CHAPTER 1

Introduction
Texts, Tools, Territories

Roy Gibson and Christopher Whitton

The book before you aims to offer a critical overview of work on Latin literature. Where are we? How did we get here? Where to next? Fifteen commissioned chapters, along with our introduction and Mary Beard's postscript, approach these questions from (we hope) a refreshing range of familiar and less familiar angles. They aim not to codify the field, but to give snapshots of the discipline from different perspectives, and to offer suggestions and provocations for its future development. Most broadly, we hope to stimulate reflection on how we – whoever 'we' may be – engage with Latin literature: what texts do we read? How do we read them? And why?

We'll spare you potted summaries of the chapters. Instead, we divide our introduction into four parts. The first situates this *Guide* in the field, and surveys topics and approaches adumbrated in it (and some that are not). Then we elaborate on two specific thrusts. One of them, signalled most obviously by the inclusion of chapters on mediaeval Latin and Neo-Latin, is a call to decentre work on Latin literature from the 'classical' corpus. The other, related to that, is to contemplate ways in which literary scholarship can enrich and be enriched by work in adjoining disciplines: history, linguistics, material culture, philosophy. Finally, we offer 'distant reading' as a complement to the close reading that defines the field. Along the way, we draw out some of the threads of the chapters to come, and sample some of the conversations running across them.

* Thanks are owed to Catherine Conybeare, Jaś Elsner, Joe Farrell, Adam Gitner, Sander Goldberg, Peter Heslin, Gavin Kelly, Myles Lavan, Carlos Noreña, Ioannis Ziogas and especially Reviel Netz for their comments on drafts of this chapter, and to Walter Scheidel for supplying a transcript of Scheidel 2020. None should be presumed to agree with the positions outlined here. This introduction focuses mainly on issues within Anglophone Classics and concentrates on Anglophone publications; we are only too aware of a large number of publications in other languages omitted here.

A *Critical Guide*: Texts, Tools, Theories

The provenance and heft of this *Guide* might invite comparison with the Latin volume of the *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* edited by E. J. (Ted) Kenney and Wendell Clausen in 1982. In part that is apt, and not just because Cambridge University Press commissioned this book as a successor, in some sense, to that one. There too contributors pooled expertise to survey the field of Latin literature in the light of recent work, free of the obligation to cover basic information and instructed to be 'critical' (p. xiii). There are some signal differences too. Most obviously, ours is not a history,[1] nor a reference book in the traditional sense:[2] no potted biographies or bibliographies for ancient authors, no arrangement by chronology or genre, no aspiration to 'full' coverage, whatever that might mean – though we do invite you to join us in venturing beyond (even) late antique Latin, if you don't already. Hence too the shift of emphasis away from introducing and explicating primary texts, and towards reflection on modes of scholarship. Scholarly approaches have changed quite a bit since the Latin *CHCL* was commissioned in 1971;[3] it won't surprise you that 'authors' (in the biographical mode) and their 'intentions' rarely feature here except to be problematised,[4] nor perhaps that the rod of judgement wielded so often there – entertainingly but not always inspiringly[5] – is rejected in favour of a more democratic search for the merits, not the failings, of our texts.[6] The profession has evolved too, in a way reflected here: no gender parity yet, still less racial diversity, but seven of the seventeen contributions are authored by women; and each chapter in its way holds up a mirror to what we do, including Therese Fuhrer's survey

[1] For which we might also direct you to Conte 1994, the volumes of the *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike* (overseen by Herzog and Schmidt) and the *Oxford History of Classical Literature* (ed. Dee Clayman and Joseph Farrell) currently in preparation. On the tradition of such histories, see Peirano Garrison (pp. 79–80) and Kelly (p. 110).

[2] A genre rapidly giving way to online resources such as Oxford Bibliographies Online and The New Pauly.

[3] The fitful evolution of the *CHCL* is related (and some stringent criticisms are levelled) by Woodman 1982.

[4] See Sharrock in Ch. 4.

[5] According to F. R. D. Goodyear, for instance, Velleius 'merits scant esteem' (p. 641), Curtius Rufus was an 'accomplished dilettante' (p. 642) and Suetonius 'possesses no original mind' (p. 663); not even Tacitus escapes a rap ('*Annals* 1–6 show a sad lack of judgment and historical perspective', p. 650). The acid isn't special to Goodyear: 'limitations disqualify Persius from greatness' (Niall Rudd, p. 510); we should keep neglecting Valerius Flaccus and Silius (D. W. T. C. Vessey, p. 558); most late antique poetry up to Ausonius forms a 'discouraging catalogue of poetasters and minor versifiers' (Robert Browning, p. 698). It's no accident, of course, that post-Augustan writers bear the brunt of it.

[6] Some might call that bland, of course; cf. Barchiesi 2001b, reviewing Taplin 2000: 'The drift of the entire survey is that there are no bad texts anymore . . . '

of Latin literature studies past and present around the globe.[7] We address a broad audience: scholars and students of Latin literature first and foremost, of course; but we hope that the chapters on linguistics, material culture, philosophy, political thought, history and Greek will both serve as bridges for Latinists into these related fields, and encourage traffic in the opposite direction too. Finally, this *Guide* has been a substantively collaborative venture, encouraged in particular by a two-day workshop in June 2018, where first drafts were discussed around a table; cross-references are just the most visible consequence of those formative exchanges.

Nearer in time, and in some ways in manner, is the Blackwell *Companion to Latin Literature* edited by Stephen Harrison in 2005. That is a hybrid of literary history and 'general reference book' (p. 1), combining surveys of the field with thematic essays on such topics as 'the passions', 'sex and gender' and 'slavery and class'.[8] Perhaps its most striking feature is the cut-off point of 200 CE, reflecting a canon of convenience enshrined in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* and in many programmes of study, but also perpetuating it. The present volume, by contrast, subjects such conventions to concerted scrutiny – one reason that it opens with Irene Peirano Garrison's chapter on canons and Gavin Kelly on periodisation (and we will have more to say about the *OLD* in a moment). And our topic is not so much Latin literature 'itself' (texts, history, genres, themes) as on how we read it: a critical guide in the maximal sense. Perhaps the nearest comparandum, or so we would like to think, is the series *Roman Literature and its Contexts* edited by Denis Feeney and Stephen Hinds;[9] like those books, the essays here are above all ideas-driven, not an encyclopaedic gathering of data; like their authors, our contributors have been encouraged to be opinionated, to adopt and address different methodologies, and to speak in whatever voice they see fit. The avowed subjectivity is programmatic, as we try to critique or at least reflect on the ideological underlay of what we do, as well as doing it.

The volume is therefore by definition partial. We have aimed for a suitable spread, and you will encounter Latin authors from Livius Andronicus in the third century BCE to Giovanni Pascoli at the turn of

[7] The fact that Fuhrer is the only contributor not in post in the English-speaking world is, we assure you, accident. Two others (Irene Peirano Garrison and Katharina Volk) are among the many continental European Latinists who have crossed the Atlantic. Thanks to Yasmin Haskell, our cast-list is not entirely confined to Europe and the USA.

[8] Including three chapters by contributors to the present volume. The edited collection of Taplin 2000 is a hybrid of a different kind, offering 'a new perspective' on Latin literature through eight (excellent) interpretative essays, running from 'the beginnings' to 'the end of the classical era'.

[9] For a provocative critique of that series, see Gunderson 2020: 208–14, in 'a comi-tragic retelling' of its evolution.

the twentieth CE, but, to repeat, we do not aspire to complete or even coverage; to take an extreme case, Erasmus Darwin's *The Loves of Plants* (1789) has ended up with several pages,[10] Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* none.[11] It's true, the 'classical Latin' of the first centuries BCE and CE is a centre of gravity; James Clackson, for instance, makes Catullus a *fil rouge* for his chapter on linguistics, and the *Aeneid* gets sustained treatment by Donncha O'Rourke and Aaron Pelttari on intertextuality, Michael Squire and Jaś Elsner on ecphrasis and Michèle Lowrie on political thought.[12] Such emphases reflect in part inherited canons, in part the expertise of many of our contributors (and of most Latinists in university posts). But this centre of gravity is also deliberately destabilised, both internally, by Peirano Garrison's opening reflections on marginality (pp. 52–9), and chronologically, by the three chapters that focus on post-antique material (mediaeval Latin, Neo-Latin and reception) and by the routine inclusion of late antique material in others.

In the same spirit, let us clarify that the 'Latin literature' of our title is a term of convenience, and intended inclusively. Latin is only one of two or more languages spoken by most of its authors, whether ancient or modern; from a cultural–historical point of view, 'Roman literature' might therefore be a better term for ancient texts – though not for much post-antique Latin.[13] (Of course that is only the tip of an iceberg about language, identity and above all the Graeco-Latin 'cultural hybridity' central to Simon Goldhill's chapter and recurrent elsewhere.)[14] And 'literature' is simply a practical choice: *Critical Guide to Latin* might suggest a book on linguistics; *Critical Guide to Latin Studies* seemed obscure. It is not, therefore, restrictive: if for many people 'literature' once meant high poetry above all,[15] tastes tend now to the catholic,

[10] Uden (pp. 433–9), exemplifying the role of classical reception in modern scientific thought.

[11] That is no reflection of the lively state of the scholarship, any more than the absence of Seneca's *Natural Questions* is. On *QNat.* see notably Williams 2012 and the translation of Hine 2010; on *HN* Beagon 1992 and 2005, Carey 2003 and Murphy 2004 remain important (see also Bispham, Rowe and Matthews 2007; Gibson and Morello 2011); Doody 2010 and Fane-Saunders 2016 are significant studies of its reception.

[12] O'Rourke and Pelttari (pp. 211–22); Squire and Elsner (pp. 658–65); Lowrie (pp. 795–804). See also *inter alios* Uden (pp. 422–7) on poetic receptions of Eclogue 2 by Anna Letitia Barbauld in the eighteenth century, and Fuhrer (pp. 499–501) on the 'Harvard' and 'European' schools in the twentieth.

[13] Cf. Peirano Garrison (pp. 80–2). Even before then, the marker 'Roman' has its own problems, of course (Lavan 2020).

[14] E.g. O'Rourke and Pelttari on translations of Greek (pp. 222–9), Clackson on Greek and Latin metre (pp. 578–82) and Volk on the Romanising of Greek philosophy (pp. 705–17). As Goldhill (p. 870) puts it, 'we cannot rely on a polarised opposition of Greece and Rome as discrete cultural entities'. We might compare the rolling process of exchange between Latin and the vernacular in mediaeval Latin and Neo-Latin (Stover, p. 290 and *passim*; Haskell, pp. 359–63), as we might compare Greek/Latin bilingual poems (Squire and Elsner, p. 635; Goldhill, pp. 890–1) with mediaeval and Renaissance macaronic texts (Stover, pp. 310–11, 314–15; Haskell, pp. 345–7).

[15] Peirano Garrison (p. 82).

and our own tenor is to encourage open-mindedness. Sander Goldberg offers a working definition: 'texts marked with a certain social status, whose "literary" quality denotes not simply an inherent aesthetic value but a value accorded them and the work they do by the society that receives them'.[16] That invites a whole series of questions about canon formation, elitism and more, but is also usefully open, allowing the case to be made that 'technical' writings, for instance, should be called literature[17] – or, more to the point, that they merit *reading* with the sorts of tools and approaches typically brought to bear on it. From another perspective, the term 'literary texts' is commonly used to denote texts which have come to us through the manuscript tradition, as distinguished from those written on stone, bronze, plaster, papyrus or wood.[18] But, as Myles Lavan argues, these latter types may respond very productively to 'literary' analysis (as shown by work on the *Res gestae*, that great exception to the rule); at the same time, literary scholars stand to gain a great deal from incorporating such material into their reading of 'literary' texts – to enrich our sense of cultural context, for instance, and to profit from opportunities to look beyond the literary elite.[19] Mediaeval Latin offers a salutary perspective, as Justin Stover remarks, and the same is true of Neo-Latin: compared with their vast corpora, no definition, however generous, could be said to make ancient Latin literature an unmanageably large field.[20]

As with texts, so the topics treated here are necessarily selective. The opening two chapters on canons and periodisation interrogate two crucial ways in which texts are sorted and shifted; a third, genre, is also addressed by them, and elsewhere.[21] Alongside the chapters on philosophy and political

[16] Goldberg 2005: 18. Feeney 2016: 153–5 points to the situatedness of 'literature' as a modern term.

[17] As it now is, increasingly: see Formisano 2017 and e.g. Fögen 2009; König and Whitmarsh 2007; Doody and Taub 2009; Formisano and van der Eijk 2017; König 2020. Sharrock (p. 176) compares Vitruvius and Horace as a case in point.

[18] Lavan (p. 825). So too Clackson (p. 571), though he would exclude grammarians and commentators.

[19] Lavan puts that suggestion into practice with a letter from the *Vindolanda Tablets*, and makes an analogous case for texts preserved by jurists (see also Lavan 2018). In similar vein, see Lowrie (pp. 759–60) on the *Res gestae* and other inscriptions (as well as art), Clackson (pp. 568–9, 579) on the hexameters of one Iasucthan, written at Bu Njem in 222 CE, Squire and Elsner (pp. 629–32) on the altar of T. Statilius Aper, and several chapters in König, Uden and Langlands 2020. Pompeian graffiti is another case in point (Clackson, pp. 613–14; Squire and Elsner, p. 614 n. 6); so is the opportunity afforded by epigraphy to expand our canon of female Latin poets (Stevenson 2005: 49–58). On reading 'beyond the elites' see Squire and Elsner (pp. 677–82); cf. Clackson (pp. 583–4) on 'vulgar Latin' and its problems.

[20] Stover, pp. 274–5.

[21] Peirano Garrison (pp. 59–67); Kelly (pp. 142–3); Stover (pp. 280–92); Haskell (pp. 363–8). Volk on philosophy (Ch. 13) and Lowrie on political thought (Ch. 14) productively cut across genres, challenging in the process the poetry/prose divide. Stimulating reflections on the aesthetic and heuristic stakes of genre include Fowler 1979, Hinds 2000, Barchiesi 2001a, Farrell 2003 and

thought we could have set one on rhetoric,[22] and another on religion;[23] education, science and law also merit attention[24] – but choices had to be made. We have preferred to spread discussion of gender, too, across the volume, while highlighting here its continued pressing importance, whether in drawing attention to female writers[25] and calling out chauvinism ancient and modern,[26] or interrogating cultural constructions of gender[27] at a time of rising challenges to binaries and an explosion of interest in trans-ness.[28] So too with the increasing attention to other suppressed voices (the enslaved, subalterns, alien cultures)[29] and, conjoined with that, the often uncomfortable role of Classics in modern experiences of race.[30]

The tools of the Latinist's trade, too, are explored in several ways. Among those tools textual editions remain a *sine qua non*;[31] Sam Huskey and Bob Kaster (Chapter 10) introduce the principles of stemmatics, consider their limitations in the face of a text such as Servius' commentary on Virgil, and explore the opportunities and challenges of editing in a digital age with reference to the Library of Digital Latin Texts under construction at the University of

Hutchinson 2013; for some different approaches to generic interaction see Harrison 2007 and Papanghelis, Harrison and Frangoulidis 2013.

