Post-Colonial Theory and Greek Literature in Rome

Martin Hose

WHEN ALEXANDER THE GREAT, after conquering the Persian Empire, had returned from his campaign in India, he turned to the West. He planned, so the ancient biographers tell us,[1] to subjugate Carthage and make his rule of the world complete. His early death prevented him. Already in antiquity there was occasional speculation what, had Alexander marched to the West, the outcome of a confrontation between Alexander and the Romans would have been. Roman authors,[2] *e.g.* Livy in his famous digression in Book 9,[3] left no room for doubt that the Romans would have been victorious; in Greek literature, on the other hand, Alexander is portrayed as a great man who, if he had not been crushed by fate or mere accident, would have conquered Rome. This opinion, nourished by the tensions that the Roman conquest of the Greek world brought about,[4] is found, *e.g.*, in Plutarch's treatise *De fortuna Romanorum* (13).[5] I should like, however, to

---

[1] *E.g.*, Curt. 10.1.17-19, Arr. *An.* 7.1.2; *cf.* J. R. Hamilton, *Plutarch. Alexander: A Commentary* (Oxford 1969) 187–188, with further literature.

[2] A. Momigliano, "Livio, Plutarco e Giustino su virtù e fortuna dei Romani," *Athenaeum* 12 (1934) 45–56.

[3] 9.17–19. *Cf.* W. Suerbaum, "Am Scheideweg der Zukunft: Alternative Geschehensabläufe bei römischen Historikern," *Gymnasium* 104 (1997) 36–54, at 53 with further literature.

[4] *Cf.* H. Fuchs, *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt*[2] (Berlin 1964) 13 with note. See also L. Braccesi, *Alessandro e i Romani* (Bologna 1975).

[5] *Cf.* G. Forni, *Plutarco: La Fortuna dei Romani* (Naples 1989) 127–128, and S. C. R. Swain, "Plutarch's *de Fortuna Romanorum*," *CQ* N.S. 39 (1989) 504–516.

pursue—from a perspective of an *ungeschehene Geschichte*[6]—the idea of a victory of Alexander over the Romans. But rather than going into what the consequences for Western civilization might have been, I shall address the consequences of such a defeat of Rome for the history of literature. By doing so, ancient literary history can be assigned a part in the lively and fruitful discourse currently going on in cultural and literary studies, which focuses on "post-colonialism."[7]

This expression, sometimes broadened to become a "post-colonial literary theory" or "-criticism,"[8] refers to a scholarly approach that is especially popular in the English-speaking world. Its aim is to analyze the structures of power and of communication that came into being because of European-American imperialism and colonialism. The relevance of this line of research is evident, since today about 75% of the world's population live with experiences of colonialism. The origins of the protagonists of this scholarly movement—*e.g.* the Bengali Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Homi K. Bhaba, who has his roots in Bombay, or Edward W. Said, who is from a Jerusalem Arab family—embody a remarkable potential for emancipation directed against a Eurocentric view of the world. The discussion of imperialism and colonialism gets its thrust not least from the fact that it reflects on a scholarly level the rich world/poor world conflict. And since its efforts and results seem strikingly compatible with the efforts and results of gender studies, this brought about, especially in the United States, a great potential for innovation. But precisely this seems to present the most

---

[6] *Cf.* A. Demandt, *Ungeschehene Geschichte*[2] (Göttingen 1986). This motif is applied by H.-G. Nesselrath, *Ungeschehenes Geschehen* (Stuttgart 1992). See further W. Suerbaum (*supra* n.3) and his "Si fata paterentur," in A. E. Radke, ed., *Candide iudex: Beiträge zur augusteischen Dichtung: Festschrift für Walter Wimmel* (Stuttgart 1998) 353–374.

[7] *Cf.* P. Childs and R. J. P. Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory* (London 1997).

[8] For orientation see these *lemmata* in A. Nünning, ed., *Metzler Lexikon Literatur- und Kulturtheorie* (Stuttgart/Weimar 1998).

severe threat to the long-held position of ancient literature in the curricula of American colleges and universities.[9] After all, the ancient writers—almost all "dead white European males"—are at the center of the "Western Canon"[10] and, thus, apparently an inseparable part of that imperialist-colonial cultural hegemony. Significantly, the leading representatives of post-colonial theory see antiquity—if they take any notice of it at all—either as a part of a monolithic Western culture or from the "Black Athena" perspective of Martin Bernal.[11] As is well known, Bernal's idea, that since the eighteenth century the picture of classical antiquity was systematically arianized by neglect of all Afro-Asian elements, is quite biased and bold.[12] But there seems to be a lack of alternative concepts as to how antiquity could remain relevant, in some detail, in the present discourse. This is the starting point for the following thoughts.

The post-colonial scholarly discourse, which I shall sketch briefly below, is focused on the imperial centers England, France, and America. This makes it possible to a certain degree to reflect on these analyses at a higher level of abstraction, but, in my opinion, the differences between the three cases are not great enough to make clear that some aspects of the possible patterns of interaction have been missed. For instance, all three cases are based on a pattern according to which an imperial power uses its cultural system as a means of exerting power, and even as an important method of stabilizing it. As William Blake put his imaginary advice to Napoleon: "It is not Arts that follow & attend upon Empire, but Empire that attends upon &

[9] Cf. D. Damrosch, "Can Classics Die?" *Lingua Franca* 5.6 (Sept./Oct. 1995) 61–66.

[10] H. Bloom, *The Western Canon* (New York 1994).

[11] M. Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization* I–II (New Brunswick 1987–91). See also E. W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York 1993) 15–16.

