

Cinna, Staius, and 'immanent literary history' in the cultural economy

Autor(en): **Hinds, Stephen**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique**

Band (Jahr): **47 (2001)**

PDF erstellt am: **10.08.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660918>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

VI

STEPHEN HINDS

CINNA, STATIUS, AND 'IMMANENT' LITERARY HISTORY' IN THE CULTURAL ECONOMY

'Intertextualities, intertextualities all'
Don Fowler¹ (*in memoriam*)

Introduction: Poets in the material world

A recent book by Tom Habinek, cultural-materialist in its accent, characterizes our usual ways of talking about literary history as overly aestheticized and insufficiently grounded in the socio-economics of literary production:

"The politics of talking about Augustan poetry, indeed of talking about classical Latin literature more generally, is by and large a politics of nostalgia and evasion: nostalgia for a realm of the aesthetic untainted by the vulgar concerns of social and material existence, and evasion of the exploitative political and economic

¹ Epigraph from *Roman Constructions. Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford 2000), 114, a volume which speaks both engagingly and provocatively to the present paper's interests, (esp.) at pp. IX-XI, 111-12 and 171. Perhaps no one has ever written better or more sympathetically than Don Fowler about why it is that we Latinists think and write as we do. I am doubly indebted to Ernst A. Schmidt and to the Fondation Hardt: first for the hospitality which produced the original version of this paper, and second for the forgiving schedule which permitted its revision and delivery as the 2001 Don Fowler Memorial Lecture for Jesus College, Oxford, and also as a Moorehead Lecture at the University of Southern California. My thanks to all the paper's audiences, as also (for further valuable comments) to Catherine Connors, Denis Feeney, Sara Myers and Carole Newlands.

practices that could bring such an ideal to realization, if only for the few".

*The Politics of Latin Literature*²

The challenge is a useful one, even if polemical shorthand leads to some under-reporting of a strong historicist strand which has always been part of the academic tradition of reading Latin poems (more so, perhaps, than modern ones)³. There is nothing new in the tendency of literary studies at large to oscillate between aestheticist and historicist poles as critical fashions and local emphases change; but the present gathering does constitute an opportune moment to acknowledge and to engage with this latest call to historicism. Literary history, despite its name, tends to display a more narrowly conceived interest in history than do many branches of literary studies; and a concentration on *immanent* literary history may seem to render the operations of history narrower and more hermetic still. Habinek's bracing intervention can fairly serve, then, to put us on our mettle.

Although Habinek's discussion has its own intellectual debts and trajectories, an engagement with his position on literary history can in some respects serve also as an engagement with Greenblattian new historicism or cultural poetics, whose broad revisionism "rejects the privileging or bracketing of a self-contained realm of art within society, which an old-fashioned historical approach to literature maintains", in favour of an emphasis on "texts as sites for the circulation of cultural energy and for the ongoing negotiation of power relations within

² T.N. HABINEK (Princeton 1998), 167. For the book's 'cultural-materialist' stance, see e.g. the early statement of alignment with the work of Raymond WILLIAMS: "I share... an abiding interest in the cultural production of meaning and values, past and present, and in the use of language as a material form that relies on specific technologies and structures of communication" (p.5).

³ One of the participants in these *Entretiens* has recently dedicated a book to the project of putting historicist and aestheticist approaches into dialogue with one another: E. FANTHAM, *Roman Literary Culture. From Cicero to Apuleius* (Baltimore 1996).

society” (my quotations come from the introduction to Carol Dougherty’s and Leslie Kurke’s *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*, another key volume in the current conversation between cultural criticism and classical studies, which puts Stephen Greenblatt in dialogue with an anthropological “poetics of power” formulated by Clifford Geertz⁴).

In accepting these cues for my paper, let me build in a polemical emphasis of my own. There is, I think, an increasing price to be paid for the marked impatience with poetic aestheticism, verging on dismissal, which characterises most versions of the new culturalism. In practice if not in precept, all this revisionary energy, bringing with it new poetic intertextualities with monuments, inscriptions and sociological constructions⁵, is tending simply to sweep aside the familiar intertextual narratives of literary history (narratives of genre, allusion and poetic genealogy); whereas perhaps the real challenge should be to recuperate the old intertextualities, to put them into productive dialogue with the new. While Habinek disavows interest in “a critical practice that mystifies its relationship to contemporary economic and social arrangements”, he is of course well aware that the elite Roman poetry which is the target of his (and our) critical practice is *poetry* that mystifies its relationship to contemporary economic and social arrangements⁶. The cultural critic may suspect the formalist tradition of unreflective complicity in the aesthetic self-mystification of the Roman *doctus poeta*; but the culturalist project of critiquing that self-mystification will not advance very far unless it makes full use of the insights gained by recent generations of formalist criticism into the elaborate aesthetic structures and generic

⁴ C. DOUGHERTY & L. KURKE (edd.) (Oxford 1998), 1-12 (quotations from 5).

⁵ Cf. D. FOWLER’S [n.1], 171 characterization of “the [critical] market of the early 1990s, where intertextuality with monuments, inscriptions and sociological constructions became fashionable”.

⁶ Quotation from T.N. HABINEK, “The Lost Ideologeme”, (unpublished) paper for 1996 APA panel entitled *Ovid and the Future of Intertextuality*.

protocols of elevated Roman verse — so that the place of such verse in history can be plotted from the inside out as well as from the outside in. ‘Power’ may be the new critical master-term; but, in poetry, power is something which tends to be most effectively wielded in relation to other poetry and poets, both past and present. Immanent literary history has its own internal power-plays which, if at times rarified, are anything but parochial in the traditions which they mobilize: we should not apologise to historicists, old or new, for seeking to establish these as real history too.

What I shall attempt to do in this paper, therefore, as a contribution to the topic of our *Entretiens*, is to offer two case-studies which explore what is at stake in poets’ gestures of literary historical positionality, and which relate these gestures to other kinds of cultural self-positioning on and off the page in Roman literature and society. In the larger critical context just sketched, my aim is to suggest that investment in the new cultural poetics need not entail any disinvestment from traditional ‘poetic poetics’. My paper offers not so much a sustained argument as rather a pair of snapshots of poets going about their literary business in the material world — one seen disembarking in style from a Bithynian ship, and the other enjoying as a house-guest the amenities of an opulent villa on the Bay of Naples.

*Shipping the spoils*⁷

*haec tibi Arateis multum invigilata lucernis
carmina, quis ignis novimus aërios,
levis in aridulo malvae descripta libello
Prusiaca vexi munera navicula*

Helvius Cinna fr.11 Blänsdorf

⁷ This section was originally conceived as a sort of neoteric sequel to my brief treatment of an earlier *locus classicus* of literary-cum-literal importation, viz. Fulvius Nobilior’s transference of Greek Muse-statues, spoils of conquest, into a Roman religious shrine, and Ennius’ associated introduction of Greek Muses into his *Annales*: S. HINDS, *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge 1998), 52-63, esp. 62-3, with bibl.

One of the axioms which critics of Roman poetry have learned to respect is that sea-voyages described in Latin verse are never just sea-voyages. Regardless of their actual historicity or otherwise, they are metaphors too — and at times specifically programmatic metaphors for poetic composition. For an illustration, we need look no further than our current *Entretiens*: in the attractive reading of Alain Deremetz, Virgil is found in *Aeneid* 3 to metaphorize his manoeuvres in epic tradition through the *régate maritime* which interweaves the voyages of Odysseus and Aeneas.

Given this tradition of metaphorical coding, Cinna fr. 11, the point of departure for my first case study, readily unpacks itself as a narrative of immanent literary history⁸. Cinna, who toils over the *Zmyrna* for nine years, is most famous among all the ‘neoteric’ poets for aligning his poetry with the *recherché* literature of the Hellenistic East; and this epigram on his importation from Bithynia of an exquisite manuscript copy of Aratus, as a gift for a friend, reads as a quintessentially neoteric position statement. The description in the second couplet of the physical properties of the book is really telling us about the style of the poetry which it contains (exquisite, exotic, miniaturist); in particular the use of bark, “a primitive writing-material, [used] as an occasional fad in historical times”⁹, is allusively appropriate to the post-Hesiodic poetry of Aratus, “a modern writing in a self-consciously archaic style”¹⁰. More particularly, the book-description tells us how readily this imported artefact will contribute to the aesthetics of Roman

⁸ Commentary by E. COURTNEY (Ed.), *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford 1993), 221-3. Brief discussions by H. TRÄNKLE, “Neoterische Kleinigkeiten”, in *MH* 24 (1967), 87-103 at 87-9; G.D. WILLIAMS, “Representations of the Book-Roll in Latin Poetry: Ovid, *Tr.* 1.1.3-14 and Related Texts”, in *Mnemosyne* 45 (1992), 178-89, at 179-80; and add now L. MORGAN, in O. TAPLIN (Ed.), *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds. A New Perspective* (Oxford 2000), 350-1.

⁹ E. COURTNEY [n.8] *ad loc.*

¹⁰ N. HOPKINSON (Ed.), *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge 1988), 137; cf. L. MORGAN [n.8], 351.

neotericism itself. It is at least symptomatic, and perhaps more, that this gift dedication speaks the same language as the book dedication of Catullus 1 (1-2):

*cui dono lepidum novum libellum
arida modo pumice expolitum?*

There as here, description of miniaturist style is conducted through description of the physical book, and with overlapping vocabulary (*dono/munera*, *arida/aridulo*, *libellum/libello*); Cinna's very multiplication of diminutives (*aridulo* and *navicula* as well as *libello*) converges with Catullan affectation¹¹. Cinna's *aridulo libello* acquires lexical distinction from the fact that it activates the antique sense of *liber* (this book really *is* bark); contrast Catullus' *lepidum novum libellum*, a *new* book containing, as the bilingual *lepidum* / *lepton* pun signals, a *new* production of the 'slender' Alexandrian aesthetic famously advertised by Aratus' 'old' book (in the acrostic 'signature' of *Phaen.* 783-7)¹².

If literary histories such as these are encoded in the Aratean book's own physical properties, so too the physical transportation of the book from Asia Minor to Italy, by Bithynian ship, is really about Cinna's desire to import into Latin the tradition of a poet who himself originated in (another part of) Asia Minor. The very boat in which the book travels is, inevitably, a diminutive one, emblematic of the small-scale poetics transferred from Greek poem to Latin importer. More than that, the conceit which links the epigram's two couplets is surely that Cinna the sailor is able to navigate his voyage precisely because of the astronomical knowledge gained by Cinna the poet from

¹¹ E. COURTNEY [n.8] *ad loc.* — though the marked fondness for diminutives in Catullus' polymetrics does not really extend to his own elegiac epigrams: cf. D.O. ROSS, *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass. 1969), 22-5; E.A. SCHMIDT, *Catull* (Heidelberg 1985), 51.