[22] See especially Lowrie (pp. 769–78) and Lavan (pp. 830–3); also Lavan (pp. 863–8) on rhetoric in historiography. The topic extends to the whole of Latin literature, pagan and Christian (e.g. Stover, pp. 299–300, on the homily). The current burst of creativity in this area includes Gunderson 2003, Peirano Garrison 2019 and Dinter, Guérin and Martinho 2020.

[23] See e.g. Kelly (pp. 141–3) and Fuhrer (pp. 455–6, 467, 480); also Clackson (pp. 564–74 and 586–94) on Venus, and Squire and Elsner (pp. 618–32 and 677–82) on pagan altars, actual and literary.

[24] See Peirano Garrison (pp. 59–67) on ancient educational canons. On legal literature see pp. 31–2 in this chapter, Peirano Garrison (p. 82), Lowrie (p. 778) and Lavan (p. 828).

[25] Including in this volume O'Rourke and Pelttari (pp. 240–6) on Proba, Sharrock (pp. 193–8) on Sulpicia and 'gynocriticism', Haskell (pp. 339–40) on neo-Latin poets and Uden (pp. 410–27) on Mary Wollstonecraft, Phillis Wheatley and Anna Letitia Barbauld.

[26] Sharrock (pp. 166–8) on violence in Ovid and (pp. 198–200) on feminist 'resistance'; Lowrie (pp. 793–4) on the female body in political narratives of rape and foundation; Uden (as prev. n.) on modern exclusions of women. See too Zuckerberg 2018 on the continuing appropriation of classical texts by 'antifeminists'.

[27] Lavan (p. 821) on the work of Keith and Corbeill; Goldhill (pp. 852–4) on the gender politics of Greekness.

[28] Just finding its way into print: see e.g. Traub, Badir and McCracken 2019, Starks-Estes 2020 and Surtees and Dyer 2020, this last launching a series from Edinburgh University Press, 'Intersectionality in classical antiquity'.

[29] Sharrock (pp. 167–8) and Lavan (pp. 821, 833–6) on slavery; Fuhrer (p. 480) on the Black presence in Roman Britain. Lavan (p. 821) and Goldhill (pp. 847–50) on post-colonial approaches to provincials and religious others; Haskell (pp. 374–5) on colonial encounters in Neo-Latin.

[30] Peirano Garrison (pp. 48–9); Uden (esp. pp. 419–22, 426, 430–1); see also n. 58.

[31] Progress continues to be made with classical texts, thanks to *inter alia* the opportunities of computer analysis (see p. 523 n. 21 on the 'New Stemmatics'), the relative ease and inexpense of travel around Europe and beyond, and the ongoing digitisation of manuscripts in many collections (spurred on by the pandemic). Mediaeval and neo-Latin texts are a different matter, with huge swathes of material still unedited (Stover, pp. 277–8; Haskell, pp. 375–9).

Oklahoma.[32] Further key resources – commentaries,[33] dictionaries and grammars,[34] translations[35] – are thematised across the volume, as are other 'technical' matters, style and metre among them;[36] Clackson (Chapter 11) considers more broadly what linguists can do for literary scholars. A technical matter of a different sort concerns ancient technologies of reading and their literary and sociocultural dimensions,[37] highlighted here in several contributions.[38] Modern technologies, in particular digital humanities, are another repeated port of call; we draw attention here to the range and uses of open-access corpora,[39] not least in intertextual studies, where text-comparison software is now a routine tool (though no panacea)[40] and big data computation offers new analytical approaches,[41] as well as in editing and stylistic studies;[42] and some broader advantages and disadvantages of scholarship in the age of the internet.[43]

[32] On digital editing see also Fuhrer (pp. 501–2). See too Peirano Garrison (pp. 57–9) on editing and the canon, Sharrock (pp. 182–3) on editing and the author, and Fuhrer (pp. 483–93) on different traditions of editing Lucretius, Horace, Propertius and Seneca. On transmission – the scribes and scholars who constitute a large part of classical reception – Reynolds and Wilson 2013 (orig. 1968) remains the go-to guide. The authoritative survey of Reynolds 1983 is due to be updated in Justin Stover's forthcoming *Oxford Guide to the Transmission of the Latin Classics*.

[33] Near to both our hearts, but much discussed in recent years: Most 1999; Gibson and Kraus 2002; Kraus and Stray 2016; Gibson 2021. See Fuhrer (pp. 493–6) on past and future developments, Haskell (pp. 337 and 377) on the practical and institutional challenges of commenting on neo-Latin texts, and Clackson (pp. 564–7) for a Catullan case study in evolution and tralaticiousness. On ancient commentary see especially Huskey and Kaster (Ch. 10) on Servius; also Peirano Garrison (pp. 74–7) on Macrobius and scriptural commentary.

[34] See Clackson (pp. 567, 590–4) on dictionaries and again (pp. 576, 594–98) on grammars; Stover (p. 273) on dictionaries of mediaeval Latin.

[35] Fuhrer (p. 501). Translations are ever more important as a point of access (or aid) for readers, but also a fundamental form of interpretation in themselves.

[36] On metre see Kelly (pp. 126–36) and Clackson (pp. 578–82). Stover (pp. 292–318) offers a *Stilgeschichte* of mediaeval Latin.

[37] On ancient books see Kenney 1982 and e.g. Blanck 1992 and Winsbury 2009, not to forget Birt 1882. Parker 2009 and Johnson 2010 are important sociological approaches; see also O'Rourke and Pelttari (pp. 251–5) on orality and reading communities. On the literary stakes of the poetic book, see e.g. Van Sickle 1980a and 1980b and Hutchinson 2008.

[38] Kelly (pp. 143–8) and O'Rourke and Pelttari (pp. 251–6) on the materiality of the bookroll and the codex; Squire and Elsner (pp. 632–52) on the page as aesthetic and literary space in Optatian, the Gospels and the Vatican Virgil.

[39] O'Rourke and Pelttari (pp. 257–9), Haskell (pp. 378–9) and Clackson (pp. 601–3).

[40] No tool is useful without a good workman, and there is more to life than lexis (cf. Lowrie's observation that many concepts in political thought 'operate within larger semantic fields even without being mentioned', p. 790).

[41] See O'Rourke and Pelttari (p. 259) with abundant references, and e.g. Coffee 2019 (with the other essays in Berti 2019), Bernstein 2020, Coffee and Gawley 2020, Heslin 2020 and Hinds 2020. Predictions of the future date rapidly, of course, as a glance back at (for instance) McCarty 2002 shows; this footnote, too, is fated to go stale particularly fast.

[42] Editing: Huskey and Kaster (Ch. 10). Style: e.g. Stover and Kestemont 2016; Dexter, Katz, Tripuraneni et al. 2017; Chaudhuri, Dasgupta, Dexter and Iyer 2018; Keeline and Kirby 2019.

[43] Bagnall and Heath 2018 is a valuable guide to digital resources for Latinists. In some respects the internet represents a leap backwards; problems include the proliferation of typo-ridden Latin texts

What of 'theory'? For many, the pragmatic truce that broke out after the wars of the late twentieth century – that 'easygoing pluralism' excoriated by Charles Martindale[44] – seems to hold; and our failure to poke some hornets' nests may disappoint some. That said, theory is of course omnipresent. It is thematised most explicitly by Alison Sharrock on authorship and identity,[45] O'Rourke and Pelttari on intertextuality (a subset of the discipline that continues to stimulate interest and scepticism in equal measure),[46] James Uden's survey – and revitalisation – of reception theory,[47] Lowrie's kaleidoscope of critical approaches to the end of the *Aeneid* (pp. 795–804), and Goldhill's exploration of Greek–Latin interactions in postcolonial terms (Chapter 16), but different theoretical approaches are displayed and interrogated throughout.[48] The centre of gravity is firmly cultural–historical, embraced explicitly by Kelly on periodisation (p. 119–20) and Lavan in his call for a more nuanced historicism

and a widespread return to antiquated – because not copyrighted – editions, translations and reference works, including the Victorian dictionary 'Lewis and Short' (which does, however, have some advantages; see n. 76). Conversely, the digitisation of much early modern scholarship has made important commentaries and other publications available outside the rare books rooms of libraries. So much for 'input'; output is also rapidly changing, given the opportunities for disseminating research – and pursuing polemic – in virtual print, on social media (Fuhrer, pp. 502–3) and in online seminars.

[44] '. . . an easygoing pluralism, involving co-existence of activities if not much active intellectual interchange, is favored within the academy – what Terry Eagleton, product of a more ideological age, used to call in his lectures "clueless eclecticism"' (Martindale 2002: 142). Cf. Sharrock (p. 185) on 'the impression that we might be living in a "post-theoretical" age (as if that were possible)'.

[45] In whose chapter you will find (e.g.) Barthes, Foucault and Derrida (pp. 184–93). See also Haskell (pp. 368–73) on 'authenticity' in Neo-Latin, Huskey and Kaster (p. 516) on authorship from a text-critical point of view, Clackson (p. 570) on linguists and intentionality; Lowrie (p. 792) advocates a move away from authors to larger conceptual histories. Several contributors unproblematically invoke metapoetics (notably O'Rourke and Pelttari, pp. 229–40, on 'self-reflexive intertextuality'), reflecting their status as a given (at least in some measure) for most or all readers of ancient literature.

[46] Also Stover (pp. 282–5) on mediaeval *imitatio*, Haskell (pp. 359–61 and 368–73) on neo-Latin intertextuality and the authentic voice; Squire and Elsner (p. 626) on Optatian (and p. 675 on '"inter-textual-pictorial" play'); Lavan (p. 841) on 'real life' intertextuality (also O'Rourke and Pelttari, pp. 254–5); Goldhill (p. 863) on the challenges of 'proof' in translingual intertextuality. Clackson (pp. 568–70) and Lavan (p. 840) remind us of the scepticism with which work on intertextuality continues to be met in many quarters, and Lowrie (p. 792) advocates for a change of approach in terms of political thought: 'To access Roman political thought as more than a collection of statements or even textual symptoms will require a concerted shift in focus from author to culture, intention to convention, reference to system.'

[47] With survey on pp. 398–406. Uden highlights resistance, exclusion and Global Classics as ways forward, using three case studies from the eighteenth century. See also Fuhrer (p. 482) on reception and reader-reception in their German/US institutional contexts. Stover's and Haskell's chapters inevitably double as studies in reception of ancient Latin, while also inviting classicists to move beyond what Philip Hardie (2018) has called 'an hour-glass model of intertextuality' (comparing a given post-antique text with an ancient one without considering what lies in between).

[48] Including, it may still need emphasising, when it comes to textual editing: as Huskey and Kaster (pp. 516–17) point out, every edition is a theory.

when addressing questions of politics and power in Roman texts;[49] so too Katharina Volk, with her manifesto for a culturally grounded reading of Roman philosophy,[50] and Uden's vindication of reception as cultural studies in the strong sense.

Where will the 'high theory' of the coming years be? Prophecy is a fools' game, but we note with Sharrock (p. 200) the still fresh shoots of ecocriticism,[51] the stirrings of posthumanism,[52] and the rich promise of the cognitive turn.[53] Queer theory continues to evolve,[54] and Global Classics is another important impulse,[55] not least in its continuing call to disciplinary self-awareness. In that spirit, we offer as one last critical tool a running self-reflexivity about the state of the discipline and its practitioners: contributors reflect explicitly on their own careers,[56] as well as on the continued imbalance in gender[57] and race,[58] the more or less explicit marginalising of areas such as post-antique and reception studies[59] and the effect on research of changing patterns of teaching and of funding structures.[60] Navel-gazing is easily mocked; but explicit reflection on individual presumptions and disciplinary norms is surely a prerequisite for truly critical engagement.

[49] As he puts it (p. 825), 'Being a good historicist requires being a good historian – and that is a non-trivial condition.'

[50] Ch. 13; so too Lavan (pp. 823–4) on Stoicism, Stover (p. 284) on mediaeval allegory, and Lowrie in her chapter on political thought.

[51] Whether in the soft sense (readings which attend to natural or human-natural relations) or a hard one (politically evaluating texts in terms of ecological ideals). Virgil's *Eclogues* has naturally been a prime target (Saunders 2008; Apostol 2015); Schliephake 2017 includes ecocritical approaches to Virgil, Columella, Lucan and Statius. Here, as often, Classics sails in the wake of English departments (e.g. Bate 1991, Glotfelty 1996, Rigby 2015), though soft ecocriticism (e.g. on landscape) of course has a long tradition.

[52] Bianchi, Brill and Holmes 2019, Chesi and Spiegel 2020.

[53] O'Rouke and Pelttari (pp. 259–60), Clackson (pp. 589–90), with Squire and Elsner (p. 652 n. 82) on the 'sensory turn'. On 'cognitive classics' see Meineck, Short and Devereaux 2019 (heavily weighted to Greek); also e.g. Riggsby 2019, a study of ancient information technologies with a strong cognitive thrust (and abundant pay-off for 'literary' readers), and Gazzarri 2020, taking a cognitive approach to Senecan metaphor.

[54] Not least into intersectionality and trans studies (see n. 28).

[55] Both as theoretical approach (see Uden, esp. pp. 428–33, and e.g. Umurhan 2018) – and as a call to decentre the tradition (cf. Seo 2019). For the important work of Andrew Laird in centring focus on Latin America, see (e.g.) Laird and Miller 2018.

[56] Sharrock (p. 184), Haskell (pp. 334–6), Uden (p. 396).

[57] See Huskey and Kaster (p. 540) and Fuhrer (p. 492) on the paucity of female textual critics in particular, and Uden (pp. 417–20) for a longer view on the education of women in Latin.

[58] Fuhrer (p. 475).

[59] See Haskell on Neo-Latin. Uden (esp. pp. 395–7 and 439–40) confronts and collapses value-inflected distinctions between philology and reception studies.

[60] Peirano Garrison (pp. 43–52) for a long view on teaching canons in the USA; Stover (p. 279) on funding work in mediaeval Latin; Haskell (pp. 355, 373–9) on the teaching and funding of Neo-Latin; Fuhrer (pp. 450–83 *passim*) on the pedagogical landscape.