[12] See Th. Schmitz, "Ex Africa Lux? Black Athena and the Debate about Afro-centrism in the U.S.," *Göttinger Forum f. Altertumsw.* 2 (1999) 17–76.

follows The Arts."[13] This gives the impression that there is a necessary asymmetry between the political rulers and the ruled, an impression that would be only confirmed if we look also at other imperial centers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries— Belgium, Italy, Germany, or Russia. But what would become of Blake's contention if one takes into consideration certain developments in the Far East, like the expansion of the Tartars/Mongols into China or of the Japanese onto the Chinese mainland? Did these not see rather a "cultural" colonization by the politically weaker? In this context, of course, a classicist is inclined to cite the famous Horatian lines (*Epist.* 2.1.156–157): *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis intulit agresti Latio,* "Greece conquered in turn conquered the savage victor and brought culture to rustic Latium."

A perspective, therefore, that focuses on connections between current post-colonial theories and the relations of the Hellenic world with Rome can be quite interesting in two ways. On the one hand, it may deepen our understanding of antiquity;[14] on the other, the results that a study of antiquity itself can bring forth may prove useful in revealing certain aspects that have, when dealing with modern history, not yet received enough attention.[15]

First, let me sketch briefly the main outlines of post-colonial theory, as I see it. The summary will be based especially on: Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffith, Helen Tiffin, edd., *The Empire Writes*

[13]"Public Address," in *Selected Poetry and Prose,* ed. N. Frye (New York 1953) 447; invoked by Said (*supra* n.11) 13.

[14]The relationship between Greece and Rome has recently been studied as a model of cultural transfer: see G. Vogt-Spira, "Die Kulturbegegnung Roms mit den Griechen," in M. Schuster, ed., *Die Begegnung mit dem Fremden* (Coll.Raur. 4 [Stuttgart/Leipzig 1996]) 11–33, and "Literarische Imitatio und kulturelle Identität: Die Rezeption griechischer Muster in der Selbstwahrnehmung römischer Literatur," in G. Vogt-Spira and B. Rommel, edd., *Rezeption und Identität* (Stuttgart 1999) 22–37.

[15]The Romanization of Gaul and Spain might be another important area to apply the questions of post-colonialism. So far as I can see, Romanization has not yet been studied from that perspective; *cf. e.g.* G. Woolf, "Becoming Roman, Staying Greek," *PCPhS* N.S. 40 (1994) 116–143, especially nn.1 and 2.

Back (London/New York 1989); Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (*supra* n.11); and Iain Chambers, Lidia Curti, edd., *The Post-colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons* (London/New York 1996).[16]

Historically, the field of post-colonial studies can be divided into two parts. First, there is the stage of colonization. It begins with the arrival of the future colonial power and encompasses the forming of the structures of domination and reactions to this by the dominated. The second stage is the actual "post-colonial period," the time after the old colonial power has retreated politically. Of special interest for research is the so-called mental-cultural "infrastructure" in the former colonial center as well as in the formerly subdued. Much progress has been made in this field since the 1960s from the approach prevalent at the time toward the study of imperialism. Looking at these two stages from the perspective of literary history, one finds several interesting results.

During the actual colonial period a necessary condition for the supremacy of the colonial power is control over the means of communication.[17] This happens immediately when the political domination is instituted: Cortez in Mexico or the British or French in Africa brought with them not simply the European system of writing, but forced upon these regions a new way of communication, incompatible with the old. In this context the function of the translator becomes very important because through him are made the essential interpretations,[18] also in the area of "symbolic power."[19] The introduction of European

[16]See also the articles "Kolonialismus," "Postkoloniale Literaturtheorie und -kritik," and "Postkolonialismus/Postkolonialität" in Nünning (*supra* n.8).

[17]See Ashcroft *et al.* 78–83, following T. Todorov, *The Conquest of Africa: The Question of the Other* (New York 1982).

[18]Instructive is Ashcroft *et al.* 80, where reference is made to W. Soyinka, *The Interpreters* (London 1965).

[19]For this term from French cultural theory (and its applicability in the field of Classics) see Th. Schmitz, *Bildung und Macht: Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit* (Munich 1997).

literacy leads to certain consequences; most important perhaps is the forming of an "historical awareness," but, at first, in terms influenced by the European tradition. A "Eurocentric" view of the world is being imposed, and with it comes the notion of the center and the periphery. The indigenous traditions are in turn increasingly muted (Ashcroft *et al.* 83–87), a process that is strengthened in that art and literature, *i.e.* the culture of the center, ennoble certain standards of behavior that are in accordance with the center. Terms like "humanity" or "civilization" and their socio-cultural implications not only bring certain standards and values to the colonies, they also stigmatize any different behavior as raw, savage, uncivilized. So literature and art indirectly work as instruments of power. Pressure is thus exerted on the indigenous culture; the privileging of the art of the center and the marginalization of the colonial art usually bring about a reorientation of the colonial art and a desire to assimilate to the center. This process is referred to in literary theory as "mimicry" (Ashcroft *et al.* 2–4).

Literature develops during the colonial period in two different stages. First, it is dominated by people representing the center, *e.g.* high officers in the administration, travelers, etc. Characteristic of their literary work is the identification with the center; it supports the idea of the center and the periphery. Subsequently there emerge people born in that country, or outsiders of the colonizing class. For these groups writing is also proof of a privileged position, especially since in their works they respect the rules of the literary discourse of the center—and implicitly strengthen them (Ashcroft *et al.* 4–6).

After political independence is achieved, a struggle takes place between the center and the former colony. First, the language of the center remains standard for any literary discourse. Only here the cultural hegemony is continued, sometimes supported by theories or models from the center that attempt to, as it were, incorporate the "post-colonial literature." In

linguistics, this can mean that the developments in certain regions, for instance the varieties of English in the Caribbean or African regions, are stigmatized as perversions of the standard-idiom (Ashcroft *et al.* 6–7; for the problems of language in general, 38–77). The center has claim even on the native literature by defining it, using a biological metaphor, "genealogically" as an "offspring" from the tree of the literature of the mother country (this expression implies domination too; Ashcroft *et al.* 16).

