

Libera Fama
An Endless Journey

Pierides

Studies in Greek and Latin Literature

Series Editors:

Philip Hardie and Stratis Kyriakidis

Volume I

Stratis Kyriakidis

*Catalogues of Proper Names in Latin Epic Poetry:
Lucretius – Virgil – Ovid*

Volume II

Antonis K. Petrides and Sophia Papaioannou (eds),
New Perspectives on Postclassical Comedy

Volume III

Myrto Garani and David Konstan (eds),
The Philosophizing Muse:

The Influence of Greek Philosophy on Roman Poetry

Volume IV

Sophia Papaioannou (ed.)
Terence and Interpretation

Volume V

Stephen Harrison (ed.)
Characterisation in Apuleius' Metamorphoses
Nine Studies

Pierides
Studies in Greek and Latin Literature

Volume VI

Libera Fama
An Endless Journey

Edited by
Stratis Kyriakidis

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Libera Fama: An Endless Journey (Pierides VI)

Edited by Stratis Kyriakidis

This book first published 2016

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2016 by Stratis Kyriakidis and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-1099-1

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-1099-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTRIBUTORS	vii
PREFACE	x
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Speech, Fame and Glory: Connecting Past and Future Stratis Kyriakidis	
CHAPTER ONE.....	28
The Negation of Fame: Epicurus' meta- <i>fama</i> and Lucretius' Response Myrto Garani	
CHAPTER TWO.....	45
<i>Poeta, Heros et Fama</i> : Perplexities and Upsets in Cicero's Epic Fragments Eleni Karamalengou	
CHAPTER THREE.....	55
Wanderings of <i>Fama</i> and 'fame's Narratives' in the <i>Aeneid</i> S��verine Cl��ment-Tarantino	
CHAPTER FOUR.....	71
The Ovidian Leuconoe: Vision, Speech and Narration Eleni Peraki-Kyriakidou	
CHAPTER FIVE.....	94
<i>famaque cum domino fugit ab Vrbe suo</i> : Aspects of <i>fama</i> in Ovid's Exile Poetry Andreas N. Michalopoulos	
CHAPTER SIX.....	111
The Universe as Audience: Manilius' Poetic Ambitions Stratis Kyriakidis	

CHAPTER SEVEN	144
Rumour and Satire: The Two-Faceted Mirror of Juvenal's World	
Sophia Papaioannou	
CHAPTER EIGHT	166
Martyrs' Memorials: Glory, Memory, and Envy in Prudentius	
<i>Peristephanon</i>	
Philip Hardie	
CHAPTER NINE	193
Pictures of Virgilian <i>Fama</i>	
Gianni Guastella	
ILLUSTRATIONS	203
AFTERTHOUGHT	206
Philip Hardie	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	208
INDEX LOCORUM.....	230
GENERAL INDEX	246

CONTRIBUTORS

Séverine Clément-Tarantino is Lecturer in Latin Literature at the University of Lille 3 – Charles de Gaulle. In her thesis *Fama ou la renommée du genre: recherches sur la représentation de la tradition dans l'Énéide* (Diss. Lille 3, 2006) having as a starting point the description of *Fama* in Book 4 of the *Aeneid* highlighted the centrality of *Fama* in the Virgilian epic tradition. She has published several articles on the subject (focusing, in particular, on the link between *Fama* and the epic voice) and other aspects of Virgil's poetry and its reception. She is co-editor (with Florence Klein) of the book, *La représentation du 'couple' Virgile-Ovide dans la tradition culturelle de l'Antiquité à nos jours*, Presses Universitaires du Septentrion (Villeneuve d'Ascq, 2015). She has published, with Alban Baudou, a translation of the first book of Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid*: *Servius. A l'école de Virgile*, Presses Universitaires du Septentrion (Villeneuve d'Ascq, 2015). She has also been working on the commentaries of Tiberius Claudius Donatus and Juan Luis de la Cerda.

Myrto Garani (BA Thessaloniki, MA and PhD London) is Assistant Professor in Latin Literature at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece. She is the author of *Empedocles Redivivus: Poetry and Analogy in Lucretius* (London and New York, 2007) and co-editor with David Konstan of *The Philosophizing Muse. The Influence of Greek Philosophy on Roman Poetry*, *Pierides III* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2014). She has also published a number of articles on Empedocles' reception in Latin literature, especially in Ovid's *Fasti*. Her other publications include articles on Propertius, Ovid and the Pseudo-Virgilian *Aetna*. She is currently working on a monograph on Seneca's *Naturales Quaestiones Book 3* and the reception of Pre-Socratic philosophers in Rome.

Gianni Guastella teaches Latin literature and language at the University of Siena. His research is focused on Roman theatre and its reception in the culture of the Medieval and Renaissance periods. His main contributions concern Terence's comedies (*La contaminazione e il parassita. Due studi su teatro e cultura romana*, Pisa, 1988), Seneca's tragedies (*L'ira e l'onore. Forme della vendetta nel teatro senecano e nella sua tradizione*, Palermo, 2001) and the rediscovery of classical theatre in the Modern

period (*Le rinascite della tragedia*, Rome, 2006 and 2013). His book on *Fama* (*Word of Mouth*) and its personifications from Ancient Rome to the Middle Ages is forthcoming from Oxford University Press.

Philip Hardie is a Senior Research Fellow at Trinity College, Cambridge, and Honorary Professor of Latin Literature in the University of Cambridge. He is the author of *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986); *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition* (Cambridge, 1993); *Virgil: Aeneid Book IX* (Cambridge, 1994); *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion* (Cambridge, 2002); *Lucretian Receptions: History, The Sublime, Knowledge*, Cambridge, 2009); *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature* (Cambridge, 2012); *The Last Trojan Hero: A Cultural History of Virgil's Aeneid* (London – New York, 2014); and *Ovidio Metamorfosi, vol. vi, libri xiii-xv* (Rome, 2015). Hardie is the editor of *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* (Cambridge, 2002); *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture* (Oxford, 2009); *Augustan Poetry and the Irrational* (Oxford, 2016). He is also co-editor (with Alessandro Barchiesi and Stephen Hinds) of *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid's Metamorphoses and its Reception* (Cambridge, 1999); (with S. Gillespie) of *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius* (Cambridge, 2007); and (with Helen Moore) of *Classical Literary Careers and their Reception* (Cambridge, 2010). He is a General Editor of *Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics*; he is also a Fellow of the British Academy.

Eleni Karamalengou is the Dean of the School of Philosophy at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Professor of Latin Literature at the Faculty of Philology. Her PhD is on Horace (Université de la Sorbonne – Paris IV). Publications include studies on the literature of the Respublica (Terentius, Cicero, Rhetoric) and the Augustan Age (Virgil, Horace, Propertius), and on the invocation of the Muse in Latin poetry.

Stratis Kyriakidis is Emeritus Professor of Latin Literature at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki and Visiting Professor at the University of Leeds. He is the author of *Roman Sensitivity: A Contribution to the Study of the Artistic Receptiveness and Creativity of the Romans (146-31BC)* (Thessaloniki, 1986) [in Greek]; *Narrative Structure and Poetics in the Aeneid: The Frame of Book 6* (Bari, 1998); and *Catalogues of Proper Names in Latin Epic Poetry: Lucretius - Virgil - Ovid, Pierides I* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2007). He is the editor (with Francesco De

Martino) of *Middles in Latin Poetry* (Bari, 2004). His publications mainly focus on Latin literature of the late Republican and Augustan periods, on Manilius' *Astronomica* and on the Latin centos.

