16. cf. Hdt. VIII 75; Pind. Nem. 9.6, Ol. 13.4; Eur. Bacc. 419. (For the latter cf. J. Roux (1972) ad loc.).

17. A. Cameron (1970) p. 346f. Also W. Barr (1981) s.v. 1.452; J. M. Gesner (1969) s.v. Stil. I 226.

Hon. 425. Loyen and Cameron¹⁸ say that in this latter case Claudian is misled by Tacitus, and indeed Claudian is usually very dependent on other sources for his geographical facts. In the case of Sardinia he seems to be mainly reliant on Pausanias.

Pausanias speaks of the foundation of Caralis and Sulci by the Carthaginians,¹⁹ a detail which Claudian also mentions (1.518 quoted above and 520-1). Claudian also speaks of rockiness, bad anchorage and pestilence which are also mentioned in Pausanias,²⁰ as well as the prosperity of the Southern part of the island.²¹

The only Sardinian towns that Pausanias in fact mentions are Olbia, Sulci, Caralis, Nora and Ogryle (mod. Osidda). The latter two are in fact inland, so Claudian has taken all that he can, and no more, from Pausanias. Olechowska argues for Claudian's debt in this passage to Virgil, Lucan and Silius Italicus.²² Strabo, Mela, Cicero, Martial and Tacitus also mention some of the features of the island present in Claudian.²³ Claudian appears therefore to be quite heavily reliant upon other literary sources for his geographical learning.

18. A.Loyen "L'Albis chez Claudien et chez Sidoine Apollinaire" (*Revue des Études Latines* vol.11 (1933)). A.Cameron (1970) p.346.

19. Paus.X 17.9.

20. Paus.X 17.10.

21. Paus.VII 17.3 and X 17.1.

22. E.M.Olechowska (1974) p.203. Cf. R.T.Bruère (1964) p.252f. and notes.

23. Strabo V 2.7; Mela II 123; Cic. ad Q.F. II 3.7; Mart.IV 60.6; Tac.Ann.II 85.

Crees²⁴ makes the following comment on Claudian's geographical learning, "In such a case [sc. dealing with events in Asia] Claudian seems to give himself more license. He follows in the track of older poets, and seeks rather to display his learning by as many proper names as possible. Britain, Africa, and Asia Minor, give him opportunities for such encyclopaedic displays."

The place names used in the account of the arrival in Sardinia are not encyclopaedic, but they are I believe inaccurate. Claudian has used passages from his predecessors in order to select his own cities for the fleet's landing. By this means he has contrived a sophistication of an Epibateric topos. Gesner²⁵ notes for Claudian's use of "Olbia", "Ὀλβία, beata, ominis causa." Claudian seems however to be doing far more than selecting a placename "of good omen". He has deliberately chosen the names Olbia and Sulci from the literature about Sardinia in order to reiterate in a highly sophisticated manner the concept of fertility and prosperity stated more openly in l.509: "dives ager frugum".

24. J.H.E.Crees (1908) p.188 n.1.

25. J.M.Gesner (1969) ad loc. s.v. B.G.I 519.

CHAPTER 5. PRAISE OF THE PERSON MET ON ARRIVAL (B2) AND
LONGING FOR HOME (B3).

Examples of the topos "praise of the person met on arrival" are few in number amongst surviving Epibateria because of the usual absence of an addressee in the genre. Examples can however be found in the listing in the Introduction. The apparent sophistications of the topos that are to be dealt with in this chapter all occur in Hom.Od.VI and concern Odysseus' praise of Nausicaa.

The Epibateric speech of Odysseus to Nausicaa in Book VI runs from ll.149-85 and it is obviously full of flattery. The points that will be raised below are all intended to show that this flattery (and hence this usage of topos B2) is more subtle and powerful than it might at first sight appear. Odysseus' first words are

Γουνοῦμαι σε, ἄνασσα· θεός νύ τις ἢ βροτός ἐσσι;
εἰ μὲν τις θεός ἐσσι, τοῖ οὐρανὸν εὐρύν ἔχουσι,
Ἄρτεμιδι σε ἐγὼ γε, Διὸς κούρη μέγαλοιο,
εἰδὸς τε μέγεθός τε φυήν τ' ἄγχιστα εἶσκω.
149-52.

He addresses her as ἄνασσα twice: here and further on in the same Epibaterion at l.175. Stanford¹ has noted that elsewhere the epithet is only used of the goddesses Athene and Demeter. He observes "[here] it is probably intended as high flattery."

The eulogy continues into the simile comparing Nausicaa to Artemis. With this we should compare a parallel simile that has gone before. At VI 102-8 the poet observes,

1. W.B.Stanford (1948) ad loc. s.v. Od.VI 149.

οἴη δ' ἄρτεμις εἶσι κατ' οὔρεα ἰοχέαιρα,
 ἢ κατὰ Τηύγετον περιμήκετον ἢ Ἐρύμανθον,
 τερπομένη κάπροισι καὶ ὠκείης ἐλάφοισι
 τῇ δέ θ' ἅμα νύμφαι, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,
 ἄγρονόμοι παίζουσι-γέγηθε δέ τε φρένα Λητώ-
 πασῶν δ' ὑπὲρ ἣ γε κάρη ἔχει ἠδὲ μέτωπα,
 ῥεῖα τ' ἀριγνώτη πέλεται, καλαὶ δέ τε πασαι·
 ὥς ἢ γ' ἀμφιπόλοισι μετέπρεπε παρθένος ἀδμῆς.

Moulton² draws attention to the link between the two similes, "at 6.102 one of the poem's longest comparisons likens Nausikaa, as she plays ball with her maids on the beach, to Artemis leading the sport of the nymphs....the princess is soon to be charmed by Odysseus' elegant and tactful greeting. In almost an echo of the poet himself, he likens her to Artemis (150-152)....The echo is lightly ironic in a sophisticated way: Odysseus, apparently so wild and desperate, possesses the resilience and tact to describe Nausikaa to her face exactly as she is independently described by the singer. It is not for nothing that Alkinoos and Eumaeus will call him *δοιδός* (11.368,17.518)."

Moulton provides examples of several pairs of similes in Homer,³ but there are only two other pairs in which one simile is given by the poet, the other by one of the characters:

(i) At 11.XIII 39-40 the Trojans are said to be following Hector *φλογὶ ἴσοι...ἠὲ θυέλλη*. Soon afterwards, Poseidon rouses the two Aiantes by saying that Hector is on his way *φλογὶ εἴκελος* (1.53). The repetition here merely serves to emphasise the fury of the Trojan attack.

2. C.Moulton (1977) p.120f.
 3. C.Moulton (1977) chs. 1A,4B.

(ii) Odysseus tells the Phaeacians at Od.X 416-7 that when he left Circe's palace and returned to his crew on the ship they were delighted to see him,

...ὡς εἰ πατρίδ' ἰκοίατο καὶ πόλιν αὐτὴν
τρηχεΐης Ἰθάκης...

He then says that they greeted him by saying

σοὶ μὲν νοστήσαντι, διοτρεφές, ὡς ἐχάρημεν,
ὡς εἴ τ' εἰς Ἰθάκην ἀφικοίμεθα πατρίδα γαῖαν.
419-20.

The repetition of the simile here highlights not only the crew's joy, but also the tragic irony of the actual idea of the simile, for the crew are destined to die before reaching home.

Such pairs of similes as these then, with one member being voiced by the poet, the other by a character, are extremely rare. The reiteration by Odysseus of the Artemis simile at VI 151-2 of course emphasises Nausicaa's beauty, but it also highlights the inherent praise (B2) given by Odysseus: we already know as an actual fact, from 11.102-8, that the maiden did really look like Artemis; Odysseus' subsequent statement to this effect makes his flattery all the more powerful and convincing.

As regards the topos of longing for one's homeland, examples of it can be traced throughout antiquity in the genre Epibaterion. However, most occurrences of it are fairly straightforward, both in the speech and the narration of arrival. As was the case with B2, the only possible sophistication of this topos is Homeric.

The long Epibaterion at Od.XIII 187-360 concerns Odysseus'

final arrival in Ithaca. The crossreference listing in the Introduction shows this passage to consist of a repeated alternation between speech and narrative (column 2). It is also indicated (column 1) that as an Epibaterion the passage begins in inverse form and becomes non-inverse later on. Odysseus in fact initially fails to recognise the land as being his homeland, and for a while cannot even be convinced by Athene.

As would be expected for the topos expressing the arriver's yearning for his home, B3 occurs in the earlier, inverse section of the Epibaterion: Odysseus laments,

...αἴθ' ὄφελ' μείναι παρὰ Φαιήκεσσι
 αὐτοῦ· ἐγὼ δέ κεν ἄλλον ὑπερμενέων βασιλῆων
 ἐξικόμην, ὅς κέν μ' ἐφίλει καὶ ἔπεμπε νέεσθαι.
 204-6.

and, referring to the Phaeacian crew who brought him,

οἳ μ' εἰς ἄλλην γαῖαν ἀπήγαγον, ἣ τὲ μ' ἔφαντο
 ἄξειν εἰς Ἰθάκην εὐδοσίεalon, οὐδ' ἐτέλεσαν.
 211-2.

The poet then tells us that Odysseus broke down and wept,

...ὁ δ' ὀδύρετο πατρίδα γαῖαν.
 219.

Odysseus is of course already, unwittingly, in Ithaca. The irony of the situation is obvious, and the hero's heartfelt wishes to be back home are both poignant and slightly humorous. Longing for one's homeland is therefore displayed in an inappropriate context; in fact, this occurrence of lamenting a lost homeland when already in that homeland seems to be unique in ancient Epibateria. It is of course clearly ironic that Odysseus should speak in this way, but we may perhaps also see here a highly effective twist to a well known topos.

CHAPTER 6. SLEEP AND WEARINESS (B4).

References to the weariness of the arriver can frequently be found in Epibateria of all periods. Sometimes variations on the more direct statements of sleepiness occur, and these generally fall into two categories. First, mention can be made that someone else is not weary, the implication being that the arriver by contrast is himself tired.¹ Alternatively, the weariness of another party can be referred to and in this case also the implication is the same.²

I begin the discussion of apparently sophisticated cases of the sleep topos by citing what, in topical terms, can be said to amount to a conflation of two topoi. Such conflation (and consequent Brachylogia) has been mentioned in ch.3 with regard to the prayer of Europa at Hor. Odes III 27.50-6. A similar conflation which is used more than once combines the topos of sleep with that of the death wish (B10a) in the notion of the "sleep of death". Euripides' Hippolytus, during his death-speech, exclaims,

...ἀμφιτόμου λόγχας ἔραμαι,
διαμοιρᾶσαι
διὰ τ'εὐνάσαι τὸν ἐμὸν βίον.
Hipp. 1375-7

and later reiterates the same wish,

...εἴθε με κοι-
μάσειε τὸν δυσδαίμον' "Αι-
δου μέλαινα νύκτερος τ'ἀνάγκη.
1386-8.

-
1. eg.Hom.Od.XII 279-93; Aesch.P.V.137-41; A.P.VII 278.2; Eur. Alc.938.
 2. eg.Ap.Rh.I 1174; Lucan V 620-2; Stat.Theb.I 330-2,339-41.

In both passages the language used to express the death wish is also evocative of sleep. For 1.1377, Barrett³ rightly notes that the term δία-εὐνάω is "a remarkable compound", and this is made more conspicuous by the tmesis. κοιμάω also has connotations of sleep, as does κοιμίζω which is the reading of MSS. A and V. In these cases, therefore, it could be said that topos B10a is obviously present but that B4 is only present by sophistication, that is by implication.

The verb εὐνάω is in fact used in the sense of "to lull into the sleep of death" in two other Greek Epibateria. A.P.VII 397 (Erycius of Thessaly) is an Epikedion/Epibaterion⁴ concerned with the death at sea of a man named Satyrus. In the second line, the sailor's weariness seems to be implied in the term εϋνηται, which ostensibly refers simply to his death,

οὐχ ὄδε δειλαίου Σατύρου τάφος, οὐδ' ὑπὸ ταύτη
 ὡς λόγος, εϋνηται πυρκαϊῆ Σάτυρος.
 1-2.

Such an implication could only be meaningful if topos B4 were actually expected here. A similar though perhaps more subtle allusion to the topos may be found at A.P.VII 278.7-8 (Archias of Byzantium) where again a form of εὐνάω is used, this time with reference to the death at sea of Theris,

μόχθων οὐδ' Ἄϊδος με κατεύνασεν, ἠνίκα μούνος
 οὐδὲ θανῶν λείη κέκλιμαι ἡσυχίῃ.

Here, even though as in the above passages the idea of death is conflated with an implicit B4, it seems as though death is not the same as sleep: Theris has been killed, but he still cannot

3. W.S.Barrett (1964) ad loc.

4. See Appendix A for this issue.

find rest. Topically speaking, this is quite complex, since the verb used to refer to the sailor's death implies a form of the sleep topos which is itself negated. This reversal of B4 is supported in 11.1-2 where Theris says that he cannot forget the sleepless waves of the sea, even though he is dead,

οὐδὲ νέκυς, ναυηγὸς ἐπὶ χθόνα θῆρις ἔλασθεὶς
κύμασιν, ἀγρύπνων λήσομαι ἠϊόνων.

The waves are sleepless, and by the convention mentioned at the beginning of this chapter it is therefore implied that, by contrast, Theris himself longs for rest.

The remaining allusions to topos B4 which are to be discussed here all occur in the two Epibateria in Virg.Aen.I; these deal respectively with the Trojans' plight in the seastorm and with their arrival in Africa. During the storm, the poet relates how the ships began to labour and concludes by saying,

accipiunt inimicum imbrem rimisque fatiscunt.
I123.

Ostensibly "fatisco" here means to "crack" or "gape open". However, as Sidgwick⁵ has observed, there seems intended here also a secondary meaning, that is to "fail" or "faint". Such connotations would of course be appropriate to the topos at issue here. Other uses of "fatisco" in Virgil all seem simply to convey the idea of "cracking";⁶ however the notion of a ship in a storm being weary was a common one in Latin poetry.⁷ I

5. A.Sidgwick (1883) ad loc.

6. Virg.Aen.IX 809; Georg.I 180; II 249.

7. cf. Ov.Met.VI 519; XI 393; A.A.III 748; R.A.811; Tr.I 10.20; Virg.Aen.V 29, and esp. (in an Epibaterion) Ov.Met.XI 531-32.

believe that in the Epibaterion which follows the storm scene (ie. I 157-79) Virgil is showing the greatest ingenuity in expressing the concept of the weary ship as a sophistication of the general topos of weariness. The landing place in Libya is described at 11.168-9,

...hic fessas non vincula naves
ulla tenent, unco non adligat ancora morsu.

"Fessas...naves" clearly expresses the idea mentioned above, but it is possible that this is reinforced by a very subtle allusion in the word "ancora". These lines are based closely on Hom.Od.IX 136-7,⁸

ἐν δὲ λιμὴν εὖορμος, ἴν' οὐ χρεὼ πείσματος ἐστίν,
οὔτ' εὐνάς βαλέειν οὔτε πρυμνήσι' ἀνάψαι.

As Conington and others observe,⁹ Virgil's use of "ancora" is anachronistic, for in Homeric times large tethered stones (εὐναὶ) were cast from the ship. However the anachronism may be deliberate on Virgil's part, since the normal meaning of εὐνή is "bed": Virgil may in fact be deliberately ~~be~~ mistranslating εὐνή ("stone") but hinting at εὐνή ("bed") in the words "fessas...naves".

This may at first sight appear unlikely; however it is of interest to note that on two other occasion Virgil uses the term "ancora" in close proximity to language descriptive of sleep,

-
8. This passage itself occurs in an Epibaterion describing the crew's arrival on the island lying off the land of the Cyclopes.
 9. See the commentaries by Conington, Papillon and Haigh, Austin, Jackson, Page, Freeman and Bailey.

hunc petimus fessi et parvae succedimus urbi;
ancora de prora iacitur, stant litore puppes.
Aen.III 276-7

sunt geminae Somni portae, quarum alter fertur
cornea, qua veris facilis datur exitus umbris,
altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto,
sed falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia Manes.
his ibi tum natum Anchises unaque Sibyllam
prosequitur dictis, portaque emittit eburna:
ille viam secat ad naves, sociosque revisit;
tum se ad Caietae recto fert litore portum.
ancora de prora iacitur; stant litore puppes.
Aen.VI 893-901.

Similar juxtapositions can be found in Ovid and Propertius,

quo ferar? unde petam lassis solacia rebus?
ancora iam nostram non tenet ulla ratem.
Ov.Tr.V 2.41-2

ecce coronatae portum tetigere carinae,
traiectae Syrtes, ancora iacta mihi est.
nunc demum vasto fessi resipiscimus aestu...
Prop.III 24.15-17.

Even though in these cases there is no anachronism with Homeric convention, it is possible that they are deliberately suggestive of the literary allusion found in the Virgilian Epibaterion.¹⁰

In the same Epibaterion, the poet says of the crew,
et sale tabentes artus in litore ponunt.
1.173.

The use of "tabentes" here is generally taken to mean "dripping wet"; but there is surely more than a hint of the other, more normal sense, "wasting away". Again, the participle may be intended as a subtle allusion to the topos of weariness. These allusive sophistications ("ancora" and

10. cf. B.Jordan "εὐναία at Euripides' Hippolytus 160" (Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies vol.19 no.1 (1978)) for possible punning between the two senses of εὐναία ("anchored" and "in bed").

"tabentes") are in fact supported by direct references to the crew's weariness at the beginning and at the end of the Epibaterion (1.157 defessi Aeneadae; 1.178 fessi rerum).

CHAPTER 7. PRAYER (B5).

This chapter and the next deal with the essentially religious topoi of the Epibaterion, that is to say topoi B5 and B6a. The frequency of usage of these topoi shows them to have been popular and important to the genre. As regards B5, perhaps the term "prayer" is too bald a description of the range of euktic motifs that are found to be used. The topos may indeed take the form of a simple prayer, either spoken in joyful worship or in desperation, but there are other possibilities. Sometimes the arriver utters a more simple invocation to a deity; on other occasions he may express a religious vow (of the form "if you do X then I will do Y").

The verb εὔχομαι, used with the infinitive in the sense "to claim" can be found in five different Epibateria. Three of these are Homeric, two Aeschylean. For the sake of clarity I shall quote and discuss these at the end of this section; first of all I hope to expound the argument that in Homer εὔχομαι meaning "to claim" in fact has strong religious connotations derived from the usual sense "to pray", and that the two usages are often placed in close proximity:

(i) In Il.I Achilles comforts Calchas the seer by saying that no-one will lay hands on him,

οὐ μὰ γὰρ Ἀπόλλωνα, Διὶ φίλον, ᾗ τε σύ, Κάλχαν,
εὐχόμενος...

86-7.

Achilles then immediately asserts that Calchas will not even be harmed by Agamemnon,

ὅς νῦν πολλὸν ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν εὔχεται εἶναι.
91.

(ii) In the fifth book of the "Iliad", Aeneas praises Pandarus' skill at archery,

οὐδέ τις ἐν Λυκίῃ σέο γ' εὔχεται εἶναι ἀμείνων
175

and he then advises Pandarus to pray to Zeus (1.174 Διὶ χεῖρας ἀνασχών) and attack Diomedes.

(iii) Aeneas in Il.XX tells the disguised god Apollo that if a god were to make war equal, then even Achilles would be unable to defeat him (Aeneas),

...οὐδ' εἰ παγχάλκεος εὔχεται εἶναι.
102.

Apollo replies by advising Aeneas to pray,

ἦρως, ἀλλ' ἄγε καὶ σὺ θεοῖς αἰειγενέτησιν
εὔχεο...
104-5.

Apollo goes on to mention Aeneas' lineage,

...καὶ δὲ σέ φασι Διὸς κούρης Ἀφροδίτης
ἐκγεγάμεν...
105-6.

Muellner¹ notes that "here φασι is a simple substitute for εὔχομαι."

(iv) Polyphemus boasts at Od.IX 519 that Poseidon is his father,

...πατὴρ δ' ἐμὸς εὔχεται εἶναι.