¹² Catullus' punning *lepidum*: B. LATTA, "Zu Catulls Carmen 1", in *MH* 29 (1972), 201-13 at 204 and 210-13; T.P. WISEMAN, *Clio's Cosmetics* (Leicester 1979), 169-70. Aratus' acrostic ΛΕΠΗΘΗ: D. KIDD (Ed.), *Aratus. Phaenomena* (Cambridge 1997) on *phaen.* 783.

his on-board copy of Aratus. The allusive self-positioning here is further intensified by the epigram's status as a variation of Callimachus' famous epigram on the composition (and the *leptotes*) of the *Phaenomena* (*Epigr.* 27.3-4 Pf.):

... χαίρετε, λεπταί
ρήσιες, Ἀρήτου σύντονος ἀγρυπνίη

The point of Callimachus' conceit about Aratean wakefulness (*agrypnie*) lies in a playful association between the poet's all-night toil and the nocturnal star-gazing which his astronomical topic requires¹³; Cinna's midnight oil (*lucernis*) moves Aratus firmly indoors and closes off the ambiguity¹⁴ — only to reopen it by reapplying the conceit of simultaneous book-scanning and sky-scanning (as just suggested) to his own Aratus-inspired navigation.

Finally, Cinna's vocabulary of connoisseurship (not just any copy of Aratus but a rare and exquisitely produced one) may work with the imagery of miniaturism to stake a claim for *this* import against its direct market rivals. The fact is that the *Phaenomena*, translated by Cicero c.85 BC, have in that sense been 'imported' to Rome before: in one perspective, then, Cinna's act of importation might be felt to be superfluous. But when read emblematically, the particular kind of aestheticism on display in Cinna's epigram implies not just an importation of Aratus but an importation of Aratus *in certain stylistic terms*. Special pleading, perhaps; but a distinction whose importance will be all the greater in later literary historical retrospect, in that systematic allusion to and (re)translation of Aratean didactic into Latin will turn out in the next three generations and beyond to be an obsessively recurrent form of Roman literary self-fashioning.

¹³ P. BING, *The Well-Read Muse* (Göttingen 1988), 36; A. CAMERON, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995), 379 (with defence of σύντομος); S. HINDS, "After Exile: Time and Teleology from *Metamorphoses* to *Ibis*", in *Ovidian Transformations*, ed. by P. HARDIE *et alii* (Cambridge [Philol. Soc.] 1999), 55 and n.12.

¹⁴ Cf. E. COURTNEY [n.8] *ad loc.*

A moment of consummate aestheticism, then, whose translation of an event in the outer world into a display of pure book-learning 'mystifies' the economics of cultural production and invites us, as readers, to collude in the mystification: we stand convicted of the charges laid against us as literary historians by Tom Habinek. And yet, let us pause to notice how much cultural history has already been uncovered by our probing of the aesthetics of this poetic voyage: the language of gift-giving, poetic self-positioning in relation to contemporary Romans and past Greeks, linked vocabularies of connoisseurship for books and their contents. Not a bad haul — and all negotiable currency for a cultural materialist.

Indeed, the deeper the critic plunges into the realm of the poem's aesthetic, the more interesting the poem becomes — as a performance of gift-giving. An aestheticist reading, taken to its logical conclusion, might go so far as to read the epigram written by Cinna to accompany his gift as actually *superseding* the gift itself and rendering it superfluous: Cinna's true gift to his friend (on such a view) is not the curious mallow-bark Aratus at all, but rather the accompanying epigram which does that friend the compliment of associating him with the allusive discourse of neoteric philhellenism and poetic self-fashioning. Arguably, aestheticist and culturalist reading practices need each other to get the most out of a moment like this. However, despite (or rather *because of*) the plausibility of this particular reading as a reconstruction of Cinna's own dedicatory intent in fr. 11, we should also acknowledge a critical imperative to step outside the charmed circle — a hermeneutic circle — of neoteric aestheticism. Habinek's charges of literary historical nostalgia and evasion do bear thinking about here: let us attempt to respond more directly by reading Cinna fr. 11 with and against some broader Roman economic and political contexts.

First and least radically, let us register the fact that, besides being an allegory of literary historical self-positioning, this poem is also part of the corpus of evidence for actual importation of material artworks from Greece and the East into Italy in

the late Republic. In this perspective, the exquisite mallow-bark book reemerges not just as a metaphor but as something intrinsically valuable, and what the epigram does is to *add to the book's value as a collector's item*. As Bettina Bergmann has recently reminded us, writing not about imported poetry but about a set of frescoes laboriously shipped from Sparta in the 50s, "an object's history of migration, especially a serendipitous one, enhance[s] its pedigree"¹⁵; for such a logic it will suffice to recall Statius' fantasy of connoisseurship heaped upon the Hercules statuette in the house of Novius Vindex (*silv.* 4.6). Viewed thus, Cinna fr. 11 is at once a note of provenance for a precious object, an appraisal by a prestigious authority, and a value-adding narrative of its acquired history. Henceforth, thanks to the 'paratextual' presence of Cinna's dedicatory epigram, the worth of this manuscript of Aratus will be enhanced by the tale of its origin in antique Bithynia, once ruled by kings called Prusias (an exotic location to add to those already inherently associated with the poetry of the much-travelled Aratus), by its association with the 'mythology' of Rome's conquest of the luxurious East, and by the very fact of its having passed through the hands of Cinna himself, a distinguished poet and connoisseur of Hellenistic poetry (whose good taste thus attaches itself to the gift).

So much for art connoisseurship. Next, a non-standard application of a text standardly deployed in literary histories of neotericism may serve to bring Cinna fr. 11 more directly still up against the economics of material culture. Among the intertexts relevant to a cultural historical reading of the poem are not only Callimachus, *Epigr.* 27 and Catullus 1, as adduced above, and not only the other texts of the past and future Latin

¹⁵ B. BERGMANN, "Greek Masterpieces and Roman Recreative Fictions", in *HSCP* 97 (1995), 79-120 at 89. The instance concerns frescoes which the aediles Varro and Murena cut out of their walls in Sparta and shipped to Rome in 59 BC for public display. What gave them especial value in the eyes of Roman viewers was the *fact of their transportation*: PLIN. *nat.* 35.173 *cum opus per se mirum esset, tralatum tamen magis mirabantur*.

Aratean tradition (from Cicero to Varro of Atax, Virgil, Ovid, Germanicus, Manilius and beyond), but also the following often-quoted *testimonium* from a life in the *Suda* (π 664 = Parthenius, *Test.* 1 Lightfoot):

... οὗτος [i.e. Παρθένιος] ἐλήφθη ὑπὸ Κίννα λάφυρον, ὅτε Μιθριδάτην Ῥωμαῖοι κατεπολέμησαν· εἶτα ἠφείθη διὰ τὴν παιδείουσιν ...

Now, whether this famous story of importation relates to the same trip of the same Cinna (as is most likely), to an earlier trip of the same Cinna, or even to an earlier trip of this Cinna's father¹⁶, the parallel remains: Cinna (and/or his family) gained wealth and prestige in Bithynia by acquiring and importing not just exquisite Greek poetic manuscripts but an actual captive Greek poet too, Parthenius of Nicaea. In isolation, this story has not been without its own history of cultural mystification: modern scholars tend to elide the awkward business of enslavement (however temporary)¹⁷ by writing as if Parthenius were a European professor taking up an attractive position at a rich American private university. To see the two anecdotes of importation side by side is to be firmly reminded that *both* concern Roman acquisition of actual material spoils of empire. Cinna's epigram on the precious book can prompt us to read Parthenius too as 'objectified' by his acquisition; he, like the book, is a prestige Hellenic import to be shipped to Rome for consumption by and circulation among the elite. And, reading in the opposite direction, the story of Parthenius' enslavement can prompt us to ask more searchingly just how Cinna came by

¹⁶ (a) Both Parthenius and book are imported after final defeat of Mithridates in 66. (b) Parthenius is imported 66, book is imported after Cinna's service on staff of Memmius (see below) in 57-56. (c) Parthenius is imported by an older family member after fall of Nicaea in 73 (a date too early for our Cinna, tribune in 44, to be active), book by our Cinna in 57-56. See E. COURTNEY [n.8], 213 and 222; T.P. WISEMAN, *Cinna the Poet and other Roman Essays* (Leicester 1974), 47-8; and, for the latest discussion, J.L. LIGHTFOOT (Ed.), *Parthenius of Nicaea* (Oxford 1999), 11-13.

¹⁷ On Parthenius' servile status see J.L. LIGHTFOOT [n.16], 13-14 with 9 n.1.

that de-luxe copy of Aratus in Bithynia: who owned it before, did Cinna (or a middle-man) pay anything for it, was it part of a larger dispersal of property, and if so where is the previous owner of that property now?

The enormous respect shown by neoteric poets like Cinna for Greek letters and Greek literary history, both past (e.g. Aratus) and present (e.g. Parthenius), is something clear, deeply felt, indeed essential to their identities. But at another level it invites interpretation as part of the 'mystification' of empire, as one among many ways in which late republican Rome culturally reprocesses the massive westward flow of Hellenic wealth imported into Italy in these years by both fair means and foul, and often without discrimination between the two.

Let me offer a further intertext for Cinna fr. 11, this time a Catullan one, apposite in that it brings together once more Cinna, Bithynia and the spoils of empire — but *not* this time in the context of traffic in poetry or in poets. Catullus is being quizzed by a rather forward girl about his own foreign service in Bithynia, on the staff of C. Memmius in 57-56 BC. How, he is asked, did he make out financially there (Catullus 10.6-8)?¹⁸

... *quid esset*
iam Bithynia, quo modo se haberet,
et quonam mihi profuisset aere.

He replies, in lively language, that pickings were slim for all — and especially for a cohort which had an *irrumator* as its praetor (9-13)¹⁹:

respondi id quod erat, nihil neque ipsis
 nunc praetoribus esse nec cohorti
 cur quisquam caput unctius referret,
 praesertim quibus esset irrumator
 praetor nec faceret pili cohortem.

¹⁸ Cf. W. FITZGERALD, *Catullan Provocations. Lyric Poetry and the Drama of Position* (Berkeley 1995), 174-6, with fine observations on "the complicity of the urbane conversational tone with the imperial ethos" here in Catullus 10.

¹⁹ With recent edd., I read Westphal's *nunc* for *nec* in 10.10.

But surely, he is asked, he was at least able to bring home a team of native bearers for his litter? "Of course", he bluffs — but as we learn a little farther on (27-30), it was not he but none other than his fellow-staffer Gaius Cinna who procured one of the special *lecticae* for which Bithynia was then famous (14-20)²⁰:

*"at certe tamen" inquiunt "quod illic
natum dicitur esse comparasti -
ad lecticam homines". ego, ut puellae
unum me facerem beatiorem,
"non" inquam "mihi tam fuit maligne
ut, provincia quod mala incidisset,
non possem octo homines parare rectos".*

Here, stripped (it seems) of mystification, is the bottom line of the traffic in imperial prestige from Bithynia. My juxtaposition of this vignette with the epigram on the imported poetry book (Cinna fr. 11) and the *testimonium* on the imported professor (Parthenius, *Test.* 1) will seem entirely natural to an historian of Roman imperialism, but perhaps a little vulgar to an historian of Roman neoteric philhellenism. And that is just the point. Lest 'Cinna in Bithynia' still seduce us as a literary historical narrative of pure artistic communion between the finest sensibilities of Hellenic and Roman book culture, transcending the vulgar associations of mere trade or plunder, let us recall this other item of human cargo famously shipped from Bithynia by Cinna (most likely a decade after the trip on which he acquired the person of Parthenius²¹): namely, a team of eight strong slaves to haul his pampered Roman body around — or to pass on to his fellow-poet Catullus, that he too might cut a swagger in the capital with the spoils of service abroad (29-32):

²⁰ On the particular association of the *lectica octophorus* with Bithynian royalty see CIC. *Verr.* 2.5.27, with C.J. FORDYCE, *Catullus. A Commentary* (Oxford 1961), 119-20 on Catullus 10.15f.

