

## **Abstracts Anchoring Innovation Conference in Soeterbeeck, Ravenstein**

Rutger Allan & Lidewij van Gils

### **Anchoring new ideas in common ground. A linguistic approach**

Verbal communication is inherently *dialogic* in that it always takes place against the backdrop of alternative views (Bakhtin 1981). In order to communicate new information or a new point of view successfully, a speaker will have to connect the information to the *common ground*, the body of knowledge, beliefs and attitudes shared between speaker and addressee (Clark 1996). A linguistic utterance therefore necessarily shows a hybrid structure: it does not only refer to a new idea, it will also contain an element that signals how the new idea relates to the common ground. In our project, we aim to show that a wide variety of linguistic phenomena can be insightfully analyzed as devices used to cognitively anchor new information into the common ground.

In this paper, we will try to demonstrate for a number of grammatical and lexical items such as discourse particles and negation how they are used by a speaker/narrator as instructions to the addressee how to anchor the message into already established cognitive structures. A specific issue that will be addressed is the role of *topoi* (in the sense of Anscombe and Ducrot 1983, Verhagen 2005) in particle use.

Anscombe, J.C. & O. Ducrot. 1983. *L'argumentation dans la langue*, Brussels.

Bakhtin, M.M., 1981, *The Dialogic Imagination*, Austin.

Clark, H.H., 1996, *Using Language*, Cambridge.

Verhagen, A., 2005, *Constructions of Intersubjectivity: Discourse, Syntax, and Cognition*, Oxford.

Mathieu de Bakker

### **Explaining the end of an empire. The use of Herodotus and Thucydides in late Byzantine historiography**

The Byzantines possessed a strong tradition of historiography whose representatives used classical Greek historians like Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon as templates. In this paper I will focus upon the last pair of these classicizing historians, Kritoboulos (ca. 1410-1470) and Laonikos Chalkokondyles (ca. 1423-1465?). Both were active when Constantinople fell into Ottoman hands (1453). Kritoboulos collaborated with the new Ottoman regime, and structured his *Histories* around this watershed in history. Laonikos presented his *Apodeixeis Historiōn* as a universal history, using the rise of the Turks as overarching theme. Following Herodotus, he includes digressions on states and tribes that were affected by the Ottomans' imperialist ambitions.

Kritoboulos and Laonikos are exceptional in their degree of engagement with Herodotus and Thucydides, whose style and themes they imitate, and whose authorial methods and explanatory models they appear to have studied closely in reflecting upon contemporary events. Typically, Laonikos refuses to commit himself to the view that Constantinople fell as divine retribution for Troy (Laon. 8.30, edition Kaldellis), and takes a surprisingly neutral point of view. In Kritoboulos' case, the debate is complicated by his presumed Ottoman bias. In this paper I will assess both historians' use of ancient (meta)narrative concepts as instances of 'anchoring innovation', and argue that in their attempt to shed a novel - and possibly dissident - light upon the events of their time, they deliberately used presentational methods that had throughout the ages proven to be powerful tools to resist religious and other doctrine.

Josine Blok & Julia Krul

### **Success and failure of anchoring political innovation: the case of Solon's *seisachtheia***

Solon's program to solve the social problems of Athens in 594, known as the *seisachtheia*, 'the shaking off of burdens', provides us with a fascinating case of an innovation that partly was anchored successfully and partly failed entirely. The *seisachtheia* entailed cancellation of all outstanding debts, a prohibition to make loans on the person, freeing of debt-slaves and recovery of all who had been sold abroad. All these measures Solon derived from the tradition of 'clean slates' of the Mesopotamian kings; only the prohibition of loans on the person, which in effect meant abolition of debt-slavery as an institution, went beyond its Near Eastern model. In Greece, where the problems of debt were as chronic and endemic as in Mesopotamia, such measures were unknown. Solon's *seisachtheia* thus entailed a set of legal innovations in Athens, which initially were received with mixed feelings. In the longer run, the abolition of debt-slavery got firmly anchored in Athenian law, with various political and economic effects on the lives of the poorer citizens. Cancellation of debts, however, was rejected, after Solon's one-off occasion: prohibition to cancel debts and several supporting statutes were entrenched in Athenian law. Why was the one part of his program enduringly accepted and the other part not? With an analysis of the success and failure of this anchoring process, this paper aims to clarify how and why political innovations may or may not become accepted.

