

CHAPTER 30

SCHOLARSHIP

ROBERT A. KASTER

THE word appears odd up there in the centre of the page, at the end of a section on Roman literary genres, and the oddities are plural. Most examples of what we consider Roman scholarship could no more claim ‘literary’ status than their modern counterparts: ‘sub-literary’ or (more neutrally) ‘non-literary’ is the label most aptly applied to both. More to the point, the works we take to constitute Roman scholarship we take that way because, however contested the entity’s essential traits might be, we have ‘scholarship’ as a cultural category ready at hand to provide the label. The Romans had no such discrete category, hence no such label: where they could speak comfortably of *historia* or *fabula palliata* or *satura*, they had no generic term for the phenomenon under consideration; and of the several familiar terms that could be promoted as candidates—*studia*, *doctrina*, *eruditio* chief among them—none simply or regularly denoted what we call scholarship. Similarly, whereas we can say that scholarship just is what scholars do—and be confident that we will be understood to refer to persons who typically occupy a small number of institutional niches (above all colleges and universities, and the institutes and think-tanks that mimic them)—the phenomenon and the Romans who perpetrated it had no such clearly differentiated place in their culture. They could appear just about anywhere, in many guises, and what they did defied generic definition in simple, formal terms.

But this chapter must be about something, and that something can be given a working definition: the scholarship that will concern us comprises writings meant to preserve or elucidate Roman cultural memory in non-narrative, non-mimetic form, with a commitment to the truth. The first part of that definition, which hinges on the very broad phrase ‘cultural memory’, glances at both the variousness

of the works in question and their essentially backward-looking character, a feature that will be stressed at the chapter's end. The second part of the definition simply distinguishes the writings eligible for consideration here from those already considered in the immediately preceding chapters. It is not the only definition that could be proposed, and it is no doubt rough around the edges. (It does not quite embrace, for example, the greatest Roman example of obsessive scholarship, the elder Pliny's *Natural History*; still less does it cover the technical writings of a Celsus, on medicine, or a Vitruvius, on architecture.) But it will serve for the purpose at hand: to grasp the range of writings that answer to the definition and the different sorts of men who produced them, and to consider a few of the cultural consequences.

In sketching the origins of Roman *grammatica*—the scholarly study, and teaching, of language and literature—the biographer Suetonius famously delivers some hard-and-fast judgements (*On Teachers of Grammar and Rhetoric* 1–3). The first stages, at the end of the third and first half of the second century BCE, were undistinguished (he says), since the practitioners—the ‘half-Greek’ poets Livius Andronicus and Quintus Ennius—did no more than ‘interpret’ Greek authors and give readings from their own works. At the next stage, in the second half of the second century, a prolonged visit by the Pergamene scholar and critic Crates of Mallos provided a model and an impetus for (on Suetonius’ view) more sophisticated study, but even then the Roman response was limited: one man, a certain Gaius Octavius Lampadio, is said to have introduced book divisions (probably an Alexandrian innovation, first imitated in Latin by Ennius) into the poem that began Rome’s epic tradition, Naevius’ *Punic War*, and others began to hold public or private readings of poems (Ennius’ *Annals*, Lucilius’ satires) that had not enjoyed wide circulation. It was really not until the end of the second century and first part of the next (Suetonius concludes) that ‘order and enrichment were brought to every aspect’ of these studies by Lucius Aelius (c.150–c.85? BCE) and his son-in-law Servius Clodius, who were as far superior to their predecessors in their scholarship as they were in social status (both were Roman knights).