²¹ For Cinna in Bithynia cf. n.16 above. *Pace* T.P. WISEMAN [n.16], 48 (against broad consensus), the clear implication of Catullus 10 is that Cinna is (again) in Bithynia and on Memmius' staff at the same time as Catullus: so E. COURTNEY [n.8], 213; E.A. SCHMIDT [n.11], 68-9.

fugit me ratio: meus sodalis
 — *Cinna est Gaius — is sibi paravit.*
verum utrum illius an mei, quid ad me?
utor tam bene quam mihi pararim.

In the end, however, the vulgar Catullus 10 does not reveal an unvarnished truth about the experience of elite Roman poets in Bithynia any more than does the idealizing Cinna fr. 11: it contains its own, inverted kind of mystification. It is significant that poem 10 is a story told by Catullus against himself, in verse and (hence) 'in character'; and no less significant that Memmius, the unsympathetic governor against whom he inveighs, the *irrumator* whom he, Cinna and their fellow staffers are forced to serv(ic)e, appears in other sources as a philhellenic dilettante not so very unlike them²². Against the parade-ground bully sketched here and (more graphically) at Catullus 28.9-10,

o Memmi, bene me ac diu supinum
tota ista trabe lentus irrumasti!

needs to be set the languid stylist and student of Greek letters characterized by Cicero at *Brut.* 247,

perfectus litteris, sed Graecis, fastidiosus sane Latinarum, argutus
orator verbisque dulcis sed fugiens non modo dicendi verum etiam
cogitandi laborem

and the writer of lascivious erotic verse later bracketed by Ovid with that of Catullus and Cinna themselves, in the company of other 'neoteric' poets (*trist.* 2.427ff.); for that matter (though this raises its own questions) the same Memmius is dedicatee of Lucretius' *De rerum natura*, another poem which, like Cinna's epigram, programmatically imports Aratean *agrypnie* to Rome in the mid first century BC²³. While noting the significance of

²² Cf. C.J. FORDYCE [n.20] on CATULL. 10.13; T.P. WISEMAN [n.16], 38 n.89.

²³ Cf. LUCR. 1.141-2 with M. GALE, *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius* (Cambridge 1994), 107 n.41.

this prosopographical nexus — a governor of known literary tastes serving in the East peoples his staff with elite young men who share them — commentators still tend to take Catullus' complaints about his foreign service under Memmius more or less at face value. But it is at least as plausible that Catullus' jibes at Memmius are an in-joke, to be appreciated by Catullus and Cinna, and even to be taken with a grain of salt by Memmius himself, their ostensible butt. It seems a fair conjecture that this governor, who took such care to construct a staff of like-minded *littérateurs*, and for whom — based on Cicero's (mixed) review of his interests, quoted above — the opportunity for recreational dabbling in Hellenic culture on this Eastern assignment will itself have been a distinct treat, will have tried to run his Bithynian headquarters as something of a *salon* for Roman philhellenes²⁴. Perhaps that was not how it seemed to Catullus; perhaps he did feel well and truly 'shafted' by Memmius in the sweltering humidity of Nicaea. More likely this is urbane role-play, the banter of the officers' mess stylized into the banter of the hendecasyllabic poet, who pulls artistic rank on his superior by affecting to regard him as just another military thug.

At any rate we know that in other moods Catullus could assimilate his Bithynian experience to the standard narratives of Roman elite philhellenism — like Cinna in his imported book epigram. So it is in two other Catullan poems about returning by sea from Bithynia to Italy, whose (circuitous) routes remystify the provincial tour of duty demystified in poem 10: one poem through a salute to the *grand tour* of the East beloved of cultivated Romans (46.4-8)²⁵,

²⁴ C.J. FORDYCE [n.20] on Catullus 10.10 aptly adduces HOR. *epist.* 1.3.6 *studiosa cohors*: "Horace speaks of [the cohort] which accompanied Tiberius to the East in 20 B.C. in terms which suggest a literary club rather than the staff of a commander on active service".

²⁵ A business-oriented context for Catullus 46 is conjectured by T.P. WISEMAN, *Catullus and his World. A Reappraisal* (Cambridge 1985), 99-101, suggesting that, for a member of the upwardly mobile Valerii Catulli, a tour of the *claras*

*linquantur Phrygii, Catulle, campi
Nicaeaeque ager uber aestuosae;
ad claras Asiae volumus urbes.
iam mens praetrepidans avet vagari,
iam laeti studio pedes vigescunt*

and one through its ventriloquization of the life story of a learned ship built of timber from a coastal region administered, as it happens, as part of Bithynia (4.13-15)²⁶:

*Amastri Pontica et Cytore buxifer,
tibi haec fuisse et esse cognitissima
ait phaselus...*

One might say that poem 4 distils Catullus' voyage home from Bithynia into an essence of all poetic voyages in the Greek world, from the Argo onwards, effacing the voyager himself into invisibility — so that here, even more than for the *Prusiaca... navicula* of Cinna fr. 11 (with which some scholars have suspected an allusive connection)²⁷, the empire-builder's return from Bithynia becomes the purest vector of westering Hellenism.

Tom Habinek, noting (in the context of Augustan elegy) the tendency of the elite personal poet to distance his world-view from that of the figure engaged in politics or military service, describes the Roman poet as thus mystifying his own relationship with the socio-economics of empire — an idea for which he usefully adduces Mary Louise Pratt's observations concerning

Asiae... urbes might conceivably involve an inspection of family estates. WISEMAN's whole Catullan oeuvre makes indispensable reading for any new-wave culturalist: cf., in the same discussion, the thought-provoking remark that "whenever he [Catullus] mentions faraway places (and he does it quite a lot) his instinct is to allude as much to their produce as to their mythological associations — silphium from Cyrene, oysters from Lampsacus, boxwood from Cytorus, grain (probably) from Africa, rabbits, dyed linen and gold from Spain".

²⁶ See C.J. FORDYCE [n.20] on Catullus 4.11 and 13 for the geography.

²⁷ See C.J. FORDYCE [n.20], 98, for scepticism about the "pleasing fancies" which would identify Catullus' and Cinna's Bithynian ships; but cf. E. COURTNEY, "Catullus' Yacht (Or Was It)", in *CJ* 92 (1997), 113-22 at 121-2.

“the efforts of nineteenth century European scholars and artists to differentiate themselves from ‘real’ imperialists, i.e. soldiers and bureaucrats”²⁸. This is a model which can attractively be applied to Cinna fr. 11, or indeed to the two poems just surveyed, Catullus 46 and 4. What is interesting about the stylization of imperial small-talk in Catullus 10, however, viewed as part of our cultural-historical Bithynian intertext, is how it does *not* fit this pattern. Instead, Catullus narrativizes his and his fellow poet’s distinctly upscale Bithynian tour of duty as the stereotypically crass Roman provincial plunder trip, where the despicable governor sticks it to his staff, the staff stick it to the natives, and everyone is on the make. In a sense Catullus 10 is a diametrically opposite kind of poem to Cinna fr. 11 (or Catullus 46 or 4): the emphasis upon a shared interest in litters rather than in letters reads as a self-conscious perversion and debasement of the philhellenic narratives otherwise available to and associated with the neoteric cohort in Bithynia. However let us not make too much of this: the probability that this debasement is self-conscious in Catullus 10 need not imply an equal neoteric readiness to question the basis of neoteric philhellenism in the other cases which we have considered. Whatever we ourselves may hold, we can hardly expect Catullus, much less Cinna, to formulate the idea that in circulating volumes of Aratus, or in accepting pointers in Greek poetics from Parthenius, they are implicated in a Roman project of processing and mystifying the spoils of empire. Even for the most self-ironizing contemporary participants in the economy of Roman elite culture, historical self-knowledge will have its limits.

²⁸ Quotation from T.N. HABINEK, “Ovid and Empire”, in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, ed. by P. HARDIE (Cambridge 2002); cf. T.N. HABINEK [n.2], 167; and M.L. PRATT, *Imperial Eyes. Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York 1992), esp. 7, 57-85, and index *s.v.* ‘anti-conquest’.

*Appraising the view*²⁹

*una tamen cunctis, procul eminent una diaetis
 quae tibi Parthenopen directo limite ponti
 ingerit: hic Graia penitus desecta metallis
 saxa, quod Eoae respergit vena Syenes,
 Synnade quod maesta Phrygiae fodere secures
 per Cybeles lugentis agros, ubi marmore picto
 candida purpureo distinguitur area gyro;
 hic et Amyclaei caesum de monte Lycurgi
 quod viret et molles imitatur rupibus herbas;
 hic Nomadum lucent flaventia saxa Thasosque
 et Chios et gaudens fluctus aequare Carystos;
 omnia Chalcidicas turres obversa salutant.
 macte animo quod Graia probas, quod Graia frequentas
 arva...*

Statius, *silv.* 2.2.83-96

Nowhere in Roman poetry is the mutuality of literary and other kinds of cultural self-positioning so openly embraced and so obsessively negotiated as in the occasional verse of Statius. This has long been familiar territory to students of the *Silvae*³⁰; but, at least in the Anglophone academy (if I may interpose a brief report on regional conditions), students of the *Silvae* until recently plied their craft in some isolation from the more established neighborhoods of late Republican and Augustan poetic studies. Now at last these patient Statians find themselves transported from the margins to the centre, as the praise poems of the *Silvae* take on a major role in the new cultural critical conversations in Roman studies³¹. Pindar's *Epinicians* have provided a corresponding focus for the new culturalism on the Greek side in recent years³². But, so far anyway, a persistent

²⁹ This second case-study has its remote origin in my own (unpublished) response to the 1996 APA panel adduced in n.6 above.

³⁰ See esp. A. HARDIE, *Statius and the Silvae. Poets, Patrons and Epideixis in the Graeco-Roman World* (Liverpool 1983).

³¹ Cf. J. HENDERSON, *A Roman Life. Rutilius Gallicus on Paper and in Stone* (Exeter 1998), 1-2, 72 and *passim*.