Territories (1): 'Classical' and Later Latins

One of the purposes of this volume is to highlight tools and methodologies that can be used to interrogate canonical texts in fresh or challenging ways. Another is to highlight less familiar texts. Why do we relegate so much of our corpus to the categories of 'marginal' and 'minor'? For most practising Latinists the largest single area of neglect is the literature of late antiquity and beyond: the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and – when Latin goes global – the modern and early modern eras.[61] Walter Scheidel has argued that Roman historians can only grasp what is specific to the Roman Empire if they pay equal attention to 'what happened later on in the same geographical space'.[62] Similarly, specialists in classical Latin – whom we take to be a large part of our readership – can benefit from asking what becomes of literature later on, in the same linguistic space.[63] As Joseph Farrell puts it, Latin can be appreciated 'as richer and more appealing for the diversity that it gained through time and space in the contrasting voices of many speakers':[64] there is clear advantage in shifting from an image of classical Latin as a cluster of texts ensconced within a *pomerium* to the thought that we lie only at the *beginning* of Latin literature. (The image of the *pomerium* also encapsulates the limited spatial distribution of the Latin literature of the late republic and early Empire, which is heavily concentrated within the metropolis; the north African Apuleius and Tertullian point the way to the greater geographical diversity of the future.) The accumulated expertise of those who work on the vast range of texts from late antiquity to neo-Latin and modern vernacular receptions of Latin texts has much to offer the rest of us in both teaching and research – not least a sense of our place within the world history of Latin.[65]

That is one reason why more than half the contributors to this volume are scholars who work primarily on material outside classical Latin literature. But

[61] See Haskell (pp. 347–8 and 356–7) on global Neo-Latin and Fuhrer (pp. 477–80) on Latin literature studies beyond Europe and the Anglophone world; Stover (pp. 278–80) and Fuhrer (*passim*) on national boundaries; on politics of global reception see again Uden (pp. 428–33) and Blanshard et al. 2020: 188–9.

[62] Scheidel 2019: 22.

[63] Where Scheidel 2019 contends that the disappearance of Rome was a precondition for future economic and social progress (a view that needs to be read against Netz 2020: 800–5 on the success of antiquity as cultural catalyst), the present volume rejects the old narrative of Latin's post-classical decline. For the trope of decline in Latin from a golden age, see Farrell 2001: 84–112.

[64] Farrell 2001: 123; cf. the agenda set out ibid. xii–xiii.

[65] For the continuing influence of early-modern commentators in the field (alongside the resources offered by modern critics), see O'Rourke and Peltari (pp. 216–17) on Juan Luis de la Cerda; conversely for the rich patrimony offered by forgotten classical philologists of the early modern period, see (e.g.) Santini and Stok 2008.

how is 'classical Latin' defined, and how useful or valid is such a definition? How big is the extant classical corpus, how does it relate to the corpus as perceived in antiquity, and how big is it by comparison with later eras? And how well is modern scholarship distributed across surviving Latin texts?

Defining Classical Latin

'Classical Latin' is a term as various as it is exclusive. To take just chronology, it may be used to describe the Latin of all antiquity (excluding mediaeval and beyond), just the Latin of the republic and early principate (excluding later antiquity), or most narrowly the 'model' prose and verse of a few select authors (excluding, then, almost everything).[66] We use it here in the second sense, as a counterpole to 'late antique', objectionable in perpetuating a polarity which this volume sets out to challenge, but adopted as a term of convenience.[67] One powerful demarcation of classical Latin in that sense is enshrined in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Issued serially from 1968 to 1982, with a second edition in 2012, the *OLD* is the flagship lexicon in the English-speaking world, and exerts due influence.[68] According to a decision taken early on, it covers texts up to around 200 CE, adding some from later,[69] but excluding even second-century Christians:[70] so for instance Ulpian (born *c.* 170) is in, but Tertullian (born 155) stays out.[71] It was a practical decision – to add Augustine alone would have doubled the material,[72] and the project took over half a century as it is – and not one that reflected scholarly

[66] The models being Cicero (or even just his oratory and dialogues) and Caesar in prose, Virgil, Horace and Ovid above all in verse. This is the norm in older grammars such as Kühner and Stegmann 1912, and remains influential, not just in education systems where prose and verse composition is privileged: commentators on imperial texts, for instance, are often prone to measure their author's usage against a 'classical' norm.

[67] Kelly (p. 107) prefers a different use, and reflects on the term 'classical'; cf. Hall and Stead 2019: 21–44 on the origins and development of 'Classics'. Zetzel 2018: 81–3 (on Fronto and Gellius) considers some differing ideas of the classical within antiquity itself.

[68] On its long gestation and vicissitudes, see Henderson 2010 and Stray 2012. The 'second edition' is essentially an aesthetic makeover, and not obviously an improvement (Whitton 2012).

[69] As late as Isidore in the sixth century and Paulus' epitome of Festus in the eighth. Others include Donatus' Terence commentary, Fulgentius Afer, Macrobius, Nonius, Priscian, Servius and the texts of *CIL*: i.e. largely paraliterary texts useful to classicists.

[70] Glare 1986: vi (= 2012: ix). The original plan had been to stop at the death of Suetonius (Henderson 2010: 147–9).

[71] Admission was granted, though, to Augustine's *City of God*.

[72] Augustine's five million words, on the estimate of Dolbeau 1998: 134–5, equal the total of all surviving Latin literature up to the first century CE. There was also a desire not to step on the toes of a dictionary of 'later Latin' under preparation for the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, which in fact never appeared; there is, however, a *Glossary of Later Latin to 600* AD (1949) by Alexander Souter, one of the first editors of the *OLD*. See Henderson 2010: 148, 152–3; Stray 2012.

consensus: 'an irreparable blunder', said Robin Nisbet;[73] 'a terminal limit devoid of linguistic or literary validity', declared Frank Goodyear.[74] But it had significant intellectual consequences: despite many advances,[75] the *OLD* has failed to supersede its flawed Victorian predecessor 'Lewis and Short' in an important point of content (as well as in actual use),[76] and it reinforces a widespread tendency to see Latin after Apuleius as exotic. (Those educated in different systems, including a Germanic tradition centred on the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, whose coverage runs into the sixth century, often conceptualise the field rather differently.)[77]

The exclusion of Christian texts continued a trend that had been in train since Wolf's *Prolegomena to Homer* (1795) and perhaps earlier, as Classics extricated itself from 'philology's shadow', theology.[78] If they were parting ways in the nineteenth century, the two disciplines remained closely enmeshed in methodological terms, thanks to a mutually reinforcing investment in textual criticism and authenticity, as well as a commitment to close – very close – reading of ancient authors.[79] By the early twentieth century, the fissure was deeper. New subjects had arrived to take the place of theology as methodological allies, and the shared concerns of the

[73] In the *Oxford Magazine*, 14.2.1969 (as quoted by Henderson 2010: 174 n. 47), following publication of the first fascicle. Nisbet anticipated a boom in late antique Latin which the dictionary would do little to foster; whether his prediction can be called right fifty years on depends on where one is standing. Ausonius, Prudentius, Ammianus Marcellinus and Claudian have all attracted very large bibliographies, alongside the enduring colossi of Augustine and Jerome. From another point of view, it is the Latin authors of the post-Virgilian age who have been signal beneficiaries, despite the discouragements of the *CHCL* (see p. 2).

[74] Goodyear 1992: 281 (orig. 1983). Other reviewers were more temperate, but not all mild: Kenney 1970; Luck 1984.

[75] Clackson, pp. 586–9 (faulting, however, the lack of attention to diachrony in semantics).

[76] Lewis and Short 1879, including inconsistent coverage up to *c.* 600. Freely available on the Perseus website and cheap to download as an app, it is unlikely to be superseded as the 'big dictionary' of choice for many readers so long as the *OLD* either exists only in print (priced at over £300) or sits behind an expensive paywall.

[77] Coverage is more or less comprehensive up to the second century, but often more selective thereafter. The *Thesaurus* is one of several large research projects in German-speaking lands, also including the *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch* and Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina; on these and others see Fuhrer (pp. 455–6), who also notes the greater institutional support for late antique studies in parts of continental Europe. On the broad cultural context for such initiatives, see Blanshard et al. 2020: 114–15.

[78] Conybeare and Goldhill 2020, esp. ch. 1. In the terms of Blanshard et al. 2020: 82–99, the separation of Classics from theology is a matter of 'repeatedly asserted differentiation' rather than 'genetic difference'. The silent erection of barriers is nothing new in the broader history of the field: early imperial Greeks, as Simon Goldhill shows (pp. 863–7), understood how to perform their ignorance of Latin.

[79] Goldhill 2020: 33–49; cf. Peirano Garrison 2020 on Lachmann's editions of both Lucretius and the New Testament.

Victorian age appeared antiquated.[80] As in many divorces, the former partners began to define themselves *against* one another, in an act of disavowal whose unacknowledged force shapes the discipline as we know it today.[81]

And yet classical Latin is in an important sense the brainchild of Christianity – one of which Quintilian might have approved, for all the Christian insistence on a gulf separating the heavenly concerns of Jerusalem from the affairs of Athens.[82] After the reign of Hadrian, Latin literature famously begins to fall quiet until the resurgence beginning with Diocletian in the late third century. It is hardly a uniform decline: not to mention Fronto, Gellius and Apuleius, jurisprudence flourishes and a Christian tradition gets underway, especially in north Africa. A century of political, military and economic turmoil from the late 160s onwards might be one explanation. Greek suffers a gradual decline in production over the course of the third century (at least by comparison with the peak years of the later second century); but authors of the stature of Athenaeus, Herodian, Philostratus and Plotinus flourish in the late second and early third centuries.[83] The reasons for the perhaps unequal fortunes between the two languages are unclear.[84] But as Latin literature made its return in the late third and (particularly) fourth centuries, the Christian population of the empire rocketed, from perhaps 5–10% in 300 CE to a position of clear dominance by 400.[85] This was the era in which (classical) Latin as the language of literature was gradually standardised to some degree: the pronounced stylistic experiments attempted in the age between Tacitus

[80] See Goldhill 2020: 57–62, esp. p. 62 'intergenerational, family conflict, the trauma of the First World War, the growth of the discipline of anthropology, and the importance of world politics after the world war . . . all worked to effect the divorce between classical philology and theology'.

[81] See Goldhill 2020: 54–7; but it might be said, given the centrality of the Greek New Testament to earlier close relations, that the effects of the divorce have been stronger on the Hellenic side than on the Latin. Classics is not uniquely guilty in this regard; see Vinzent 2019: 46–7 on institutional divides between scholars of patristics and scholars of the New Testament.

[82] See Peirano Garrison (pp. 67–77) and Kelly (pp. 140–3) on the complexity of Christian ideological responses to 'classical' Latin, and on the Christian preservation of pagan works, including a vast amount of fragmentary texts. For the use of 'Athens' by the Latin-speaking Tertullian, see Goldhill (p. 884).

[83] Netz 2020: 691–727. For the possibility of a rupture in Latin literature in the years 254–84 CE, see Farrell 2001: 9–10; cf. Kelly (p. 113) on the absence of elite genres from surviving third-century texts.

[84] Leonhardt 2013: 80–6 suggests that the growing cultural capital of Greek, evident already in the time of Trajan and Hadrian, was a factor: Greek rhetoricians and philosophers who lived in Italy did not usually write in Latin, and Roman practitioners displayed an increasing willingness to compose in Greek. However, the association of *paideia* with Greek was more likely to have been a constant across all eras.

[85] Trombley 2006.

and Apuleius in the second century seem to became rarer in the new era.[86] Such standardisation was in part due to the gradual diffusion of an accepted canon of (classical) works taught at school for emulation: Cicero and Virgil, of course; also Terence, Sallust, Horace and Livy.[87] Like most canons, it had stylistic diversity within it; in any case, as Clackson remarks (p. 584), classical Latin had never been an unchanging monolith.[88] Augustine could move seamlessly, all the same, from teaching Latin rhetoric at the schools of Carthage to those of Rome and Milan, despite consciousness of his north African ('Punic') accent.[89] It is one of the great paradoxes, then, of the *OLD* and the field it serves that the very authors and texts who colluded in creating a canon of classical Latin are so often excluded from view.

Sizing up the Corpus

We will return in a moment to those flimsy yet consequential barriers between classical and later Latins. First, we address some questions about scale in the classical corpus: how much literature survives, and how much was there? Surprisingly little effort seems to have been put into answering the second question; but inspiration can be found in Reviel Netz's *Scale, Space and Canon in Ancient Literary Culture* (2020), a provocative and challenging essay on the extent of Greek literature in antiquity.[90] Netz's approach cannot be mapped directly onto Latin, given the quantitative and qualitative differences between the surviving Greek and Roman corpora. But we summarise it here to gesture at the bigger picture of the ancient literary Mediterranean, and to illustrate the methodology and potential rewards of a quantitative approach.

[86] Stylistic experimentation lived on in the work of e.g. Ammianus, Aurelius Victor and (later) Sidonius.

[87] Leonhardt 2013: 87–8. Very broadly, the classicism of late antiquity eventually gave way to the more mannered style of the late fifth and early sixth centuries, before a temporary resurgence of the *sermo humilis* of the Vulgate; see Stover's chapter (Ch. 6). On the mediaeval educational canon (which overlaps to some degree with the late antique, besides the addition of the Vulgate and Christian Latin classics), see again Stover: like the late antique canon, the mediaeval canon allowed for significant stylistic diversity.

[88] As the Romans themselves knew. Repeated attempts to 'reform' Latin and return to classical 'stability' (Farrell 2001: 5–6, 15–17) should be read against this relative diversity in practice.

[89] Augustine, *De ord.* 2.45.

[90] Keith Hopkins once estimated the number of 'fluent and skilled literates' among early Christian communities across the whole Mediterranean at 42. This (Douglas Adams-esque) number is not of course to be taken literally, but stands as 'a symbol for a small number of unknown size' (Hopkins 2018a: 463–4). In other words, rough orders of magnitude are the order of the day.