Bé Breij

### **Anchoring *oratio figurata*, *oratio figurata* anchoring**

As its title suggests, the subject of this paper is bipartite. After a brief introduction of the ancient concept of *oratio figurata* ('veiled speech') the first part, Anchoring *oratio figurata*, discusses ways in which rhetors anchored these innovative and evidently controversial theories and methods in long-existing, venerable texts such as Homer's *Iliad* and Plato's *Phaedon*. The second part, *oratio figurata* anchoring, concerns practice rather than theory: it looks at the way *oratio figurata* could help anchor new and controversial political developments. The case in point is Cicero's *Pro Ligario*, in which the Roman orator uses *oratio figurata* in order to come to terms with, or even mitigate, the unprecedented length and impact of Julius Caesar's dictatorship.

Esmée Bruggink

### **A libation of blood: self-sacrifice as *pharmakon* for the city in Euripides' *Phoenician Women***

This paper aims to explore the way in which current views on power and responsibility in the political tumult of late-fifth century Athens are represented and reflected on in the third episode of Euripides' *Phoenician Women*.

In this central episode, the seer Teiresias finally reveals to Creon what the gods have shown him: 'your son Menoecus must be slaughtered for the city's sake' (ll. 913-4). It is generally accepted that both his message and the politician's response will have come as a surprise to the Athenian audience. Apparently, the salvation of threatened Thebes lies with the legendary bloodline of the autochthonous Spartoi and an act of atonement by its last pure member. Upon Teiresias' departure, Creon tells his son to leave the city and save his own life instead. But when Menoecus breaks his silence, soon enough it appears that he will not flee from his responsibility. With the fighting citizens in the back of his mind, he is the first acting male in the play to put civic interest above private advantage. Yet from this no immediate remedy for the city's sickness follows: with only scant notice of his self-sacrifice, war continues and more blood is shed. Did the libation serve any purpose at all?

By including the sacrifice scene in his tragic retelling, Euripides strikingly innovated the Theban story. What exactly does this scene address? With what contemporary discourse does Menoecus' speech resonate? And how is this discourse and the episode as a whole anchored in the mythological plot?

Vanessa Cazzato

### **Anchoring the solo parts of tragedy in ‘song culture’**

That tragedy is properly understood as one manifestation of *mousike* or ‘song culture’ on a continuum with many others in fifth-century Athens has been a matter of agreement in scholarship ever since Herington’s seminal monograph *Poetry into Drama* (Berkeley 1985) was published thirty years ago. This important insight has produced a wave of interesting scholarship on tragedy, but this has mostly affected our understanding of the choral nature of tragedy. Thus the tragic chorus is understood as a species of the genus chorus to which belong also, for instance, dithyrambic or parthenaic choruses, and the ritual function of the chorus has been recognized as one of the things which lends classical tragedy its distinctive charge. A whole new dimension is added when choral songs interact with lyric genres which have a life outside of tragedy: when a chorus sings something that is in some way like, e.g. a *threnos*, it has a power that goes beyond just ‘pretending’ or ‘acting’ the way a modern theatre group would do. As a result, teasing out the entanglement of the ritual and mimetic functions of the chorus has become a well-established interpretive strategy. But what about the solo parts of drama? Little if any attention has been paid to the corresponding set of problems posed by the interaction between the solo parts of tragedy on the one hand and broader *mousike* and its manifestations in other genres on the other. This presentations will summarize the first fruits of an investigation into the ways in which the solo parts of tragedy are anchored in broader ‘song culture’.

Maarten De Pourcq

### **The classical reference in contemporary culture**

*abstract tba*

Roald Dijkstra & Dorine van Espelo

### **The fisherman’s anchor: establishing papal authority in Peter’s grave (2<sup>nd</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> centuries)**

From the earliest beginnings, Peter’s grave has been an important place in Christian culture and tradition. In the first centuries, it seems that the bishop of Rome did not exert particular influence over the cult site. In 800, however, the *confessio* played a major role in Charlemagne’s imperial coronation by the hands of pope Leo III. By discussing four pivotal moments in the history and development of Peter’s grave we will demonstrate how it gradually came to fulfil the role of a physical and symbolical anchor in the representation of papal authority.