³² See esp. L. KURKE, *The Traffic in Praise. Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca 1991).

contrast distinguishes Pindaric and Statian praise poetry from one another as heuristic texts for the modern exploration of this methodological nexus, viz. the enduring prestige associated in classical studies with Pindar in particular and fifth century Greek culture in general, *versus* the lingering stigma attached to the *Silvae* in particular and Roman 'Silver-Age' culture in general. Even the most dispassionate Pindarists seem dazzled by the society that Pindar praises; even the most enthusiastic Statians seem embarrassed by the society that Statius praises³³. As the current Statian renaissance gathers momentum, it might be interesting to monitor whether the new fashion for cultural criticism, often criticized for jettisoning ideas of canon and poetic value, is in fact more prone to the opposite vice of internalizing and perpetuating the canon- and period-driven prejudices so characteristic of traditional literary history.

And this thought can cue a kind of transition between the present paper's two case-studies. Like the 'neoteric' productions of Cinna and Catullus, the poetry of Statius is characterized by a highly aestheticized style and a preoccupation with various kinds of aesthetic self-fashioning in literature and in life. But, as with modern reactions to Statian praise, there is a tendency among scholars to keep a certain distance from Statian aestheticism, to find it excessive or even pathological; and this contrasts markedly with the celebration of neoteric aestheticism which revolutionized the study of Catullus and the 'new' poets in the 1960s and after — a scholarly enterprise which was energized by an almost intuitive sense of identification with neoteric vocabularies of taste and artistic discrimination³⁴. Again, this bears thinking about in terms of the aesthetics of

³³ Within Hellenic studies themselves, and *mutatis mutandis*, one may remark an analogous contrast between scholarly attitudes to Pindaric and to Hellenistic praise-poetry. Praise of a fifth-century athletic victor (whatever his *polis* and politics may be) sits better with most classical Hellenists than does encomium of a Ptolemaic queen: so R.F. THOMAS, *Reading Virgil and his Texts* (Ann Arbor 1999), 9-10 n.13.

³⁴ Cf. S. HINDS [n.7], 74-83.

culturalism itself. The first half of my paper committed a kind of ideological heresy in presuming to elucidate the literary history of neoteric poetry by means of a vulgar inquiry into its economics. The second half of my paper will offer the same kind of reading of a poem by Statius — once again literary history will be alloyed with a kind of economic history — but this time there is no tradition of untainted aestheticism to be affronted. Modern study of the *Silvae* has *always* been as much about economics as about aesthetics. Here is a different way in which the new critical fashion may be more bound up in the canon-driven prejudices of traditional literary history than it acknowledges: is it possible that a ‘cultural poetics’ actually depends for its methodological *frisson* upon the transgressive breaking of an aesthetic spell, and hence is parasitic upon the very aestheticism which it seeks to demystify? Will an exposure of the social and material underpinnings of a poem by Statius *count for less* than an exposure of the social and material underpinnings of a poem by Catullus or Cinna, or indeed by Pindar, simply because for traditional reasons of literary-historical snobbery the aesthetic stakes are felt to be lower?

I turn to *silv.* 2.2³⁵, Statius’ highly wrought celebration of the highly wrought villa of Pollius Felix at Surrentum, prominently situated on the rich and resort-studded Bay of Naples³⁶. Recent scholars have already laid down the main lines of a cultural critical reading, noting as characteristically Statian the juxtaposition and layering of different kinds of consumption, the easy oscillation between celebration of material and of spiritual goods, and the pointed exploration of parallels between the perspectives of patron and of poet in the cultural economy³⁷. An

³⁵ Commentary by H.-J. VAN DAM (Leiden 1984). Earlier key articles by H. CANCIK, “Eine epikureische Villa”, in *Der altsprachliche Unterricht* 11 (1968), 62-75; R.G.M. NISBET, “*Felicitas* at Surrentum (Statius, *Silvae* 2.2)”, in *JRS* 68 (1978), 1-11.

³⁶ Cf. J.H. D’ARMS, *Romans on the Bay of Naples* (Cambridge, Mass. 1970), the classic study; 220-2 for Pollius’ Surrentine villa.

³⁷ K.S. MYERS, “*Miranda fides*. Poet and Patrons in Paradoxographical Landscapes in Statius’ *Silvae*”, in *Materiali e Discussioni* 44 (2000), 103-138 (with

ideal point of access, then, to my paper's themes; and controversial only if I allow myself (as I probably will) to get too enthusiastic about the poem's beauties of pure form, or dare to hint (as I may already have done) that Statius' undoubted fascination with elite lifestyle, usually read as a mere perversion of the aesthetic and moral values of previous poetic generations, can more interestingly be plotted within an underlying sociology of the representation of wealth in polite Roman poetry, which, despite episodes of variation and modification³⁸, shows much essential continuity throughout the late Republic and early Empire.

Consider the passage which I have placed at the head of this section. While these verses deal with imported Greek marbles, not with imported Greek poetic manuscripts, and while Statius is describing someone else's property rather than his own, there is a sense in which this highly ornate description operates in much the same way as does Cinna's epigram (fr. 11) about the volume of Aratus: once again material and non-material perspectives can be felt to work together in a narrative of philhellenic refinement and elite connoisseurship.

In these elaborately ecphrastic lines, to look through a window is to frame a conversation about cultural history. Some, like Pollius, amass cultural capital by building villas ornamented with precious stones imported from the Greek world, which bespeak their wealth and taste. Others, like Statius himself, amass cultural capital by building poems ornamented with names, epithets and inflexions imported from the Greek world, which bespeak their wealth *of learning* and their taste. In displaying their wealth, the owner who commissions the marble

generous bibl.); B. BERGMANN, "Painted Perspectives of a Villa Visit: Landscape as Status and Metaphor", in *Roman Art in the Private Sphere*, ed. by E. GAZDA (Ann Arbor 1991), 49-70. When my article was in final preparation, I saw in draft Chapter 5, "Dominating Nature: Pollius' Villa in *Silv.* 2.2", from Carole NEWLANDS' forthcoming book *Statius' Silvae and the Poetics of Empire*.

³⁸ The brevity of this qualification is not meant to minimize the continuing importance of attention to such patterns of change: see now K.S. MYERS [n.37].

ornament and the poet who catalogues it find themselves in closely analogous positions, each combining due acknowledgement of a culturally agreed repertoire of precious materials with individual virtuosity in the manner of juxtaposing and setting them off³⁹.

Such 'poetics of real estate', if one may so term them, are sustained throughout the poem. The view of Parthenope (i.e. Naples) afforded by the sumptuous room whose marbles are catalogued in *silv.* 2.2.83-94 is itself the climax of a catalogue of segmented prospects of the far side of the famous Bay visible from the villa's many windows, with each glimpse of this geography of elite enjoyment figured through Statius' language as a *possession* over which Pollius' villa exercises ownership (72-5):

... *quid mille revolvam*
culmina visendique vices? sua cuique voluptas
atque omni proprium thalamo mare, transque iacentem
Nerea diversis servit sua terra fenestris.

And Pollius' command of this aesthetic (and quasi-material) capital is complemented and enhanced by Statius' collaborative participation in the no less aestheticized tradition of poetic description of the Bay of Naples — a tradition which is pre-eminently concerned to negotiate the area's status as a "contact zone" between Greek and Roman culture⁴⁰, exploring its history and topography in allusive and ornamental variations upon a rich heritage of Greek nomenclature and Trojan mythic aetiology (76-80):

haec videt Inarimen, illinc Prochyta aspera paret;
armiger hac magni patet Hectoris, inde malignum
aera respirat pelago circumflua Nesis;

³⁹ On virtuosic display and virtuosic cataloguing of marble in Statius: K.M. COLEMAN (Ed.), *Statius. Silvae IV* (Oxford 1988) on *silv.* 4.2.26; C. CONNORS, in O. TAPLIN (Ed.) [n.8], 492-518 at 512-13; B. BERGMANN [n.37], 63; Z. PAVLOVSKIS, *Man in an Artificial Landscape* (Leiden 1973), 15-16.

⁴⁰ Roman/Greek "contact zones": for this fruitful application of M.L. PRATT's ([n.28], 6-7) term, see D.C. FEENEY, *Literature and Religion at Rome. Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs* (Cambridge 1998), 67-70.

*inde vagis omen felix Euploea carinis
quaeque ferit curvos exserta Megalia fluctus.*

As in the inventoried marble décor, Statius' poem finds a verbal equivalent to the wealth of the villa's prospects in the sumptuous expenditure of language with which it catalogues those prospects, along "with all their mythological and etymological accessories" (H.-J. van Dam, *ad loc.*, pp.241ff.).

The above catalogues offer a context in which to read one further catalogue of domestic appointments which precedes them in the central section of *silv.* 2.2. Here the oscillation is not so much between Pollian and Statian constructions of wealth, as between two different ways of constructing Pollian wealth (63-72):

*quid referam veteres ceraeque aerisque figuras?
si quid Apellei gaudent animasse colores,
si quid adhuc vacua tamen admirabile Pisa
Phidiacae rasere manus, quod ab arte Myronis
aut Polycliteo iussum est quod vivere caelo,
aeraque ab Isthmiacis auro potiora favillis,
ora ducum ac vatium sapientumque ora priorum,
quos tibi cura sequi, quos toto pectore sentis
expers curarum atque animum virtute quieta
compositus semperque tuus?...*

In effect two histories of cultural philhellenism are superimposed upon one another in these verses. In his villa Pollius celebrates his treasured Greek intellectual and spiritual role-models (statesmen, poets and philosophers) by giving them tangible form in a Getty-like museum of imported old-master portraits in paint and in sculpture — which have their own intrinsic value as artworks. For this ultimate consumer of Greek cultural history, material and spiritual assets exist (not without an element of paradox, on which more later) in a relationship of mutual validation... rather as they do in Cinna fr. 11. Within his broader 'poetics of real estate', the author of *silv.* 2.2 can readily be felt to endorse and to identify with this kind of cultural self-positioning.

The fact is that the poem's very ecphrastic connoisseurship encourages one to read the villa itself throughout as a kind of collaboration between Pollius and Statius⁴¹. Statius compliments Pollius as a poet more accomplished than Surrentum's eponymous Sirens (112-17)⁴²; but, more than that, the owner's massive earth-moving works in the building of the villa (54-59) are themselves figured, through invocation of the magic powers of Arion, Amphion and Orpheus, as an archetypal act of poetic creation (60-62):

*iam Methymnaei vatis manus et chelys una
Thebais et Getici cedat tibi gloria plectri;
et tu saxa moves, et te nemora alta sequuntur*

And the reference to Amphion carries an extra point. The numeral in the phrase *chelys una / Thebais* draws paradoxical attention to the fact that this Statian conceit allusively allows Pollius to eclipse not *one* Theban lyre but *two*: not just the instrument of the musical builder of Thebes but also that of the musical 'builder' of the *Thebaid*⁴³. The compliment actually works to Statius' advantage: if the property-owner acquiesces in a conceit which figures him as a super-poet, the momentary deference shown by this particular poet to this particular owner is outweighed by the increase in status thus granted to poetry in general. This is an old trick of praise-poets from Pindar to Horace; only an *idée fixe* about Statian grovelling might cause one to misconstrue such a strong poetic move as a weak one.