On Netz's projection, by the end of the second century CE around 30,000 people had written literature in Greek,[91] of whom around 10,000 had works still circulating; the latter number fell to perhaps 500 to 1,000 by the ninth century.[92] Today around 200 authors are transmitted either in whole works or in whole parts of works (i.e. one or more constituent books still whole).[93] In other words, surviving Greek authors represent perhaps 2% of the total circulating in 200 CE and well below 1% of the authors active to that date.[94]

Those proportions rise if we include fragmentary authors.[95] But to reach even a 10% survival rate from before 200 CE, we would need works or fragments of 3,000 authors.[96] The canon of the *Thesaurus linguae Graecae* runs to around 4,000 – but across a much longer span (to the fall of Byzantium); and late antique Christians are on the whole more likely to be preserved than their earlier pagan counterparts, for a simple practical reason: a text written in 400 BCE had to survive much longer before being copied onto parchment than one written in 400 CE.[97] Even including fragmentary authors, then, perhaps no more than 5% have survived in any extent. As for the quantity of surviving text, this is often assumed to be less than 1%.[98] Suppose, though, that most of our 30,000 putative writers were neither eminent nor prolific, failing to spur the sorts of efforts put into preserving the likes of Aristotle, Plutarch and Galen: that might raise the estimate to perhaps 2%.[99]

[91] Projecting attestations for *c.* 5,000 Greek authors in the period before 200 CE, Netz suggests that the ratio for attested authors in proportion to all pre-200 authors (attested and unattested) probably lies somewhere between 1:5 (or just below) and 1:9. In consequence, there were perhaps anywhere between 22,500 and 45,000 Greek authors active in the period before late antiquity (Netz 2020: 527–624).

[92] Netz 2020: 550–1, 557–9. Most were probably technical and philosophical writers rather than strictly belletristic; but we have already mentioned the problem of defining 'literature'.

[93] Ibid. 551.

[94] More than that, Netz (ibid. 546, 557–8) argues for a survival rate of only 15% for a putative 20,000 pre-imperial authors into the imperial period itself.

[95] See the quantitative analysis performed on the *TLG* by Berti et al. 2009: 'for the period between the 8th century B.C. and the 3rd century A.D. included, 59% of the authors is preserved only in fragments, 12% is known both from entirely preserved works and fragmentary ones, while 29% is represented by surviving works'.

[96] I.e. 60% of the probable 5,000 authors *attested* in total for the period before 200 CE (see n. 91).

[97] Or papyrus (see Kelly, p. 145).

[98] In 1494 Pietro Bembo, concerned about the disappearance of ancient Greek literature in his own time, and perhaps after some acquaintance with the *Suda*, estimated that only 1% of ancient Greek literature was still in existence; see his *Oratio pro litteris Graecis* with Wilson 2003. A similar claim has been staked in modern times (Blum 1991: 8, 13 n. 4), and is often repeated anecdotally. The true rate of survival in bulk is perhaps less than 1%, i.e. somewhere between survival rates for papyrus and stone (see next n.), even allowing for the recopying that texts regularly enjoyed and inscriptions did not.

[99] As suggested to us by Reviel Netz. For estimates of the (low) survival rate of ancient texts preserved via other media, including inscriptions, papyri and military diplomata, see Duncan-Jones 1982: 360–2; Eck 2002: 93–5; Netz 2020: 528–36. Using the genre of narrative fiction in medieval Europe

Can Netz's approach be replicated for Latin? His estimates come from probabilistic arguments based on attestations in ancient sources. Despite a high attrition rate, the surviving Greek corpus is not small, and we have plenty of attestation-rich works, including the post-classical *Suda*. Latin is perhaps as well endowed with similar texts, proportionally.[100] But there is perhaps ten times as much Greek literature down to the fifth century CE extant as there is Latin,[101] with presumably a significant multiplicative effect on attestations of lost authors. In consequence, we probably have less information about texts we know of but do not possess, and an even shakier basis for estimating what else there was. Above all, we lack the Egyptian papyri that, for Greek literature, grant direct access to antiquity and preserve many texts not otherwise selected for re-copying onto parchment. There is, then, a fundamental quantitative *and* qualitative difference between the surviving Latin and Greek corpora and what they are equipped to tell us about losses.[102]

Still, Netz provides the impetus for a quantitative approach to the Latin corpus. But we start at the other end with extant (rather than attested) authors. The *OLD* cites over 700 different whole or fragmentary works from about 370 authors, including grammarians and those embedded in the *Digest*;[103] of these, around 65 have works wholly or substantially extant. There are also around 35 unattributed works fully extant (some perhaps written by authors with attributed works extant; but to be generous to the corpus, let us assume the overlap is relatively small), and 270 or so authors of whom only fragments survive. These numbers are rough and ready (leaving aside, for instance, the *XII Tables* and similar compilations), but they offer a basic starting-point.[104]

(*c.* 600–1450 CE), Kestemont, Karsdorp et al. 2020 estimate survival rates for the total number of works on a range from 38.6% (England) to 79% (Germany) and 81% (Ireland), and the percentage of surviving documents that carried these works on a range from 4.9% (England) to 19.2% (Ireland).

[100] Where Greek features citation-rich sources such as Plutarch, Athenaeus and Photius, as well as the *Suda*, Latin offers e.g. Cicero's *Brutus*, Quintilian, Gellius, Jerome's *De uiris illustribus*, Festus and Nonius.

[101] This ratio for Greek literature down to Nonnus in the fifth century is quoted in the 1925 preface of LSJ (1996: v), and attributed to Diels 1905: 692, who wrote at a time of great rediscoveries of Egyptian papyri.

[102] Cf. Kelly (pp. 148–9) on the difficulties of applying the methods of Netz 2020 to Latin literature.

[103] For this exercise we have excluded the handful of non-juristic works from after 200 CE.

[104] Figures for authors, of course, are independent of estimates of quantity: the corpora of Cicero and Livy are massive, that of Gallus minute.

It is safe to assume that the *OLD* does not draw on every pagan author from before 200 to survive. What percentage does it include?[105] For the period up to 140 CE, Peter White counts just over 120 poets 'of whose verse any portion is extant in a manuscript tradition';[106] 95% of them are listed among the *OLD*'s sources. If we guess that prose is less privileged, we might suppose – at least as a sighting shot – that the *OLD* cites around 80% of authors whose work substantially survives, and around 50–60% of authors who survive as fragments.[107] If so, we can project a surviving Latin classical (and pagan) corpus with 100 to 125 authors surviving in whole or whole parts and 270 to 450/540 authors in fragments. Assume an overall survival rate, as for Greek, of 5%, and we might (very) provisionally project something between 7,400 and 11,500/13,300 Latin authors before 200 CE.[108] Then again, the average Latin text was much younger by the time it was first copied onto parchment, suggesting a better survival rate; our projections should be dropped a little if so.[109] The corpus of Classical Latin as understood by the *OLD* then consists, on any reasonable estimate, of perhaps not very much more than 100 authors surviving whole or in whole parts.[110] The overall survival rate, assessed by bulk, looks – as might be expected – low.[111]

[105] In the preface to the first volume of *La Littérature latine inconnue* (1952), H. Bardon cited some estimates made in 1903 by one A. F. Wert (in fact A. F. West 1902): 772 Latin authors known by name, 144 with one or more works transmitted, 352 surviving as fragments quoted in other works, and 276 attested but not extant. It appears that West based his estimates on M. Schanz's 1875–87 revision of W. S. Teuffel's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*; the figures include Latin authors down to 500 CE, 'excluding all Christian Latin and all Greek books written by Romans'. West added that of the 144 survivors, 64 had lost the majority of their books, 43 retained the greater part of their writings, and 37 possessed all or very nearly all of their works.

[106] White 1993: 211–22.

[107] The estimates are deliberately conservative, to leave room for an unknown number of fragmentary jurists and grammarians not cited. A glance at the contents list for Cornell's *Fragments of the Roman Historians* (2013) suggests that only around 50% of the authors appear in the *OLD*; collections of fragments in other prose genres perhaps register an even lower strike rate.

[108] Here as elsewhere, it is orders of magnitude that matter; the precise figures are eminently open to revision. A further question is raised: who counts as an 'author'? One definition might be: someone whose work was read and circulated beyond the (extended) family of the writer. Pliny's *Epistles* offer numerous examples of versifiers whose work would presumably have remained a family affair (e.g. the *lyrica doctissima* of Vestricius Spurinna at *Ep.* 3.1.7), were it not for Pliny's unique interest.

[109] Whether Latin produced proportionately more belletristic authors than Greek remains a subject for speculation.

[110] Classical Greek, it appears, has only twice that particular number of surviving authors; but they and their fragmentary fellow authors produced on average much more text per head.

[111] Fragmentary authors survive largely as quotations in later texts, and do not have the advantage enjoyed by Greek of extensive supplementation through papyrus finds. (Even the currently available Herculaneum papyri are mostly Greek.)

On 'Representativeness'

It is conventional to lament the loss of large swathes of Ennius or Livy and the near or total disappearance of others such as Gallus: like Greek, and unlike many other disciplines in the humanities, scholarship on classical Latin 'has a constitutive relationship to loss'.[112] Lamentation may be misplaced in two rather different senses. In ethical terms, the neglect, indifference or cultural hostility suffered by Latin literature over the centuries might be viewed in the context of the 'epistemicide' (cultural, environmental, religious) that the Romans themselves so enthusiastically inflicted on their imperial subjects.[113] In simpler terms of scale, what survives in fact appears to be, to a perhaps surprising extent, representative of works circulating in antiquity: we have many of the authors who were most widely read.

In a famous passage of his *Education of the Orator*, written in the early 90s CE, Quintilian sets out which Greek and Latin authors a budding orator should read (*Inst.* 10.1.38–131). Towards sixty writers make the cut in Latin, including poets, historians and philosophers as well as orators. Of course, the list is not straightforwardly representative of what actually was being read in his day: Quintilian is not much interested in literature before Cicero, excludes authors alive at his time of writing, and omits several genres altogether (no biography, epistolography, fables, novels or pastoral; no *Apocolocyntosis* and no *Natural History*, to mention a couple): he is prescribing a canon, and specifically a paedagogical one (for the aspiring orator), as much preserving one. Still, in other ways his tastes look catholic, including poets whose manner and content were far from smooth or risk-free (Lucretius, Catullus, Lucan).[114] Of his nearly sixty authors, we possess over a third either whole or in whole parts, and substantial fragments of many of the rest. The spread is uneven across genres: only one of Quintilian's fourteen orators (Cicero – who of course supplies a very great deal of our extant prose), but wholes or whole parts of two-fifths of the poets and historians, and one-third of the philosophers. Still, this is a striking outcome: although perhaps only 5% (or slightly more) of classical

[112] Blanshard et al. 2020: 129. [113] On Roman epistemicide, see Padilla Peralta 2020.

[114] On Roman canons (including Quintilian's), see Peirano Garrison's chapter (Ch. 2). The letters of Pliny the Younger reveal a set of tastes more thoroughly biased towards his own time and personal acquaintances (Gibson 2014): of the Latin writers he admires, we possess whole or in whole parts 45% of the poets, 36% of the historians, 12% of the orators, and none of the handful of philosophers (ibid. 206).

Latin authors may have survived in any form at all, we seem to have a disproportionately good sample of mainstream literature as it appeared towards the end of the first century CE.[115]

Otherwise put, it appears that the classical canon that Christians would later make their own in the fourth century and beyond was already forming in the first. That suggests considerable stability in tastes, and commensurate fortune in transmission – allowing for the addition of Petronius and others who found more favour with Christian copyists than with Quintilian (whose focus on education overrides all other considerations).[116] But how 'traditional' is our own canon in research and teaching? In other words, how many of the 100 or so classical authors whose works survive wholly or substantially attract regular attention?

Answers to that question must be subjective. What counts as regular? One dedicated article each year? A monograph a decade? The expanding girth (or, nowadays, database) of *L'Année philologique* tells its own story about the increasing volume of classical research, but not about its distribution. The teaching canon remains small. The 'Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics' (better known as the 'Green and Yellows') is certainly the largest and perhaps the most widely used commentary series in the world; yet despite a pronounced expansion in range since its inception in the 1970s, it features only around twenty Latin authors.[117] Just one of those is late antique; five others, or at least their floruits, postdate Quintilian (Tacitus, Pliny, Juvenal, Suetonius and Apuleius), and two were alive when he was writing, disqualifying them from mention (Martial and Statius).[118] The remaining twelve 'Green and Yellow' authors all feature in Quintilian's list: sign of a remarkably static canon. Of course, curricula are not tied inexorably to that series; even so, probably no more than thirty

[115] This accords in some respects with conclusions reached by Netz 2020: 13–14 that, for Greek literature before 200 CE, prestige and popularity largely coincided: good reputation ensured wide circulation; cf. Netz 2020: 624: 'We have truly lost much of the detailed contents. We have also lost even the trace of some passing fads. What we do know, truly well, is the broad contours of the constants.' However, reading Quintilian cannot of course tell us how many Petroniuses (et al.) he omits. For the criticism that Netz takes insufficient account of the fundamental effects of Byzantine tastes on the surviving Greek canon, see the review by Elsner 2021: why did the hugely popular Menander fail to survive in manuscript form?

[116] Likewise for the wide range of styles other than strict Ciceronianism adapted by neo-Latin authors, albeit with episodes of moral panic over perceived decline in the purity of Latin: see Haskell's chapter (Ch. 7); also Stover's on anti-classical Latin styles in the Middle Ages (Ch. 6).

[117] Gibson 2021.

[118] The late-antique author is Augustine (Clark 1995, White 2019). Clark's book and Kenney 1990 (Apuleius' *Cupid & Psyche*) were the two Latin volumes in a short-lived parallel series (the 'Imperial Library') clothed in purple and mauve. See also Kelly (pp. 115–17) on similar results for coverage provided by other series of texts.

writers of classical Latin are taught with any regularity, at least in the Anglosphere.[119]

Not many more receive systematic attention in research. If we expand that to irregular or incipient research and to figures whose stock has been rising, but who remain on the edges of many scholars' horizons – prose writers such as Valerius Maximus, Velleius Paterculus, Pomponius Mela and Florus, for instance; the poets Germanicus, Grattius and Phaedrus; the pseudepigrapha pinned to Virgil, Tibullus and Ovid – we might reach a total somewhere in the sixties. The number of authors considered 'mainstream' has undoubtedly expanded in recent decades, with the rehabilitation of such previously derided figures as Valerius Flaccus, Silius Italicus and Pliny the Younger.[120] Yet there remains ample room for expansion: an already small canon is more constricted than need be.[121] And, as this volume is designed in part to demonstrate, we have the tools that we need to undertake the research. More fundamentally, as Peirano Garrison argues in her chapter on canons (Chapter 2), we need to interrogate the link between the perceived authority of the critic and the market value of a text; to recognise that a discourse of the 'minor' might be a textual strategy deliberately co-opted by an author; and to embrace marginality 'as a way of doing business'.[122]

Looking to Late Antiquity

This is not a call to abandon Quintilian's authors. Other constituencies within and beyond academia expect and even rely on us to curate the

[119] Haskell (pp. 374–5) offers suggestions for the incorporation of neo-Latin texts into classical teaching programmes.

[120] See Peirano Garrison (pp. 52–3).