The first of these is the monumentalisation of the grave in the second century by representatives of local Christian worshipers. After a basilica had been built over the grave by the emperor Constantine, the *confessio* features in papal and imperial claims to power. A significant step in papal appropriation of Peter’s *memoria* came in the sixth century with the first edition of the *Liber pontificalis*, a collection of Roman pontifical biographies dispersed from the Lateran, in which we hear e.g. about Gregory the Great’s interventions in the liturgical disposition of the basilica. In Carolingian times, papal employment of the *confessio* reaches full momentum in their diplomatic relations with the Frankish kings.

Aniek van den Eersten

### **To yoke a bridge: poetical implications of the subjugation of nature in Herodotus’**

*Histories*

Herodotus set out on a fascinating journey in writing his *Histories*. He chose to write a new genre of historiography in prose and combine the more abstract and fact-orientated tradition of prose with the story-telling of poetry. Predecessors and contemporaries from both genres have greatly influenced the historian (Fowler 1996, Thomas 2000 and Rengakos 2001) and it is thought that

his new genre is a mosaic of elements he approves of from the different genres (see Boedeker 2000).

In my project I take a closer look at the poetic side of Herodotus' prose with a focus on imagery and metaphors. I explore the poetic quality of Herodotus' metaphors and imagery by looking at his indebtedness to poetic predecessors, but also discuss the function of imagery in the *Histories*. In this paper the difficulties of treating imagery as an exclusively poetical device will be discussed and, taking my departure from Lakoff and Turner's study on poetic metaphors, I will ask how poetical Herodotus' images are. As a case study, I will discuss the image of the yoke. In Aeschylus' *Persians* the yoke is one of the main metaphors. Herodotus takes over some of the implications of the image from Aeschylus, but expands it to make it fit his own (hi)story. He arguably employs the image to throw his audience an anchor to grasp the direction of his (hi)story.

Boedeker, D. 2000. 'Herodotus's genre(s)', in: Depew, M. and D. Obbink (eds.), *Matrices of Genre: authors, canons and society*. Cambridge, MA, 97-114.

Fowler, R.L. 1996. "Herodotus and his Contemporaries", *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 116, 62-87.

Lakoff, G. and M. Turner. 1989. *More than Cool Reason. A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago.

Rengakos, A. 2001. "Epic Narrative Technique in Herodotus' *Histories*", *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* 4, 253-270.

Thomas, R. 2000. *Herodotus in Context*. Cambridge.

Hans Joachim Gehrke

### **Historiography as innovation: the Greeks, their past, and the search for truth**

*abstract tba*

Zoë Ghyselink

### **Classical reception and architectural reform in early 19th-century German theatre: the Case of Karl Friedrich Schinkel**

Countering the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century dominance of French court drama and Italian opera early nineteenth-century reformative practices in German theatre aimed at mediating national consciousness through German-language repertoires, which witness a revival of ancient Greek tragic and mythological themes (Flashar 2009). German theatre was attributed with social meanings of national unity and tradition and was expected to produce these ideals also through architectural reform, especially with regard to the blurred social and spatial relationship between the auditorium and the stage (Radice 1998).

It is, however, less well-documented that architectural reforms within German theatre around 1800 were embedded in contemporary neoclassicist, mainly philhellenist tendencies.

In my paper, I therefore examine the architectural devices on the proscenium and auditorium in the writings and drafts of the German architect Karl Friedrich Schinkel (1781-1841). On the basis of Foucault's discussion of the panopticon and the role of architecture in processes of social control, I argue that Schinkel's designs on the removal of privileged seats, the construction of amphitheatrical auditoria and changed lighting devices enacted (the control over) social unity between actors and audiences. Schinkel thereby embedded his arguments in contemporary philhellenist images of the relationship between individuals and masses in ancient Greek (theatre) architecture, which appeared in popular travelling accounts of archeologists, such as James Stuart's and Nicholas Revett's *The Antiquities of Athens* (1762) and were based on readings of the Roman architect Vitruvius.

As a more comprehensive research outlook this paper aims at opening the discussion towards Schinkel's meaning for reformative architectural conceptions of theatre as all-enhancing socio-cultural and ritual mass performances in the early twentieth century.

