

CAESAR
THE GALLIC WAR

WITH AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION BY
H. J. EDWARDS



HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
LONDON, ENGLAND

First published 1917

LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY® is a registered trademark
of the President and Fellows of Harvard College

ISBN 978-0-674-99080-7

*Printed on acid-free paper and bound by
The Maple-Vail Book Manufacturing Group*

Nostrī omīssis pīlis gladiis rem gerunt. Repente post tergum equitatus cernitur; cohortes aliae appropinquant. Hostes terga vertunt; fugientibus equites occurrunt. Fit magna caedes. Sedulius, dux et princeps Lemovicum, occiditur; Vercassivellaunus Arvernus vivus in fuga comprehenditur; signa militaria septuaginta quattuor ad Caesarem referuntur: pauci ex tanto numero se incolomes in castra recipiunt. Conspicati ex oppido caedem et fugam suorum desperata salute copias a munitionibus reducunt. Fit protinus hac re audita ex castris Gallorum fuga. Quod nisi crebris subsidiis ac totius diei labore milites essent defessi, omnes hostium copiae deleri potuissent. De media nocte missus equitatus novissimum agmen consequitur: magnus numerus capitur atque interficitur; reliqui ex fuga in civitates discedunt.

89 Postero die Vercingetorix concilio convocato id bellum se suscepisse non suarum necessitatum, sed communis libertatis causa demonstrat, et quoniam sit fortunae cedendum, ad utramque rem se illis offerre, seu morte sua Romanis satisfacere seu vivum tradere velint. Mittuntur de his rebus ad Caesarem legati. Iubet arma tradi, principes produci. Ipse in munitione pro castris consedit: eo duces producuntur; Vercingetorix deditur, arma proiciuntur. Reservatis Aeduis atque Arvernīs, si per eos civitates recipere posset,

Our troops discarded their pikes and got to work with their swords. Suddenly the cavalry was noticed in the rear; other cohorts drew near. The enemy turned to flee; the cavalry met them in flight, and a great slaughter ensued. Sedulius, commander and chief of the Lemovices, was killed; Vercassivellaunus the Arvernian was captured alive in the rout; seventy-four war-standards were brought in to Caesar; of the vast host few returned safe to camp. The others beheld from the town the slaughter and rout of their countrymen, and, in despair of safety, recalled their force from the entrenchments. Directly they heard what had happened the Gauls fled from their camp. And if the troops had not been worn out by frequent reinforcing and the whole day's effort, the entire force of the enemy could have been destroyed. The cavalry were sent off just after midnight and caught up the rearguard: a great number were taken and slain, the rest fled away into the different states.

On the morrow Vercingetorix summoned a council, at which he stated that he had undertaken that campaign, not for his own occasions, but for the general liberty; and as they must yield to fortune he offered himself to them for whichever course they pleased—to give satisfaction to the Romans by his death, or to deliver him alive. Deputies were despatched to Caesar to treat of this matter. He ordered the arms to be delivered up, the chiefs to be brought out. He himself took his seat in the entrenchments in front of the camp: the leaders were brought out to him there. Vercingetorix was surrendered, arms were thrown down. Keeping back the Aedui and the Arverni, to see if through them he could recover their states, he distributed the rest of the prisoners, one

STUDYING GENDER
IN CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY

LIN FOXHALL



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521557399

© Cambridge University Press 2013

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2013

Printed and bound in the United Kingdom by the MPG Books Group

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

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Foxhall, Lin.

Studying gender in classical antiquity / Lin Foxhall.

pages cm. – (Key themes in ancient history)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-521-55318-6 (hardback) – ISBN 978-0-521-55739-9 (pbk.)

1. Greece—Civilization. 2. Rome—Civilization. 3. Classical antiquities.

4. Gender identity—Greece. 5. Gender identity—Rome.

6. Sex role—Greece—History. 7. Sex role—Rome—History. I. Title.

DE71.F69 2013

305.30938—dc23 2012047925

ISBN 978-0-521-55318-6 Hardback

ISBN 978-0-521-55739-9 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in
this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is,
or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Controlled violence, exerted under appropriate circumstances, was acceptable for men. This might even include violence against women (Schaps 1998: 169–70), for example in the case of nagging wives. In the *Iliad*, Zeus threatens his wife Hera with violence when she questions and chides him about his conversation with the goddess Thetis, though the threat is averted by the intervention of her adult son Hephaistos (Homer *Il.* 1.536–89). Similarly, in Semonides' misogynistic poem, the bitch-wife deserves to be clouted for her nagging and snooping:

and the one made from a bitch, whining(?), just like her mother,
 she who wants to hear everything and know everything
 and everywhere peeing and prowling she barks, even if she sees no one.
 A man could not stop her either with threats
 nor if, angered, he knocked out her teeth with a stone,
 nor by speaking to her sweetly, not even if she chances to be sitting among
 guests,
 but constantly she keeps up her unstoppable yapping.
 (Semonides F7.12–19; tr. Gerber 1999: 305, 307)

