The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Passing Under the Yoke

W. Warde Fowler

The Classical Review / Volume 27 / Issue 02 / March 1913, pp 48 - 51

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00004534, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00004534

How to cite this article:

W. Warde Fowler (1913). Passing Under the Yoke. The Classical Review, 27, pp 48-51
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00004534

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Ib. XX. 7 'ποῖον δὲ στόμα τοιοῦτο γέγονεν, ἢ γένοιτ' ἂν ἥδιον δι' οὗ γε δὴ τοιαῦτα μέλη γε καὶ ἔπη διαπορεύεται;' (Δι.) ὁμοιος οὗτος, καθάπερ εἰρηκας δαιμονίως ἐν τῷ . . . ακοτι πρὸς τὸν ποιητήν.

So Dr. Hunt, who translates 'what mouth has there been such or could be sweeter than that from which proceed songs and words like his. (Di) He resembled the man who . . . to the poet, as you have admirably said in . . .' Read however τοιοῦτου, governed by ἥδιον and explained, as it so often is, by the relative pronoun, δι' οὗ. The comma should therefore follow ἥδιον, not γέγονεν. I think the meaning of the rest is also missed. In *εντῶι* the *ω* and *ι* are by no means certain (Dr. Hunt tells me), and I therefore suggest ὁμοιος οὗτος, καθάπερ εἰρηκας, δαιμονίως ἐντεθουσιακότι πρὸς τὸν ποιητήν. οὗτος is the man from whom ποῖον δὲ κ.τ.λ. is quoted. Dr. Hunt (without committing himself to my suggestion) thinks there is room for the letters of ἐντεθουσιακότι. ὁμοιος=ἔοικε with dative, *seems to be*; cf. Plutarch, *Mor.* 376B.

For πρὸς we should rather expect περί.

I append a few other notes.

Fr. 38. II. 8 (quotation)

ὄτῳ πάρεστιν τὸ πονεῖν τό τ' ἀγαθὸν κεκλήσθαι φίλος ὧν ἐμὸς λεγέσθω. 'Let the man who works and who is known to be the friend of the good be called my friend' (Hunt). I think ἀγαθὸν is partitive, a *good man*. φίλος ὧν=φίλος εἶναι, like *Philebus* 22 Ε μετόν . . . λέγοιτο, *Soph. El.* 676 θανόντ' Ὀρέστην νῦν τε καὶ πάλαι λέγω, etc.

Ib. IV. 33 αὐτόν seems to be Socrates, not Euripides.

Fr. 39. VI. 15 After πατρί put a comma only. What precedes is what φαίη ἂν τις.

Ib. VII. 17 τὰ συνέχοντα τὴν νέαν κωμῳδίαν are the things, not which 'comprise,' but which make up the New Comedy, its chief elements.

Ib. IX. 15 ἀπλῶς with ἅπαν, not with the participles.

Ib. XIX. 8 Μακεδόνων . . . ὕστερον ᾗσθοντο, learned, not later from the Macedonians, but later than they.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

PASSING UNDER THE YOKE.

In ancient Italy, when an army surrendered in the field, there were three alternatives before the victors for dealing with the vanquished. First, they might put them to death; there was nothing to prevent this but the feeling and tradition among Italian peoples in historical times against unnecessary bloodshed.¹ (See Livy ix. 3, both for the legality of the practice and the feeling against it). Secondly, they might keep them as prisoners of war, and sell them as slaves; but in early times this was practically out of the question, partly owing to the difficulty of feeding and guarding them before they were sold, and partly because the machinery of sale had not then been invented—there were neither slave agents at hand, nor slave-markets in the cities. Thirdly, they might let their captives go free,

with or without imposing conditions on them to be ratified by their State. This was really the simplest and easiest plan, and was adopted in the few cases recorded by Livy in which whole armies were captured (*i.e.* in iii. 28, ix. 6, and x. 36). But before the vanquished were dismissed, they were made to go through the ceremony of passing under the yoke (*sub iugum missi*), which Livy, when he first mentions it (iii. 28, Roman victory over Aequi), explains as a kind of dramatised form of degradation. Two spears were fixed upright in the ground, and a third was fastened horizontally by each end to the tops of them; under this extemporised arch the conquered army had to pass, disarmed, and apparently wearing nothing but an under-garment (*tunica*), or the older *subligaculum*, the dress rather of slaves than of soldiers or citizens. Livy's language is explicit: 'ut exprimaturs confessio subactam

