Dan –
Here's that [illegible]
All best, [illegible]

Copyright © 2000 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in Publication Data

Matrices of genre : authors, canons, and society / edited by Mary Depew & Dirk Obbink.
p. cm. — (Center for Hellenic Studies colloquia ; 4)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-674-00338-1
1. Classical literature—History and criticism—Theory, etc. 2. Literature and society—Greece—History. 3. Literature and society—Rome—History. 4. Canon (Literature) 5. Literary form. I. Depew, Mary. II. Obbink, Dirk. III. Series.

PA39 .M38 2000
880′.09 21; aa05 06-09—dc00 00-040942

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION
Mary Depew and Dirk Obbink 1

CHAPTER ONE
Generating Genres: The Idea of the Tragic *Glenn W. Most* 15

CHAPTER TWO
Epigram and Reader: Generic Force as (Re-)Activation of Ritual
Joseph W. Day 37

CHAPTER THREE
Enacted and Represented Dedications: Genre and Greek Hymn
Mary Depew 59

CHAPTER FOUR
Formulas, Voice, and Death in *Ehoie*-Poetry, the Hesiodic *Gunaikon Katalogos*, and the Odysseian *Nekuia* *Ian Rutherford* 81

CHAPTER FIVE
Herodotus's Genre(s) *Deborah Boedeker* 97

CHAPTER SIX
From Aristophanes to Menander? Genre Transformation in Greek Comedy *Eric Csapo* 115

CHAPTER SEVEN
Theocritus and the "Demythologizing" of Poetry *Marco Fantuzzi* 135

CHAPTER EIGHT
Lycophron's *Alexandra:* "Hindsight as Foresight Makes No Sense"?
Stephanie West 153

CHAPTER NINE
Rituals in Ink: Horace on the Greek Lyric Tradition
Alessandro Barchiesi 167

CHAPTER TEN
The Dialectics of Genre: Some Aspects of
Secondary Literature and Genre in Antiquity *Ineke Sluiter* 183

CHAPTER ELEVEN
The Didactic Plot *Don Fowler* 205

CHAPTER TWELVE
Essential Epic: Genre and Gender from Macer to Statius
Stephen Hinds 221

NOTES 247

BIBLIOGRAPHY 305

CONTRIBUTORS 340

INDEX 343

In Memoriam

Don Fowler

CHAPTER TWELVE

Essential Epic: Genre and Gender from Macer to Statius

STEPHEN HINDS

Preface: Heinze, Kroll and Beyond

Broadly speaking, three approaches have been taken in twentieth-century criticism to classical Latin poems considered problematic as to generic category; broadly speaking, each approach has arisen in reaction to its predecessor. For a schematic doxography, consider the poem that is often regarded as the extreme test case of any genre-based reading of Rome's highly formalized literary traditions, the hexameter *Metamorphoses* of Ovid.

(1) The essential purity of the *Metamorphoses* as an epic has been asserted, with "unepic" elements played down and their importance minimized; therefore, Richard Heinze's 1919 comparison and contrast of hexametric and elegiac narrative styles in Ovid is still regularly invoked as a starting point for discussion.

(2) The poem's impurity as an epic has been counterasserted, with the implication either (a) that it is to be defined as a post-Hellenistic crossbreed or hybrid of existing genres (that is, as an outcome of "Die Kreuzung der Gattungen," in Wilhelm Kroll's enduring 1924 formulation)[1] or (b) that it resists *any* appeal to genre as a useful interpretative tool (so Galinsky 1975.viii "the generic terminology has imposed its limitations even on those who have disagreed with Heinze"). A third variant (c) might hold that the *Metamorphoses* renders necessary the invention of a *new* genre or genre label (compare the idea in Klein 1974 that Callimachus's *Aetia* establishes a "counter-genre" of aetiology). Knox 1986 embraces elements of (a), (b), and (c), emphasizing the roots of the *Metamorphoses* in largely unepic Alexandrianism and applying Ross's influential view

(1975:37) of earlier Augustan poetic genealogy: "the discovery of a single unified tradition comprehending a variety of forms and genres means that genre need no longer count for much."[2]

(3) The epic identity of the *Metamorphoses* is reasserted; but now discrepant elements, instead of being played down (as by Heinze) or of being treated as witnesses to the irrelevance of genre (as by Galinsky), are embraced as part of a dynamic process of self-definition: the poem's generic self-consciousness is expressed and negotiated not just in its observance but also in its creative transgression of the expected bounds of epic (3a, Hinds 1987:99–134).[3] Whereas approach (2) accepts generic *poikilia* as (in one way or another) a fait accompli, approach (3) insists on a continuing and active dialectic between the genres so mixed, for author and readers alike, "staged" within the text of the poem concerned.[4] An especially important and well-theorized version of (3) is Conte's account of the *totalizing* ambition of a given genre (3b, 1994:115–125), which reads (say) the Ovidian *Herois* not as an elegy that threatens cross-border incursions into other genres (transgression) but as an elegy that seeks programmatically to *coopt* and subsume all other generic systems to its own narrow but all-encompassing worldview;[5] such an account can also be applied, mutatis mutandis, to the epic ambition of the *Metamorphoses*.

What approaches (2a) and (3) have in common with (1) is a strong sense that an appeal to some essence or substratum of a given genre is inscribed in Roman poetic thinking: as the pure form from which crossbred forms are hybridized (2a); as the "default setting" from which experiments and transgressions measure their distance (3a); or as the nucleus into whose orbit all other matter will be attracted in the formation of an enlarged, totalized genre (3b). This generic essence may be explained simply with reference to meter or with reference to the sets of stereotyped rules that metrical categories attract in ancient philological and bibliographical traditions of taxonomy—even from practitioners who do not practice what they preach (for example, Ovid at *Remedia* 372ff., to be discussed later).

Some moderns have sought to define generic essence as a moving target, ever changing to adapt to changes in poetic practice; this emphasis on historical accommodation underlies (say) much of Alastair Fowler's 1982 book on genre (grounded in a study of the "kinds" of English literature).[6] However, such a commonsensical approach is rendered inadequate to the present paper's purposes by its very readiness to narrow and to negotiate *away* the gap between prescription and practice, which is so fundamental to the construction of genre in a classical Roman poem. The remarkable thing about the appeals to generic essence in Roman critical and metapoetic discussion—whether defined in

terms of approaches (1), (2a), or (3)—is their persistence *in the face of* poetic practice. "Unepic" elements, no matter how frequently they feature in actual epics, continue to be regarded as unepic; as if oblivious to elements of vitality and change within the genre (for which he himself may be in part responsible), each new Roman writer reasserts a stereotype of epic whose endurance is as remarkable as is its ultimate incompatibility with the actual plot of any actual epic in the Greek or Latin canon.

A good way to look afresh at Roman generic poetics, then, will be to consider how and why some of epic's most recurrent features are systematically treated as threatening the essence of the genre rather than as helping to constitute it—hence my specific theme. I want to focus on the continually affected surprise of Augustan and post-Augustan poets at the fact that women and love—and women *in* love—can have a place in epic. The role of the female in actual epics never becomes canonized within stereotyped descriptions of the genre, but a case can be made that *surprise* at the role of the female in actual epics *does* become so canonized: woman never becomes theorized into epic as an essential element of the genre, but woman does achieve a kind of essentialized theoretical status as an *ambusher* of the purity of epic. How the regular-as-clockwork involvement of the female in the actual plots of epic can be obsessively characterized as adulterating the genre, without ever really coming to be characterized as defining it, is a question that exposes the well-known but little understood tension between Roman generic theory and Roman generic practice; and it is a question worth probing in terms formal, ideological, and epistemological.

In this respect, of course, Roman epic's enduring failure to theorize some of its own most representative features involves particular exclusions that are no less interesting to critics of gender than they are to critics of genre; so that my paper will have the further purpose of bringing together two methodological conversations still too often carried on in isolation from one another.