[121] In his inaugural lecture of 1956, C. O. Brink entered a special plea for the study of the 'margins' of classical literature, in fear that through concentration alone on the avowed 'classics', scholars would lose sight of the broader literary canvas of a period and soon begin seriously to distort its dimensions. A case in point was the *Appendix Vergiliana*, whose poems allowed a glimpse of 'an Alexandrian continuity, culminating in Ovid and scarcely interrupted by the great Augustans', whose 'classicism' was arguably quite unrepresentative of the tastes of the day (Brink 1957: 15–19, with quotation from p. 17; Brink's successor as Kennedy Professor at Cambridge returned to the issue in his inaugural lecture: Kenney 1975: 16–17). Underworked Latin authors and texts would dominate the early decades of the Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries ('Orange') series established by Brink (see Gibson 2016), and still do: alongside Tacitus (Woodman 2017 and 2018), the most recent Latin authors treated are Decimus Laberius (Panayotakis 2012), Gargilius Martialis (Zainaldin 2020) and – opening the door for the first time to Christian Latin – Venantius Fortunatus (Kay 2020).

[122] On canons, margins and the question of aesthetic quality, see also Formisano 2018; Franklinos and Fulkerson 2020: 1–9.

'classic' texts, and the boom in reception studies has perhaps had the unintended consequence of focusing attention on a relatively small number of canonical works whose reception has 'gone global'.[123] We can in any case now generate more data for interpretation, frame our tasks with more precision, and ask new and challenging questions of our canonical texts. There are also limits to how far we can go in our embrace of the classical margins – albeit limits that we are far from reaching. The long arc of the late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century demand for re-evaluation of previously neglected authors was a necessary reaction to an earlier era which seemed to give little serious attention to poets other than Virgil or Horace (Quintilian was hardly so narrow). After all, why should there be a monotonous function from how 'central' an author is to how often they should be studied? But many would consider it a stretch to insist that Cornelius Nepos' *Eminent Foreign Generals* should be studied as intensively as Tacitus' *Annals*.[124] Another (and complementary) route lies across the disciplinary and institutional boundaries erected between classical philology and theology – and giving serious attention to the Latin (and mainly Christian) texts of what is called 'late antiquity'.[125]

Many (classical) Latinists will have their own prejudices to overcome. 'The field of Classics', as Peirano Garrison observes, can easily pose as a 'protector of the secular in opposition and response to the culturally hegemonic reach of monotheistic religions . . . in a kind of scholarly post-enlightenment version of the separation of State and Church'.[126]

[123] Both issues are sensitively discussed by Formisano 2018; cf. Güthenke and Holmes 2018: 59–61 on Charles Martindale's response to the 'politics of globalization' espoused by Page DuBois in *Out of Athens* (2010).

[124] For the persistence of 'value' in the field and the need to take responsibility for 'likes' and 'dislikes', see Blanshard et al. 2020: 15–18. This is as close as we come to the sorts of value judgements encapsulated in *CHCL* (n. 5).

[125] On the term 'late antique' see Peirano Garrison (p. 47); Kelly (p. 115) issues a complementary call to expand our gaze. Two significant resources for late antique Latin literature are the forthcoming *Cambridge History of Later Latin Literature* and *Cambridge Dictionary of Later Latin Literature*, both being edited by Gavin Kelly and Aaron Pelttari; see also the *Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity*, edited by Oliver Nicholson in 2018. A new series of short monographs, *Cultures of Latin*, edited by Catherine Conybeare for CUP, is devoted to continuities from classical to late antique Latin and beyond.

[126] Peirano Garrison 2020: 88. She aptly quotes Shuger 1994: 3 'the sacred is . . . drained, is emptied out, in order to provide modern culture with sufficient intellectual and symbolic capital to start up its own economy'; cf. Farrell 2001: 78–83 on ideologically driven neglect of Christian Latin. Also relevant is a perceived difference between the balancing of competing opinions characteristic of Roman law or ancient Judaism versus the dogmatism and hierarchy of early Christianity (traced by Hopkins 2018a: 469–75 to the rarity of literate readers within small Christian cells). For a vigorous response to such thinking (in the guise of reflections on Dodds' 1965 work *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety*), see Morgan 2019.

(Certainly the rich vein of 'republican' thinking in Roman texts analysed in Lowrie's chapter has been an important inspiration to early modern and modern theorists of the avowedly secular state.[127]) The *OLD* instantiates a version of this polarity between church and state.[128]

Yet such binary thinking is false at an elementary level in the study of literature: the language that Cicero attempted to standardise in the first century before Christ (or 'before the common era', in the dating system imposed in this volume) was largely unchanged in the essentials of morphology and syntax nearly half a millennium later. Change was already underway, of course, as Stover reminds us in his chapter, with the emergence of Christian *sermo humilis* and, in the late fifth and early sixth centuries, a non-classical 'mannered' style. And, as Peirano Garrison shows (pp. 72–3), Christian education eventually recognised a distinction between secular and ecclesiastical texts. Nevertheless, continuity in language and persistence of cultural processes demand that we think across the disciplinary gulf between classical and late antiquity. Goldhill (pp. 891–6) situates Jerome's translation of the Greek New Testament within a long tradition of Roman encounters with the literature and culture of the Greek-speaking Empire – albeit, in this case, one that eventually led to the imposition of rigid barriers between east and west. The intertextual practices of classical writers, as O'Rourke and Pelttari argue (pp. 240–51), similarly benefit from being considered as part of a continuum with the poetic centos of late antiquity and the typological reading of Jewish scriptures by Christian authors. And, Volk suggests (pp. 736–7 and 740), both Apuleius and his north African compatriot Tertullian need to be seen as operating in the same tradition of the Roman sophist.

Of course, just because we can read the Latin texts of Christian late antiquity does not mean that we are necessarily equipped to understand them.[129] Yet if we hive off to departments of history, religion or theology the responsibility for understanding the culture of this era, then we will not be able to understand fully even the intellectual milieu that produced the

[127] Cf. Marx's claim that the French Revolution was enacted 'in Roman costume' (Blanshard et al. 2020: 21, 38–9).

[128] If Latin students face charges of neglect of religious texts largely of late antiquity, classical Greek students face charges of neglect of the Hellenistic era (Septuagint) and early imperial age (the New Testament); see Goldhill 2020: 57.

[129] It is worth asking how far we are restricted by the effects of training within a narrowly confined canon (i.e. effects that can be eliminated by opening the canon), and how far by the human capacity to master the necessary information one needs to understand both a Catullus and a Cassiodorus.

late antique grammarians, critics and commentators such as Servius and Macrobius – considered here by Huskey and Kaster (pp. 537–40) and O'Rourke and Pelttari (pp. 250–3) – who remain fundamental to comprehension of earlier texts.[130] So too with visual commentary: in the words of Squire and Elsner (p. 652), illuminated manuscripts such as the Vatican Virgil demand respect as 'a series of responses to . . . works closer to their original resonance and reception than our own reactions'. More fundamentally, as Kelly argues, 'The continuity of . . . patterns of thought [across classical and late antiquity] is why periodisation matters and . . . how it does intellectual harm, by narrowing our horizons and by encouraging a fundamentally unhistorical understanding of literature' (p. 119). There is also the incongruity of ignoring something so essentially Roman as late antique Christianity. It is difficult to decide, as Keith Hopkins put it, whether the transformation that followed Constantine's great decision 'should be called the triumph of the Christian church or the triumph of the Roman state'.[131]

The riches of the late antique corpus are extensive; how extensive is harder to say. Not even the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* keeps count of all its *auctores* and *fontes*.[132] But the general impression that significantly more Latin authors from late antiquity are extant than there are from before it gets empirical confirmation from handbooks such as Part 6 of the *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, dedicated to 'the age of Theodosius' (374–430).[133] Covering just fifty-five years, its two volumes treat well over 200 authors and pseudonymous or anonymous texts or collections of texts[134] – more than double the number that survive from the four centuries to 200 CE.[135] Much of this work can be said to fall outside the

[130] See Peirano Garrison (pp. 74–7).

[131] Hopkins 1999: 84. As for Rome's legacy, Walter Scheidel argues in *Escape from Rome* (2019) that 'the Greco-Roman legacy is far less important in the making of later European successes than is usually assumed – with the possible exception of Christianity, which rather perversely tends to be marginalised by proper classicists and many ancient historians' (Scheidel 2020). But for the dangers of assuming wholesale rupture from a 'classical' past, see Blanshard et al. 2020: 26–30.

[132] For a rough sense, the *TLL* lists over 120 authors whose name begins with A, four times the number in the *OLD*. As for works, the 2018 digital index for the *TLL* (https://thesaurus.badw.de/tll-digital/index/a.html) contains just under 5,000 rows cataloguing – in theory – either a single work or author. If we assume that around half of these rows represent cross-references or are superfluous in some way, we might (very) provisionally end up with 2,000–3,000 separate works from before 600 CE. The *Clavis patrum Latinorum* (Dekkers and Gaar 1995) attempts to list all Christian Latin texts from Tertullian to Bede.

[133] Berger, Fontaine and Schmidt 2020.

[134] A handful of lost works is included in these volumes, e.g. the histories of Nicomachus Flavianus.

[135] Parts 4 and 5 covered 117–284 and 284–374 in one volume each, suggesting that the explosion in literary activity was specifically at the end of the fourth century and start of the fifth.

realms of high literary culture; but it is hard not to be impressed by such an extraordinary outpouring of intellectual energy, and by its hardiness in survival (helped of course by the shift in this period from papyrus roll to codex, a seismic change which also brought with it a marked increase in the visualisation and illustration of the written corpus);[136] similarly with the astonishing quantities of prose produced by the likes of Augustine and Jerome. If 'definitions of the classical', as Peirano Garrison puts it (pp. 44–5), 'have been traditionally invested in claims of the universal superiority of the Graeco-Roman tradition and therefore implicitly of western culture', then a willingness to go beyond the boundaries of the classical is a necessary first step towards dismantling these attitudes.

Using bulk rather than author count, Jürgen Leonhardt estimated that Christian texts comprise around 80% of all Latin texts to survive antiquity, including inscriptions. But even the combined bulk of pagan and Christian texts is as nothing compared with the quantity of post-antique Latin. Antique texts as a whole are outnumbered by 10,000 to 1 (constituting, then, '0.01 percent of the total output');[137] classical Latin texts, therefore, by 50,000 to 1.[138] To be sure, these dizzying figures pay no attention to quality of text, and they include plenty of material (legal dissertations, for instance) which few would call literature. But Leonhardt does have a point: there is a lot of Latin out there. And much of it, particularly that of late antiquity, the high Middle Ages, the Renaissance and early modernity, is written in a form (at least) comprehensible to those trained in classical Latin.[139] Here is an ocean of material compared with the pond of classical Latin texts.[140]

One of the functions of this volume is to point the way towards this world of Latin beyond the second century CE, to decentre classical Latin, and to provide some first points of orientation. Attitudes to the Latin

[136] See Squire and Elsner (pp. 632–52).

[137] Leonhardt 2013: 2. Neo-Latin has lived on well past the eighteenth century: see Haskell (pp. 352–3).

[138] Ibid. 2–3 (he does not reveal the basis of his calculations). On the difficulties of estimating extant, published and lost mediaeval Latin, see Stover (pp. 272–3).

[139] Important caveats remain. Viewed as a whole, mediaeval Latin exhibits 'bewildering linguistic variety', including mannerism that borders on incomprehensibility to the classically trained; see Stover's chapter (Ch. 6), with Haskell (pp. 341–3) on some humanist responses. Scholars of Neo-Latin typically look 'sideways' to other Renaissance or early modern texts rather than 'backwards' to classical models (Haskell, p. 341); the reverse is true of classical reception scholars.

[140] This raises an important question: does the quantitative difference between classical and post-classical texts entail different interpretative parameters, so that the quantity of texts available makes a qualitative difference to the type of criticism that is either possible or appropriate? See below (pp. 33–4) on 'close' and 'distant' reading.

canon in all periods *are* becoming more expansive.[141] Yet the encounters of classical Latinists with later texts (and their scholarship) are often a product of serendipity or toe-dipping.[142] We aim to provide broader vistas of landscapes ahead – without, we hope, being gripped by the 'Columbus complex', with its delusions of easy access to lands long settled by others with superior environmental knowledge and skills.[143] Since an ideal of competence in all periods of Latin is clearly impossible, we might instead aim for the 'nodal' Classics advocated by Constanze Güthenke and Brooke Holmes as a solution to the tensions between expansion (hyperinclusion) and limitation (hypercanonicity) in the discipline: 'rather than imagine the individual as encompassing a body of material, either within a field of vision or by means of her own self as the frame by which the fragments are restored to wholeness, we could imagine her as situated within a potential web of connections'. The task is to bring constituent parts of the web into contact.[144]

If the absence here of dedicated chapters on late antiquity and Christianity appears paradoxical in that light, it is positively motivated: rather than roping those areas off (as the discipline so often does), we have aimed at organic incorporation. Individual chapters routinely bring together texts which are 'classical' and 'late', pagan and Christian; and the relationships between and across them are repeatedly put under scrutiny. Peirano Garrison challenges the inherited distinction between Christian and pagan canons (pp. 67–77), and Kelly interrogates the boundaries between the classical, the late antique and the mediaeval (pp. 97–120). Stover adumbrates the vast terrain of extant (and largely unpublished) mediaeval Latin literature. 'Heterogeneous, and the product of accidental formation' (p. 275), the mediaeval canon cannot realistically be defined by the usual touchstones of period, place or literary analysis. Instead, Stover models different ways of approaching the field, with a particular emphasis on diachronic 'microhistories' of genre (particularly epic and bucolic) and synchronic histories of style, including the non-classical 'mannered' style affected by many elite literary productions. Yasmin Haskell investigates the benefits of more explicit disciplinary

[141] This is particularly evident in the digital edition of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (*OCD*[5]), which includes significantly expanded coverage of late antiquity.

[142] See Haskell's chapter (Ch. 7).

[143] The term is from Haskell 2001: 48–9 (' . . . we run that risk . . . when we turn our classical telescopes on so many enticing New Worlds, worlds which our mere mastery of the Latin language seems to reveal to us').

