

Author(s): John Peradotto

Reviewed work(s): The Author of the Prometheus Bound by C. J. Herington

Source: *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 69, No. 3, (Feb. - Mar., 1974), pp. 258-260

Published by: The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Inc.

ship. Each of the ten analyses deals with one significant Ode of the first three books. The application of the most thorough *explication du texte*, including an uncommon understanding of the potentialities of the Latin language when handled by a mastermind, and a feeling for the refinements and overtones of the Horatian style, is accompanied by numerous references to the rest of the poet's lyrical work. In consequence, in addition to the enrichment of our knowledge of the details (so essential with the archetype of the *poeta doctus*), this book offers one more comprehensive picture of *Orazio lirico*; and the author constantly discusses, both in agreement and in disagreement, the work of Pasquali, fountainhead of modern Horatian studies, and his other predecessors, including, among others, Kiessling-Heinze, Klingner, Wilkinson, Commager, and especially, of course, E. Fraenkel. If modern fashions of pseudo-Romantic emotionalism have occasionally impaired Horace's stature as one of the three great representatives of world literature in Latin poetry, Pöschl's approach will help to restore his image, and the appreciation of the Roman genius in literature in general with its emphasis less on originality than on constant re-creation of traditional, particularly Hellenic, patterns of form and thought.

The ten Odes, unequal in length and weight, cover the various aspects of the poet's formal mastery and of the personal and philosophic reactions of an independent and skeptical, essentially Epicurean, mind in the face of the problems of existence in Augustus' *imperium sine fine*. Thus we meet some of the best known and frequently discussed poems, such as the *Soracte* Ode, the *Cleopatra* Ode, the *Fortuna* Ode (I. 35), the *Otium* Ode (II. 16), the first of the Roman Odes, and the *Exegi Monumentum* Ode; even here the author's reinterpretation proves fruitful, strengthened through parallels not only from ancient literature but also from modern poetry and criticism. The other poems: the *Maecenas* Ode, *Tyrrhena Regum Progenies*, the *Pyrrrha* Ode; finally, III. 25 (*Quo Me Bacche*), and III. 28 (*Festo Quid Potius Die*) indicate Pöschl's ability to discover significant meaning even in passages so far overlooked or regarded as not deserving critical notice. While discarding the frequently overzealous concern with discovering in these poems data for quite unessential details of Horatian biography, he pays much attention to structural analysis, sound patterns, and imagery. Among Pöschl's keen investigations into particulars, one may mention his discussion of the meaning of *necessitas* as the embodiment of torture in the *Fortuna* Ode and the convincing proof of the authenticity of the *cura* stanza in II. 16. The index includes not only names and passages, but, as a welcome feature, the concepts and ideas mentioned and discussed. The pleasant format is in line with the style of the book; Horace himself would have enjoyed receiving this *libellus* as a new assurance of his survival being untouched by *annorum series et fuga temporum*.

FELIX M. WASSERMANN

Marquette University

**The Author of the Prometheus Bound**, by C. J. HERINGTON. Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1970. Pp. 135. \$4.75.

THE ORIGINAL FORM of this slender volume, a dittoed typescript circulated among interested scholars, provided the base for a spirited seminar at the 1968 annual meeting of the American Philological Association in Toronto. It is now published as the first volume in "The New Delphin Series" of monographs, whose announced intent is "to make available critical and scholarly work consonant with the approach of the *Arion* school of classical criticism . . . ranging from traditional philology to literary criticism to translation." Herington's monograph is a very auspicious beginning for the series.

In counteracting Wilhelm Schmid's monumental assault upon the authenticity of the *Prometheus Bound* — for that is the whole thrust of this book — Herington has not lightly dismissed the philological arguments either on vague "intuitive" or "aesthetic" grounds, needless to say, or even by the application of more systematic methods of literary criticism. On the contrary, he brings essentially the same traditional tools which Schmid and others had brought to bear on the problem, and uses them with a rigor no one who calls himself a philologist could fault. And yet there is a difference. It would be difficult to find another work which catalogues so much leaden statistical data with quite so much economy, grace, and occasional good humor.

Herington's general program is (1) to take a fresh look at the conditions of the problem, especially in the light of the down-dating of the *Supplices*, (2) to catalogue the actual or supposed anomalies of the play, and then (3) to construct a hypothesis consistent with them.

On the first point, Herington undertakes to show the serious consequences which denial of proper attribution entails. It means, for one thing, setting aside whatever external testimony may exist, in this case, the Alexandrian scholars, who not only possessed more material than we do, but who were also no less inclined than their modern counterparts to doubt received attribution on

linguistic and stylistic grounds, i.e., what they considered “characteristic” of a given author. Herington is too modest, so early in his argument, to press their claims to credibility very far, but the implication is clear: the Alexandrian may (just *may*) have been less scientific than the modern philologist, may have been less likely, say, to tabulate instances of metron overlap in anapaestic dimeters, but if conclusiveness in any classificatory system (What else is attribution or its rejection?) depends upon sufficiency of coverage, then they were in an infinitely better position to judge what is “characteristic” of Aeschylus than those whose evidence amounts to a mere seven plays, including only one complete trilogy, from a total output of seventy-five (or ninety?).