These judgements are neither wholly reliable (especially where the direct influence of Crates is concerned) nor entirely fair; in particular, they rather understate the skill and literary sophistication that both Livius Andronicus and Ennius brought to their own work (cf. Goldberg 1995: 64–73, 86–108, Hinds 1998: 52–63). But Suetonius was nothing if not conscientious in gathering the data he used to compile his accounts: if he found little or nothing to speak of before the work of Lucius Aelius, there was probably little or nothing to find. By contrast, there was a virtual flood of work in the century that followed, as the first century BCE witnessed the construction of Roman scholarship, just as it witnessed the construction of Roman literature (cf. Goldberg 2005). Here in tabular form is a survey of the kinds of work

produced in the first century BCE, or just after the start of the common era, by the men who people Suetonius' *On Teachers of Grammar and Rhetoric*. The categories indicated are merely rubrics useful for a rough sorting, and some works could plainly be sorted under more than one rubric (numbers in parentheses denote the chapter in Suetonius' text where the person is mentioned, though Suetonius himself does not cite all the works associated with each person; for details, see Kaster 1995 ad locc.):

Antiquarian research (for present purposes 'antiquarian research' can be defined as any inquiry into the origin or nature of past practices, beliefs, or institutions that does not place the inquiry's result in a narrative or other larger explanatory context: the inquiry's answer to the question 'What did the ancients do about X?' or 'How did the practice of Y come about?' is regarded as satisfactory in itself. Cf. Momigliano 1966: 3): Cornelius Epicadus, on Latin *cognomina* and on the statuettes (*sigillaria*) associated with the Saturnalia (12); Verrius Flaccus, on the calendar, on Saturn, and on Etruscan matters (17); Iulius Hyginus, on families who traced their origin back to Troy, on Italian cities, on the Penates, and on the specific attributes of gods (*de proprietatibus deorum*) (20); Iulius Modestus, on holidays (20).

Textual interpretation: Lucius Aelius, on the *ius civile*, pontifical books, Twelve Tables, and *carmen Saliare* (3); Antonius Gniphio, a commentary on Ennius (? : 7); Pompilius Andronicus, a critique (*elenchus*) of Ennius (8); Ateius Philologus, an essay 'Did Aeneas Love Dido?' (10; probably written with reference to Naevius' *Punic War*, see Horsfall 1973–4); Curtius Nicias, on Lucilius (14); Crassicius Pansa, a commentary on the poet Cinna's *Zmyrna* (18); Iulius Hyginus, a commentary on Cinna's *propempticon* to Pollio and books (perhaps commentaries) on Vergil (20).

Linguistic inquiry: Lucius Aelius, on semantics and etymology, especially of legal and sacral language (3); Servius Clodius, etymological glosses on Plautus (3); Cornelius Nepos, on apparent synonyms (? : 4); Messalla Corvinus, on the letter s (4); Antonius Gniphio, 'on Latin discourse' (7); Orbilius Pupillus, on apparent synonyms (? : 9); Ateius Philologus, a book on unusual words (*glossemata*: 10); Staberius Eros, on grammatical analogy (13); Santra, on 'ancient' usage (*de antiquitate verborum*: 14); Verrius Flaccus, books on spelling (*de orthographia*), on obscure usages of the elder Cato, and a Latin lexicon (*On the Meaning of Words*) in twenty-six volumes (17); Scribonius Aphrodisius, a polemical response to the latter on spelling (19).

Catalogues and lists: Lucius Aelius, a list of the genuine plays of Plautus, similarly Servius Clodius (3); Aurelius Opillus, a literary catalog (*pinax*: 6).

Compilations (of miscellaneous learning, edifying anecdotes, and the like): Cornelius Nepos, *Exempla* (4); Furius Bibaculus, *Lucubrations* (4); Aurelius Opillus, *Musae* (6); Verrius Flaccus, on 'memorable matters' (*res dignae memoria*: 17); Iulius Hyginus, *Exempla* (20); Maecenas Melissus, collections of amusing anecdotes and sayings (21).

Other: Lucius Aelius, notes on Stoic dialectic (3); Ateius Philologus, an abridged account (*breviarium*) of Roman history (for Sallust), a handbook on style (for Asinius Pollio), *epistulae* with scholarly content (10); Valerius Cato, pamphlets on unspecified literary or linguistic subjects (*grammatici libelli*: 11); Cornelius Epicadus, on meter (12); Pompeius

Lenaeus, translations of Greek writings on medicinal plants (15); Verrius Flaccus, *epistulae* with scholarly content (17); Iulius Hyginus, on agriculture and apiculture (20).

