REVIEW ARTICLE

The Beginnings of a Literature in Latin

DENIS FEENEY

W. SUERBAUM (ED.), *HANDBUCH DER LATEINISCHEN LITERATUR DER ANTIKE. ERSTER BAND: DIE ARCHAISCHE LITERATUR. VON DEN ANFÄNGEN BIS ZU SULLAS TOD. DIE VORLITERARISCHE PERIODE UND DIE ZEIT VON 240 BIS 78 V. CHR.* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft VIII.1.) Munich: Beck, 2002. Pp. xlviii + 611. ISBN 3–406–48134–5. €118.00.

I THE DILEMMAS OF LITERARY HISTORY

As part of the ongoing renewal of the *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, the old five volumes of Band VIII, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, known to all its users as 'Schanz-Hosius', are being replaced in eight volumes, in a plan conceived by Reinhart Herzog and Peter Lebrecht Schmidt.[1] The fifth volume in chronological order, edited by Herzog and covering 284–374 C.E., was published in 1989; the fourth, edited by Klaus Sallmann and covering 117–283 C.E., came out in 1997. In 2002 appeared the first volume in chronological order, under the editorship of Werner Suerbaum. The volume is a massive document of collaborative learning, and its utility to students of Latin literature is going to be very great for the foreseeable future. We shall all be plundering its great stores of testimonia and bibliography, and turning to it as a first resource when dealing with any of the authors or texts it covers; many a dissertation will be floated on the waves of bibliography between its covers. Since much of my discussion will be in disagreement, it is important to stress at the outset that I have nothing but admiration and gratitude for the enterprise as a whole. Suerbaum and his team have merited well of Latin studies: they have succeeded magnificently in their primary objective of selflessly providing their colleagues and successors with the material with which to work on this period.

Sadly, the volume was dogged and delayed by misfortune. Three crosses mark the list of eight contributors on the title page, and the editor speaks in his Preface of the many other obstacles the team had to overcome, with work being lost on the underground and in a crashed computer (xxi). The contingency of events has marked the volume in other respects as well. The period and the issues which it covers are far more topical in contemporary scholarship than S. could have imagined when he first took the work in hand in the mid-1980s. Old theses are being burnished and new ones are being freshly minted, as scholars return to the problems surrounding the emergence of a literature in Latin with an intensity that no one could readily have predicted twenty years ago. The volume under review provides an opportunity to take stock of the debate, for it not only supplies a mass of documentation but has its own line to take into the bargain. This is really S.'s book, not just in terms of the bulk of the coverage, but in the conception of the issues as well; he has

---

[1] I gladly thank those who have given me help and criticism, usually in response to public lectures on the invention of Roman literature: Alessandro Barchiesi, Emma Dench, Harriet Flower, Karl Galinsky, Dayton Haskin, Terry McKiernan, Brendon Reay, Katharina Volk, Stephen White, Peter Wiseman, James Zetzel, and the Old Dominion Fellows at Princeton. Special thanks to Nicholas Horsfall, Robert Kaster, Joshua Katz, and Christopher Smith for reading drafts. I warmly recommend the important review of this volume by Ingo Gildenhard (*BMCR* 2003.09.39), and am in full agreement with him on the substantive points at issue.

JRS 95 (2005), pp. 226–240. © *World Copyright Reserved.*
Exclusive Licence to Publish: The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies 2005

responded quickly to the movements of opinion, and his contributions cumulatively add up to a strong position on the most controversial questions under debate. The *Handbuch* may not become orthodoxy, but it is worth pointing out what the consequences would be if it did.

Before investigating these old and new controversies, we should consider the status of the volume as a contribution to literary history. S. announces in the Preface (xvii), 'Dies sind *commentarii*, keine *historia*: dies ist ein "Handbuch", keine Geschichte "der lateinischen Literatur der Antike".'[2] It is hard to gauge the degree of irony in this pronouncement that the volume is a handbook and not a history, for he follows up with Cicero's dictum on how Caesar wanted to provide the material for others to work up into history (*Brut.* 262), and he remarks enigmatically that one knows what became of Caesar's wish ('Was aus Caesars Wunsch geworden ist,... weiß man'). Even if his protestations are straight-faced, a volume such as this cannot escape being a narrative of a kind, and, as we shall see later, there is indeed a storyline in S.'s mind. The volume will inevitably be read as a literary history, and it must be said that there is very little self-conscious reflection here on the strengths and weaknesses of the literary-historical method.[3]

The volume's very title, *Die archaische Literatur*, includes a potent adjective whose significance remains unexamined throughout. The chronological limits of the work are briefly justified in terms which leave quite unscathed very large assumptions about what this kind of periodization entails (3): the archaic period can be said to end around 80 B.C.E. (with the exception of Lucretius) because after that date *ars* becomes more important than *ingenium* and the hallmarks of the ideally unified classical work are in place. Periodizations are almost inevitably part of a teleological agenda, and the perspective here is indeed profoundly teleological, with the authors under discussion playing their helpful part in leading up to a fulfilment in the figures of Cicero and the Neoteric and Augustan poets (7). Cicero and the Neoterics and Augustans get to set the terms of debate, deciding who and what is going to count as 'archaic', and why. Indeed, one of the byproducts of the book is precisely that it illuminates just how much our whole conception of Latin literature before 45 B.C.E. is mediated to us via Cicero. The list of names in the section on oratory (459–78) is inconceivable without Cicero's *Brutus*, as S. rightly stresses (461), yet Cicero's fingerprints are on practically every page of this book: he claims the longest entry in the index (Varro is a close second, and Ennius is third). Cicero himself, however, was able to deploy a sense of historical relativism from which the contributors could have learnt, as Hinds has shown in his discussion of the perils of this kind of periodization, paying tribute to Cicero's finely calibrated treatment of Naevius' and Ennius' degrees of primitivism in *Brutus* 71–6.[4] Hinds's fundamental point, once apprehended, can never be forgotten: Ennius did not know that he was 'archaic', and Naevius was a 'new' poet in his time.[5] As we shall see, these artists were far more 'new' than they are given credit for here.

No history, literary or otherwise, can be written without decisions about contextualization: which contexts are going to be put in the foreground, which in the background, and what kinds of connections are going to be constructed between these contexts and the 'events' or 'texts' under discussion? In literary history, thanks to the ungovernable variety of possible contexts, the contexts and the connections will always be chosen or foregrounded in a process that cannot escape being arbitrary, yet we cannot write literary history without making such choices.[6] In this book we are given little contextualizing of any kind. The historical context of mid-Republican Rome is scarcely evoked (apart from controversial claims for the oral culture of the aristocracy, to which I return below), and very little reference is made to the context of third- and second-century Italy, from whose Greek, Oscan, Messapian, and Umbrian towns came the first practitioners of what we now call Latin literature.

---

[2] Typographical errors are so rare in this book that I hesitate to spot one here, but it looks as if the opening quotation mark should come before 'Geschichte', not after.

[3] The best introduction to the problems remains D. Perkins, *Is Literary History Possible?* (1992).