⁴¹ So too K.S. MYERS [n.37]. Cf. esp. here C. NEWLANDS, "Silvae 3.1 and Statius' poetic temple", in *CQ* 41 (1991), 438-52, a persuasive reading of that related poem on the rebuilt temple to Hercules on Pollius' same Surrentine estate, which finds therein a figural mutuality between architecture and poem-construction, grounded in Statian allusion to the metapoetic temple of Virgil's *georg.* 3 proem. As further context for a rapport between villa architecture and villa writing Alain Deremetz (in conversation) aptly adduces PLIN. *epist.* 5.6, esp. 41-4.

⁴² *Surrentum* etymologized from *Sirenes*: *silv.* 2.2.1 with H.-J. VAN DAM [n.35] *ad loc.*, p.195.

⁴³ Cf. 2.2.114; *Theb.* 1.33-4; and *Ach.* 1.12-13 *meque inter prisca parentum / nomina cumque suo numerant Amphione Thebae.*

In these ways and more, then, Statius uses *his* kind of capital throughout the poem to boost the value of Pollius' kind of capital, and also to increase his own by association; so that *silv.* 2.2 offers a rich cultural-materialist case-study in how prestige is generated and circulated between a rich property-owner and his praise-poet.

The poem also offers an opportunity to consider how cultural prestige can be *mystified* within such a relationship (to revisit a term much used in the first half of my paper). Both the conspicuous consumer of exquisite marbles and the conspicuous consumer of exquisite poetic language achieve their highest levels of cultural prestige when they *disavow* the importance of their own accumulated wealth — without, of course, giving any of it up. As we shall discover by the end of the poem, the true measure of Pollius' prestige as a property-owner is his professed Epicureanism, already glimpsed above in lines 70-72, which allows Statius to present his addressee as playing down his material wealth in favour of the ethical and philosophical sources of his serenity⁴⁴. And the true measure of Statius' own prestige as a praise-poet is the confidence which allows him to include in the prose preface of this highly wrought book of verse an apology to Pollius for the hastiness and carelessness of the present poem's composition (2 *praef.*)

*Polli mei villa Surrentina quae sequitur debuit a me vel in honorem
eloquentiae eius diligentius dici, sed amicus ignovit.*

— a gesture which in turn allows prestige to circulate back to Pollius by constructing him as the kind of cultivated addressee who will recognise this, like other such gestures in the *Silvae*, for the elegant modesty-*topos* which it is⁴⁵.

What structures and unifies all the cultural wealth described, constructed and disavowed in *silv.* 2.2 is a strong thematization

⁴⁴ See final page of this section, with nn.67 and 68.

⁴⁵ On the disingenuous art of Statius' *Silvae*-prefaces, see esp. C. NEWLANDS [n.41], 438-9 with 449-50; J. HENDERSON [n.31], 102-7, 113.

of the gaze. The emphasis throughout on ecphrastic or quasi-ecphrastic visuality does much to impart to the poem its marked (and characteristically Statian) sense of aestheticism⁴⁶. But what is of especial interest in the context of the present paper is that, as the poem progresses, the characteristic gaze is, more and more, a *proprietary* gaze. Recall once again the vocabulary used to describe the prospects from Pollius' windows (73-75):

... *sua cuique voluptas*
atque omni proprium thalamo mare, transque iacentem
Nerea diversis servit sua terra fenestris.

Since Cancik⁴⁷, critics have laid stress upon this strong thematization of the gaze of ownership in *silv.* 2.2; and, appealing both to the poem's language and to Roman villa culture at large, they have elicited particular connotations of ownership as especially relevant. Pollius' domestication of Nature in building his villa (52-53) is figured by Statius as an enlightened form of "military domination over a grateful subject" (Myers)⁴⁸ (56-58) —

... *domuit possessor, et illum*
formantem rupes expugnantemque secuta
gaudet humus. nunc cerne iugum discentia saxa

— and, in line with this, the owner's view from his *speculatrix villa* (3; a *speculator* is a *military* observer)⁴⁹ emerges as the

⁴⁶ 'Quasi-ecphrastic': a term used in G. ROSATI's fine characterization of Ovid's "poetica della spettacolarità", in *Narciso e Pigmaliione. Illusione e spettacolo nelle Metamorfosi di Ovidio* (Firenze 1983), 136-52, at 140.

⁴⁷ H. CANCEK [n.35], 66, 68-70; cf. B. BERGMANN [n.37], 60, "The villa is a dynamic image that itself looks out..., and subjugates the land it sees in a succession of framed views".

⁴⁸ In K.S. MYERS [n.37].

⁴⁹ On *silv.* 2.2.3 H. CANCEK [n.35], 66 n.13 suggestively cites SEN. *epist.* 51.11 (concerning villas at Baiae) *videbatur hoc magis militare, ex edito speculati late longeque subiecta. aspice quam positionem elegerint* [sc. Marius, Pompeius, Caesar], *quibus aedificia excitaverint locis et qualia: scies non villas esse sed castra*; cf. H.-J. VAN DAM [n.35] *ad loc.*, p.196.

privatized version of a distinctly imperial gaze⁵⁰. Both incoming views and imported decoration “embellish Pollius’ villa like the *spolia* of captured places” (Bergmann)⁵¹; the marbles are like “imperial maps” (Connors)⁵²; and it is noteworthy that some of Pollius’ statues of Greek sages are fashioned from Corinthian bronze (68 *aeraque ab Isthmiacis... favillis*), that fabled alloy from 146 BC which at once literalizes and emblemizes the forging of philhellenic cultural history and connoisseurship in the fire-storms of Roman conquest⁵³. For all that Pollius and Statius both belong to a Neapolitan community whose Hellenic roots run deeper than any in Italy, this is the vocabulary of a specifically *imperialized* Hellenism; it is but a short step from this back to Cinna’s Bithynian imports a century and a half earlier.

As in his gallery of old-master portraits of Greek sages, so in his villa at large, Pollius’ proprietorial gaze embraces all the wealth, both material and non-material, of the Roman philhellene — more specifically, of the Roman *imperial* philhellene. Many elite Latin readers of Statius’ poem will readily identify with such an owner’s perspective. But now let us reconnect more narrowly with the theme of our *Entretiens* by considering what might be special about Statius’ own literary gaze. What does our praise-poet see when he looks out from Pollius’ villa — not just as a Neapolitan, not just as a participant in the larger project of cultural self-fashioning, but as a poet, and

⁵⁰ “Privatized version”: an important emphasis in C. NEWLANDS [n.37], K.S. MYERS [n.37] and C. CONNORS [n.39], 512-13 — but differently developed in each.

⁵¹ B. BERGMANN [n.37], 62.

⁵² C. CONNORS [n.39], 512-13 on lavish architectural displays of exotic coloured marble as, in effect, “imperial maps” to a knowledgeable elite consumer.

⁵³ On ‘Corinthian bronze’, supposedly created when all precious metals in Corinth melted together in the fire which destroyed the city, when it fell to the Roman general Mummius in 146 BC, see PLIN. *nat.* 34.6, with other ancient refs. (but no interpretation) at H.-J. VAN DAM [n.35] on *silv.* 2.2.68-72, pp.236f.; also C. CONNORS, *Petronius the Poet. Verse and Literary Tradition in the Satyricon* (Cambridge 1998), 107, along with 20-1 on Trimalchio’s distortion at PETRON. 50.5-6.

hence as someone with a stake in a specifically literary historical economy?⁵⁴

Well, as noted earlier, he sees (both in the views across the Bay and in the decoration of the belvedere's own marbled windows) a rich tradition of Greek naming and myth-making, which allows him to set against Pollius' wealth his own patrimony as the latest inheritor of Roman literary Hellenism — and perhaps, more specifically, his own claim (through a Greek-speaking father) to something like true cultural bilingualism. But also Statius may see in the literary and cultural topography of the Bay of Naples something of peculiar relevance to him as a poet of the Latin tongue, namely a specifically *Virgilian* vista of cultural history.

Let us revisit the prospect from the highest room in Pollius' villa (83-85, 94-97).

*una tamen cunctis, procul eminent una diaetis
quae tibi Parthenopen derecto limite ponti
ingerit...*

*omnia Chalcidicas turres obversa salutant.
macte animo quod Graia probas, quod Graia frequentas
arva, nec inuideant quae te genuere Dicarchi
moenia: nos docto melius potiemur alumno.*

Note, first of all, how the terms of the poet's compliment here allow him a certain edge over the villa-owner. Despite all the praise which he bestows upon Pollius throughout the poem, Statius enjoys one cultural advantage over his addressee, namely that he welcomes Pollius to the emblematically Hellenic city of Naples as a *native* son welcoming an adopted one (*alumno*). Pollius' birthplace of Puteoli is in reality only a stone's throw from Naples, of course, and no less Greek in its foundation; but in the cultural economy of Hellenism Naples is the prestigious location, and the more appropriate home for one who is *doctus*⁵⁵.

⁵⁴ I am indebted to Elaine Fantham for help in sharpening this transition.

⁵⁵ H.-J. VAN DAM [n.35] on 96-7, p.253. Cf. J.H. D'ARMS [n.36], 59-60 and 142-6; A. HARDIE [n.30], 2-5.

Beyond that, however, the naming of 'Parthenope' in 84 may combine with the compliment in *docto... alumno* (97) to cue a poetic memory of a more famous *alumnus* of Statius' native city:

*illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti,
carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuventa,
Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.*

Virgil, *georg.* 4.563-6

Statius lays claim to the place-names of the Bay of Naples as his personal geography by virtue of birth and early upbringing⁵⁶. But for a post-Augustan poet this is also, inevitably, the geography of *Virgil*: through the Neapolitan nurture (*dulcis alebat / Parthenope*) acknowledged in the closing *sphragis* of the *Georgics*, where alone Virgil names himself in his *oeuvre*⁵⁷; through the mythic topography of the *Aeneid*, especially in its sixth book; and (canonizing these earlier associations) through the potent presence there of the master-poet's own tomb. As an *alias* for Naples the name 'Parthenope', which commemorates the supposed resting place of a ktistic Siren buried on the Campanian shore⁵⁸, seems to enter Latin verse at *georg.* 4.564, and maintains its strong Virgilian resonance in poetic usage through a posthumously felt association between the Siren's

⁵⁶ A. HARDIE [n.30], 2.

⁵⁷ As Denis Feeney suggests to me, the sphragistic association in *georg.* 4.563-4 between Virgil and Parthenope may be cemented for posterity by the apparent translational pun on the poet's nickname 'Parthenias'. Cf. J.J. O'HARA, *True Names. Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor 1996), 289: "the proximity of the proper names *Vergilium* and *Parthenope* may allude to the pun *Vergilius / virgo* and to Virgil's nickname 'Parthenias'". For Virgil as 'Parthenias' see DON. *vita Verg.* 11 (= 37-8); and cf. now J.L. LIGHT-FOOT [n.16], 14.