In opposition to this there emerges in the "post-colonial" cultures a complex process of emancipation. Political and cultural developments and a new theoretical discourse, which observes and influences these developments, are closely connected to one another, the crucial question being that of identity. Instead of a concept of filiation, which the center offers, one searches for a concept of "otherness," *e.g.* in the Franco-African regions the term *négritude,*[20] elsewhere the expression *black writing* (Ashcroft *et al.* 20). But besides these strategies of delimitation, several models also pay more attention to the many different elements in post-colonial literatures or cultures. Here the term "hybridity" is brought into play,[21] which is relevant also for other phenomena of the postmodern era. When applied deliberately, this systematic syncretism can set free creative and productive energies, as becomes quite evident when one considers the works of Salman Rushdie or Tony Morison. But as a method and systematic approach in the study of post-colonial literature, it helps to free it from reception under the conditions of a mimetically influenced reading and to appreciate its subversive potential directed against the European tradition. The basic goal of the post-colonial theoretical approach is clear: to

[20] See *e.g.* L. S. Senghor, *The Africa Reader* (London 1970); *cf.* also Nünning (*supra* n.8) 395.

[21] See Nünning (*supra* n.8) 220–221. *Cf.* M. Fludernik, ed., *Hybridity and Postcolonialism* (Tübingen 1998).

generate acceptance for a notion of "difference on equal terms."[22]

So much for a sketch of the term "post-colonial." Let us now turn to antiquity, to Rome and the Greeks. If we conduct the experiment that was begun at the outset of this paper, one might think of a scenario like this: Alexander conquered Italy and Rome. Macedonian *diadochi* ruled the country, their power perhaps resting on the fundamentally Greek cities in the south of the peninsula. This hegemony would have had far reaching consequences for Roman culture. Hellenistic *paideia* would have been brought there by Greek teachers and have superseded Roman education. Homeric epics, for instance, would have been taught to young Roman aristocrats, first in translation, then, presumably, more and more in the Greek original. Consequently, the Roman self-image would have changed gradually. "Identity" needs contrasting ideas and images: these the Greek world would have supplied, *e.g.* the idea that Rome was culturally inferior to Greek civilization. The whole Roman culture and its political system would have changed: Roman gods, if they had not been forgotten already, would have assumed some Greek traits, with an *interpretatio Graeca* of the Greek pantheon projected onto the Roman *numina*. Roman history, perhaps the most important means of self-interpretation for the state and society, would have been rewritten, with focus on the Greeks and their culture. Just like the Hellenized (*i.e.* the Hellenistic) East,[23] Rome would have been connected to Greek myth, and thus in an imperialistic manner would have been incorporated into the Greek cosmos. The description of the Roman political system in Greek terms would have led to new interpretations and also implications arising from Greek political theory and social philosophy. Likewise "Roman" literature would have developed according to the prevalent colonial conditions. First,

[22] *Cf.* Ashcroft *et al.* 34, 37.
[23] *Cf.* T. S. Scheer, *Mythische Vorväter* (Munich 1993).

only Greeks would have written in Rome, and about Rome, then Romans, but in Greek in order to adapt to the dominating culture. Roman indigenous cultural traditions would have become forgotten, excepting perhaps remnants of certain vulgar forms not belonging to the higher culture.

Any classicist hearing this will probably be startled. For Rome in fact *did* develop just as, according to the theory of colonialism, it would have had to if Alexander had actually conquered Rome. This should have a devastating effect on the theory (if its representatives were aware of it). It means no less than that political-military power and cultural power do not necessarily go hand-in-hand—or, to use Blake's terms, that empire does not necessarily follow the arts. This conclusion, however, does not make the theory futile in every respect. Its observations and analyses can be useful for a study of early Roman history and the relations between Greeks and Romans, because they confront newly asked questions with the sources. This I should like to do to in what follows.

We know little about early Rome. The time from the eighth to the fifth century B.C., the emergence of the state from Etruscan and Latin elements, its religion with the gods Mars, Ops, Jupiter, and Quirinus, its way to hegemony in middle Italy: these things can scarcely be reconstructed from literary sources. Only together with archaeology (and Etruscology) can one get some clues about this period.[24] Certainly an explanation of the "silence" on the part of the Romans is that they were not yet literate at the time. But the expression "not yet" implies a "colonial" perspective and means that the Roman way to remember the past is judged as deficient, just as from the viewpoint of Greek historiography. But one forgets easily that in

[24]See the synopses by R. M. Ogilvie, *Early Rome and the Etruscans* (Atlantic Highlands 1976), and by M. Torelli, "Archaic Rome between Latium and Etruria," and A. Momigliano, "The Origins of Rome," *CAH*² VII.2 (1989) 30–51, 52–112. Still rich in valuable materials and viewpoints are A. Alföldi's *Early Rome and the Latins* (Ann Arbor 1965) and *Römische Frühgeschichte* (Heidelberg 1976).

Rome *memoria* had in fact been cultivated, namely by the aristocratic families, where *memoria* took the form of images of the ancestors.[25] It is interesting to see that already the later Roman historians, who were predominantly influenced by the Greeks, felt that the difference between Roman *memoria* and Graeco-Roman historical writing was really a deficiency on the part of the Romans—and they found an interesting solution. Livy notes this problem of the scarcity of sources for Books 1–5 of his work, *i.e.* the early Roman history:

> I have presented [*sc.* the early Roman history] in five books, matters that are obscure not only because of their old age—like objects far away that can hardly be discerned—but also because in those days there was only rare use of writing, the only trustworthy guardian of the memory of past events, and because most of the records that *did* exist in the commentaries of the priests and in other public and private documents were destroyed when the city burned (6.1.2).

Livy's complaint[26] about the scarcity of sources for the time before the Gallic invasion of 390 returns with more emphasis in the doubts of modern historians regarding those early Roman records, the "annals" of the priests,[27] wherever they complement the simple list of names, the *fasti*.[28] Significantly, more solid ground for analyses is to be found only in the Greek historians.[29] Diocles of Peparethus in the middle of the third

---

[25] *Cf.* recently, with references to further literature, K.-J. Hölkeskamp, "Römische gentes und griechische Genealogie," in Vogt-Spira/Rommel (*supra* n.14) 3–21. See also H. I. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford 1996).