And all this is to say nothing of important figures whom Suetonius—mainly concerned as he is with men who happened to teach—does not mention: so, for example, Julius Caesar tackled the subject of grammatical analogy and the morphological regularity of language; the senator Nigidius Figulus wrote on grammar also, as well as science and theology; Cicero's friend the wealthy equestrian Atticus composed a chronological summary of the history of Rome, and 'the world' more generally (the *Liber Annalis*); and the prodigious Varro wrote, almost literally, on everything, in perhaps as many as seventy-five different works ranging from a survey of the 'liberal arts' (*Disciplinae*, in nine books) through 'divine and human antiquities' (*Antiquitates rerum humanarum et divinarum*, in forty-one books) to the Latin language (see below) and beyond.

None of the works catalogued above survives intact. Most are known only by title or from some very general characterization of their content, while for the rest we must mainly content ourselves with isolated nuggets preserved by later writers (see the relevant entries in Funaioli 1907). In two cases only do we have a tolerably clear view of the whole. The twenty-six-volume dictionary of Verrius Flaccus was abridged by Pompeius Festus in the second century CE, and that abridgement was in turn abridged in the eighth century by Paul the Deacon: taken together the two epitomes—the former partially, the latter entirely extant—allow us to form reasonably firm judgements of Flaccus' working methods. Much the same can be said of Varro's *On the Latin Language*, the first work to attempt a systematic account of that subject and as such an ancestor (though not a direct ancestor) of the countless grammatical handbooks (*artes*) that were to follow. Though of the original twenty-five books only two survive completely (5–6), and 4 others in part (7–10), we have enough to know the plan and proportions of the work as a whole: after an introductory book Varro addressed, in turn, the topics of etymology and the relations between words and things (Books 2–7), inflectional morphology (Books 8–13, including the conflict between regularity and irregularity in grammar, or 'analogy' vs. 'anomaly'), and the formation of propositions (Books 14–25, a species of syntax previously addressed by Lucius Aelius).

Yet even the generally wretched state of preservation allows us to identify some important shared characteristics of all these works, which in themselves established the norms for Roman scholarship in the centuries to come. To start with the most obvious trait: a desire to accumulate and categorize plainly outstripped any desire to synthesize. Knowledge was organized in various closely related forms—especially in lists, catalogues, and miscellanies—by a process of accretion, bit by bit. Any given bit would be grouped with other bits according to one or another a priori criterion—by having a topic or letter of the alphabet in common, say, or by occupying a given place in a chronological or (in a commentary) textual

sequence, or simply in virtue of being ‘memorable’—but the bits did not cohere, and were not meant to cohere, so as to provide a synoptic view or sustain a thesis. In this respect, Varro’s systematic approach to Latin was much the exception, whereas Verrius Flaccus’ dictionary was more the norm; and even within Varro’s massive oeuvre, *On the Latin Language* was rather different from the one work of his whose loss any Romanist must most regret, the encyclopedic *Account of Ancient Things Human and Divine*. Divided unevenly into twenty-five books on ‘things human’ (which is to say, Roman) and sixteen on ‘things divine’, the work was a grand *catalogue raisonné* of the culture. Thanks in no small part to Saint Augustine, who pillaged it enthusiastically for his *City of God*, the books on *res divinae* are better represented among the fragments (Cardauns 1976): organized, after an introductory book, in triads—on priestly functionaries (Books 2–4), sacred places (Books 5–7), religious celebrations (Books 8–10), private and public rites (Books 11–13), and the gods (Books 14–16)—the collection must in its original state have comprised an elaborate, and by no means unsceptical, collection of categories, definitions, and carefully catalogued attributes, accompanied by the lore of what ‘people say’. As H. D. Jocelyn put it (1982: 198–9): ‘Varro intended a certain unity in [Books 14–16, on gods]. This unity, however, should be distinguished from the sort of philosophical work [*On Gods*] which Varro himself refers to [elsewhere]. . . . His model was rather of the grammatical kind exemplified by Apollodorus’ [*On Gods*], a work which attempted to explain the names and descriptive epithets of the deities of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.’ (Compare the observation, regarding the fragments of Varro’s *On the Way of Life of the Roman People*, that ‘a substantial part of these are definitions of the dazzling array of jugs available to Romans of the Republic’ (J. McAlhany, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 12 (2004), 27.)