Andreas N. Michalopoulos is Associate Professor of Latin at the Classics Department of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. He is the author of: *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Commented Lexicon* (Leeds, 2001); *Ovid, Heroides 16 and 17: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Cambridge, 2006); *Ovid, Heroides 20 and 21: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary* (in Greek, Athens, 2013); *Roman Lyric Poetry: Horace Carmina* (in Greek, Athens 2016, with Charilaos N. Michalopoulos); *Roman Love Elegy* (in Greek, Athens 2016, with Charilaos N. Michalopoulos). His research interests include Augustan poetry, ancient etymology, Roman drama, Roman novel, and modern reception of classical literature.

Sophia Papaioannou is Associate Professor of Latin Literature at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. Her teaching and research interests include Augustan literature and poetics, Roman comedy, and Latin epic. She has authored and edited several books on the above subjects, most recently the volume *Terence and Interpretation*, Pierides IV (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2014) and (with Patricia Johnston and Edit Kraehling) a special issue of the journal *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* [53 (2013)] entitled *Idyllic Poetic Landscapes in Antiquity: Arcadia, the Golden Age, and the Locus Amoenus* (Budapest, Akademia Kiado, 2014). She is also the author of: *Epic Succession and Dissension: Ovid, Metamorphoses 13.623-14.582, and the Reinvention of the Aeneid* (Berlin and New York, 2005); *Redesigning Achilles: The 'Recycling' of the Epic Cycle in Ovid, Metamorphoses 12.1-13.620* (Berlin and New York, 2007) and *Titi Macci Plauti, Miles Gloriosus. Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, (Athens, 2009) [in Greek].

Eleni Peraki-Kyriakidou is a retired Assistant Professor of Latin Literature at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Her main areas of interest are Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, Roman epic and historiography. She has also published a number of articles on ancient etymology and etymologising. Together with Stelios Phiorakis she has written a book on *The Law Code of Gortyn* (Herakleion, 1973).

PREFACE

This book is the product of a happy coincidence. At the beginning of 2012, Philip Hardie's book *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature* (Cambridge) was published. This scholarly work, the outcome of long research over a number of decades, offers its readers a sound and profound study of the material drawn from the literature and arts of many centuries. The study of the various aspects of fame from antiquity to the days of Milton and Alexander Pope is rewarding, not only for the understanding it affords of the ancient world but also – and mainly – because it illuminates the thread that connects antiquity to later periods, even to our contemporary world. The theme of the book is not only the many faces of fame in antiquity but also the many faces of its personifications from Homer to Milton.

Reading Hardie's book, I realised that one of its great assets is its 'open-endedness' as each one of us can find a cue to further his/her own thoughts on Greek and Latin or later literature. It also provides food for thought on situations and conditions of contemporary life.

I shared my thoughts on Hardie's book with my colleague Prof. Eleni Karamalengou, who took the initiative and organised a one-day conference under the title, '**Fama scripta**': *Wanderings of Fama in Latin Literature*, at the School of Philology, University of Athens, where we were able to present the book to the Greek academic audience and discuss some further aspects on the theme of fame/*Fama*. Philip Hardie attended the event and shared with us some personal reflections from the process of writing *Rumour and Renown*. On board was Alessandro Barchiesi, whose presentation "Far from the Madding Crowd: Hardie, Astrourfing, and Seneca" took the theme beyond the limits of classical scholarship. In this volume Philip Hardie participates with a topic from the field of Christian poetry. His contribution broadens the subject matter of the volume and it elucidates essential aspects of Christian poetry vis-à-vis its predecessors, namely ancient Greek and Roman literature.

In addition to the colleagues who participated in the conference, two more colleagues participate in this volume: Eleni Peraki-Kyriakidou with a paper on Ovid's Leuconoe and Gianni Guastella who returns to the subject of fame/*Fama* following two other of his publications on the subject (see bibliography). His contribution concludes the volume with iconographic

examples of *Fama* in which are depicted, one may argue, different kinds of response to the phenomenon of fame.

The editor of this volume and the participants of the conference express their sincere thanks to Prof. Eleni Karamalengou and her colleagues for setting up the whole event and for their hospitality. Thanks also go to Prof. Maria Voutsinou-Kikilia for also contributing to its success. I would further like to express my gratitude to all the contributors for their collaboration and Olympian patience. Last but not least, I would like from this position to thank sincerely Philip Hardie for his collaboration at all stages of preparation of this volume.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the team at Cambridge Scholars Publishing for their unfailing professional collaboration and friendly approach to the preparation of this volume. Courtney Blades, Victoria Carruthers, Sophie Edminson and Anthony Wright (to mention them alphabetically) have offered their help and assistance at all stages. I would also like to thank Amanda Millar who has contributed greatly to the preparation of all the volumes of the *Pierides*. It has been a great pleasure to work with such a competent team.

INTRODUCTION

SPEECH, FAME AND GLORY: CONNECTING PAST AND FUTURE

STRATIS KYRIAKIDIS

“The future of your words matters. That future is continually in the past.”
Jack Spicer¹

Anyone with a copy of Philip Hardie’s book *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature* (Cambridge, 2012) possesses a serious study of the various ways in which ancient literary thought, as well as the thought of later periods (Italian, Renaissance, Elizabethan, early modern English), have dealt with the issues of speech, rumour, fame, and glory. Through a host of writers and poets from a wide spectrum of time, from Homer to John Milton and Alexander Pope, Hardie investigates the various aspects of the subject and analyses their intricate relationship in the periods and worlds under examination. Hardie’s work shows that, from antiquity, these issues were always of the utmost importance in daily and intellectual life. Indeed, fame and glory often proved to be the motivation to success (but often the cause of the downfall of many) and the means to escape oblivion: *fama, cui soli serviunt* (fame, the only thing they serve, Tac. *Dial.* 10).

For poets and writers fame and glory was the impetus and the driving force behind the creation of a work or a poem. At the same time every new creation in literature and the arts, one way or another, relied on and alluded to a model which as a rule was drawn from what constituted the tradition and with which each author, poet or artist were constantly emulating.

The contributions to this volume deal with the issue of fame and glory in the works of Lucretius, Cicero, Virgil, Ovid, Manilius, Juvenal and Prudentius as well as with the artistic representation of the phenomenon

¹ Jack Spicer, *A Textbook of Poetry*, 21, in E. Gizzi and K. Killian (eds), 309.

with its various and often variant qualities. All of them, each in his own way, strove to escape oblivion (as the *primus ego topos* shows). Among them Lucretius and Manilius had specific philosophical inclinations; the former to Epicurean and the latter to Stoic philosophy. Both schools of philosophy, however, condemned or had reservations – to a degree – as to the pursuit of glory. The reader, therefore, may rightly ask how can a poet – like Lucretius or Manilius – strive so fervently for renown. On this issue we must consult the sources themselves and see the impact that philosophy had on poetic discourse.