Later, he utters a prayer (11.526-7 Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι / εὔχετο χεῖρ' ὀρέγων; 1.536 "Ὡς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος...) and this prayer he mentions the god's claim to be his father:

εἰ ἔτεόν γε σός εἰμι, πατὴρ δ' ἐμὸς εὔχεαι εἶναι...
529.

1. L.C.Muellner (1976) p.77 n.13.

(v) Finally, in Od.XXI Penelope tells the suitors of Odysseus' claim to nobility,

πατρός δ' ἔξ ἀγαθοῦ γένος εὖχεται ἔμμεναι υἱός.
335.

Odysseus' prayer that he may string the bow is then referred to,

εὔ κέ μιν ἐντανύσῃ, δῶρ δέ οἱ εὖχος Ἀπόλλων...
338.

In actual fact, this use of εὖχος could also signify Odysseus' boast of noble lineage.

These examples indicate that frequently in Homer a religious, euktic association was felt in uses of the verb εὖχομαι which ostensibly mean "to claim". Muellner² says that if a relation between sacral and secular εὖχομαι were felt, Homer would have made more prominent use of it. I feel however that the link is indeed felt, if only to a certain extent, and that it is occasionally exploited in the epics. Muellner cites Il.VIII 190, Od.V 450 and IX 529 as examples of secular εὖχομαι within a prayer. The two Odyssean examples have been cited here (for Od.V see below); Il.VIII 190 does not however seem to occur in a real prayer: here Hector asks his horses to act bravely since they have been fed well by Andromache, "who gave them better tending than she gave even to me, who claim to be (l.190 εὖχομαι εἶναί) her husband." His speech does indeed end at l.198 with the words "Ὡς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος, but here εὐχόμενος seems rather to mean "claiming as his right". Adkins³

2. L.C.Muellner (1976) p.112 n.15.

3. A.W.H.Adkins (1969) p.26f.

argues well that εὐχόμενος refers to Hector's claim. He calls it a "do sicut des (or da sicut dedit Andromache) prayer" but it is not a prayer in the normal sense.

To return to the Epibateric uses of εὐχομαι, the verb is used in the sense "to claim" several times, and I believe that in nearly every case, following the line of argument expounded above, the idea of prayer (B5) is strongly alluded to.

(i) Athene, on her arrival at Odysseus' palace, says to Telemachus,

Μέντης ἄγχιάλιοι δαίφρονος εὐχομαι εἶναι
υἱός...

I 180-1

and, soon afterwards,

ξεῖνοι δ' ἄλλήλων πατρώιοι εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι
ἐξ ἄρχῆς...

187-8.

Telemachus has in fact already asked the stranger about his crew at 1.172 (outside the Epibaterion itself),

τίνες ἔμμεναι εὐχετόωντο;

The plural verb in 1.187 is very strange: Athene is claiming to be Telemachus' friend, but Telemachus is making no such claim, so how can she say "we claim.."? Corlu⁴ notes that in Greek it is impossible to say "I claim that we are..." since in the verb+infinitive construction the subject of the verb must be the same as that of the infinitive. Hence, to convey the idea that "we are friends", the part of εὐχομαι must also be plural. According to Corlu, this explains Od.I 187 (above), XV 196 and Il.IV 405.

4. A. Corlu (1966) pp.25,32,34.

However I feel that the "odd" usage of the plural εὐχομαι in Od.XV 196 and Il.IV 405 is in fact only what would be expected.

Telemachus tells Peisistratus at Od.XV 196

...ξεῖνοι δὲ διαμπερὲς εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι.

The two men here do in fact already know each other, so they can indeed both make this claim.

At Il.IV 405 Capaneus tells Agamemnon, who has rebuked Diomedes for cowardice,

ἡμεῖς τοι πατέρων μὲγ' ἀμείνονες εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι.

Here again, the plural verb is acceptable, since he means "we all claim to be better than our fathers." All the other uses of εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι in Homer⁵ are perfectly acceptable. It seems therefore that Od.I 187, Athene's claim, is the only exception. As has been mentioned, Corlu says that "I claim that we are" is impossible in Greek. But surely it would be more fitting for Mentos to say "I claim to be your friend", for which there is an easy precedent at Od.XXIV 114,

...ξεῖνος δέ τοι εὐχομαι εἶναι.

What Homer has actually written is therefore strikingly unique, and may well amount to a deliberately highlighted occurrence of the topos of prayer in implicit form.

(ii) During the ἀναγνώρισις between Odysseus and Telemachus in Od.XVI, Telemachus asks his father about the crew,

...τίνες ἔμμεναι εὐχετόωντο;
223.

5. ie. Il.VI 231, XV 296, Od.IX 263.

It seems impossible to impute any euktic quality into this usage of εὐχομαι.

(iii) In the Epibaterion at Od.V 441-57 Odysseus is in a cold river, praying to its god (l.444 εὐξάτο). He concludes his prayer by making the claim

...ἰκέτης δέ τοι εὐχομαι εἶναι
450.

As this line is read, the first impression one receives is of εὐχομαι "to pray". Before the word εἶναι is reached, ἰκέτης δέ τοι εὐχομαι seems to constitute a statement of prayer. Denniston⁶ says that the ethic dative τοι is difficult to translate but could be rendered "look you". He argues that it is very likely that it is associated with the dative of σύ. This being so, Odysseus' claim, before the word εἶναι is reached, could indeed have the force of "I pray to you as a suppliant".

The only other Epibateric poet who seems to allude to prayer (B5) during secular uses of εὐχομαι or related words is Aeschylus. He does so on three occasions:

(i) At Supp.15-8 the Suppliants make powerful claims to divine lineage,

...ὄθεν δὴ
γένος ἡμέτερον τῆς οἰστροδόου
βοῶς ἐξ ἐπαφῆς καὶ ἐπιπνοίας
Διὸς εὐχόμενον τετέλεσται.

The use of εὐχόμενον here seems to signify "vaunted" but it has been seen as a reflection of Homeric usage: Rose⁷ observes

6. J.D.Denniston (1954) p.537.

7. H.J.Rose (1937) vol.I ad loc.

"εὐχόμενον]A variation of the common Homeric εὐχεται (εἶναι)." The hint of prayer in this usage will be strongly supported in the same Epibaterion by real prayers uttered at 11.1-4 and 23-39.

(ii) The Suppliants later make a similar claim after their prayer to Zeus,

Δῖαι τοι γένος εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι
 γὰρ ἀπὸ τᾶσδ' ἔνοιοι.
 536-7.

Again it is likely that a sacral force of εὐχομαι is intended, as the verb (though ostensibly meaning "to claim") is used immediately after their prayer to the god (11.524-35). Furthermore, as in (iii) above, before εἶναι is uttered, the implication of Δῖαι τοι γένος εὐχόμεθ' could be felt to be "we, the race from Dia, pray to you." Again τοι could have a connotation of σοι .

(iii) At Aesch.Ag.506-7 the herald, on arrival back in Argos, exclaims

οὐ γὰρ ποτ' ἤνυχον τῆδ' ἐν Ἀργείᾳ χθονὶ
 θανῶν μεθέξειν φιλτάτου τάφου μέρος.

αὐχέω is probably closely associated with εὐχομαι. Boisacq⁸ says of the former, "αὐχέω...Etym. obscure; on a supposé un rapport avec εὐχομαι εὐχος (?)". The verb may here also have qualities of prayer, qualities supported by the direct prayer at 11.512-7 and also possibly by a religious usage of χαιρει at 1.508 (see below). The verb αὐχέω is in fact used elsewhere by Aeschylus as being vitually synonymous with εὐχομαι, eg. in

8. E.Boisacq (1916) s.v. αὐχίη.

Darius' lament at Pers.739-41,

...ἔς θ' ἔ παῖδ' ἔμδν
δεύς ἀπέσκηφεν τελευτήν θεσφάτων· ἐγὼ δέ που
διὰ μακροῦ χρόνου ἠύχουν ἐκτελευτήσειν θεούς.

As regards prayer-like features in the herald's speech of arrival (Aesch.Ag.503-21,539-66), Corlu⁹ observes, "employé absolument, χαῖρε est un salut à la terre natale chez Aesch.Ag.508 (νῦν χαῖρε μὲν χθών...) et équivaut à une invocation (cf. ibid. 514:προσαυδῶ)." Corlu also sees as an invocation Odysseus' remark to the nymphs, in another Epibaterion,

νῦν δ' εὐχολῆς ἀγανῆσι
χαίρετ'...
Od.XIII 357-8.

Adkins¹⁰ asks the vital question concerning the actual meaning of εὐχολῆς. What is it that the nymphs are to rejoice in? εὐχολῆς cannot here refer to a prayer, since none has been made. Nor is it a vow. Adkins concludes "it would almost appear that to say χαίρετε might be a εὐχολή: a possibility which we must bear in mind."

χαῖρε / χαίρετε are of course extremely prominent in prayers and addresses to gods: they are used thirty-four times in the Homeric Hymns, thirteen times in the hymns of Callimachus.

The only other Epibaterion which uses such an exclamation is A.P.IX 458.1 (anon.), the speech of arrival that Odysseus "should" have made on his return to Ithaca. It begins

χαῖρ' Ἰθάκη'...

9. A.Corlu (1966) p.165f.

10. A.W.H.Adkins (1969) p.29.

If indeed χαιρει does carry such euztic associations as have here been indicated, then its usage in the Epibateria may constitute an occurrence of the prayer topos. The Homeric and Aeschylean examples can in fact be found to be supported by more obvious references to prayer in the same Epibateria: before addressing the nymphs in Od.XIII we are told that the hero

αὐτίκα δὲ νύμφης ἠρήσατο χεῖρας ἀνασχών.
355

and he has already uttered two prayers (11.213-4 to Zeus, 11.230-1 to Athene). The herald in Aesch.Ag. has, before exclaiming χαιρει μὲν χθών, made possible allusion to prayer in his use of ἀχέω (1.506, see above); and he is soon to make a full address (11.512-7) to Apollo, the gods of war and Hermes.

CHAPTER 8. DIVINE INTERVENTION (B6a) AND EMOTION (B7).

The most frequently used of all the recurrent motifs in ancient arrival poetry is that of divine causation of the arrival. Such divine intervention is normally stated quite directly as having given rise to the arrival in question. There are however variations on this theme and on the way in which it is presented. The topos may on occasion be completely reversed, that is to say that it may be stated (or implied) that divinities did not cause the arrival, or indeed that they actively opposed it. Alternatively, the standard theme of divine causation may be presented in an allusive form. A frequently found allusion to divine causation of or opposition to the arrival takes the form "the gods helped X", thereby implying "they have helped me also",¹ or its reverse, "the gods helped X", thereby implying "but they have not helped me".² This chapter investigates other possible sophistications of the topos of divine causation (B6a). First however a few points must be made regarding the actual assignment of this topos in the extant Epibateria.

As was the case with topoi Bla, Blb and Blc (the topoi of praise or vituperation of the place of arrival and other places), precise allocations of references for B6a are not always easy to define. Sometimes it is known that a particular arrival was ultimately brought about by a divine agency, but it

1. eg. Hor. Odes I 7.27-9; Ov. Tr. IV 4.69-70.

2. eg. Ov. Tr. I 5.76; E. P. I 8.63-4; IV 10.15-6; Sil. It. XVII 262-3.

is impossible to give exact references for this intervention, in the poetry. For example, the storm at sea in Virg.Aen.I is ultimately caused by the gods, but it is difficult to give precise references to this divine intervention in the Epibaterion itself. Therefore not all references to B6a which occur outside Epibateria are included in the list of topical references in the Introduction.

The topos as it has been assigned is extremely flexible, because the recurrent motif of divine causation of the arrival takes many forms. Mention of thanksgiving given to a god on arrival, or erection of an altar, offering of a sacrifice etc. are suitable indications that as far as the arriver is concerned his arrival did not come about without the will of a god or gods. Finally, references to Augustus as a "deus" in Ovid Tr. and E.P. have been included in this topical category; they frequently constitute a recognition on the part of the poet that his exile was brought about by an agency which is above the human level, and perhaps constitute a deliberate usage of a known topos.

As regards allusion to topos B6a in the corpus of arrival poetry, there seems to be an occasional word play between θέω (θεός) and θεός in Homer. I begin by discussing some ancient accounts of the etymology of the verb θέω. It is variously given at all periods and it is only half correct to assert, as does H.Stephanus "Thesaurus Graecae Linguae" (Paris 1841) s.v. θεός, "omnium receptissima (sc.etymologia) est ἀπὸ τοῦ θέειν, currere." This derivation is in fact less frequent than the sum of all the others; nevertheless no other

individual etymology was ever as popular as this throughout ancient times.

The earliest witness to the etymology is Plato,

ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ γῆν καὶ ἄστρο
καὶ οὐρανόν· ἅτε οὖν αὐτὰ ὄρωντες πάντα
ἀεὶ ἰόντα δρόμῳ καὶ θέοντα, ἀπὸ ταύτης
τῆς φύσεως τῆς τοῦ θεῖν θεοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐπονομάσαι.

Crat.397D.

After this it appears in Apollodorus: this is testified and apparently accepted by Seleucus.³ A further reiteration can be found near the beginning of Cornutus' "Natura Deorum", where the word θεύσις seems to have been coined by Cornutus himself from θέω,

εὐλογον δὲ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς θεύσεως
ἐσχημέναι τὴν προσηγορίαν·

N.D.1.

Another weighty supporter is Macrobius Sat.I 23.3,

θεοὺς enim dicunt sidera et stellas ἀπὸ τοῦ θέειν id
est τρέχειν quod semper in cursu sint...

At a much later date the etymology seems still to have been prevalent (the fact that many of these sources give alternatives is of no importance, since we are not dealing with linguistic dogma but with a range of possibilities), cf.

θεὸς διήκων τῶν ὅλων ποιημάτων
φθάνει παρὼν ἅπασι καὶ δοκεῖ θέειν·

Johannes Mauropus of Euchaita "Etym." 2-3.⁴

Given this pseudo-etymological tradition, it is interesting that on one occasion in Epibateric poetry word play between θέω (and its cognates) and θεός seems to be present. At

3. See R.Reitzenstein (1897) p.160.

4. Ibid. p.173.

Od.III 286-9 Nestor is describing Menelaus' difficult voyage from Troy,

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ κείνος ἰὼν ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον
ἐν νηυσὶ γλαφυρῆσι Μαλειάων ὄρος αἰπὸν
ἶξε θέων, τότε δὴ στυγερὴν ὁδὸν εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
ἔφράσατο...

In this Epibaterion θέων ("running") appears in the same line as Zeus who is, although not specifically named as such, a θεός. Under normal circumstances we might regard this as an accident, but the use of θέων here does in fact seem to have been contrived: in view of the previous participular clause (ἰὼν) it seems strange that Homer reiterates what Menelaus was already doing when he reached the ὄρος αἰπὸν. The entirely distinct meaning of ἰὼν and θέων makes the repetition even more cumbersome, in view of their identical syntactical roles. Furthermore, as Perrin⁵ observes, ἶξε θέων would normally be used of a ship rather than a sailor. The poet therefore seems to be forcing θέων into this position in order, I believe, to suggest the association of θέων...Ζεὺς which implies a word play between θέω and θεός. Indeed the very name Ζεὺς probably has etymological links with θεός itself,⁶ and this would support a play between the god's name and θέων.

In support of this theory I give five further examples of possible word play between these terms in the Homeric poems.

- 1) βῆ δὲ θέειν παρὰ νῆας ἐπ' Αἰακίδαην Ἀχιλλῆα.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ κατὰ νῆας Ὀδυσσεὺς θείοιο
-

5. B.Perrin (1889) ad loc. Of course, ἶξε θέων may be used literally of a man running, eg. at Il.XI 807 quoted below.
6. cf. Liddell and Scott s.v. θεός.

ἴξε θεῶν Πάτροκλος, ἵνα σφ' ἀγορή τε θέμις τε
ἦν, τῇ δὴ καί σφι θεῶν ἐτετεύχαιτο βωμοί...

Il.XI 805-8.

Here forms of θέω and θεῖος/θεός are alternated line by line, the former being placed in the first half of the hexameter, the latter in the second. Furthermore the two forms of θέω occupy the same sedes. Such repetition and parallelism would strike any attentive audience: a poet attempting word play between θέω and θεός could hardly do better, and etymologising seems highly probable.

2) C.W.Macleod⁷ notes Il.I 290-1 as a possible case of word play between τίθημι and θεός,

εἰ δέ μιν αἰχμητὴν ἔθεσαν θεοὶ αἰὲν ἔόντες,
τοὔνεκα οἱ προθέουσιν ὄνειδέα μυθήσασθαι.

But προθέω also must share in the word play and the -θέουσιν element cannot be divorced from the similar sounds in the preceding line. As Seymour⁸ observes, "the word seems chosen here with reference to ἔθεσαν." All three words then appear to be involved in verbal association. Indeed it is possible that Homer is engaged here also not only in word play, but also in etymologising, by exploiting both the link between θεός and τίθημι,⁹ and that between θεός and θέω.

3) θεός is the adjective directly derived from θέω and it is also possible to find in Homer word play between θεός and θεός.

...αἴθ' ἅμα πάντες
"Ἐκτορος ὠφέλετ' ἀντὶ θεῆς ἐπὶ νηυσὶ πεφάσθαι.
ὦ μοι ἐγὼ πανάποτμος, ἐπεὶ τέκνον υἱας ἀρίστους

7. C.W.Macleod (1982) p.51.

8. T.D.Seymour (1887) ad loc.

9. cf. Hdt.II 52.1.

Τρούη ἐν εὐρείῃ, τῶν δ' οὐ τινά φημι λελεῖσθαι,
Μήστορά τ' ἀντίθεον καὶ Τρωῖλον ἱππιοχάρμην...

Il.XXIV 253-7.

There seems to be a balance here between ἀντὶ θεός and ἀντίθεον. What makes this particular passage all the more remarkable is that nowhere else in Homer is ἀντί directly followed by any part of θεός. Forms of ἀντίθεος occur sixty-two times in Homer. Knowing the total length of the Homeric poems, it can be calculated that the chances of finding (as here) ἀντί + a part of θεός at a separation of three lines from a part of ἀντίθεος are extremely remote: they are in fact one in 451.5. Furthermore ἀντὶ governs ἔκτορος and is therefore postponed. Liddell and Scott¹⁰ observe that "ἀντί rarely follows its case." In fact it is postponed in Homer on only three of nine occasions. Homer therefore seems deliberately to be contriving the juxtaposition of ἀντὶ and θεός in order to create the word play with ἀντίθεον.

4) ἀντίθεος features in another Homeric example, this time from the Odyssey,

...αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Ἄιγυπτόνδε με θυμὸς ἀνώγει ναυτίλλεσθαι,
νῆας ἐὺ στείλαντα, σὺν ἀντιθέοις ἐτάροισιν.
ἐννέα νῆας στείλα, θεῶς δ' ἔσαγείρετο λαός.

Od.XIV 245-8.

The last two lines both contain a weak third-foot caesura, and there is verbal and conceptual balance between the first halves of the two hexameters (νῆας ἐὺ στείλαντα / νῆας στείλα). At first sight the symmetry of the two second halves is not

10. Liddell and Scott s.v. ἀντί.

complete, although both conclude by mentioning the crew (ἑτάροισιν/λαός). However if a verbal association between ἀντιθέοις and θεῶς is understood, then perfect symmetry would result.

5) At Il.XIV 256-61 Zeus is angry and scatters the gods, after which he pursues Sleep who is rescued by Night,

...ὁ δ' ἐπεγοόμενος χαλέπαινε
 ῥιπτάζων κατὰ δῶμα θεοῦς, ἐμὲ δ' ἔξοχα πάντων
 ζήτει· καί κέ μ' ἄριστον ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἔμβαλε πέντη,
 εἰ μὴ Νύξ δμητέρα θεῶν ἐσάωσε καὶ ἀνδρῶν·
 τὴν ἰκόμην φεύγων, ὁ δ' ἐπαύσατο χωόμενος περ·
 ἄζετο γάρ, μὴ Νυκτὶ θεῆ ἀποθύμια ἔρδοι.

There is a clear antithesis here between the two epithets of Night: Zeus need not fear her because she is θεῆ (1.261) but because she is δμητέρα θεῶν (1.259). Here again therefore a part of θεός balances a part of θεός, and the antithesis is perhaps supported by the previous reference to θεοῦς in 1.257.