Arms and the [Wo]man

We all know what, programmatically and prescriptively, a Roman epic is supposed to treat: *arma virumque* (arms and the man, Virgil, *Aen.* 1.1); *reges et proelia* (kings and battles, Virgil, *Ecl.* 6.3); *res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella* (exploits of kings and generals and grim wars, Horace, *A.P.* 73). We are also by now familiar with the paradox (just rehearsed in my Preface) that the more Roman poets mix, blur, and hybridize generic categories in their poetic practice, the more persistently they tend to appeal to unmixed, essentialized, and unchanging conceptions of the genre in their poetological policy

statements. In Ovid (on whom I shall continue to focus for a while) this gulf between theory and practice amounts to something of a methodological scandal. Here in the *Remedia Amoris* is the soon-to-be author of Rome's most elegiac epic (the *Metamorphoses*) and Rome's most epic elegy (the *Fasti*):

> If you have sense, match each theme to its proper meter. Bold wars (*fortia . . . bella*) rejoice to be related in Homeric feet: what place can there be in this medium for erotic airs (*deliciis illic quis locus esse potest*)? . . . Let seductive Elegy sing of quivered *Amores*, and, light in love, keep to her playful caprices. Achilles is no theme for the meter of Callimachus; Cydippe is wrong for the voice of Homer. (*Rem.* 372–374, 379–382)

How can Ovid of all poets, the poster boy of Augustan generic hybridization, offer (in whatever cause) this doctrinaire credo of generic purity?

As our understanding of the generic rules of engagement in Augustan poetry has grown more sophisticated, recent critics have found such essentialist and fundamentalist poses by Augustan poets ever more irritating. Of course Ovid knows full well how to import *deliciae* into epic and (just as important) how to read the previous history of epic as a *history* of the importation of *deliciae* into epic. And of course he knows full well how Achilles can fairly be treated in Callimachus's elegiac meter. In the third of his own *Heroides*, in fact, just a few years earlier, Ovid himself had imported the hero of the *Iliad* into an epistolary elegy for 77 couplets—and had done so not by accident but in full generic self-awareness:

> arma cape, Aeacide, sed me tamen ante recepta,
> et preme turbatos Marte favente viros!
> propter me mota est, propter me desinat ira,
> simque ego tristitiae causa modusque tuae (*Her.* 3.87–90)

> Take up arma, Aeacides—yet take me back first—and with the favor of Mars put harried warriors to rout! On my account your wrath was stirred, on my account let it end: let me be both cause and conclusion of your grim sadness.

To offer a genre-enhanced paraphrase of Briseis's ventriloquized words here in their Ovidian context (a paraphrase whose tendentiousness should be justified by the subsequent course of my discussion): "Fulfil your martial epic project,

Achilles, but take care of erotics first! Lay your wrath to rest—i.e. lay to rest your programmatic μῆνιν . . . Πηληιάδεω Ἀχιλῆος—as being coterminous with our temporary elegiac estrangement."[7] In other words, underlying Briseis's exhortation in *Heroides* 3 is the idea that the *Iliad*, although the foundational text of the epic tradition, is also interpretable (on a female-gendered "reading," anyway) as a tale of erotic elegiac separation and reunion. We should register the real strength in this appropriative argument, even as we register the limitation of the knowledge granted by Ovid to Briseis. (At the time of her writing, Patroclus has not yet gone out to die;[8] unbeknownst to Briseis, a second, greater source of epic *ira* / *menis* awaits Achilles in the near future—which will deny to his wrath the easy closure that Briseis, the female and elegiac reader, has here envisaged.)

To return to the *Remedia* passage and its definition of epic, what is interesting about such a normative theorization of the genre, in the light of actual Augustan poetic practice, is not in itself the programmatic insistence on stereotyping the epic genre as the genre of *arma* or *bella*,[9] but rather the persistent *and often explicit* exclusion of anything female or erotic from that stereotyped definition: *deliciis illic quis locus esse potest?* As Ovid's elegiac "take" on the *Iliad* in *Heroides* 3 can remind us, no actual Greek or Roman epic capable of being coopted to the *arma* stereotype is without its female and erotic elements, from the *Iliad* to the *Aeneid*; and the fact is that in most epics, from the *Iliad* onwards, an eroticized female, rather than just offering an interlude in conflict, functions as the *catalyst* of conflict. A commonsense Fowlerian characterization of Iliadic and post-Iliadic epic might build on accumulated weight of literary historical precedent to characterize the genre as, in essence, one of war between men *and over women;* but in the Romans' own characterizations of epic, the essential role of the female is tendentiously suppressed or skewed.

Perhaps the first and most telling terms in which to make sense of this continual remarginalization of the female and the erotic are as follows: The taxonomic bias of Alexandrian and Roman criticism means that essentialized characterizations of epic are most often offered (as in the *Remedia* passage) in the immediate vicinity of essentialized characterizations of elegy. And generating the same juxtaposition, programmatic allusions to the composition of epic are a recurrent topos *within* Propertian and Ovidian elegy. In this well-known topos, an epic project is commonly envisaged as being abandoned, postponed, or better left to someone else; the love poet's choice of elegy over epic is presented as a renunciation of warfare and other concerns of the public, male sphere in favor of the demands of *amor* (or *Amor*) and of the (mostly) female beloved. Both structurally and ideologically, the presentation of the elegist's

typical concerns in these terms has the inevitable effect of excluding the erotic and the female from the *stereotypable* concerns of epic—however important the erotic and the female might be to *actual* epic plots. Again and again in Augustan elegy, then, the topos of contrasting poetic projects has the effect of reinforcing a programmatic stereotype of epic as "all war, all male, all the time." Thus, for instance, *arma* are opposed to *amor* as epic to elegy in Propertius 1.7,

> Ponticus, while you tell of Cadmean Thebes and the grim *arma* of fraternal warfare, competing for primacy (so help me) with Homer himself. . . , I, as is my wont, get on with my *amores*, in quest of something to use against a hard-hearted mistress (1–3, 5–6)

in Propertius 2.10,

> Let youth sing of loves, and age sing of conflicts: I will sing of wars, when my girl has been written (*bella canam, quando scripta puella meast*) (7–8)

and at the beginning of Ovid's *Amores*, with its formalist fiction that the poet was set to embark on an epic when Cupid sabotaged his project by stealing a foot from the second of a pair of hexameters:

> Arms, and violent wars, in weighty measure: that was the output I planned, with matter suited to the meter. The second verse was equal to the first—but Cupid, they say, with a laugh stole away one foot. (Ov. *Am.* 1.1.1–4)

What is the *materia* suitable for writing epic in Ovid's elegiac proem? *arma* and *violenta bella*. Any mention of the erotic tensions that so often underlie or structure those *arma* and *bella* in actual epics, any allowance for Cupid's own appearances in the divine machinery of (say) the *Argonautica* or *Aeneid*, is ruled out by the need for a clean rhetorical and ideological contrast with the *materia* designated as suitable for elegy:

> "And yet I have no matter suited to lighter measures—neither a boy, nor a girl with combed long locks." (1.1.19–20)

Not only does the common Augustan habit of contrasting the programs of epic and elegy help to make sense of blank exclusions of the female and of the erotic from *theorizations* of epic, but also (to move on to my more subtle point) that same habit of contrast helps to explain how references to epic's *actual* female and erotic forces, where they do occur, tend to present those female and erotic forces as subversive of, rather than constitutive of, the epic plot.

This treatment is observable in another poem in the *Amores*, 2.18. Here, as well as offering the familiar contrast between his elegiac project and an epic project that he had previously envisaged, Ovid makes a further contrast between the elegiac *Amores* and an actual epic written not by himself, but by his friend Macer:

> While you, Macer, take your poem down to the wrath of Achilles, and invest the oath-bound men with their first arms (*carmen ad iratum dum tu perducis Achillem / primaque iuratis induis arma viris*), I dally in the indolent shade of Venus, with tender Amor crushing my grand designs. Often I have said to my girl "Go away, why don't you?"—her immediate response has been to sit in my lap . . . I am vanquished, and my talent is recalled from the taking up of arms: I sing of exploits at home and of my personal wars (*resque domi gestas et mea bella cano*). (*Am.* 2.18.1–6, 11–12)

So far, the characterization of epic poetry here is very much along the same lines as in the Propertian and Ovidian passages just discussed: all war, all male, all the time. Note the first couplet's evocations of the *incipit*-words of both *Iliad* and *Aeneid*;[10] note too how the description of elegy in line 12 allusively domesticates and eroticizes the most famous of all Augustan characterizations of epic, Horace's at *Ars Poetica* 73 (translated earlier):

> res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella

However, when the closing lines of the elegy return to Macer's "*Iliad*-prequel," an interesting twist has been added to Ovid's characterization of his friend's epic project:

> nec tibi, qua tutum vati, Macer, arma canenti
>   aureus in medio Marte tacetur Amor:
> et Paris est illic et adultera, nobile crimen,
>   et comes extincto Laodamia viro.
> si bene te novi, non bella libentius istis
>   dicis, et a vestris in mea castra venis (*Am.* 2.18.35–40)

Nor where it is safe for you, Macer, as a bard of *arma*, do you leave golden Amor unsung in the midst of Mars. Both Paris and his adulteress—a celebrated scandal—are there, and Laodamia, companion to her husband in death. If I know you well, you do not tell of wars more gladly than of these: you are moving over from your camp into mine.