[144] Güthenke and Holmes 2018, cited by Uden (p. 432).

dialogue between classical, Renaissance and early modern varieties of Latin by considering Neo-Latin as a modern discipline and historical discourse, before using old, new and hybrid genres alongside the undervalued element of 'emotion' as paths into the neo-Latin domain and its varied canons. The global reach of the Latin language well beyond Europe and North America and its continuing life as a literary medium emerge clearly from this chapter. Fuhrer demonstrates that the study of Latin can sometimes signify rather distinctive things in other intellectual cultures where disciplinary boundaries are positioned differently. In particular, varying levels of institutional investment and support for late antique or Neo-Latin studies can be detected in Europe, north America and elsewhere.[145] And Uden looks at the decentring effects of the global reception of classical texts, urging that we lessen the risk of insularity in reception studies by subjecting ourselves to refereeing processes from those beyond the field.[146]

Uden issues an invigorating call 'to transform the centre and periphery of Classics itself, reconceptualising work on Latin literature in later periods as part of the core of the discipline' (p. 432). We hope this volume may contribute in some small way to that endeavour.

Territories (2): Disciplinary Neighbours

A second principal drive of this volume is to look afresh at relations between Latin and its fellow sub-disciplines within Classics. Specialists in Latin and Greek literature (and most are one or the other) and in ancient archaeology, art, history, linguistics, philosophy may find themselves grouped together in various institutional combinations, particularly in larger departments of Classics and Ancient History in the Anglosphere. This is proudly cited as proof that ours is the original interdisciplinary 'subject'. But how much do we have in common? What are the (largely undiscussed) problems standing in the way of more successful communication? What can we learn from one another?

To start with linguistics, a 'literary' Latinist trying to use a book such as Pinkster's *Oxford Latin Syntax* or Adams' ground-breaking trilogy on Latin bilingualism, regionalism and social variation might well come away

[145] Fuhrer, *passim*. Stover and Haskell also consider how national boundaries can artificially limit corpora. Formisano 2018 addresses clashes in ideas of canon and literary 'importance' between the continental European and US educational systems. On 'Classics' as a discipline, with its national differences, see Blanshard et al. 2020: 65–81.

[146] See also Peirano Garrison (pp. 43–52) on the work performed by 'reception' on the canon.

puzzled or discouraged.[147] Literary allusion is not admitted as part of grammatical explanation, but poorly evidenced Italic languages are freely cited; it is assumed that (reconstructed) spoken Latin is the primary point of reference as well as focus of research; single explanations are preferred to multiple competing interpretations; and Proto-Indo-European appears to be the object of baffling cultic veneration. (PIE linguists perhaps share an unacknowledged disciplinary border with theology: the existence of the invisible subject of study is ultimately a matter of faith; God is in the gaps.) For linguists, as Clackson puts it (p. 575), 'individual utterances or texts are of themselves only revealing insofar as they can give information about the language system that produced them'. The goal is to make a general statement about Latin as a language, not to explicate the apparent quirks of individual authors: literary Latinists attempting the journey from general description to particular explanation will encounter linguists travelling in the opposite direction. Yet, as Clackson argues, a better understanding of such differences will allow the two constituencies to make better use of each other's work: to take one of his examples, work on the historical semantics of *Venus/uenus* can help literary readers of Catullus as well as linguists.

If linguists and Latinists at least share a language as object of study, that has been less true of Latinists and ancient philosophers. Despite the fact that Hellenistic philosophy is preserved largely through Latin accounts of it, Roman philosophy scarcely existed as a subject for most of the twentieth century. As Volk suggests (p. 701), such devaluation has much to do with the institutional history of philosophy as a university subject, where 'what is relevant is the originality and, as it were, quality of a given argument, the way it stands up to scrutiny and improves on earlier approaches' – leaving Roman philosophy 'derivative and second rate' by comparison to Greek. (Not a view shared by all, of course.)[148] If we are to understand Roman philosophy, a paradigm shift is required: much philosophy in Latin was written by non-philosophers who wanted to understand how to apply the teachings of philosophy to their own lives; they wanted to make it work, not to elaborate technical innovations. The tense cultural imbrication of Rome with Greece, and assumptions (by Hellenists) of the cultural superiority of Greek over Latin – both considered by Goldhill in his chapter – provide the larger context for these struggles for recognition.[149]

[147] Pinkster 2015; Adams 2003, 2007, 2013.

[148] Volk, p. 702 n. 4; also e.g. Gildenhard 2007, Baraz 2012 and Schofield 2021 on Cicero's conceptual creativity in the *philosophica*, and Gildenhard 2010 on his oratory.

[149] See also Fuhrer (pp. 453–4 and 464–5) on the perceived greater cultural prestige of Greek in the modern world compared with Latin (and reactions against this in Italy), Farrell 2001: 28–51 on the

Institutional relationships between Classics and Archaeology have not always been good, at least in the Anglosphere.[150] Many archaeologists speak of 'text-hindered' approaches or look with disdain on a field that does not annually produce vast new sets of data. To classicists, archaeological reports can seem hopelessly fragmented, their authors 'more interested in doing another dig and writing up last year's finds than in making sense of the last generation's advances'.[151] Although literary scholars often share departments with researchers who identify primarily as art historians or archaeologists, there is all too little cross-fertilisation with work on material culture, as Squire and Elsner (pp. 614–17) point out – a state of affairs that allows, for instance, the illustrated manuscripts of late antiquity mentioned earlier to fall down the cracks between Latin literature and Roman art history. More fundamentally, they argue, there is too little appreciation of the fact that ecphrasis is not exclusively a literary phenomenon, or that epic texts and representations of epic action in paintings or friezes share a common cultural framework. In sum, 'if Latin texts can help in reconstructing theories and practices of Roman seeing, so too can material objects help us to understand the conceptual framework that Roman authors and readers brought to the composition and reception of Latin literature' (p. 672).

Latin literature and Roman history, at least in the English-speaking world, are not so much guilty of ignoring one another as in serious danger of reaching a crisis after previously close relations. Viewed from the outside, the coming of that crisis may not be immediately apparent.[152] Fuhrer (p. 460), writing from the perspective of a career spent in Germanophone Classics, draws a contrast between an older German tradition of antiquarian, lexicographical and philological scholarship in Latin and an Anglophone tradition that often has stronger links with cultural history: witness the *Journal of Roman Studies*, whose pages are equally at home with a study of the army and the spread of Roman citizenship as they

trope of Latin's linguistic poverty, and Blanshard et al. 2020: 117–25 on the differences between 'not knowing Greek' and 'not knowing Latin'.

[150] The classic verbalisation by Redfield 1991 of antipathies between anthropology and Classics stood duty for the largely unwritten history of inter-departmental tension between archaeology and Classics until the appearance of the essays collected by Sauer 2004 on the boundaries between Graeco-Roman archaeology and ancient history; see especially Laurence 2004, and cf. Porter 2003 and Blanshard et al. 2020: 128–43 more broadly on Classics, archaeology and materiality.

[151] Hopkins 2018b: 199 n. 79 also encapsulates attitudes designed to annoy archaeologists: the latter dig up stuff for the former to analyse 'properly'.

[152] It has been long in the making; cf. Netz 2020: 26–7 on the professionalisation in the 1960s of the humanities as a whole and its different effects on sub-branches of papyrology: 'the study of documents *professionalized outwards*, while the study of literary texts *professionalized inwards*'.

are with digital analysis of Latin prose rhythm or the question of how Romans conceptualised future time.[153] Such mingling reflects to some extent the institutional structures in the Anglosphere, where experts in (for instance) literature and history more commonly cohabit than in the German-speaking world, where Latin literature and Roman history rarely share a building, never mind a library.

From the outside looking in, a relative lack of philological depth in Anglophone Latin studies – in part stemming from a lack of exposure to historical linguistics during the training of Latinists – may be compensated by a broader cultural-historical range.[154] Yet not every scholar trained in the German tradition sees advantage in the Anglosphere's stabling of sub-disciplines. In his 2020 address to the American Association of Ancient Historians, Walter Scheidel called for a decoupling of Graeco-Roman history from literature. His goal was not to reinstate the continental European system, where, he argued, a narrowness of focus has isolated classical historians from History as a broader discipline. Rather, he proposed re-imagining ancient Mediterranean studies as global and comparative history: scholars might aim for expertise in 'state formation in literate state-level pre-industrial societies' rather than 'in the history of the Later Roman Empire with a side line in Augustine and Mediaeval Latin'.[155] There are clear but unacknowledged dangers in this venture. As the 'Postclassicisms Collective' observes, 'interdisciplinarity risks repeating many of the same tropes of disciplinary behavior, but on a larger scale'.[156] In any case, the ground continues to move unbidden beneath our feet. Economic, social and then cultural history dominated the agendas of the most forward-thinking ancient historians of the 1960s to the 1990s, and global history captured the biggest headlines in the first two decades of the new millennium; but new currents of thinking continue to be generated. Maintaining a global perspective remains important: the Graeco-Roman world is only one among many ancient pasts available for study, even within the ambit of the Mediterranean.[157] But, as history at the same

[153] Articles on these three subjects appeared in *JRS* 109 (2019).

[154] As Fuhrer suggests (p. 460); on exposure to linguistics, see Clackson (pp. 603–5). That range is illustrated also by the series *Roman Literature and its Contexts*, mentioned earlier.

[155] Scheidel 2020. [156] Blanshard et al. 2020: 79.

[157] On the 'discernable trend back to the big' in ancient history, see Shaw 2008. Blanshard et al. 2020: 182–200, esp. 193–7 advocate for 'deep immersive reading' of Graeco-Roman texts alongside 'horizontal, comparative reading' of texts from other ancient world cultures; they also comment (ibid. 87–8, 195–6) on the institutional exclusion of other ancient Mediterranean languages from Classics. For reservations about imposing the term 'classical' on other ancient pasts, see Formisano 2018: 13–14; Blanshard et al. 2020: 12–14.

time returns to a bottom-up approach and re-examines relationships with 'sources' – in part through recognition that the Roman Empire is too vast and diverse to bear many more generalisations – this is a good time for Latinists to re-examine their ties with Roman historians.

Lavan warns that the relationship between literary and historical studies is under threat: 'I think Latinists ought to be worried by the degree of disinterest [*sc.* in their work by historians], which sometimes borders on alienation' (p. 817). The historiographical turn is a case in point: transformational work has been done on the rhetoricity and literary texture of ancient historians, with important consequences for historians as well as for literary readers; but such work risks not so much being provocative, as evading 'complex questions about the relationship between historiography and history' (p. 841). So too on broader historical questions: where literary Latinists, working primarily on texts produced by or for the senatorial elite, are often fixed on political history, and (when it comes to the literature of the principate) obsessed with responses to monarchy, historians are more likely to be interested in wider social history, and in an elite perspective that goes beyond anxieties *vis-à-vis* the emperor. Latinists can perhaps find more common ground with their historian colleagues, Lavan suggests, by taking an interest in the *longue durée* of social formation (rather than particular imperial dynasties) or in the kinds of non-literary texts where skills of close reading remain in demand (inscriptions, the juristic corpora, documentary letters).

The Limits of Literature

That brings us back to the question of which texts we read, and which we do not. Why study epigrams transmitted on parchment, but ignore the vast corpus of epigram inscribed on stone?[158] Perhaps the greatest challenge, however, is to re-examine our focus on texts produced by or for the Roman political elite. Finding other sorts of texts to read is clearly one direction for the future. Equally, as Lowrie shows in her chapter, we can radically change the questions we ask of elite canonical texts, and in the process move into closer contact with disciplines beyond the world of Classics. If we focus on political thought, rather than on political and dynastic history, a whole body of Latin texts can be re-evaluated for their contribution to political

[158] See Clackson (pp. 568–9) on inscriptional verse. On epigraphy as sub-discipline, see Blanshard et al. 2020: 69–77, including reflection on epigraphy's lack of a 'canon', but arbitrary separation from papyrology.

theory. Roman works of the classical era, unlike their Greek counterparts, are usually deemed short on abstract political theory. Yet they are rich in 'commentary . . . on the actual and ideal organisation of human life and the obstacles to success' (p. 756). It is important to 'probe *how* the Romans thought about politics in their own language in addition to *what* their ideas were', in poetry as well as in prose.[159] Practices of thinking, rhetoric, works addressed to emperors, reflections on the constitution, (contested) exemplarity, histories of conceptual terms, metaphor – all these become resources for understanding Roman political thought.

Political thought is not confined, of course, to canonical texts. Roman law is rich in resources for this area of study, but offers a particularly resonant example of a set of texts marginalised in the Anglosphere, at least. This corpus straddles key boundaries we have mentioned, between classical and later Latin, pagan and Christian, Latin west and Greek east. Jurists flourished in the third century CE, just as belletristic literature faltered. Roman law was one of the reasons that a Greek under Rome might want to learn Latin (so Libanius claimed),[160] and it was Justinian, ruling in Constantinople, who initiated the single most influential codification of Roman law in his *Corpus iuris ciuilis*.[161] From the eleventh century onwards, Roman law began to inform legal education and administration across Europe, giving rise to an enormous body of interpretative literature.[162] Yet the prestige of the Roman jurists is low in the Anglosphere, the degree to which Roman literature and thought are permeated by law underappreciated.[163]

One partial explanation for this relative neglect is that civil codes in the English-speaking world, unlike those of continental Europe and elsewhere,

[159] The embeddedness of Roman political thought shares obvious parallels with the embeddedness of philosophy in much Latin poetry (see Ch. 13 by Volk).

[160] Libanius, *Orat.* 1.234, 255; 49.27: see Nesselrath 2014: 253. On Latin in the eastern Empire see also Kelly (pp. 139–40).

[161] However, the Greek materials used to teach the corpus soon effectively superseded the Latin text; see Corcoran 2017: 101–16. Frier 2016 provides an annotated text and translation of the *Codex* of Justinian (one part of the *Corpus iuris ciuilis*).

[162] Stein 1999 gives a brief overview.

[163] As Fergus Millar suggested, 'no one will deny that . . . an interest [in the jurists] is rare to the point of eccentricity' (Millar 1986: 272). For recent work in a variety of national traditions (with reference to further work in those traditions), see e.g. Ziogas 2021 on Ovid and Roman law and Ziogas and Bexley 2022 on Roman law and Latin literature; Gebhardt 2009 on law and Augustan poetry; and Mantovani 2018 on the jurists as literature. For accessible introductions to Roman law and its contexts, see Riggsby 2010; du Plessis, Ando and Tuori 2016. As ever, the narrative is not straightforward or unilinear: to take a parochial example, Roman law was one of six 'caucuses' into which the Cambridge Classics Faculty was divided until the 1980s (a place later taken by the 'interdisciplinary' caucus).

largely derive from sources other than Rome. The resulting disparity in interest in Roman law carries shades of opposition between church and state and between Protestant and Catholic.[164] (The concomitant neglect of Roman law and patristic Latin perhaps renders reception of the ancient world in the Anglosphere distinctly eccentric in a global context.) The inclusion of imperial edicts in Justinian's codification gave prominence to ecclesiastical policy and religious orthodoxy,[165] and his own *Novella* 131, added in 545 CE, gave the status of law to the rulings of the great church councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon, so initiating the canon law of the church. To make things almost too neat, in 529 CE – the year which saw publication of his first edition of imperial edicts – Justinian is said to have closed down Plato's Academy in Athens. True or not,[166] the symbolic power of the story is self-evident: Justinian, codifier of Roman law and steadfast proponent of religious orthodoxy, ended a millennium-long tradition of free enquiry. Yet in terms of recognised intellectual stature, Roman law is a counterpart to the Greek philosophical corpus, and one which has doubtless had greater influence on how lives have been actually lived. Much work remains to be done here, not least in promoting conversation between specialists in Roman law, with their own set of abstract concepts, historians who mine it for data or try to reconstruct socio-economic contexts, and literary scholars studying how law shaped the thinking of other texts too[167] – if not (and why not?) reading the jurists themselves.

