Latin literature and Greece

'In elegy too we challenge the Greeks': Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, *10. 1. 93. The dictum seems to epitomize a familiar way of looking at Latin literature. Greeks came first; the task of Roman writers was to emulate them; our task is to read Latin literature in terms of its Greek traditions. Yet how inevitable or appropriate are such formulations, natural as they may seem to Hellenists? The editors invited some eminent Latinists to give their views.*

CHARLES MARTINDALE

Perhaps the most crucial stage of my own intellectual formation took place in a university profoundly committed to interdisciplinarity and one in which the study of Classics was conducted in the context of larger configurations of European culture. Accordingly I was surprised, when I finally joined a more orthodox classical department, to find sovereign there a curiously pure version of English Romantic Hellenism. The Hellenic world was the Edenic site of origins, the realm of the authentic and the organic, whereas Rome was hybrid, derivative, second-hand and second-rate, the occluding shadow to what a distinguished colleague once referred to, revealingly, as 'the pure light of Greece' (this view was in fact shared by most of those who taught Latin at that time). It was also noticeable that whereas the Latinists concerned themselves with the whole of classical antiquity, the Hellenists were largely uninterested in anything much beyond the fourth century BC. Somewhere deeply internalized in many Hellenists seems to be an aestheticized and secularized version of the myth of the Fall, along with an emotional commitment to a transhistorical Greekness encounterable as much among the goats and peasants of the contemporary Peloponnese as in ancient texts (a commitment that quite ignores the substantial historical ruptures between Greece then and now). The belief in a prelapsarian world of civic community helps to explain the obsession with the supposed transition from orality to literacy. In truth a purely oral world is by definition inaccessible to us, while in all of antiquity, if in changing combination, the oral and the literate coexist. There are thus no grounds for sharp distinctions between, say, primary Greek lyric embedded in the immediacies of actual social life and the secondary, purely 'literary'

DIALOGOS | Hellenic Studies Review | Number 5 (1998)
Latin literature and Greece | pp. 139-149

lyric of the Roman poet Horace.

'Greece', I would argue, is a series of construals, and among the first construers of course were the Romans; indeed we may say that the idea of Greece as the origin of Western civilization is largely the invention of Rome. Although most Hellenists are ostensibly historicists, they are in practice reluctant to historicize their discipline, with its own historically conditioned assumptions and modes of enquiry; if they did, they might admit that to find Greece may mean taking the road to Rome (after all the Romans, a practical people, are conceded to have been prime road-builders). Modern versions of Hellenism might be traced back to Winckelmann, in whose work an idealized Greece is constructed within a wider context of 'Greco-Roman civilization'; by contrast, Greece could be reconfigured for example as 'Eastern' as much as 'Western' (Martin West makes some suggestive moves of this kind in connection with Hesiod). Whatever one thinks of his detailed arguments, Martin Bernal is surely right to alert us to the insufficiently acknowledged ideological infrastructure of the modern discipline of Classics (in the nineteenth century the Hellenic was construed in opposition not only to the Roman but to the Hebraic, in what Herder, with a twist of anti-semitism characteristic of himself and his age, called 'the quarrel that Judaic spiritualism carried on against the Hellenic splendour of life'). Moreover, within Classics before the second half of the eighteenth century, Greece was very much the inferior partner. For much of the Middle Ages knowledge of Greek was largely lost and 'Greece' known only from within Latin texts; nor did the Renaissance bring a widespread recovery of Greek, as is often erroneously supposed. Elizabethan schoolboys spent most of their time reading and writing Latin, learning only a little Greek, mainly in order to read the New Testament. Modern scholars, supposing that the discourses within which they work alone can deliver valid 'findings', frequently argue that Latin literature can only be properly understood in relation to its Greek 'sources'. Yet did not the Greekless Dante effect one of the two or three most powerful readings of Virgil – what Harold Bloom would call a 'strong misreading' – in the *Divine Comedy*, his narrative revision of the *Aeneid*? The scholarly concern with source criticism – however illuminating within its own discourse – is bound up with the whole ideology and power-structure of Classics as an institution.