When Cicero praised Varro’s writings for making his fellow Romans feel at home in their own city (*Academica* 1. 9), he surely meant, not that Varro had explained the city and its culture in a comprehensive or novel way, but that he had made over to them a treasure-house of lovingly organized *facts*.

Such facts attached themselves, especially, to individual words: for example, as explanations or illustrations of given lexical items, as data gathered together under certain rubrics, or as explanations attached to the words that stood as the lemmata in commentaries on literary texts. (Even less than their modern counterpart did ancient commentators lift their eyes from the lemma immediately before them to contemplate the text as a whole, and the results, when they do, usually do not make us wish that they did it more often: the late antique Virgilian commentator Servius has many useful and intelligent things to say on matters of detail but is at his least helpful when telling us that ‘all’ of *Aeneid* 4 is ‘transferred from’ Apollonius of Rhodes’ *Argonautica*, Book 3 (Thilo-Hagen 1878–81: 1. 459) or that Virgil’s ‘aim’ in the *Aeneid* is, simply, ‘to imitate Homer and praise Augustus through his ancestors’ (ibid. 1. 4).) Whether viewed as a linguistic phenomenon inviting description or definition, as a label for an institution, or a person, or as a component of a text, a

word was the smallest unit to which meaning could be given, hence the smallest unit to which useful knowledge could be attached. Roman scholars were in this respect miniaturists, producing small, gem-like bits of learning: others might assemble these bits to tell larger stories, but the scholars generally eschewed such stories of their own. Described in these terms, the scholarly enterprise sounds rather pinched and lacking in scope, and no doubt from some points of view it was: unlike rhetoric, for example, literary and antiquarian scholarship did not claim to prepare men directly to participate in public affairs—a form of modesty plainly related to the fact that the reception and practice of formal rhetorical study at Rome were contested in ways that the study of literature and antiquities never was. (On the reception of rhetoric, and other controversies concerning rhetorical education at Rome, see Andrew Riggsby's discussion in Chapter 23.)

But the umbratile nature of the study need not imply that its practitioners thought it idle or useless. Scholars from a later period whose works survive—Aulus Gellius, for example, from the mid-second century CE—commonly stress the edifying, even ennobling, utility that they think their efforts will provide, and there is no reason to suppose that this view was not found in the earlier works of scholarship, now lost, on which Gellius certainly drew:

I for my part . . . have taken on board [*sc.* from my extensive reading] only those elements that would either quickly and easily lead the eager and able to a desire for honourable learning and a contemplation of useful skills or free people hemmed in by life's other occupations from an ignorance of words and facts that is surely shameful and peasantish.
(*Attic Nights*, preface 12)

The kind of confidence visible on the surface here seems implied in works of Roman scholarship more generally: the confidence that there are those 'out there' who will benefit, perhaps by putting the scholar's work to some use still unimagined, as a brick fired today might be used in a building not yet designed. And in fact we know that such confidence was not misplaced, that the bricks were used well: without Atticus' *Liber Annalis* to clarify many chronological details, Cicero could not have achieved the synthesis of Roman oratorical history offered up in the *Brutus*; without the antiquarian investigations of Varro, the calendrical researches of Verrius Flaccus, and other works like them, Virgil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Fasti* would look very different indeed. Organizing knowledge in ways that will ultimately benefit someone other than oneself requires a cultural confidence and a generosity that are the opposite of pinched.