The erotic, the female and (in Paris's case) the effeminate turn out to have a place in Macer's epic after all—unlike in the stereotyped descriptions of the genre quoted before. But consider the terms in which these elements are introduced:

nec tibi, *qua tutum* vati, Macer, arma canenti

"*where it is safe* for you . . .": for a poet who sings of *arma*, it seems that there are risks involved in the introduction of Amor. An incipient interest in Amor makes of Macer a potential traitor to his genre: acknowledgment of the erotic and female dimensions of the Trojan war myth produces, not a broad-based, Fowlerian epicist, but rather a generic turncoat likely to sneak across to the camp of elegy. As soon as a Trojan war epic begins to dwell on the seduction of Helen, indispensable though this be to the war plot, that epic is flirting with generic transgression. Once again, the ever-available contrast with elegy has locked the genre into a narrow stereotype of itself. The implication is that once epic gets in touch with its feminine side, its essential epic-ness is threatened: what at first sight looked like a broadening and feminizing of the epic paradigm turns out to be something close to the opposite.

"*qua tutum vati* . . .": by way of preparation for the extended discussion of Statius's *Achilleid* that will conclude this paper, let me return parenthetically to a passage in *Amores* 1.1 that can suggest that something even more shameful than an imputation of treachery may await the poet who adulterates the purity of epic: in a word, emasculation. In that programmatic *aition* of the elegiac couplet, the move from the "hard" themes of epic to the "soft" themes of elegy entails an enervation in the poet's style, and ultimately (through an easy innuendo), in the poet's own manhood:

cum bene surrexit versu nova pagina primo,
attenuat nervos proximus ille meos (*Am.* 1.1.17–18)

When my new page has risen up well with its first verse, the next verse diminishes my—*nervos*.[11]

To resume. In *Amores* 2.18, Ovid explains (away) the erotic and the female elements in Macer's Trojan epic; in his great *apologia* from exile, *Tristia* 2, he does the same for the *Iliad* itself:

denique composui teneros non solus amores:
composito poenas solus amore dedi . . .
Ilias ipsa quid est aliud nisi adultera, de qua
inter amatorem pugna virumque fuit?
quid prius est illi flamma Briseidos, utque
fecerit iratos rapta puella duces? (*Trist.* 2.361–362, 371–374)

Finally, I am not the only author to write tender *amores*; but I am the only author to be punished for it . . . The *Iliad* itself—what is it but an adulteress about whom her lover and her husband had a fight? What occurs in it before the flare-up for Briseis, the wrath of the generals due to the seizure of the girl?

Ovid is using literary historical arguments to deny that there is anything exceptional, or exceptionable, in the erotic poetry of the *Ars Amatoria*. His tactic, in the lines quoted, is to turn Homer himself into a kind of erotic elegist—rather as he had done with Macer in *Amores* 2.18, but now in a genre-defining game with higher stakes. What is the *Iliad*, he asks, but the adultery of Helen and the fire of passion ignited by Briseis? (Note that Ovid here renders explicit the very reading of the *Iliad* that I argued to be implicit in Briseis's "own" elegiac arguments back in *Her.* 3.87–90.) Ovid's characterization of the defining text of epic is clearly meant to come across as a perverse and exaggerated one (*Ilias ipsa quid est aliud nisi* . . . accents the tendentiousness); and what it perverts is, precisely, the essentialized view of epic that emphasizes the maleness and militariness of the genre to the exclusion of matters female and erotic. Now the female and the erotic within epic are to be acknowledged—but with a very characteristic kind of skewing. Recall the distinction proposed in my preface: the role of the female in actual epics never becomes canonized within stereotyped descriptions of the genre; but *surprise* at the role of the female in actual epics *does* become so canonized. Such is the dynamic here: Ovid offers a perverse characterization of the *Iliad*'s epic qualities to make an elegiac point (the *Iliad* is a collection of *Amores*); what is entirely normal is his use of the *Iliad*'s own female characters to achieve that perversion.

So far my approach to these questions of genre and gender has been wholly relational: I have focused on discussions *in elegiac texts* of what is normal and

what is transgressive in epic. It is time to consider the operation of these questions within epic texts themselves. Let me take a few bearings, then, in that most canonical Augustan treatment of epic *arma virumque*, Virgil's *Aeneid*—firstly and most summarily in the Dido episode, at whose transgression of the epic norm of "all war, all male, all the time" Ovid had affected some disingenuous surprise at another moment in his address to Augustus in *Tristia* 2:

> Some loudly celebrate wars and their bloody weaponry; some sing of the exploits of your line, some of your own. As for me—envious nature has confined me within a narrow space, granting but slight powers to my talent. And yet that most favoured *Aeneid*-poet of yours brought his "arms and the man" to a Tyrian couch (*et tamen ille tuae felix Aeneidos auctor / contulit in Tyrios arma virumque toros*), and no part of the whole work is more read than that union of illicit *amor*. (*Trist.* 2.529–536)

On Ovid's tendentious reading, Virgil sets up an assignation for his epic *Aeneid* in the purple sheets of a Tyrian bed—in which, at the lowest stratum of meaning, *arma virumque* can function like a phrase in Ausonius's *Cento Nuptialis* to endow our man with the "equipment" he needs for erotic burlesque.[12] But is some element of surprise at the *Aeneid*'s assimilation of such an erotic episode encoded, albeit less luridly, within the *Aeneid* itself? I think so: the *Tristia* 2 vignette is as much a commentary on Virgil's own self-conscious play with epic norms as it is a parodic reading—even granted that Ovid's purposes lead him to deemphasize Dido's more obvious affinities with tragedy in favor of her affinities with elegy and other "slight" genres.

One might look to the fact that, whereas the Carthaginian episode in *Aeneid* 1 and 4 boasts the full paraphernalia of epic divine machinery, the agent of that machinery is none other than Cupid, the divine player stereotypically associated with erotic elegy; remember *Rem.* 379 *blanda pharetratos Elegia cantet Amores.* One might cite the marked downsizing of epic *lexis* embodied in Dido's famously affective diminutive at *Aen.* 4.328–329, at the moment when her foundation-narrative is definitively eclipsed by Aeneas's: *si quis mihi parvulus aula / luderet Aeneas* (if a darling little Aeneas were playing in my palace . . .). Or one might consider the terms in which hostile witnesses are allowed to define Aeneas's entanglement with Dido in the various narrative focalizations of *Aeneid* 4: what to Mercury is a stalling of the *Aeneid*'s mission by a hero who has become, unepically, *uxorius* (*Aen.* 4.266), is to Fama a forgetting of *regnum* by a ruler who has sunk into a winter of erotic servitude (*Aen.*

4.193–194), and is to Iarbas a perversion of natural justice by a perfumed Paris with a retinue of Asiatic eunuchs (*Aen.* 4.215–217)—this last being especially unsettling in its alignment of the *Aeneid*'s hero with the familiar stereotype of an emasculated, orientalized, un-Roman other.

So much by way of brief evocation of the Dido episode. Let me dwell a little longer on another Virgilian nexus of genre and gender, in *Aeneid* 7—which I select because it is founded on an unexpected and suggestive reprise of a celebrated speech by Hector in the sixth book of the *Iliad*, in which the Homeric hero is responding to his wife's attempt to persuade him to avoid the dangers of battle. (My discussion here is deeply indebted to a fine treatment by Alison Keith in her forthcoming book *Engendering Roman Epic*, a major intervention in the present paper's field of interest.)