Critical Reading

Roman law is cited by Lavan too as one genre where the close reading skills of Latinists might establish common ground with Roman historians. He remarks, though, that in the course of his journey away from Latin literature he has found himself 'producing fewer close readings of particular texts and more often trying to generalise about Latin language and discourse' (p. 819). This disciplinary divergence raises questions about the privileged status of 'close reading' among Latinists. The habit has been part of the genetic code of the sub-discipline since antiquity: Terence, Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Persius, Lucan, Statius, Juvenal and others attracted

[164] For various senses in which 'Protestant *vs* Catholic' structures the study of Latin (and Classics), see Farrell 2001: 101–5 and 125–6; Morgan 2019: 184–5; Blanshard et al. 2020: 88–90.
[165] Corcoran 2017: 97, 100–1. [166] Cameron 2016.
[167] See e.g. the essays collected by du Plessis 2013, especially Howley 2013 on Gellius and the law, and the work of Jill Harries (1998, 2006, 2007).

from the outset a variety of intensive reading practices, including marginal and interlinear annotations, *quaestiones* and treatises, mythological companions, single-author and *variorum* commentaries, and essayistic exposition.[168] Christian authorities likewise developed a rich tradition of linear and lemmatic commentary on biblical texts, often deriving from sermons in which oral exposition was offered of a text read aloud to a Christian congregation.[169]

This symbiosis between classical and Christian reading practices has endured into the modern era: lemmatic commentaries are characteristic of and fundamental to Graeco-Roman literature, as they are in biblical studies.[170] Literary monographs likewise tend to privilege intense work with selected key passages. Close reading is something Latin literary work is good at, and revels in; and it plays an avowedly central role in the chapters to follow. Reading across texts is also hardwired into the discipline, traditionally in the currency of 'parallels'; more recently in the contested dimensions of allusion, reference and intertextuality.[171] But what of 'distant reading'?[172] This might take us to a different set of authors from the 'minor' writers identified by Peirano Garrison, many of whom (particularly the pseudonymous poets) offer intense rewards, intertextual and other, to close readers. Keith Hopkins notoriously derided an inductive approach to history whereby credit went 'to the ancient historian who makes the best pattern out of the largest number of pieces and cites the most obscure sources relevantly':[173] he advocated rather for a deductive approach, insisting that historians first create a broader framework within which to contextualise the piecemeal ancient data.[174] Something of this method can be seen in Netz's *Scale, Space and Canon*, which attempts a survey of all Greek literature up to 200 CE in order to contextualise what we have, and to understand long-term shifts in literary culture, such as the collapse of the early imperial model of patron and author and a change in late antiquity towards the model of the teacher and his circle.

[168] For an overview of Roman philology and scholarship, see Zetzel 2018: esp. pp. 159–200, 253–77 on commentary and exegesis (also Zetzel 1975, 2005). On mythological companions, see Cameron 2004.
[169] See e.g. Cain 2010: 16–41 on Jerome as biblical commentator.
[170] Houlden 1990. On classical commentaries see n. 33 and pp. 19–20.
[171] See n. 46.
[172] 'Distant reading' as a concept is generally traced back to Moretti 2000.
[173] Hopkins 1978: 182.
[174] E.g. the model lifetables of the United Nations offered a structure within which to analyse ages of death recorded on Roman tombstones; a hypothetical graph of steady-line growth for early Christianity allowed the testing of claims about the nature of the sect: see Kelly 2018: 3–6.

Smaller data sets than the whole of Greek or Latin literature can also be read from a distance. To take an example close to the interests of both editors of this volume, around fifty Graeco-Roman 'literary' letter collections survive in manuscript form from the period up to the sack of Rome in 410. They run to many thousands of individual letters: the correspondence of Cicero, Libanius, Augustine and Isidore of Pelusium alone consists of nearly 5,000 pieces.[175] Much of this vast corpus responds well to close reading of the sort normally practised on poetry, including readings with an explicitly intertextual focus. But perhaps as much is resistant: letters of recommendation, consolation and friendly solicitation or regard, for instance, tend to work with a relatively small number of repeated tropes. The 'Ancient Letter Collections' project run by Roy Gibson, Andrew Morrison and Antonia Sarri aims for 'distant' reading of all fifty collections by collecting data on selected aspects of each one (numbers of senders and addressees; number and range of length of letters; the arrangement of the letters in manuscripts; what else is transmitted with each collection). Andrew Riggsby suggests other ways in which we might read epistolographical corpora from a distance, by focusing for instance on discourse structure, topic modelling and sentiment analysis.[176] Biography, declamation, sermons, dialogues, commentaries and works of exegesis, martyr narratives and medical and technical texts might benefit from similar approaches. The greatest riches for distant reading are offered by digital humanities and the vast amounts of data that computer-led approaches can harvest for interpretation.[177] The greatest obstacle remains the incomplete digitisation of Latin texts in machine-readable form, particularly for later antiquity and the early mediaeval period, and the fact that databases are frequently locked behind paywalls.

There is ample place, then, for both 'close' and 'distant' reading – critical readings both – in a field which is far from exhaustion, but also ripe for expansion. If we have focused here on just some of the ways in which that expansion might be pursued – distant reading, conversations across sub-disciplinary fences, and more dialogue between classical and later Latins – we hope that this introduction has offered a suitable taste of the *Guide* that awaits.

[175] Cicero (*c.* 946 letters); Libanius (*c.* 1544); Augustine (*c.* 308); Isidore of Pelusium (*c.* 2000).
[176] Riggsby 2022.
[177] See pp. 6–7; also Underwood 2019 on the possibilities for new understandings through digital humanities of periodisation and shifts in theme, gender and genre in modern literary history.

References

Adams, J. N. (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge.
(2007) *The Regional Diversification of Latin, 200 BC – AD 600*, Cambridge.
(2013) *Social Variation and the Latin Language*, Cambridge.
Apostol, R. (2015) '*Urbanus es, Corydon*: ecocritiquing town and country in Eclogue 2', *Vergilius* 61: 3–28.
Bagnall, R. and S. Heath (2018) 'Roman studies and digital resources', *JRS* 108: 171–89.
Baraz, Y. (2012) *A Written Republic: Cicero's Philosophical Politics*, Princeton.
Barchiesi, A. (2001a) 'The crossing', in S. J. Harrison, ed., *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics: Literary Theory and Classical Scholarship* (Oxford), 142–63.
(2001b) Review of Taplin 2000, *BMCRev* 2001.12.01.
Bardon, H. (1952) *La littérature latine inconnue. Tome 1*, Paris.
Bate, J. (1991) *Romantic Ecology: Wordsworth and the Environmental Tradition*, London.
Beagon, M. (1992) *Roman Nature: the Thought of Pliny the Elder*, Oxford.
(2005) *The Elder Pliny on the Human Animal: Natural History Book 7*, Oxford.
Berger, J.-D., J. Fontaine and P. L. Schmidt, eds. (2020) *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike. Sechster Band: Die Literatur im Zeitalter des Theodosius (374–430 n. Chr.)*, 2 vols., Munich.
Bernstein, N. (2020) 'Quantitative and qualitative perspectives on the use of poetic tradition in Silius Italicus' *Punica*', in Coffee et al. 2020, 373–88.
Berti, M. (2019) *Digital Classical Philology: Ancient Greek and Latin in the Digital Revolution*, Berlin.
Berti, M., et al. (2009) 'Collecting fragmentary authors in a digital library', *in Proceedings of the 9th ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Conference on Digital Libraries* (Austin, TX), 259–62.
Bianchi, E., S. Brill and B. Holmes, eds. (2019) *Antiquities Beyond Humanism*, Oxford.
Birt, T. (1882) *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur*, Berlin.
Bispham, E., G. Rowe and E. Matthews, eds. (2007) *Vita vigilia est: Essays in Honour of Barbara Levick*, London.
Blanck, H. (1992) *Das Buch in der Antike*, Munich.
Blanshard, A., S. Goldhill, C. Güthenke et al. (2020) *Postclassicisms: the Postclassicisms Collective*, Chicago.
Blum, R. (1991) *Kallimachos: the Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*, Madison, WI.
Brink, C. O. (1957) *Latin Studies and the Humanities: an Inaugural Lecture*, Cambridge.
Cain, A. (2010) *St Jerome: Commentary on Galatians*, Washington, DC.
Cameron, A. (2004) *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*, Oxford.
(2016) 'The last days of the academy in Athens', in A. Cameron, *Wandering Poets and Other Essays on Late Greek Literature and Philosophy* (Oxford), 205–46.
Carey, S. (2003) *Pliny's Catalogue of Culture: Art and Empire in the Natural History*, Oxford.

Chaudhuri, P., T. Dasgupta, J. P. Dexter and K. Iyer (2018) 'A small set of stylometric features differentiates Latin prose and verse', *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* 34: 716–29.
Chesi, G. M. and F. Spiegel, eds. (2020) *Classical Literature and Posthumanism*, London.
Clark, G. (1995) *Augustine. Confessions Books* I–IV, Cambridge.
Coffee, N. (2019) 'Intertextuality as viral phrases: roses and lilies', in Berti 2019, 177–200.
Coffee, N. and J. Gawley (2020) 'How rare are the words that make up intertexts? A study in Latin and Greek epic poetry', in Coffee et al. 2020, 409–20.
Coffee, N., C. Forstall, L. Galli Milić and D. Nelis, eds. (2020) *Intertextuality in Flavian Epic Poetry: Contemporary Approaches*, Berlin.
Conte, G. B. (1994) *Latin Literature: A History* (trans. J. B. Solodow, rev. D. P. Fowler and G. W. Most), Baltimore.
Conybeare, C. and S. Goldhill, eds. (2020) *Classical Philology and Theology: Entanglement, Disavowal and the Godlike Scholar*, Cambridge.
Corcoran, S. (2017) 'Roman law and the two languages in Justinian's empire', *BICS* 60: 95–116.
Cornell, T. J., ed. (2013) *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, Oxford.
Dekkers, E. and E. Gaar (1995) *Clavis patrum Latinorum*, 3rd edn, Turnhout.
Dexter, J. P., K. Katz, N. Tripuraneni et al. (2017) 'Quantitative criticism of literary relationships', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 114 (16): E3195–E3204.
Diels, H (1905) 'Der lateinische, griechische und deutsche Thesaurus', *Neue Jahrbücher fur das klassische Altertum* 15: 689–96.
Dinter, M. T., C. Guérin and M. Martinho, eds. (2020) *Reading Roman Declamation: Seneca the Elder*, Oxford.
Dolbeau, F. (1998) 'Découvertes récentes d'oeuvres latines inconnues', *SEJG* 38: 101–42.
Doody, A. (2010) *Pliny's Encyclopedia: The Reception of the Natural History*, Cambridge.
Doody, A. and L. Taub, eds. (2009) *Authorial Voices in Greco-Roman Technical Writing*, Trier.
DuBois, P. (2010) *Out of Athens: The New Ancient Greeks*, Cambridge, MA.
Duncan-Jones, R. (1982) *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies*, 2nd edn, Cambridge.
du Plessis, P. J. , ed. (2013) *New Frontiers: Law and Society in the Roman World*, Edinburgh.
du Plessis, P. J., C. Ando and K. Tuori, eds. (2016) *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Law and Society*, Oxford.
Eck, W. (2002) 'L'empereur romain chef de l'armée. Le témoignage des diplômes militaires', *Cahiers Glotz* 13: 93–112.
Elsner, J. (2021) Review of Netz 2020, *BMCRev* 2021.06.40.
Fane-Saunders, P. (2016) *Pliny the Elder and the Emergence of Renaissance Architecture*, Cambridge.

Farrell, J. (2001) *Latin Language and Latin Culture from Ancient to Modern Times*, Cambridge.
(2003) 'Classical genre in theory and practice', *New Literary History* 34: 383–408.
Feeney, D. (2016) *Beyond Greek: The Beginnings of Latin Literature*, Cambridge.
Fögen, T. (2009) *Wissen, Kommunikation und Selbstdarstellung: Zur Struktur und Charakteristik römischer Fachtexte der frühen Kaiserzeit*, Munich.
Formisano, M. (2017) 'Introduction: the poetics of knowledge', in Formisano and van der Eijk 2017, 12–26.
(2018) 'Marginality and the classics: exemplary extraneousness', in Formisano and Kraus 2018, 1–28.
Formisano, M. and C. S. Kraus, eds. (2018) *Marginality, Canonicity, Passion*, Oxford.
Formisano, M. and P. van der Eijk, eds. (2017) *Knowledge, Text, and Practice in Ancient Technical Writing*, Cambridge.
Fowler, A. (1979) 'Genre and the literary canon', *New Literary History* 11: 97–119.
Franklinos, T. E. and L. Fulkerson (2020) 'Authoring, reading and exploring an *Appendix*', in T. E. Franklinos and L. Fulkerson, eds., *Constructing Authors and Readers in the Appendices Vergiliana, Tibulliana, and Ovidiana* (Oxford), 1–23.
Frier, B.W. (2016) *The Codex of Justinian. A New Annotated Translation, with Parallel Latin and Greek Text*, 3 vols., Cambridge.
Gazzarri, T. (2020) *The Stylus and the Scalpel: Theory and Practice of Metaphors in Seneca's Prose*, Berlin.
Gebhardt, U. C. J. (2009) *Sermo iuris: Rechtssprache und Recht in der augusteischen Dichtung*, Leiden.
Gibson, R. K. (2014) 'Suetonius and the *uiri illustres* of Pliny the Younger', in T. J. Power and R. K. Gibson, eds., *Suetonius the Biographer: Studies in Roman Lives* (Oxford), 199–230.
(2016) 'Fifty shades of orange: Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries', in Kraus and Stray 2016, 346–75.
(2021) 'Fifty years of Green and Yellow: the Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics series 1970–2020', in S. Harrison and C. Pelling, eds., *Classical Scholarship and its History from the Renaissance to the Present: Essays in Honour of Chris Stray* (Berlin), 175–217.
Gibson, R. K. and C. S. Kraus, eds. (2002) *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory*, Leiden.
Gibson, R. K. and R. Morello, eds. (2011) *Pliny the Elder: Themes and Contexts*, Leiden.
Gildenhard, I. (2007) *Paideia Romana: Cicero's Tusculan Disputations*, Cambridge.
(2010) *Creative Eloquence: The Construction of Reality in Cicero's Speeches*, Oxford.
Glare, P. G. W., ed. (1982) *The Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford.
(2012) *The Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 2nd edn, Oxford.