Annette Harder

### **Anchoring through aetiology**

Aetiology is a popular concept, found all through Greek and Latin history in a great variety of sources, particularly in poetry. It helps to create a firm basis for the present in the past by showing that the present is the result or continuation of what happened or was begun in the past. Thus the past is used as a means of legitimizing or explaining the present and of creating a sense of roots and continuity, i.e. of anchoring the present.

However, the device is not only used to anchor a well-established present, but one may also relate the concept of anchoring *innovation* to aetiology. Here we may distinguish two ways of anchoring: (1) new institutions can be linked to an aetiological story from the past and be presented as sanctioned by these events (e.g. the institution of the Areopagus at the end of Aeschylus' *Oresteia* or the alliance of Athens and Argos at the end of Euripides' *Supplikes*); (2) more experimentally, the present can be cast as the past of the future: an event in the present will then provide a reason for a specific institution in the future (as in e.g. the catastrophe of the lock of Berenice at the end of Callimachus' *Aetia* and the apotheosis of Caesar at the end of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*).

In this paper I will discuss some examples of both ways of anchoring innovation through aetiology as brief case studies and suggest further questions to explore.

Olivier Hekster

### **Anchoring religious change. The case of Elagabalus**

The reign of the emperor Elagabalus (218-222) is characterised by its rather extreme religious innovations, in which Jupiter Optimus Maximus was replaced as supreme god by the god Elagabalus who was worshipped in the form of a black conical stone. The religious innovations turned out to be a failure. On the other hand, it has long been recognised that the reign of the emperor Augustus was characterised by its emphasis on tradition. As a result, it has often been argued, his (religious) innovations turned out to be successful. This paper will argue that there was relatively little difference in the way both rulers presented religious change. Both tried to create a shared field of experience through which they tried to make their new systems understandable to various groups in the Roman Empire. The starting points of both emperors, however, were hugely different. Since these starting points functioned as anchors, and mental adjustments are typically insufficient to compensate for anchors, Elagabalus failed whereas Augustus was successful.

Stephen Hinds: University of Washington, Seattle

### **The dual-citizen Muse: anchoring cross-linguistic poetic consciousness**

A case can be made (as it has by Denis Feeney) that European literature comes into being not with the invention of Greek literature, but with the invention of a relationship between Greek literature and Latin. *Mutatis mutandis*, this relational paradigm will continue to energize and to delimit poetic innovation across language and culture in the Western tradition through early modernity and beyond. A paradigm anchored in Roman practice; but (to press the metaphor) anchors can sometimes sink poetic ships as well as keeping them safe.

Denis Feeney, *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs*, Cambridge 1998, pp.52-3, 66-7, 74-5

Raphael Hunsucker & Raf Praet

## **Reinventing tenacious anchors: Romulus in the cultural memory of the early and late Roman Empire**

In this paper, we would like to show how the concept of cultural memory (central to several ongoing research projects within Dutch classical studies) can contribute to the method of anchoring innovation. The 'soggy' and flexible nature of cultural memory, we argue, makes it particularly fertile ground for anchoring. Our hypothesis is that the tenacious aspect of Roman cultural memory can account for the longevity and success of an anchoring device, even if that device is applied to different ends or in conflicting contexts. The omnipresence of such tenacious anchors in Roman memory forces every potential heir to the Roman legacy to engage with them.

Romulus is one of these tenacious anchors. His role in the foundation of Rome figures prominently in two crucial periods of transformation in Roman history. In the Augustan age, Romulus was reconfigured to anchor the 'Roman revolution' that transformed an aristocratic republic into a monarchic empire. Late antiquity saw fundamental shifts in the religious and political focus of the empire, shifts which were again mediated through the figure of Romulus. When Rome developed from pagan to Christian capital, Peter and Paul were reconfigured as the new Romulus and Remus. In Constantinople, the new Rome at the Bosphorus, different authors debated the moral legitimacy of the old capital of the empire through a close scrutiny of the questionable character of Romulus, who had founded Rome on the blood of his brother Remus.

The tenacity of Romulus as an anchor is not impeded by the fundamental ambiguity inherent in his character. On the contrary, the multi-layeredness of Romulus proved highly potential for the anchoring of Roman identity throughout the vicissitudes of Roman history. The persistence of such a tenacious anchor may call for innovation in the use of the anchor itself – and that is exactly what this paper aims to study.