It seems therefore highly probable that Homer was consciously indulging in word play based on the pseudo-etymological tradition found later in Plato and his successors. The five cases cited above lend strong support to the idea of such word play in the Epibaterion at Od.III 286-92. By means of alluding to θεός in the term θέων (ostensibly from θέω), Homer skilfully reinforces the motif of divine intervention (B6a) which is then presented in direct form,

ἴξε θέων, τότε δὴ στυγερὴν ὁδὸν εὐρύσοπα Ζεὺς
 ἐφράσατο...
 288-9.

The fact that the five other Homeric examples which support this word play are non-Epibateric presents no argument against a generic sophistication occurring at Od.III 288: word play may

of course occur anywhere in a poet's work, and non-Epibateric examples merely reveal that the poet was interested in such word play. An example of it within an Epibaterion however may well be designed as a subtle variation upon a known topos, regardless of where other examples of the same word play are found.

This section dealing with topos B6a concludes with a discussion of topical allusion in Lucan V. During the Epibaterion describing the great seastorm the poet says,

...credit iam digna pericula Caesar
fatis esse suis...

653-4.

Immediately after this Caesar proudly proclaims that if it has been fated for him to perish in the storm, then he will accept death willingly, as long as he is respected and feared throughout the world. He boastfully announces at ll.659-60,

...licet ingentes abruperit actus
festinata dies fatis, sat magna peregi.

He is convinced that it is already fated for him to die in this manner, and mention is made of Fortuna, here personified, at ll.665-8,

nec sciet hoc quisquam, nisi tu, quae sola meorum
conscia votorum es, me, quamvis plenus honorum
et dictator eam Stygias et consul ad umbras,
privatum, Fortuna, mori...

Caesar's speech ends at l.671 and the following description of his safe return to land begins with the words "haec fatum" (l.672). The speech itself has been primarily concerned with the role of fate and with Caesar's own

destiny,¹¹ which may be regarded as an occurrence of the topos of divine intervention (B6a) in this particular Epibaterion. It is my contention that the words "haec fatum" reflect a deliberate attempt by the poet to emphasise the importance of fate in this section of the narrative.

The word "fatum" ("fate") is known to have been etymologically derived from "for", being "that which has been decreed or stated" by the gods:

Ab hoc tempora quod tum pueris constituent Parcae
fando, dictum Fatum et res Fatales.

Varro L.L.VI 52

and Fatum autem dicunt esse quidquid dii fantur, quidquid Iuppiter fatur. A fando igitur fatum dicunt, id est a loquendo.

Isidore of Seville VIII 11.90.

Clearly at Lucan V 672 the ostensible meaning is simply "having said this" but within the epic as a whole there seems to be a deeper association between fate and "simple" uses of "for" than is at first apparent.

1) At II 632-48 Pompey gives instructions to his soldiers. His set of commands is immediately preceded by the word "adfatur" and followed by "sic fatur". Three lines later, there is a reference to fate,

At numquam patiens pacis longaeque quietis
armorum, ne quid fatis mutare liceret,
adsequitur generique premit vestigia Caesar.

650-2.

It is possible to construe this final reference to destiny as being closely associated with Pompey's words. What Caesar is

11. cf. 11.592-3 and other examples of B6a in this Epibaterion (see list in Introduction).

concerned about is the course of events, to which Lucan gives the term "fata". The course of events has already been determined by Pompey. Consequently the words "adfatur" (1.632) and "fatur" (1.648) seem to take on more significance. They refer to Pompey's proclamation about what will happen, and this is then termed "fata" in the subsequent narrative.

2) Caesar's soldiers voice their dissatisfaction with the way they are being treated at V 261-95. They conclude their complaint with the words,

"Nos fatum sciat esse suum. licet omne deorum
obsequium speres, irato milite, Caesar,
pax erit"...

293-5.

The next words of the narrative are "haec fatus". Again, the use of "fatus", ostensibly very simple, is given added significance in the light of the soldiers' final remarks. It is a very unusual claim that they are putting forward; they are actually claiming to be Caesar's "fatum", the power that will dictate events for their leader. "Haec fatus" then ceases simply to mean "having said this" and is endowed with the sense of a decree of fate, of the words of destiny themselves.

3) A very similar case occurs in the speech of Caesar to Amyclas at V 532-7. The whole speech runs as follows,

..."exspecta votis maiora modestis,
spesque tuas laxa, iuvenis. si iussa secutus
me vehis Hesperiam, non ultra cuncta carinae
debebis manibusve inopem duxisse senectam.
ne cessa praebere deo tua fata volenti
angustos opibus subitis implere penates."

The next words of the narrative are "sic fatur". Just as in the previous example the soldiers associated themselves with the concept of fate, so Caesar does here. It is he who can

change the fortunes of Amyclas and, if obeyed, will bestow on him great wealth. He is thereby linking himself directly with the powers above, with the "deus" and "fata" of 1.536. Consequently the use of "fatur" immediately after the speech takes on precisely the same connotations of "fate's decree" as did "fatus" at V 295.

These examples should make it clear that Lucan frequently made deliberate use of the recognised etymological connection between "for" and "fatum". The association can also be found in the "Aeneid", eg. at I 254ff. where Jupiter reassures Venus about Aeneas' future destiny. His speech is introduced at 256 with "dehinc talia fatur:" and his first words are

parce metu, Cytherea, manent immota tuorum
fata tibi....

257-8.

Only three lines later the association between "fatum" and Jupiter's own words (for, fari) is again stressed:

hic tibi (fabor enim, quando haec te cura remordet,
longius, et volvens fatorum arcana movebo)
bellum ingens geret....

261-3.

It is clear that Jupiter is voicing the will of destiny and hence his own speech is consistently linked with the "fata" of Aeneas.

At Aen.IX 641-44 Apollo congratulates Iulus on killing Remulus and speaks of Ascanius' future destiny,

"macte virtute, puer, sic itur ad astra,
dis genite et geniture deos. iure omnia bella
gente sub Assaraci fato ventura resident,
nec te Troia capit."....

Apollo represents the voice of fate here, as did Jupiter in the

example above, and the term "fatum" is used in 643. Apollo's speech is introduced by "atque his victorem adfatur Iulum" (640) and concluded by "haec effatus" (644). A connotation of fate (fatum) in these uses of "adfor" and "effor" seems therefore to have been intended. There is therefore good reason to suppose that the practice is being employed in the Epibaterion in Lucan V. Caesar's speech at 11.654-71 is, as mentioned above, preoccupied with the idea of fate. Fate is mentioned immediately before the speech and during it at 1.660, Fortuna being referred to at 1.668. The words "haec fatum" which immediately follow the speech can be seen as reflecting the idea of fate which has previously been so important. "Haec fatum", immediately following Caesar's words, seem to balance "fatis esse suis" which immediately preceded them. In conclusion, this ostensibly straightforward use of "fatum", by reinforcing the references to the role of fate in the previous lines, seems to constitute an ingenious sophistication of the topos of divine intervention.

Allusion to the topos of the arriver's emotion seems only to be apparent on one occasion, in the Epibaterion at Ovid A.A.I 525-64 concerning Ariadne. Ovid wrote two Epibateria dealing with Ariadne's desertion on Naxos, the other being Her.X. In both passages, Ariadne weeps. Her weeping in Her.X is stated quite clearly (11.43,55,114,138,148) and the same is true at A.A.I 533. But the preceding line in A.A.I reads,

indigno teneras imbre rigante genas.
532.

The idea of cheeks being wettened (by the rain) is highly suggestive of weeping, and this seems to amount to allusion to the tears which are referred to directly in the following line,

clamabat, flebatque simul...

533.

l.532 therefore mentions rain in such a way as to suggest weeping, even though weeping is specifically referred to immediately afterwards. In Her.X there is a much less subtle equation between tears and rain,

Aspice demissos lugentis more capillos,
et tunicas lacrimis sicut ab imbre gravis.
137-8.

It seems as though Ovid were attempting in A.A.I to better this earlier simile in Her.X. There are four other occasions in Ovid where weeping is poetically associated with rainfall:

- (i) Am.III 6.67-8
Dixerat. illa oculos in humum deiecta modestos
spargebat teneros flebilis imbre sinus.
- (ii) Tr.I 3.17-8
uxor amans flentem flens acrius ipsa tenebat
imbre per indignas usque cadente genas.
- (iii) Tr.IV 1.95-8
saepe etiam lacrimae me sunt scribente profusae,
umidaque est fletu littera facta meo,
corque vetusta meum, tamquam nova, vulnera novit,
inque sinum maestae labitur imber aquae.
- (iv) Tr.III 2.19-20 (in an Epibaterion)
nil nisi flere libet, nec nostro parciior imber
lumine, de verna quam nive manat aqua.

When these passages are taken in conjunction with Her.X and A.A.I, it appears that Ovid gradually developed this metaphor. In the earlier works (Her.X and Am.III 6) it is baldly stated that rain=tears. The later works (A.A.I and two of the "Tristia" passages above: (ii) and (iii)) refer to rain and

thereby imply tears in a subtle manner. No.(iv) above (Tr.III 2.19-20) does state that "imber" flows from the poet's eyes, but there is a kind of extended comparison with melting snow which makes the actual meaning of "imber" more vague. Ovid seems therefore to have developed the idea gradually; as it stands in A.A.I 532 it is a very interesting case of what we know to be an Epibateric topos (B7), being in form more subtle than the earlier equation of tears with rain at Her.X 137-8.

CHAPTER 9. WILD ANIMALS (B9).

Within the corpus of Epibateric poetry which we possess, reference to wild animals in the place of arrival is a popular and recurrent motif. Mention of birds, fish and mammals can serve several purposes in the Epibaterion: such creatures may be merely illustrative of the fact that the terrain is wild and uncivilised; the arriver may become a prey to the animals; he may alternatively fear becoming or even wish to become such a prey.

Birds.

The first speech of Prometheus in Aesch.P.V. (88-127) may be regarded as an Epibaterion, since it is the speech made on his arrival at the rocky crag. After uttering a lament about the place in which he is now captive, Prometheus seems to think that he can hear the eagle approaching to devour his liver,

φεῦ φεῦ, τί ποτ' αὖ κινάθισμα κλύω
πέλας οἰωνῶν; αἰθῆρ δ' ἔλαφραῖς
πτερύγων ῥιπαῖς ὑποσυρίζει·
πᾶν μοι φοβερόν τὸ προσέρπον.
124-7.

This passage represents an occurrence of topos B9 (since Prometheus fears becoming a prey to a creature), but according to S.V.Tracy¹ the threat of the eagle is foreshadowed at 11.114-7 where Prometheus laments,

ἄ ἄ ἕα ἕα·
τίς ἀχῶ, τίς ὀδμὰ προσέπτα μ' ἀφεγγής;
θεόσυτος ἢ βρότειος ἢ κεκραμένη
ἵκετο τερμόνιον ἐπὶ πάγον;

1. S.V.Tracy (1971).

Tracy refers to the Hesiodic myth where the approach of the eagle follows immediately upon Prometheus' enchainment. Prometheus is of course full of panic (1.114 ἄ ἄ ἕα ἕα) but the language which he uses is also appropriate to a vision of an approaching bird of prey: ὄδμᾶ (115) is a ἄπαξ in Aeschylus and is more suitable to a carrion bird than an approaching chorus. προσέρπτα (115) clearly hints at a bird. Hermes later threatens that an eagle will be sent from Zeus (1.1021ff.) and so θεόστυτος (116) is again appropriate. Tracy also argues that Prometheus' panic is emphasised by the admission of lyric elements into spoken iambics in 11.115-7. These arguments seem convincing, but more can be said. At 1.127 Prometheus concludes

πάν μοι φοβερὸν τὸ προσέρπον.

It may be noted that the verb ἔρπω is used elsewhere in the play in association with the eagle. At 11.272-3 Prometheus asks the chorus to come down and listen to his woes,

τὰς προσερπούσας τύχας
ἀκούσαθ', ὡς μάθητε διὰ τέλους τὸ πᾶν.

They then descend and say that they have come

...κραιπνόστυτον θᾶκον προλιποῦσ'
αἰθέρα θ' ἄγνὸν πόρον οἰωνῶν.
279-80.

It is surely ominous that they should denote the air as the "highway of birds of prey." Indeed soon afterwards Prometheus probably has a fright when Ocean arrives on a πτερυγῶχη...οἰωνὸν (1.286).

In the later passage where Hermes threatens Prometheus with the prospect of an eagle sent from Zeus, the bird is

described as ἀκλιητος ἔρπων (1.1024). 11.114-27 probably do therefore have strong forebodings of the eagle known from the Hesiodic myth. Such lengthy usage of B9 is supported by other possible allusions to animals at 11.108 and 109, for which see below.

During the Epibaterion at Ovid Met.XI 478-572 which describes the plight of Ceyx in a storm at sea, the drowning man calls his wife's name,

Alcyone Ceyca movet, Ceycis in ore
nulla nisi Alcyone est...
544-5

...sed plurima nantis in ore
Alcyone coniunx...
562-3

dum natat, absentem, quotiens sinit hiscere fluctus,
nominat Alcyonen, ipsisque immurmurat undis.
566-7.²

It is frequently the case in topos B9 of the Epibaterion that the arriver manages to have a kind of communication with animals.³ It is possible that in Met.XI there is a very ingenious variation on the motif of such communication. The myth would already be known by a Roman audience, including the subsequent transformation of Alcyone into a kingfisher ("alcyon"). There may therefore be the suggestion here that Ceyx is "addressing a kingfisher", just as Propertius does in the Epibaterion at I 17 (1.2). Douglas⁴ states that according to Oppian the kingfisher always ends its song by crying "Ceyx!

2. See E.Fantham (1979) p.337 and n.32.

3. cf. A.P.285.3-4 (Glaucus of Nicopolis);652.5-6 (Leonidas of Tarentum);654.5-6 (Leonidas of Tarentum);Prop.I 17.1-2; Ov.E.P.III 1.21-2.

4. N.Douglas (1928) p.112.

Ceyx!" It has proved impossible to trace this reference in Oppian and it seems falsely attributed; however we read at Seneca Ag.680-2

...licet alcyones
Ceyca suum fluctu leviter
plangente sonent.

"Ceyca" must be the direct object of "alcyones...sonent" since if "Ceyca" were taken with "fluctu...plangente" the term "suum" would be inappropriate. This therefore means that the kingfishers do actually cry out "Ceyx!" which may be indicative of a general belief in ancient times. This being so, Ovid in Met.XI may be ingeniously reversing the idea by making Ceyx cry out "Alcyone!" This sophistication begins with the first of Ceyx's cries at l.544. Previous to this, several topoi have been "bunched together" in a very short space, as if to lead into this sophistication of B9: during ll.539-43, topoi B7, B10a, B5 and B3 are used consecutively, and this apparent "list of topoi" amounts to Brachylogia.

Other creatures.

The majority of this section of chapter 9 concerns the use of "monstrum" in Statius Theb.I. Theb.I contains two Epibateria, dealing with the arrival in Argos of Polynices and Tydeus respectively (312-89 / 401-7, 452-65). Between these two passages mention is made of the prophecy of the men's arrival made by Apollo to Adrastus,

cui Phoebus generos-monstrum exitiabile dictu!
mox adaperta fides-fato ducente canebat
saetigerum suem et fulvum adventare leonem.
395-7.

The term "monstrum" ostensibly means "omen". However it is probable that here there are connotations of animals. "Monstrum" or related words are used in the sense of "beast" twice in Tydeus' Epibaterion (1.453 monstriferae Calydonis; 1.549 iura insita monstris). Later on, Tydeus' lion skin is compared to that of a lion killed by Hercules, this latter animal being again termed "monstrum" (1.487). Furthermore this use of "monstrum" immediately precedes a speech of Adrastus in which omens and augury feature prominently (490 omine; 491 oracula; 492 monitus; 495 ambagibus; 496 portendi; 503 fati; 504 omina). Hence the initial use of "monstrum" qua "beast" seems to take on connotations of "monstrum" qua "portent".

Of course, "monstrum" can frequently mean a bird or beast of omen and hence combine both ideas (eg. Stat.Theb.III 510, Hor. Odes I 2.6⁵ etc.), but sometimes poets seem deliberately to play upon the two senses,

1) At Ovid Met.XIII 912-3 Scylla wonders what the merman Glaucus can be,

constitit hic et tuta loco, monstrumne deusne
ille sit, ignorans...

Soon afterwards Glaucus says

non ego prodigium nec sum fera belua, virgo,
sed deus....

917-8.

He has answered her unexpressed question saying "I am not a

5. F.Cairns (1971) says that seals, fish and deer are not monstrosities so there can be no hint of "monstra" (qua "monsters") here. They are however animals so the connotation of animals in "monstra" can still be felt.

"monstrum" but a "deus"." For "I am not a "monstrum"" he says "I am not a "prodigium" nor a "fera belua"" and thereby combines both senses of "monstrum".

2) At Virg.Aen.VII 15-20 the crew can hear emanating from Circe's island the groaning of lions, pigs, bears and wolves that Circe has created from men. The narrative continues at 1.21,

Quae ne monstra pii paterentur talia Troes...

"Monstra" here signifies "atrocities" but there is an obvious hint of the previous animals which implies the sense "lest the good Trojans should suffer (ie. undergo transformation into) such creatures."

3) The poisons of Tisiphone are described at Ov.Met.IV 500ff.,

attulerat secum liquidi quoque monstra veneni.
500.

Two of the substances then listed are

oris Cerberei spumas et virus Echidnae.
501.

When Ovid says "liquidi monstra veneni" (where "monstra" means "nasty things") this could in fact be hypallage for "liquidum monstororum venenum" (where "monstororum" means "of beasts"). Indeed "monstris" is used at 1.488 to describe real monsters (snakes, Luctus, Pavor, Terror and Insania).

A re-emphasis of topos B9 in the term "monstrum" at Stat.Theb.I 395 seems therefore very likely, lying as it does between the Epibateria of Polynices and Tydeus.

During the Epibaterion at Aesch.P.V.88-127 Prometheus relates how he stole fire for mankind,

ναρθηκοπλήρωτον δὲ θηρῶμαι πυρὸς
πηγὴν κλοπαίαν...

109-10.

This usage of θηρᾶω is very unusual in its context and may be intended as a hint of θήρ and consequently of topos B9. It is conspicuous standing next to ναρθηκοπλήρωτον which is a ἄπαξ. Furthermore, θηρῶμαι is a graphic historical present while the other two verbs in the narration (108 ἐνέζευγμαι; 111 πέφηνε) are both perfect. In fact the sentence containing ἐνέζευγμαι,

...θνητοῖς γὰρ γέρα
πορῶν ἀνάγκαις ταῖσδ' ἐνέζευγμαι τάλαις.
107-8

may itself have animal associations: Rose⁶ observes, "the metaphor is from yoking cattle and ἀνάγκαις has something left of its physical meaning of choking pressure."⁷ As mentioned above, other B9 occurs at 11.114-6 and 124-7. θηρεύω is used at P.V.858 in connection with animals, where it refers to hawks hunting doves. At Pers.233 the phrase θηρᾶσαι πόλιν is used and Broadhead⁸ notes "certainly θηρεύειν is a suitable verb for hunting men down." This therefore leaves θηρῶμαι used with regard to fire as unique, and as a possible allusion to topos B9, especially since the theme of hunting animals is a recurrent motif of Epibateria.⁹

6. H.J.Rose (1957) vol.I ad loc.

7. cf. Eur.Or.1330.

8. H.D.Broadhead (1960), ad loc.

9. cf. Soph.Phil.954-8; Ap.Rh.I 989-91; Mart.I 49.13-14.

CHAPTER 10. DEATH WISH (B10a, B10b) AND THE FOUNDER OF THE PLACE (B11).

Most occurrences of the death wish in Greek and Latin Epibateria are found, as would be expected, in inverse examples of the genre. However the only real sophistication of the motif that can be detected is a sophistication of the rarely used topos B10b: this is the theme that the arrival is so happy that the arriver would willingly die (which may itself be seen as a variation on the common death wish (B10a)).

Aesch.Ag.503-21,539-66 is the Epibateric speech of the herald on arrival home after the Trojan War. He exclaims at 1.539,

χαίρω τὸ τεθνάναι δ'οὐκέτ'ἀντερῶ θεοῖς.