¹ See, *e.g.*, Phillipson, *International Custom of Ancient Greece and Rome*, vol. ii. p. 253 ff.

domitamque esse gentem.' It is possible of course that this is the true explanation, and in any case it is likely that in historical times this was the commonly received view. But there is some reason to believe that the passage under the yoke originally had another object and meaning. In the second edition of his *Golden Bough*, vol. iii. p. 406, Dr. Frazer, after collecting a number of practices in which human beings or animals are passed through a space limited in some way on either side, suggests in a footnote that the passage under the yoke may have been 'a purificatory ceremony, designed to strip the foe of his malignant and hostile powers before dismissing him to his home.' The reader who wishes to grasp the full force of this suggestion should study the examples given in the eight or ten pages preceding this footnote. It is however desirable to find, if possible, analogous usages on Italian or Roman soil before finally accepting Dr. Frazer's suggestion.

This, I think, is not impossible. There were two objects in Rome itself which may be compared with the *iugum*: 1, the *tigillum sororium*, as it was called, and 2, the *porta triumphalis*.

On the steep slope of the Carinae, just above the hollow where the Coliseum now stands,¹ there was a small street called the *vicus Cuprius*: and where it was crossed by another (*ad compitum Acili*), a beam (*tigillum*) stretched from one side of the street to the other, called the *tigillum sororium*. Festus, p. 297, tells us that this had originally rested upon two other beams, like the spear under which the captured army passed; and that it was set up in this manner by the father of Horatius, who in the legend had murdered his sister, after his acquittal by the people, and after certain sacrifices to Janus Curvatus and Juno Sororia, whose altars remained there to the latest age of Roman history.² But what was the

object of this beam? Livy, Festus, and Dionysius all agree that Horatius was made to pass under it, *velut sub iugum missus*, as an *expiatio* for the crime he had committed. His acquittal by the people was not enough; he was not, by that method of procedure, 'liberatus omni noxia sceleris' (Festus). Something had yet to be done in order to make him fit to mingle with his fellow-citizens, and what was done was of a religious character. He is represented as having his head covered, which is a sure sign of this, even if we cannot trust the tradition about the two altars below the beam. He passed under the beam, *velut sub iugum missus*, and was then clear of all *scelus*, with the approval of the augurs.

I have used the Latin word *scelus*, not wishing to commit myself to the notion that the thing thus got rid of was *moral* guilt; had it been that, our modern minds would naturally suppose that it was wiped away by the acquittal. Far from it; the sister's blood had been shed, and no lay court could possibly get rid of that stain. Horatius was undoubtedly *sacer*, i.e. taboo, in an infectious condition, dangerous to society.³ But in this peculiar form of passage under an arch or *iugum*, the religious authorities were able to apply a method of disinfection, which in the language of a later age is naturally spoken of as *expiatio* or purification.

The second object in Rome which may be compared to the *iugum* was the *porta triumphalis*. A victorious army, before entering the city, had to pass under a gateway or arch which was called by this name. Its exact position we do not know for certain, but it is quite clear from a passage in Josephus (*Bell. Iud.* 7. 5. 4.) that it was in the Campus Martius, i.e. that it was an archway standing by itself outside the

¹ The best account of the position is in Hülsen-Jordan, *Röm. Topographie*, I. iii. 322 ff.; where also the texts relating to the *tigillum* are quoted in full (Liv. i. 26; Festus, p. 297; and Dionys. III. 22. 7).