Leopoldo Iribarren

### **Teleology in Plato's *Timaeus*. Anchoring a Socratic innovation in cosmological discourse**

The defining feature of Presocratic philosophy is the designation of the cosmic principles responsible for the origin and permanent unity of being. Guided by the specific nature of the principles laid down, Presocratic systems speculate on the physical evolution of the cosmos, the movement of the planets and the origin of living species. Although they also speculate at length upon human topics— namely embryology, physiology, sense perception and cognitive faculties— they never explicitly develop an anthropocentric point of view. In Presocratic philosophy, humankind is a by-product of a larger cosmic process. Unlike mythical cosmologies (Hesiod), which offer an explanation of the human condition as such, Presocratic cosmologies are, in general, not concerned by human values, deeds, fate and ends (Empedocles being a conspicuous exception). Anthropocentric teleology, so prominently deployed in Plato's and Aristotle's world systems, is a Socratic innovation originally developed within an ethic and dialectic context. In my paper, I will examine the conceptual strategies used by Plato in the *Timaeus* to anchor this Socratic notion in a cosmologic discourse. I shall argue that Plato creates in the *Timaeus* a "general cosmology", eclectically inspired by his predecessors (philosophers as well as mythologists), in which the mythic figure of the cosmic demiurge embodies the Socratic principle of the supreme Good, ethically governing the physical evolution of the cosmos. The anchoring of the Socratic notion of Good in a cosmological discourse results in the first "humanized" representation of the universe.

Irene de Jong

### **Leonidas 'the best of the Achaeans': how Herodotus anchors prose via poetry**

Fifth century BC Greece witnessed a major innovation: the emergence of written prose as a new medium of communication, next to (semi-) oral poetry. A key figure in this process is Herodotus, who chose for his new genre of historiography the new genre of written prose. Of course there had been prose-writers and even 'historians' before him, but his ambitions were much higher: to give prose the grandeur and hence authority of epic (see e.g. Fowler 2006, Barker 2009: 144-202).

In my new research project, which consists in writing a narratological commentary on (parts of) Herodotus' *Histories*, I pay special attention to the way in which the Herodotean narrator adopts and adapts epic narrative techniques and themes. This focus flows forth from my interest in diachronic narratology (see de Jong 2014), but Herodotus employing epic devices to give his own text epic grandeur also is an obvious case of anchoring innovation. In my paper I will discuss some examples, taken from the episode of the battle of Thermopylae (7.215-33), which show the potential and pitfalls of such an AI approach .

E.T.E. Barker, *Entering the Agōn: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy*, Oxford 2009

R. L. Fowler, 'Herodotus and his Prose Predecessors', in C. Dewald, J. Marincola (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*, Cambridge 2006, 29-45

I.J.F. de Jong, 'Diachronic Narratology (The Example of Ancient Greek Narrative)', in P. Hühn, J.C. Meister, J. Pier, W. Schmid (eds.), *Living Handbook of Narratology* (electronic publication <http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de>) and in P. Hühn, J.C. Meister, J. Pier, W. Schmid (eds.) *Handbook of Narratology*, volume 1 (Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter<sup>2</sup> 2014), 115-22.

Jacqueline Klooster

### **On dealing with tyrants: Plutarch's anchoring of his moral instructorship in Solon of Athens**

Plutarch's project of writing the *Parallel Lives* of great Greek and Roman statesmen and generals is a strikingly innovative literary feat. As recent scholarship has acknowledged, moreover, we should not separate the *Lives* from the *Moralia*, Plutarch's philosophical essays: together they form a moral protreptic, aimed at the Greco-Roman elite with political aspirations.

In this paper I want to look at the way Plutarch anchors his own persona of wise adviser of the ruling class in the figure of the ancient Athenian sage Solon. The *Life of Solon* takes a unique position in the *Parallel Lives* in that Solon's parallel, Publicola, is said to have actually learned from him. Besides introducing his famous legislation, Solon tried to educate king Croesus and stop Peisistratus from taking up tyrannical rule in Athens. Publicola, on the other hand, successfully drove out the tyrant Tarquinius and innovated the Roman constitution by adopting Solon's laws.

In showing that a Roman statesman could learn from a Greek sage how to deal with tyrants, and innovate politics, Plutarch was arguably anchoring his own educational aims in the figure of Solon.