[4] S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (1998), 64–9; the absence of this book is rightly remarked upon by Gildenhard, op. cit. (n. 1).

[5] As Hinds puts it (55): 'archaic poets are never aware of the fact that they are archaic poets. An "archaic period" is always something invented by later poets or critics. Therefore, in studying poets commonly deemed to be "archaic" it is important not to leave that term uninterrogated.' S.'s 'Anhang', 'Zur Rezeption der archaischen römischen Literatur im Altertum' (583–8), is characteristically masterly in its command of the material and the bibliography, yet even this closing reception-orientated perspective does not elicit from him reflections on the issues discussed by Hinds.

Further, a second-order contextualization is lacking, for the testimonia which make up so much of the book are seldom contextualized in their own right. All too often the testimony of Cicero or Varro or Livy is free-floating, while their status as 'evidence' is seldom put to the question. In discussing Livy's famous excursus on the development of Roman drama (7.2.3–13), for example, S. describes Livy's failure to mention any Greek dimension as a 'zweifellos unberechtigte Ignorieren', remarks that Livy represents the process as 'italisch-autochthon', and leaves the matter there (54–5). Certainly Livy is deliberately ignoring the Greek dimension, but S. does not press the question of why; we miss an alertness to what was at stake for Livy in discussing drama, a competing art form and one which occupies a large space in his moral agenda.[7] We need always to ask why the later authors are advancing any claim at any particular point, and to consider carefully the context of their words, which can all too easily become detachable items in their own right when repeated often enough as independent testimonia. Here, as regularly, the much briefer treatment of A. S. Gratwick in the *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* is a good counter-example, more alive to the partiality of the sources and receptive to the larger contexts within which the evolution of Latin literature began.[8]

Some readers of this volume may feel that the noun in *Die archaische Literatur* needs as much scrutiny as the adjective.[9] It is regularly claimed, after all, that the term 'literature' cannot be applied without qualification to the ancient world, for many scholars see the institution we now label 'literature' as a phenomenon of the modern world — the product of specific social practices accompanying the rise of print culture, copyright, and organized curricula, together with a reification of the category of the aesthetic.[10] For my part, I think the term continues to have a heuristic value for students of Rome, where one eventually observes libraries, endowed professorships, a common educational track with a 'core' and 'periphery' of accomplishments, a career path as a writer, empire-wide circulation of texts, copying houses, and transmission of authoritative texts together with the scholarship that accompanied them.[11] Naturally, these conditions do not spring out of the earth in the middle of the third century B.C.E., and debate is possible over the stages by which such institutions were established at Rome with enough density eventually to justify our use of the term 'literature'.

It seems to me that Roman conditions were receptive to adapting to such institutions from early on. The first producers of the texts that became 'Roman literature' were constructed by Suetonius, at least, as *grammatici*, who taught Greek and Latin authors (*Gram.* 1.2). The conditions in the Greek world in which these first authors of Latin literary texts trained were conducive to self-consciousness about what was involved in codifying and organizing an institution of literature in Greek, against which it was possible to conceive of measuring a corresponding institution in Latin: Naevius was a contemporary of Eratosthenes, and a young man when Callimachus was writing his last works.[12] Certainly by the time Ennius was finishing the *Annales* Rome was already home to numbers of γραμματικοὶ καὶ σοφισταὶ καὶ ῥήτορες . . . Ἕλληνες (Plut., *Aem.* 6.5), and this became a flood after the conquest of Macedonia in 168 B.C.E. (Polyb. 31.24.6–7): Suetonius too tidily wanted to mark a definitive moment in the visit of Crates of Mallos at around this time (*Gram.* 2).[13] Accius, from the next 'poetic' generation, produced *Didascalia*, whose title alone marks a claim to a Roman theatrical tradition to be analysed and organized on the Greek model. Similar ambitions are detectable in the fragments of Porcius Licinius' and Volcacius Sedigitus' poetic versions of Roman literary history, which dealt with problems of chronology and ranked authors in order of merit.

---

[6] cf. Perkins, op. cit. (n. 3), 121–52.

[7] cf. A. Feldherr, *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History* (1998), ch. 5, esp. 178–87; S. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X. Volume 2* (1998), 54. Neither book is cited in the relevant bibliography, but even a Suerbaum, for all his intentions of documenting up to the end of 1999 (xvii) cannot be held accountable to this degree.

[8] 'The origins of Roman drama', in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature II. Latin Literature* (1982), 77–80.

[9] There is some discussion of the term 'literature' (9–10), but solely in terms of which varieties of writing are going to count as entering under the rubric.

[10] An introduction to the issues in S. Goldhill, 'Literary history without literature: Reading practices in the ancient world', *SubStance* 88 (1999), 57–89; cf. Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (1998), 90–1.

[11] 'Core' and 'periphery' are the terms preferred to 'curriculum' by Morgan, op. cit. (n. 10), 71–2; on these developed institutions, see above all S. F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome* (1977) and R. A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (1988).

This information is, for the most part, to be found in *Die archaische Literatur* (though Crates is not in the index), yet it is fragmented over the distribution of the various authors. The reader is not given any overall picture of the institutional and social contexts in which Greek and Roman teachers and writers were working in Rome.[14] The fragmented evidence does yield a picture of a self-conscious construction of an apparatus of documentation and scholarship which tracks that of the Greeks, yet it is not brought together in that way here. Perhaps S. and his team did not regard providing this kind of context as part of their brief; perhaps they did not provide it because they saw the emergence of such an institution as natural, or inevitable. But the emergence of the institution of Latin literature is not in the least natural or inevitable, and the writers of this book are not as amazed at the sheer existence of their topic as they should be. The main reason it is important to take stock of what it means to speak of a Roman or a Latin literature is that otherwise we all too easily lose sight of how very extraordinary it is that such a thing existed, and exists.

II THE CONTINGENCY OF LATIN LITERATURE

Scholars in general appear not to question the inevitability of a literature in the Latin language. Sometimes they wonder why it did not emerge sooner, or later.[15] Yet we should be wondering why it happened at all, for it is one of the most remarkable events in ancient history.[16]

It may appear natural for literate societies to have a literature, but this is a modernizing assumption against which we must be on our guard. Nor, despite the recent claims of Habinek, was it a necessary condition for running an empire in the ancient world to have a national literature in the terms we are discussing here.[17] The Persians and the Parthians managed without one — the Parthian governing class were illiterate. The Greeks had a literature, but 'the Greeks' were not an empire. The Ptolemaic kingdom came close to having a 'national' literature and literary culture, although it was very shortlived; the Seleucid and Macedonian kingdoms had nothing of the kind, despite intensive attempts at patronage from Pella. More significantly perhaps, the Carthaginians appear not to have had a national literature, although for three centuries they contested control of Sicily with the Greeks, and were living in intimate interaction with Greek culture all that time. The Romans themselves for at least a generation ran something that we could, without much imprecision, call an empire, one including Greek-speaking cities, before they began the process which led to a national literature, with all the institutional apparatus surrounding the systematic transmission of texts in Latin composed on Greek models.[18]

---

[12] E. Fantham remarks on the crucial role of critical theory and formal education in grammar and rhetoric in the early stages of the new literature in Latin: 'The growth of literature and criticism at Rome', in G. A. Kennedy (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism I. Classical Criticism* (1989), 220–44, at 220; cf. D. Fowler, *Unrolling the Text* (forthcoming): 'From its beginnings . . . Roman literature reflected on its own practice and its relationship to the Greek background especially.'