² *Auct. de viris illustribus*, iii. 4. It is singular that the *tigillum* itself seems to have been

the object of worship: the *Fasti Arvales* have a note on Oct. 1, 'tigillo sororio ad compitum Acili.' Henzen, *Acta Frat. Arv.*, p. ccxxxviii. Pais, *Storia di Roma*, i. 298-9, gets out of his depth in speculating on these worships and their connexion with the gens Horatia. My own opinion on these puzzling points is expressed in my *Roman Festivals*, p. 237 ff.

³ See the *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. i., p. 58 ff., and my *Religious Experience of the Roman People*, p. 28.

walls, and it is probable that it was close to the famous ara Martis, but separated from it by the stream called Petronia amnis, which had a religious importance of its own.¹ We may suppose that in ancient times the army was lustrated *in campo*, near the ara Martis, and that it then crossed the sacred stream and passed under the *porta triumphalis*. What this was like we do not know; neither description nor representation of it survives. But I may conjecture that it was not wholly unlike the oldest triumphal arch surviving, that of Augustus at Rimini (Ariminum). There can hardly be a doubt that when triumphal arches were first introduced as ornamental memorials of some achievement, they took the form of the old *porta triumphalis* familiar to Roman soldiers, and that a more elaborate style of ornamentation was only gradually developed. Now if we look at the arch at Ariminum (of which there is a cut handy in the *Dictionary of Antiquities*, s.v. *arcus triumphalis*), we shall notice that the most striking part of the arch consists of two upright Corinthian pillars with an architrave laid across them: within this is an arch proper built on the usual plan.² I hope I am not too fanciful in suggesting that we have here a reminiscence of the *tigillum* resting on two upright *tigilla*, and of the two spears of the *iugum* supporting a third spear. This was in fact almost the very oldest form of gateway, as one sees in the Lion gate at Mycenae, and thus a course of development can be traced from two upright beams or stones, with a third laid across them, to the most elaborately decorated archways of the Roman emperors.

Now is there any common idea in the use of these three arches (or whatever we choose to call them)—the *iugum*, the *tigillum*, and the *porta triumphalis*?

¹ See Hülsen-Jordan, *op. cit.*, I. iii. 494 and *reft.*; also Domaszewski, *Abhandlungen zur Röm. Religion*, p. 222 ff.

² *I.e.*, my idea is that the Greek ornamentation, as it is usually called, the pillars and architrave, were really an ornamented form of the old wooden gate or arch. This is seen well in the old Roman gate of Thessalonica, figured in Schreiber, *Atlas of Classical Antiquities*, Pl. 50. See *Companion to Latin Studies*, p. 522.

Let us compare the objects in the three cases, so far as they can be made out.

The object is clearest in the case of Horatius. He had to be cleansed from something dangerous and infectious, and the consummation of this cleansing is signified by his passage under an object which formed a limit between the region of the *sacrum* and that of the *profanum*: he could not mingle with his fellow-citizens if he were *sacer*, but the sacrifices and the passage under the *tigillum* effectually rid him of this burden. It was what M. van Gennep has called a 'rite de passage,' and may safely be compared with those in which a human being passes through some divided object as a cleft tree, or between two posts, in order to get rid of some disease or other trouble.³

The passage through the *porta triumphalis* may well have had the same meaning originally. The army was guilty of bloodshed, like Horatius, and had been moving about in places where there were strange beings, human and spiritual, with whom it would be unsafe to come in contact—unsafe not only for the soldiers themselves, but for the citizens to whom they might communicate the infection on their return. Even if we cannot exactly say that the returning host was *sacer*, we know that it needed *lustratio*, and that it underwent this process immediately before passing through the *porta*: which was exactly what happened to Horatius, according to the story.

Lastly, let us return to the *iugum* of the three spears. I think we are now justified in assuming that there was a religious or magical element in this degrading ceremony:⁴ apart from the

³ See Van Gennep, *Rites de Passage*, chap. ii. p. 19 ff.; Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 2nd edition, vol. iii. p. 400 ff. The examples given on p. 401 from Kamskatka are specially interesting.