Caroline Kroon

### **Anchoring as a communicative device: Tacitus' presentation of Piso's conspiracy (Tac. A. 15.47-74)**

Communication can only be successful if the speech participants (speaker-hearer; writer-intended reader) share a certain *common ground*. The idea of common ground is central to our research project "Classical Historiography and the Discourse of Innovation" (Allan, van Gils, Kroon). In this project, we attempt to explore the linguistic mechanisms by which an author embeds his

message(s) in the knowledge and beliefs shared with the intended reader. The idea behind this is that a reader will only be able to *interpret* the message and be *persuaded* by it, if it is firmly *anchored* in the common ground (see Allan's contribution to the AI 2<sup>nd</sup> Expert Meeting, June 2015).

Herbert Clark, founder of the linguistic common ground theory, distinguishes two types of common ground (Clark 1996): *communal* common ground (based on cultural copresence; shared knowledge of e.g. cognitive schema's, prototypes, genre conventions) and *personal* common ground (based on physical or linguistic copresence in a concrete discourse situation). In my presentation I will give a brief impression of the subtle discourse-linguistic mechanisms by means of which Tacitus, in his account of Piso's Conspiracy (*Annales* 15.47-74), anchors his message into the shared common ground. I will focus, first, on Tacitus' rhetorically skilful use of *natural/prototypical narrative patterns* (Labov 1972), as an example of anchoring information into communal common ground. Next, I will briefly discuss Tacitus' use of the present tense in this episode, as an example of anchoring information into personal common ground. I will argue that being aware of communicative anchoring mechanisms like these, and of the rhetorical use that Tacitus makes of them, may add to our understanding of the text.

Clark, H.H., 1996, *Using Language*, Cambridge.

Labov, W., 1972, *Language in the Inner City*, Philadelphia.

Pagán, V.E., 2005, *Conspiracy Narratives in Roman History*, Austin.

Inger Kuin

### **What do Sulla and the philosophers have in common? Not much**

What do Sulla and the philosophers have in common? As little as a dolphin and an ox, according to Aelian. The statement is intended to be a reflection on Sulla's violent, uncultured nature and occurs in a fragment (53 Hercher) that discusses Sulla's theft of the statue of Athena from a temple in Boeotia. Aelian further describes Sulla's painful death and sarcastically contrasts it with his agnomen 'Felix.' The author remembers Sulla's Greek campaign of the First Mithridatic War primarily as a destruction of cultural capital, and this, I argue, is typical of several Greek authors of the early Empire.

Sulla's siege of Athens was especially violent and looms large in the Greek remembrance of the war. In imperial Greek literature his demolition of sites and artifacts of Greek art and philosophy is emphasized, and this tendency appears to become stronger over time. In the first century BCE Sulla is a destroyer of human life *and* Greek culture, e.g., in Diodorus and Strabo, but from the first century CE onwards the focus gradually shifts to his reputation as a looter. This change starts with Plutarch and Memnon and is completed, via Appian, with Lucian, Pausanias and Aelian, at which point Sulla has become a ruthless destroyer of art.

This development, I argue, occurs under the influence of the political and cultural climate experienced by each author: in order to be able to live in (and with) the present they adapt their history. In the period I examine 'Greece' comes increasingly to be understood as a cultural rather than a political entity, by Romans and Greeks. Second century CE authors, in order to anchor this role for Greece, retroject it onto an earlier period. The way in which the memory of the siege of Athens evolves shows, then, how a dynamic attitude towards the past can be used in coping with the present.

Andrea de March

### ***Novom aliquid inventum* (Pseud. 569). An unsurprising innovation?**

In 1948 Francesco Araldi defined the *Pseudolus* as «the most Roman of Plautus' comedies». Such a statement must partly rely on the title-protagonist of the play, Pseudolus, the peculiar character

that overwhelms many Plautine plots. This character provides specific evidence for Plautus' general tendency to anchor some peculiar elements of his own theatre to the Greek framework of New Comedy. Actually Pseudolus, inclined to pragmatism and shrewdness, is a fully Roman character. Nonetheless, throughout the play he also engages with philosophical reflection. By analyzing this seemingly contradiction thanks to the comparison of Pseudolus to Davos, his more philosophizing counterpart in Menander's *Aspis*, I aim to retrace the process through which Plautus applied his predecessors' characterization to his own slave. The analysis of such a particular case will provide a first contribution to the definition of the concept of 'anchoring innovation' as inherent to Plautine art. Pseudolus is actually a meta-literary character aware of the novelty of his own figure. Yet, he is bound to some archetypal aspects of his Greek ancestor. Thanks to this strategy, Plautus made the Greek framework of the *palliata* familiar to his Roman audience; conversely, a spectator used to Greek theatre could appreciate the persistence of its peculiarities. Thus, speaking of a 'double anchoring' seems legitimate, since this strategy does not only concern the structural features of comedy as a genre, but it also involves the reciprocal cultural exchange between Greece and Rome.