[13] R. A. Kaster, *Suetonius* De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus (1995), 62.

[14] The closest S. comes is in his section 'Zur Literatursoziologie der Schriftsteller der archaischen Epoche' (87–9), discussing birth and status of the Latin authors, together with patronage and the *collegium scribarum histrionumque*. The possible political contexts are left undiscussed. For example, despite S.'s enthusiasm for T. Habinek's *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome* (1998), he does not adopt or refer to Habinek's instrumentalist view of the political function of the new literature in the hands of the élite.

[15] Gratwick, op. cit. (n. 8), 79.

[16] I return below to the problem of what it means to date the first moment in this event in the way it regularly is dated, to September 240 B.C.E., with the production of a scripted Latin play (or plays) at the *Ludi Romani*, adapted from Greek originals by Livius Andronicus.

[17] op. cit. (n. 14), 45 ('all but inevitable').

It is worth reminding ourselves that, on the available evidence, no society in the ancient world other than the Romans took over the prototypical forms of the institution of Greek literature as the basis for a corresponding institution in their own vernacular.[19] Naturally, absence of evidence is not in itself evidence of absence. Sometimes, indeed, there are even scraps of evidence. What was in the library of Carthage apart from Mago's books on agriculture, which were apparently felt to be so indispensable they were rescued from the sack in 146 B.C.E. and translated from Punic into Latin?[20] Is there an iceberg beneath the tip of the testimony to tragedies and histories in Etruscan?[21] Amongst the great richness of the improvisational Oscan dramatic culture, were there scripts in Oscan, and what kind of relationship might these scripts have had to Greek scripts?[22] Perhaps the Sabellians, Umbrians, and Messapians, or the Lucanians and Bruttians, with their long interaction with the cities of Magna Graecia, developed a vernacular literary culture of some kind, of which no trace whatever survives.[23]

Once we stop taking it for granted that a literate society has a literature, however, the burden of proof shifts. If we perform the thought-experiment of imagining what kinds of texts might have been in production in which languages in the third century B.C.E., it becomes clear that for the Romans 'literature' and 'Greek literature' were co-extensive sets in the Venn diagram of the Mediterranean. Readers of *JRS* know about the existence of, for example, Indian and Chinese literature, even if we may happen not to have read any of it. The Romans did not know of anything of the kind. As Paul Veyne puts it, as far as the Romans were concerned, 'Hellenistic civilization was . . . not Greek civilization or foreign civilization, but civilization pure and simple'.[24]

---

[18] Habinek, op. cit. (n. 14), seriously misdates Rome's imperial phase to a much later period, because he wishes to synchronize the new literature with the transformation of Rome from a city-state to an aristocratic empire. Hence his remarkable statement that '[p]rior to the Second Punic War Rome was an influential polis of central Italy' (35). For 'Punic', read 'Samnite'.

[19] The unique nature of this development is stressed by Fantham, op. cit. (n. 12), 220; R. G. Mayer, '*Graecia capta*: the Roman reception of Greek literature', *PLLS* 8 (1995), 289–307, at 300.

[20] Plin., *HN* 18.22 for the committee that translated Mago. The evidence for other texts in Punic is collected by W. Huss, *Geschichte der Karthager* (1985), 504–6, but much of this evidence concerns 'Punic books' written after the sack of Carthage, and Huss begins by taking it for granted that Carthage had a literature, whereas the comparative evidence for the ancient Mediterranean inclines one against such an assumption. Carthage certainly had massive documentation in papyrus form. Roger Wilson kindly refers me to the discovery in a temple complex of 4,762 clay seals which were once part of the binding for individual papyrus rolls, burnt in the Roman sack of 146 B.C.E.: these documents will have been records of transactions between the temple and the outside world (D. Berges, 'Die Tonsiegel aus den karthagischen Tempelarchiv', in F. Rakob (ed.), *Karthago II* (1997), 10–214, at 20–4, 'Die Funktion des Archivs').

[21] Testimony in Suerbaum (23). Varro (*Ling.* 5.55) reports that one Volnius wrote tragedies in Etruscan, but Volnius postdates the Roman adaptation of the late third century B.C.E., and we cannot know if anyone had done this before him: see H. D. Jocelyn, *The Tragedies of Ennius* (1967), 14, who leaves the question open.

[22] For some fascinating speculation, which eventually comes down against the possibility of a transmitted dramatic literature in Oscan, see J. Geiger and H. Rosén, 'Osca bybliotheca?', in J. Herman and H. Rosén (eds), *Petroniana: Gedenkschrift für Hubert Petersmann* (2003), 123–5; J. N. Adams, 'A passage of Varro, *De Lingua Latina* and an Oscan fragment of Atellan farce', *Mnemosyne* 57 (2004), 352–8 (references I owe to Joshua Katz). On the Oscan dramatic tradition, see, conveniently, E. Rawson, 'Theatrical life in Republican Rome and Italy', *PBSR* 53 (1985), 97–113 = *Roman Culture and Society: Collected Papers* (1991), 468–87; for its survival in a Roman context even into the early Empire, see J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (2003), 117–18. One would give a lot to know whether the Oscan farces were in verse, and, if so, whether it was a Greek-based verse.

[23] Profound scepticism on this score in H. D. Jocelyn, 'The poems of Quintus Ennius', *ANRW* 1.2. (1972), 987–1026, at 991.

When contemplating the process which we now label 'the beginning of Latin literature', in which Greek literary forms are taken over systematically into the vernacular, it is important to be precise about terminology, so that we may be clear about what is at issue and what is not. Rome by the third century B.C.E. had been *literate* for centuries, with written laws in the market-place for two hundred years, and with the first Latin inscriptions going back to the seventh century.[25] Further, Roman and Greek culture had been interacting dynamically for centuries — in art, religion, and social practice.[26] It is absolutely not the case that the adaptation of Athenian dramatic scripts for the *ludi scaenici* in 240 B.C.E. is the first encounter of the Romans with an alien verbal culture. For our purposes, the best starting-point for orientation is still Fraenkel's *Plautinisches im Plautus* (1922); in his third chapter he shows how deeply knowledge of the Greek stock of tales had penetrated into Roman culture, with the morphological adaptation into Latin of the great names of Greek myth having already taken place well before the end of the third century B.C.E.[27] To some degree we are talking about a general receptivity to Greek culture in the '*koine*' of mid-Italian society, but Rome's degree of responsiveness looks unusually high even in the archaic period in comparison with the other mid-Italian states.[28]

Finally, it is not at all the case that Rome in the period before what we call 'Latin literature' had no drama, no songs, no verse forms, no speech acts in which excellence in skill was prized.[29] I return in the next section to the question of what kind of forms this activity may have taken, and what kind of continuity there may have been across the watershed. Nonetheless, the fact remains that the process that began in the last third of the third century B.C.E. was unparalleled in nature, and extent. Before then, Rome was like many other non-Greek Italian societies, who used their own languages in imitation of the Greek manner for writing in legal and especially religious contexts;[30] but after then, Rome was on her own, with scripts and texts based on Greek forms and prototypes — texts that were transmitted and preserved, and commented on, and imitated in their own turn. W. V. Harris helps bring the distinction into clear relief, when he comments on the importance of writing in religious contexts in archaic Rome: 'Many of the archaic functions of writing in Rome and Italy resembled its functions in Greece. However this complex of religious uses is something of a distinguishing mark of archaic Roman and Italic culture, just as the preservation of poetic texts is a distinguishing mark of archaic Greece.'[31] After 240 B.C.E. the preservation of vernacular poetic (and eventually not only poetic) texts became a distinguishing mark of Rome as well — and of nowhere else in the non-Greek Western Mediterranean.