The open-handed men who gave their learning away for the benefit of others clustered, at the outset, at the opposite ends of the social spectrum, as men who were either completely self-sufficient or completely dependent—in short, aristocrats and slaves. On the one hand, as already noted, the men who in Suetonius' estimation first put literary scholarship on a sound footing, Lucius Aelius and Servius Clodius, were Roman knights and therefore wealthy men of leisure, and

they were by no means the men of highest rank to gain a reputation for scholarship. Caesar had already held the consulship by the time he wrote his work on grammatical analogy while on campaign in Gaul, and Nigidius Figulus and Varro were both men of praetorian rank; Messalla Corvinus, author of a monograph on the letter *s*, was a prominent military man, public figure, and literary patron. In a later generation, the emperor Tiberius enjoyed the company of scholars, and enjoyed testing them with particularly challenging questions (Suetonius, *Life of Tiberius* 70.3); Claudius took matters a step farther, not only writing a monograph on the need for additional letters of the alphabet but also using his authority to see that the letters were actually used in imperial documents and inscriptions (Suetonius, *Life of Claudius* 41.3, Tacitus, *Annals* 11.13.3, 11.14.5).

On the other hand, most of the men whose lives Suetonius recounts as teachers and scholars passed through slavery, a fact that significantly distinguishes the figures we meet at Rome from their counterparts in Greek culture. The ripples stirred by Rome's imperial expansion brought some such men to Italy from the eastern Mediterranean, where—if they were reduced to slavery as adults—they might already have been important actors in their own communities, carrying with them habits of Greek learning that could be adapted and cultivated in their new circumstances (see e.g. Suetonius, *On Teachers of Grammar and Rhetoric* 10, on Ateius Philologus). Still others, finding themselves enslaved by one mischance or another, came from Gaul, Spain, Illyria, and even parts of Italy itself (see, respectively, *ibid.* 7, 20, 12, 18, 23). Whatever their origins, and whether they were educated before being enslaved or educated in the households that enslaved them, their learning was in the first instance put at the service of their masters, teaching their children, serving as literary advisors, and in general enhancing their cultural capital. Often, they were rewarded with their freedom in return, leaving them at liberty to serve others with their learning and seek their patronage: so, for example, Ateius Philologus, who very likely came to Rome from Athens as a slave in the household of the jurist Ateius Capito's family, later cultivated the Claudii Pulchri (as tutor and travelling companion), the historian and former senator Sallust (whom he provided with a summary of Roman history), and the historian, general, and statesman Asinius Pollio (for whom he wrote a handbook on style: *ibid.* 10). In this respect, the story of scholarship's first three generations at Rome, from the late second century to the end of the Republic, could in good measure be told in terms of a relatively small number of great households whose members, dependants, and connections formed especially dense centres of gravity, from Sulla through Pompey to the palace of Augustus (see, respectively, *ibid.* 12, 14–15, and 17, 20–2).

As scholarship and *studia* came to be 'naturalized' over the course of the first century BCE, they also came to play a role as a medium of social exchange and interaction within the elite, another form of the connoisseurship through which men acquired and displayed the cultural capital that solidified their standing. The acquisition of and access to books provides one example among many. At

his villa in Tusculum Lucius Lucullus painstakingly assembled a fabulous library, which he opened to the free use of friends (Plutarch, *Lucullus* 42.1–2); it became a magnet for both Greek and Roman intellectuals, and remained such even after Lucullus' death, when Cicero visited the place to use some of the books and found Cato seated amid a heap of Stoic texts (*On the Ends of Goods and Evils* 3. 7). Cicero's own acquisition and disposition of libraries reveals a similar nexus of intellectual and social relations. In 60 BCE, through the good offices of his friend Papirius Paetus, Cicero acquired the library of one of Paetus' relatives, who happened to be the Servius Clodius whom Suetonius ranks as one of the two founders of Roman literary scholarship. Because the library was in Greece (Clodius had left Rome under a cloud, after plagiarizing from his father-in-law, Lucius Aelius, who responded by dissolving Clodius' marriage), Cicero had to engage the help of yet another friend, Atticus, to ensure that the books were transmitted safely to Rome (*Letters to Atticus* 1.20.7, 2.1.12); and a few years later, when Cicero wanted to organize the library in his villa at Antium, he was able to call in Tyrannio, a Greek scholar and friend of Atticus, as well as some of Atticus' trained slaves to help with the labelling (ibid. 4.41.1, 4.8.2).