[26] Livy here seems to continue Claudius Quadrigarius; see S. P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X* (Oxford 1997) I 381 (with further literature).

[27] *Cf.* Ogilvie (*supra* n.24) 17–19.

[28] See R. M. Ogilvie and A. Drummond, "The Sources for Early Roman History," *CAH* VII.2 1–29, esp. 17–18.

[29] There are occasional earlier references to Rome/Latium in early Greek poetry, *e.g.* Hes. *Theog.* 1011–16, Stesich. *Iliupersis* (*FGrHist* 840 F 6b). See below for the legend of the foundation, and also the report in Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.6.

century B.C. seems to be the first to have dealt with Roman history. Plutarch writes about him in the *Life of Romulus* (3.1):

> The version [*sc.* of the events prior to the founding of Rome] that is most credible and with best testimonies was in its essential content brought to the Greeks first by Diocles of Peparethus, and followed for the most part by Fabius Pictor (*FGrHist* 820 T 2a).

It is worth noticing first that Fabius Pictor, the first Roman historian, seems to have followed a Greek source,[30] and that, thus, the "imperialist center" had the power to define Rome and its history, and that this authority was not questioned by the early Roman authors. This had consequences for the concept as well as for the content. A Greek historian interprets Rome using his own terminology and imagery. He can, *e.g.*, transfer the terms *ktisis* (T 2b), *polis*, or *boule*, and with these their implications, to Rome and so incorporate Rome into Greek thought. This can be interpreted in different ways: "the Greeks were sufficiently impressed by the size and importance of Rome to invest it with the respectability of Greek associations," Ogilvie writes, in a different context.[31] Those who study colonialism, on the other hand, would rather emphasize the aspect of the power that is exerted. In favor of the latter there is other supporting evidence. A significant case is that of Timaeus of Tauromenium, who included Rome in his history of the Greek West. Felix Jacoby summarizes his effect on the Romans: "It is clear that reading this author was part of the general education, especially for the Romans and especially of Polybius' time, and that Polybius' criticism of this did not change much, for obvious reasons: for them, T[imaeus] was the first historian of their people."[32]

With this as a background, early Roman historiography reveals a new and perhaps important characteristic. Fabius Pictor

---

[30] Against the reversal of the relationship (*e.g.* E. Schwartz, "Diokles [47]," *RE* 5 [1903] 797–798) see the literature given by W. Eisenhut, "Diokles (9)," *Der kleine Pauly* II (1967) 53–54.

[31] Ogilvie (*supra* n.24) 34.

[32] Com. *ad FGrHist* 566 (p.526).

wanted Greeks to read his historiographical work written in Greek because he wanted to promote Rome and her politics;[33] he was forced to do so in Greek terminology, *i.e.* in the terms of Greek notions of politics. An adequate translation of fundamental Roman ideas, for instance the expressions *fides* or *bellum iustum*,[34] as is well know, is quite difficult. *Fides* means reliability, credibility, but not, like *pistis*, trust, faith.[35] The work of Fabius Pictor and his Greek-writing successors, Lucius Cincius Alimentus (*FGrHist* 810) and Gaius Acilius (813), can, therefore, be compared to that stage of colonial development in which the indigenous culture adopts the values and standards of the center.

We may go even further: Fabius Pictor also represents the adopting of a hellenocentric view of the world, which defined Rome—culturally—as periphery. Diocles of Peparethus had described the founding of Rome by modeling the Romulus legend after the Sophoclean tragedy *Tyro*:[36] the exposure of the twins, their recognition (*anagnorismos*) by means of a piece of evidence (the tub in which they had been exposed), and the happy ending through the punishment of the evil Amulius (this corresponds to the fate of the step-mother Sidero in Sophocles)—all these motifs, accordingly, found their way into official Roman history. Further, the Romans accepted the position of belonging to the geographical-historical periphery that was forced upon them in Greek writings. Today, for us, it is perfectly

[33]See the thorough analysis by M. Gelzer, "Römische Politik bei Fabius Pictor," *Hermes* 68 (1933) 129–166, reprinted in V. Pöschl, ed., *Römische Geschichtsschreibung* (Darmstadt 1969) 77–129.

[34]For this expression see H. Drexler, "Iustum Bellum," *RhM* 102 (1959) 97–140, and E. Straub, *Das Bellum iustum des Hernán Cortés in Mexico* (Cologne/Vienna) 1976.

[35]*Cf.* R. Heinze, "Fides," *Hermes* 64 (1929) 140–166. For a summary of Heinze see H. Fuchs, "Rückschau und Ausblick im Arbeitsbereich der lateinischen Philologie," *MusHelv* 4 (1947) 147–198, esp. 158. For the difficulties arising from the differences between them see Gelzer (*supra* n.33) 86–87 and Fuchs 158 with references to Polyb. 20.9–10 and Livy 36.27–28.

[36]See D. Flach, *Einführung in die römische Geschichtsschreibung* (Darmstadt 1985) 61–63.

normal that the Romans saw Aeneas as their ancestor[37] and that this origin means a kind of ennobling of Rome and even legitimation of her "reign over the world." But actually this is the result of a fundamental reinterpretation, which is represented by Vergil and the Augustan Age.[38] Ever since the sixth century, Greek literature had presented several mythological genealogies for the Romans and connected their origins with certain Greek heroes.[39] For example, there was a genealogy that put much emphasis on Heracles' journey to the West;[40] and there were several attempts to bring into play the *nostoi* of the Trojan War,[41] especially Odysseus', but also to speak in this context of Trojan captives.[42] Aeneas, even though this is really not compatible with the *Iliad*,[43] seems to have played a (not too dominant) role here quite early. This is supported by scenes in Etruscan art that show him carrying his father on his shoulders.[44] Hellanicus (*FGrHist* 4 F 84) even seems to have disseminated a version according to which Aeneas and Odysseus founded Rome together.[45] But this version becomes predominant not before the third century, and some have

[37] A remarkable testimony for this is Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*. His first two books deal with the Trojan origin of the Romans.