---

[24] P. Veyne, 'The hellenization of Rome and the question of acculturations', *Diogenes* 106 (1979), 1–27, at 8.

[25] T. Cornell, 'The tyranny of the evidence: a discussion of the possible uses of literacy in Etruria and Latium in the archaic age', in *JRA Suppl. Vol. 3* (1991), 7–33.

[26] T. Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000–264 BC)* (1995), ch. 4, 'The Rise of the City-state', 81–118; C. J. Smith, *Early Rome and Latium: Economy and Society c. 1000 to 500 BC* (1996), 225–8; H. D. Jocelyn, 'Forme letterarie e vita sociale', in A. Schiavone (ed.), *Storia di Roma* (1990), 2.1, 595–629.

[27] Other classic texts are G. Pasquali on the hellenized nature of Roman life even in 'La grande Roma dei Tarquinii' (*Preistoria della poesia romana* (1936)); E. Norden, *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern* (1939), esp. 245: 'Diese traditionelle Klassifikation: vorliterarisch = national, literarisch = hellenisierend lässt sich nicht mehr aufrechthalten.'

[28] Cornell, op. cit. (n. 26), 118.

[29] Diverse contributors provide a rich collection of evidence and testimonia for a wide range of such speech acts, written and unwritten (30–83).

[30] Jocelyn, op. cit. (n. 23), 991.

[31] *Ancient Literacy* (1989), 154.

III PRE-LITERARY' ROME

The last 'archaic' Latin author observed that 'nil posse creari de nilo', and it is entirely proper that a volume such as this should devote attention to 'die vorliterarische Periode', especially since the whole subject of verbal and performance culture in pre-literary Rome has become so topical and controversial in the last decades.[32] As S. remarks (49), positions are polarizing and there is hardly any dialogue between what each side sees as the other's romanticism or sceptical hypercriticism.

S. strongly stresses continuity between the pre-literary and literary periods.[33] This means that he wishes to credit as much as possible of the tradition about the pre-literary period, while downplaying the degree to which the new literature represented a revolution. Certainly it is always a good idea to be suspicious of ancient tales of origin, such as the one enshrined in the supposed epochal moment in September 240 B.C.E., 'the beginning of Latin literature', with the production of a scripted Latin play (or plays) at the *Ludi Romani*, adapted from Greek originals by Livius Andronicus. We should scrutinize carefully any narrative which involves such 'inflated divides', as Eviatar Zerubavel has labelled these moments of accentuated 'before and after'.[34] The evidence itself for this moment is disconcertingly rocky. Accius, who was, after all, born only seventy years after the *Ludi* of 240 B.C.E., dated Livius' plays a generation later than 240 B.C.E., and it was Varro and Atticus who asserted the 'firstness' of Livius and dated him to the now generally accepted era.[35]

An identifiable epochal moment itself, however, is not the real issue. Rather, we should take stock of the differences between artistic and textual production in Rome in, say, 260 B.C.E. and in, say, 200 B.C.E. S. appears to minimize these differences, claiming, for example, that it is inconceivable that the Romans would not have had drama and narrative and lyric poetry, even without Greek models (5). We certainly know that they had drama before the systematic adaptation of Greek scripts into Latin began in the 230s, for the *Ludi Romani* had included *ludi scaenici* since 364 B.C.E. It is very hard to know what Romans were watching at the *ludi scaenici* in those years before 240 B.C.E. There is plenty of artistic evidence for the popularity of stage-shows in central Italy, now beautifully illustrated and discussed in Wiseman's *The Myths of Rome*; but these shows represent a medley of styles, from tragedy to strip-tease, 'mix[ing] hero-tales with erotic farce'.[36] These productions are already inconceivable without Greek culture, of course, but the productions of the 230s on are categorically different. They are written adaptations of Greek scripts, observing Greek generic demarcations, and they use verse forms which have adapted Greek metrics to the very different language of Latin.[37] A crucial difference from the improvisational occasionality of the earlier productions appears to be this new determination to 'get it right' in transposing from the model culture. The power of the eventual Roman model perhaps predisposes us to see this fidelity as the natural or preferable model for cross-cultural interaction, but the alternative possibility represented in the evidence of Wiseman's *cistae* is, as they say in American elementary schools, 'not better, not worse, just different'. It is a model where 'the garbled names and unexpected juxtapositions . . . imply . . . an imaginative mythic world in which the characters of Greek heroic legend, known not from texts but from oral story, might be combined in quite uncanonical ways'.[38] The texts of Ennius or Naevius are from a very different world.

---

[32] From a very large literature note especially G. Vogt-Spira (ed.), *Studien zur vorliterarischen Periode im frühen Rom* (1989); N. Zorzetti, 'Poetry and ancient city: the case of Rome', *CJ* 86 (1991), 311–29, with the responses of T. Cole (377–82) and C. Robert Phillips, III (382–9); N. Horsfall, 'The prehistory of Latin poetry: some problems of method', *RFIC* 122 (1994), 50–75; Habinek, op. cit. (n. 14); J. Rüpke (ed.), *Von Göttern und Menschen Erzählen: Formkonstanzen und Funktionswandel vormoderner Epik* (2001), with the important review of A. Barchiesi (*BMCR* 2002.06.26); P. Wiseman, *The Myths of Rome* (2004), the summary of much earlier work.

[33] 83–7; Blänsdorf, however, in his later section on drama (143), appears perfectly content with the watershed of 240 B.C.E.

[34] *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past* (2003), 87–8.

[35] Suerbaum, 93–6; cf. Oakley, op. cit. (n. 7), 61–3.

[36] op. cit. (n. 32), 114.