Classicists normally engage in what might be termed a species of 'forwards reading'; that is, their concern is with Homer's 'influence' on Virgil, not with how Virgil has changed the way Homer has been read. By contrast, for T. S. Eliot the

canon of great authors constitutes a system, at once temporal and timeless, in which 'the introduction of the really new work of art' means that 'the relations, proportions, values of each work of art toward the whole are re-adjusted'; the past is 'altered by the present as much as the present is directed by the past' ('Tradition and the Individual Talent'). The commonsense distinction between originary meaning and subsequent tradition and reception rests, I have argued in *Redeeming the Text*, on an epistemology and a theory of reading that are highly questionable. The meaning of texts is inseparable from what readers and reading communities have made of them, and in this way reception becomes not an optional extra but hermeneutically indispensable. Thus we need to learn to read 'backwards' as much as forwards, indeed to recognize that any act of historical interpretation involves a simultaneous double reading of the past backwards and forwards at the same time (though one element of this double movement will normally be occluded). For us, then, there cannot be any 'Greece' which does not contain the textual traces of 'Rome'.

Excudent alii . . . The agon in which the above has been an intervention could be characterized as a critical replication of the self-characterizations of the ancient Greeks and Romans themselves: the Greeks despised *barbaroi*, and ignored Latin writings, at least until late antiquity; the Romans suffered cultural anxiety in relation to Greece, while asserting their superiority in specific areas. In a heterogeneous postmodern world operating a new *imperium* under the signs of hybridity and difference, I would seek to align my voice with that of Anchises: *tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento.*

R.O.A.M. LYNE

'In elegy too we challenge the Greeks.' The questions raised by Quintilian's claim may be illustrated with reference to the love elegy of Propertius. Certainly Propertius has Greek influences, but his character and milieu are primarily Latin. It distorts him to read him as a continuation of Greek literature.

I summarize some salient Propertian features. Greek mythical figures are repeatedly cited as desired ideals of love and the beloved, but these ideals are usually doomed to disappointment (1.3.1ff., 1.15.9ff. etc.). The poet-lover lives in servile subjection to his girl (1.1, 1.4 etc.). He follows a despicably unambitious

life (1.1, 1.6 etc.). But the mistress who dominates this life is divine in aura (2.2.6 ff. etc.); she is the source and inspiration of the poetry, indeed the poet's Muse (2.1 etc.). And witness above all the obsessional connection Propertius sees between love and death. Catullus' dream of love for life (5, 109) is morbidly adjusted: love until death, indeed death for love (1.6.25-30, 2.1.47 *laus in amore mori*, 'to die in love is glory', etc.). May love even survive death? Mutely denied by Catullus (the motif is conspicuous by its absence from his version of Protesilaus in 68b), this possibility is tensely mooted in 1.19 (also involving Protesilaus), and raised with some wit in 2.15 and 2.27. And bound up with these thoughts is the notion of a kind of sex-death, sex in death (2.26b.43, 57-8), a 'romantic agony' upon which Ovid (*Amores* 2.10.35-8) will disrespectfully capitalize.[1]

Plato (for example) had drawn attention to the servility of the lover;[2] Cynthia as Propertius' Muse – not Calliope (2.1.3-4) – turns round Callimachus to whom Calliope had, along with the other Muses, told the *Aetia*, fr. 7.22; *Liebestod* has precedents in Sophocles' Haemon, Euripides' Alcestis and others;[3] and perhaps other poets before Catullus 68b (a vital source for Propertius' mythical comparisons) had explored personal love through myth.[4] But such part-parallels and possible parallels in theme and method with the Greeks merely enhance our appreciation of Propertius' startling idiosyncrasy.

Propertius is more aware of, and more competitive with, his Latin predecessors and rivals than with the Greeks. Just as 1.19 is in dispute with Catullus 68b, so there are rivalries over the respective gorgeous women. Cynthia tops the beloveds of Calvus and Catullus (2.25.3-4); Tibullus' Delia's good looks (1.5.43-6) are magnificently trumped in Propertius 2.2.5-14 and 2.3.9ff.; and Tibullus' Delia, blessed with an Apolline name and yet dreamed of as a mere rustic housewife (1.5.19-34), is surely shown up by the deservedly Apolline Cynthia, Muse and poetess (2.1, 2.3.17ff., already 1.2.27ff). Tibullus' dubious delight in spicy erotic violence by men towards women (1.10.53-66) is dismissed with magnificent aesthetic superiority by Propertius in 2.5.25ff.[5] In the last poem of Book 2, Propertius constructs a canon of love poets, but they are all Latin and he of course is the climax.

Propertius' aesthetic terms and proclamations are fresh and amusing in impact, and to an underestimated extent Latin in complexion. There are, to be sure, overlaps and comparisons with Callimachus – the Greek poet with whom modern scholars, encouraged by Propertius himself, are most inclined to associate him – but even here Latinity is his ultimate point of reference.