[38] *Cf.* H.-P. Stahl, "Griechenhetze in Vergils Aeneis: Roms Rache für Troja," in Vogt-Spira/Rommel (*supra* n.14) 249–273.

[39] For a synopsis see E. S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (London 1992) 6–51.

[40] Reported in Dion. Hal. *Ant.Rom.* 1.34ff.

[41] In this context Dion. Hal. *Ant.Rom.* 1.72.3 even refers to Aristotle (fr.609 Rose = *FGrHist* 840 F 13a).

[42] Besides Arist. fr.609 see also his student Heracleides Lembus in Festus p.329.6 Lindsay (= *FGrHist* 840 F 13b).

[43] Poseidon's prophecy (*Il.* 20.293–308) predicts for Aeneas' descendants rule over the Troas (see E. Heitsch, *Aphroditehymnos, Aeneas und Homer* [Göttingen 1965] 14 and 68).

[44] See Ogilvie (*supra* n.24) 33–34. and Gruen (*supra* n.39) 21–22.

[45] Αἰνείαν ... μετ' Ὀδυσσέως οἰκιστὴν γενέσθαι τῆς πόλεως, ὀνομάσαι δ' αὐτὴν ἀπὸ μιᾶς τῶν Ἰλιάδων Ῥώμης (Dion. Hal. *Ant.Rom.* 1.72.2 = *FGrHist* 840 F 8).

therefore concluded that it was actually invented only then,[46] which is probably wrong.[47] In any case, the context of this important Troy-motif is crucial for us; it represents a perfectly "colonialistic" attribution. King Pyrrhus, as Pausanias tells us (1.12.1), thought that because he was a descendant of Achilles he would capture Rome, given her Trojan origin. So here we have connected with the genealogy also a "dis-ennobling" of the opponent for political purposes.[48] This the Romans adopted just as the people of the colonies in the nineteenth century adopted eurocentric ideas of geography and biology.

In Rome an important part in this process was certainly the taking up of the Greek educational system. Even though its representatives might have belonged to the socially less priv-ileged classes, like the freed captive slave Livius Andronicus[49] or the hostage Polybius, they were nevertheless able to produce in their masters a feeling of inferiority. They seemed to have spoken repeatedly of the Romans as barbarians and "Opics": *nos quoque dictitant barbaros et spurcius nos quam alios opicon appellatione foedant*, the elder Cato writes in a letter ("us, too, they call barbaric and more offensively than others they abuse us with the name 'Opics'").[50] Even if there should be some exaggeration in this,[51] at the bottom of Cato's bitterness lies a hard-to-overcome inferiority complex. The term "barbaric" alone was bad enough, but it was even topped by "Opics." The

[46]J. Perret, *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome* (Paris 1942). Similarly H. Strasburger, *Zur Sage von der Gründung Roms* (*SBHeid* 1968, 5).

[47]See A. Momigliano, *JRS* 35 (1945) 99–104.

[48]A similar "unauthentic" version is offered by Menecrates of Xanthus (*FGrHist* 769 F 3) who has Aeneas betray Troy (an unreasonable date is offered in the article "Menekrates [24]," *RE* 15 [1931] 801).

[49]See E. Fraenkel, "Livius Andronicus," *RE* Suppl. 5 (1931) 598–607, esp. 601 about the credibility of the report that Livius Andronicus was a teacher. Additional information is offered by W. Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen zur Selbst-darstellung älterer römischer Dichter* (Hildesheim 1968) 1–12; see also A. Seele, *Römische Übersetzer: Nöte Freiheiten, Absichten* (Darmstadt 1995).

[50]*Ad Marcum fil.* fr.1 Jordan (cited by Plin. *HN* 29.14).

[51]*Cf.* Vogt-Spira, "Kulturbegegnung" (*supra* n.14) 17.

word was probably used originally to designate just one Italic tribe (*cf. e.g.* Thuc. 6.2.4), perhaps meaning "Oscans,"[52] but the Romans apparently took this as an insult. In Greek, this expression was less decisively negative. Philodemus uses it in a love epigram (*Anth.Pal.* 5.132.7–8) in which he first portrays himself as being enthusiastic about the beautiful body of his concubine, and then concludes:

> εἰ δ' Ὀπικὴ καὶ Φλῶρα καὶ οὐκ ᾄδουσα τὰ Σαπφοῦς,
> καὶ Περσεὺς Ἰνδῆς ἠράσατ' Ἀνδρομέδης.
>
> If she is Opic and Flora and she does not sing Sappho,
> Perseus, too, was in love with the Indian Andromeda.

A similar inferiority complex, I believe, can be detected in Polybius' famous report about his crucial encounter with the young Scipio (31.23–24). Scipio very much longs for the respect and help of Polybius, a representative of Greek culture, in order to become a man able εἰς τὸ καὶ λέγειν τι καὶ πράττειν ἄξιον τῶν προγόνων (31.24.5: "to speak and to do things worthy of my ancestors").[53] Scipio's emphatic wish reveals what an important goal this is for him: εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ ταύτην ... ἴδοιμι τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐν ᾗ σὺ πάντα τἄλλα δεύτερα θέμενος ἐμοὶ προσέχεις τὸν νοῦν καὶ μετ' ἐμοῦ συμβιώσεις (31.24.9: "if I could only see that day when you, putting in second place everything else, will turn your attention toward me and will live together with me"). Perhaps the most evident sign of the Romans accepting the standards of the "center" is the prologue of the Plautine comedy *Asinaria* (10–12):

> ... *huic nomen Graece Onagost fabulae;*
> *Demophilus scripsit, Maccus vortit barbare;*
> *Asinariam volt esse, si per vos licet.*

---

[52] See A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig 1890) 256, and M. Dubuisson, "Les *opici*: Osques, Occidentaux ou Barbares?" *Latomus* 42 (1983) 522–545.

[53] *Cf.* the interpretation by R. Harder, "Die Einbürgerung der Philosophie in Rom," *Die Antike* 5 (1929) 291–316, reprinted in *Kleine Schriften* (Munich 1960) 330–353, here at 336–337.