Excessive and/or unseemly aggression was viewed negatively in Greek sources as characteristic of the man who lacked proper self-control, as shown in the example of Timarchos (Aeschin. 1). However, the violence associated with military activities was a different matter. Warfare was legitimized as violence against outsiders on behalf of the community, sanctioned by the state and in the interests of its defence, expansion or as a means of acquiring wealth. War was thus a proper job for a man (Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 519–20). And participation in war was often entwined with social roles and political status for men.

Women at war

Women, in contrast, are almost never depicted in written or visual sources as engaging in any kind of violent behaviour beyond verbal abuse and nagging. In war, they were more often victims than active participants (Schaps 1982). At best, they might be seen to urge on their male relatives (as Spartan women reputedly did), or support their men in other ways (Loman 2004). The few exceptions are telling. The mythical and often scary Amazons, described by Pindar (*Olympian* 13.87–90) as an 'archered army of women', and ubiquitous in Greek and Roman art and literature, were never believed to be either Greek or Roman. Although perspectives on them changed over time (Hardwick 1990), from Homer onwards they were always depicted as 'foreign' and 'other': armed women with a masculine lifestyle utterly unlike that of 'real' Greek or Roman women.

Globalized Antiquity

Uses and Perceptions of the Past in South Asia,
Mesoamerica, and Europe

Edited by

Ute Schüren, Daniel Marc Segesser, and Thomas Späth

Reimer

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung
des Schweizerischen Nationalfonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung
der Fondation Johanna Dürmüller-Bol und
der Bürgergemeinde Bern

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der
Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind
im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

© 2015 by Dietrich Reimer Verlag GmbH · Berlin
www.reimer-verlag.de

Umschlaggestaltung: Nicola Willam · Berlin
Umschlagfoto: "Oracle Pansion" at the Temple of Apollo at Didyma (today Didim, Turkey)
Photo by Thomas Späth
Satz: Dietrich Reimer Verlag · Berlin
Druck: Hubert & Co GmbH & Co. KG · Göttingen

Alle Rechte vorbehalten
Printed in Germany
Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier

ISBN 978-3-496-01600-7

Chapter 7 Imagining a Nation: Elite Discourse and the Native Past in Nineteenth-Century Mexico <i>Wolfgang Gabbert</i>	189
Chapter 8 Decolonizing Memory: The Case of the Ñuu Sau (Mixtec People), México <i>Gabina Aurora Pérez Jiménez</i>	211
Chapter 9 On the History of Archaeological Research in Mesoamerica, with Particular Reference to Pre-Columbian Maya Civilization <i>Jeremy A. Sabloff</i>	219
..... of the Ancient Maya: Indigenous Organizations Appropriation of History in Yucatán, Mexico, and Guatemala	231
..... of European Antiquity and the Perception of Ancient Cultures	
..... "Classical Antiquity": A Brief Introduction	253
..... Path of Ruins in the Graeco-Roman World	259
..... Schlegel, and Lucian: "....." about Late Eighteenth-Century Fragmented Antiquity <i>.....bach</i>	281
Chapter 13 The Making of a Bourgeois Antiquity: Wilhelm von Humboldt and Greek History <i>Stefan Rebenich</i>	297

Conclusion

Chapter 14 Provincializing Antiquity? Uses of the Past Compared <i>Thomas Späth</i>	319
Index of Personal Names.....	339
Index of Geographical Names.....	343
Index of Subjects.....	346