In her contribution **“The Negation of Fame: Epicurus’ meta-fama and Lucretius’ Response”**, Myrto Garani (ch. 1) explores Lucretius’ inner thoughts and ambitions concerning the survival of his name and poetic work and whether the pursuit of fame was in agreement with his ideological beliefs, implicitly or explicitly presented in his *De Rerum Natura*. Opening the series of the contributions in this volume, Garani addresses the issue of the relation of the poetic diction of Lucretius and the philosophical discourse of his great master, Epicurus.

As the two major philosophical schools in Roman times were the Stoic and the Epicurean, Garani realises that a Stoic was mainly interested in the *provider* of fame as well as the quality and the nature of that fame (“the evaluation of fame itself,” as she puts it) [p.38]. On the other hand, Epicureans could focus their attention on “its recipient and the latter’s *final goal* of pursuing”, rather than on “the evaluation of fame itself”. The celebrated phrase, *λάθε βιώσας* (live unknown) which has been attributed to Epicurus by the later tradition (Epicurus fr. 551, Usener) has created the impression that the Greek philosopher was firmly opposed to the pursuit of fame. Because of this, it was broadly thought that Epicurus was apolitical. This resulted in Plutarch’s accusations against him and his followers that they referred to politicians only to disparage them. Plutarch went even further, considering Epicurus totally untrustworthy; for him there was a vast gap between the philosopher’s words and deeds; he also asserted that Epicurus showed the same fickleness of character on other issues and that his attitude was generally deceitful and served him only as a means of attaining fame. In different works and with a varied imagery (with that of famine prevailing), Plutarch argued each time that Epicurus not only strove for glory but that his *φιλοδοξία* (love of glory) was such that it was detrimental to his soul.

It is natural that Plutarch’s position raises questions and we should turn to Epicurus’ own work in order to evaluate his view on the issue: Epicurus’ essential objective was the formulation of his own truth even if that would entail the displeasure of the many and thus the lack of their

praise. But even if Epicurus' theoretical approach had its own clarity, things were never black and white. Diogenes Laertius is illuminating: in the *Life of Epicurus*, he acknowledged a reservation in the philosopher's stance: Epicurus may indeed consider that a philosopher does not need to pursue fame (*ἐβδόξϊαν*) but he should not allow matters to become detrimental to him and his reputation. The whole picture becomes apparent with the actual words of the philosopher (*ΚΑ* 7), who acknowledges that *δόξα* should serve the natural good of security (*ἀσφαλεία*) and that ambition is tolerable if it is compatible with a person's natural disposition. In fact, he agreed with the view that those who are ambitious by nature should pursue action and their participation in politics. The philosophical framework within which the desire for fame can be viewed is Epicurus' ethical doctrine where the desires are listed as 'natural and necessary', 'natural and unnecessary' or 'neither natural nor necessary'. In this way an ethical framework is formed according to which the acceptance of a number of desires and pleasures is subject to certain conditions; for an Epicurean, their pursuit is in accordance with one's nature, as is the sense of security. Although fame does not relieve the soul of disturbance, its observance could nevertheless be accepted only under these conditions.

After unravelling the philosophical tenets of Epicurus and his followers in respect of fame, Garani turns to Lucretius. She particularly discusses the "moralising digression" at *DRN* 5.1117-1135 and relates it to the proem to Book 2 (esp. 2.14-22) as well as to the Sisyphus myth (3.995-1002) with the latter metaphor referring to the arduous nature of the political career which comes together with unrestrained ambition. Within the digression of Book 5, Lucretius rejects the kind of wisdom which comes "from the lips of others" (5.1133), thus prominently distinguishing *external* hearsay from *internal* wisdom, the "*external* words" and the "*internal* experience" leading to the Epicurean *ataraxia*. At the same time, Lucretius seems to keep his distance from the Epicurean precept of not giving value to the "words of others". In attempting to place himself in the line of the great natural philosophical epic poets, Lucretius goes back to Homer, Empedocles, Ennius, and above all, to his own Master, Epicurus, for whom he reserves the most prominent place in his poetry by acknowledging his fame and glory (*ad caelum gloria fertur*, *DRN* 6.8). This leads Garani to inquire into the conditions under which Lucretius justifies the pursuit of fame as Lucretius seeks his own fame (the praise that is, coming from the lips of others) at least twice, in lines 1.921-950² and early in Book 6 (95). Since such a pursuit of fame is supposed not to

² *DRN* 4.1-25 = 1.926-950.

have a place within the Epicurean system, and as an answer to this ‘inconsistency’ between philosophical deed and poetic practice, Garani returns to Epicurus’ pursuit of fame, which can be accepted subject to the inclination of one’s nature, which drives the poet to aspire for fame.

It was this natural inclination which was the impetus and the drive for Lucretius’ ambitions to *posteritas*. In order to secure his position in the long series of great poets, however, he should feel, through *aemulatio*, that he had contributed something which made him *primus* in relation to his literary forebears. Described in contemporary terms, this is the Bloomian ‘anxiety of influence’ which possessed the ancient poets and writers; the means to overcome this anxiety was their *aemulatio* with the past. Through this process each poet or writer could and would attain his posterity becoming simultaneously the initiator of the ‘new’ and the conveyor of the ‘previous’ and the ‘old’. The relationship of a poet or artist with tradition in the attainment of *fama* is the central issue of all the following papers in this volume.

Before we proceed, allow me to share some personal thoughts, starting with what the word *φήμη* / *fama* really stands for: the word ‘fame’ in its Greek and Latin form belongs to the group of words ending with the suffix *-μη* (*-μα*), *-μα*, indicating the ‘result of an action’. Indeed in most grammars the word *fama* is a typical example in this category (*φήμη* <*φημί* / *fama* <*fari*, like *γραμμή* <*γράφω*, *γνώμη* <*γι-γνώσκω*, or *μήνυμα* <*μηνύω* etc.). *φήμη* or *fama*, therefore, defines the outcome of speaking, ‘what has been said’, ‘utterance’, ‘word’, ‘speech’.³ The word *φήμη* – *fama* focuses on the ‘fact’ that something has [already] been said and exists in its own right.⁴ However, what is said, it cannot return, cannot be retrieved. Therefore, speech or report often has something of a ‘winged’ quality in its nature as has been concisely rendered with the Homeric formulaic phrase *ἔπεα πτερόεντα* (winged words);⁵ once uttered, that is, it does not come back. The word *ἔπος*, on its own, means ‘what is uttered’, ‘what is said’. But at the same time it has the dynamism to spread out among the people. Milman Parry, in a much discussed paper (written as an answer to Calhoun’s paper [1935]), argued that the Homeric epithet *πτερόεντα* bears

³ See *LSJ* I 1, 2, II. As Hardie puts it: “*Fama* is a personification of **things said**”. [(2012) 158] (emphasis mine); also 6; see also Hardie (2009a) 558.

⁴ See below p. 12. Cf. Guastella (2012) 249: “Con *fama* si indica il fatto che ‘si parla’ di qualcuno/qualcosa; e la ‘parola’ in questione è immaginata come **un’entità autonoma**, che si muove da sé all’interno di una folla indistinta di persone, che si trasmettono l’informazione ‘di bocca in orecchio’” (emphasis mine).