[37] S. does not pronounce on the question of when Greek dramatic metres were adapted for Latin; the section on drama by Blänsdorf (145) leaves me uncertain whether or not he thinks 'die Existenz einer lateinischen Dichtersprache und Metrik' predates the new plays of the *ludi scaenici*. I would have welcomed more discussion of the crucial question of metre, and especially of whether in the case of drama an individual was responsible for the fundamental and determining adaptations of the quantative metrical systems of Greek into the very different stress-based language of Latin, as Ennius was in the case of the dactylic hexameter (137–8 offer a helpful bibliography on Ennius' metre but no dedicated discussion of his *modus operandi*). Certainly Gratwick does not regard the adaptation as a sequential process: 'The origin of the Roman brand of iambo-trochaic verse remains a mystery, but whoever did invent the form, and in particular the principles respecting word-accent and prosody, was a genius; for analogous principles were naturally followed in all other forms of quantitative verse borrowed from the Greeks' (op. cit. (n. 8), 92–3).

S., however, regularly gives the impression that the literature in Latin of the 230s B.C.E. onwards was somehow a continuation of policy by other means, as if the forms observable in the later period are a natural extension of what had gone before; the larger unexamined presupposition appears to be, again, that it is natural for a society to have a literature. Future research on these questions would do well to take in the evidence of comparative models, such as the ironically piquant example of the modern Greek 'creation' of a national literature after independence, where we see Greek authors unable to get the project off the ground without turning to contemporary Italian exemplars.[39] Literature is not just a matter of writing down what people are saying anyway.

After drama, the forms of lyric or narrative take us directly to the other 'continuity' issue, and that is the question of how much to credit the Roman tradition about the pre-literary period. S. stands out among the contributors in having a strong commitment to the positions advocated by Zorzetti and more recently by Habinek.[40] S. follows Zorzetti's reconstruction of a panoply of oral performance contexts for pre-literary Rome, building principally on the testimony of Cato, Cicero, and Varro concerning the *carmina conuiualia*, sung at *conuiuia* to celebrate the great deeds of men of old. A new orthodoxy appears to be developing, especially in the United States and Germany, as the pendulum swings back to long-abandoned positions, and faith is restored in hypotheses that go back almost two hundred years to Niebuhr.[41] This is a recent development, and a swift one (at least in terms of paradigm shifts in scholarship): as recently as 1989 Horsfall could say that 'the ballad theory has been under heavy attack since 1816 and now lacks respectable exponents'.[42] And now it is in the *Handbuch*.

It is striking that S. shows no interest in the related phenomenon of Wiseman's reconstruction of a pre-literary dramatic pageant tradition as a venue for the transmission of stories of Roman history or myth.[43] Wiseman's hypothesis is attracting considerable attention in Britain, yet in this volume it passes totally unremarked, partly as a result of the book's fissiparous principles of organization. S.'s discussion of pre-literary drama is keyed in to the testimonium of Livy 7.2, so that only Wiseman's 1988 article on satyrs is mentioned (52); E. Stärk, who covers the *praetexta*, says nothing about any pre-literary scenarios, and refers to no work by Wiseman, but only to the article by H. Flower which expresses serious reservations about Wiseman's whole hypothesis of a flourishing tradition of historical pageants.[44] On the whole, I share Flower's reservations, but it is remarkable that a volume which is so committed to constructing continuity in other traditions should leave undiscussed the most conspicuous and original modern theory of a continuous mechanism of transmission of tradition.[45]

---

[38] op. cit. (n. 32), 110.

[39] My thanks to Michael Paschalis for a fascinating talk on this subject to the Program in Hellenic Studies at Princeton, and for conversation afterwards.

[40] In the works cited above in n. 32; to S., Habinek's work is a new start that points to the future (85), although his own interest in continuity is at odds with Habinek's emphasis on rupture, and on the role played by the new literature in the deliberate murder of the old oral culture. S.'s emphasis is not necessarily shared by his collaborators: H. and A. Petersmann are more cool in their embracing of the *carmina conuiualia* (41–3).

[41] A history of the issue in A. Momigliano, 'Perizonius, Niebuhr and the character of early Roman tradition', *JRS* 47 (1957), 104–14.

[42] *Cornelius Nepos: a Selection, including the Lives of Cato and Atticus* (1989), 123.

[43] The theory dominates *The Myths of Rome* (2004), which appeared too late for consideration, but the book summarizes work going back to the late 1980s.

As far as the Zorzetti model is concerned, it is striking how clearly the various possible positions bring into relief the never-ending problematic of how scholars ancient and modern negotiate the Greek dimension to Roman culture. The intellectual path of Habinek, who is cited here as a model, illustrates the competing possibilities. In 1992 he published a splendid essay in the course of which he denounced the way that Latinists deferentially and enviously mimic the splendid Romanticism of Hellenists.[46] Six years later this article forms the core of ch. 1 of *The Politics of Latin Literature*, yet the chapter is missing the earlier swashbuckling polemic against Latinists, who, 'like colonized peoples everywhere, . . . have tended to mimic, even to exaggerate, the discourse and attitudes of the metropolitan power' (i.e., Greek studies).[47] In ch. 2, 'Why was Latin Literature Invented?', one sees why, for here he is himself mimicking the discourse of the metropolitan power, following Zorzetti's arguments for an analogy between archaic Greece and archaic Rome, and importing a model from Greek oralist studies to account for a Roman decline from a state of orality to a state of literarity.[48]

Once one has remarked that the testimony of Cato, Cicero, and Varro makes preliterary Roman culture look awfully like the music culture of archaic Greece, one can either accept the equation and flesh it out by analogy, or one can countenance the alternative interpretation advanced by Dahlmann and Horsfall, namely, that the later Romans' accounts of their early 'literary' history are fundamentally calqued upon Greek accounts of theirs.[49] The later Roman authors, on this hypothesis, had no independent knowledge of conditions which had, even for Cato, disappeared 'multis saeculis ante suam aetatem' (Cic., *Brut.* 75).[50]

Yet for modern scholars the argument from analogy is as alluring as it was for ancient, despite its many pitfalls.[51] Between the Greek *symposion* and the Roman *conuiuium*, according to the evidence from the archaic period onwards, there are clearly major differences, including whether you lay or sat, or whether respectable women were present or not.[52] It also makes a big difference to the model which particular Greek society is chosen as a *comparandum*, as Cole has well pointed out: if you turn the prism a little, then Cato's chanting Romans look much less like Aeolic or Ionian symposiasts than Cretan or Spartan *syssitioi*.[53] Finally, the entire basis of the analogy between a supposed oral archaic Greek and Roman song culture looks fragile once one considers the actual conditions in archaic Greece. Zorzetti does not commit himself to the question of orality versus writing, but Habinek and S. both incline to the view that there existed in Rome an oral song culture independent of texts;[54] they do so in part because they assume that there is an analogy with Greece in the archaic period. But there is no such analogy with Greece in the archaic period, since those archaic Greek songs were texts, and very voluminous ones at that. If there is any analogy, it has to be with pre-literate Greece, and that is another kind of argument altogether, which would have to begin on the ground that *uixere uates ante Archilochum*.

---

[44] Stärk, 168–9, referring to H. Flower, 'Fabulae Praetextae in context: when were plays on contemporary subjects performed in Republican Rome?', *CQ* 45 (1995), 170–90. Note now the special issue of *Symbolae Osloenses* 77 (2002) on 'Historical Drama in Ancient Rome'.

[45] It is interesting that the British scholar is more interested in reconstructing a popular tradition, while the others are more interested in the supposed activity of the aristocracy.