The conventions of learning also became the currency of ordinary conversation and correspondence. When he is speaking with the scholar and teacher Curtius Nicias, Cicero's conversation of course turns to matters of literary scholarship (*de philologis*: ibid. 13.28.4, cf. 7.3.10), as it does also when he is speaking about the same scholar. Reporting to his son-in-law Dolabella a financial dispute involving Nicias and another man that the former asked Cicero to arbitrate, Cicero turns the report into an elaborate joke in which he casts himself in the role of Aristarchus—the great Alexandrian scholar renowned for his ability to assess the authenticity of texts—and recounts how he had 'obelized' (condemned as spurious) the document that appeared to put Nicias in the wrong (*Letters to his Friends* 9.10.1, cf. Suetonius, *On Teachers of Grammar and Rhetoric* 14.2: to put the matter in perspective, Cicero allows himself this highly embroidered *jeu d'esprit* only because, as he says, there is nothing really important to report from Rome). The sort of conversation *de philologis* that Cicero enjoyed with Nicias surely became, for many of the elite, a staple of the refined soirees that were an increasingly important element in their self-fashioning. We have already noted the table-talk of Tiberius, which so tested the experts that one scholar tried to find out what the emperor had lately been reading, the better to 'cram' when it came time to be his guest (the scholar allegedly paid with his life: Suetonius, *Tiberius* 56). And by the time we come to the world conjured up in Aulus Gellius' *Attic Nights*, in the middle of the second century CE, such learned testing and probing are all-pervasive elements of the environment: not just a conversation at a friend's table (2.22) but a stroll through the Field of Agrippa near the Campus Martius (14.5) or a chat struck up by gentlemen standing about the vestibule of the imperial palace (19.13)—any of these occasions, and diverse others, might spark discussion, sometimes heated, of a proper grammatical

form or the correct terms to denote various winds, or midgets. Though it would probably be imprudent to believe the literal truth of Gellius' vignettes (he does love to tell a good story), it would be equally imprudent to suppose that he intended to represent the culture of the day in a way that readers would find implausible and unfamiliar.

The apparent diffusion of *studia* as an ornament of the elite was accompanied by a broadening of the social base on which such pursuits were supported. Scholarship and *studia* themselves gradually came to provide a way into the elite for those who otherwise would not have enjoyed it, a shift from clientage to independence epitomized by the men whose careers are recounted in Suetonius' *On Teachers of Grammar and Rhetoric* (for what follows, cf. Kaster 1995: pp. xliv–xlv; numbers in parentheses refer to the sections of Suetonius' text). At the very start of the first century BCE we see the freedman Aurelius Opillus, whose scholarship ran to a literary catalogue and a miscellany, close up his school and accompany the Roman statesman Publius Rutilius Rufus into exile in Asia Minor (6.2), a gesture best read as an act of loyalty to a singularly important patron. From that point on each successive generation gives evidence of a change from this steeply hierarchical model. By the middle of the century we find the first attested freeborn teacher, Orbilius of Beneventum (9), establishing himself in Rome, where his pupils included Horace. A generation later another freedman, Verrius Flaccus, made a name both as the most important Roman scholar after Varro and as the most innovative and successful teacher of his day, a position that gave him a certain leverage to negotiate when the emperor Augustus sought to engage him as a tutor to his grandsons (10). Under Tiberius another grammarian, Pomponius Porcellus, did not scruple to criticize the emperor's diction to his face (22.2); not long after, the louche and arrogant Remmius Palaemon (23), another freedman and the author of a very influential grammatical handbook, defied Tiberius and Claudius, both of whom denounced him for immorality and warned fathers to keep their sons from his school—warnings that did not prevent him from becoming very rich indeed. (It is impossible to imagine Palaemon following anyone into exile.) Under the Flavians, finally, we see the lionization of Valerius Probus (24), probably a descendant of a Roman legionary settled in Beirut under Augustus, who became a taste-maker and one of the forerunners of the archaizing fashion that came to maturity under the Antonines. By the end of the first century CE learned expertise clearly provided a stable basis on which one could establish a respectable social identity. The movement that we can trace, while far from representing a 'democratization' of culture, certainly represented a distribution of cultural capital beyond the relatively few aristocratic families who were the centres of *studia* in the first century BCE.