⁵⁸ Cf. H.-J. VAN DAM [n.35] on *silv.* 2.2.1-3; K.M. COLEMAN [n.39] on *silv.* 4.8.1-3, p.209f.; and esp. F. BÖMER, *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen. Kommentar. Buch XIV-XV* (Heidelberg 1986) on *met.* 14.101 (noting Virgil's role in putting the name into the poetic mainstream): "Unter Vergils... und Ovids Einfluss wurde... im 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr. der Name vor allem bei den Dichtern häufig verwendet".

tomb and the poet's own; it is significant that the name recurs in the epitaph attached to Virgil and his Neapolitan grave at *vita Donati* 36 (= 135) (and throughout the biographical tradition)⁵⁹:

ossa eius Neapolim translata sunt tumuloque condita... in quo distichon fecit tale:

*Mantua me genuit, Calabri rapuere, tenet nunc
Parthenope; cecini pascua rura duces.*

This is *Kampanien als geistige Landschaft*, in the title of a recent monograph by Ekkehard Stärk⁶⁰. Arguably, the overlap between Statius' personal geography and the geography of Virgilian life and letters activates the Bay of Naples itself as a key trope in the Flavian poet's negotiation of his literary historical relationship with his predecessor — as, for instance, when the *via Domitiana* culminates in a post-Virgilian encounter with the Cumaean Sibyl in *silv.* 4.3⁶¹, or as when, in our poem, Pollius' villa looks out upon Cape Misenum (*silv.* 2.2.77 *armiger hac magni patet Hectoris*), the marker of a death memorialized in *Aen.* 6.162ff.⁶², or upon the island which Statius calls *Inarime* (76, i.e. Aenaria, or Pithecusa), a name etymologically customized by Virgil for *Aen.* 9.715-16 as a gloss upon a piece of Homeric topography (at *Il.* 2.783 Typhoeus lies εἰν Ἀρίμοις)⁶³.

⁵⁹ Cf. E. COURTNEY [n.8], 257-8, for commentary; K.M. COLEMAN [n.39] on *silv.* 4.4.54, p.148. For a rhetorical analysis which argues the epitaph to be an allusive sequel to the Georgic *sphragis*, see M. BETTINI, "L'epitaffio di Virgilio, Silio Italico, e un modo di intendere la letteratura", in *Dialoghi di archeologia* 9-10 (1976-7), 439-48 at 440-2.

⁶⁰ E. STÄRK, *Kampanien als geistige Landschaft* (München 1995), esp. ch.1 "*Rus Maronianum*" (my thanks to Ernst A. Schmidt for pointing me to this discussion); for a survey of biographical data linking Virgil with Naples cf. J.H. D'ARMS [n.36], 230-1.

⁶¹ Cf. E. STÄRK [n.60], 59, 83-6.

⁶² Misenum: in the formulation of E. STÄRK [n.60], 59, one of those names which are, since the *Aeneid*, "nicht mehr allein Orte, sondern dichtersprachliche Institutionen". For Misenum in Statius and Virgil cf. also *silv.* 5.3.167-8 with *Aen.* 6.233-4, noted by H.-J. VAN DAM [n.35] on 2.2.77-8, p.242.

⁶³ *Inarime*: a name for Aenaria, as the resting place of Typhoeus, coined (?) by Virgil at *Aen.* 9.715-16 from an misdivision of words at *Il.* 2.783, where

Anywhere that Statius directs his ecphrastic gaze around the Bay of Naples, he will find himself invoking names charged not just with his own history but with Virgilian literary history⁶⁴; and nowhere more so than Parthenope itself, site of his own birth and intended retirement (see below), site of Virgil's adopted home and place of final rest. Witness *silv.* 4.4, in which Statius narrativizes a personal update of Virgil's Parthenopeian *otium* through the remarkable device of an actual visit to Virgil's tomb, shot through with linguistic and thematic reminiscence of the celebrated Georgic *sphragis* (49-55)⁶⁵:

... *nos otia vitae*
solamur cantu ventosaeque gaudia famae
quaerimus. en egomet somnum et geniale secutus
litus, ubi Ausonio se condidit hospita portu
Parthenope, tenues ignavo pollice chordas
pulso Maroneique sedens in margine templi
sumo animum et magni tumulis adcanto magistri

Witness also *silv.* 3.5, in which a more muted reminiscence of *georg.* 4.564 (*studiis... ignobilis oti*) underwrites Statius' commendation to his wife of the *desidis otia vitae* (85) in the Parthenope (78-9 *nostra... Parthenope*) to which he now seeks to return in his latter years (12-13) — with the Virgilian resonance guaranteed this time by a 'georgic' context of sustained allusion to, and Neapolitan particularization of, Virgil's praises of Italy and of rustic life (*silv.* 3.5.81ff.)⁶⁶.

Typhoeus lies εἰν Ἀρήμοις: H.-J. VAN DAM [n.35] on 76, p.241; P. HARDIE (Ed.), *Virgil. Aeneid. Book IX* (Cambridge 1994) on *Aen.* 9.715-16, pp.223f.; J.J. O'HARA [n.57], 221-2; E. STÄRK [n.60], 67-8 and 137.

⁶⁴ Back in the *silv.* 2.2 passage quoted above, *Chalcidicas turres* (94) can function as a further Virgilian trigger: cf. *Aen.* 6.17 *Chalcidica... arce* with H.-J. VAN DAM [n.35] on 94, pp.251f. and E. STÄRK [n.60], 59 with n.92.

⁶⁵ In the *silv.* 4.4 passage, as in the *georg.* 4 *sphragis* (563-66), the poet contrasts his own literary idleness (*otia vitae... ignavo pollice; studiis... ignobilis oti*) with another's (Marcellus', Caesar's) weighty public service. Cf. K.M. COLEMAN [n.39] on *silv.* 4.4.46-7, 51-2, 53, pp.146-8; E. STÄRK [n.60], 142-3.

⁶⁶ VERG. *georg.* 2.136ff., 458ff.; cf. E. STÄRK [n.60], 139 on *silv.* 3.5: "Neapel... ist bei Statius die Stadt erfüllter virgilischer Träume".

Here is one answer to the quest for something special and distinctively literary in the poet's contemplation of Neapolitan wealth in *silv.* 2.2. The author of the *Silvae* gazes out from Pollius' villa at an asset which is his more than Pollius', and which is crucial to his own cultural identity alike as poet and as Neapolitan: namely, the topography of Virgilian literary history. We may register an element of belatedness in this, familiar from other Statian invocations of Virgil. Virgil inhabited Parthenope first; Statius comes later, and in *silv.* 4.4.55 (quoted above) dramatizes his secondary status by singing at the "great master's" tomb. Yet at the same time, as a native son of Parthenope, Statius enjoys a kind of compensatory genealogical precedence over Virgil, who is (like Pollius) an adopted son, a *doctus alumnus*.

A further gloss on the Parthenopeian intertext may be added, still more pertinent to the present paper's themes. For the Statius of the *Silvae*, unlike for others in the area's luxurious resorts and watering places, the Bay of Naples represents not so much the proverbial site of Roman elite *otium* in general, as rather (through repeated allusion to the Georgic *sphragis*) the site of a specifically Virgilian and specifically poetological *otium*. And, conversely, Statius' specification of the leisured lifestyle of the Bay of Naples as a post-Virgilian lifestyle offers to the modern culturalist a kind of opportunity to plot the aestheticized *topoi* of Statian (and indeed of Virgilian) poetic *otium* within larger economies of Roman leisure lived on the Bay throughout the period under study.

The most striking conjunction in *silv.* 2.2 between a Statian gaze, a Virgilian gaze, and the wealth of the Bay of Naples remains to be noticed. Early in the poem, having completed his voyage across the Bay to Surrentum (lines 1-29), Statius ascends to a point high on the villa's citadel-like eminence (31 *urbis opus*). It is from this vantage point that he will list the estate's glorious appointments and prospects in the central portion of his text. First, he invokes the *topos* of 'epic incapacity' to emphasize the scale of the cataloguing task before him (36-42):

*non, mihi si cunctos Helicon indulgeat amnes...
 innumeras valeam species cultusque locorum
 Pieriis aequare modis...*

As it turns out, the immediate function of the *topos* is to throw into relief a closely worked allusion, in the very next lines (42-45),

... *vix* ordine longo
suffecere oculi, vix, dum per singula ducor,
*suffecere gradus. quae rerum turba! locine
 ingenium an domini mirer prius?...*

to the beginning and the end of an *actual* epic catalogue — in the sixth book of Virgil's *Aeneid* (6.752-5, 888):

*dixerat Anchises natumque unaque Sibyllam
 conventus trahit in medios turbamque sonantem,
 et tumulum capit unde omnis longo ordine posset
 adversos legere et venientum discere vultus*

...

quae postquam Anchises natum per singula duxit

The 130-verse Virgilian catalogue whose frame is so neatly collapsed into the *Silvae*-poet's allusion is nothing less than the whole expansionist history of Rome itself (*Aen.* 6.756-886), from its beginnings to its Augustan *telos*, as revealed in the Underworld to Rome's own founding father. Outrageously, the allusion raises the generic stakes to trope Statius' spectacular catalogue of Pollian real estate as the greatest imperial spectacle of them all. Recall how, on Myers' description, the next subsection of *silv.* 2.2 figures Pollius' architectural subjugation of Nature as an enlightened form of "military domination over a grateful subject". On rereading words like the following, of Nature and the builder (52-53),

... *hic victa colenti
 cessit et ignotos docilis mansuevit in usus*

of what can one now think but Anchises' climactic characterization of Roman civilization itself (*Aen.* 6.852-3)?

... *pacique imponere morem,
parcere subiectis et debellare superbos*

In a very immediate sense, then, the gaze constructed by Statius to consume the wonders of Pollius' villa *does* become, in its epic and Virgilian coding, a reenactment of the archetypal Roman imperial gaze. The misfit between the two situations remains startling, and was surely intended to be so. However, my remarks above, on the ways in which the Bay of Naples itself structures a literary historical relationship between Statius and Virgil, can at least suggest a mitigating appeal to Virgilian geography in the allusion. What are the *Aeneid's* Tartarus and Elysium, after all, but the subterranean coordinates of Statius' own and Virgil's adopted Parthenope? This perspective suggests one very limited way in which to negotiate the yawning generic gap between the Statian and the Virgilian catalogues. In topographical terms, all that Statius has done is to resume Virgil's imperial pageant above ground, staging it *on* the Bay, rather than directly *under* it.

Statius' appraising Virgilian gaze in lines 42-45, at the moment of his ascent of the villa's quasi-citadel (31 *urbis opus*), is balanced by the last and best known of all the poem's gazes (which I have withheld until now), a gaze directed downward from a fully metaphorical 'citadel' in lines 131-132 by Pollius himself — and focalized through another poetic predecessor, Lucretius⁶⁷:

... *celsa tu mentis ab arce
despicias errantes humanaque gaudia rides*
silv. 2.2.131-132

*sed nil dulcius est, bene quam munita tenere
edita doctrina sapientum templa serena,
despicere unde queas alios passimque videre
errare atque viam palantis quaerere vitae*
Lucretius 2.7-10

⁶⁷ On Lucretian echoes and language in this section of the poem, cf. Fr. VOLLMER (Ed.), *P. Papinii Statii Silvarum libri* (Leipzig 1898), 351-2; R.G.M. NISBET [n.35], 1-2.