⁵ For Hardie [(2012) 2]: “the word is notoriously winged and evasive”.

no special significance as it is part of a formulaic phrase.⁶ Ever since antiquity, however, efforts have been made to explain the Homeric phrase by giving emphasis to the epithet *περόεντα*, the modifier of the word *ἔπεα*. One such case was that of Plutarch's:⁷ *ἔπεα γὰρ ἑπερόεντα φησὶν ὁ ποιητής· οὔτε γὰρ πτηνὸν ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ἀφέντα ῥάδιόν ἐστιν αὐθις κατασχεῖν, οὔτε λόγον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος προέμενον συλλαβεῖν καὶ κρατῆσαι δυνατόν* (The poet speaks of 'winged words'; for it is neither easy to catch the bird which left from one's hands, nor is it possible to catch and hold a word which has been uttered, *De garrul.* 507A.6-10). The report travels and in its journey leaves its mark on the people it reaches and the places it visits.

But every time it is repeated, it may be 'contaminated' by the people it has reached. The initial word, therefore, may suffer a total or partial change in meaning during its dissemination.

Cicero was one to experience this phenomenon. Catilina's conspiracy had affected Cicero's political career decisively and he felt the need to remedy that 'contamination' to his interest. In approximately the same period as Lucretius, Cicero, an intellectual and a statesman, was the most prominent orator in Rome. He was the *novus homo* who attained consulship in 63 BC and was craving for *gloria*. It seems that he had written a work on glory (*De Gloria*) which is now lost.⁸ His need for renown is often implied and often expressly stated in his works. He is recorded to have desired the composition of an epic that would extol his great offer to the Respublica: in his speech *Pro Archia poeta*, delivered in 62 BC, he explicitly states that he expects Archias to write an epic in Greek celebrating his consulship.⁹ Evidently this epic never materialised. He then undertook to compose two epic poems, the *De Consulatu Suo* (or *Consulatus Suus*),¹⁰ fragments of which have survived, and the *De Temporibus Suis* which – if ever published – is now lost. There are, however, some testimonies which indicate the presence and the role of

⁶ Parry (1937). Guastella (2004) studies the meaning of the phrase. Noting that "in realtà il contrasto fra le due interpretazioni ("uccelli – frecce") della metafora non sembra ... così importante" he concludes that the important element is the speed: "il punto da cui bisogna partire è il volo: le parole volano, e la loro capacità di attraversare l'aria rappresenta il modo più veloce che gli antichi concepissero di sportarsi nello spazio" (p. 232).

⁷ See also Guastella (2004) 227-228.

⁸ e.g. Souter (1932) 151-152; Sullivan (1941) 382.

⁹ *Pro Archia* 28; see also Cicero's Letter to L. Lucceius (April 52 BC) *Ad Fam.* 22 SB and the comments therewith at 318-322.

¹⁰ See Courtney (2003) 156.

some characters of this work. The greatest orator of the Republican period, therefore, resorted to the poetic discourse of the past, the epic – the time-honoured method for the praise of one’s renown – in order to present himself as the saviour of his country. The contribution of **Eleni Karamalengou (ch. 2) “Poeta, Heros et Fama: Perplexities and Upsets in Cicero's Epic Fragments”** deals with these two epics (but, as expected, mainly with the first) and with the orator’s involvement in the turbulent political events of his consulship. The *De Consulatu Suo* has been written around 60 BC and in it Cicero attempts to highlight his personal contribution to saving the Commonwealth from the abortive coup (63 BC) of Catilina and his followers. The political reactions that followed the execution of the conspirators without trial led to the exile of Cicero in 58 BC and upon his return he probably wrote (55/54 BC) the second work, *De Temporibus Suis*. By that time Cicero’s reputation had begun to wane and there were doubts as to whether he was in the position to have further influence on political matters. In the *De Consulatu Suo*, of which we have a substantial fragment in the *De Divinatione* 1.17-22, the poet Cicero writes on Cicero the consul, in order to secure his future renown. With this work he tries to establish his good reputation – “the genuine’ or intradiegetic *fama*”, as Karamalengou puts it–, which in fact is Cicero’s answer to what he considered as the ‘fake’ *fama*, the *rumores* that is, of his opponents or “the extradiegetic *fama*”. Under such circumstances, “*fama-rumor* as extradiegetic element determines the conditions under which the intradiegetic *fama-gloria* functions”.

To build his personal fame he looks back not only to literary tradition but also to his own translation of Aratus’ *Phaenomena*, the *Phaenomena Aratea*, a work of his youth. Being, however, at the same time the poet and the central character-hero of his own work, Cicero “upsets”, as Karamalengou argues, the epic principle of the distance between the poet/narrator and the narrated events (transgressing, that is, Aristotle’s epic code, *Poetics*, 1460a). It seems, therefore, that Cicero is the inventor of a literary genre, the ‘autofiction’. But, this is not the only “upset” to the epic code, as the convergence between the poet and the hero triggers further subversions, such as the elimination of the existing tension between *narration* and *discourse*. At the same time, the convergence of poet and hero compels Cicero/the poet to limit the *fama-gloria* attributed to his hero (Cicero/the consul) through the use of a number of literary techniques in order to avoid self-ridicule. One such technique, to which Karamalengou draws our attention, was the formation of characters with similar features, such as the double identity, or of characters who “have undergone a change of identity”. Such characters are mainly those gods

who at one point are Greek gods and deities as they appear in the *Aratea* and at another are their Roman surrogates. The discussion concerns mainly Zeus/Jupiter, the Greek god who in the *Aratea* permeates the universe, while in the *Respublica* is the Roman god who is responsible for the restoration of peace. Cicero's epic work was manifestly an attempt to influence the reception of both, past and current, events; it was also an instance of redeeming his past actions from the *fama-rumor*.

As becomes obvious from Hardie's book and I trust from the papers of this volume, each poet (among them Cicero) invented various ways to propagate his fame and glorify himself. But above all, each and every one of the contestants had first to gain insight into the very phenomenon of fame and its qualities. In practice, awareness of its qualities led in some instances to the personification of fame.

Virgil's personification in particular is the one that has left an indelible imprint on generations and this is the central theme of Hardie's study.¹¹ Virgil's personification, however, was not a creation *in vacuo*; it is rather the 'next' step in a recurring tradition. Hardie starts with Homer and then proceeds to Hesiod, where *Fame* (*Φήμη*) was considered a goddess (*θεός νύ τις ἔστι καὶ αὐτή*; she [i.e. *Φήμη*] is, therefore, a god of a sort, *WD* 764).¹² In Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 157, she is the immortal child of *Hope* (*Ἐλπίς*): *εἰπέ μοι, ὦ χρυσέας τέκνον Ἐλπίδος, ἄμβροτε Φάμα* (tell me, immortal Fame, child of golden Hope). We see in **Clément-Tarantino's** paper (below **ch. 3**) that Fame may be situated within the house, as in Euripides' *Helen* (820); she may also run unrestrained in the city – even under a different name, *᾽Οσσα* (=voice)¹³ – when at *Odyssey* she announces the death of Penelope's suitors: *᾽Οσσα δ' ἄρ' ἄγγελος ὄκα κατὰ πόλιν ὄψετο πάντη / μνηστήρων στυγερὸν θάνατον καὶ κῆρ' ἐνέπουσα* (meanwhile, *Ossa* [Rumour] as a messenger went swiftly through the city announcing the suitors' horrid death and fate, 24.413-414).¹⁴ In Virgil, too, personified *Fama* is not enclosed within the limits of the house; her fixity will be presented later on by Ovid.