Chapter 13

The Making of a Bourgeois Antiquity: Wilhelm von Humboldt and Greek History¹

Stefan Rebenich

Abstract

The question “Where do we stand?” asked by Wilhelm von Humboldt in his review of the eighteenth century expresses a borderline experience around 1800, which lastingly influenced the perception of the past and the present in Germany. The main focus of the reception of antiquity shifted from Rome to Hellas. Individuals were meant to grasp Greek culture in its diversity and Greek character in its totality. The study of Greek history established a new conception of upbringing, education and scholarship, but also of nation, state, and society. The idealised Greek city-states were a pivotal point of reference and comparison for the definition of education, which is seminal to bourgeois society as a permanent process of self-perfection, for the description of the relationship between freedom and education, for the connection between individual, society and state, and for the discussion of principles of social organisation and structure. The study of classical antiquity was the main theme of neo-humanistic teaching – and an effective instrument of social exclusion in nineteenth-century class society. The historical upheaval in the study of antiquity, which was tangible in Germany around 1800, brought forth the concepts of both classical scholarship and bourgeois culture in the nineteenth century.

“Where do we stand?” asked Wilhelm von Humboldt in his review of the eighteenth century. “Which part of its long and arduous path has mankind covered? Is it on a course that leads to the final destination?”² The text is more than just a glimpse of the past: it

- 1 The works of Wilhelm von Humboldt referred to in this essay are cited in accordance with his *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 1–17 published by the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences (*Königlich Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften*), Berlin 1903–1936 (reprinted 1967/68). Volume and page numbers follow the abbreviation GS. Volume and page numbers in brackets refer to the following anthology: Wilhelm von Humboldt, *Werke in fünf Bänden*, eds. A. Flitner and K. Giel, Darmstadt 1960–1981 (various reprints). – An earlier version of this paper was published in LANIERI 2011: 119–137. I would like to thank Richard Brobson for his help with the translation.
- 2 Humboldt, “Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert”, GS II, 1 (I, 376).

fields of *Wissenschaft* and education took shape before Humboldt's reform;¹⁴ that older scholarly literature tended to idealise Humboldt;¹⁵ and that making the "Humboldt myth" topical was of exceptional importance in numerous educational and higher-educational policy crises.¹⁶ But it is also indisputable that Humboldt's reflections on the content and function of education and his ideas about the different kinds of teaching at schools and universities had a continuous effect after 1810, even beyond the scope of Cabinet politics. After Humboldt was appointed head of the newly founded section for cultural affairs and education in the Ministry of the Interior, he was able to exploit the euphoria for reform, which had prevailed in the devastated Prussian state after its military defeat. Leveraging this mood during his term of office, which lasted barely sixteen months, enabled Humboldt to give important impulses to the creation of a unified public school and university system, which reflected his ideas of a general education. Furthermore, he communicated his views to a large circle of friends by way of many personal as well as written contacts.¹⁷

For the purposes of this essay, it is particularly important that Humboldt's reform constituted a new understanding of antiquity. The historical point of reference that sustained his vision was Greek antiquity.¹⁸ In encountering Greece, Humboldt succeeded in bolstering the political demands of the bourgeoisie by means of his educational ideal, which amalgamated stimuli and notions of different provenance. As Georg Bollenbeck has aptly put it, Humboldt effectively defined *Bildung*, education, "as a general and harmonious development of an individual aptitude; as acquisition of the world from within without any specific purpose; as an unfinished process, result and standard mediated by 'culture.'"¹⁹

Antiquity and Bourgeois Culture

Perfectibility: Education as a Permanent Process of Self-Perfection

Education was one of the central values of bourgeois culture. It facilitated the development of the individual and the progress of society. For Humboldt, the study of Greek antiquity helped the formation of the individual's personality, as in Greece there was to be found "an accomplished form," which "encouraged us to replicate it." Humboldt celebrated the Greeks' "refinement and accuracy of the mind," their "strength" and their "dynamic power of imagination," their "agility and liveliness of emotion," their "prolific genius for the plastic arts and poetry," their "noble freedom of convictions," their "agreeable unity

14 NEUGEBAUER 1990.

15 See, for example, SPRANCER 1910; SPRANCER 1909.

16 ASH 1999.

17 At this point, I refer only to JEISMANN 1996: vol. I; JEISMANN 1996: vol. II; see further JEISMANN/LUNDGREEN 1987: vol. III; VOM BRUCH 1999; RÜEGG 1999; KRAUS 2008: 69f.