The modern scholar who sets about determining what is or is not characteristic of Aeschylus must not only bear in mind the scantiness of his evidence, but also address himself to the more general question of possible variability within any artistic career, which will increase, in Herington's words, “the mightier the poet concerned, the more experimental his art, the greater his mastery of his medium; the more turbulent the political and intellectual atmosphere of his lifetime.” But in Aeschylus' artistic personality, even as fragmentary as it presents itself to us, it is precisely his *versatility* that Herington sees as the one constant factor – versatility in meter, diction, word creation, creation of dramatic forms and ideas, the kind of versatility whose full range is not evident at any single moment in his career, but is articulated, like Picasso's or Beardsley's or Klee's, in successive periods, each with its own distinct characteristics, its own “personality.” Herington observes two such successive periods or phases in the 14-year span within which (the contested *PV* aside) all the extant plays fall: (1) ca. 472-467 (*Persae*, *Septem*), and (2) 466-458 (*Supplices*, *Oresteia*). The bulk of Herington's subsequent argument is the demonstration of the credibility of this two-phase taxonomy, and, what is more important, the assignment of the *PV* to the second of these phases.

Chapter two is a checklist, with commentary, of minor stylistic and metrical features of the *PV*: (1) those unparalleled in drama, e.g., high coincidence of choric quatrains and of word and phrase repetition; (2) those unparalleled in tragedy, e.g., non-stop interlinear hiatus after trimeters; (3) those unparalleled in extant plays and fragments of Aeschylus, e.g., high proportion of resultative perfects, first-foot anapaests in the trimeters, enjambment, and *gnomai*; (4) those confined to (or predominant in) *PV*, *Supplices*, and *Oresteia* (i.e., Herington's “second phase”), e.g., *Liebblingswörter*, use of *δεῖ*, *πέπρωται*, *ἀπαλλαγῆ πόνων* and related phrases, *ἐβμενῆς βία* and related phrases, and low incidence of trimeter resolutions; (5) particles in the *PV* whose usage, far from rousing suspicions about its authenticity, actually sets it in the same class with Aeschylus' later plays.

In chapter three Herington defines the fundamental differences in world view between the first phase and the second, and finds the Prometheus-trilogy clearly affiliated with the Danaid-trilogy and the *Oresteia*. In the plays of the first phase we see a cosmos much like that in Herodotus and the early Sophocles, simple, stable, unified, hostile to man; and we find a unidirectional movement of cumulative disaster. In the second phase, the universe of men and gods is split into opposites – male vs. female, Olympian vs. Chthonian, new vs. old, etc. – but this dialectical dislocation, reflected in the antistrophic movement of the first two plays, is resolved in the third. In this hopeful resolution Herington sees (and has argued elsewhere at length) the influence of Old Comedy, with which the *PV* also shares certain stylistic eccentricities unparalleled in tragedy. Other striking features of the world view shared by the *PV* and the second-phase trilogies are the appearance of gods on stage (Aphrodite in the *Danaiides*), and dramatically heightened interest in a Zeus no longer identified, as in the *Persae* and *Septem*, with the totality of powers in the archaic cosmos, but seen as an ambiguous divinity, who does not himself transcend the struggle of opposing forces. And to those critics who find the Zeus of the *PV* irreconcilable with the *Oresteia*-Zeus, and so odiously presented as to defy redemption in any conceivable sequel, Herington answers with a simple but telling analogy: “Suppose that only lines 1 through 396 of the *Eumenides* had been preserved, what scholar in his senses could or would believe that in the last third of the play the ‘Furies’ would have become the ‘Kindlies’?”

In chapter four miscellaneous items bearing on date and authenticity are discussed. Once the giant-puppet theory is, with Arnott, discounted, the play requires a third speaking part, which implies a date not much earlier than the *Oresteia*. Its dramatic prologue, lonely, defiant hero, and potential for Aristotelian “pity and fear” suggest a likeness to Sophoclean drama, which again implies a later date, as do those actor-monodies which are not in lyric interchange with the chorus. Awareness of pre-Socratic philosophical thought is evident in the *PV* and in the second-phase plays, but not in the first phase. Schmid's arguments for sophistic/rhetorical influence on the *PV* are corrected and enlarged, notably by the observation that the sophistic/rhetorical emphasis on *πειθῶ* as a substitute for *βία* in the *PV* also occurs in the *Eumenides* (e.g., 5, 970 f.) and in *Supplices* 621-624 (and, I would suggest, accounts for the oxymoron of *Ag.* 385: *βιάται δ' ἄτάλανα πειθῶ*).