In 2.13.3 his epithet for his governing Muses (*gracilis*, 'thin') amusingly translates one half of Callimachus' punning Μοῦσαν . . . λεπταλέην (*Aetia* fr. 1.24), but makes little attempt to convey Callimachus' aesthetic message.[6] Meanwhile his contempt for popular judgement (2.13.13f. *populi confusa ualeto / fabula*, 'goodbye to the confused babble of the people') derives directly from Catullus (95.10) rather than Callimachus,[7] and his reliance on Cynthia as sole art-critic (2.13.14 *nam domina iudice tutus ero*, 'for I shall be secure in the judgement of my mistress') trumps Cornelius Gallus.[8] That same line of Catullus (95.10 *at populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho*, 'but let the people rejoice in their swollen Antimachus') is where the epithet punningly comes from in Propertius' literary pronouncement at 3.9.35f. *non ego uelifera tumidum mare findo carina: / tota sub exiguo flumine nostra mora est*, 'not in a ship with bellying sail do I cut through the swollen sea: I am wholly occupied by a tiny river' – a fine mash of imagery which has amusingly mangled origins in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* 108-12,[9] but an immediate source in Vergil's *Georgics* 2.41 and 4.117. In 2.1, Propertius exploits an epithet which has a Callimachean background (*angustus*, 'narrow', cf. *Aetia* fr. 1.27, 28), but in new and funny surroundings (Callimachus' chest and Propertius' bed, 40 and 45). Readers will find much talk of Callimachus in 3.1 and 3.3, but they should see here a Roman poet implausibly and unseriously pushing a 'Greek' identity to match and parody Horace, who had recently proclaimed himself the Roman Alcaeus. The poems are actually a fancy and funny re-presentation – aimed at Horace – of the same old Latin love poet. And in amongst the Callimachean imagery the reader finds not only jokes (like a triumph turning into a race that is impracticable because the road is Callimachus' narrow one, 3.1.10ff.), but motifs that are Roman post-Callimacheans' rather than genuine Callimachean originals.[10] And Propertius not only jokes with Callimachus' imagery, he jokes with the post-Callimacheans' imagery: Vergil had translated Callimachus' λεπταλέος as *deductus*, 'fine', 'fine-spun' (*Eclogues* 6.5); accordingly, we find the drunken Cynthia reading Propertius' poems *deducta uoce*, 'in a dainty voice', in 2.33.38.

Provocatively, Propertius does not talk about his literary art in his opening poem. His first description (in 1.7) employs *mollis* ('gentle, conciliatory'),[11] and this epithet holds a dominating position in his references to elegy (1.7.19, 2.1.2, 2.34.42, cf. 1.9.12 *carmina mansuetus lenia quaerit Amor*, 'gentle Love seeks soothing songs'). It is not an obvious term for a poet who will appear to align himself with Callimachus.[12] But it is a fitting epithet for a poet with the

idiosyncratically *faux-naïf* message that the or a main function of love-elegy is to persuade the beloved.[13]

In short this is a poet who is rarely far from wit, especially when he is talking about literature, whose erotic self-presentation is individual in character and method, and whose literary relationships and rivalries are more with his Roman predecessors and contemporaries than with any Greek poets. Latin Elegy has its own ambience: Quintilian missed the point.

ALESSANDRO SCHIESARO

1 The myth of origins has a distinctive, irresistible appeal about it. As students of (classical) literature we more or less take for granted that our first and often foremost duty is painstakingly to chart the 'background' of the text at hand, and assess 'intentions' and originality of the text (no inverted commas here) against that background. I am not at all sure that the substantial revision of the hermeneutic procedure which classical studies have witnessed in the past two or three decades has in any fundamental way eroded the power of this myth. We may have revised our lexicon and our tools, but we are as beholden to 'what lies before' the text as our distinguished historicist predecessors. Not unlike them, we tend to believe that a rigorous amount of *Forschung* will hopefully lead us to the fated *Quellen* where Meaning and Truth are revealed.