It is in the nature of the epic genre to have the grand scale as a measure. Indeed when Virgil describes *Fama* in a state of quick motion growing in all directions and reaching the clouds (*Aen.* 4.177), the Roman

¹¹ esp. Hardie (2012) 48-77.

¹² Hardie (2012) 50.

¹³ See below Clément-Tarantino referring to Heyne [-Wagner] [(*ad loc.*): nn. 31 and 39]: Hardie (2012) 68: "*᾽Οσσα* the collective voicing of the Achaean people"; also n. 40.

¹⁴ Hardie (2012) 64.

poet gives epic dimensions to the monstrous creature; its size is analogous to its effect on humans. Strictly speaking, with his description Virgil personifies not just what was said, *fama* itself, that is the content of the report, but also (and mainly) the *movement* and *dissemination* of the report in time and space, its reception¹⁵ and the transmutations it undergoes in its course by the recipients of the message. Virgil's description of *Fama*, therefore, represents the potential of the report to travel and to renew itself/herself while moving. In its/her journey, *Fama* with its/her reception may undergo numerous transmutations, verbal or otherwise, which in turn may create praise or reproach, admiration or condemnation; envy is often involved. It is with this process that Virgil is primarily concerned in his imagery. As regards Dido and Aeneas, the reception of the reports about their union in Book 4 of the *Aeneid* had a disastrous development, as the outcome of the narrative shows. *Fama* confirmed her poetic characterisation as *malum* (4.174) and *monstrum horrendum* (181). As a matter of fact, the imagery of the Virgilian *Fama* has common – but also different – traits with the characterisation of Polyphemus in the *Aeneid*; first his name is etymologically directly connected with that of *Fama* and it means “having many utterances”.¹⁶ He, too, is described as *monstrum horrendum ... ingens* (*Aen.* 3.658) like *Fama*; however, he lacks the element of swiftness, a principal characteristic of *Fama* (*pedibus celerem et pernicipibus alis*, 4.180); furthermore his blindness is stressed (*lumen ademptum*, 3.658), while *Fama* is described as covered with eyes (*cui quot sunt plumae / tot vigiles oculi subter*, 4.181-182). When Polyphemus lost his sight, he also lost his power; he could not even replace it with the strength of an *in-sight*. *Fama*, on the contrary, retains her speed and her visual contact with humans keeps her alive and powerful. As we shall see below, the relation of report to the external or internal vision is treated by Ovid in the *Metamorphoses* in the episode of Leuconoe [the subject of **Peraki-Kyriakidou's** contribution (**ch. 4**)].

Fama in Virgil has been already extensively studied. Among other studies on the issue, Hardie (2012) singles out that by **Clément Tarantino** (2006): *Fama ou la renommée du genre: recherches sur la représentation de la tradition dans l'Énéide* (Diss. Lille) as he expressly acknowledges that: “[she] provides a detailed anatomy of important aspects of *fama* in

¹⁵ In a very simple way Ovid encapsulates this process in his phrase: *hi* [i.e. *rumores*] *narrata ferunt alio* (*Met.* 12.57).

¹⁶ Loudon [(1995) 41] with further references; also Hardie [(2009a) 92-93] with references to the name's etymology at n. 80; also p. 96; (2012) 99. Perhaps lines *Od.* 9.252-255, 355-356 may justify his name (Louden *ibid.*).

the Greco-Roman tradition”.¹⁷ After Clément-Tarantino, Hardie with his book in 2012 considerably broadened the spectrum of research on *Fama*, always retaining Virgilian *Fama* at the epicentre of the work. The interest in *f/Fama* remains unfailing. In 2013 Antonia Syson published her own work, *Fama and Fiction in Vergil's Aeneid* (Ohio). In her study Syson highlights various and interesting theoretical aspects, focusing her interest strictly and almost exclusively on the Virgilian text.

Virgil looks back at the tradition continuously, with his eyes wide open; it is this relation of the poet to the past which mainly attracts Séverine Clément Tarantino's attention as far as the study of *f/Fama*'s manifestations is concerned. For Clément-Tarantino (ch. 3, “**Wanderings of *Fama* and ‘fame’s Narratives’ in the *Aeneid*”**), *Fama*, this multifaceted personification of speech, who discloses the affair between Dido and Aeneas, although described in the *Aeneid* as ‘wandering’ with the characteristics of a bacchant of a sort, should not be exclusively considered as such, since – if we see things within the broader perspective of the epic structure – references to her in the epic are not related to digressions or “centrifugal constructions”. As Clément-Tarantino herself notes, however, the very description of *Fama* constitutes a digression which in turn forms a pause in the narrative, holding out a “‘mirror’ of what is being stated ... on a thematic (and historical) level: the union of the proto-founder of Rome with the foundress of Carthage”. *Fama* gives the impression that it is she who influences Jupiter to intervene in order to keep the narrative on the line of what the *fata* have ordained, by convincing Aeneas to leave Carthage (in this perspective the function of *fama* and *fata* conflate – a topic to which Hardie, too, gives particular emphasis).¹⁸ Taking this thought further, *Fama* can even be considered an aspect of Jupiter.¹⁹

Further to the personified *Fama* who encapsulates within a few verses the dynamic of the epic, Clément-Tarantino also focuses on formulaic phrases concerning the spread of the report, such as *ut perhibent, fama est, dicitur, fertur*, considering that “on occasion these phrases identify the epic voice of the poet with tradition which the poet inevitably recreates by

¹⁷ Hardie (2012) xi; also (2009a) 109.

¹⁸ Hardie (2012) 103-106. See also Syson (2013) 6-7; and her index (p. 234).

¹⁹ Hardie [(2012) 99] talks about the “opposition between the chthonic *Fama* and the Olympian Jupiter”. For Syson [(2013) 56 n. 29]: “Jupiter implicitly presents the reckoning of death and fame as an exchange”; also (55): “*Fama*, as a bridge from mortality to story-borne immortality, belongs to humans, but is also a form of speech that has special links to the divine realm”.

renewing it”, thus retaining his creative self. For Clément-Tarantino there are times that the poet seems to turn to tradition by referring to *fama* not so much for showing what he draws from it, but rather to imply what he leaves behind from that tradition. By doing so, Virgil offers the reader a better way to acknowledge his poetic choices. To this end, she discusses in detail one such phrase, *ut perhibent*, by which the poet brings us back to tradition, especially to the Hesiodic text of *Theogony*, naming *Fama* as the daughter of Earth (*Terra... /extremam, ut perhibent, sororem / progenit, Aen. 4.178-180*). With this allusion the poet places *Fama* in the position of Typhoeus (*Theog. 820-821*), managing in this way to criticise her negative role. At the same time, the very word *extremam* renders the literary game more complicated as it may indicate that what is said in Virgil is a mythological addition.²⁰ *fama* therefore, functions as a link between different periods as well as between different genres. However, it has a major role not only in the dialogue between texts of different periods but also in the intratextual dialogue between the different parts of the work itself. Under this capacity rumour or *fama* becomes a factor of transition or cohesion and on occasion comes close to the Muses; she can also function as an aspect of *kleos*. *fama* can also serve in Virgil the “narrative shift” (p. 64). The presence of the winged *Fama*, especially in the second half of the epic (*Aen. 7.104*), which anticipates the functioning mode of fame and glory in the Ovidian *Metamorphoses*, owes its role to the precedent of fame as *fama-transitus*. Through this unifying quality of *fama*, Clément-Tarantino asserts that other poetic genres and in particular Attic tragedy can be brought into the discussion as to the origins of the narratological role *fama* plays in the epic. Clément-Tarantino, following Ogle [(1924) “Dame Gossip’s Role in Epic and Drama”], acknowledges in Attic tragedy the “exploitation of rumour and other ill-defined noises (e.g. news or gossip) in the writing of entire sections of their dramas as the forces behind the development of events”. This is also valid for the *Aeneid*, and Clément-Tarantino gives us examples of this capacity from the second half of the epic (*Aen. 9.473-477, 10.510-512 and 11.139-141*). Unlike the Greek *φήμη* (*φήμα* or *φάμα*) of Bacchylides or Pindar, epic *fama* in the *Aeneid* never becomes a harbinger of victory. Also, unlike the archaic epic *kleos*, epic *fama*, especially in the second half of the *Aeneid*, tends to become the “voix endeuillée” of the Greek tragedy, which concentrates on the painful consequences of war. In this way Virgil’s *Fama* becomes the model for some of her future applications in the Roman epic.