The momentary dissolution of the villa's lofty eminence into pure metaphor is itself symptomatic of the trajectory of the argument in this final section of *silv.* 2.2, which celebrates Pollius' specifically Epicurean transcendence of worldly concerns — at a stage in the poem when all his worldly wealth (including the richly ornamented vantage-points described in lines 72-97) has been duly catalogued and admired. In Robin Nisbet's fine discussion of 121-42, "The lush *topothesia* gives place to more explicit Epicurean symbols: the Marina di Puolo [i.e. Pollius' harbour in lines 13-29]... is transmuted into the haven of the wise, the sea becomes the tumult of the world (as in the proem to Lucretius 2), the panoramic vista the *spectaculum* of human folly, the secluded villa the citadel of the mind"⁶⁸. It is worth remarking that Statius' especial attention, in this passage, to the opening themes of *De rerum natura* 2 necessarily stops just short of the verses where Lucretius singles out for dismissal, as worthless assets, houses filled with gilded statuary, gold and silver ornament, and panelled ceilings (2.24-8). Our poet understands and responds to the delicate balancing-act involved in the Pollian version of Epicureanism: the point is to compliment Pollius on the gracefully unworldly attitude which he takes to his wealth, not to vilify the wealth itself⁶⁹. In Statius' finely poised poetics of real estate, the allotment of the Lucretian gaze to Pollius (*silv.* 2.2.131-2), and of the Virgilian and Aenean gaze to himself (42-44), constitutes the perfect piece of mystification: to the man who owns the sumptuous property is given the gaze of the unworldly philosopher; to the man who does not is given the gaze of the imperial poet and hero.

⁶⁸ R.G.M. NISBET [n.35], 1-2; cf. H. CANKIK [n.35], 71-5; with esp. *silv.* 2.2.129-32 on the *celsa... mentis... arce*, and 138-42 on the *securos portus*.

⁶⁹ For the same balancing-act in another villa-poem, cf. *silv.* 1.3.90-4; further Statian parallels at H. CANKIK [n.35], 74 n.45. Statius' poetics of real estate in *silv.* 2.2 involve in this respect a 'rewriting' not just of Lucretius but also of Horace in the *Odes*: excellent discussion in C. NEWLANDS [n.37].

And there let us take our leave of Pollius' Surrentine property (Stattius himself will return to it as early as *silv.* 3.1). In lieu of a conclusion I offer a brief appendix, produced *subito calore et quadam festinandi voluptate*, which toys with the idea of revisiting these Statian "poetics of real estate", about a decade later, in another nexus of *immanente Kulturgeschichte* on the Bay of Naples.

*Appendix: Silius, Pliny and the poetics of real estate*⁷⁰

scribebat carmina maiore cura quam ingenio, non numquam iudicia hominum recitationibus experiebatur. novissime ita suadentibus annis ab urbe secessit seque in Campania tenuit ac ne adventu quidem novi principis inde commotus est. ...

erat φιλόκαλος usque ad emacitatis reprehensionem. plures isdem in locis villas possidebat, adamatisque novis priores neglebat. multum ubique librorum, multum statuarum, multum imaginum, quas non habebat modo, verum etiam venerabatur, Vergili ante omnes, cuius natalem religiosius quam suum celebrabat, Neapoli maxime, ubi monimentum eius adire ut templum solebat.

Pliny, *epist.* 3.7.5-8

*Silius haec magni celebrat monimenta Maronis,
iugera facundi qui Ciceronis habet.
heredem dominumque sui tumulive larisve
non alium mallet nec Maro nec Cicero.*

Martial 11.48

*iam prope desertos cineres et sancta Maronis
nomina qui coleret pauper et unus erat.
Silius orbatae succurrere censuit umbrae,
et vates vatem, non minor ipse, colit.*

Martial 11.50 (49)

⁷⁰ With this appendix cf. D.W.T.C. VESSEY, "Pliny, Martial and Silius Italicus", in *Hermes* 102 (1974), 109-16; M. BETTINI [n.59], esp. 445-8, an article grounded in a reading of *SIL.* 12.393-7; and add now M. LEIGH, in O. TAPLIN (Ed.) [n.8], 478-83. For commentary on *MART.* 11.48 and 50(49) see N.M. KAY, *Martial. Book XI. A Commentary* (London 1985), whose text and interpretation I follow for 11.50(49).3-4, mangled in transmission.

It is Silius' fate in literary history to be labelled a second-rate Virgil, or (more recently) a second-rate Lucan. Pliny's barbed obituary now combines with our "poetics of real estate" to open up the possibility of reading him as a second-rate Statius. Even without the example of the close symbiosis between good taste in poetry and in real estate negotiated in the *Silvae*, Pliny's verdict on Silius' poetry and his verdict on Silius' villa-buying habits would read as two sides of the same coin. The restless purchase of villa after villa reads like an Epicurean cautionary tale: not for this wealthy consular the *docta fruendi / temperies* attributed by Statius to the spending habits of Pollius and his wife in *silv.* 2.2.153-4. The association between Silius' expenditure on villas and his expenditure on books, statues and portraits operates in the same way as does the description of Pollius' portrait gallery at *silv.* 2.2.63-72 to associate the property owner's material investments with his spiritual investments; once again, the comparison is to Silius' disadvantage. It becomes tempting to seek in Pliny's negative criticisms of Silian spending some implicit particularization of his earlier negative criticism of Silian poetry: is Silian verse perhaps as ill-judged in its expenditure of literary effects as are other kinds of Silian expenditure? is there the same suspicion of excessive reverence for heritage? do Silius' interventions in the cultural economy lack the kind of flair for 'mystification' which enables wealth (and learning) to be worn lightly?

And what of Silius' approach to the geography of Neapolitan literary history? From the point of view of Martial's two epigrams, the *pietas* towards Virgil seems beyond reproach. Silius' purchase and restoration of Virgil's tomb is a service to all lovers of literature and literary *otium* — including Statius who, as we have seen in *silv.* 4.4, derived pleasure alike from the material and from the spiritual amenities of the site⁷¹.

⁷¹ P. HARDIE, *The Epic Successors of Virgil. A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition* (Cambridge 1993), 64-5, attractively reads Hannibal's cultivation of the death-shrine of Dido at the beginning of the *Punica* as a self-conscious poetic

However, the testimony that Silius bought a villa of Cicero's (probably his *Cumanum*⁷²) *as well as* the tomb of Virgil (Martial 11.48) reopens (with help again from Pliny's letter above) the question of overkill and lack of discrimination in the literary real-estate market. Must Silius buy square footage in *every* author whom he admires?⁷³ In such a perspective, a desire merely to *visit* Virgil's tomb may seem a more graceful homage than a desire to own it: does a similar contrast between Statian tact and Silian heavy-handedness perhaps obtain in the allusive practices applied by the two poets to Virgilian verse itself?

But Silius has suffered enough from the artistic condescension of ancients and moderns alike: let us not here cast aspersions upon his cultural performance in poetry, or in property, solely on Pliny's say-so. Pliny is himself, after all, a writer who combines a marked interest in opulent villas with a posthumous reputation for pedestrianism. Perhaps the lesson to be drawn from this particular epistolary exercise in the poetics of real estate is that people who live in glass houses should refrain from throwing stones.

intertext for Silius' own real-life cult of Virgil: "In Hannibal's oath at the shrine of Dido, which is also the poem's promise to remain faithful to the *Aeneid* in exchange for the release of the model's creative powers, we may also read the man Silius' cultivation of the shade of Virgil in the hope of his own poetic birth (or rebirth)". This is a discussion to put in dialogue not just with my own, but also with M. BETTINI [n.59], in the context of his reading of *Pun.* 12.393-7.

⁷² J.H. D'ARMS [n.36], 207-8 with 198-200. An intermediate stage in the history and mythography of (what is most likely) the same villa is explored by Llewelyn MORGAN in a fine paper for the September 2000 symposium in memory of Don Fowler at Jesus College, Oxford: "*Natura narratur*: Tullius Laurea's Elegy for Cicero".

⁷³ The question endures even after due attention to cultural contexts for such acts of commemoration: cf. esp. J. BODEL, "Monumental villas and villa monuments", in *JRA* 10 (1997), 5-35.

DISCUSSION

A. Kerkhecker: We have been wondering several times on which evidence to base our investigation of *immanente Literaturgeschichte*. Only on explicit statements? Or on any passage implicitly relating to the literary tradition? Either definition presents difficulties. The former offers little more than the re-examination of well-known 'programmes'. The latter is rather wide, if not all-embracing. You have taken an open approach, and are prepared to interpret a variety of statements as programmatic metaphors. Do you feel a need to control such allegorical interpretation?

St. Hinds: I do think that the intensive study of implicit poetics in the past generation has had a transformative effect upon our sense of Roman literary history. There are interpretative risks in some of the directions which this work can take. But if critics had treated W. Wimmel's foundational work on the imagery of poetic self-positioning in *Kallimachos in Rom* (Wiesbaden 1960) as the last word rather than as an invitation to press further, I think that many of our conversations about Roman poetry would now be the poorer.

A. Deremetz: Les deux poèmes que vous avez choisis pour illustrer votre analyse nous offrent deux exemples particulièrement clairs de thèmes méta-poétiques communs dans la poésie romaine, la course d'un navire à travers la mer et la construction d'un édifice. S'agissant du second, si l'on admet une interprétation selon laquelle Stace compare son art démiurgique à celui de son dédicataire, Pollius, et introduit une similitude voire une complicité entre eux, sans annuler la distance qui les sépare sur le plan social, que pouvons-nous dire d'une telle stra-

tégie poétique? Est-elle ou non caractéristique de ce qu'on appelle la poésie de circonstance et pouvons-nous voir en elle, selon la formule de C. Calame, le signe d'une dissimulation par le poète de la manipulation sociale dont il est l'enjeu?

St. Hinds: Yes indeed: whatever the precise truth about Pollius' status (cf. R.G.M. Nisbet [n.35], 3-4), the social dimension in Statius' manoeuvres *vis-à-vis* his wealthy addressee is a crucial one.

M. Citroni: Ho apprezzato molto l'originalità del metodo e la grande efficacia dell'analisi. Farò solo un breve commento sull'appendice. Marziale sa di fare cosa gradita a Sillio mettendo sullo stesso piano l'eredità artistica di Virgilio e Cicerone e il possesso di 'oggetti di antiquariato' appartenuti ad essi. Ho sempre pensato che questa banalizzazione di una grande eredità culturale fosse una testimonianza significativa della epigonalità della letteratura flavia. Queste analisi di Hinds mi fanno ora capire che questa corrispondenza tra eredità artistica e eredità di un oggetto si inserisce in un contesto più ampio e coerente. Essere eredi di Virgilio e di Cicerone significa essere eredi dei due vertici supremi della poesia e della prosa latina e dunque di tutto ciò che di meglio ha prodotto la cultura letteraria latina. Ma nel caso di Cicerone l'estetizzazione banale di una grande eredità si estende al di là del piano artistico, ai valori di impegno civile delle arti della parola. I *Punica* ci attestano i limiti entro cui Sillio riusciva a essere erede letterario di Virgilio. Se possedessimo le orazioni di Sillio in senato, quale confronto potremmo fare tra chi aveva usato la parola in drammatici scontri politici fino al sacrificio della vita e chi aveva usato sempre la parola per compiacere gli imperatori?