Glotfelty, C. (1996) 'Introduction: literary studies in an age of environmental crisis', in C. Glotfelty and H. Fromm, eds., *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology* (Athens, GA), xv–xxxvii.
Goldberg, S. (2005) *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge.
Goldhill, S. (2020) 'The union and divorce of classical philology and theology', in Conybeare and Goldhill 2020, 33–62.
Goodyear, F. R. D. (1992) Review of *OLD*, in F. R. D. Goodyear (ed. K. Coleman et al.), *Collected Papers in Latin Literature* (London), 281–7. First published in *Proceedings of the African Classical Associations* 17 (1983), 123–46.
Gunderson, E. (2003) *Declamation, Paternity and Roman Identity: Authority and the Rhetorical Self*, Cambridge.
(2020) 'Theology's shadow', in Conybeare and Goldhill 2020, 199–224.
Güthenke, C. and B. Holmes (2018) 'Hyperinclusivity, hypercanonicity and the future of the field', in Formisano and Kraus 2018, 57–73.
Hall, E. and H. Stead (2019) *A People's History of Classics: Class and Greco-Roman Antiquity in Britain and Ireland*, London.
Hardie, P. (2018) 'A tale of two loves: the greatest hits of post-medieval writing in the Latin language', *TLS* 19.1.2018.
Harries, J. (1998) *Law and Empire in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge.
(2006) *Cicero and the Jurists: From Citizens' Law to the Lawful State*, London.
(2007) *Law and Crime in the Roman World*, Cambridge.
Harrison, S. J. (2007) *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*, Oxford.
Haskell, Y. (2001) 'The Columbus paradigm – or complex? – in neo-Latin studies', *SO* 76: 47–51.
Henderson, J. (2010) 'A1–ZYTHIUM: DOMIMINA NUSTIO ILLUMEA, or out with the *OLD* (1931–82)', in C. Stray, ed., *Classical Dictionaries: Past, Present, Future* (London), 139–76.
Herzog, R. and P. L. Schmidt (2002–) *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, Munich.
Heslin, P. (2020) 'Lemmatizing Latin and quantifying the *Achilleid*', in Coffee et al. 2020, 389–408.
Hinds, S. (2000) 'Essential epic: genre and gender from Macer to Statius', in M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds., *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society* (Cambridge, MA), 221–44.
(2020) 'Pre- and post-digital poetics of "transliteralism": some Greco-Roman epic incipits', in Coffee et al. 2020, 421–46.
Hine, H. M. (2010) *Lucius Annaeus Seneca: Natural Questions*, Chicago.
Hopkins, K. (1978) 'Rules of evidence', *JRS* 68: 178–86.
(1999) *A World Full of Gods: The Strange Triumph of Christianity*, London.
(2018a) 'Christian number and its implications', in Hopkins 2018c, 432–80. First published in *JBCS* 6 (1998), 185–226.
(2018b) 'Economic growth and towns in classical antiquity', in Hopkins 2018c, 160–206. First published in P. Abrams and E. A. Wrigley, eds. (1978) *Towns and Societies: Essays in Economic History and Historical Sociology* (Cambridge), 35–77.

(2018c) *Sociological Studies in Roman History* (ed. C. Kelly), Cambridge.
Houlden, J. L. (1990) 'Commentary (New Testament)', in R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden, eds., *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (London and Philadelphia), 129–32.
Howley, J. (2013) 'Why read the jurists? Aulus Gellius on reading across disciplines', in du Plessis 2013, 9–30.
Hutchinson, G. O. (2008) *Talking Books: Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry*, Oxford.
(2013) 'Genre and super-genre', in Papanghelis, Harrison and Frangoulidis 2013, 19–34.
Johnson, W. A. (2010) *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire*, Oxford.
Kay, N. M. (2020) *Venantius Fortunatus: Vita Sancti Martini. Prologue and Books* 1–11, Cambridge.
Keeline, T. and T. Kirby (2019) '*Auceps syllabarum*: a digital analysis of Latin prose rhythm', *JRS* 109: 161–204.
Kelly, C. (2018) 'Introduction – Keith Hopkins: sighting shots', in Hopkins 2018c, 1–54.
Kenney, E. J. (1970) '*Dimidium qui coepit habet*', *CR* 20: 91–4.
(1975) *New Frameworks for Old: The Place of Classical Literature in the Cambridge Classical Course. An Inaugural Lecture*, Cambridge.
(1982) 'Books and readers in the Roman world', in Kenney and Clausen 1982, 3–32.
(1990) *Apuleius. Cupid & Psyche*, Cambridge.
Kenney, E. J. and W. Clausen, eds. (1982) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature,* II*: Latin Literature*, Cambridge.
Kestemont, M., F. Karsdorp et al. (2022) 'Forgotten books: the application of unseen species models to the survival of culture', *Science* 375: 765–69.
König, A. (2020) 'Tactical interactions: dialogues between Greece and Rome in the military manuals of Aelian and Arrian', in König, Uden and Langlands 2020, 134–56.
König, A., J. Uden and R. Langlands, eds. (2020) *Literary Interactions in the Roman Empire, 96–235: Cross-Cultural Interactions*, Cambridge.
König, J. and T. Whitmarsh, eds. (2007) *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*, Cambridge.
Kraus, C. S. and C. Stray, eds. (2016) *Classical Commentaries: Explorations in a Scholarly Genre*, Oxford.
Kühner, R. and C. Stegmann (1912) *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre*, 2nd edn, 2 vols., Hannover.
Laird, A. and N. Miller, eds. (2018) *Antiquities and Classical Traditions in Latin America*, Hoboken.
Laurence, R. (2004) 'The uneasy dialogue between ancient history and archaeology', in Sauer 2004, 99–113.
Lavan, M. (2018) 'Pliny *Epistles* 10 and imperial correspondence: the Empire of letters', in A. König and C. Whitton, eds., *Roman Literature under Nerva,*

Trajan and Hadrian: Literary Interactions, AD *96–138* (Cambridge), 280–301.
(2020) 'Beyond Romans and others: identities in the long second century', in König, Uden and Langlands 2020, 37–57.
Leonhardt, J. (2013) *Latin: Story of a World Language* (trans. K. Kronenberg), Cambridge, MA.
Lewis, C. T. and C. Short (1879) *A Latin Dictionary. Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freud's Latin Dictionary*, Oxford.
Luck, G. (1984) Review of *OLD*, *AJPh* 105: 91–113.
Mantovani, D. (2018) *Les juristes écrivains de la Rome antique: les oeuvres des juristes comme littérature*, Paris.
Martindale, C. (2002) 'Classics, theory, and thought', *Arion* 10: 141–55.
McCarty, W. (2002) 'A network with a thousand entrances: commentary in an electronic age?', in Gibson and Kraus 2002, 359–402.
Meineck, P., W. M. Short and J. Devereaux, eds. (2019) *The Routledge Handbook of Classics and Cognitive Theory*, London.
Millar, F. (1986) 'A new approach to the Roman jurists', *JRS* 76: 272–80.
Moretti, F. (2000) 'Conjectures on world literature', *New Left Review* 1: 54–68.
Morgan, T. (2019) 'Pagans and Christians: fifty years of anxiety', in C. Stray, C. Pelling and S. Harrison, eds., *Rediscovering E. R. Dodds: Scholarship, Education and the Paranormal* (Oxford), 182–97.
Most, G. W., ed. (1999) *Commentaries – Kommentare*, Göttingen.
Murphy, T. (2004) *Pliny the Elder's Natural History: The Empire in the Encyclopedia*, Oxford.
Nesselrath, H.-G. (2014) 'Emperors and empire in Libanius', in L. van Hoof, ed., *Libanius: a Critical Introduction* (Cambridge), 187–219.
Netz, R. (2020) *Scale, Space and Canon in Ancient Literary Culture*, Cambridge.
Nicholson, O. (2018) *The Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity*, Oxford.
Padilla Peralta, D. (2020) 'Epistemicide: the Roman case', *Classica* 33: 151–86.
Panayotakis, C. (2012) *Decimus Laberius. The Fragments*, Cambridge.
Papanghelis, T. D., S. J. Harrison and S. Frangoulidis, eds. (2013) *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations*, Berlin.
Parker, H. N. (2009) 'Books and reading Latin poetry', in W. R. Johnson and H. N. Parker, eds., *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome* (New York), 186–229.
Peirano Garrison, I. (2019) *Persuasion, Rhetoric and Roman Poetry*, Cambridge.
(2020) 'Source, original and authenticity between philology and theology', in Conybeare and Goldhill 2020, 86–109.
Pinkster, H. (2015) *Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume 1: The Simple Clause*, Oxford.
Porter, J. (2003) 'The materiality of classical studies', *Parallax* 9: 64–74.
Redfield, J. (1991) 'Classics and anthropology', *Arion* 1: 5–23.
Reynolds, L. D., ed. (1983) *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford.

Reynolds, L. D. and N. G. Wilson (2013) *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 4th edn, Oxford.
Rigby, K. (2015) 'Ecocriticism', in J. Wolfreys, ed., *Introducing Ecocriticism in the 21st Century*, 2nd edn (Edinburgh), 122–54.
Riggsby, A. M. (2010) *Roman Law and the Legal World of the Romans*, Cambridge.
(2019) *Mosaics of Knowledge: Representing Information in the Roman World*, Oxford.
(2022) 'What do (Cicero's) letters count as evidence for?', in R. Gibson and R. Morello, eds., *The Epistolary Cicero: Further Readings in the Letters*, Dublin (= *Hermathena* 202–3), 265–84.
Santini, C. and Stok, F. (2008) *Esegesi dimenticate di autori classici*, Pisa.
Sauer, E., ed. (2004) *Archaeology and Ancient History: Breaking Down the Boundaries*, London.
Saunders, T. (2008) *Bucolic Ecology: Virgil's Eclogues and the Environmental Literary Tradition*, London.
Scheidel, W. (2019) *Escape from Rome: The Failure of Empire and the Road to Prosperity*, Princeton.
(2020) 'The ancient historian on the tightrope', recorded lecture, http://web.stanford.edu/~scheidel/Scheidel%20AAH%202020%20Keynote%20Lecture.mp4
Schliephake, C., ed. (2017) *Ecocriticism, Ecology, and the Cultures of Antiquity*, Lanham, MD.
Schofield, M. (2021) *Cicero: Political Philosophy*, Oxford.
Seo, J. M. (2019) 'Classics for all: future antiquity from a global perspective', *AJPh* 140: 399–715.
Shaw, B. (2008) 'After Rome', *New Left Review* 51: 89–114.
Shuger, D. (1994) *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity*, Berkeley.
Starks-Estes, L. S. (2020) *Ovid and Adaptation in Early Modern English Theatre*, Edinburgh.
Stein, P. (1999) *Roman Law in European History*, Cambridge.
Stevenson, J. (2005) *Women Latin Poets: Language, Gender, and Authority from Antiquity to the Eighteenth Century*, Oxford.
Stover, J. and M. Kestemont (2016) 'The authorship of the *Historia Augusta*: two new computational studies', *BICS* 59: 140–57.
Stray, C. (2012) 'The *Oxford Latin Dictionary*: a historical introduction', in Glare 2012, viii–xvii.
Surtees, A. and J. Dyer, eds. (2020) *Exploring Gender Diversity in the Ancient World*, Edinburgh.
Taplin, O., ed. (2000) *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A New Perspective*, Oxford.
Traub, V., P. Badir and P. McCracken, eds. (2019) *Ovidian Transversions: 'Iphis and Ianthe', 1300–1650*, Edinburgh.
Trombley, F. (2006) 'Overview: the geographical spread of Christianity', in M. M. Mitchell and F. M. Young, eds., *The Cambridge History of Christianity. 1: Origins to Constantine* (Cambridge), 302–13.

Umurhan, O. (2018) *Juvenal's Global Awareness: Circulation, Connectivity, and Empire*, London.
Underwood, T. (2019) *Distant Horizons: Digital Evidence and Literary Change*, Chicago.
Van Sickle, J. (1980a) 'The book roll and some conventions of the poetic book', *Arethusa* 13: 5–42.
(1980b) 'Reading Virgil's Eclogue book', *ANRW* II.31.1: 576–603.
Vinzent, M. (2019) *Writing the Early History of Christianity: from Reception to Retrospection*, Cambridge.
West, A. F. (1902) 'The lost parts of Latin literature', *TAPhA* 33: xxi–xxvi.
White, P. (1993) *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge, MA.
(2019) *Augustine. Confessions Books* V–IX, Cambridge.
Whitton, C. (2012) Review of *OLD* (2nd edn), *TLS* 20.7.2012.
Williams, G. D. (2012) *The Cosmic Viewpoint: A Study of Seneca's Natural Questions*, Oxford.
Wilson, N. G. (2003) *Pietro Bembo: Oratio pro litteris Graecis*, Messina.
Winsbury, R. (2009) *The Roman Book: Books, Publishing and Performance in Classical Rome*, London.
Woodman, A. J. (1982) Review of Kenney and Clausen 1982, *LCM* 7: 102–8.
(2017) *The Annals of Tacitus. Books 5 and 6*, Cambridge.
(2018) *The Annals of Tacitus. Book 4*, Cambridge.
Zainaldin, J. (2020) *Gargilius Martialis. The Agricultural Fragments*, Cambridge.
Zetzel, J. E. G. (1975) 'On the history of Latin scholia', *HSPh* 79: 335–54.
(2005) *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance: The Commentum Cornuti and the Early Scholia on Persius. BICS* Supplement 84, London.
(2018) *Critics, Compilers and Commentators: An Introduction to Roman Philology 200* BCE*–800* CE, Oxford.
Ziogas, I. (2021) *Law and Love in Ovid: Courting Justice in the Augustan Age*, Oxford.
Ziogas, I. and E. Bexley, eds. (2022) *Roman Law and Latin Literature*, London.
Zuckerberg, D. (2018) *Not All Dead White Men: Classics and Misogyny in the Digital Age*, Cambridge, MA.