There is nothing intrinsically misguided about this hermeneutic protocol, provided, at least, that we are aware of its implications. Within it we are encouraged to interpret Latin texts with constant reference to their Greek models, whether ignored or revered. The relationship between Latin and Greek literature could indeed be rewritten in the language of family relationship, of unabated Oedipal tension, of a burning desire to kill the father coupled with a deep-seated unwillingness to proceed with such an act. It is in the Otherworld of Greece that we find the *primum mobile*: as commentary after commentary refers back to ever more ancient works, we finally approach the fathers of all sources, Homer and Hesiod, talking – literally – only to each other. (*Loci paralleli* are anything but parallel: they relate to one another in the rigid hierarchical order of items in a stemma.) The critic as therapist, then. But is any other path available, if Latin literature from Plautus to Horace and from Ennius to Lucan does indeed, as so

many generations of scholarship seem to assure us, revel in its afterness, its unabashed declaration of dependence, its pride in hailing the experience of 'beginning' as a 're-beginning'?

2 David Lodge tells the amusing tale of a young scholar snubbed by the lit-crit jet-set for his uninspired intention to study Shakespeare's influence on Eliot, but promptly hailed as the hot new thing as soon as he half-jokingly admits to be working on (of course) Eliot's influence on Shakespeare. We may wonder whether in the past thirty years, as we progressively asserted the assiduous dependence of the major Augustan poets on Callimachean poetics, we haven't also shaped a Callimachean *ars poetica* more stringent and orthodox than the original. The Roman Callimacheanism which has emerged extols the virtues of levity and grace, of private poetry as opposed to imperial eulogy, and appears to be a very poor medium indeed for panegyric and propaganda.

Kallimachos in Rom, Walter Wimmel's ponderous, if closely focused, book was published in 1960;[1] four years later, in a slender article with a programmatic title –'Callimachus and Latin poetry'[2]– Wendell Clausen neatly defined the new agenda and the new canon which it inspired. Clausen's Callimachus is a powerful and appealing character, the master of sophisticated and elegant verse against the rude excesses of some of his contemporaries. First and foremost, he is 'a scholar, a *grammatikós*, a man whose business was literature'; he laboured in the great wonder of the Alexandrian library, where men 'came to know the exquisite delight of writing books about books', as theirs was 'a bibliothecal poetry, poetry about poetry, self-conscious and hermetic'.[3] Similarly, Parthenius, whose demiurgic role Clausen greatly exalts, was nothing short of a 'Greek professor', probably 'a forceful and persuasive teacher: he won his freedom *dià paídeusin*'[4] in the 'vast stagnant peace' of the empire, working 'in a suburb of Alexandria'.[5] Callimachus becomes the paramount model for a professional and professorial engagement with poetry, a poetry which eschews bombast as much as it abhors violence and mistrusts power. It is the leisured, opaque and elegant pursuit of men wearied by war and concerned above all that it be not repeated ever again in their lifetime. If the *Eclogues* are 'one of the few perfect books' in as much as they trade the demands of martial epic, of the 'violence and disorder of civil strife', 'the infinite sadness of exile',[6] for the escapist solace of the countryside, a poem like the *Aeneid* can be appreciated only if it is shown to contain, barely disguised under its epic surface, a similar vein of wistful sadness and pained scepticism.

3 Clausen's Callimachean manifesto establishes a powerful web of influential associations. It implies, first of all, an idiosyncratic image of the critic and his tasks, in that it testifies to a suggestive identification of the critic with the poet he studies. If Callimachus' refined poetry is akin to the scholarly work of modern professors, then the paradise lost of the Alexandrian library, the domain of refined *grammatikoi*, can fittingly stand for the ivory icon of an exclusive and exclusionary form of *Hauptphilologie*.

Secondly, the hyperbolic promotion of Callimacheanism to a privileged touchstone for assessing the virtues and vices of classical Latin poetry precipitates the formation of an intransigent canon whose most stunning casualty is Lucretius' *De rerum natura*, hastily banned – in effect – from the mainstream of first-century poetry. The 'umbratile'[7] and learned poets in the Callimachean mould confined themselves to composing an erudite, if superficial, didactic poetry whose 'aim was to shine, not to persuade'; in such poetry, inevitably, 'breathed no Lucretian fire'.[8] And with that, Lucretius disappears from Clausen's essay – and from the purview of many of his followers – as if his very 'fire' entailed a risky alternative to Callimachus' supposedly unengaged and unengaging writing. Within the narrow confines of this peculiar brand of Callimacheanism there can be no space for a poetry that is elegant, refined, self-consciously original, and *at the same time* intense and profound in its masterful application of *musaeum lepos* to *magnae res*.[9]