Two things are worth noticing here. First, by the end of the third century it is possible for a poet to say before a Roman audience, without upsetting anybody, that a play in Latin is written *barbare*. Second, *Graece* seems to be a trait that implies high quality, even if the play, as has been proposed recently with remarkable arguments,[54] might have been written, for the most part, by Plautus himself.[55]

So far I have sketched some phenomena similar to those that I characterized as typical of a colonial context. We have seen how Greek culture with its system of communication, *i.e.* with "literature," dominates Rome in the fourth and third centuries, and how first Greeks in Rome write about Rome: Diocles of Peparethus, Timaeus, and Livius Andronicus; how they imported a "graecocentric" view of the world, which makes Rome geographically-mythologically (and chronologically) part of the Greek world; how authors of Roman origin accept the "colonialist" rules: Fabius Pictor writes in Greek in a genuinely Greek genre, Naevius, one might continue, adopts the Hellenistic, historical epic poetry, Plautus (like the other early playwrights) Greek drama, for which Rome first had to create a *Sitz im Leben*, an institutionalized place in the community life:[56] *ludos scaenicos Graecos esse faciundos* could have been, according to Wissowa, the words of the senatorial decree.[57] Together with this kind of literature and culture certain standards and values were introduced to Rome, which denigrated the Romans as "barbarians."

Earlier I cited William Blake: "It is not Arts that follow & attend upon Empire, but Empire that attends upon & follows The Arts." The art of the Greeks, we may say, was at Rome in

---

[54] G. Vogt-Spira, "Asinaria oder Maccus vortit Attice," in E. Lefèvre, E. Stärk, G. Vogt-Spira, edd., *Plautus Barbarus* (Tübingen 1991) 11–69.

[55] That the passage from the *Asinaria* is not a "mistake" by Plautus is proved by a parallel in the *Trinummus* 18–19: *huic Graece nomen est Thensauro fabulae: Philemo scripsit, Plautus vortit barbare*.

[56] See P. Habel, "Ludi publici," *RE* Suppl. 5 (1931) 608–630, esp. 610.

[57] G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*² (Munich 1912) 462–463.

the third century—but empire did not follow. This led to a special tension during the second century, when Rome was conquering the Greek world, a tension which is in certain respects similar to *post*-colonial relations. An essential question for Rome on her way to emancipation, I believe, was the question of "Roman" identity. This posed a problem because it was not possible simply to start from zero. Troy and Aeneas had already been accepted, but the Greek definition of the Romans as *barbari* was no longer tolerable. Jewish culture, in a similar situation when surrounded by Hellenistic culture, took the smart way of incorporating the threatening cultural attraction by coming up with a "proof of seniority," according to which the Jewish tradtion was older, more venerable, and "truer" than the Greek. Moses was made teacher of Solon or Pythagoras. Rome, however, could not go in this direction. For in the second century there were no longer any independent traditions still alive, because the myth of Troy had settled that matter for all time.

The Romans, therefore, had to look for a different kind of "otherness" in relation to the Greeks to supply them with an identity of their own. This "otherness" they found, in short, in their "Romanness." With the perhaps somewhat exaggerated and historically not always correct recollection of the "virtues" of early Rome, the Roman aristocracy developed a repertoire of key terms like *pietas, auctoritas, fides, honos, gloria,* and so on;[58] their representatives became the early Roman heroes. The ancestors, the *maiores*, thus showed admirable and exemplary *mores*, compared to which the present, deeply influenced by the Greeks, appeared inferior. Significantly, from the second century onward the complaint about the moral decay of Rome is a central motif in Roman politics and literature. This new self-image of a morally ascetic "Romanness" made it possible to redefine the relationship between Rome and the Greeks. A model that had actually been invented in Greece in the fifth century was

[58]*Cf.* H. Oppermann, ed., *Römische Wertbegriffe* (Darmstadt 1967).

simply adapted. In this model the Greeks, and especially the Athenians, were the virtuous, brave, ascetic, and unselfish fighters, while their Persian opponents were portrayed as decadent barbarians and tricky cowards.[59] This stereotype the Romans adapted, representing the Greeks as decadent, themselves as virtuous. So a new concept for self-definition was found, which remained in effect well into the imperial period, and whose last prominent literary spokesman was Juvenal. At the same time, this redefinition had far-reaching consequences for intellectual history. The stigmatizing of the Hellenistic Greek culture distorted, still in the twentieth century, the reception of the literature of that period, owing to the Roman "prejudices" that deeply influenced the literary judgement of modern times.

Rome's striving for emancipation from the "colonial power" of Greek culture can be studied in particular by looking at two Romans, Cato and Ennius. Thanks to an impressive article by Friedrich Klingner of 1934, it has become common to see Cato as the defiant and stern "old" Roman who hated the Greeks, but at the same time secretly had learned from them.[60] At first sight, he seems to be the "last representative of the old-Roman morale."[61] But closer study of the fragments from his writings and his speeches, and also of the testimonies about him, leads to a more differentiated picture.[62] Cato learned Greek at the age of 30, composed a handbook about agriculture following Greek models, made a collection of Greek sayings;[63] it even seems that his rhetoric was influenced by Greek rhetoric. He had probably

[59]S. E. Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian* (Oxford 1989); E. Hall, "Asia Unmanned: Images of Victory in Classical Athens," in J. Rich *et al.*, *War and Society in the Greek World* (London 1993) 108–133.

[60]F. Klingner, "Cato Censorius und die Krisis des römischen Volkes," *Römische Geisteswelt*[5] (Munich 1965; originally 1934) 34–65.

[61]R. Till, *Die Sprache Catos* (*Philologus* Suppl. 28.2 [Leipzig 1935]) 1.

[62]*Cf.* D. Kienast, *Cato der Zensor* (Heidelberg 1954) 103–104; Gruen (*supra* n.39) 52–83.