The sense of this line seems to be, as Fraenkel¹ has supposed, that the herald is so full of joy that he would no longer object to dying. These sentiments seem to be reiterated by the chorus at 1.550,

ὡς νῦν, τὸ σὸν δῆ, καὶ θανεῖν πολλὴ χάρις.

As such, 1.550 therefore re-emphasises the earlier expression of B10b by the herald and it does so in an unusual fashion: such a death wish, expressed by a party other than the arriver himself, is unique.

This line however presents a crux and an alternative

1. E.Fraenkel (1950) ad loc.

reading is advocated by Lynch.² He argues: "Because ὧν (550) can be a relative the omitted antecedent of which was a partitive genitive with τινάς (549), because this partitive genitive contributes to the vagueness which the frightened chorus feels is necessary, and because νῦν (550) makes, with the imperfect ἔτρεψ (549), a contrast sufficiently strong to justify the assumption of a verb "I fear" in 550, it is proposed here that the meaning of the manuscripts be restored with the following word-division and the following translation:

ὧν νῦν τόσον δῆ καὶ θανεῖν πολλὴ χάρις.

"(I feared some of those) whom, as a matter of fact, I now fear just as much. And death can bring great joy." The χάρις of verse 550 will be Clytemnestra's, not the chorus'."

Several objections can be raised against this argument:

1) The reply ὧν νῦν τόσον δῆ to the question in 1.549 (ἀπόντων κοιρανῶν ἔτρεψ τινάς;) is very obscure indeed. (a) A temporal contrast between ἔτρεψ (impf.) and νῦν is far too abrupt to "justify the assumption of a verb "I fear" in 550". It risks losing the sense altogether. (b) The idea of ὧν picking up an omitted antecedent dependent on τινάς (ie. "some of those whom") is very difficult and awkward. It involves a difficult assimilation of accusative to genitive. Furthermore, in reading ὧν one immediately thinks of it as referring to ἀπόντων κοιρανῶν with which it is

2. C.A.Lynch "Aeschylus Agamemnon 550" (Classical Philology vol.47 (1952)). The line as quoted and supported here follows Scaliger's reading (ὧς): MSS. F., Tr. and Scholia Vetera have ὧν where ὧν refers to 539, but this seems to be impossible.

clearly unconnected.

2) Surely καὶ θανεῖν πολλὴ χάρις cannot be taken to mean "and there is joy [for Clytemnestra for others] to die." The words must mean that the person who enjoys the χάρις is the person who dies. For Lynch's translation to be reasonable, the Greek would have to be either καὶ κτείνει πολλὴ χάρις (for Clytemnestra), or, taking θανεῖν as a nominative in sense, καὶ θανεῖν πολλήν χάριν (φέρει). But even the latter implies that the person who dies is the person who has the joy.

3) Lynch says that it is ridiculous for the chorus to have the idea of wishing to die on their king's return because they have been so afraid in his absence. He says that their fears should be alleviated now, not intensified. This is exactly the point: their fears are now alleviated³ and they are so glad that they want to die. For the idea of happiness in the death wish see all the examples of Bløb in the list in the Introduction. The question was "did you fear some people?" and they reply "Yes, so now that you are back and I am safe, I am glad to die, as you just said yourself."

4) Fraenkel⁴ argues well that δῆ is common in formulas of quotation and therefore probably recalls 1.539. Even Lynch agrees that Fraenkel's reasons are good.

The chorus therefore seems to be reiterating the herald's happy death wish of 1.539 and this forms an unusual usage of

3. This however clashes with Fraenkel's more pessimistic interpretation that they fear worse to come (see n.5).

4. E.Fraenkel (1950) vol.II p.277f. cf.J.D.Denniston and D. Page (1957) ad loc.

topos Bl0b. Fraenkel⁵ suggests sinister overtones in the chorus' remark and this may involve the normal, more despairing Bl0a as well. In other words, 539 involves Bl0b while 550 implies Bl0a in its recollection of 539. Such subtle working of the death topoi seems to be supported earlier in the same Epibaterion at 11.506-7 where the herald says,

οὐ γὰρ ποτ' ἠΰχουν τῆδ' ἐν Ἀργείᾳ χθονὶ
θανῶν μεθέξειν φιλιτάτου τάφου μέρος.

Praise of the founder of the place is a topos recommended by Menander Rhetor in his section on the Epibaterion;⁶ however in the examples that we have the founder is usually merely mentioned. On one occasion it is possible that the topos is inverted,

nunc ego Medae vellem frenare dracones.

Ov.Tr.III 8.3.

Ovid says here that he would even rein Medea's dragons in order to return home. Tomis was founded where Medea cut up the body of Absyrtus (Tomis = Gk. τομή) and so she is in a sense the founder of Ovid's place of exile. The myth is given in the very next poem in fact (Tr.III 9). III 8.3 therefore possibly constitutes a hostile, inverse occurrence of Bl1.

In Horace Odes I 7 the story of Teucer is used as an exemplar for Plancus. The future place of arrival for Plancus is Tibur and, as Cairns observes,⁷ the founder, Tiburnus, is

5. E.Fraenkel (1950) p.278. For the same view see J.D. Denniston and D.Page (1957) ad loc.

6. Περὶ Ἐπιδεικτικῶν 382.24ff.;383.9f.

7. G.C. p.213.

mentioned at 1.13 (et praeceps Anio ac Tiburni lucus...). However Teucer is seen from the included myth to be the founder of Salamis in Cyprus. The myth in several ways parallels the real arrival situation,⁸ and so it appears that mention of Teucer qua founder constitutes an oblique reference to the idea of the foundation of the real place of arrival, Tibur.

8. eg. the themes of wine (19/22) and toil (18/30).

CHAPTER 11. TOPICAL OMISSION.

In the foregoing chapters an attempt has been made to investigate individual sophistications which have apparently been applied to Epibateric topoi. Such topical sophistications, taken en masse, form a powerful argument in favour of a generic theory such as that proposed in the Introduction. The discussion has so far mainly centred on the ways and means by which poems altered, readapted or hinted at the topoi which appear in their Epibateria. What has not yet been examined however is the possible deliberate omission of certain topoi in certain Epibateria. Omission of topoi might sometimes be just another type of sophistication similar to those described in the chapters above. It would have therefore been possible to have mentioned it sporadically in all the relevant chapters where it can be found. However it has seemed much more convenient to amass all the evidence for it, insofar as it applies to several of the topoi, and discuss it separately in a single chapter.

Arguments from silence are always difficult and it is perhaps for this reason that omission has not been treated in any depth in generic scholarship, although several remarks do occur in G.C.¹ Before looking at what I believe to be significant cases of topical omission, I feel it necessary to reassess a short interpretation of omission in an Epibaterion found in G.C.² Cairns observes that in the Epibaterion at

1. cf. G.C. General Index s.v. "Omission".
2. G.C. p.62f.

Hom.Od.V 299-312 Odysseus omits (i) praise of his homeland, and (ii) a description of his place of arrival (the seastorm) as a desert, as opposed to a city.

To explain (i), Cairns says that (a) Odysseus possibly regards Troy as his starting-point and therefore thinks of Troy rather than Ithaca in contrast to the sea; or (b) Odysseus' longing for death (11.306-12) could be a sophistication or reversal of the usual longing for home and for life.

As an explanation of (ii) Cairns simply says that it would be ridiculous for Odysseus to stress the point that the sea is not a city.

These interpretations require certain qualifications. It is true that Odysseus does omit the topos of longing for home (i), but it is, I feel, unlikely that this is purely because Troy is more in his mind (a). Topos B3 (qua longing for Ithaca) is used frequently by Odysseus on his wanderings in actual Epibateria,³ so he is clearly conscious of his absence from home. The idea (b) that Odysseus' death wish is some kind of sophistication of the longing for home topos (B3) is doubtful: the death wish is a wholly different topos and exists in its own right (B10a: see the list of topoi in the Introduction). It would in fact be quite possible for both B3 and B10a to appear in this Epibaterion, as many Epibateria do contain both.

As regards the observation (ii) that Odysseus omits the

3. eg. Od.I 49,57-9/IX 34-6 (actually a separate Epibaterion: see ch.13 s.v. "Inversion" (i) and "Inclusion" (1)(i)), XIII 206,212,219.

idea that the place of arrival is a desert, this does not need any explanation. The idea "place of arrival = wilderness" is only one form which topos Bla may take (see ch.4). The omission of this particular form is insignificant; in a sense Bla permeates the Epibaterion as a general tone of despair.

A discussion now follows of six cases of omission which seem to be generically significant. It has proved very difficult to find examples of topoi which must have been omitted as a sophistication, ie. not merely because they are inappropriate to the context. The only way to find such sophisticated omission has been to look at pairs or triads of Epibateria dealing with the same basic subject, and in each pair or triad to see why one member may be omitting topoi used in the other(s). This will become more apparent from the examples themselves. In each case a topical schema of the pair or triad will be given, from which relative omissions will be clearly visible. The symbol * signifies that a particular topos is present. For the sake of convenience, some of the Epibateria will be referred to as A, B, C.

| 1) | A | B | C |
|-------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Ep. | Hcm.Od.I 48-62 | H.Od.IX 29-33,37-8 | H.Od.XVII 142-6 |
| (B)1a | | * | |
| 3 | * | (*) | |
| 5 | * | | |
| 6a | * | * | * |
| 7 | * | | |
| 10a | * | | |

Epibaterion A above takes the form of a narration by Athene to Zeus; it is the description of Odysseus' plight in the land of Calypso. B and C are the other two Epibateria where Odysseus is the arriver and Calypso's land the place of

arrival. As may easily be seen, A makes use of more of the available topoi than either B or C and the corollary of this is consequently that, relative to A, B and C present cases of topical omission.

The reason for this omission perhaps lies in the actual situation being described in each case. In A Athene tells Zeus of Odysseus' miserable predicament in order to persuade him to do something about it. B is Odysseus' own account of his stay with Calypso; C is Telemachus' report of Menelaus' own account of Odysseus in the land of Calypso. In topical terms A is far more elaborate and the reason seems to be simply that Athene actually wants something to be done. She therefore exaggerates Odysseus' misery by using topoi that do not occur in the other two Epibateria on the same theme:

B5: ...οὐ νύ τ' Ὀδυσσεύς
 Ἀργείων παρὰ νηυσὶ χαρίζετο ἱερὰ δέζων
 Τροίῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ;...
 Od.I 60-2

B7: ...δύστηνον ὀδυρόμενον κατερύκει
 I 55

B10a: ...θανέειν ἰμείρεται...
 I 59.

Hence omission in B and C shows how much less extreme the situation is relative to A.

| 2) | A | B |
|-------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Ep. | Aesch.Ag.503-21, 539-66 | Aesch.Ag.810-3, 851-4 |
| (B)1a | * | |
| 4 | * | |
| 5 | * | * |
| 6a | * | * |
| 7 | * | |
| 8 | * | |
| 9 | * | |
| 10b | * | |

Epibateria A and B of this pair deal with the arrival back in Argos after the Trojan war of the κῆρυξ and Agamemnon respectively. Both take the form of a speech of arrival and the difference in the topical usage of the two is clear. Agamemnon's speech uses religious topoi (B5 and B6a) but omits many of the more emotional ones which are present in the speech of the herald (B):

B1a: ἰὼ (503); χαῖρε...χαῖρε (508); ἰὼ...φίλοι στέγαι (518)
 Xo. ἔρωσ πατρώας τῆσδε γῆς σ' ἐγύμνασεν;
 Kη. ὥστ' ἐνδακρῦειν γ' ὄμμασι χαρᾶς ὑπο
 540-1

B4: 540 above.

B7: 541 above.

B8: The herald narrates his previous ordeals at 555-66.

B9: ἔνθηρον τρίχα (562); χειμῶνα...οἰωνοκτόνον (563)

B10b: οὐ γάρ ποτ' ἦχουν τῆδ' ἐν Ἀργείᾳ χθονὶ
 θανῶν μεθέξειν φιλιτάτου τάφου μέρος.
 506-7

followed by Kη. ...τεθνάναι δ' οὐκέτ' ἀντερῶ θεοῖς.
 Xo. ὡς νῦν τὸ σὸν δῆ, καὶ θανεῖν πολλὴ χάρις.⁴
 539, 550.

The omission of such topoi as these in Agamemnon's speech seems to be an indication of his regal dignity. This is then well borne out by the fact that he only uses topoi of a religious quality.

4. See ch.10 for a defence of this reading.

| | | |
|-------|----------|-----------------|
| 3) | A | B |
| Ep. | Ov.Her.X | Ov.A.A.I 525-64 |
| (B)1a | * | * |
| 1b | * | |
| 3 | * | |
| 4 | * | * |
| 5 | * | |
| 6a | * | * |
| 7 | * | * |
| 9 | * | * |
| 10a | * | |
| 10c | * | |

There are in fact four Epibateria which deal with the arrival of Ariadne on Naxos and their emotional tone may be graded as follows,

(i) Ov.Her.X Pure lament.

(ii) Cat.LXIV 52-75,116-203 Bacchus arrives but his appearance is frightening, hence there is no happiness for Ariadne.

(iii) Nonn.XLVII 315-415 A happy reconciliation with Bacchus.

(iv) Ov.A.A.I 525-64 " " " " "

In order to continue this discussion of topical omission, I shall compare the two Ovidian Epibateria ((i) and (iv) above) since they are so different in mood. Cat.LXIV 52-75,116-203 is intermediate in its tone and so is not a very good case for comparison; and although the Nonnus passage is similar to the Epibaterion in Ov.A.A., it is still better to compare two Epibateria by one poet, to see how he creates two versions of the same story.

Even though B in the above schema has a more happy outcome for Ariadne than does A, both Epibateria are very much inverse. As may be seen from the schema, however, B omits many of the topoi which appear in A. These are topoi which make the

Ariadne of Her.X seem to be full of despair,

B1b: tantum ne religer dura captiva catena
neve traham serva grandia pensa manu,
cui pater est Minos, cui mater filia Phoebi
quodque magis memini, quae tibi pacta fui!
Her.X 89-92.

B3: non ego te, Crete centum digesta per urbes,
aspiciam, puero cognita terra Iovi!
at pater et tellus iusto regnata parenti
prodita sunt facto, nomina cara, meo,
cum tibi, ne victor tecto morerere recurvo,
quae regerent passus, pro duce filia dedi,
cum mihi dicebas: "per ego ipsa pericula iuro,
te fore, dum nostrum vivet uterque, meam."
67-74.

ergo ego nec lacrimas matris moritura videbo.
119.

B5: Di facerent, ut me summa de puppe videres;
movisset vultus maesta figura tuos!
113-4.

B1Øa: me quoque, qua fratrem, mactasses, clava;
esset, quam dederas, morte soluta fides.
77-8.

morsque minus poenae quam mora mortis habet.
82.

aut semel aeterna nocte premenda fui.
112.

B1Øc: si prius occidero, tu tamen ossa feres!
15Ø.

Why then does the Epibaterion in A.A.I omit such inverse topoi as these? The answer is not that the Epibaterion as a whole is more happy, for it is not: only the ending is joyful; the Epibaterion as a whole is a picture of a girl in despair. The reason must be, I believe, that by means of omission Ovid manages to underplay Ariadne's desperation in order to make a more easy transition into the happy reconciliation with Bacchus at the end. This is also the reason for topical omission in Moschus II (see (6) below) where it is Europa who is to be

reconciled with Zeus.

4) A schema of the three Epibateria of Tib.I 3 is given in ch.3. A fairly lengthy discussion of this elegy has already been provided in that chapter. There it was shown that the poem consists of three separate Epibateria and that there is a gradual change of mood, from pessimism to optimism, throughout these Epibateria. Each of the relevant topoi was taken in turn and shown to be illustrative of this change in tone. I do not intend to reproduce any of the arguments used there in this chapter. All that should be noticed is that when one of the topoi was used in one of the three Epibateria, it was consequently omitted from the others, and this omission is therefore significant to the change of mood; eg. not only is the occurrence of B3 in the first Epibaterion significant for the gradual change of mood through the three Epibateria, but so is its consequent omission in the second and third Epibateria. This is true for all the topoi that have here been referred to, and their respective occurrences and omissions can be seen clearly in the schema of I 3 in ch.3.

5)

| Ep. | Hom.Od.IX 116-51 | Virg.Aen.I 157-79 |
|-------|------------------|-------------------|
| (B)1a | * | * |
| 4 | * | * |
| 6a | * | |
| 9 | * | |

The Epibaterion at Virg.Aen.I 157-79 describing the arrival of Aeneas and his crew in Africa is closely modelled on Hom.Od.IX 116-51 where Odysseus and his crew arrive at the island lying off the land of the Cyclopes. Both Epibateria blend a description of the place as pleasant with more sinister

overtones. The Homeric passage seems to begin with an evocation of the land as a wilderness. The description then becomes increasingly eulogistic,

οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακὴ γέ...
131.

Aen.I 157-79 on the other hand appears to alternate favourable and unfavourable aspects of the place of arrival (vastae rupes...minantur/sub vertice late aequora tuta silent/horrenatique...inminet...scopulis/aquae dulces/saxo/unco non adligat ancora morsu⁵...telluris amore...optata...harena/Achates⁶...frangere saxo).

ll.140-1 of Od.IX,

αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ κρατὸς λιμένος ῥέει ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ,
κρήνη ὑπὸ σπείους'...

are clearly reflected in Aen.I 162-4,

...vastae rupes....
...quorum sub vertice late
aequora tuta silent.

The mention made by Virgil that there is no need of anchors to hold the ships (Aen.I 168-9) is a readaptation of two lines in the Odyssean Epibaterion (Od.IX 136-7).⁷

Finally, the description of Odysseus' crew settling down for the night,

ἔνθα δ' ἀποβρίξαντες ἐμείναμεν ἦν δ' ἴαν.
151

is reflected at Aen.I 171-3,

-
5. See ch.6 for a discussion of this use of "ancora".
6. See ch.4 for this reference to Achates.
7. See n.5 above.

....ac magno telluris amore
egressi optata potiuntur Troes harena
et sale tabentes artus in litore ponunt.

It is clear therefore that even though these two Epibateria do not share the same arriver or place of arrival they still have a great deal in common, the Virgilian one being very much indebted to the Homeric. From the schema above it will be seen that in topical terms, Virgil follows Homer's use of B1a and B4 but omits B6a and B9. The reason for this seems to be that both topoi B6a and B9 are in a sense implied by Virgil:

We know from the whole description of the storm that went before⁸ that the gods were ultimately responsible for Aeneas' arrival in Africa. The point does not therefore have to be emphasised in the Epibaterion itself, as it is in the Homeric passage (Od.IX 142-3).

As regards the topos of wild animals, Aeneas is soon to go hunting and kill seven stags.⁹ This later event makes it clear that the land does after all breed wild creatures, and so, again, the point did not have to be stressed in the Epibaterion itself (as it was at Od.IX 118-21,124 where goats are mentioned).¹⁰

If Virgil's omission of these topoi is explained in this way, then the parallelism between the Virgilian and Homeric

8. Virg.Aen.I 81ff.

9. Virg.Aen.I 184ff.

10. Strictly speaking, B6a and B9 in the Virgilian Epibateric example occur outside the Epibaterion itself, and so should be included in the reference list (in the Introduction) in square brackets []. This has been done for B9; but see the beginning of ch.8 for why this is impossible for B6a.

Epibateria is preserved in generic terms.

| | | | |
|-------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|
| 6) | | | |
| Ep. | Mosch.II 131-52 | Hor.Odes III 27.25-76 | |
| (B)1a | | | * |
| 1c | * | | |
| 3 | * | | * |
| 5 | * | | * |
| 6a | * | | * |
| 7 | | | * |
| 9 | | | * |
| 10a | | | * |

The Epibaterion of Europa in Moschus II has already been referred to in ch.3 in connection with Horace Odes III 27.25-76. I argued there that the Horatian Epibaterion was contrived to be as bitter and vitriolic as possible in order to render the reconciliation with Jupiter especially abrupt and surprising. Passages from Moschus II were compared throughout to show how topically inferior his Epibaterion is. The schema above shows that Moschus totally omits many of the topoi which caused ode III 27 to be so inverse (B1a,B7,B9,B10a). In ch.3, I showed that even where Moschus does use topoi which are in ode III 27 (B3,B5,B6a), these topoi are very much underplayed.