> "But go home and see to your own tasks, the loom and the distaff, and bid your handmaids ply their work; war will be the concern of men, myself above all, that dwell in Ilium (*πόλεμος δ' ἐμοί, Ἰλίῳ ἐγγεγάασιν*)." So saying, glorious Hector took up his horse-plumed helmet; and his dear wife went home, looking back often, and letting big tears fall. (*Il.* 6.490–496)
>
> (πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει / πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ' ἐμοί, τοὶ Ἰλίῳ ἐγγ

This famous Iliadic exchange is one that might be expected to generate considerable interest among Augustan characterizers of epic norms, and, perhaps, to be regarded as a foundational moment for the pure-*arma* stereotype; and I think it was so regarded by the Augustans.[13] Here in *Aeneid* 7, Virgil's Turnus confronts an aged priestess—unbeknownst to him, she is really the Fury Allecto—who has just attempted to tell him how to run his war:

> "sed te victa situ verique effeta senectus,
> o mater, curis nequiquam exercet, et arma
> regum inter falsa vatem formidine ludit.
> cura tibi divum effigies et templa tueri;
> *bella viri pacemque gerent quis bella gerenda*" (*Aen.* 7.440–444)

> "But old age, madam, exhausted, decayed, and barren of truth, worries you needlessly with cares, and deludes your prophetic vision with false fears amid the *arma* of kings. Your responsibility is to watch over the statues

and temples of the gods; *men will handle war and peace, for wars are theirs to handle*."

For Turnus, as for Hector at *Il.* 6.492–493, but with much Augustan programmatic enhancement, the making and breaking of war is *man's* work. But whereas Andromache, the recipient of this speech in the *Iliad*, accepts Hector's division of labor between the sexes and beats a wordless and tearful retreat, this time the epic male is speaking to a very different kind of epic female—one who is by no means ready to accept a marginalized role within the genre of *arma*. When Allecto throws off her disguise, she ceases to be the elderly priestess Calybe (Turnus's ageism is, then, of only momentary interest), but she continues to be a female, albeit a female of a different kind than *either* Andromache *or* the priestess to whom Turnus had imagined he was speaking. And *this* female throws Turnus's characterization of the genre back in his teeth:

> "See me now (*en ego*) exhausted, decayed, whom old age, barren of truth, deludes with false fears amid the *arma* of kings. Pay heed to this: I am come from the seat of the dread sisters; war and death are in *my* hand (*adsum dirarum ab sede sororum, / bella manu letumque gero*)." (*Aen.* 7.452–455)

Turnus's allusion to the *Iliad* 6 passage has to be heard in order for the full programmatic force of Allecto's reply here to be apprehended. Turnus had repeated the standard androcentric view of epic *arma*; he had allusively grounded it in a foundational passage from the *Iliad*; and he had voiced it within an epic whose very titular opening confirms the androcentrism of epic warfare: *arma virumque*. But now a female character within the *Aeneid* challenges the paradigm, thereby challenging not just Turnus but also Hector, Homer, and ultimately the narrator of her own epic. (Not that that challenge is allowed finally to prevail: it is by no means irrelevant to the portrayal of Allecto that her agency is associated with a brand of warfare represented in the schemes of the *Aeneid* as both irrational and doomed.)

This discussion well illustrates a point to which I intend to give increasing emphasis in the remainder of my paper: namely, that the institutionalized otherness within epic of the genre's female and erotic elements never becomes formulaic, but rather exists as something mobile and continually open to renegotiation. Let me reinforce that point and also take stock more broadly, by applying some of the categories used in my Preface. Virgilian practice vis-à-vis epic's female and erotic elements does not conform to Heinze's static model of epic purity (1), whereby unepic elements are played down and their importance minimized. Nor does it conform to Kroll's static model of epic impurity (2a), whereby a combination of epic and unepic elements is presented as an *achieved* hybrid, an *outcome* of prior negotiation. Rather the model that best explains Virgilian practice is one of *dynamic impurity* (3). Virgil uses, say, Dido, at once protagonist in her own ktistic narrative and secondary love-interest in Aeneas's, to emplot into his epic poem a *continuing* discussion about the otherness of the epic female; and he does so in such a way that even the terms of reference of the debate do not remain static, either intratextually or intertextually. Thus too, in the *Aeneid* 7 nexus analyzed before, Allecto, the demonic Fury, is not Andromache, nor Calybe either: neither the princess tending the palace nor the priestess tending the temple. Turnus repeats in *Aen.* 7.444 a canonical formulation about the role of women in epic; but the shift in the identity of the female interlocutor, not just between Homer and Virgil but within the Virgilian passage itself, draws attention simultaneously to a continuity in epic's marginalization of the female, as well as to a mobility and renegotiability as to *what* such marginalization of the female may entail, *whom* it may involve, and *how* it may be emplotted.

A few broader thoughts, then, concerning the theory and practice of epic as a generic category in Rome. One thing that has emerged, I think, is the interestedness of any Augustan reading of generic norms. The "otherness" within epic of epic's female and erotic elements persists; but the number of ways in which that otherness can be expressed and the number of different and sometimes contradictory agendas that it can serve, are legion. We have just seen a single moment in the *Iliad* invoked by Virgil as the *aition* for a multiple set of viewpoints on the role of the female in epic. We saw earlier that Ovid could appeal to epic in at least three mildly incompatible ways to defend elegy against the stigma of (over)indulgence in the erotic:

Rem. 372ff.: what is right for epic is not right for elegy, and vice versa;
Trist. 2.529ff.: even epics sometimes dabble in elegiac *amor*;
Trist. 2.371ff.: epics are nothing but elegiac *amores*.

This ability of the Augustans to expose an enduring generic prejudice to continual renegotiation is the very thing that (as noted as the outset of the present section) has often exasperated recent critics of Latin poetry. But, in formal terms at least, this ability to renegotiate is a clear strength, which guarantees the dynamism of genre as an operative category in the poetry of Augustan Rome.

To some extent, this continual renegotiability is nothing more (and noth-

ing less) than the working out of a universal law of discourse. Iteration entails alteration: with generic oppositions, as noted, but also with generic norms and essences themselves. Even a sign of generic essentialism as solid, say, as the programmatic buzzword *arma* must pick up and shed traces of context and resonance each time it is (re)cited and (re)framed—whether in discrete passages quoted earlier such as Prop. 1.7.2, Virg. *Aen.* 1.1, Ov. *Am.* 1.1.1, *Am.* 2.18.2 and 35, and *Trist.* 2.534, or, within the *Aeneid* itself, in the changes self-consciously rung on the epic's opening *arma virumque* at 1.119, 4.495, 6.233, 8.441, 9.620, 9.777, 11.747, and elsewhere.[14] In Duncan Kennedy's notable formulation, "in the repetition which attracts the description 'generic,' there is inevitably a recontextualization, involving marks of repetition and traces of citation from other sources, which brings about generic change in the very act of repetition."[15] Kennedy here mediates "a law of impurity or a principle of contamination" that Jacques Derrida seeks to find "lodged within the heart of the law [of genre] itself."[16] The Derridean perspective is useful in that it offers us a way to maintain some critical distance from the often occluded appeals to generic essentialism at the core of even the most relativistic model of "dynamic impurity." At some ultimate level it is indeed worth thinking of a generic essence like the *arma*-stereotype as an objectivist fiction masking an infinite set of subjective negotiations with tradition by an infinite set of infinitely repositionable authors and readers. But perhaps not at every level. The usefulness of the Derridean perspective for a close consideration of poetic form is limited by the fact that Augustan generic essences really *are* much more powerfully and pervasively essentialized, among their first reading communities at least, than anything that Derrida contemplates in "La loi du genre"; under the timelessness of his opening aphorisms, Derrida is treating specifically Romantic and post-Romantic ideas of genre, and applying his interpretative pressure to the metrically unmarked novel or novella (whose ancient ancestor differs from epic or elegy in that it seems never to be overtly theorized or even named as a generic category by the ancients themselves).

Where Kennedy's Derridean terms of reference can add a fresh dimension to the present discussion, however, is in their (implicit) readiness to reach beyond considerations of strict poetic form in envisaging "traces of citation from other sources." In practice, generic essences and oppositions will always find some interpretative context outside even the most tightly self-referential literary system; and one reason why the role within epic of epic's own female and erotic elements has to be continually renegotiated, without any closure, is surely sociological. Unless the Romans had somehow and at some point ceased to regard the female as anomalous in the *res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia* *bella* of contemporary sociopolitical experience, how was any reconciliation between women and weaponry to be expected in the world of epic poetry? As Keith's forthcoming book will show, the construction of epic at Rome was powerfully complicit with the construction of elite male education and homosocial discourse.[17] And (to press in this context my argument about the continuing maneuverability of this enduring female and erotic otherness) unless Romans had somehow lost the capacity to be surprised and perturbed when public affairs actually *were* disrupted by interventions of female, effeminate, and eroticized agents, why should representations of such otherness in Roman epic have ever become predictable or routine? In the case of the *Aeneid*, such interplay between epic and societal tensions is unusually close to the surface in the parallelism of Dido and Cleopatra, in and between the lines of the text—both of them powerful women who threaten the ideological purity and masculine autonomy of the male protagonists associated with them (Aeneas in one story, Caesar and Antony in the two versions of the other).