St. Hinds: You must be right: any aesthetic judgement which we would make about Silius' speeches (if we had them), in comparison with those of Cicero, would surely be affected by our sense of the very different political contexts of their use.

E. Fantham: Can I raise a problem of *decorum*, or better, ethics, that seems to me inherent in appraising Statius, *silv.* 2.2? In our society it is seen as selfish to indulge in luxurious possessions and bad form to display or boast about them. At Rome too, in the age of Cicero (cf. *Verr.* 2.4 on the art 'collections' of Verres and his circle) and of Augustus, it was felt that works of art and elaborate buildings should be public, not private (Hor. *carm.* 2.15, retrojecting to the republican *maiores*), Agrippa declaring that works of art should be displayed in public galleries as they were in the Porticus Octaviae? Indeed Satire makes a butt of hosts who display and praise their furnishings or hospitality (Nasidienus in Hor. *sat.* 2.8, and of course Trimalchio). So what has changed, that Statius' generation expect to be praised for private luxury?

You noted, moreover, how Statius praises Pollius for overruling Nature, or at least because Nature surrenders willingly to his construction. Here again we naturally recall Sallust and Horace's condemnation of villa-builders for violating Nature by levelling hills and decking over the sea. Moralists systematically condemned what they disapproved of by calling it a violation of Nature. Is it a sign of change for the worse that (as in this poem) Romans are now willing to find it laudable to do violence to land and sea?

St. Hinds: Patterns of consumption and display do indeed change between Cicero's generation and Statius', as A. Wallace-Hadrill (*Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* [Princeton 1994]), has most recently explored — even if these kinds of change are less easy to date and to document than the changes in political institutions addressed in Mario Citroni's question.

But for me the risk of an *exclusive* emphasis upon change in the area of private luxury is that underlying continuities in both cultural and poetic practice (see C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* [Cambridge 1993], 137-60) may

be underestimated. Notwithstanding the striking reversals of its *topoi* in Statius and sometimes in Martial (but not always: 12.50), the tradition of invective against luxurious building flourishes *in essentially unchanging terms* from the second century BC to the second century AD; one possible conclusion to draw from this is that the patterns of conspicuous consumption which fuel that moralizing discourse also show some continuity throughout the late Republic and early Empire. Perhaps, then, in accounting for the open celebration of material wealth in the *Silvae* we should look as much to other factors as to *Zeitgeist* (e.g. generic appropriateness, social status of poet *vis-à-vis* addressee).

My only other reservation about an appeal to increasing private luxury under the Empire to account for Statian (bad) taste is strategic rather than substantive. The common move which pushes our modern scruples about Roman greed and excess into the 'Silver' period while allowing late Republicans and Augustans to be people *like us* is one which will always tend to exaggerate the differences between the first century BC and the first century AD. If we find the displays of wealth in a Flavian villa excessive, does it necessarily follow that we should find the slightly smaller armies of slaves and the slightly shorter porticoes of a late Republican villa to be in harmony with our own sense of propriety in consumption and display? If Statius' celebration of Pollius' well-heeled Epicureanism strikes us as mere pandering to the vanity of the rich, does that necessarily mean that we should find no dissonance at all in the philosophical celebrations of the simple life written by the well-housed Horace for his even better-housed friends?

This may be the moment to respond to an invitation from Ernst Schmidt to apply my "poetics of real estate" to a figure from the first half of my paper, C. Memmius. This contemporary of Cicero, Cinna and Catullus eclipses all our Flavian villa-owners to achieve what is by common consent the most infelicitous conjunction on record between Epicureanism and the Roman poetics of real estate: in 51 BC, as we learn from Cic.

fam. 13.1 and *Att.* 5.11.6, he acquires Epicurus' own ruined house in Athens, with the intention of tearing it down and rebuilding on the site; the issue is especially fraught because Epicurus' will had provided that the adjoining gardens should be at the disposal of the Epicurean school in perpetuity. The modern assumption that Memmius' plan was motivated either by indifference to the associations of the site or by bloody-minded vandalism (which derives from Cicero's epistolary concentration upon the ire of Patro, head of the Epicurean school at Athens) may be unwarranted. Perhaps what Memmius wished to do was to *appropriate* the site's philosophical associations, not to erase them. Such an impulse to fuse philosophy and real estate would not be so very unfamiliar to the Cicero who recreated the grove of the Academy in his own *Cumanum* (Plin. *nat.* 31.6) — or to Pollius, many years later, in his *Surrentinum*. A disgruntled Patro might be forgiven (as indeed might we) for considering all these acquisitive home-owners to be essentially similar to one another in their characteristically Roman attempts to privatize and possess Greek philosophical space.

A. Barchiesi: Gli storici dell'arte hanno spesso commentato sull'effetto della convivenza e mescolanza degli stili e delle epoche per quanto riguarda i manufatti artistici greci esposti a Roma.

Questo può essere rilevante al nostro tema per due motivi. Uno è che la convivenza e mescolanza di stili e provenienze e periodi nel mondo 'materiale' dell'arte può avere incoraggiato e interferito con la crescita di una autocoscienza 'storica' nel campo delle lettere.

L'altro è che l'effetto estetico della 'esposizione caotica' non poteva essere del tutto separato da una consapevolezza sulla provenienza, spesso legata a spoglie, saccheggio, *imperium*. Questo mi ricorda la pagina iniziale del grande romanzo di Henry James, *The Golden Bowl*, in cui la mescolanza di stili e culture in una vetrina di antiquario londinese viene letta dal

narratore come un'icona dell'idea stessa di Impero Britannico.

St. Hinds: For me your first observation points to an interesting imbalance, either in Roman practice or in our modern understanding of it. When a Latin poem mobilizes multiple Greek models, we expect to find in it considerable sensitivity to the *generic* contexts of those models, and a sophisticated interest in possibilities for generic 'mixing' at the level of the intertext. We have had much less to say about how considerations of *period* and geographical *provenance* within Greek literature impinge upon Roman poetic consciousness.

Your invocation of *The Golden Bowl* is especially suggestive for my reading of Pollius' gallery at *silv.* 2.2.63-72; and it also adds substance to my own rather flippant analogy with the Getty Museum in Malibu. The fact is that modern museum science has not altogether banished from the Getty that element of *esposizione caotica*, expressive (in this case) of the power of the petrochemical dollar to (re)create in a transplanted Villa dei Papiri a sense of the spoils of Empire.

J.P. Schwindt: Mit Ihrer so eleganten wie nachdrücklichen Zurückweisung des Habinekschen Buches haben Sie eine weitere wichtige Grundlage geschaffen, auf die wir uns, wie ich glaube, im Verlauf unserer *Entretiens* noch oft beziehen können. Ich habe mich beim Erscheinen des Buches gefragt, wie es möglich ist, das methodische *pattern* des New Historicism, das uns immerhin zu entscheidenden Berichtigungen formalistisch-strukturalistischer Ansätze geführt hat, so einseitig materialistisch zu fassen. Ist die zeitliche Verspätung in der wechselseitigen Rezeption kontinentaleuropäischer und angloamerikanischer Theorien mittlerweile so gross, dass dreissig Jahre vergehen müssen, bis der eine vom anderen Kenntnis genommen hat? In Deutschland hat sich die Sozial- und Institutionengeschichte schon vor einiger Zeit 'totgelaufen', und selbst manche Gründerväter dieses Wissenschaftszweiges haben sich zu etwas bekehrt, das sie abzuschaffen angetreten waren: zur Literaturwissenschaft und Ästhetik. Diese

freilich präsentieren sich heute in einer epistemologisch avancierten Form, von der man wünschen möchte, dass sie auch von unseren amerikanischen Mitforschern beachtet und rezipiert würde.

E.A. Schmidt: Der Sachverhalt selbst ist in meinen Augen beunruhigend, dass nämlich in der inneramerikanischen Auseinandersetzung innerhalb unseres Faches offenbar kein Kontakt zu wissenschaftlichen Diskussionen des Auslands besteht. So sehr eine solche Tendenz überall zu spüren ist, so scheint sie doch in den USA besonders ausgeprägt. Kann man *classics* betreiben allein mit Englisch und im Horizont allein amerikanischer Diskussionen? Für um so wichtiger halte ich Arbeitskonferenzen wie die *Entretiens Hardt* mit ihren institutionalisierten Begegnungen von vier oder fünf Sprachen und nationalen Wissenschaftstraditionen.

St. Hinds: Jürgen Schwindt's question dramatizes an observation which I made in my introduction, namely that literary studies (in general) can be argued to be in continual motion between aestheticism and historicism as critical fashions *and local emphases* change. My own view is that one cannot expect different academic communities all to move in lock-step in this regard; nor can one expect Roman literary studies (in particular) to behave in the same way *within* each academy, given differing experiences of centrality and marginality, and given the very different kinds of symbolic value accorded to ancient Rome in different parts of the larger world in recent history. Therefore, while I welcome Schwindt's support, I would also like to defend Habinek against the particular line of criticism which he adopts. It seems to me that Habinek's own self-positioning has less to do with any lack of grounding in foreign material than with a conscious desire to address local conditions. Indeed, Habinek gives fair notice of this by devoting his book's first chapter to an historical sociology of American classics. (Incidentally, although I found it convenient to associate

Habinek's position on literary history with that of a U.S.-based New Historicism, even the Anglophone parts of his theoretical bibliography have their cosmopolitan roots in British as well as in American forms of cultural criticism: 'Birmingham school' as well as Berkeley.)

Before responding to Ernst Schmidt's broader version of the criticism, let me offer two prefatory remarks. First (a little facetiously), I wonder whether this is really the right forum in which to ask U.S. classics, or indeed Anglophone classics at large, to account for themselves: as I look around this room, I see the American academy represented by an Irishman and an Englishwoman, and the British academy by a German! Second, I do have to say that, as I scan the footnotes to my own paper, I find it hard to locate an American book or article which comes close to fitting Schmidt's pessimistic characterization of U.S. isolationism.

But I am being a little disingenuous. Yes, of course I know what he is talking about, I share (with an Anglophone's due sense of guilt) his concern over the erosion of multilingualism in classics, and I fully agree with him about the importance of an institution like the Fondation Hardt to counteract this and all other forms of scholarly insularity. Not so much to make us simply include footnotes to books and articles in other languages (most good scholars, given a few hours alone with *L'Année Philologique*, can figure out how to do that); but rather to make us understand where books and articles in other languages are coming *from*, something which we classicists tend to do much less well (Anglophones and non-Anglophones alike). *Vive la Fondation!*