The reason for this these omissions is, I believe, that Moschus is aiming to achieve an easy transition into the scene of Europa's reconciliation with Zeus at the end of the poem (11.154-66). This is in fact precisely what is argued in G.C. for ode III 27, and I have countered this in ch.3. It is also the same explanation of omission that was given in (3) above to account for the difference between Ov.Her.X and A.A.I 525-64.

It is hoped that these examples serve to show that omission could be a particular type of generic sophistication. It remains to clarify one further point. A possible argument

which might be raised is as follows: could it not be possible that such omissions as those described in this section merely arise because the Epibaterion is itself short? In other words, is it not possible that, in a pair of Epibateria denoted as A and B, A should omit several of the topoi found in B merely because it is actually shorter? The answer to this is that what must be considered first is the possible sophistication involved, for example omission being used to provide an easy poetic transition (as in (3) and (6) above). It is this sophistication which itself determines not only the amount of topical omission, but the length of the actual Epibaterion.

CHAPTER 12. TOPICAL ORDER.

As well as topical omission, discussed in the previous chapter, another interesting issue in relation to the topoi of the genre Epibaterion is their order. The "usual order" of some of the topoi of the genre Propemptikon has been mentioned in G.C.,¹ but there is still lacking in any study of a genre a detailed investigation of the real τάξις of any particular genre. It is the aim of this chapter to provide just such an investigation, in which computing techniques have been applied, in the case of the Epibaterion.

Three computer programs, written in Basic, are given in Appendix B, and are named ORDERG, ORDERL and COMP (=comparison).

Programs ORDERG and ORDERL calculate the average order of topoi within all Greek Epibateria and all Latin Epibateria respectively. These two programs work in precisely the same way as each other, the only difference being the details of the Epibateria which are contained in the DATA statements, and the size of the array required, which is different in each program.

The DATA statements of these programs contain the actual topical formats of each and every Epibaterion, and for the sake of convenience, the following letters have been used for the topoi:

B1a=A/B1b=B/B1c=C/B2=D/B3=E/B4=F/B5=G/B6a=H/B6b=I/B7=J/B8=K/
B9=L/B10a=M/B10b=N/B10c=O/B11=P.

1. esp. G.C.p.115f.

In the DATA statements, each line contains the topical format of one Epibaterion, hence

DATA DMEJ

means that this line contains the details of an Epibaterion which contains topoi B2, B10a, B3 and B7 in that order. One topos may of course recur in a format.

Epibateria of one poet are grouped under a REM statement which acts as a "poet heading" for those Epibateria.

When these programs are run, they calculate the average fractional position of each topos, ORDERG dealing with the Greek Epibateric formats, ORDERL with the Latin.

eg. if the DATA statement only contained ABA,&

MNAB

then the average fractional position of each topos would be the sum of its fractional positions in both Epibateria divided by the total number of occurrences of that topos,

ie. for topos A, average position = $(1/3 + 3/3 + 3/4)/3$

for topos B, " " = $(2/3 + 4/4)/2$

for topos M, " " = $(1/4)/1$

for topos N, " " = $(2/4)/1$

As can be seen, for each occurrence of, say, topos A, its fractional position equals its position in the line divided by the length of the line (the number of characters in the line).

Once these programs have calculated the average position of each topos, it can then be seen easily what the "usual" or "average" order (τάξις) of topoi is in Greek and Latin Epibateria. Two problems are however involved here:

(i) This method is made necessarily inaccurate by the problem

of "weighting". Epibateria which only have very short topical formats give very inaccurate results. For example in an Epibaterion whose format was simply MF (ie. which used only B10a followed by B4), then the fractional position of M would have to be taken as 1/2, and that of F as 2/2. This kind of inaccuracy (worse still in an Epibaterion containing only one topical occurrence) cannot be avoided.

(ii) As may be seen in the list in the Introduction, topos Bla occurs "passim" in Ovid Tr. and E.P. It has therefore been impossible to include "A" (Bla) in the formats of those Epibateria by Ovid, for a true position in the format cannot be given. A unique case arises concerning Ov.E.P.IV 7 which only uses topos Bla. "A" could have been used as the format of this Epibaterion, but for the sake of continuity with the other Ovidian formats I have substituted a format "Z" for this poem, a format which will be ignored when the program is run.

The results of these two programs are given at the end of this chapter.

This method therefore gives a very general idea of the order of topoi on average in Greek and Latin Epibateria. However it presents one major drawback: when we see from, say, ORDERG that topos K usually precedes topos M, it is not necessarily the case that any individual poet felt that K should precede M: in ORDERG the average position of K in all Epibateria is calculated, and likewise for M. It is not therefore necessarily the case that any (or many) individual poets used both together in one Epibaterion.

For example, if the formats of five Epibateria were as follows,

MAAAAK, &
KAAA, &
KAAA, &
AAAM, &
AAAM

then ORDERG would give a τάξις in which K occurs before M, since it considers all occurrences of all topoi. However the sequence of K before M is not true of any of the actual Epibateria: indeed in the only one which uses both topoi, K occurs after M.

In order then to determine how individual poets arrange their topoi on average, a different approach must be used. Program COMP makes use of ORDERG and ORDERL. Several versions of ORDERG and ORDERL were created, each to calculate the average order of topoi in one poet, ie. one version for Homer, one for Stesichorus, etc. For each of these, only the formats for the Epibateria of the one poet concerned were used in the DATA statement, eg. the "Apollonius Rhodius version" is exactly the same as ORDERG except that the DATA statement only contains the formats for the Apollonian Epibateria (and the arrays are altered to suit). When each of these versions is run, a calculation is made of the average topical τάξις for each poet. Hence one "average topos format" is achieved for each poet.

These formats are then used in the first DATA statement of program COMP (line 230), each line of data being the average format for one poet. What COMP does is to compare all possible pairs of topoi excluding of course two topoi which are the same

(ie. it compares A&B,A&C,A&D,A&E...A&P,B&A,B&C...C&A,C&B,C&D... P&N,P&O).

COMP then prints out the actual number of times that the first member of the pair occurs before the second, and the number of times that it occurs after the second, in these formats. Obviously any one topos cannot occur more than once in any format, so it is pointless to compare A with A, B with B etc.

The final results will appear as follows,

eg. A<B 2 TIMES
A>B 6 TIMES

A<C 3 TIMES
A>C 1 TIMES

This example means that in the set of topical formats (derived from the several versions of ORDERG and ORDERL for each poet), A occurs before B two times, after B six times, while A occurs before C three times, after C once. (<="has a position less than" and >="has a position greater than").

COMP can therefore compare topical positional relationships as they actually occur in individual poets, whereas ORDERG and ORDERL set up a τάξις the relationship of whose members may not be a true relationship in any actual poet. To take the case of the five hypothetical formats laid out above, ORDERG would compute a τάξις such as "K...M" whereas in fact K does not appear before M in any actual format. COMP however will give much more valuable results:

K<M 0 TIMES
K>M 1 TIMES

These results will be actually true of the formats involved.

Results.

Programs ORDERG and ORDERL show that the average $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\varsigma$ of topoi is as follows,

(i) for Greek Epibateria,

(B)8,6b,5,1c,2,4,10c,1b,1a,7,6a,10b,3,9,10a,11

(ii) for Latin Epibateria,

(B)1b,1a,8,11,4,6a,7,9,6b,10a,3,1c,5,10c,2,10b

The results of COMP, however, show that for most pairs of topoi the "> value" is very similar to the "< value"; that is to say that it usually seems not too important whether the first member of the pair precedes the second or vice-versa. However, in a few cases the individual poets seem to favour one "pair sequence" much more than its reverse:

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|---|---|---|---|---|
| A(B1a) precedes E(B3) much more frequently than vice-versa. | | | | | | | |
| A | " | F(B4) | " | " | " | " | " |
| A | " | G(B5) | " | " | " | " | " |
| A | " | L(B9) | " | " | " | " | " |
| A | " | M(B10a) | " | " | " | " | " |
| B(B1b) | " | F(B4) | " | " | " | " | " |
| B | " | G(B5) | " | " | " | " | " |
| B | " | J(B7) | " | " | " | " | " |
| H(B6a) | " | M(B10a) | " | " | " | " | " |

Individual poets therefore seem to prefer to set up a description of the place of arrival (B1a) and other places (B1b) early on in the Epibaterion.²

2. The reason why this fact may not be apparent from the $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\varsigma$ derived from ORDERG and ORDERL is given above in the explanation of the uses of program COMP.

CHAPTER 13. INVERSION, INCLUSION AND DECEPTION.

1) INVERSION. The process known as "inversion" is described fully in G.C. ch.5. The basic requirement of generic inversion is that a generic example should contain vituperation in place of the more normal eulogy. This is a feature which is common in Epibateria: normally the arriver can be said to enjoy a happy arrival in a place which is praised either by him or by the poet himself. When inversion occurs, however, the arrival described is unpleasant and the attitude of the arriver becomes hostile.

Column 1 of the crossreference listing in the Introduction indicates which of the Epibateria that we have are inverse as a whole (those marked "X") and which are "normal" (those left unmarked). Some examples of the genre however exhibit unusual qualities regarding inversion, either being semi-inverse throughout (marked "A"), changing from non-inverse to inverse during the course of the Epibaterion (marked "B"), or from inverse to non-inverse (marked "C"). Generic or topical inversion as an epideictic feature has been very important in the discussion of topical sophistication in ch.4ff. However there are some interesting cases of inversion which should be discussed here as a group, since they are all of the same type and yet involve several topoi.

Most of the topoi given in the topical list in the Introduction seem to be of such a kind that they will be likely to occur in both the normal and the inverse examples of Epibaterion. However some topoi by their very nature appear to

suit only one kind of Epibaterion. We would therefore expect B2 to be present only in the normal (non-inverse) genre, while B3, B1Øa and B1Øc seem far better suited to the inverse genre.

In the majority of cases, this is found to be so, but there are however some instances of B2 in the inverse genre and of B3 and B1Øa in the normal genre (B1Øc is not in fact found in non-inverse Epibateria). There is often a simple explanation for these occurrences of topoi in ostensibly alien surroundings: flattery of an addressee (B2) can still occur even though the arrival itself is unpleasant, and longing for home (B3) or for death (B1Øa) may occur in the more inverse sections of essentially non-inverse Epibateria, for example in flashbacks, during a pleasant arrival, to unpleasant events which occurred before the arrival.

Nevertheless such explanations do not cater for all the unusual occurrences of B3. There still remain a couple which seem to have been included in the normal genre for the sake of a particular sophistication which must be investigated. The occurrences of these topoi are as follows:-

- (i) Hom.Od.IX 34-6
- (ii) Ov.Tr.III 12.1-26

In each of these cases the nature of the actual arrival involved should be clearly apparent, and I do not intend to go into great detail over the context of each passage as an Epibaterion. I shall merely discuss the ostensibly strange inclusion of such "hostile" topoi in these non-inverse Epibateria.

- (i) As may be seen from the list of Epibateria given in the

Introduction, Od.IX 29-33,37-8 forms a complete Epibaterion, that of Odysseus in the lands of Calypso and Circe. It will be seen that ll.34-6 form a separate Epibaterion which is included in that of Odysseus.¹ It must be regarded as a separate Epibaterion because it deals with a totally different arriver (A1) and arrival (A2). ll.34-6 in fact concern the predicament of an abstract figure (τις) who finds himself far away from home. I quote the whole of ll.29-38,

Ἴη μὲν μ' αὐτόθ' ἔρουκε καλυψὼ δῖα θεᾶων
ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι, λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι·
ὥς δ' αὐτως Κίρκη κατερήτυεν ἐν μεγάροισιν
Αἰαίη δολδέσσα λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι.
ἀλλ' ἔμδον οὐ ποτε θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἔπειθεν.
ὥς οὐδὲν γλύκιον ἤς πατρίδος οὐδὲ τοκῆων
γίγνεται, εἴ περ καὶ τις ἀπόπροθι πῖονα οἶκον
γαίη ἐν ἀλλοδαπῇ ναίει ἀπάνευθε τοκῆων.
εἰ δ' ἄγε τοι καὶ νόστον ἔμδον πολυκηδέ' ἐνίσπω,
ὄν μοι Ζεὺς ἐφέηκεν ἀπὸ Τροίηθεν ἰόντι.

The inclusion of this short Epibaterion serves as an exemplar for the situation in which Odysseus find himself. He too is far from home. What is at issue here though is the usage of topos B3. We might expect a mention of Odysseus' longing for home or at least of his absence from home in the Epibaterion specifically relating to him (ll.29-33,37-8). However there is none. What we do have though is an occurrence of B3 in the included Epibaterion. We are told that anybody will long for home, even if he dwells in a rich land. This Epibaterion relating to τις concerns a land which is not described in hostile terms, and in this respect it differs from

1. For generic inclusion see below and cf. esp. G.C. ch.7.

Odysseus' Epibaterion. Odysseus' Epibaterion is inverse yet contains no B3, whereas the Epibaterion of ΤΙς is favourable and, surprisingly, does make use of B3.

So why is the topos of longing for home so unusually incorporated in an Epibaterion where the place of arrival is favourable(πίονα οἶκον)? The reason must simply be that Homer is trying to convey the idea "if a man in a good place still longs for home, then I, Odysseus, in the essentially unpleasant realms of Circe and Calypso, naturally longed for it a great deal more." In other words Odysseus' own longing for home, though not stated in his own Epibaterion, is implied and emphasised greatly by the yearning of τΙς in a pleasant land.

Of course this much could easily be construed on the basis of a traditional, non-generic interpretation. But the force of it is felt far more keenly if one regards this as a case of topical sophistication. In other words, the concept of Odysseus longing for his home all the more because even a man in a good place longs for home will be given far more emphasis and weight if the reader is given a generic surprise, namely the unusual use of B3 in a non-inverse Epibaterion.

(ii) OvidTr.III 12 presents us with some very interesting issues related both to generic inversion² and generic deception.³ Since in this poem these two devices are interrelated I shall discuss them both here and only mention them briefly in the section concerning deception below. In

2. cf. esp. G.C. ch.5.

3. cf. esp. F.Cairns (1979) Index s.v. "Deception" and ch.7.

nearly all the Epibateria that have here been assigned in Ovid Tr. and E.P., the arrival in question is that of Ovid himself in Tomis.⁴ Tr.III 12 is one such Epibaterion and as a whole it is a vituperation of the place in which the poet finds himself.

The poem begins with praise of the springtime and the optimistic tone comes as a pleasant change to most of the poetry that has gone before. In fact it appears initially that Ovid is praising the beauty of his surroundings. This description lasts for thirteen lines, but then it is broken,

quoque loco est vitis, de palmitē gemma movetur:
nam procul a Getico litore vitis abest;
quoque loco est arbor, turgescit in arbore ramus:
nam procul a Geticis finibus arbor abest.

It is broken in a particularly effective and forceful way, for not only is Ovid saying that these joys do not belong to the Getic land, but that the reason that the bud is pushing from the vine-shoot and the branch from the tree is precisely because the vine and the tree do not exist in the Getic land (nam...nam...)⁵

Before this is made clear, the opening lines, in generic terms, would form topos Bla in its non-inverse form. But once the deception is realised, it can be seen that Ovid is here praising Rome from which he is barred, and so these lines (in fact, 11.1-26) amount to the usual longing for home of topos B3.⁶

4. See Introduction n.11.

5. This issue is alluded to by B.R.Nagel (1980) p.25 n.16.

6. These lines in fact amount to topical Macrologia, ie. protraction of a topos. See G.C. esp. p.119f.

However Ovid appears not only to be indulging in topical deception here, but in deception re. the inversion of the genre. Before the deception is realised, the reader supposes the opening lines to constitute praise of Tomis. The Epibaterion at this stage therefore seems to be eulogistic, happy and non-inverse. However once it is realised that these lines in fact constitute Ovid's yearning for home, his hostility to Tomis becomes once again apparent and it is seen that the Epibaterion is inverse after all. Strictly speaking, therefore, B3 does not occur in a non-inverse Epibaterion, because as soon as we realise that the opening is B3, not Bla, the genre becomes inverse. But Ovid is apparently indulging in some fairly complex generic deception here.

In column 1 of the crossreference listing in the Introduction this poem has been labelled, uniquely, both "X" and "B". "X" means that it is an inverse Epibaterion, and indeed, when we look at it with hindsight and realise the deception, it is. But for the first-time reader, the poem seems to begin in a non-inverse fashion and then suddenly becomes inverse after the poetic trickery has been disclosed. In this sense, therefore, "B" is also a correct label for describing the poem.

2) INCLUSION. In the outline of generic studies which closes the first chapter of G.C., Cairns says that "the whole of classical poetry is written in accordance with the sets of rules of the various genres." If this were in fact found to be the case, then an attempt at a comprehensive investigation of

the process of inclusion would involve an enormous amount of study. Inclusion is the process by which one genre is juxtaposed with another, though not necessarily being included in it.⁷ If indeed a whole play, for example, were to be regarded as consisting of a series of linked generic examples, then some form of inclusion would have to be understood at every generic juncture. The state of generic scholarship is not yet such that a comprehensive study of all such inclusions can be carried out, for a work of any length. It is therefore necessary to restrict the investigation to examples of juxtaposition, and therefore inclusion, which can easily be attested. During such an investigation though it must be borne in mind that if indeed "the whole of classical poetry" follows generic principles, the study of known inclusions will be inadequate.

This is perhaps better illustrated by a simple schema. Suppose that in the middle of a lengthy work an Epibaterion were found which "included" a Propemptikon, thus:

(A)EPIBATERION / PROPEMPTIKON.....(B)

It would be quite easy to discuss the inclusion of the Propemptikon in the Epibaterion, since both genres are well-known and easily recognisable. It would also be easy to see which of the two is the including, and which the included, genre, because their relative importance can be compared. But if it is to be supposed that all ancient poetry was written in

7. G.C.ch.7.

accordance with generic principles, then we should surely consider the passage preceding the Epibaterion (A), and the passage following the Propemptikon (B). If, because of the state of generic scholarship, nothing can yet be said about these passages, then difficulties arise. We cannot know whether the Epibaterion also includes A, whether A includes the Epibaterion (and / or the Propemptikon), whether B is included by or includes the Epibaterion and Propemptikon, etc. In short, if nothing is known of the generic status and importance of contiguous passages, any discussion of inclusions that are apparent must be open to doubt.

Nevertheless it is necessary to say what can at present be said about Epibateric inclusion. In the following discussion I shall ignore Epibateria which are included by other genres. This would necessarily involve a greater understanding of the other genres, for which this thesis is not the place. I shall however deal with (1) Epibateria included by other Epibateria, and (2) other genres included by Epibateria. In each case references to different Epibateria are separated by an oblique stroke (/).

1) (i) Hom.Od.IX 29-33,37-8/34-6. These Epibateria have already been discussed above under "inversion" (1(i)). As in all cases where an Epibaterion is included by another, the distinction between the two Epibateria is determined by the primary elements of the genre. In this case the arriver involved in 11.29-33,37-8 (Odysseus) is different from the arriver in 11.34-6 (τῆς), and hence the two "arrivals" are themselves distinct.

(ii) Hom.Od.XVII 109-41,147-9/142-6. The first of these two Epibateria takes the form of a narration by Telemachus to Penelope of his arrival home after having consulted Nestor in Pylos and Menelaus in Sparta. This is not in fact a speech of arrival in the strict sense, but a narration of an arrival by the arriver himself. The description of his adventures in Pylos and Sparta seem to constitute topos B8, being a narration of events prior to his return home.