18 See FLASHAR 1986; JECHT 2003; MATTHIESSEN 2003; MENZE 1992; QUILLIEN 1983; REHM 1936; STADLER 1959.

19 BOLLENBECK 1996: 147f.

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY ***Rethinking the Concept***

R. W. CONNELL

University of Sydney, Australia

JAMES W. MESSERSCHMIDT

University of Southern Maine

The concept of hegemonic masculinity has influenced gender studies across many academic fields but has also attracted serious criticism. The authors trace the origin of the concept in a convergence of ideas in the early 1980s and map the ways it was applied when research on men and masculinities expanded. Evaluating the principal criticisms, the authors defend the underlying concept of masculinity, which in most research use is neither reified nor essentialist. However, the criticism of trait models of gender and rigid typologies is sound. The treatment of the subject in research on hegemonic masculinity can be improved with the aid of recent psychological models, although limits to discursive flexibility must be recognized. The concept of hegemonic masculinity does not equate to a model of social reproduction; we need to recognize social struggles in which subordinated masculinities influence dominant forms. Finally, the authors review what has been confirmed from early formulations (the idea of multiple masculinities, the concept of hegemony, and the emphasis on change) and what needs to be discarded (one-dimensional treatment of hierarchy and trait conceptions of gender). The authors suggest reformulation of the concept in four areas: a more complex model of gender hierarchy, emphasizing the agency of women; explicit recognition of the geography of masculinities, emphasizing the interplay among local, regional, and global levels; a more specific treatment of embodiment in contexts of privilege and power; and a stronger emphasis on the dynamics of hegemonic masculinity, recognizing internal contradictions and the possibilities of movement toward gender democracy.

Keywords: *masculinity; hegemony; gender; social power; agency; embodiment; globalization*

The concept of hegemonic masculinity, formulated two decades ago, has considerably influenced recent thinking about men, gender, and social hierarchy. It has provided a link between the growing research field of men's studies (also known as

AUTHORS' NOTE: The authors are grateful to the journal's reviewers, Pat Martin, Mike Messner, and Kirsten Dellinger, for extremely helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article. We also extend our thanks to John Fisher, whose patient and inventive searching of bibliographical databases provided essential support for this article.

GENDER & SOCIETY, Vol. 19 No. 6, December 2005 829-859

DOI: 10.1177/0891243205278639

© 2005 Sociologists for Women in Society

as exemplars at the regional level, such as the “iron man” discussed by Donaldson (1993), exhibit contradictions.

At the local level, hegemonic patterns of masculinity are embedded in specific social environments, such as formal organizations. There are, for instance, well-defined patterns of managerial masculinity in the British corporations studied by Roper (1994) and Wajcman (1999). Socially legitimated hegemonic models of masculinity are also in play in families. For instance, men’s gender strategies shape negotiations around housework and the “second shift” in the U.S. families studied by Hochschild (1989). Hegemonic patterns of masculinity are both engaged with and contested as children grow up. Gender is made in schools and neighborhoods through peer group structure, control of school space, dating patterns, homophobic speech, and harassment (Mac an Ghaill 1994; Thorne 1993). In none of these cases would we expect hegemonic masculinity to stand out as a sharply defined pattern separate from all others. A degree of overlap or blurring between hegemonic and complicit masculinities is extremely likely if hegemony is effective.

The overlap between masculinities can also be seen in terms of the social agents constructing masculinities. Cavender (1999) shows how hegemonic masculine models were constructed differently in feature films in the 1940s compared with the 1980s. This is not just a matter of the characters written into the scripts. Practice at the local level—that is, the actual face-to-face interaction of shooting the film as an actor—ultimately constructs hegemonic masculine fantasy models (in this case, “detectives”) at the society-wide or regional level. (We will explore this question of the relations between levels in the Reformulation section of the article.)

The Problem of Reification

That the concept of hegemonic masculinity reduces, in practice, to a reification of power or toxicity has also been argued from different points of view. Holter (1997, 2003), in the most conceptually sophisticated of all critiques, argues that the concept constructs masculine power from the direct experience of women rather than from the structural basis of women’s subordination. Holter believes that we must distinguish between “patriarchy,” the long-term structure of the subordination of women, and “gender,” a specific system of exchange that arose in the context of modern capitalism. It is a mistake to treat a hierarchy of masculinities constructed within gender relations as logically continuous with the patriarchal subordination of women. Holter (1997) tellingly points to Norwegian survey evidence showing that the gender identities of men do not map directly onto such equality-related practices as attitudes toward violence.

Holter (1997, 2003) certainly is correct that it is a mistake to deduce relations among masculinities from the direct exercise of personal power by men over women. At the least, we also must factor in the institutionalization of gender inequalities, the role of cultural constructions, and the interplay of gender dynamics with race, class, and region.