The most important effects of this strategy can be felt in Virgilian criticism. A plaintive, pessimistic *Aeneid* is not the invention of the post-war Harvard-Balliol critics, as they are sometimes called. Important moves in that direction surface from time to time, as each generation is called to confront one of the building blocks of western culture. A melancholy Virgil is tenderly and persuasively depicted by Chateaubriand just after the French Revolution, by Cyril Connolly in war-time London, by W.H.Auden in the Fifties. What is – I believe – new and peculiar to the Harvard-Balliol brand of 'pessimism' is that it is causally connected with Callimacheanism as an indispensable presupposition. Shortly after Wimmel's *Kallimachos,* Adam Parry, in his 'Two voices' (1963), charts the methodological approach to the *Aeneid* which also characterizes Clausen himself (1964) and Putnam (1965).[10]

The interconnectedness of 'Callimacheanism' and 'pessimism,' which is operative to a considerable degree in all of these works, is most evident in Clausen's 1964 essays – 'Callimachus and Latin poetry' and 'An interpretation

of the *Aeneid*'. The diptych may well have been written to show that 'technical and literary scholarship [are] not incompatible',[11] but they nonetheless display a very forceful political option. It is now commonplace to assume that Virgil's ostensibly laudatory purpose in the *Aeneid*, which Servius summarized with touching naïveté as 'to praise Augustus, beginning with its ancestors', must be little more than a clever disguise. The advantage is clear: while, for instance, an entire generation of young British poets writing between the wars turned away from the *Aeneid* as an imperial war song which carried unbearable echoes for the scanty survivors of an unprecedented carnage, the rider that the refined, Callimachean Virgil does not really mean what he appears to be saying has made his work read and appreciated by post-World War II Europe and the United States. In this way professional critics can also reap a handsome dividend. Not only do they succeed as the clever demiurges who hold a lamp to an immortal masterpiece only to reveal its deeper hidden colours; they are also, *eo ipso*, the privileged purveyors of humanistic values, the champions of peace against war, of truth against propaganda, of subversion against oppressive power. The oppositional critic soothingly mirrors the oppositional poet.

4 The critical metalanguage we adopt as we investigate the palimpsestic truth(s) of the text reveals, not surprisingly, the persistent influence of a hermeneutic procedure heavily implicated in the detective-mode. What lies 'before' the text is naturally intertwined with what is 'beneath' it. We even meet references to the poet's 'alibi', to disguise and deception, to imaginative subtexts that conceal dangerous truths from the ears of vengeful tyrants but can now be gleaned by astute readers. Perhaps we are collectively, if unacknowledgedly, beholden to a concealed Freudian(ish) hermeneutic, which strives to retain the inductive objectivity of its powerful 'scientific' ancestors (our *Quellenforscher*) but puts it to use in the search for less material truths. Symptoms are but obscure disguises of inner truths which the analyst can piece together from seemingly incoherent sets of unrelated data. There is no doubt, in traditional Freudian epistemology, that the 'cause' before and behind the verbal and behavioural text is the truth we are looking for. Looking back at the progenitors of the poetry we study affords a more profound critical vista, and in all likelihood a 'subversive' one.

What is less obvious, we convince ourselves, must contain a higher percentage of truth, a lower dose of dissimulation. The contrast between what the text proclaims and what it obliquely suggests has thus become the prevalent hermeneutic

procedure of much recent criticism in the field of Latin. Again, one is left to wonder whether we really haven't gone too far. Neronian culture has now been systematically rewritten as a tale of oppression and resistance to a Stalinist tyrant, and, perhaps more unexpectedly, Ovid's exile invective has invited sustained comparison with Dostoevsky's *Notes from the Underworld.*[12] It may be that here we are inheritors of a Romantic notion (Byron fighting on the Acropolis), or a bohemian view of the poet as *maudit*, or an implicit acceptance of a Marxist or Gramscian position. What is important to recognize, in any event, is that the enduring appeal of the *Quellenforschung* protocol is inextricably linked to the same passion for hidden, oppositional meanings. Thus a glorious monument to Callimachus can also stand for a celebration of the critics' courage and ingenuity, as the comfortingly familiar tale of Greek origins takes on a comforting hermeneutic guise.

NOTES TO LYNE

1 Much excellent material on love and death in Propertius is to be found in T.D Papanghelis' *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death* (Cambridge 1987).

2 Plato *Symposium* 183A; cf. further R.O.A.M. Lyne, '*Seruitium amoris*', *CQ* 29 (1979) 118-20.

3 It surfaces interestingly in Greek mime: cf. P. Oxy 413 (III,41), 'Kill them out of sight of each other lest filled with the sight of one another they die with pleasure.'