The included Epibaterion runs from 11.142-6 and concerns the plight of Odysseus in the land of Calypso. Odysseus' predicament is reported by means of a narration within a narration: Telemachus tells Penelope how Menelaus described Odysseus' position. This "double" narrative is unique in ancient Epibateria.⁸

Merry⁹ comments that the phrase "ταῦτα τελευτήσας" at 1.148 is "startlingly abrupt." It is true that Telemachus has not exactly "achieved" anything. The words seem to mark some kind of transition at this point, and this might lend credence to the idea that there is a generic change. Menelaus' Epibaterion of Odysseus ends at 1.146 and the poet seems at 1.148(147 is a mere formality: ὧς ἔφατ' Ἀτρεΐδης, δουρικλειτὸς Μενέλαος) to be marking very strongly the resumption of Telemachus' own Epibaterion. If such generic practices can indeed be traced back to Homeric times, the idea of actually

8. In fact it is further complicated here since Menelaus is himself repeating what he has been told by Proteus.

9. W.W.Merry (1907) vol.2 ad loc.

sandwiching Epibateria might have been felt to be so unusual (as opposed to mere juxtaposition, which is well-known) that a clear indication of the resumption of the first Epibaterion was necessitated.

(iii) Eur.And.1-5/6-20. The distinction between the two juxtaposed Epibateria here is as very simple one. Even though the arriver, Andromache, does not change, the place of arrival alters. In 11.1-5 she relates her past enviable arrival in Troy, but then contrasts this with her present wretched status in Greece. Both Epibateria of course make use of Epibateric *topoi* (see lists in Introduction) but there is a structural difference between them: the first is inverse in form whereas the second is not. This contrast would probably be felt more keenly by an audience who understood the arrival situation as a genre.

(iv) Ter.H.T.121-36,138-9/136-7. From this generic assignment it will be seen that there is an apparent overlapping of the two Epibateria at H.T.136. However I am treating as the second generic example the sentence beginning in this line, namely,

...nam usque dum ille vitam illam colet
inopem carens patria ob meas iniurias.

while everything before and after this belongs to the first Epibaterion. The lines quoted above form the inverse Epibaterion of Menedemus' son, Clinia, in Asia, and this is in the form of a narration by Menedemus himself. The surrounding Epibaterion is Menedemus' own speech of arrival back home. This too is inverse: he finds his return home unhappy because of his son's plight abroad, the very plight described in the

included Epibaterion.

(v) Tib.I 3.1-56/57-82/83-94. For my subdivision of this elegy into three Epibateria see ch.3.

(vi) Ov.Tr.V 4.1-2,13-14,49-50/3-12,15-48. When regarded generically, Tr.V 4 involves a more complex inclusion procedure than any other pair of Epibateria. As will be seen from the assignment given here, the poem seems to consist of two Epibateria which are interlocked in the form ABABA. "A" should be understood to be the arrival of the "epistula" sent by Ovid in exile to Rome. "B" is the Epibaterion relating to Ovid's own predicament in Tomis, and of course is in the form of a "narration by the letter".

There are some interesting subtleties involved here. First of all, the narration that the "epistula" makes about Ovid ("B") is of course Ovid's own narration of his miserable exile. He is therefore employing a kind of substitute speaker.¹⁰ A further sophistication occurs here with regard to topos B5 (prayer), which I have chosen to mention here rather than in ch.7. The letter concludes with the words,

.....quod ille,
qui bene te novit, non rogat, ipsa rogo.
49-50.

In other words, the topos of prayer is said not to have been employed by Ovid himself. The letter therefore uses the topos in its own Epibaterion, and by saying that Ovid makes no such prayer, it is implied that B5 is absent from Ovid's own Epibaterion. This is in fact the case. There is no B5 in

10. cf. G.C. ch.8.

Epibaterion ^{"B"}~~"A"~~, where Ovid's own predicament and actions are related. This therefore is a very subtle topical link which connects the two generic strands in this poem, and only through a topical understanding can it be appreciated.

(vii) Mart.I 49.1-18/19-42. In this final example of "multi-Epibateric" inclusion the distinction between the two examples of the genre should be quite clear. As in the case of Andromache above (iii), the arriver is the same in both Epibateria. Here it is Martial's friend, Licinianus. But whereas his arrival in 11.1-18 is at Bilbilis, Caius etc., there is a contrast in 11.19-42 where he is said to be going to Tarraco and Laletania. It would, I believe, be pointless to regard each individual place as denoting a separate Epibaterion, and the places mentioned fall clearly into two groups. These groups are demarcated by the season, and each may be taken separately as implying one arrival. In Summer, Licinianus will go to the places mentioned in 11.1-18, in Winter, to those mentioned in 11.19-42.

In the above I have set out to give an outline of what multi-Epibateric inclusions do in fact occur. Such an outline has necessarily been cursory and, for the reasons given earlier, dubious, but it is important to bear inclusion in mind when these poems are dealt with later on.

2) The following is a brief discussion of other genres which can be found included by the Epibaterion. In actual fact in the four cases given below, the other genre should probably be

said to be "absorbed" rather than "included".¹¹ This is because it is not a whole genre in its own right, and is not as important as the Epibaterion which includes or absorbs it.

(i) The opening of Tib.I 3 will be mentioned below under "deception". The poet seems to be attempting to deceive the reader at the beginning that he is reading not an Epibaterion (or three Epibateria: see ch.3) but a Propemptikon. This argument is used by Cairns,¹² and I agree that it is probably the case, and there is in fact further evidence in support of it in the text of the poem itself. The apparent Propemptikon runs from ll.1-4, and yet in these lines there are to be found two topoi of the Epibaterion, namely Bla in its hostile form (l.3 *ignotis terris*) and BlØa in its reversed form (l.4 *abstineas avidas Mors modo nigra manus*). This is in fact therefore a "bridge passage", a passage which combines elements of two different genres.¹³ Such passages sometimes make for a smooth transition between two included genres,¹⁴ but here the passage gives the reader an intimation of the deception which is at work: the Epibaterion is hinted at by its own topoi, while the poetry reads like a normal Propemptikon. This then is a very sophisticated form of inclusion of another genre by the Epibaterion, involving as it does use of both bridge passage and deceptive techniques.

(ii) Cat.LXIII 27-73 is an Epibaterion describing the arrival

11. For this distinction see G.C. pp.88-91 and ch.7.

12. F.Cairns (1979) p.167.

13. cf. F.Cairns (*ibid.*) Index s.v. "Bridge-passage".

14. See on Hor.Odes III 27 in ch.3 above.

of Attis on Ida. For the precise assignment of this generic example, see ch.3. Included in it is an unusual example of the Paraclausithyron, where Attis sadly reflects upon his happy youth,

mihi ianuae frequentes, mihi limina tepida,
mihi floridis corollis redimita domus erat,
linquendum ubi esset orto mihi sole cubiculum.
65-7

As Copley¹⁵ observes, this is the only Komos in Latin literature where the affections are directed towards a boy. What is of interest here is that ll.65-7 (as well as 64) constitute an occurrence of topos B3 in this Epibaterion, since Attis is lamenting his past life at home which he has now lost. It could therefore be said that the included or absorbed genre (Komos) is itself a topos of the Epibaterion. This practice is discussed by Cairns,¹⁶ and it can also be claimed for the remaining two examples of Epibateric inclusion of other genres. (iii) It is explained in Appendix A how certain examples of the genre Epikedion can simultaneously be described as Epibateria. One such example is Prop.III 7 which treats of the death of Paetus at sea. It is described as an Epikedion in G.C. where mention is also made of the included genre Mandata Morituri at ll.57-64.¹⁷ This is the section where Paetus' "novissima verba" are actually quoted by the poet.

As in the Catullan example, the included genre here takes the form of an Epibateric topos, or rather topoi. Several of

15. F.O.Copley (1956) p.158 n.27.

16. G.C. p.85ff.

17. G.C. p.90.

the formulaic topoi for the Epibaterion can be found in Paetus' lament:

B1a and B9,

a miser alcyonum scopulis affligar acutis!
61

B3 and B5,

at saltem Italiae regionibus evehat aestus:
hoc de me sat erit si modo matris erit.
63-4

B6a,

Di maris Aegaei quos sunt penes aequora, venti,
et quaecumque meum degravat unda caput,
quo rapitis miseros primae lanuginis annos?
attulimus longas in freta vestra manus.
57-60

and

in me caeruleo fuscina sumpta deo est.
62

(iv) During the course of Ovid Tr.III 3, a typically morose Epibaterion, the topos of longing for home (B3) is used several times (see the list in the Introduction). One occurrence of it runs from ll.39-44, and within this there is a hint of the same genre as in (iii) above, the Mandata Morituri (1.43 nec mandata dabo...). Here again, it seems possible that a real genre is being used to aid the formation of an Epibateric topos in a negated form.

3) DECEPTION. The practice of deception has already been referred to in the above section concerning inversion. It is a much less important device than either inversion or inclusion, and the most interesting example, Ov.Tr.III 12, has been

discussed above. This elegy has been shown to combine topical deception with deception re. the inversion of the genre.

Another possible, though less obvious, example of this latter kind of deception may be found in an Epibaterion in Hom.Od.V. The Epibaterion of Odysseus at 11.465-73 is inverse in its tone and mood, as are all the previous parallel Epibateria in V (11.299-312/356-64/408-23/441-57). As may be seen in the list in the Introduction, sometimes *topoi* may be found lying outside the body of the Epibaterion itself. That is to say, material that would normally be associated with a *topos* of the genre may be found lying near, but not within, the speech of arrival or description of arrival itself. A case of this seems to occur at V 463 where Odysseus at first seems overjoyed on reaching land,

...κύσε δὲ ζεῖδωρον ἄρουραν*

A quotation of this phrase is in fact prescribed by Menander for the Epibateric Lalia (391.31ff) and was clearly regarded as appropriate for the non-inverse, eulogistic Epibaterion. In terms of the formula that has been adopted here, the line constitutes a display of Odysseus' emotion and therefore amounts to B7. It lies outside Odysseus' actual speech of arrival, however, (11.465-73) and we might expect it to pave the way for this speech. However it is a surprise to find that far from adopting the optimistic tone suggested in 1.463, the speech itself is yet another hostile complaint by the hero. The *topoi* used in it are B1a, B4 and B9 (precise references for each may be found in the list in the Introduction) and all of these contribute to the hostility of

tone of the Epibaterion. In generic terms, therefore, it seems that 1.463 was intended to delude the reader. A reader aware of the topical format for the genre would have recognised a non-inverse topos (an emotion of happiness) and expected the following speech to be in a similar mood. He would then find himself deceived. The surprise is heightened if the passage is read with a generic understanding, and the deception concerning inversion, once understood, makes Odysseus' words all the more wretched.

The only other kind of deception to be found in ancient Epibateria is that concerning the type of genre itself. The only occurrence of this generic deception amongst the Epibateria which we have occurs at Tib.I 3. I merely refer the reader to the relevant passage in Cairns,¹⁸ where it will be seen that I 3, though actually Epibateric in nature, appears initially to be an example of the genre Propemptikon, ie. a send-off poem to Messalla (also see above under "inclusion"). I use the term "Epibateric" guardedly however, since, as mentioned above, I believe that I 3 should be treated as three separate Epibateria rather than as merely one, as in Cairns. For this issue see the discussion in ch.3.

18. F.Cairns (1979) p.167.

CHAPTER 14. CONCLUSION.

On the evidence of the above arguments for topical sophistication(chs.4-11) it seems fair to conclude that poets and audiences in antiquity were conscious that the arrival situation was a well understood tradition with well known topoi. Poets could therefore indulge in sophistication and expect it to be appreciated by their audience. It is not however clear whether the arrival tradition was predominantly literary, since in most cases topical sophistication cannot be said to amount to specific literary imitation. The tradition may have been a cultural one, in which poets adapted the real-life topoi of the arrival situation. It may alternatively have been a tradition based upon specific, but non-extant, rhetorical prescriptions.

These alternatives have been discussed in the Introduction where reference was made to DuQuesnay's concept of genre. It may well be that particular examples of arrival poetry were composed in accordance with a combination of these alternatives. This is precisely how DuQuesnay¹ explains Virgil's poetry: "It is therefore natural to suppose that Vergil was perfectly conscious of the ways in which he was exploiting, manipulating and defeating the expectations of his readers which they shared with him as a result of their common cultural, literary and educational background."

It is not the purpose of this thesis to attempt to

1. I.M.LeM.DuQuesnay (1981) p.56.

disentangle literary imitation from social convention or rhetorical formula. As DuQuesnay observes (see the Introduction), all of these explanations of ancient poetic composition demand a comparative, generic approach to the poetry involved. Just such an approach has been adopted in this thesis. The result has been that highly sophisticated techniques of allusion and topical adaptation have been attested; these techniques would have remained unnoticed had a non-generic approach been used.

This chapter continues with an account of some statistical methods which have been used in the analysis of Epibateria, and concludes by answering some anti-generic arguments which have been voiced in recent years.

To begin with the statistics, it may be discovered, for example, how often a particular topical sophistication does occur, and how often we would expect it to occur in a random system, i.e. if no such sophistication were consciously intended. The real figure can then be compared with that of the random distribution and if it is significantly greater, then we may suppose that the sophistication was indeed intended. It is however possible to give some results of a more general kind, results consequent upon my assignment of Epibateria, *topoi* etc. (as in the Introduction). In each case I have avoided giving lengthy tables of data, for the sake of space and clarity. The reader must therefore accept that when, for example, the number of occurrences of B3 in Homer is to be divided by the number of Homeric Epibateria, the relevant

figures have indeed been calculated.

1) In addition to the normal type of arrival where the arriver comes to a place or comes to land from the sea, there are four more specific types of arrival possible in poetic Epibateria (in each case the place of arrival is given):

- (i) Sea (arriver is shipwrecked or in trouble at sea).
- (ii) Sea (arriver is killed at sea).
- (iii) Land (arriver is washed up dead on land).
- (iv) Hades.

It is possible to analyse the number of times any particular topos occurs in each of these types. Having carried out a complete calculation of every topos in each kind of situation, it has to be admitted that in the case of many topoi, there is little variation in topical occurrence from one type to the next. Certain results can also be anticipated: types (ii), (iii) and (iv) above all involve the arriver being dead, so we would not expect to find here many cases of B5, B10a/b/c or B11. Rebuke of the place of arrival (B1a) and prayer (B5) would be expected to occur more in type (i) than in any other type, and indeed they do.

However there are two topoi which do reveal results of interest. Mention that the gods caused the arrival (B6a) is used far more in type (i) than in any other type (80% of the examples of type (i) use it as opposed to between 40% and 61% in other types including the normal type of Epibateria). Perhaps what is interesting here is not so much that gods were seen as responsible for shipwrecks but that they are not ^{as} ~~is~~

important in other types of arrival.

The topos of wild animals (B9) on the other hand predominates in type (ii) where the arriver is killed at sea (62% of the examples of this type use it as opposed to between only 4% and 25% in other types including the normal type of Epibaterion). Type (ii) is in fact the type of arrival poetry to which many examples of the Epikedia/Epibateria in A.P.VII, as well as Prop.III 7,² belong. The preponderance of wild animals (especially fish and sea-birds) in this type of Epibaterion is very interesting because the importance of such animals to the Epikedion genre has been discussed by others.³ It seems therefore that this is an important topos of both genres, and therefore used extensively when the genres are conflated.

It is possible to subdivide the normal type of Epibaterion and one subgroup of it concerns the arrival of someone on land, alive, after being at sea. Topoi are generally used fairly normally in this type of Epibaterion, but there is a preponderance of Blb in it over and above all other types. 44% of examples of this type involve topos Blb as opposed to between 0% and 17% in all other types. It seems therefore to have been popular practice for someone reaching land from the sea to criticise another place. In many cases the place

2. See Appendix A.

3. cf. esp. E.Schulz-Vanheyden "Properz und das Griechische Epigramm" (Diss. Munster 1969) and W.Kese "Untersuchungen zu Epikedion und Consolatio in der Römischen Dichtung (von Catull bis Statius)" (Diss. Göttingen 1950).

criticised is the sea, but other places vituperated are Troy and its perils,⁴ a place of servitude,⁵ the desert,⁶ the reefs of Corsica⁷ and the inhospitable Northern part of Sardinia.⁸

2) An analysis has also been carried out to compare topical usage from one poet to another. What has been calculated for these purposes is the average number of times (per Epibaterion) that each topos has been used by all the Epibateric poets. This involves dividing the number of occurrences of say, topos T in poet P by the number of Epibateria written by poet P. Once this has been done for all topoi and all poets, the following may be concluded:

(i) B2 is generally not used, but it is very prominent in Homer, Apollonius Rhodius and Plautus.

(ii) B5 is used most of all by the Roman elegists Tibullus and Propertius, far more so than any other poets.

(iii) B6a is used very much more by Lucan than by any other poet.

(iv) B8 is used mainly in Greek Epibateria (Hom., Aesch., Eur., Ap.Rh.) and not at all in Latin Epibateria except for Statius.

(v) B9 is generally far more popular in Latin than in Greek

4. Troy's perils are vituperated at Eur.Cycl.347-55 but it should be noted that this is only an arrival from the sea in metaphorical terms. The language associated with the sea is pure metaphor (348-9 ...νῦν δ' ἔς ἀνδρὸς ἀνοσίου / γνώμην κατέσχον ἀλίμενον τε καρδίαν).

5. Plaut.Rud.218.

6. Ibid. 227.

7. Claud.B.G.I 506.

8. Ibid. 511-15.

Epibateria.

In arriving at these results, the problem of "weighting" must be borne in mind. That is to say that any figures arrived at in the division of statistics above will be less significant in poets writing only a few Epibateria than in poets who write many: one Epibaterion can hardly give a fair picture of a poet's topical interests.

3) We can also calculate and compare the average number of topoi per Epibaterion in each poet. This will be the total number of topical occurrences used, divided by the number of Epibateria written, for each poet. The following conclusions may then be drawn:

(i) The poets who on average make use of the most topoi are Propertius, followed by Nonnus (and assessment of Ovid is here impossible since precise references to all Bla in Tr. and E.P. are too many to list).

(ii) Generally speaking, Latin Epibateria seem to make greater use of the available topoi than do Greek Epibateria.

(iii) There is a gradual increase in the usage of topoi throughout the ancient period from Homer, through Latin poetry, to Nonnus. In fact, approximately twice as many topoi are used by poets at the end of the period ^{than} ~~as~~ by those at the beginning.

4) It is of great interest in a survey of any genre to assess the relative amount of sophistication used by the different poets who have written examples of that genre. The relative number of topical sophistications is however a rather elusive concept: sometimes it is not altogether clear whether a

particular apparent sophistication was intended or not.

However in this assessment, for the Epibaterion, only those sophistications which have been discussed in the chapters above (chs.4-11) have been counted. There is again a possible problem of "weighting" involved here in the case of poets writing only a few Epibateria; but perhaps the problem is less of an obstacle here than in (2) above, since it could be argued that a poet composing, say, only one Epibaterion should be as concerned to display sophisticated techniques in it as one writing many, and that a comparison of their respective interests can still be carried out.

For each poet, therefore, the average number of sophistications per Epibaterion has been calculated. This is the total number of sophistications divided by the number of Epibateria written. The results of this show that in general, a real trend in the use of sophisticated devices is difficult to find; however, the poet exhibiting by far the highest level of sophistication is Lucan, followed by Apollonius Rhodius, Virgil and Claudian (roughly equal to each other).

5) A further statistic that is of interest is the actual relative interest in, and usage of, the genre Epibaterion, amongst the poets concerned. The poets making the greatest use of the genre can easily be seen in the list of Epibateria in the Introduction. They are, in descending order, Ovid, Homer, Aeschylus and Euripides.

Some major objections that have been raised against the

generic theory occur in J.Griffin "Genre and Real Life in Latin Poetry" (JRS vol. LXXI (1981)) and I deal with these first. Griffin seems to present the most comprehensive attack against generic procedures as a method of poetic composition; some similar arguments are however given by Russell and Wilson,⁹ and I conclude by answering these.

A) The arguments used by Griffin may be summarised as follows:

(i) The genres seem to be too dependent on praise and/or abuse. Surely the whole of ancient poetry does not revolve around these concepts.

(ii) Some of the genres exist in their own right and we may well imagine patrons paying for their composition (wedding-speeches, speeches of greeting, etc.). But others seem to have been invented in modern times and their composition could not have been patronised (eg. "Gloating over fulfilment", "Mandata morituri" etc.).

(iii) It is argued in G.C. that the ancient rhetoricians are most important in expounding these models. But the rhetoricians themselves frequently refer the reader to poetic models as examples. It is therefore wrong to give priority to the rhetoricians over the poets when the rhetoricians themselves make use of the poets.