Stéphane Martin

### **Early Roman magistracies with Celtic names: native substrate or innovation anchoring?**

A central aspect of the Roman conquest of Gaul was the municipalisation of these new territories, i.e. the implementation of the Roman civic system with its magistracies. Although the situation varied locally, as a general rule this new system came to replace existing institutions, albeit without erasing native elements. This is best exemplified by the existence of Gallic-named magistracies (mostly the *vergobret* and the *arcantodan*) between c. 50 BC and c. AD 50. Up to this day, these magistracies have been interpreted in terms of "Celtic substrate", i.e. as a survival of long-standing pre-Roman realities. However, a detailed re-examination of the case of the *arcantodan* shows that, although the name is Gallic, it was probably created after the conquest, maybe as a short-lived parallel to the Roman *triumviri monetales*. In this case, an interpretation in terms of anchoring, i.e. as a deliberate and conscious attempt to introduce and adapt a new institution, is to be preferred.

Margaret Miles

### **Hephaistos, Daidalos, Iktinos: Divine, Heroic, and Human Architectural Innovations**

In the ancient Greek literary imagination, innovations in art and architecture could come about through a wide range of agency: divine, heroic or human. While the results were usually admired and remembered, some advances or inventions were potentially dangerous, such as the walking statue Talos, who patrolled Crete. Engineering triumphs like Xerxes' bridges over the Hellespont resulted in collapse and catastrophe, later considered a warning about violations of nature. Anxiety over newness sometimes led to technophobia, even in an age of constant artistic advance. Since art and architecture served as the primary furnishing and setting for ritual, statues and temples had to be acceptable both to gods and devotees, an acceptability established through the test of time. Greek religious architecture had a peculiarly conservative artistic tradition, yet within seemingly similar temples, we find creativity, innovation, and dazzling experimentation that adapted a basic design to specific religious settings, with fresh experiences for devotees. Anchoring newness in the past was one strategy to overcome society's suspicion of the new and reluctance to admit change in the religious sphere.

Eric Moormann

### **Pompeii and grand architecture in the eighteenth century**

The discoveries of Herculaneum and Pompeii in the middle of the eighteenth century brought to light the remains of two towns rather than single edifices like those known for ages in Rome. The impact of that specific quality was immediately recognized, but we may ask ourselves whether the remains as such led to new tendencies in the applied arts and in architecture. In this paper I address the aspect of architecture. The item was relevant in the public debate during the second half of the eighteenth century, since discoveries in Paestum, Sicily, and Greece provided the opportunity to see and study grand monuments especially Greek temples.

Margaret Miles

**Hephaistos, Daidalos, Iktinos: Divine, heroic, and human architectural innovations**

*abstract tba*

Frits Naerebout

**The dynamics of Graeco-Roman religion**

*abstract tba*

Ruurd Nauta

**Un-Anchoring Innovation. Lucan and Tacitus on the Principate**

*abstract tba*

Onno van Nijf

**Anchoring agonistic innovation: Greek contests after Sulla**

One of the unexpected consequences of Sulla's military operations in the Greek world during the Mithridatic war was a revival of various agonistic traditions in different cities and sanctuary sites. Traditional Greek festivals were flourishing - and new festivals were set up in a traditional mould. But this was not pure antiquarianism: the traditional language of the Greek festival was used to re-connect cities and regions torn apart by the wars and give them a place in a new world order dominated by Rome. Sulla's agonistic innovations were anchored in traditional Greek practice, paving the way for the imperial cult.