²⁰ Hardie (2012) 99 and 215-217; Guastella (2012) 252 n. 7. On this issue see also Syson (2013) 46-47.

The discussion on the *Aeneid* inevitably leads us to Ovid. Here we shall see the *fama* personified once more. Hardie's exemplary analysis does not leave much room for further discussion. However, I would like to express some personal thoughts which rely on his analysis: Reading Virgil, we notice that the Ovidian treatment of the personification – at least in Book 12 of the *Metamorphoses* (39-46) – is different,²¹ to say the least. In Virgil the emphasis is given not to the content of the report but rather to the journey of that report, during which it is augmented or even distorted to become a *monstrum horrendum*. In Ovid now, *Fama* remains immovable at the cosmic junction she has chosen for her dwelling. She lives there as calm as an Epicurean persona, as Hardie has aptly put it.²² Her limited actions are tellingly denoted by the verbs *videt* and *inquirit*,²³ emphatically put in the last line of her description (***videt totumque inquirit in orbem***, *Met.* 12.63).²⁴ Obviously, in Ovid, *Fama* has nothing in common with the Fury Allecto with whom the Virgilian *Fama* is in “close affinity”.²⁵ Mutability, one of Allecto's main characteristics, hardly fits the Ovidian *Fama*'s description.²⁶ This description implies a static quality such as that characterising an accomplished action which – together with the next half-line, *fecerat haec notum* (she had made known, *Met.* 12.64) – tends to imply the meaning and the etymology of *fama* –φήμη, since the suffix of the word expresses, as we have seen, the result of an action, literally a ‘fait accompli’.²⁷ Indeed in Book 12 of the *Metamorphoses* her role in the narrative is confined to the past by having let the Trojans know

²¹ Cf. however, the Virgilian-like personification of *fama* at *Met.* 9.137-139: *quae veris addere falsa / gaudet, et e minimo sua per mendacia crescit* (who enjoys mingling false with true things and through her own lies grows enormous from very small.)

²² Hardie (2012) 152.

²³ The verbs *videt* and *inquirit* (63) are not synonymous and the latter may purely refer to the *in-sight* of an action. In the phrase *totumque inquirit in orbem* Hardie [(2012) 155] –following Barchiesi – sees an allusion to the epic cycle and hints at the Roman epic cycle as well. He also draws our attention to the ring composition of the verb *videt* with the opening of the description.

²⁴ See also next page. Hardie (2012) 152: “In fact Ovid's *Fama* does not practice total non-intervention in the human world, but compared with the Virgilian *Fama*'s demonic inflammation of passions her effects are pale indeed”.

²⁵ Hardie (2012) 101-102, 152.

²⁶ Syson (2013) 19.

²⁷ Hardie's interpretation at this point [(2012) 154] is particularly apt since he relates etymologically the word *fecerat* with the Greek verb *ποιεῖν* thus hinting to the etymology of *poeta* and strengthening the thought that *Fama* here functions as tradition.

that the Greeks had arrived, an action stated in the plusperfect tense, since this had already been mentioned in the narrative (12.37-38). It is really intriguing that the personification in Ovid takes place at the opening of the ‘Trojan’ section of the *Metamorphoses*²⁸ and perhaps this position has contributed to the effectiveness of the imagery. The mythological material of the Trojan war, more than anything else in the tradition, was received in so many and varying ways by ancient poets.

The mobility of the Virgilian creature, the “unexpected embodiment of the epic tradition”,²⁹ represented the continuously repeated reception of the report. Ovid, on the other hand, does quite the opposite: he shapes his *Fama* as something static and abstract, without any special features or facial characteristics³⁰ and without denoting her movement (a similar treatment which Manilius has reserved for his *Gloria*, as we shall see later in **Stratis Kyriakidis’** contribution, **ch. 6**). Ovid’s *Fama* has the quality of finality, as a creation of the past. *Fama*, therefore, represents what tradition stands for: everything that has already been written or said (with all the conflicting and varying elements).³¹

As we have already seen, the Ovidian *Fama* sees (*videt*, 12.63) everything happening in the sky, in the sea, and on the earth and investigates all things in the world (*ipsa, quid in caelo rerum pelagoque geratur / et tellure, videt totumque inquiri in orbem*, Rumour herself looks at what takes place in heaven, on the sea and on the earth and investigates the whole world, *Met.* 12.62-63), actions, that is, which imply the inquisitiveness of her character. Some lines earlier it was *Fama* herself who chose (*legit*, 43) the location of her house in the *triplicis confinia*

²⁸ Hardie [(2002b) 70 and (2012) 153] sees the presentation of *Fama* at this stage of the narrative as though it serves one of her roles as a ‘scene-changer’ (a view shared by Tarantino in this volume, pp. 65 and n.31, 67-68 n.36) since the action is transferred from Aulis to Troy proper whereas at the same time in Book 12 “we enter properly on the sequence of, firstly, Homeric and, secondly, Virgilian epic subject matter that will, through every distortion and digression, occupy the reader for the rest of the poem”. On *Fama’s* representation at the opening of Book 12, see also Zumwalt (1977).

²⁹ Hardie (2012) 151.

³⁰ Guastella (2012) 253. For Papaioannou [(2007) 47]: “Ovid’s composition expands not on what *Fama* looks like, that is, something that nobody is ever to see and verify, but on how *Fama* is perceived among people, namely, as an inextricable accumulation of voices of indistinguishable origin and inherent co-dependence, which people experience regularly even beyond a literary environment”.

³¹ Hardie (2012) 156: “... firstly I shall allegorize the Ovidian *Fama*, at first sight just a personification of rumour, as a personification of the poetic tradition ...”. See also Zumwalt (1977) 212; Papaioannou in this volume.

mundi (the confines of a tripartite world, 40) where everything could be seen or heard (*unde quod est usquam, quamvis regionibus absit / inspicitur, penetratque cavas vox omnis ad aures*, from this place everything, however distant, is seen and every word enters into the hollow ears, *Met.* 12.41-42).³² *Fama* has also acted as an architect to her house (*ac mille foramina tectis / addidit et nullis inclusit limina portis*, and she added a thousand openings on the roof and entrances with no doors to shut, 44-45). In the same house live the personified vices which traditionally may distort the truth, in one way or another, *Credulitas*,³³ *Error*, *Laetitia*, *Timores*, *Seditio*³⁴ and *Susurri* (12.60-61). *Fama* herself constructed it in such a way so that anyone could enter and leave the house and say anything, true or false, obviously filtered by its tenants.³⁵ *Fama*-tradition permits rumours to gather and circulate there (53-55); however, she does not interfere in the process.