(iv) Poems which would otherwise have been regarded as of poor quality suddenly attain excellence if they "play the

9. D.A.Russell and N.G.Wilson "Menander Rhetor" (Oxford 1981).

generic game". What place is there then for passion, sublimity and truth?

(v) If the generic theory is correct, no poem will ever be about the poet himself.

(vi) According to Cairns Prop. I 3 is a Komos. However many of the usual elements of this genre are absent, so we are forced to pay attention to what is not there and why, and ignore what is: we must ignore the beautiful opening scene and the final tableau of the lonely Cynthia. Generically speaking, the poem is said by Cairns to have four points of wit, but this is surely not the intention of the elegy.

(vii) Prop. I 6 is, according to Cairns, a schetliastic Propemptikon, addressed to Tullus. Cairns argues that since Tullus is the poet's superior, and poets addressing their superiors could not by convention be uncomplimentary, we must ask how this appearance of schetliasmos has come about. However, (a) Tullus was probably a friend of Propertius of equal status anyway, and (b) over half the poem concerns Propertius, and the poem as a whole must be about him, but as a Propemptikon all the emphasis is wrongly placed on Tullus.

(viii) Prop. I 8 is discussed by Cairns as a Propemptikon. In the first half the poet complains that Cynthia is to go away; in the second he rejoices that she has been won over by him and will stay. This, according to Cairns, is an example of the constructive principle known as "reaction" since Cynthia has changed her mind. Such a generic device as this would be totally impossible in public affairs where such genres were used: it would be chaotic if a governor suddenly decided to

Argument (ii) seems to suppose that the genres had to be given names in antiquity in order to be valid. This is not so.¹⁰ Nor is it of course fair to say that they should always have been subsidised. The Epibaterion itself is a fine example of a genre which, though of a formal rhetorical type in Menander's prescription, often has a very private, personalised form. Obviously no-one would pay for this kind of private speech of arrival, but this does not invalidate its identity as an example of the genre.

One of the three alternative methods of composition which DuQuesnay outlines is as "a more sophisticated expectation of what would be said in literature, based on a knowledge of classical models and a general rhetorical education." Griffin's view (iii) that only the rhetoricians are being considered by generic scholars is totally untrue. The rhetoricians are indeed important, although it is impossible to suppose that their prescriptions are always the correct model, but the poets themselves are equally vital in establishing the generic formula, or at least the generic pattern. Both Cairns¹¹ and DuQuesnay¹² have made great use of the poetry itself in setting up their generic models, and the same approach has been adopted in this work.

The notion that "passion, sublimity and truth" cannot be present in a work which follows a generic procedure (iv) is non-sensical. Such "romantic" ideas as these may of course

10. cf. the generic names used in G.C.

11. cf. G.C. p.21 etc.

12. cf I.M.LeM.DuQuesnay (1981) pp.63,98 etc.

occur, either within the topical structure of the genre, or outside it. Furthermore it is surely of great moment to Classical scholarship if a work that was previously regarded as being of poor quality achieves excellence by means of a new interpretation, provided that that interpretation is valid.

There is no reason at all to suppose (v) that a poet cannot speak of himself merely because his techniques of composition are of a generic nature. As far as the Epibaterion is concerned, the best generic examples to belie such an opinion are those in Ovid Tr. and E.P., and I merely refer the reader to them.¹³

The main criticism that Griffin levels at Cairns' interpretation of Prop. I 3¹⁴ is that to regard it as a Komos places too much emphasis on what is not there (vi). However by far the majority of Cairns' argument concerns actual komastic elements in the poem, of which there are many. Griffin cannot accept some of the "sophistications" which are said to occur here (eg. Propertius being admitted yet, since Cynthia is asleep, remaining the "exclusus amator"). But the generic account of it is perfectly plausible and Griffin has no actual arguments with which to counter it. He says "the element of ingenuity and wit is over-valued" here, but again this is not an argument. Ingenuity is always of great importance in generic analysis; as for wit, Cairns never says that it is the intention of the poet to be witty: Griffin clearly distorts the

13. See list in Introduction.

14. F.Cairns "Two unidentified Komoi of Propertius. I 3 and II 29" (Emerita vol.45 (1977)).

generic interpretation when he says¹⁵ at the four sophistications described by Cairns¹⁶ are "witty points".

The objection to a generic interpretation of Prop. I 6 (vii) is equally problematic. To begin with, Griffin is completely wrong in saying that Cairns has to "explain away" the schetliamos which Propertius directs towards Tullus: Cairns explicitly states (G.C. p.7) that "it [sc. I 6] does not contain schetliamos." So Griffin is quite wrong here. The argument that a Propemptic interpretation of the elegy puts too much weight on Tullus when the poem is clearly about Propertius is unfair. Admittedly ll.1-4 do concern Tullus but Cairns himself shows¹⁷ that ll.5-18 are an included Propemptikon of Cynthia to Propertius and so the poet himself is the central figure of this section. Griffin seems to have missed this point regarding inclusion altogether. ll.19-36 do indeed return to the encomium of Tullus, but Propertius' own wretchedness is contrasted throughout and he remains very much in the limelight along with Tullus.

It has been pointed out in the Introduction (s.v. Menander Rhetor) that there is a great difference between public and private types of Epibaterion, and it is likely that this will be true of other travel genres. The statement (viii) that a change of mind on the part of the Propemptic addressee will be inappropriate on a public occasion is therefore merely a truism. Public Propemptika are bound to be very different from

15. Griffin p.42.

16. Cairns p.336.

17. G.C. p.12ff.

private Propemptika, and so obviously whereas Cynthia decides to stay, an important governor would not. This can in no way be regarded as an antigeneric argument.

Finally, argument (xi) reveals a simple misunderstanding of the travel genres. To say that "I sail away from her" has no generic name and so the arrival elsewhere has to be looked at and called an Epibaterion is totally wrong. The type of speech "I sail away from her" does have a name: the "Syntaktikon". Epibateria therefore are not "created out of nowhere" because of the absence of another genre, but (as I hope this thesis will illustrate) have an independent existence of their own.

B) An objection to the generic procedure which is very similar to one of those voiced by Griffin can be found at pp.xxxiii-xxxiv of the commentary on Menander by Russell and Wilson. Here they seem to make the same mistake as in (iii) above, by criticising the total emphasis placed on the ancient rhetoricians: "It follows that to regard his [sc. the rhetorician, generally] prescriptions as a standard form by which poems on similar subjects may be judged, and their sophisticated allusions and subtle omissions detected- which is Cairns' procedure- involves the risk of treating what are really common encomiastic features or direct imitations of early poetry as original traits of the assumed "genre"."

This is of course not the generic procedure at all. As noted above, the poetry is just as important for the formulation of generic prescriptions as are any rhetorical

handbooks that happen to be available. DuQuesnay¹⁸ begins his analysis of the speech of departure by saying "The following analysis of the syntaktikon is based partly upon the prescription of Menander Rhetor for the "syntaktikos logos", partly upon analysis of eighteen poetic examples of the genre." This, ironically enough, very much resembles the procedure that Russell and Wilson themselves go on to recommend.

They conclude their criticism by observing that "It is unnecessary and dangerous to reconstruct a "generic pattern" of the epithalamium existing in its own right apart from these stages [sc. the various poetic stages, involving development, imitation etc.]." This is of course perfectly true, but it cannot be said to be a description of generic practice and therefore need not be answered. DuQuesnay¹⁹ in fact answers it on a false basis: he quotes only part of the original statement, ie. "It is unnecessary and dangerous to reconstruct a "generic pattern"" and then objects that on the contrary it is "necessary, salutary and illuminating" to do so. He is in fact distorting the original argument here; Russell and Wilson are not supposing the formulation of any generic pattern to be bad methodology, but only one which is formulated without due reference to the relevant poetry. It appears therefore that DuQuesnay's counter-argument is directed at a criticism that was never made; the original criticism was however itself based on a false premise concerning generic procedure.

18. I.M.LeM.DuQuesnay (1981) p.62.

19. Ibid. p.61.

APPENDIX A.

It has been found that the ancient Epibaterion is a great deal more flexible than a mere description of or speech of "arrival" in the literal sense. An arrival of some kind is indeed necessary, but an Epibaterion may simply involve a person finding himself in a new situation or predicament. As Cairns explains (G.C. p.61) a storm at sea can be the context of an Epibaterion just as well as a man arriving in a city, because the same language would be used of a seastorm as of an arrival in a hostile land. So the "Epibaterion" has been taken to include any situation where someone finds himself in a new predicament.

It is particularly interesting to note that some poetry which ostensibly belongs to the genre "Epikedion" (a description of a death: see G.C.) may also be regarded as Epibateric. This is because the character who dies is described as being in some way an arriver, either in a storm at sea, or on the beach dead, or in Hades. Examples in the list of Epibateria in the Introduction are Prop.III 7 and many of the funerary epigrams in A.P.VII. Since it is the situation which determines the generic name, these Epikedia are here regarded as being also Epibateric.

APPENDIX B.

Computer programs (Ch.12).
ORDERG.

```
10 DIM A$(143)
20 FOR I=1 TO 143
40 READ A$(I)
50 NEXT I
60 B$="A"
70 GOSUB 390
80 B$="B"
90 GOSUB 390
100 B$="C"
110 GOSUB 390
120 B$="D"
130 GOSUB 390
140 B$="E"
150 GOSUB 390
160 B$="F"
170 GOSUB 390
180 B$="G"
190 GOSUB 390
200 B$="H"
210 GOSUB 390
220 B$="I"
230 GOSUB 390
240 B$="J"
250 GOSUB 390
260 B$="K"
270 GOSUB 390
280 B$="L"
290 GOSUB 390
300 B$="M"
310 GOSUB 390
320 B$="N"
330 GOSUB 390
340 B$="O"
350 GOSUB 390
360 B$="P"
370 GOSUB 390
380 GOTO 900
390 REM SUBROUTINE
391 Z=0
392 F=1
395 J=1
400 M=0
410 A=0
420 FOR I=1 TO 143
430 FOR N=1 TO 20
440 X=POS(A$(I),B$,J)
445 J=X+1
450 IF X=0 THEN GOTO 500
460 L=LEN(A$(I))
```

```

470 Y=X/L
480 Z=Z+Y
490 NEXT N
500 F=F+N-1
510 J=1
530 NEXT I
531 IF F=1 THEN GOTO 540
532 M=Z/(F-1)
535 IF M>0 THEN PRINT "AVERAGE POS. OF ";B$;" IS ";M
540 RETURN
580 REM HOMER
590 DATA DMEJ, &
OE, &
CHHE, &
GOHHMH, &
EHHJEMGH, &
GKG, &
AHAA, &
HH, &
IHHH, &
H, &
HAAJLH, &
GBBFF, &
AFAFL, &
AA, &
DKHK, &
AHH, &
E, &
ALLHF, &
AHF, &
HKF, &
HKHGE, &
BE, &
FFCHAHHCH, &
FAJACELEGEJGAALJKFJHAAPJGG, &
KAHAHD, &
BHED, &
JHJLGFHH, &
KKHA, &
H, &
G
600 REM STES.
605 DATA E
610 REM ALC.
615 DATA HEALG
620 REM THEOG.
625 DATA CA
630 REM AESCH.
640 DATA AGNGAHGANAFJNKLL, &
GHIG, &
AGGGGAA, &
GABGAG, &
GBEM, &
GGA, &
AA, &

```

GHHLLLAHL, &
GFAM, &
HKHFF, &
H, &
K, &
AFHHFMLGFFHH, &
KFHHHHHEAHHHAHH, &
BAB
650 REM SOPH.
660 DATA GFIFNFHGIN, &
BFANFU, &
L
670 REM EUR.
680 DATA A, &
M, &
HHGMFMF, &
MFHIM, &
HHA, &
HHAEEJ, &
KEHAEAF, &
IF, &
BAGBG, &
E, &
KE, &
EJ, &
KHAAAAA
690 REM ARIST.
700 DATA AAA, &
JELCALCJHHMM, &
AAAAHN
710 REM AP.RH.
720 DATA AHHALAL, &
FFH, &
AAAAAAAAAAHAAAAB, &
DKF
730 REM MOSCH.
740 DATA ECHHEGH
745 REM NONN.
750 DATA JFFCAFAGGFCAEHCJJ
760 REM A.P.
770 DATA G, &
AA, &
A, &
C, &
AHKHL, &
LL, &
FAF, &
AA, &
L, &
ACFL, &
AKH, &
HLA, &
LB, &
BFLBH, &
HAC, &

L, &
KHL, &
AA, &
AM, &
B, &
FALAH, &
AHA, &
HH, &
ACAA, &
A, &
KAFC, &
A, &
A, &
HE, &
HKH, &
BLHB, &
HH, &
HHEEG, &
EHH, &
HHCAG, &
CAH, &
KCH, &
A, &
L, &
L, &
HE, &
ELH, &
H, &
A, &
H, &
H, &
LCH, &
AJH, &
E, &
EMH, &
IH, &
HO, &
A, &
A, &
GEF, &
GE, &
BH, &
BH, &
BEM, &
B, &
E, &
AH, &
H, &
GAB, &
E, &
GCAA, &
GA, &
HH, &
HJ, &
GA

900 END

ORDERL.

```
10 DIM A$(85)
20 FOR I=1 TO 85
40 READ A$(I)
50 NEXT I
60 B$="A"
70 GOSUB 390
80 B$="B"
90 GOSUB 390
100 B$="C"
110 GOSUB 390
120 B$="D"
130 GOSUB 390
140 B$="E"
150 GOSUB 390
160 B$="F"
170 GOSUB 390
180 B$="G"
190 GOSUB 390
200 B$="H"
210 GOSUB 390
220 B$="I"
230 GOSUB 390
240 B$="J"
250 GOSUB 390
260 B$="K"
270 GOSUB 390
280 B$="L"
290 GOSUB 390
300 B$="M"
310 GOSUB 390
320 B$="N"
330 GOSUB 390
340 B$="O"
350 GOSUB 390
360 B$="P"
370 GOSUB 390
380 GOTO 900
390 REM SUBROUTINE
391 Z=0
392 F=1
395 J=1
400 M=0
410 A=0
420 FOR I=1 TO 85
430 FOR N=1 TO 20
440 X=POS(A$(I),B$,J)
445 J=X+1
450 IF X=0 THEN GOTO 500
460 L=LEN(A$(I))
470 Y=X/L
480 Z=Z+Y
490 NEXT N
```

```

500 F=F+N-1
510 J=1
530 NEXT I
531 IF F=1 THEN GOTO 540
532 M=Z/(F-1)
535 IF M>0 THEN PRINT "AVERAGE POS. OF ";B$;" IS ";M
540 RETURN
550 REM PLAUT.
560 DATA HBE,&
A,&
HHAHHHAMAEB,&
MB,&
G,&
HBL,&
DD,&
HE
570 REM TER.
580 DATA A,&
AE
590 REM LUCR.
600 DATA A,&
FE,&
BJ
610 REM CAT.
620 DATA AAAEFAAP,&
LFAJEALEEEAL,&
FAAHFAJEHCLMCGEAFGL
630 REM VIRG.
640 DATA HAHJMHAHAHFH,&
FAAAAAFAFAFA,&
BAGFFGB,&
HF,&
HGHAMF
650 REM HOR.
660 DATA CAPPI,&
BPFHAAN,&
HLEEMJEHEMGMMLLAHHJH
670 REM TIB.
680 DATA AMGEIIGGGCGM,&
HAAHBLLLG,&
GFHG
690 REM PROP.
700 DATA LAGHMAMHAAGOEHG,&
ALLHGAHHHJEJAEAJHLAHEHF
710 REM OV.
720 DATA LFLFFJFAAJAAJAEMMLBHLAFMJELAGAJJFUJ,&
HAFJJLL,&
AHMILLEFJMGEELGLH,&
GHHGGHCOLGGGIGGEGHG,&
HHEGEF,&
HHEBEBEBEHHEHEH,&
EIGEGE,&
HBBJEMGHMH,&
EFEGEOHEEMEF,&
EH,&

```

GBPEGGGCFHMC, &
 HHLHLHLHL, &
 EHLGG, &
 HFGHGLIHLH, &
 HGH, &
 EFFEM, &
 LFEHFEGHEIH, &
 LHFHEJJE, &
 GFLHFGO, &
 FGG, &
 JEHHE, &
 MHL, &
 EILLHME, &
 JHHHEHL, &
 ELFHJMFEMCHGEHG, &
 EELEBE, &
 FFCIHEHGGEJ, &
 PEHEC, &
 FFGH, &
 HEH, &
 LHLHHE, &
 GGHMOGH, &
 CE, &
 CLLC, &
 GHMFMFCHM, &
 Z, &
 BHHEHL, &
 CMLH
 730 REM SEN.
 740 DATA AFE, &
 AEHE, &
 MAM, &
 GF, &
 AHHHGGMHGHHHHH, &
 AGMG, &
 HMLG
 750 REM MAN.
 760 DATA BALH
 770 REM SIL. IT.
 780 DATA MH
 790 REM LUCAN
 800 DATA AHHHLHFHMH
 810 REM MART.
 820 DATA AAALA, &
 LBF, &
 CCF
 830 REM STAT.
 840 DATA EAEJEGHFLFEHALF, &
 HPLL, &
 HBGGHKHEEGHH
 850 REM AUS.
 860 DATA HAJAJF
 870 REM CL.
 880 DATA BBLHPAAPAAH
 900 END

```

COMP.
5 A=0
7 B=0
10 DIM A$(28)
20 DIM B$(16)
30 DIM C$(16)
40 FOR I=1 TO 28
50 READ A$(I)
60 NEXT I
70 FOR N=1 TO 16
80 READ B$(N)
90 NEXT N
100 FOR M=1 TO 16
110 READ C$(M)
120 NEXT M
140 FOR N=1 TO 16
150 FOR M=1 TO 16
160 FOR I=1 TO 28
162 IF B$(N)=C$(M) THEN GOTO 200
165 X=POS(A$(I),B$(N),1)
170 Y=POS(A$(I),C$(M),1)
175 IF X=0 OR Y=0 THEN GOTO 195
180 IF X<Y THEN LET A=A+1
190 IF X>Y THEN LET B=B+1
195 NEXT I
197 PRINT B$(N);"<";C$(M);A;" TIMES"
198 PRINT B$(N);">";C$(M);B;" TIMES"
199 PRINT
200 A=0
201 B=0
205 NEXT M
210 NEXT N
230 DATA ICBAJKLDGFEHM,&
E,&
HEALG,&
CA,&
GENFHKABJLM,&
BFGAIHNLJ,&
KHBIAGEMFJ,&
EJLCAHMN,&
DAHFKLB,&
CEHG,&
FAGCJEH,&
HMADBEGL,&
AE,&
BFAEJ,&
HJFACEMLGP,&
JHABGMF,&
BCEFLMGPUHAIN,&
AEHIFBMGLC,&
LMAJHGEOF,&
PBAFLJHIEGMOO,&
AHMGLEF,&
BALH,&

```


MH, &
ALHFM, &
CALBF, &
BJGEAKHFL, &
HAJF, &
BLPHA
240 DATA A, &
B, &
C, &
D, &
E, &
F, &
G, &
H, &
I, &
J, &
K, &
L, &
M, &
N, &
O, &
P
250 DATA A, &
B, &
C, &
D, &
E, &
F, &
G, &
H, &
I, &
J, &
K, &
L, &
M, &
N, &
O, &
P

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- ADKINS, A.W.H. ΕΥΧΟΜΑΙ, ΕΥΧΩΑΗ, and ΕΥΧΟΕ in Homer (Classical Quarterly vol. XIX ('69))
- ALEXIOU, M. The ritual lament in Greek tradition (Cambridge 1974)
- AREND, W. Die typischen Scenen bei Homer (Diss. Berlin '33)
- AUSTIN, R.G. P. Vergili Maronis Liber Primus (Oxford '71)
- AUTENRIETH, G. A Homeric dictionary (Oklahoma '58)
- AVERY, W.T. Tibullus 13.85 Positaque Lucerna (The Classical Journal vol. 49. no. 4 ('54))
- BAKKER, J.T. Publii Ovidii Nasonis Tristium Liber V (Amsterdam 1946)
- BARR, W. Claudian's Panegyric on the fourth consulate of Honorius (^{Liverpool} ~~Francis Cairns~~ '81)
- BARRETT, W.S. Euripides Hippolytus (Oxford '64)
- BOISACQ, E. Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Grecque (Heidelberg 1916)
- BÖMER, F. P. Ovidius Naso Metamorphosen Buch X-XI (Heidelberg 1980)
- BRIGHT, D.F. A Homeric ambiguity (Mnemosyne vol. XXX fasc. 4)
- " A Tibullan Odyssey (Arethusa vol. 4.2 ('71))
- BROADHEAD, H.D. The Persae of Aeschylus (Cambridge '60)
- BRUÈRE, R.T. Lucan and Claudian: the invectives (Classical Philology vol. 59 ('64))
- BURLIAN, P. Suppliant and Saviour: Oedipus at Colonus (Phoenix