If the preceding paragraph serves to set a poem like the *Aeneid* in a particular cultural frame, let this episode of the stocktaking end with a brief consideration of the proposition that the *Aeneid* itself *constitutes* a cultural frame. My case studies in the continual renegotiation of generic tensions have established that there was a healthy tendency in Augustan poetic practice to treat literary form dynamically. But the continuity of such dynamism for post-Augustan epic faced a new threat from the *Aeneid* itself. Virgil's *chef d'oeuvre* was so rapidly and completely institutionalized as Rome's national epic that it inevitably became the "code model" of the genre for most subsequent Roman poets and readers.[18] Does this outcome mean that even elements that had been emplotted by Virgil as *transgressive* for epic (like the erotic dalliance at Carthage) were now read as *normative* for the genre? Once the *Aeneid* became the code model, did it lose all potential to be read as, in places, an unepic epic?

A generation or two ago, most modern Latinists would probably have answered a straightforward yes to the two questions just asked. However, happily (at least for those of us who are devotees of "dynamic impurity"), the most recent revaluations of early imperial poetry, notably by Denis Feeney and Philip Hardie,[19] have argued for an epic tradition in the century and more after Virgil's death that challenges its readers to revive and renegotiate Virgilian tensions rather than simply to accept the *Aeneid* as an achieved hybrid, a Krollian end result. And so it is in my last and most extended case study, from the mid 90s C.E., a conspectus of Achilles' erotic encounter with Deidamia on the island of Scyros, which dominates the first book of Statius's unfinished one-and-a-quarter-book epic fragment, the *Achilleid*. Whatever the preferred explanation

may be, more than a century after Virgil had brought Aeneas to Carthage, more than three centuries after Apollonius had brought Jason to Colchis, and more than eight centuries after Homer had given Odysseus an erotic package tour of the entire Mediterranean basin, the canonical epic moment at which the hero courts a woman on a foreign shore *still* seems, on the evidence of this episode, to be constructed as threatening its poem's generic identity rather than confirming it.

Achilles on Scyros[20]

The presence of such generic tension in the *Achilleid* is expected; and the way in which it is negotiated manages, as expected, to surprise. Previous epic heroes too had adulterated the plot of epic *arma* by engaging in erotic liaisons with women; but in the case of the *Achilleid*, the hero compounds the generic adulteration by engaging in an erotic liaison with a woman *while himself dressed as a woman.*

> Achilles' mother sees him undecided and willing to be compelled, and puts the garments upon him. Then she softens his stiff neck, bows his heavy shoulders, and relaxes his strong arms; she tames and styles his uncombed tresses, and switches her own necklace to his dear neck; then, shortening his stride within the embroidered skirt, she teaches him how to walk, move, and speak with modesty . . . Nor does she struggle long; for abundant gracefulness is at her son's disposal, his manly vigor notwithstanding (*invita virtute*), and beholders are misled by an indeterminate sex (*ambiguus . . . sexus*) that by a narrow distinction hides its secret. (*Ach.* 1.325–331, 335–337)

An Achilles cross-dressed by his mother, anxious to keep him from the Trojan War draft, is a given in any treatment of the action on Scyros. However, Statius further foregrounds a decision to "unman" his epic hero for the greater part of his poem's opening book by presenting the entire Scyrian setting as an emblematically unwarlike land (*Ach.* 1.207 *imbelli . . . Lycomedis . . . aula*), and even as a kind of theme-park of gender- and genre-bending imagery; this is a milieu in which the suppression of Achilles' manhood and martial impulse works itself out at the levels of language, setting, and plot in a sustained refraction and distortion of the epic discourses of *arma* and masculine self-fashioning.[21] In fact, with a degree of mannerism that shows Statius at his most thoroughly post-Ovidian, Scyros in the *Achilleid* is persistently the land not just of

gender- (and genre-) bending imagery, but of the *bending* of gender- (and genre-) bending imagery.[22]

It is just after Thetis has presented to the resistant Achilles the idea of "passing" as a female that we, along with Achilles, have our first sight of Deidamia and her sisters. They have come down to the shore to celebrate a festival of Pallas Athena—whose cult statue they adorn by cheering up the goddess's severe hairstyle with leaves and by decorating her spear with flowers:

> exierant dare veris opes divaeque severas
> fronde ligare comas et spargere floribus hastam (*Ach.* 1.288–289)
>
> They had gone forth to offer the riches of the spring, to bind the stern locks of the goddess with foliage and to shower her spear with blossoms.

To offer a tendentious paraphrase: Deidamia and her sisters worship a masculinized female, the goddess of war; and they do so by making her more feminine. As if to encourage this way of unpacking the passage, exactly the same reading and revision of Pallas is repeated just below, only this time figuratively, in a comparison that equates Deidamia's appearance with that of the goddess of war . . . *if* the goddess of war were to divest herself of her martial equipment and demeanour:[23]

> atque ipsi par forma deae est, si pectoris angues
> ponat et exempta pacetur casside vultus (1.299–300)
>
> Her beauty is equal to the goddess's own—if the goddess should lay aside the snakes on her breast, remove her helmet and pacify her countenance.

My reading of the codes will initially seem overdone: but the fact is that the scene just sampled, with its problematization of boundaries between male and female, warlike and unwarlike, is retrospectively focalized through the soon-to-be-made-over Achilles (1.301 *hanc ubi . . . vidit*), and the scene effectively foreshadows the terms of the hero's own imminent negotiations with the boundaries of gender and genre.

In an earlier context in the book's narrative (1.165–166), Statius had compared Achilles to Apollo, modeling his simile on the famous comparison of *Aeneas* to Apollo in *Aen.* 4.143ff. (both Apollos on homecoming from Lycia). In the present scene (1.294–296), Statius fleetingly compares Deidamia to Diana, modeling the passage on the famous comparison of *Dido* to Diana in *Aen.*

1.498ff. (both Dianas standing taller than their entourages). So far, near-perfect symmetry: the allusion to the *Aeneid*'s pair of sibling-deity similes sets up Achilles and Deidamia to repeat the erotic match of their Virgilian forebears Aeneas and Dido. But a little farther on, at the moment when Thetis finishes talking Achilles through his feminine makeover, the imagery responds with a category disruption of its own:

> dicit et admoto non cessat comere tactu.
> sic ubi virgineis Hecate lassata Therapnis
> ad patrem fratremque redit, comes haeret eunti
> mater et ipsa umeros exsertaque bracchia velat;
> ipsa arcum pharetrasque locat vestemque latentem
> deducit sparsosque tumet componere crines (1.343–348)

> As she instructs him, she does not cease to apply the styling touch. Thus when Hecate returns worn out from Therapne (haunt of Spartan maidens) to her father and brother, her mother attends her path and veils her child's shoulders and exposed arms; she arranges the bow and quiver, draws down the hitched-up dress, and takes a mother's pride in arranging the disordered tresses.

This time it is *Achilles* who is compared to Diana (under her chthonic alias of Hecate) in an intratextual and intertextual disruption of the protocols: the imagery perversely aligns Achilles with the female, not the male, player in the classic maritime love story of Virgilian and pre-Virgilian epic. More than that, Statius's simile foregrounds and complicates the gender transgression: Achilles is compared to the *female* deity of the *male* province of the hunt at a moment in which that tomboy deity herself receives an uncharacteristically feminine makeover.