[46] T. Habinek, 'Grecian wonders and Roman woe: the Romantic rejection of Rome and its consequences for the study of Roman literature', in K. Galinsky (ed.), *The Interpretation of Roman Poetry: Empiricism or Hermeneutics?* (1992), 227–42.

[47] op. cit. (n. 46), 236.

[48] op. cit. (n. 14), 182.

[49] H. Dahlmann, 'Zur Überlieferung über die altrömische Tafellieder', *Abh.Ak.Wiss.Mainz* 17 (1950), 1193–1202; Horsfall, op. cit. (n. 32); idem, *The Culture of the Roman Plebs* (2003), 33, 96–8; cf. F. Jacoby, *Atthis: the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens* (1949), 60; S. Goldberg, *Epic in Republican Rome* (1995), 43–6. Zorzetti's own initial formulations rely on a comparative framework which sees the fundamental social institutions of Greek and Roman life as sharing common origins and hence common features. From this perspective, the options of 'analogy' or 'calque' collapse into one another, as Joshua Katz suggests to me.

[50] I cannot improve on Horsfall's formulation (op. cit. (n. 32), 72–3): 'If from Cato on, our sources lament the demise of the *carmina* and if virtually all the details preserved in the learned tradition can be shown to conform to Greek usage and in almost all cases to derive from extant Greek scholarship on the συμπόσιον, then it seems to me incautious and ingenuous to say that we do actually know something about the *carmina*. Perhaps they existed . . . But we have little choice but to admit that we really and truly do not know.'

[51] Wiseman's drama model, as Robert Kaster points out to me, likewise relies heavily on a Greek analogical model, except that the *comparandum* is not archaic Greece but democratic Athens.

S.'s strong privileging of the oral is also evident in his discussion of early Roman historiography, where he claims that the Roman tradition bears the features associated with 'oral tradition': a collective nature, a contemporary focus, and a distinctive 'hour-glass' structure in which the distant origins and the most recent three generations receive the great bulk of attention, with a 'floating horizon' lying on the border of the middle ground and moving as the contemporary timeframe moves.[55] Here I need only say that I strongly endorse Gildenhard's criticisms of this model: 'it would be difficult to find an archaic society less amenable to analysis along oral-tradition lines than mid-republican Rome.'[56] Even when discussing the period after the arrival of the new literature in Rome, S. is intent on downplaying the textual and elevating the oral. According to him (17), the first epics have a primarily oral reception in private recitation, and the circumstances of Roman literature are such that one can speak of an oral literature until the first century B.C.E.

S. is, of course, not alone in this wish to elevate the oral over the textual.[57] It would be the subject of another article to investigate what is at stake in this movement in contemporary Latin studies, beyond the kind of deferential mimicking of Hellenism we remarked upon above, with its goal of recovering the same spontaneity and authenticity wistfully imagined in Greek culture. The results are pervasive. A striking example occurs in S.'s discussion of Lucilius' claim that, in fear of the critical judgement of Scipio and Rutilius, he is writing for the men of Tarentum, Consentia, and Sicily (reported by Cicero: 'quorum ille iudicium reformidans Tarentinis ait se et Consentinis et Siculis scribere').[58] Here S. will have it that Lucilius is being ironic, for his main audience is really the circle of Scipio, 'ein exklusives Publikum' (315–16). S. is clearly right to say that Lucilius is being ironic — Cicero follows his gloss immediately with 'facete is quidem, ut alia'. And it goes without saying that it would be a mistake to cite this passage as hard evidence for who actually was as a matter of fact reading Lucilius. But we should not gloss lightly over the fact that, for someone writing Latin poetry towards the end of the second century B.C.E., it was a sayable thing to claim that his readership extended to the Greek city of Tarentum, the Bruttian town of Consentia, and the overseas province of Sicily. These are imperial claims, however ironically expressed, and evidence of a reception far beyond the aristocracy of the metropolis.

---

[52] Smith, op. cit. (n. 26), 110.

[53] op. cit. (n. 32), 379–81.

[54] Habinek, op. cit. (n. 14), 37; Suerbaum, 84.

[55] Suerbaum, 353–4; cf. 378, 390–1 (Cato), 419 (Cassius Hemina).

[56] op. cit. (n. 1); he well lays out the alternative venues in monuments and spectacle for commemoration and self-advertisement.

[57] Note, e.g., Rüpke, op. cit. (n. 32).

[58] Cic., *Fin.* 1.7 (fr. 594 Marx).

Around the time Lucilius was born, Ennius was introducing his revolutionary *Annales* with the mighty claim 'latos <per> populos res atque poemata nostra/ . . . clara> cluebunt' (12–13 Sk.); Lucretius alludes heavily to this passage in his own prologue, saying that *Ennius noster* brought down from Helicon a crown 'per gentis Italas hominum quae clara clueret' (1.119). The earthquake of the Social War had intervened between Ennius and Lucretius, redefining everyone south of the Rubicon as a Roman citizen, so that it is hard to know what Lucretius means by *noster*: 'one of us Italians', or 'one of us Romans'? Ennius certainly envisages an audience far wider than a Roman élite, or even an audience in Rome; he envisages an audience of more than one *populus*, and widely-spread ones at that. Lucretius at any rate thinks he is envisaging an Italian audience.[59]

IV THE ITALIAN CONNECTION

During the period covered by this volume, Rome's relationship with the peoples of Italy was in a process of ceaseless change.[60] At the beginning of the book's coverage, from the end of the Pyrrhic wars on (roughly from 275 B.C.E.), there was a massive shift in the movement of spoils and cultural supremacy to Rome.[61] This shift was taking place, however, while the Italian peoples in general were competing in taking over aspects of Greek culture for prestige, snobbery, and as an entry ticket to Mediterranean culture.[62] How did it come about that the Romans were the only Italian people to go so far as to take over 'literature' as well as other manifestations of Hellenism?

It is hard to believe the new literature was meant to impress the Greeks, who for centuries found it sublimely easy to ignore Roman literature: Momigliano mentions how remarkable it is that Polybius gives no sign of any knowledge at all of a literature in Latin.[63] What impact would a *Latin* literature have on the Greek or Hellenized aristocracies of Italy? The fact that this new literature was in Latin is key, and it is thrown into relief by an interesting aspect of the history of early Roman literature. It is well known to everybody that the first practitioners of Latin literature were not native-born Roman citizens, but bi-lingual or tri-lingual Greeks or 'semi-Greeks'— *semigraeci*, as Suetonius calls them (*Gram.* 1.2).[64] The man who supposedly first adapted a Greek dramatic script into Latin for performance in Rome was a Greek, Andronikos; he was probably captured as a prisoner-of-war in Tarentum in 272 B.C.E. by one of the Livii, to be manumitted and enrolled in the citizenry as L. Livius Andronicus. Ennius was from Rudiae; he must have grown up speaking Greek and Messapian (and perhaps Oscan as well), before learning Latin as a third (or fourth) language.[65] He is the only author of Latin poetry mentioned by Strabo, who comments, when he gets to the 'Greek city' of Rudiae, that this was his birth-place (6.3.5):[66] Ennius' Greekness was remembered by Greeks. The first native-born Roman citizen to write poetry in Latin is the low-born Accius, son of ex-slaves, who was thirty years old in 140 B.C.E., a century after Livius' first production. Lucilius, born around 180 B.C.E., is also a contender for this title, but he was from the Latin colony of Suessa Aurunca and may very well not have been a Roman citizen.[67]

---

[59] And Havet made Ennius say so accordingly, emending 'latos per populos' to '<perque> Italos populos'.