- vol.15 ('61))
- CAIRNS,F. Generic composition in Greek and Roman poetry
(Edinburgh '72)
- " Horace odes I2 (Eranos vol.LXIX fasc.1-4 ('71))
- " Horace, odes, III,13 and III,23 (L'Antiquite
Classique vol.XLVI ('77))
- " Theocritus Idyll VII62 (Mnemosyne vol. XXXI fasc.1
('78))
- " Tibullus. A Hellenistic poet at Rome (Cambridge
1979)
- " Two unidentified komoi of Propertius.I3 and II29
(Emerita vol.45 ('77))
- " Venusta Sirmio. Catullus 31 (in Quality and
Pleasure in Latin Poetry ed. T. Woodman and D. West
(Cambridge '74))
- CAMERON,A. Claudian. Poetry and propaganda at the court of
Honorius (Oxford '70)
- CAMPBELL,C. Tibullus: elegyI 3 (Yale Classical Studiesvol.
XXIII ('73))
- CAMPBELL,L. Sophocles (Oxford 1879)
- CAUER,P. Homers Odyssee (Leipzig and Berlin '20)
- CELLARIUS,C. Geographica antiqua (London 1808)
- " Notitia orbis antiquae (Cambridge 1703)
- CHANTRAINE,P. Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Grecque
(Paris '74)
- COPLEY,F.O. Exclusus amator. A study in Latin love poetry
(American Philological Association '56)

- CORLIJ, A. Recherches sur les mots relatifs à l'idée de prière, d'Homère aux tragiques (Paris '66)
- CREES, J.H.E. Claudian as an historical authority (Cambridge 1908)
- CUNNINGHAM, M.P. Review of H.P.Syndikus, "Die Lyrik des Horaz: eine Interpretation der "Oden"" (Classical Philology vol.72 ('77))
- CURTIUS, G. Principles of Greek etymology (London 1886)
- DAY, A.A. The origins of Latin love-elegy (Oxford '38)
- DENNISTON, J.D. The Greek particles (Oxford '54)
- DENNISTON, J.D. and PAGE, D. Aeschylus "Agamemnon" (Oxford '57)
- DINDORF, G. Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Oxford 1875)
- DODDS, E.R. Euripidis Bacchae (Oxford '60)
- DOUGLAS, N. Birds and beasts of the Greek Anthology (Frome and London '28)
- DUQUESNAY, I.M.Lem. From Polyphemus to Corydon (in Creative Imitation and Latin Literature ed. D.West and T.Woodman (Cambridge '79))
- " Vergil's first Eclogue (in Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar vol.3 (Francis Cairns '81))
- " Vergil's fourth Eclogue (in Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar '76 (Francis Cairns '76))
- EBELING, H. Lexicon Homericum (Leipzig 1880)
- ERBSE, H. Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Berolini '74)
- ERNOUT, A. and MEILLET, A. Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine (Paris '39)
- ESTÈVE FORRIOL, J. Die Trauer- und Trostgedichte in der

- Römischen Literatur untersucht nach ihrer topik und ihrem
motivschatz (Diss. Munich '62)
- FANTHAM, E. Ovid's Ceyx and Alcyone: the metamorphosis of a
myth (Phoenix '79)
- FENIK, B. Studies in the Odyssey (Wiesbaden '74)
- " Typical battle scenes in the Iliad (Wiesbaden '68)
- FITTON-BROWN, A. D. Oedipus meets the Eumenides (Liverpool
Classical Monthly Vol. I no. 8 ('76))
- FRAENKEL, E. Aeschylus Agamemnon (Oxford '50)
- " Horace (Oxford '57)
- FRAZER, J. G. Pausanias's description of Greece (London 1898)
- GESNER, J. M. Cl. Claudiani quae supersunt (Hildesheim '69)
- GLENN, J. Ariadne's daydream (Cat. 64.158-63) (The Classical
Journal vol. 76 no. 2 ('80))
- GOW, A. S. F. and PAGE, D. L. The Greek Anthology: the garland of
Philip and some contemporary epigrams (Cambridge '68)
- " The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic epigrams (Cambridge
'65)
- GRIFFIN, J. Genre and real life in Latin poetry (The Journal of
Roman Studies vol. LXXI ('81))
- HANSLIK, R. Tibulls Elegie I 3 (Forschungen zur Römischen
Literatur ed. W. Wimmel (Wiesbaden '70))
- HEITSCH, E. Episch Kunstsprache und Homerisch Chronologie
(Heidelberg '68)
- HOW, W. W. and WELLS, J. A commentary on Herodotus (Oxford '61)
- JACOBSON, H. Ovid's Heroides (Princeton '74)
- JEBB, R. C. Sophocles. The plays and fragments (Cambridge '28)

- JORDAN, B. *Εὐναία* at Euripides Hippolytus 160 (Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies vol.19 no.1 ('78))
- KESE, W. Untersuchungen zu Epikedion und Consolatio in der Römischen Dichtung (von Catull bis Statius) (Diss. Göttingen '50)
- KITTO, H.D.F. Greek Tragedy (New York '61)
- KROLL, W. Studien zum Verständnis der Römischen Literatur (Stuttgart '24)
- LATTIMORE, R. Themes in Greek and Latin epitaphs (Urbana '62)
- LEAF, W. The Iliad vol.2 Books XIII-XXIV (London 1888)
- LEE, G. Tibullus elegies (Guy Lee '75)
- LEIER, B. Topica carminum sepulcralium latinorum (Philologus '62 (1903))
- LEUMANN, M. Homerische Wörter (Basel '50)
- LOYEN, A. L'Albis chez Claudien et chez Sidoine Apollinaire (Revue des Études Latines vol.11 ('33))
- LUCK, G. The Latin love elegy (Methuen '59)
- " P. Ovidius Naso. Tristia (Heidelberg '77)
- LYNCH, C.A. Aeschylus Agamemnon 550 (Classical Philology vol.47 ('52))
- MACLEOD, C.W. Homer Iliad Book XXIV (Cambridge '82).
- MARX, F. Plautus Rudens (Leipzig '28)
- MENDELL, C.W. Catullan echoes in the "odes" of Horace (Classical Philology vol.30 ('35))
- MERRY, W.W. Homer Odyssey, Books XIII-XXIV (Oxford 1907)
- MOLYNEUX, J.H. Aeschylus, Agamemnon 562 (Hermes vol.91 ('63))
- MOONEY, G.W. The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius (London '12)

- MORFORD, M.P.O. The poet Lucan (Oxford '67)
- MOULTON, C. Similes in the Homeric poems (Hypomnemata vol.49 (Göttingen '77))
- MUELLNER, L.C. The meaning of Homeric εὐχόμεαι through its formulas (Innsbruck '76)
- MURPHY, G.M.H. Ovid Metamorphoses Book XI (Oxford '72)
- NAGLE, B.R. The poetics of exile. Program and polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid (Latomus vol.170 ('80))
- OLECHOWSKA, E.M. Le "De Bello Gildonico" de Claudien et la tradition épique (Museum Helveticum vol.XXXI ('74))
- OOST, S.I. Count Gillo and Theodosius the Great (Classical philology vol.57 ('62))
- PALEY, F.A. P.Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Books V and VI (London 1888)
- PALMER, A. P.Ovidii Nasonis Heroides (Oxford 1898)
- PERRIN, B. Homer's Odyssey Books I-IV (Boston 1889)
- PLATT, A. The Iliad of Homer, Book XVIII (London 1903)
- PUTNAM, M.C. Tibullus, a commentary (Oklahoma '73)
- QUINN, K. Review of "Generic composition in Greek and Roman Poetry" by F. Cairns (Edinburgh '72) (Phoenix vol.27 ('73))
- RANK, L.P. Etymologiseering en verwante verschijnselen bij Homerus (Diss. Utrecht '51)
- REITZENSTEIN, R. Geschichte der Griechischen Etymologika (Leipzig 1897)
- ROSE, H.J. A commentary on the surviving plays of Aeschylus (Amsterdam '57)

- " Anth.Palat.VII 729 (The Classical Quarterly vol.31 ('37))
- ROUX,J. Euripide: Les Bacchantes (Paris '72)
- RUSSELL,D.A. and WILSON,N.G. Menander Rhetor (Oxford '81)
- SANDY,G.N. Catullus 63 and the theme of marriage (American Journal of Philology vol.92 ('71))
- SCHENKEVELD,D.M. Review of "Generic composition in Greek and Roman poetry" by F. Cairns (Edinburgh '72) (Mnemosyne vol.28 fasc.4 ('75))
- SCHMIEL,R. Moschus' Europa (Classical Philology vol.76 ('81))
- SCHULZ-VANHEYDEN,E. Properz und das Griechische Epigramm (Diss. Munster '69)
- SCOTT,W.C. The oral nature of the Homeric simile (Leiden '74)
- SEYMOUR,T.D. Homer's Iliad Books I-III (Boston 1887)
- SHIELDS,M.G. Sight and blindness imagery in the Oedipus Coloneus (Phoenix vol.15 ('61))
- SIDGWICK,A. P.Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber I (Cambridge 1883)
- SKUTSCH,O. A note on the Tibullan pentameter (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies no.19 ('72))
- SOUTAR,G. Nature in Greek poetry (St.Andrews '39)
- STANFORD,W.B. Ambiguity in Greek literature (Oxford '39)
- " The Odyssey of Homer (Macmillan '47 (vol.I),'54 (vol.II))
- STEPHANUS,H. Thesaurus Graecae Linguae (Paris 1841)
- THESAURUS LINGVAE LATINAE (Leipzig 1900)
- THOMAS,R.F. On a Homeric reference in Catullus (American Journal of Philology vol.100 ('79))

- THOMPSON, D'A.W. A glossary of Greek birds (London '36)
- TRACY, S.V. Prometheus Bound 114-117 (Harvard Studies in Classical Philology vol.75 ('71))
- TRAILL, D.A. Catullus 63: Rings around the sun (Classical Philology vol.76 ('81))
- TSAGARAKIS, O. Form and content in Homer (Hermes vol.46 ('82))
- TUCKER, T.G. The Supplices of Aeschylus (London 1889)
- USENER, H. and RADERMACHER, L. Dionysii Halicarnasei opuscula (vol.II Leipzig 1904-29)
- VAIO, J. The unity of Horace "Carm." I7 (Classical Philology Vol.61 ('66))
- VESSEY, D. Statius and the Thebaid (Cambridge '73)
- WACHSMUTH, D. Πόμπιμος ὁ Δαίμων (Berlin '67)
- WADDELL, W.G. Herodotus Book II (Methuen '39)
- WALDE, A. Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg '10)
- WALLACE, M.B. Notes on early Greek grave epigrams (Phoenix vol.XXIV.2 ('70))
- WENDEL, C. Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera (Berolini '58)
- WHEELER, A.L. Ovid with an English translation. Tristia; Ex Ponto (Loeb Classical Library, London and New York '24)
- WITKE, C. Verbal art in Catullus, 31 (American Journal of Philology vol.93 ('72))
- ZETZEL, J.E.G. A Homeric reminiscence in Catullus (American Journal of Philology vol.99 ('78))

WORD PLAY BETWEEN ΘΕΩ/ΘΟΟΣ AND ΘΕΟΣ IN HOMER

by

MARK S. HAYWOOD

(University of Liverpool)

Word play has long been recognised as a Homeric literary technique, perhaps the best-known instance being the *οὔτις/μήτις* joke at *Odyssey* 9,405-14; and recent scholarship has brought to light and investigated further examples.¹ This paper deals with one hitherto unrecognised² type of Homeric word play which is later paralleled in ancient pseudo-etymology – that between *θέω/θοός* and *θεός*.

I begin with the later pseudo-etymological evidence because it throws light back upon Homeric procedure. The etymology of *θεός* is variously given at all periods and it is only half correct to assert, as does H. Stephanus *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae* (rev. edn Paris, 1841) s.v. *θεός*, that “omnium receptissima [sc. etymologia] est ἀπὸ τοῦ θέω, currere.” This derivation is in fact less frequent than the sum of all the others; nevertheless no other individual etymology was ever as popular as this throughout ancient times.

The earliest witness to the etymology is Plato: *ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ γῆν καὶ ἀστροὺς καὶ οὐρανὸν· ὅτε οὖν αὐτὰ ὁρῶντες πάντα δεῖ ἰόντα δρόμῳ καὶ θέοντα, ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς φύσεως τῆς τοῦ θεῖν θεοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπονομάσαι* (*Cratylus* 397D). After this it appears in Apollodorus: this is testified to and apparently accepted by Seleucus.³ A further reiteration can be found near the beginning of Cornutus *De Natura Deorum*, where the word *θεύσις* seems to have been coined by Cornutus himself from *θέω*: *εὐλογον δὲ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς θεύσεως ἐσχηκέναι τὴν προσηγορίαν*. Another weighty supporter is Macrobius *Saturnalia* 1,23,3: *θεοὺς enim dicunt sidera et stellas ἀπὸ τοῦ θέω id est τρέχων quod semper in cursu sint . . .* At a much later date the etymology seems still to have been prevalent: cf. Johannes Mauropus of Euchaita *Etymologicon*⁴ 2f.: *θεός διήκων τῶν ὄλων ποιημάτων / φθάνει παρῶν*

ἅπανσι καὶ δοκεῖ θέεω. The fact that many of these sources give alternatives is of no importance, since we are not dealing with linguistic dogma but with a range of possibilities.

Given this later pseudo-etymological tradition, it is interesting that there are a number of occasions in the Homeric epics where word play between θέω/θούς and θεός seems to be present. I shall leave aside dubious cases⁵ and treat five examples in which word play between these terms seems fairly evident.

1. βῆ δὲ θέεω παρὰ νῆας ἐπ' Αἰακίδην Ἀχιλλῆα.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ κατὰ νῆας Ὀδυσσεύς θείω
ἔξε θέων Πάτροκλος, ἕνα σφ' ἀγορή τε θέμυς τε
ἦην, τῇ δὴ καὶ σφι θεῶν ἔτετεύχαστο βωμοί . . .

(*Iliad* 11,805-08)

Here forms of θέω and θεῖος/θεός are alternated line by line, the former being placed in the first half of the hexameter, the latter in the second. Furthermore the two forms of θέω occupy the same *sedes*. Such repetition and parallelism would strike any attentive audience: a poet attempting word play between θέω and θεός could hardly do better, and etymologising seems highly probable.

2. Macleod (*op.cit.* n.1, p.51) notes *Iliad* 1,290f. as a possible case of word play between τίθημι and θεός:

εἰ δέ μιν αἰχμητὴν ἔθεσαν θεοὶ ἀλὲν ἔοντες,
τοῦνεκά οἱ προθέουσιν βνεῖδα μυθήσασθαι;

But προθέω also must share in the word play and the -θέουσιν element cannot be divorced from the similar sounds in the preceding line. As Seymour⁶ observes, "the word seems chosen here with reference to ἔθεσαν." Indeed it is possible that Homer is engaged here too not only in word play, but also in etymologising, by exploiting both the link between θεός and τίθημι (cf. Herodotus 2,52,1), and that between θεός and θέω.

3. Θούς is the adjective directly derived from θέω and it is also possible to find in Homer word play between θούς and θεός:

αἰθ' ἅμα πάντες
Ἐκτορος ὠφέλετ' ἀντὶ θοῆς ἐπὶ νηυσὶ πεφάσθαι.
ὦ μοι ἐγὼ πανάποτμος, ἐπεὶ τέκον υἱὰς ἀρίστους
Τροίῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ, τῶν δ' οὐ τῶα φημι λελεῖφθαι,
Μήστορά τ' ἀντίθεον καὶ Τρωῖλον ἱππιωχάρμην . . .

(*Iliad* 24,253-57)

There seems to be a balance here between *ἀντί θοῆς* and *ἀντίθεον*. What makes this particular passage all the more remarkable is that nowhere else in Homer is *ἀντί* directly followed by any part of *θεός*. It is therefore extremely unlikely that the proximity of *ἀντί θοῆς* to a part of *ἀντίθεος* should have been purely accidental, especially as the latter word occurs only sixty-two times in Homer.

4. *Ἀντίθεος* features in another Homeric example, this time from the *Odyssey*:

αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
 Αἴγυπτόνδε με θυμός ἀνώγει ναυτίλλεσθαι,
 νῆας ἐὺ στείλαντα, σὺν ἀντιθέοις ἐτάροισιν.
 ἐννέα νῆας στείλα, θεῶς δ' ἔσαγειρετο λαός.

(*Odyssey* 14,245-48)

The last two lines both contain a weak third-foot caesura, and there is verbal and conceptual balance between the first two halves of the two hexameters (*νῆας ἐὺ στείλαντα / νῆας στείλα*). At first sight the symmetry of the two second halves is not complete, although both conclude by mentioning the crew (*ἐτάροισιν / λαός*). However if a verbal association between *ἀντιθέοις* and *θεῶς* is understood, then perfect symmetry would result.

5. At *Odyssey* 3,286-89 Nestor is describing Menelaus' difficult voyage from Troy:

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ κέυος ἰὼν ἐπὶ οὐνοπα πόντον
 ἐν νηυσὶ γλαφυρῆσι Μαλειῶων ὄρος αἰπύ
 ἔξε θέων, τότε δὴ στυγερὴν ὁδὸν εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
 ἐφράσατο.

Here *θέων* (running) appears in the same line as Zeus who is, although not specifically named as such, a *θεός*. Under normal circumstances we might regard this as an accident, but the use of *θέων* here does in fact seem to have been contrived: in view of the previous participial clause (*ἰὼν*) it seems strange that Homer reiterates what Menelaus was already doing when he reached the *ὄρος αἰπύ*. The entirely distinct meaning of *ἰὼν* and *θέων* makes the repetition even more cumbersome, in view of their identical syntactical roles. Furthermore, as Perrin⁷ observes, *ἔξε θέων* would normally be used of a ship rather than a sailor.⁸ The poet therefore seems to be forcing *θέων* into this position in order, I believe, to suggest the association of *θέων . . . Ζεὺς* which implies the standard word play between *θέω* and *θεός*.

These examples show, I believe, that Homer was prepared to indulge in word play based on the similarity of sound between $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ plus its cognates and $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$. It is perhaps possible, particularly on the basis of examples 1) and 2), to go further than this and to suggest that Homer, whose general interest in 'etymology' is widely recognised, already knew and was exploiting the pseudo-etymology found in Plato and his successors.⁹

NOTES

1. E.g. D.F. Bright 'A Homeric Ambiguity' *Mnem.* 30 (1977) pp.423-26; C.W. Macleod (ed.) *Homer Iliad Book XXIV* (Cambridge, 1982) pp.50-53.
2. It is notably absent from L.P. Rank *Etymologiseering en verwante verschijnselen bij Homerus* (Diss. Utrecht, 1951).
3. See R. Reitzenstein *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika* (Leipzig, 1897) p.160.
4. *Ibid.* p.173.
5. E.g. *Il.* 5,719-22; 14,257-61; 15,583-85; 19,159-61; 24,564; *Od.* 2,211-12; 8,192-94; 11,330-32; 13,86-89.
6. T.D. Seymour (ed.) *Homer's Iliad Books I-III* (Boston, 1887) *ad loc.*
7. B. Perrin (ed.) *Homer's Odyssey Books I-IV* (Boston, 1889) *ad loc.*
8. $\Upsilon\acute{\iota}\epsilon \theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon$ may of course be used literally of a man running, e.g. at *Il.* 11, 807 quoted above.
9. I am indebted to Professor F. Cairns, Dr R. Maltby and Mr I.M. LeM. Du Quesnay for their helpful advice on this paper.