This broadening of the base tended to stabilize the shared culture, and thereby to stabilize society at a certain level, as a literary education and with it at least a tincture of literary scholarship became one of the identifying marks of an elite

that extended across the empire (Kaster 1988: 11–70). This shared culture was remarkably homogeneous despite its great geographical spread, as much the same texts were read, and in much the same ways, in whatever corners of the empire literate Latin culture extended. The homogeneity, moreover, tended to take on a temporal dimension as well: the point can be illustrated, to draw this survey to a close, if we consider the ‘moving horizon’ of Latin textual scholarship in the first century BCE.

The man whom Suetonius identified as the Roman founder of such scholarship, Lucius Aelius, gave particular attention to studying the language of Rome’s pre-literary texts—especially the Twelve Tables (still memorized by schoolboys when Cicero was a child: *On the Laws* 2.59)—and to establishing a list of the genuine plays of Plautus. Roughly two decades later we find interest in Plautus’ younger contemporary, Ennius, in the work of Antonius Gniphio and Pompilius Andronicus, both active from the 80s to the 60s BCE (Suetonius, *On Teachers of Grammar and Rhetoric* 7–8); by the 50s the horizon has reached the satires of Lucilius, from the latter part of the second century BCE, in the *libri* of Curtius Nicias (ibid. 14.4). At that point the movement accelerates: a commentary on the *Zmyrna* of Cinna, a ‘new poet’ in the circle of Catullus, was produced before the late 30s, not much more than a decade after the poet’s death (ibid. 18.2, with Kaster 1995: 200); and while the earliest attested scholarly writings on Virgil’s poetry, by Iulius Hyginus (Suetonius, *On Teachers* . . . 20; Funaioli 1907: 528–33), probably post-date the poet’s death, they were certainly produced under Augustus, beginning a tradition of scholarly attention that continued unbroken for another five centuries.

But that is where the ‘moving horizon’ effectively stops. Though the poetry of another Augustan, Horace, appears to have enjoyed a more or less continuous tradition of commentary down through late antiquity, that can be said of no other contemporary or later Latin author. Indeed, when scholarly fashion next changed, it was not to take up neglected authors of the early Empire but to move in precisely the opposite direction: the ‘archaizing’ interests that are most fully on display in the pages of Aulus Gellius represent a turning back of the clock, to authors of (predominantly) the second century BCE. The body of commentary eventually built up around some early Imperial authors—Lucan, Statius, Juvenal—is entirely the creation of late antiquity, after those authors were introduced into the school curricula in the late fourth and early fifth centuries CE.