Aurora Raimondi Cominesi

**Anchoring the house: early Augustan residences between tradition and innovation**

In Roman history, Octavian's rise to power in the second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE represents a drastic moment of innovation, recognized not only by modern scholarship but also by Octavian's contemporaries. Following his efforts, a new form of government, the Principate, was established. How, however, was this change presented and received, especially when it first appeared? We know that Octavian had to act within a system characterized by a deep-rooted 'disinclination to novelty', and his response was to show continuity with Rome's traditional past, which can be usefully interpreted as using an anchor to make the new system acceptable.

This paper intends to address the question of how this continuity was used by Octavian as a means of propaganda in his private dwellings, in particular his Palatine residence. There, a dichotomy between public modesty and private lavishness emerges from the reading of ancient sources, as well as the analysis of the material recovered by excavations. I will focus especially on the painted decorations of Octavian's house, and on the decorations of the residences owned by people connected to his inner circle, where it seems that a new style emerged and was disseminated, concurrently with the establishment of the new political order.

Lydia Spielberg

## **Anchoring the barbarians: ethnographic *topoi* in Tacitus' Batavian Revolt**

This paper considers the sustained use of ethnographic *topoi* in Tacitus' narrative of the Batavian Revolt of 69 CE (*Hist.* 4.12-5.26). Although Civilis, the revolt's leader, and his allies are Romanized elites, their speeches portray the war as a rebellion against Rome and Romanization, employing commonplace ethnographic dichotomies such as nature/culture, wilderness/city, and freedom/subjugation. I argue that this systematic ethnographic discourse allows Tacitus to "have his cake and eat it, too", as he exposes the anchors on which Civilis' deceptive rhetoric relies while exploiting his own audience's receptivity to them.

Batavian speakers in Tacitus adopt ethnographic *topoi* to anchor their proposed "new empire" in an imaginary past, eliding divisions among their audiences in favor of an artificial "Germanic" and "non-Roman" identity. When they base their cause in *topoi*, however, the Batavians turn themselves into a recognizable "other" who can be defeated by their ethnographically knowledgeable opponents. Thus when the Tencteri claim that a shared "Germanic" disdain for enclosure should induce the Romanized inhabitants of Colonia Agrippinensis to join them (4.64.3), they invoke a *topos* that Tacitus shows to be untrue even of them. The Agrippinenses subsequently exploit their would-be allies' "barbarian" unfamiliarity with town life to destroy them (4.79.2).

Finally, then, these *topoi* anchor Tacitus' narrative in a familiar paradigm of Roman vs. Other. By adopting ethnographic *topoi*, Civilis and his allies confirm the accuracy of Roman ethnographies, and this justifies the historian's emphasis on "foreign" elements in a conflict that is disturbingly *permixtum* between civil and external war.

Antje Wessels

## **Shaping the (hi)story of innovation – Livius Andronicus as the first poet of Latin literature**

According to ancient testimonia, Latin Literature began in 240 BC, when Livius Andronicus, a Greek freedman, produced the first Latin drama at the Ludi Romani. The date of the performance, shortly after the First Punic War (264-241 BC), was already debated in antiquity, and today it is still not entirely clear what Livius performed and in what respect he had been innovative: Was he the first one to translate a Greek drama into Latin, the first one to write a Roman drama (*fabula*), or the first one to provide dramatic plots (i.e. a dramatic *fabula* that, unlike preliterate-improvised performances, exhibits an *argumentum*)? At any rate, in ancient reflections on the history of Roman literature, Livius is clearly established (1) to have made extensive use of or even translated Greek literature; and (2) to be not only Rome's first dramatist, but also the first poet to produce Latin literature.

Based on these findings, three major points emerge:

1. We may assume that Livius' (re-)production of Greek elements was meant to provide a common ground or basis, which was employed to make the innovation of Roman literature accessible and attractive to its contemporary addressees, that is, to a Roman society primarily familiar with Greek literary culture.

2. The story of Livius' production as it was subsequently *shaped* by later authors motivates two specific ideas concerning Roman Literature: a) its 'Greekness' and b) its political impact (cf. the dating of its appearance in relation to the First Punic War). Livius Andronicus is the first author to meet these two requirements.

3. Finally, this story clearly follows a narrative which links the introduction of poetic innovation to the technique of anchoring (cf. Hor. c. 3, 30. 13sq: *princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos | deduxisse modos*). That said, we may even argue that it was precisely *by assigning* the technique of anchoring to Livius Andronicus that later authors characterized his poetic work as an *innovation*.