[60] The best general introduction is now E. Dench, *Romulus' Asylum* (2005), ch. 3, 'The Idea of Italy'.

[61] J.-P. Morel, 'The transformation of Italy, 300–133 B.C. The evidence of archaeology', *CAH*² 8 (1989), 477–516, at 483–4.

[62] E. Dench, *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples from the Central Apennines* (1995), 29–66; cf. N. Purcell, 'South Italy in the fourth century B.C.', *CAH*² 6 (1994), 381–403, at 395, 403.

[63] *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization* (1975), 38. He suggests that the development of a vernacular literature was part of collaboration with the Greek or Hellenized aristocracies of south Italy and Sicily, although this is 'not a sufficient explanation' (17).

[64] Noted by Suerbaum (26, 87), Blänsdorf (145, 170), and Stärk (159). On the concepts associated with such 'half-and-half' categories across the Greek and Latin language borders, see F. Biville, 'The Graeco-Romans and Graeco-Latin: a terminological framework for cases of bilingualism', in J. N. Adams, M. Janse and S. Swain (eds), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word* (2002), 77–102.

[65] On Ennius' languages, see Adams, op. cit. (n. 22), 117.

The early literary activity in Rome is even more complicated in its categories of origin and language, because these *semigraeci* were not the only ones to take up writing extensive texts: so did well-born Romans, senators such as Fabius Pictor or Cincius Alimentus, writing histories of the city, but in the Greek language. And Greek remained the language of history-writing for Roman senators until Cato began his *Origines*, some time in the 160s B.C.E. In the first two generations, then, we have a striking chiasmus: the 'Greeks' are writing drama and epic in Latin, and the Romans are writing ethnographic history in Greek.

This is a curious phenomenon. The distribution makes narratives of continuity very complicated, for the Greek-writing senators were not carrying on any tradition within the city, and nor were the outsiders, however much we allow for the possible presence of non-Romans as performers in Rome from early on.[68] According to Momigliano, Fabius Pictor and his like were doing what had been done by Xanthus of Lydia, Berossus of Babylon, Manetho of Egypt, and even Demetrius the Jew, namely, using Greek history/ethnography to give an account of their own country to Greeks, to the 'civilised world'.[69] It is normally said that Fabius and his peers were also writing for Romans like themselves;[70] they must have been writing, in addition, for an Italian audience, since Greek was the *lingua franca* for the educated section of the peninsula.

The Italian context is likewise a fruitful one in which to view the problem of how to account for the fact that the *semigraeci* were writing in Latin.[71] The cultural interface is now not so much 'Rome meets Greece', but rather 'Latin meets Greek', in a competitive environment involving a range of linguistic cultures under the Roman *imperium*. This 'contact zone', like so many others, was an environment of enormous creative potential, and it was identified as such by Mikhail Bakhtin; he responded vividly to the overlapping linguistic cultures of third- and second-century Italy, as an analogue to his favoured Rabelaisian period, where another vernacular literature emerged out of a comparable linguistic and cultural mixing.[72]

It is worth seeking some of the impetus for the creation of a Roman vernacular literature in the intricate relationship between Romans and Italians, on which Dench's work sheds so much light. An important part of this relationship involved the barbarianization of the other Italians by Romans intent upon establishing cultural superiority.[73] This self-assertion on the part of the Romans was vigorously contested, naturally: the Italians had their own view, in which they could take up the Greek role in the

---

[66] I thank Katherine Clarke for confirming this information.

[67] Discussion in *RE* 13.2, 1618–19; cf. Adams, op. cit. (n. 22), 121 with n. 53. S. (87) does not mention this possibility, and describes Lucilius as a Roman citizen whose status is an exception to the general pattern of early writers of Latin literature.

[68] For Oscan and Greek companies performing in Rome, see Rawson, op. cit. (n. 22, 1991), 475–6; cf. N. Horsfall, 'Roma', in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora and D. Lanza (eds), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica. 1,2. L'Ellenismo* (1993), 791–822, at 803.

[69] op. cit. (n. 63), 7, 92; further on this theme, and on the massive innovation represented by the eventual Roman shift into a historiography in Latin, see eundem, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (1990), 24.

[70] H. Beck and U. Walter, *Die frühen römischen Historiker I: von Fabius Pictor bis Cn. Gellius* (2001), 58–9.

[71] I am indebted to Dench, op. cit. (n. 62) for suggesting this Italian context.

[72] On the 'contact zone', see M. L. Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (1992), 7; cf. M. M. Bakhtin, *Rabelais and his World* (trans. H. Iswolsky, 1968), 470–2.

[73] Dench, op. cit. (n. 62), 74–6.

Greek/barbarian paradigm.[74] Still, Rome was remarkably successful at casting the other Italians as barbarians, so that, for example, to Dionysius of Halicarnassus Rome is the only naturally Greek city amongst the non-Hellenic peoples of Italy. Part of the same phenomenon is the Roman reluctance to learn any language other than Greek, strongly observable in the period under review.[75]

The establishment of the new literature in Latin is part of this long-standing strategy of rusticizing the other Italians, with the Romans setting themselves up as the only people in Italy who had a counterpart to a distinctively Greek institution, one of immense cultural prestige. This assertion of cultural superiority through Latin is related to what Adams has called the 'assertive' or 'aggressive' use of Latin in everyday contexts;[76] it goes together with the crucial fact that deference or 'anxiety of influence' is far to seek in the literature of the Romans, which, 'with all the imitation of alien models, was immediately original, self-assured and aggressive'.[77] For the Italians, the stakes were very high, and one possible reaction was clearly to trade up, and to acquire the language of the ruling power, in a process which paradoxically solidified an increasing sense of an Italian identity.[78]

It is important to take stock of how guarded and self-consciously policed the institution of a literature in Latin was as an appurtenance of Hellenism, in keeping with Rome's general commitment to 'borrow only what she wanted to borrow and only to the extent that she wished'.[79] Third- and second-century Rome was not as fully hellenised in many respects as some other non-Greek parts of Italy, in particular Campania.[80] Dench points out that the Romans could play it either way on the Italian stage when it came to the Greek role: 'Rome did not always promote herself straightforwardly as a Greek city, but can also be seen exploiting her ambiguous position of both sharing in the Greek world and having an identity separate from this. At other times, she actually exploited her "barbarian" status.'[81] On the one hand, then, the Romans could play the Greek, so as to be able to pose as the only other Mediterranean culture;[82] on the other, they could play up the degree to which they were un-Greek, or anti-Greek. The Trojan myth sums up this doubleness very handily: it could help make the Romans part of the Greek scheme of things, or it could be activated to cast them as anti-Greek if necessary.[83]