From all this evidence, Herington concludes that if the play is by Aeschylus it belongs to the

later phase, and, by whatever author, was probably written after the *Oresteia*, certainly not before 466. Furthermore, it is well nigh impossible to construct a hypothesis consonant with all the facts other than that Aeschylus was its author. Herington conjectures that the major cause for the doubts of Schmid and his generation was the *developmental concept of divinity* in the *PV*, a scandal not only to their "sub-Victorian" religious and literary frame of mind, but also to their consequent misreading of the *Oresteia* and the *Supplices*, especially of Zeus' role therein — all of this buttressed by a flawed early dating of the *Supplices*. As for the remaining eccentricities of the play, Herington offers a hypothesis to explain them: the *PV* was composed in Sicily, not, as Focke had conjectured, during the visit to Hieron's court (sometime between 472 and 467), but during Aeschylus' final residence there (458-456/5), which would easily account for the relatively high incidence of pre-Socratic, comic, sophistic, and rhetorical influences on the play.

Will this book bring the *Prometheus* controversy to an end? It would probably be too sanguine to hope for so much. In any case, it will make it impossible to approach the problem without seriously rethinking the whole issue of methodology in such studies.

JOHN PERADOTTO

State University of New York at Buffalo

**Dalmatia**, by J. J. WILKES. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969. Pp. xxvii, 572; 59 pls. \$15.00.

BRITISH AND WESTERN EUROPEAN INTEREST in the antiquities of Dalmatia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina (the Roman province of "Dalmatia") began in the eighteenth century. An early monument of this attention is R. Adam's studies and drawings of Diocletian's palace in Split (1764); then followed the descriptive books of A. A. Paton, Sir Gardner Wilkinson, and R. Monro. The direction indicated by Mommsen in collecting the available inscriptional evidence (*CIL*, vol. III) was not followed by subsequent researchers, who based their writings primarily on the ancient literary sources: G. Zippel, *Die Römische Herrschaft in Illyrien bis auf Augustus* (1877), and H. Cons, *La Province Romaine de Dalmatie* (1881). Nearly one hundred years ago, Sir Arthur Evans contributed several numismatic and archaeological studies of southern Illyricum, based on surface surveys and visits with local antiquarians. These were preceded by a graphic account of his overland journey on foot through Bosnia at the time of a widespread insurrection against the Turks, with observations on terrain, history, and population (1876). Austrian domination of this region stimulated extensive archaeological surveys and historical studies (by C. Patsch and W. Kubitschek, among others), and also fostered the first generation of local scholars (e.g., Bulić, Abramić). From them arose the still thriving school of archaeologists and historians with which R. Syme and others in the west were to establish close communication. Within this century has been produced a large body of specialist publications on the antiquities and history of Dalmatia, much of it coming after the foundation of modern Yugoslavia and written in Croatian, but generously supplemented by the researches of Austrians, Italians, Hungarians, and others. For the reader of English, there has been no general discussion of Roman Dalmatia since Mommsen's *Provinces of the Roman Empire* (1886), though further information could be searched out in chapters of general works on the empire by Rostovtzeff and A. H. M. Jones. For a basic introduction to Dalmatia, the researcher has had to rely on the sketchy *RE* article "Illyricum" by Vulić, the fuller article "Dalmatia (als spätantike Provinz)" by B. Saria (*RE* suppl. 8, 1956), and lately on Géza Alföldy's *Bevölkerung und Gesellschaft der römischen Provinz Dalmatien* (1965).

Dr. Wilkes of Birmingham is now part of this tradition. He has accomplished something remarkable, in mastering the scholarship of nearly a century so as to give us the first book ever which surveys all important aspects of Illyricum and Dalmatia, from the earliest Greek and Roman contacts to late antiquity. Topics which do not come within the scope of this book are Illyrian language, civilization, and culture (except as they are touched by the Roman conquest and Romanization), and provincial art and native cults. All else is here: a narrative history of the province, analysis and description of Roman administration and the military garrison, the native population at the time of the Roman conquest, urbanization and enfranchisement, the upper classes, rural society, and trade. The narrative history comprises less than one-fourth of the book; the remainder, in the author's words, is "an anatomy of Dalmatia under the principate, based primarily on the evidence of inscriptions" (preface, p. xvii). Inscriptions are indeed the key to Dr. Wilkes' method: he has combed and catalogued the evidence in *CIL* III, gleaned a surprising amount of sociological information from it. The even harder task, for which he deserves our special thanks, is to have studied the inscriptions published in subsequent periodical literature. Many of these appear in hard-to-find Yugoslav journals, but with other scattered European articles they are brought together here as never before. The detailed apparatus of footnotes and the twenty-one-page bibli-