4 Cf. F.Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge 1979), ch. 9, on 'The origins of Latin love-elegy'. Of great interest too is P. Oxy. 3723 (LIV, 58-64). But I remain sceptical that anything like the use of myth made by Catullus in 68 was made before him.

5 F. Solmsen, 'Propertius in his literary relations with Tibullus and Vergil', *Philologus* 105 (1961), 273ff. = *Kleine Schriften* II. 299ff. Note that, following Catullus (83, 92), Propertius (3.8) likes Cynthia to show fury and violence to him.

6 Perhaps the only clear sign of *gracilitas* being used in a stylistic context before Propertius is the image at Cic. *Brut.* 64, though Gellius 6.14.6 (cf. 2, where *gracilis* in fact translates ἰσχνός) virtually ensures that Varro used it; cf. *TLL* VI.2132.26ff. But Callimachus pregnantly gets an aesthetic message across. He plays between the Muse with a capital M, who must be kept on a reduced diet and muse = poetry. λεπταλέος, λεπτός, means 'thin', but is also used of finely woven material; and given the stock metaphor in Greek of 'weaving' literature, it thus punningly conveys the high quality style that Callimachus seeks in his small-scale, 'slim' poetry.

7 *Aetia*. 1.25ff, *Epigram* 28 Pf. = *AP* 12.43.

8 For Gallus' text see E.Courtney *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford 1993) 263-8 (fr. 2). Gallus had seen his mistress's approval as important (fr. 2.7 *quae possem domina deicere digna mea*), but Viscus was a crucial critic, *iudex*, as was, perhaps, Valerius Cato: 2.8f. *non ego, Visce,/... Kato, iudice te uereor.* Valerius Cato may be being addressed as a critic in the vocative along with Viscus (R.G.M. Nisbet in 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr Ibrim', by R.D. Anderson, P.J. Parsons and R.G.M. Nisbet, *Journal of Roman Studies* 69 [1979] 143-7), or *Kato* may be the nominative subject of a relative clause (? *quae canit, ulla, Kato*, Courtney *ad loc.*), and he may be being cited *qua* poet. Propertius 2.13.14, *nam domina iudice tutus ero,* gives exclusive focus on the *domina*, goal of the poetry (2.13.7 ff.) *and* wittily chosen critic.

9 Cf. 3.3.15, a mixture of inspirational spring imagery (probably employed in Callimachus' 'Dream' preface) and the river imagery of *h.Apollo* 108-9.
10 E.g. Catullus' *pumice* (3.1.8, Cat. 1.1) and Vergil's *pagina* (3.1.18, Verg. *Ecl.* 6.12).
11 *OLD*, s.v. 11.
12 Note esp. 3.1 and 3.3. The most important Greek precedent for *mollis* is Hermesianax fr. 7.36 Powell.
13 Note esp. 1.7-9, 3.2, 3.23. Cf. W. Stroh, *Die römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung* (Amsterdam 1971), esp. 19.

NOTES TO SCHIESARO

1 Hermes Einzelschriften 16, Wiesbaden.
2 *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 5 (1964) 181-96.
3 Preceding quotes from Clausen,'Callimachus', 183.
4 Clausen, 'Callimachus', 192.
5 Clausen, 'Callimachus', 185.
6 Clausen, 'Callimachus', 193.
7 Clausen, 'Callimachus', 183.
8 Clausen, 'Callimachus', 194.
9 Lucr.1.931 and 934 respectively (=4.6 and 4.9). Rescue will come from another Cambridge: cf. E.J. Kenney, 'Doctus Lucretius', *Mnemosyne* 23 (1970) 366-92, who acknowledges the important, if generally unheeded, earlier contribution by L. Ferrero, *Poetica nuova in Lucrezio* (Florence) 1949.
10 A. Parry, 'The two voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*,', *Arion* 2 (1963) 66-80; W.V. Clausen, 'An interpretation of the *Aeneid*', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68 (1964) 139-147; M.C.J. Putnam, *The Poetry of the Aeneid* (Cambridge, Mass. 1965).
11 W.V. Clausen, 'Appendix,' in N. Horsfall (ed.),*A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (Leiden 1995) 313-4.
12 On Nero: V. Rudich, *Political Dissidence Under Nero. The Price of Dissimulation* (London 1993) and *Dissidence and Literature under Nero. The Price of Rhetoricization* (London 1997). On Ovid: G. Williams, *The Curse of Exile: A Study of Ovid's Ibis* (Cambridge 1996) 65-9.