[63][Aur. Vict.] *De vir. ill.* 47.1; Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 2.6.

studied Greek rhetorical handbooks and Demosthenes.[64] There is no sign that Cato sternly defied Greek literature (and culture). His "hatred of the Greeks," I think, is not so much to be understood as resulting from his old-Roman beliefs and attitudes, but much rather as the attempt for emancipation from Greek culture. Cato, therefore, resembles the intellectuals and politicians of post-colonial nations, who, on the one hand, have gone through the educational system of the former colonial power,[65] but on the other hand try to find for their country a post-colonial identity, turning back, for this purpose, to certain earlier traditions.

Cato's struggle for emancipation can be seen in his political conception of inner delimitation: through his effort the famous embassy of philosophers of 155 B.C. is driven out of the country because Carneades' speeches harm the Roman youth. Unlike other Romans, Cato does not, when representing Rome politically, speak Greek with the Greeks—even though he knows the language. Instead he employs a translator. He tries to break the lofty prestige of Greek in Rome by making fun of Roman aristocrats who, like the senator A. Postumius Albinus, write in Greek; and he polemicizes against the man who symbolized Greek intellect, Socrates, because he, Cato says, had done harm to his city. He attempts to do away with the "racist" stigmatizing of the Romans as barbarians or Opics by verbally stigmatizing the Greeks and making fun of them—as in the case of the Greek hostages in Rome and Italy, whom Scipio wants to help. "Little old Greeks" is Cato's expression for them (Dicta 17 Jordan).

This destruction of "colonialism" is accompanied, on the other hand, by a constructive effort to devise a new concept of "being Roman." Cato creates for his son a Roman ἐγκύκλιος

---

[64] Cf. Till (supra n.61) 21–22.

[65] Cf. some dicta Catonis which seem to quote Greek literature: Polyb. 36.8.7 (Od. 10.495); Plut. Cat. Mai. 9.3.

παιδεία in which agriculture, rhetoric, medicine, and probably also warfare were covered. He emphasizes the importance of the Roman study of the law in contrast to Greek philosophy.[66] Very noticeable is Cato's "decolonization" in his historiographical work in seven books, the *Origines*.[67] Book 1 gives the history of the founding of Rome, Books 2 and 3 the origins of the Italic cities.[68] Cato, too, retained the legend of Troy, but by transferring the founding of Rome to an Italic environment— significantly, in these fragments, the Aborigines play an important part—he weakened the Greek elements in Roman history as well as the Greek historiographical tradition. "There are so many lines that converge in the Roman state. One should not be silent about Italy," such was Friedrich Klingner's interpretation of that emphasis.[69] Books 4 to 7 present Rome's wars from the First Punic War onward. In these books Cato employed a way of writing that might seem strange at first sight: *atque horum bellorum duces non nominavit, sed sine nominibus res notavit*, we read in Nepos (*Cato* 3). Cato, as it seems, is not interested in giving the names of the aristocratic protagonists: *imperator noster* (fr.82 Peter) or *exercitus Romanus* (fr.83) are the principal agents. It has been thought that this way of writing expresses Cato's goal "to narrate the deeds of the Roman people, not of the great aristocratic leaders ..."[70] But this literary style also offers a "Roman identity," a *Romanitas* that is powerful in history and forms a new important category beside the old bipartition of the world into Greeks and barbarians. And there is one more essential element in the delimitation of Greek culture: *in quibus [sc. libris] multa industria*

[66]*Cf.* Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 22.7.

[67]See W. A. Schröder, *M. Porcius Cato. Das erste Buch der Origines, Ausgabe und Erklärung der Fragmente* (Meisenheim 1971).

[68]See Nep. *Cato* 3; M. Chassignet, ed., *Caton, Les Origines (Fragments)* (Paris 1986) x–xviii.

[69]Klingner (*supra* n.60) 59.

[70]Klingner (*supra* n.60) 59.

et diligentia comparet, nulla doctrina, Nepos writes (*Cato* 3.4).
Cato does not reveal his erudition (*doctrina*), which was a char-
acteristic of Greek writing on local history, the *ktisis*-literature.
Thus, Cato's Rome and Italy are no longer part of the Hellenistic
scholarly discourse; they have become emancipated.

*Quintus Ennius poeta Tarenti nascitur, qui a Catone quaestore
Romam translatus habitavit in monte Aventino parco admodum
sumptu contentus et unius ancillae ministerio*: so the *Chronicle* of
Eusebius/Jerome (*Ad ann. Abr.* 1777). Nepos (1.4) too writes
about Cato's part in bringing Ennius to Rome in 204 B.C. Cato
seems to have thought highly of Ennius as a poet.[71] Several frag-
ments of Cato show echoes of and allusions to Ennian verses.
Cato, and later Marcus Fulvius Nobilior, whose political goals
were similar to Cato's, supported Ennius. Sociologically, Ennius
is an interesting person: *Quintus Ennius tria corda habere sese
dicebat, quod loqui Graece et Osce et Latine sciret*, Gellius reports
(17.17.1). He can be seen as a man on the borders between
different cultures and one who first came into contact with
Rome as a stranger.[72] Eminent among his many works (extant
only in fragments) are the *Annales*. Until Vergil this epic was *the*
national poem for Rome.[73] Ennius managed to present Roman
history in a way that fitted the Roman self-image—or in a way
that this self image could easily form around his presentation.
Maybe it was due to his perspective on Rome "from outside"
that enabled him to identify striking traits of the Roman world
and present them so powerfully. It seems to have been an
accomplishment of Ennius to use the division into books as a
means to structure Roman history in an easily comprehensible
way. Furthermore, as we can tell from the fragments, he
portrayed the Romans in such a way that their manners and

[71]See Till (*supra* n.61) 15–21.

[72]*Cf.* C. J. Classen, "Ennius: ein Fremder in Rom," in *Die Welt der Römer* (Ber-
lin/New York 1993) 62–83.