Things come to a head at a women-only festival of Bacchus later in Book 1 (598 *lex procul ire mares* "the law bids males keep far away"), when Achilles, still dressed as a female, sexually asserts his manhood with Deidamia. Again, the paradoxical situation is accorded a highly mannerist treatment. Statius's epic imagery responds thus to our hero's increasingly impressive but sustainedly ambiguous appearance (605 *et sexus pariter decet et mendacia matris* "his true sex and his mother's counterfeit suit him alike") as he dons the garb of a Bacchant for this paradigmatically liminal rite . . . and wields the *thyrsus* (1.612) with noticeable authority:

> talis, ubi ad Thebas vultumque animumque remisit
> Euhius et patrio satiavit pectora luxu,
> serta comis mitramque levat thyrsumque virentem
> armat et hostiles invisit fortior Indos (1.615–618)

> Just so Euhius, after relaxing his visage and spirit at Thebes, and enjoying to the full his homeland's soft living, removes bonnet and garlands from his hair, arms the green *thyrsus*, and with an accession of boldness goes to meet his Indian foes.

One cannot improve on the Loeb note of Mozley to this passage: "There is a sort of inverted comparison here: the warlike Achilles putting on Bacchic garb is compared to effeminate Bacchus making ready for war." As early as the opening verse of the episode, in fact, an etymologizing reading of the god's own patronymic is available to mobilize and to annotate the thematics of gender confusion: 1.593 *lucus Agenorei sublimis ad orgia Bacchi* ". . . of Bacchus, of *Real-Man's* line."

Finally, back to Deidamia and her entourage, observed at the banquet in honor of the members of the Greek army who arrive in quest of their absentee colleague. By this point, it seems that the Scyrian girls' own collective femininity has been somehow compromised by their absorption of the cross-dressed Achilles; for when they are first espied by Ulysses (our hero amongst them), a simile compares them to Amazons:

> . . . subeunt, quales Maeotide ripa,
> cum Scythicas rapuere domos et capta Getarum
> moenia, suppositis epulantur Amazones armis (1.758–760)

> They approach like Amazons who, after plundering Scythian homesteads and captured Getic forts, dine on the Maeotid shore with their *arma* stowed beneath them.

But again there is a mannerist twist: the simile compares the Scyrian girls to transgressively masculinized and militarized women—at the moment in which those women (like Pallas in *Ach.* 1.299–300) are temporarily dissociated from their weaponry.

A move from imagery to plot will show more clearly how all this gender-bending is also operative as genre-bending. Immediately after Achilles announces himself to Deidamia in the courtship scene (1.650 *ille ego* . . .), he de-

clares himself properly ashamed of the female dress that is cloaking his true male identity:

> "... nec ego hos cultus aut foeda subissem
> tegmina, ni primo tu visa in litore: cessi
> te propter, tibi pensa manu, tibi mollia gesto
> tympana ..." (1.652–655)

> "I would not have put up with this adornment or vile garb, had I not seen you on the shore: on your account I submitted; for you I handle the wool-task and the 'soft' drum."

The terms of his protest are significant: the draft-dodging epic hero has shamefully feminized and "softened" himself in the cause of his love for Deidamia; the application of the adjective *mollia* to the noun *tympana* is ideological and programmatic more than straightforwardly descriptive.[24] A reading sensitive to the history of courtship episodes in epic can argue these lines to be symptomatic: the cross-dressed Achilles has externalized and (almost) literalized an emasculation that is the fate of *all* epic heroes who stray from *arma* into *amor*[25] (as of all the limp male protagonists of the genre of *amor* itself[26]).

What rescues Achilles from his transgressive behavior and unmanly avoidance of war is, precisely, a desire for emblematically epic *arma*, seen early on in displaced form in Thetis' presentation to the Scyrian king of "Achilles' sister," Amazonian (of course) in "her" interests:

> "Do you not see how fierce she is about the eyes, how like her brother? So spirited is she, she would ask for arms and a bow to bear on her shoulders (*arma umeris arcumque*), and would seek, in the Amazonian way, to reject wedlock." (1.351–353)

This same desire immediately stirs Achilles, though still dressed inappropriately for *arma*, just as soon as the Greek leaders arrive:

> Hardly does Achilles conceal his new joy: eagerly he desires, even as he is, to see the new-arrived heroes and their arms (*novos heroas et arma / vel talis vidisse*). (1.753–755)

His desire is finally and decisively realized in the actual gift of *arma* presented by Ulysses to trick the hero out of hiding:

> But fierce Achilles was no sooner confronted by the gleaming shield, engraved with battles—ruddy too, by chance, with the savage stains of war (*saevis et forte rubebat / bellorum maculis*)—, and leaning there on the spear, than he let out a roar and rolled his eyes, his hair standing up from his brow. Gone are his mother's orders, gone his secret love (*nusquam occultus amor*): his whole breast is full of Troy. (1.852–857)

The comprehensiveness of Achilles' conversion from *amor* to *arma* is underlined in the fact that the shield presented by Ulysses, unlike the elaborate cosmic icon "later" presented to the hero in the *Iliad*, is engraved with nothing but battles (*caelatum pugnas*); its reductively martial message is further enhanced by the bonus of some actual bloodstains. Not only is Achilles ready to embrace the icons of war, but he is also ready to embrace war itself, gobbets of gore and all.

~~Achilles on Scyros~~

The language and action of *Achilleid* 1 are internally structured, then, by tensions of genre and gender, through which the repressed terms of *arma virumque* find devious ways to return to the unwarlike land from which they have been excluded. While my final case study could end there, I have one more perspective to offer. I chose to dwell on the *Achilleid* in part because, like the *Metamorphoses* in my Preface, it has often seemed to modern critics to be so peculiar as to resist classification as an epic on any comfortable terms whatsoever. Even among adherents of "dynamic impurity," the dalliance on Scyros has seemed so far to set the agenda as to render the fragment more easily describable under some other rubric: to Conte, the *Achilleid* is "relaxed and idyllic," to Feeney a "charming, almost novelistic, fragment."[27] Such characterizations are fair enough—provided that they do not elide the poem's own internal dialectic of generic self-definition. I want to close with the suggestion that, at an important level, the beginning of the *Achilleid*'s second book actually dramatizes or "stages" a metapoetic meditation on the (in)appropriateness of the whole Scyrian episode to the epic narrative that it has inaugurated.

What the poet does early in Book 2, I think, is to emplot a number of moves whose cumulative effect is to put the Scyrian action under erasure, *sous rature*, in a kind of programmatic *damnatio memoriae* of the episode—*proposed by Achilles himself, as epic hero.* Here are the stages in the process (paraphrased a little schematically for the sake of brevity):

(1) As Achilles prepares to set sail from the island, now a proper epic hero complete with *arma*, the people of Scyros are *afraid to remember* what he had

been for much of the previous book—an idea expressed in a locution of almost Tacitean pregnancy:

> There is Aeacides, his breast now bare of the purple dress, shining forth in his newly-seized *arma*—for the breeze and his kindred seas are calling. All gaze on him and fear him, as young man and chieftain, not daring to remember a thing (*Aeaciden . . . prospectant cuncti iuvenemque ducemque / nil ausi meminisse pavent*); so wholly changed is he in his restored aspect, as though he had never suffered the Scyrian shores, but were embarking straight from the cave on Mount Pelion. (2.5–11)

(2) A little later, on board ship, Ulysses asks Achilles to explain how on earth Thetis had effected the shameful feminization of the future destroyer of Troy. More than mere narrative economy is involved, I think, in the hero's refusal to be drawn back into an account of the causes of his indecorous delay on Scyros:

> . . . "longum resides exponere causas
> maternumque nefas; hoc excusabitur ense
> Scyros et indecores, fatorum crimina, cultus" (2.43–45)

> "It would take too long to expound inaction's causes and a mother's unspeakable conduct; this sword shall excuse Scyros and the shameful styling, reproach of destiny."

Instead, *Achilles asks Ulysses* for a very different narrative of causation, namely, an account of the first beginnings of the Trojan war itself:

> "tu potius, dum lene fretum zephyroque fruuntur
> carbasa, quae Danais tanti primordia belli,
> ede: libet iustas hinc sumere protinus iras" (2.46–48)

> "Rather *you* should declare (while the sea is mild and the sails enjoy the zephyr) what the *primordia* were for the Greeks of so great a war: my desire is to draw from this a rush of righteous anger."