In Virgil, the initial message recorded about the affair between Dido and Aeneas in Book 4 of the *Aeneid* was not responsible *per se* for the outcome of this liaison. It is, strictly speaking, the dissemination of the rumours – the result that is, of the activity Virgilian *Fama* has been involved in concerning the event (*Aen.* 4.189-221) which activated Jupiter's reaction (4.222-237). In Ovid, on the other hand, the point of reference is the house of *Fama*, where all new rumours and reports gather. *Fama* herself does not travel. On the contrary, through the innumerable openings she has added to her dwelling (44-45) without any doors to close these entrances (45), she lets all rumours visit and run through it and it is there that the reports are formed and renewed. Characteristic of this situation is line 58: *et auditis aliquid novus adicit auctor* (and each new teller adds something to what he has heard).³⁶ According to Hardie *novus*

³² Tissol (2002) 308: “The house occupies a liminal site, hovering at the boundaries between earth, sea, and sky. The structure itself—if it can be called a structure—scarcely separates inside from outside, for its porous nature defeats such distinctions”.

³³ Hardie (2002b) 73; (2012) 157.

³⁴ Hardie (2012) 161.

³⁵ Zumwalt (1977) 222: “*Fama* and *vetustas* ... are susceptible to human hopes and fears, to irrational passions of all sorts, to parochial, particular political manipulations – all of these are forces which distort the truth. Ovid presents a chronicle of effects of these forces in myth, legend, and history, and this vision is the closest that one can hope to get to the truth”.

³⁶ See Barchiesi [(2002) 196] on the multiple meaning of the word *auctor* (also below p. 59 n. 14). For Hardie [(2002a) 73] the phrase “scarcely needs comment as an unveiled definition of the dynamic of a literary tradition – for example Ovid’s rewriting of Virgil’s description of *Fama*”.

auctor means “the latest, most recent authority”.³⁷ What is visualised here is that the tradition is the ‘meeting place’ of all; it is an acknowledgement that the report of the past has the power to draw to itself all the new voices³⁸ which will then be filtered through the house of *Fama*.³⁹ At this we may well remember T.S. Eliot’s words who many centuries later was writing: “No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead”.⁴⁰

Ovid craved that his work would survive oblivion and aspired to be part of the literary continuum but also a point of reference for poets to come. As Feeney says: “Ovid remains confident and alert in his energetic production of a new *Fama*...” and “presents himself as a new repository for the *Fama* which future generations will inherit”.⁴¹

In the *Metamorphoses* where flux and movement are in the nucleus of the narrative, *Fama* remains surprisingly static, whereas in the Virgilian epic, where every moment has its own importance and value and the poet sometimes gives the impression that he attempts to ‘freeze’ time,⁴² *Fama* is in a thorough movement and bears clearer ‘Ovidian’ characteristics.⁴³

Virgil’s *Fama* has as many eyes as there are feathers on her body (*cui quot sunt plumae / tot vigiles oculi subter*, *Aen.* 4.181-182) while Ovid’s *Fama* sees everything happening in the world from her house (*ipsa, quid in caelo rerum pelagoque geratur / et tellure, videt ...*, *Fama* herself looks at what takes place in heaven, on the sea and on the earth ..., *Met.* 12.62-

³⁷ Hardie (2012) 157.

³⁸ For Hardie [(2012) 157]: “Ovid gives himself up to the *leve vulgus* who come and go in the House of *Fama*”. *leve vulgus* (*Met.* 12.53) visiting *Fama*’s abode probably alludes to Hellenistic poetry which constitutes a large part of the tradition and in its turn has had a great impact on later poetic production. On the adjective *levis* see below, pp.76-78.

³⁹ Cf. Barchiesi (2002) 195 n. 29: “... in this poem, where the richness of tradition becomes difficult to master, the main effect is to stress the reader’s dependence on the author as the only force able to control background noise and give a narrative shape to this interplay of competing narrators”.

⁴⁰ T.S. Eliot (1917) “Tradition and the individual talent” in *Selected Essays* 1917-1932, New York, 4; see also Falck (1994²) 92.

⁴¹ Feeney (1991) 248.

⁴² Kyriakidis (2007) 135.

⁴³ See also Clément-Tarantino below, concerning *fama as transitus*: “I think it is important to notice that a literary device which seems so obviously Ovidian was in fact anticipated by Virgil” (below, p. 64).

63). This description is the visual imagery of the common experience that sight often leads to the creation of a report.⁴⁴ It is with our sight to a great extent that we see and perceive the external events before we describe them in words.⁴⁵ However, on occasion our experiences entail a deeper cognitive process such as is required for the study of literature, where literary experience is gained without any involvement of sight. This kind of insightful vision – unlike the external vision – may create a different sort of discourse. In Book 12, the Ovidian *Fama* “seeking wholeness”⁴⁶ through seeing and enquiring, uses both activities, as line 63 shows.⁴⁷ However, earlier, in Book 4 of the *Metamorphoses* the poet explores the dynamics and the consequences of the unilateral vision and the kind of discourse it leads to. This is the subject of the next contribution by **Eleni Peraki-Kyriakidou, (ch. 4) “The Ovidian Leuconoe: Vision, Speech and Narration”**.

In Book 3 of the *Metamorphoses* Bacchism has prevailed among the Theban women. In Book 4, Leuconoe, the daughter of Minyas, and her two sisters, have rejected the Bacchic rites performed in the open and in the mountains (*Met.* 3.708), and have decided to spend their time indoors weaving and narrating; each one of the sisters would tell her own story. Peraki-Kyriakidou focuses on Leuconoe’s story. With this, the poet challenges the narrative frame he himself has set in the previous book thus creating a clash between two fundamentally different kinds of life and behaviour: Bacchism – and all it represents – against *doctrina* and self-composed social and cultural behaviour. *Doctrina* is under the protection of Minerva. Obviously in this episode Bacchus and Minerva do not carry all the religious features and qualities they have in tradition. Nevertheless, they are two deities poles apart to whom the poet has entrusted the representation of two different ways of life. Eventually a question is posed: can *doctrina* and culture stand on their own without some features of Bacchism? Can there be an one-sided attitude to life and intellect? Ovid’s answer to this question seems to be negative: the convergence of the two is essential in life. However, the reading of Leuconoe’s narrative poses one more question: what is the value and the impact of a report, if it overlooks the essence of the message conveyed, a report, that is, made

⁴⁴ And vice versa: Hardie (2012) 159: “But for ancient poets and critics one of the most impressive powers of the spoken word was its ability to conjure up visual images, or *enargeia*”.

⁴⁵ Our audience, therefore, has access only to our words and not to what we have seen ourselves: see Syson [(2013) 138.

⁴⁶ See below, p. 91.

⁴⁷ See above, p. 11.

only on the basis of the external vision and experience without the necessary mental processing of what is seen?