[73]*Cf.* H. Prinzen, *Ennius im Urteil der Antike* (Stuttgart/Weimar 1998), and
O. Skutsch, ed., *The Annals of Ennius* (Oxford 1985) 10–46.

accomplishments were perceived as paradigmatic, as the "Roman virtues." Lines like *moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque* (fr.156 Skutsch) or *unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem* (fr.363.1.1) prove this.

Thus the *Annales*, like the *Origines* which were written somewhat later, as a literary form could be called a mimicry of a Greek Hellenistic epic poem that achieves an emancipatory effect. Significant in this context is the intentional rivalry of Ennius with *the* quintessential Greek poet, Homer. Even though much about the proem of the *Annales* is a matter of dispute,[74] the fragments and *testimonia* do show that Ennius reports a dream in which Homer appears to him, revealing that his soul has entered Ennius. In addition, the dream includes an encounter with the Muses, who crown Ennius as a poet. This proem thus invokes Greek poetics; its motifs—dream, initiation as a poet through a famous predecessor, approval by the Muses —appear also in the *Aitia* prologue of Callimachus or Herodas' eighth poem. In Ennius these motifs are adopted and at the same time surpassed. He doubles the motivation for being a poet, and puts more emphasis on the theme of succeeding Homer. After all, Ennius by metempsychosis is Homer.

Ennius et sapiens et fortis et alter Homerus, Horace writes (*Epist.* 2.1.50). So Ennius implicitly claims for his *Annales* and for himself the same position as Homer—and as a Roman Homer he drove the Greek Homer out of Roman schools. This is an enormous contribution toward the emancipation of Rome from the cultural colonial power of Greek literature. Cato and Ennius, therefore, established a "post-colonial" literature. Rome thus emancipated herself in the field of literature from Greece. According to the theory that I sketched above, there should now begin a new productive and creative momentum, the mixture, the hybrid in culture and literature. I would suggest that we

[74]*Cf.* Suerbaum (*supra* n.49) 43–113; R. Häussler, *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil* I (Heidelberg 1976) 121–150; Skutsch (*supra* n.73) 147–153.

view the satire of Lucilius from this angle. It represents a new literary form that developed from its initial stages, only vaguely recognizable in Ennius. On the one hand, Lucilius adopts certain Greek traditions (for instance the diatribe), but at the same time he creates something new.[75]

Furthermore, according to post-colonial theory, we should now find attempts by the "center" to maintain its cultural hegemony through certain models and theories. It can be observed that literary theory and criticism continue to be dominated by the Greeks. Suetonius notes that at the time of Ennius, *primus ... studium grammaticae in urbem intulit Crates Mallotes* (*Gramm.* 2).[76] It is quite significant that Lucilius, when he turns to literary theory, stays within the Greek models and terminology.[77] The history of literary theory in the second and first centuries B.C. is a difficult field. However, the influence of Greek theory on Roman literature may be reckoned to be quite profound, especially since many Greek intellectuals were teachers at Rome. One can think, in this context, of Dionysius of Halicarnassus or of the anonymus author of the treatise *On the Sublime.* But every now and then some light is cast on the influence of these teachers. Thus, recently Michael Erler has been able to show that Vergil in the *Aeneid* adopts certain positions of Philodemus.[78] But we also find, beginning in the middle of the first century B.C., some Roman contributions to literary theory, associated with the name of Varro.[79]

[75]*Cf.* P. L. Schmidt, "Invektive – Gesellschaftskritik – Diatribe? Typologische und gattungsgeschichtliche Vorüberlegungen zum sozialen Engagement der römischen Satire," *Lampas* 12 (1979) 259–281; C. J. Classen, "Satire," in *Enciclopedia Oraziana* I (1996) 275–279.

[76]*Cf.* H. J. Mette, *Spairopoiia* (Munich 1936) 105–106.

[77]*Cf.* frr.376–385 in W. Krenkel, *Lucilius, Satiren* (Leiden 1976), with Krenkel's commentary on the difference between *poema* and *poesis.*

[78]M. Erler, "Orthodoxie und Anpassung. Philodem, ein Panaitios des Kepos?" *MusHelv* 49 (1992) 171–200, esp. 184–192.

[79]See D. Fehling, "Varro und die grammatische Lehre von der Analogie und der Flexion," *Glotta* 35 (1956) 214–270; 36 (1958) 48–100. *Cf.* my "Fiktionalität und Lüge – Über einen Unterschied zwischen römischer und griechischer Terminologie," *Poetica* 28 (1996) 257–274.

The most obvious attempt in the field of theory to incorporate Rome takes place at the end of the first century B.C. In his *History of Archaic Rome* Dionysius turns the Romans into Greeks[80] by making the native inhabitants of Latium, the Aborigines, colonists from Arcadia: οὐκ ἂν ἑτέρου τινὸς εἴησαν ἄποικοι γένους ἢ τοῦ καλουμένου νῦν Ἀρκαδικοῦ (*Ant.Rom.* 1.11.1–2). But this attempt takes place already on a borderline: the whole Greek world has become part of the Roman Empire, the "colonial" people have become the masters over the former center. The focus of perspective can now be changed.[81] The Romans usurp the literary discourse. Vergil wants to surpass Homer, Horace the Greek lyric poets. Earlier, Cicero had not only "naturalized philosophy in Rome,"[82] by doing so he also robbed the Greek language of the exclusive right to be the only voice in philosophical discourse.[83]

May, 2001   Universität München
                           Seminar für Klassische Philologie
                           Geschwister-Scholl-Platz 1
                           D- 80539 München, Germany
                           M.Hose@klassphil.uni-muenchen.de

---

[80]*Cf.* E. Gabba, *Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome* (Berkeley 1991); Gruen (*supra* n.39) 7–8.

[81]See E. Rawson, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (Baltimore 1985) 3–18.

[82]Harder (*supra* n.53) 330–353.

[83]This paper is a revised version of an Oldfather Lecture, delivered at the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign on 13 October 2000. I am grateful to Oldfather Professor William M. Calder III for the invitation and to Dr Markus Dubischar for his welcome editing of the original manuscript.