A more manly agenda, to be sure: note in particular how Achilles' active embrace of "anger" finds him refashioning himself as, in effect, the canonical Iliadic hero of an epic of *menis*.[28]

(3) Ulysses has not forgotten his original question to Achilles, however; and by the time he ends the requested account (2.50–83) of *tanti primordia belli*, he

has cunningly managed (via Greek outrage at the abduction of Helen) to bring the conversation back to Scyros, the very area in which Achilles wished to avoid further probing: how would Achilles react, he asks, if someone were to steal Deidamia? Achilles blushes, apparently from a mixture of outrage and embarrassment (2.84–85); but now Diomedes comes to the rescue by asking the young hero himself to put *another* narrative of first beginnings on the table. This time, the theme is Achilles' own elemental training on Mount Pelion at the hands of Chiron—a tale of extreme hardiness, as we soon learn, which is entirely free of the softness and effeminacy of the subsequent Scyrian misadventure:

> . . . "quin, o dignissima caeli
> progenies, ritusque tuos elementaque primae
> indolis et, valida mox accedente iuventa,
> quae solitus laudum tibi semina pandere Chiron,
> virtutisque aditus, quas membra augere per artes,
> quas animum, sociis multumque faventibus edis?" (2.86–91)

> "O worthiest progeny of heaven, why not instead tell us (your friends and admirers) the modes and elements of your early character; and then, as the strength of your youth increased, what seeds of glory, what paths to manhood Chiron was wont to disclose to you, by what arts he would strengthen your limbs and your spirit?"

Here is an Achillean narrative on which Achilles is only too happy to embark. After a diffident beginning, he proceeds to unfold the theme for the next seventy lines:

> Who would find it a chore to tell of his own deeds? Yet he begins modestly, a little uncertain, and with the air of one compelled. "The story goes that even in my tender and still-crawling years, when the old Thessalian received me on his stark mountain, I did not devour any common food, or sate my hunger at the nourishing breast, but ingested lions' tough entrails and the marrow of a still-living she-wolf. . ." (2.94–100)

What this scene of shipboard storytelling[29] does, I think, is to adumbrate two ways other than Statius's of beginning an Achilles epic from first principles: either with the *primordia* of the whole Trojan war, as in Ulysses' narrative (2.50–83), or with the *elementa* of our hero's own basic training, starting from infancy, as narrated by Achilles himself (2.96–167). Where *the poet* had chosen

to begin, of course, back in Book 1, was a little farther on in the eponymous hero's life story, with the draft-dodging, emasculating intervention of Thetis, which made Achilles into a woman on Scyros. This plan is not how the hero himself would have organized the epic. He ends his own narrative of hardy boyhood training at the point where his story catches up to the "soft" narrative controlled by his mother—and does so with a marked aposiopesis:

> "hactenus annorum, comites, elementa meorum
> et memini et meminisse iuvat: scit cetera mater" (2.166–167)

> "Thus far, comrades, I remember and am pleased to remember my formative years: the rest my mother knows."

Note how *hactenus . . . et memini et meminisse iuvat* picks up the vocabulary of memory that described the fearful self-censorship of the Scyrians back in 2.8–9. The aposiopesis in 167 is marked for another reason too: this is the moment at which the *Achilleid* itself falls silent. Statius publishes no more, and (we assume) death imposes premature closure on his latest epic project.

What Statius had foregrounded in Book 1, Achilles (whose investment in poetic fame appears as early as 1.188–194 in his performance of a self-reflexive song about "the mighty seeds of glorious deeds"[30]) would like to forget here in the opening scenes of Book 2: such is epic's reemplotment, more than a century after Virgil, Ovid, and Macer, of its inevitable but ever-mobile preoccupation with its own generic tensions. Statius *versus* Achilles on the proper decorum for starting an *Achilleid:* it is both apt and frustrating that the unfinished poem breaks off just where the poet has a cue to seize back the agenda from his hero. What *is* Statius's epic decorum in the *Achilleid*? Will the narrative be presented in Achilles' strictly martial terms from now on, or will there be more backsliding into the unepic softness and effeminacy authorized by the poet in *Achilleid* 1? We can never know. However, given the craftiness with which Statius has framed and problematized the generic agenda in his opening book and a quarter, we may be certain of two things: first, that Statius would have failed just as surely as did all his Roman predecessors to come up with an essentially epic epic; and second, that the *idea* of an essentially epic epic would have emerged stronger, not weaker, at the end of the *Achilleid*'s innovative negotiations with the genre.

Notes
Bibliography
Index

42. Compare Chapman's note on the first line of the *Odyssey* in his translation: "the information or fashion of an absolute man; and necessary (or fatal) passage through many afflictions (according with the most Sacred letter) to his natural haven and country, is the whole argument and scope of this inimitable and miraculous poem." In general, compare Stanford 1963, especially 118–127, Buffière 1956:376 n. 39, Hoistad 1948:94–102.
43. Gale 1994:52, and especially 124–125.
44. Muir *The Journey Back* (Muir 1960:175). Muir constantly returns to the theme of the journey: his second collection was *Journeys and Places* (1935), his third and fourth *The Voyage* (1946) and *The Labyrinth* (1949). See also "The Return of Odysseus" from *The Narrow Place* (1943).
45. *Tractatus* 6.54.
46. Conte 1994:1–3.
47. Compare Hardie 1986:209–213, Salemme 1980:9–21.
48. On the problems of definition, compare Kroll 1925, Fabian 1968, Rifaterre 1972, Pohlmann 1973, Effe 1977, and Schuler and Fitch 1983.
49. With this sort of generic "inclusion"—rather than mixing or hybridization—compare Cairns 1989, Davis 1991:11–77.

12. Essential Epic

My thanks to my fellow participants in the CHS colloquium, whose comments and whose own presentations helped me better to define this paper's discursive space; especially to Mary Depew and Dirk Obbink (organizers and editors), and to Carolyn Dewald and Kathryn Morgan (respondents). More good advice came my way at Kathleen Coleman's March 1998 Statius Workshop in Trinity College, Dublin: my especial thanks to Elaine Fantham, Peter Heslin, and Susanna Morton Braund, themselves all authors of forthcoming papers that bear in different ways on the Statian matters briefly treated here. Two Texan audiences, in Austin and at Baylor University, sharpened my final revision; I am indebted to Andrew Zissos and to the UT Department of Classics for the opportunity to visit, and to work for a fortnight on the *Achilleid* with a lively graduate seminar. Alessandro Barchiesi has been an important interlocutor throughout, in person and in print: to Barchiesan bibliography below, add "The Xing," forthcoming in S. J. Harrison and J. Birchall, eds., *The Common Task*, which situates Krollian Kreuzung anew in literary and intellectual history.

1. A Krollian reading of the *Metamorphoses* can better be divined from the chapter thus titled as a whole (Kroll 1924:202–224) than from the remarks specific to the *Metamorphoses* (pp. 215–216). The latter show some evasiveness, evidently because Kroll is reluctant to acknowledge direct disagreement with the terms of Heinze 1919.
2. Ross's comment (on Virg. *Ecl.* 6) is cited alongside Kroll at Knox 1986:1 and notes.

3. In a revaluation of Heinze's central case study (elegiac and hexametric Persephones in *Fasti* and *Met.*), especially p. 117: "whether they are being kept or broken, generic rules are always relevant to an Augustan poem."
4. Compare Barchiesi 1997:66 on Ov. *Fast.* 3 and 4 proems: "the interplay between literary genres has come out of the workshop and moved onto the stage, and the effect is as ambiguous and shifting as a shadow play."
5. A good point of access, this, to Conte's extensive writings on genre; included is a discussion of the "staging" of generic choice, and a notable critique of Kroll.
6. Fowler 1982, especially 45–48.
7. For *tristitia* in the erotic estrangements of Augustan elegy, compare Gallus fr. 2 Bü and (e.g.) Prop. 1.18.10.
8. On the "timing" of *Her.* 3, see Barchiesi 1992:17, 185, 189, 209.
9. On which see further Barchiesi 1997:16–23 ("'*arma*' and literary genres").
10. McKeown 1987 *ad loc.*
11. Kennedy 1993:59 (with further discussion): "the word *nervus* can refer to a sinew muscle, strength, literary vigour—and the penis."
12. Sexual metaphor in *arma:* compare, e.g., *Am.* 1.9.26, with Adams 1982:21. See also Barchiesi 1997:27–28.
13. For a differently tendentious allusion to the *Il.* 6 scene, see Ov. *Am.* 1.9.35–36.
14. See McKeown 1987 on the *Am.* passages and, more radically, Buchan 1995; Hardie 1994 on Aen. 9.57 for "the eleven repetitions (with varying case and number of vir) in the poem of the first two words of the poem arma virumque"; Fowler 1997:20 on post-Augustan "*arma.*"
15. Kennedy 1989:210, in a finely theorized review of Knox 1986 and Hinds 1987a.
16. Derrida 1980, at 178 and 204.
17. See especially her chapter 1 (citing Sedgwick 1985 for the term "homosocial").
18. For the term "code model," "*modello-codice,*" see Conte 1986:31; on the generic pressure exerted by the *Aeneid* on Virgil's epic successors, compare Hinds 1998:105–107, 120–122, 143.
19. Feeney 1991 and Hardie 1993, both transformative of our understanding of epic.
20. This final case study supplements Hinds 1998:124–129 and (especially) 135–144. Here as there, my approach has a debt to Rosati 1994a and 1994b, and a telepathic affinity with work in progress by Alessandro Barchiesi. Compare Koster 1979; and add now Cyrino 1998:232–239, which appeared just before this paper went to press.
21. For comparable manipulation of genre imagery in Ovid's *Fasti*, see Hinds 1992:81–112. With "the unwarlike court of Lycomedes," compare in particular the sketch of the island of Battus at *Fast.* 3.569–578, with Hinds 1992.110–111 and Barchiesi 1997:21–23.
22. More on the post-Ovidian Statius of the *Achilleid:* Rosati 1994a, Hinds 1998:135–144.