This distanced and nuanced engagement with Hellenism is part of what is happening with the vernacular adaptation. By having a literature in Latin the Romans were able to have their cake and eat it too. They were participating in Hellenic *paideia*, but in a mediated fashion, on terms they could dictate.[84] The way that the Roman governing class did not themselves at first participate in person in the new literature is part of this distancing, and there are numerous other signs of the same attitude. We already glanced at Livy's account of the beginnings of Roman drama in Section I above, when we saw how he and his sources concentrate on the Italian and Etruscan dimension, and play down the Greek: 'it is striking that this source and others seem determined to mention nothing Greek in connexion with early Roman drama.'[85] Indeed, Livy's digression on the institution of the *ludi scaenici* comes soon after his notice of the opening of the year, which is signalled by a typical piece of deadpan Livian humour: in this year, he says, 'nihil dignum memoria actum' (7.2.2). Rome, as we all know, had no permanent theatre until Pompey's was dedicated in 55 B.C.E. If you were a Greek travelling around the peninsula in 60 B.C.E., you would see a theatre, the canonical mark of Hellenism, in many non-Greek Italian cities, and you would certainly be struck when you got to Rome to find that there was not one there. As Momigliano points out, the mirror image of such attitudes, from the point of view of the Greeks, is the spectacle of Greeks like Polybius doing everything they can to ignore Roman sophistication in Greek matters or in their own vernacular literature.[86] Such 'pro-Roman' Greeks needed to preserve their image of the noble untainted Roman. It is an interesting thought that if Polybius were our only evidence we would never dream that the contemporaries of Aemilius Paullus and Cato were watching and reading productions by Ennius and Plautus.

---

[74] As Christopher Smith well reminds me. On this topic, see now E. Dench, 'Beyond Greeks and barbarians: Italy and Sicily in the Hellenistic Age', in A. Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (2003), 294–310, at 299, 300, 302–3.

[75] A major theme of Adams' work on bilingualism (op. cit. (n. 22), esp. 151, 293–5, 755). Whether this exclusive focus on Greek was always part of the Roman way is much harder to assess, as James Zetzel points out to me. Earlier on, Etruscan and Punic seem to have been special cases for the Romans (Adams, 165, 201). It looks as if the powerful privileging of Greek may well be a phenomenon of the period of the later third century B.C.E. on.

[76] Adams, op. cit. (n. 22), 550, 558–61, 589.

[77] Momigliano, op. cit. (n. 63), 17.

[78] On Italians being pressured into learning Latin, see Adams, op. cit. (n. 22), 151, 293, 755; on Latin as part of an Italian identity, even before the Social War, see Adams, ch. 6, 642–86, on 'Italici' at Delos.

[79] Morel, op. cit. (n. 61), 515, using an analogy with modern Japan.

[80] H. Mouritsen, *Italian Unification: a Study in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (1998), 66–7; Morel, op. cit. (n. 61), 515.

[81] Dench, op. cit. (n. 62), 71.

[82] cf. Veyne, op. cit. (n. 24), 8: 'Rome had to teach itself world civilization. To equal the superiority of the Greeks, Rome did what Japan later did to free itself from Western domination. A voluntary and selective Hellenization pushed it up to the international level.' Similarly E. S. Gruen, *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy* (1990), 84, on how victory in the First Punic War 'would be marked by elevation of the *ludi* to a cultural event that announced Rome's participation in the intellectual world of the Greeks'.

[83] cf. E. S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (1992), 6–51.

[84] On this mediated Roman engagement with Greek *paideia*, see A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'Greek knowledge, Roman power', *CPh* 83 (1988), 224–33.

Any observation on Roman Hellenism oversimplifies and exaggerates uniformity of response. One cannot encapsulate reactions to Greek culture and literature even among members of the élite over a span of a hundred years or more. The relationship is always oscillating, on both sides, 'between concentrating on otherness, by focusing on what is similar about their rivals, and concentrating on similarity, by the imitative process which best enables them to define and master what makes up that otherness'.[87] The addition of an Italian dimension complicates the picture even more. Yet when we are investigating textual production at Rome, we must always be considering these larger contexts, which ripple out to the extremities of the Mediterranean within two generations of the *Ludi Romani* of 240 B.C.E.

The artists themselves deserve a last word, in conclusion — the men who were the first practitioners, Suetonius' Greeks or *semigraeci*, the crucial 'cultural brokers' who were the mediating agents, representatives of a type that flourishes on these margins at times of heightened cultural exchange.[88] From their perspective, the 'invention of Roman literature' is not just a matter of the Romans doing something, but rather of someone else doing something with or for the Romans and their language. We automatically tend to think of the project as operating 'heraus', so to speak, from a Roman perspective, as the importation inwards of something *from* outside; but from the point of view of the artists the project operates 'hinaus', from their position inside Greek culture *to* outside. The challenge of thinking in another language is one that few Greeks ever lived with intimately, but the first composers of Latin literature are translating out of a language they know extremely well—natively, or practically so — into another language that they also know extremely well, but not natively, having at the same time usually grown up with a third language. These men are able to accrue fabulous gains in status by brokering their skills. They also gain great advantages in artistic, or career, terms, for they have the opportunity to be a very big fish in a practically non-existent pond instead of a herring in the ocean of Greek literature. If we put ourselves in Ennius' shoes, there is an undeniable appeal to being the first person to write a dactylic hexameter epic in Latin rather than the two hundredth person to write one in Greek.

---

[85] Gratwick, op. cit. (n. 8), 79.

[86] op. cit. (n. 63), 38.

[87] D. Feeney, *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs* (1998), 68, summarizing M. Taussig, *Mimesis and Alterity: a Particular History of the Senses* (1993).

[88] On 'cultural brokers', see G. Woolf, *Becoming Roman: the Origins of Provincial Society in Gaul* (1998), 15.

A key reason why these men are indispensable cultural brokers is that, in order to know Greek literature well enough to adapt it into Latin, being a native speaker of Greek was an enormous advantage. Habinek claims that 'it seems perfectly possible that Roman citizens could have been trained to serve as literary professionals' in the third century B.C.E.,[89] but this is dubious in an era before dictionaries, encyclopedias, concordances. Even when the project of a hellenized literature in Latin had been underway for two centuries, engaging intimately with someone like Callimachus was clearly a massive challenge for a native Latin speaker. For the challenges facing those writers, almost every single one of them from an Italian city, and not from the city of Rome, we shall have to await the next volume.

S.'s Preface ends in a melancholy mood, as he wonders if handbooks are any longer worthwhile parts of scholarship. He should take heart. Schanz-Hosius needed replacing, and S. and his team have discharged a service to scholarship for which we must all be profoundly grateful. I have been expressing disagreement for the most part, but these are issues which will be the subject of lively debate for some time to come, and S.'s volume will be an indispensable part of that debate.

Princeton University
dfeeney@princeton.edu

---

[89] op. cit. (n. 14), 38.