Leuconoe – being one of the three internal narrators in this episode – recounts *Solis amores*: *Sol* (Sun) had witnessed the secret love affair of Venus and Mars and had spread the news. Venus retaliated by making Sun fall in love with Leucothoe, the central – albeit silent – character of the story. Clytie in turn, who was in love with Sun and envious of Leucothoe, disclosed the maiden's affair with Sun to her father. Enraged with the news he buried his daughter alive. Both Sun and Clytie reported what they saw; yet their perception was partial. Both reports by Sun and Clytie are the outcome of an external visual impression and experience, based only on subjective and partial perception, as both of them did not take into consideration important aspects of the reported event: Sun has missed the cosmic symbolism of that union, in which the two deities allegorise the cosmological concepts of *νεῖκος*, and *φιλότης*, whereas Clytie, blinded with love, treats the victimised maiden, Leucothoe, as a rival, ignoring the *aetion* and the causes of the affair. It is clear that both Sun and Clytie have gained nothing from their disclosure; on the contrary: when Sun falls in love with Leucothoe, his partial perception evolves into a restricted and partial optical range as he – love-stricken – focuses only on his beloved. He ceases, therefore, to be a *παντόπτης*, an all-seeing deity. Clytie on the other hand – motivated by her *invidia*, unable that is, to see the truth (*in-priv.+ video*) – loses her ability to speak and is left fixed and speechless to gaze for ever at Sun (as a result of her *invidia* [*in- cop.+video*]). The two reports have proven to both fruitless, *inrita verba*, as Sun loses the power of his vision and Clytie, the power to communicate and speak (Clytie < *κλύω*, 'hear', 'learn/ κλείω – κλέω (*LSJ*, s.vv.), 'call', 'tell of', 'make famous', 'celebrate'); in other words they both lose their main characteristic. To show this fruitlessness, Leuconoe suppresses both speeches in her narrative. However, Leuconoe herself has fallen victim of a similar attitude, since the choice she has made to reject Bacchism also entails an one-sided approach: she has refused the external experience and her narrative is motivated only by her mental experiences, whereas her characters in the narrative reject the mental processing of the information and rely for their report solely on their external vision. Under such circumstances the reader of the episode may well wonder how useful the recounting of the story is for Leuconoe and her sisters who were devoted to Minerva, thus shunning any service paid to Bacchus. The answer is given by the poet. After their stories were told, the three daughters of Minyas were transformed into bats, *vespertiones*, with the poet himself explicitly etymologising the word from *vesper* (*a vespere nomen*, *Met.*

4.415). Bats are liminal beings as they appear at dusk, the time that is, when the darkness of the night takes over from daylight. Parallel to this metamorphosis, the symbols of Minerva are also transformed into symbols of Bacchus. The young girls, however, will remain within the bounds of the household and will not be carried outdoors, the natural locus of Bacchism. The characteristics of the two different worlds have finally converged, each one having first lost individual features.

When Ovid was relegated to Tomis he moved away from the epic genre. His techniques, however, and manner of writing never left him. In the exile poetry Ovid often refers to his work and does not hide his wish for his future renown. Away from his beloved *Vrbs* Ovid never ceases to express himself concerning this. How much, though, does the relegation count in Ovid's poetic consciousness and how does he express his thoughts? **Andreas N. Michalopoulos** turns our attention to this issue. In his contribution to the volume (**ch. 5**) with the title "*famaque cum domino fugit ab urbe suo: Aspects of fama in Ovid's Exile Poetry*" Michalopoulos examines different facets of *fama* in Ovid's exile poetry. His work is divided into two major sections: 1. "*Fama* as 'reputation' and 'fame'", and 2. "*Fama* as 'news', 'rumour', 'hearsay'". Each section then is subdivided into parts which again correspond to particular situations. In the first section, Michalopoulos turns to *Tristia* 3.7 where the poet highlights the superiority and the high-spiritedness of the poetic discourse vis-à-vis political authority. Poetic fame is not related to physical presence but rather transcends what is material and perishable and tends to be eternal as long as 'eternal' Rome exists: it is the *ingenium* of the poet which secures the posterity of the name and the work of the poet. However, at *Tristia* 4.1, Ovid looks at the reverse situation. At lines 1-4, the poet argues that, owing to the existing conditions of exile, the quality of his poetry has dropped and he is, therefore, in search of solace rather than poetic renown. Michalopoulos reads this poetic statement as an acknowledgment of the stimulus the poet had in his previous literary activity which would secure him everlasting fame, as he clearly had declared in the epilogue of the *Metamorphoses* (15.871-879). The attitude expressed at *Tristia* 4.1 leads Ovid to "the repudiation of *fama* as a motivation for writing poetry in exile". Related views can also be found in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, especially in the elegy *Ex Ponto* 3.9 addressed to Brutus where the poet highlights the "purely utilitarian role" of the poetic discourse while in exile (Michalopoulos questions the poet's veracity regarding this assertion especially because of the emotional pressure Ovid felt in exile). Ovid also points to the renown bestowed to others through

his work. His wife, characterised as the ideal model of conjugal faith, is forewarned lest she fails to live up to these standards (*Pont.* 3.1.43-48); owing to his poetry she is turned to a literary heroine viewed, as if on stage, by numerous spectators. In this way *fama* is identified with the poet's work. Ovid comes back to the same theme in the last elegy of the collection of the *Tristia* (5.14) where he acknowledges his wife's devotion and brings up by way of example the names of women from the past famous for their devotion. Michalopoulos, however, notices a strange twist in the poet's approach to fame when in a letter addressed to his friend Maximus (*Pont.* 1.5), he expresses the view that fame has fled the City together with him and that it is now 'buried' together with him in exile. Fame has turned from 'everlasting' and 'omnipresent' to a quality confined to the narrow geographical limits of the poet's physical presence in exile.

In the second section of his contribution ("*Fama* as 'news', 'rumour', 'hearsay'") Michalopoulos discusses aspects of *fama* as 'news', 'rumour' or 'hearsay' as presented in the exile poetry. For his communication with the outside world the poet is dependent mainly on sailors and this transforms the sailors into a personified *Fama*, of a sort, since they are the agents of the 'news' he gets. But the news reaches Tomis late and only rarely, and its quality is debatable. This poor quality of news contributes in turn to the formation of the portrait of the exiled poet. *Fama* once more acquires some of the qualities of her Virgilian personification, although the news on the consulship of Sextus Pompeius which she reveals to the exiled poet (*Pont.* 4.4.11-18) is good. Incapable of seeing *Fama*, Ovid can only hear her speaking to him for something he is unable to witness as he is absent from Rome. This 'absent presence' is not only a characteristic of *Fama* but of the poet himself in the exile poetry, since he is almost identified with *Fama* as regards the function of poetry.

Through Michalopoulos' analysis, the reader sees that the issue of reported speech and fame was a major concern of the poet throughout his career. Ovid often shows how keen he is not simply as regards the characterisation of the report and its effects; more importantly he is keen – as we have already seen – to show his desire for the perpetuity of his own work and the impact it will have on generations to come, as he does in the *coda* of the *Metamorphoses*; similar views and expressions are more or less explicitly (or implicitly) present in other parts of his oeuvre. As Michalopoulos shows us, the same poet studies various aspects of fame and he often attempts in his diction to argue on contrasting aspects of it.

We are all well aware that it was not only Virgil or Ovid who aspired to a place in posterity by leaving a *monumentum* of poetry, as Horace