23. See also now Cyrino 1998:234, "a simile tense with transvestite ambiguity."
24. For *mollis* as a word charged with unmasculine, unmartial, and unepic values, see Kennedy 1993:31–34, Hinds 1987b:22–23, and above all, Edwards 1993:63–97.
25. For the startling contribution of the clausula *litore: cessi* to such a reading (across the sense pause!), see now Barchiesi 1997b:215–217.
26. On the effeminacy of the elegiac male poet/lover, see Wyke 1994:115–121.
27. Conte 1994b:487, Feeney 1991:376 n. 199.
28. The allusion is not without its intertextual irony: Statius's Achilles can anticipate his *menis*, but he "misreads" the source from which that *menis* will be drawn in Homer's canonical inauguration of the theme: viz from offenses perpetrated by *his own* side. Pertinent here is Rosati 1994b:42 on an echo/anticipation of Achilles' anger over Briseis just below at 2.84–85, citing *Il.* 1.194. Compare also my earlier remarks on Briseis's own limited foreknowledge of Achillean *menis* at Ov. *Her.* 3.87–90.
29. Shipboard: i.e., programmatically enhanced?
30. *Ach.* 1.188–189 *immania laudum / semina* (compare Homer's *klea andron*); on the metapoetics of this song, see Hinds 1998:126–128. As Elaine Fantham points out to me, the phrase is echoed in Diomedes' programmatically charged prompt to Achilles at 2.89 (quoted earlier).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbenes, J. G. J., Slings, S. R., and Sluiter, I. 1995. *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle: A Collection of Papers in Honour of Professor D. M. Schenkeveld.* Amsterdam: VU University Press.

Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary.* London: Duckworth.

Alcock, S. E., and Osborne, R., eds. 1994. *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aleshire, S. B. 1989. *The Athenian Asklepieion: The People, Their Dedications, and the Inventories.* Amsterdam: Gieben.

Alexander, L. 1990. "The Living Voice: Scepticism towards the Written Word in Early Christian and in Graeco-Roman Texts." In *The Bible in Three Dimensions: Essays in Celebration of Forty Years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield* (= *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* Suppl. Series 87), D. J. A. Clines, S. E. Fowl, and S. E. Porter, eds. 221–247. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Alexander of Aphrodisias. 1991. *On Aristotle's Prior Analytics* 1.1–7. J. Barnes, S. Bobzien, K. Flannery, S. J., and K. Ierodiakonou, trans. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Allen, T. W., Halliday, W. R., and Sikes, E. E., eds. 1936. *The Homeric Hymns.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Aloni, A. 1994. "L'elegia di Simonide dedicata alla battaglia di Platea." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 102. 9–22.

Althusser, L., and Balibar, E. 1970. *Reading "Capital."* Ben Brewster, trans. London: New Left Books.

Amiotti, G. 1982. "Lico di Reggio e l'Alessandra di Licofrone." *Athenaeum* 60. 452–460.

Armayor, O. K. 1985. *Herodotus' Autopsy of the Fayoum: Lake Moeris and the Labyrinth of Egypt.* Amsterdam: Gieben.

Arnott, W. G. 1972. "From Aristophanes to Menander." *Greece and Rome* 19. 65–80.

———. 1978. "Coscinomancy in Theocritus and Kazantzakis." *Mnemosyne* 31. 27–32.

Asheri, D. 1983. "Il millennio di Troia." In *Saggi di Letteratura e Storiografia antiche*, D. Ambaglio, D. Asheri, and D. Magnino, eds. 53–98. Como: Edizioni New Press.

Assmann, J. 1990. "Die Macht der Bilder: Rahmenbedingungen ikonischen Handelns im alten Ägypten." *Visible Religion* 7. 1–20.

Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Austin, N. 1967. "Id. 16: Theocritus and Simonides." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 98. 1–21.

[Bibliography for Hinds, 'Essential Epic.']

Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London: Duckworth.

Barchiesi, Alessandro. 1992. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum 1-3*. Florence: Le Monnier.

---. 1997. *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Revised trans. of 1994 Italian ed.

---. 1997b. "Otto punti su una mappa dei naufragi." In Hinds and Fowler 1997.209-226.

Buchan, Mark. 1995. "Ovidius Imperamator: Beginnings and Endings of Love Poems and Empire in the *Amores*." *Arethusa* 28, 53-85.

Conte, Gian Biagio. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, ed. Charles Segal. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

---. 1994. *Genres and Readers*, trans. Glenn W. Most. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. Expanded from 1991 Italian ed.

---. 1994b. *Latin Literature: A History*, trans. Joseph B. Solodow, rev. Don Fowler and Glenn W. Most. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cyrino, Monica Silveira. 1998. "Heroes in D(u)ress: Transvestism and Power in the Myths of Herakles and Achilles." *Arethusa* 31, 207-241.

Derrida, Jacques. 1980. "La Loi du genre / The Law of Genre." *Glyph* 7, 176-232.

Edwards, Catharine. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feeney, D.C. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fowler, Alastair. 1982. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Fowler, Don. 1997. "On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies." In Hinds and Fowler 1997.13-34.

Galinsky, G. Karl. 1975. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: An Introduction to the Basic Aspects*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hardie, Philip. 1993. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 1994. *Virgil: Aeneid Book IX*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heinze, Richard. 1919. *Ovids elegische Erzählung*. Leipzig: Sächsischen Akademie. Reprinted in *Vom Geist des Römertums*, 4th ed. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1972.

Hinds, Stephen. 1987. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 1987b. "Generalising about Ovid." *Ramus* 16, 4-31.

---. 1992. "*Arma* in Ovid's *Fasti*. Part 1: Genre and Mannerism. Part 2: Genre, Romulean Rome and Augustan Ideology." *Arethusa* 25, 81-153

---. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hinds, Stephen, and Don Fowler, eds. 1997. *Memoria, arte allusiva, intertestualità / Memory, Allusion, Intertextuality. Materiali e Discussioni* 39. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Inrternazionali.

Keith, Alison M. 2000. *Engendering Roman Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kennedy, Duncan F. 1989. Review of Knox 1986 and Hinds 1987. *Journal of Roman Studies* 79, 209-210.

---. 1993. *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klein, T. M. 1974. "The Role of Callimachus in the Development of the Concept of the Counter-Genre." *Latomus* 33, 217-231.

Knox, Peter E. 1986. *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.

Koster, Severin. 1979. "Liebe und Krieg in der Achilleis des Statius." *Würzburger Jahrbücher für Altertumswissenschaft* n.F.5, 189-208.

Kroll, Wilhelm. 1924. *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart: Metzler.

McKeown, J. C. 1987-. *Ovid: Amores*. Liverpool and Leeds: Francis Cairns.

Rosati, Gianpiero. 1994. "Momenti e forme della fortuna antica di Ovidio: l'Achilleide di Stazio." In M. Picone and B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Ovidius redivivus: von Ovid zu Dante*, 43-62. Stuttgart: Metzler.

---. 1994b. *Stazio: Achilleide*. Milan: Rizzoli.

Ross, David O. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sedgwick, Eve. 1985. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wyke, Maria. 1994. "Taking the Woman's Part: Engendering Roman Love Elegy." *Ramus* 23, 110-128.