⁴ This was originally suggested by Roscher in article 'Ianus' in his *Mythological Lexicon* (vol. ii. p. 21) with reference to the *tigillum sororium*. He quoted Grimm for a case of squeezing oneself through a split tree to get rid of some disease. This is practically the same kind of explanation as Dr. Frazer has applied to the passage under the yoke. I may just add that in my own village of Kingham I have known an intelligent man carry his child

'rites de passage' collected by Dr. Frazer, the *tigillum sororium* strongly suggests it, and plainly reminded the Romans, as we saw, of the *iugum*. And the passage through the *porta triumphalis*, though it is the passage of a victorious and not a surrendered army, had beyond doubt a religious or magical meaning, which should suggest an analogous one in the case of the *iugum*. Still there is a difficulty. What can have been the object of subjecting the captives to the same kind of ceremony as the murderer, or the victorious host? Dr. Frazer thinks that it was to deprive them 'of their malignant and hostile

powers' before sending them home. I do not see that we can find a better explanation, though I might put it somewhat differently. They had to be brought out of one status into another; they must not be any longer the same beings they were before the *deditio*; just as in historical times the *dediticius* passed out of his former status into a new one, and became absorbed in the body politic of the conqueror, to be henceforward harmless. But it is hard to express the conception lying at the root of these practices, however strongly we may be convinced that we feel or understand it. I will leave it to experts in primitive culture.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

Kingham, Chipping Norton, Oxon.

seven times across a bridge to get rid of the whooping-cough—which is probably a reminiscence of the same notion.

NOTES

EURIPIDES, *HECUBA*, ll. 898-901.

ΑΓ. ἔσται τάδ' οὕτω· καὶ γὰρ εἰ μὲν ἦν
στρατῶ
πλοῦς, οὐκ ἂν εἶχον τήνδε σοι δοῦναι
χάριν·
νῦν δ', οὐ γὰρ ἔησ' οὐρίας πνοᾶς θεός,
μένειν ἀνάγκη πλοῦν ὀρώντας ἥσυχον.

THIS passage, taken in conjunction with what has gone before in the play, affords, I think, a very good illustration and, as far as it goes, a confirmation of the late Dr. Verrall's well-known theory of the critical and satirical purpose underlying much of Euripides' treatment of the Greek legends in their religious and moral aspects. The sacrifice of Polyxena has been demanded by the shade of Achilles, who is detaining the Greek fleet on its way back from Troy at the Thracian Chersonese, and performed by his son, praying that Achilles may come to drink 'a maiden's dark pure blood' and grant the Greeks favourable winds. To the human and pathetic side of the situation and to the dignity and courage of the virgin-martyr Euripides does full justice, as is his wont, in his exquisite treatment. Then later, when Hecuba is begging Agamemnon to help her in exacting

vengeance for the murder of Polydorus, comes this disconcerting remark of the King's, put in quietly and unobtrusively, just as suits the conditions postulated by Dr. Verrall's theory. After all the horror perpetrated and witnessed by the Greeks they are just as much dependent as ever, it seems, on the vagaries of the weather!

W. J. GOODRICH.

Bradford Grammar School.

A GREEK PROVERB.

LIDDELL and Scott, *s.v.* ὄρισμα, say 'Proverb. Μυσῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν ὀρίσματα, of disputed points, Plut. 2. 122 C.' A reference, however, to the passage shows that this is not so. An indignant physician is there represented as approaching a couple of philosophers, βοῶν ἔτι πρόσωθεν οὐ μικρὸν οὐδ' ἐπιεικὲς ἔργον ἡμῖν σύγχυσιν ὄρων τετολμήσθαι, διαλεχθεῖσι περὶ διαίτης ὑγιεινῆς. 'Χαρίς' γὰρ ἔφη τὰ φιλοσόφων καὶ ἱατρῶν ὥσπερ τινῶν 'Μυσῶν καὶ Φρυγῶν ὀρίσματα,' κ.τ.λ. Here the meaning is obviously that the doctor and the philosopher have different provinces and jurisdictions, and that neither should trespass upon those of the other. On the other hand,