The early Imperial formation of a ‘classical canon’ in the schools—with Virgil and Terence dominating the poetry side, Sallust and Cicero the prose—had broad and obvious consequences. The language that was described in the scholarly handbooks, taught in the schools, and passed down from generation to generation allowed the educated classes to speak with one voice, the voice of ‘Received Standard Imperial Latin’ (Löfstedt 1959: 48), which remained immune from the changes that affected the language of the market and the countryside. In ethics, too, the stock of edifying examples—of virtuous or patriotic behaviour (or their

reverse), like those collected in Valerius Maximus' *Memorable Deeds and Sayings*—remained very heavily weighted toward the Republican past rather than the Imperial present. In these and many other ways, Roman scholarship excelled at its job of 'preserving and elucidating Roman cultural memory', to the extent that much of that memory remained fixed in a golden, late Republican/mid-Augustan noon.

FURTHER READING

Anyone seeking an overview of Roman scholarship in the late Republic must begin with Rawson 1985, which should be read with her important essay on the development of logical organization in Latin prose (Rawson 1978 = Rawson 1991: 324–51). For the earliest phase, down to 78 BCE, Suerbaum 2002: 539 ff. is useful; Della Corte 1981 brings much material together, but his synthesis is often wilful; for a broader chronological survey emphasizing the transmission of texts, Reynolds and Wilson 1991: 18–43. Varro, who is everywhere in Rawson's learned book without ever quite being its focus, still wants a comprehensive modern treatment to place him in his time and culture: pending that, Cardauns 2001 is a reliable introduction. On the scholars themselves, beyond the works referred to in the text above, see Christes 1979 and, for Aulus Gellius and his milieu, Holford-Strevens 2003 and Holford-Strevens and Vardi 2004; for later antiquity, Kaster 1988; P. L. Schmidt, in Herzog 1989: 101–58; P. L. Schmidt and K. Sallmann, in Sallmann 1997: 67–82, 218–61. On commentaries and commentators, Most 1999 and Gibson and Kraus 2002 are good places to start; on Latin scholia and textual criticism in antiquity, Zetzel 1975, 1980, 1981a, 1981b, 2005; on the history of Latin grammatical thought, Barwick 1922, Taylor 1974, Holtz 1981, Hovdhaugen 1982, Kaster 1988; on mythography in the Roman era, Cameron 2004; on the emergence of Lucan, Statius, and Juvenal as 'suitable authors' in late antiquity, Kaster 1978.

REFERENCES

- BARWICK, K. (1922), *Remmius Palaemon und die römische Ars Grammatica*, Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- CAMERON, A. (2004), *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- CARDAUNS, B. (1976), *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*, Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.
- (2001), *Marcus Terentius Varro: Einführung in sein Werk*, Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- CHRISTES, J. (1979), *Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen im antiken Rom*, Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- DELLA CORTE, F. (1981), *La filologia Latina dale origini a Varrone²*, Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice.
- FUNAIOLI, G. (1907), *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta*, Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

- GIBSON, R. K. and KRAUS, C. S. (eds.) (2002), *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory*, Leiden: Brill.
- GOLDBERG, S. M. (1995), *Epic in Republican Rome*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- (2005), *Constructing Literature in Republican Rome: Poetry and Its Reception*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HERZOG, R. (ed.) (1989), *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, vol. 5: *Restauration und Erneuerung: Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.*, Munich: C. H. Beck.
- HINDS, S. (1998), *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HOLFORD-STREVEVS, L. (2003), *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*, rev. edn., Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- and VARDI, A. (eds.) (2004), *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HOLTZ, L. (1981), *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical*, Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- HORSFALL, N. M. (1973–4), 'Dido in the Light of History', *Proceedings of the Virgilian Society*, 13: 1–13.
- HOVDHAUGEN, E. (1982), *Foundations of Western Linguistics: From the Beginning to the End of the First Millennium A.D.*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- JOCELYN, H. D. (1982), 'Varro's *Antiquitates rerum divinarum* and Religious Affairs in the Late Roman Republic', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 65: 148–205.
- KASTER, R. A. (1978), 'Servius and *idonei auctores*', *American Journal of Philology*, 99: 181–209.
- (1988), *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- (ed.) (1995), *Suetonius: 'De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus'*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LÖFSTEDT, E. (1959), *Late Latin*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1966), *Studies in Historiography*. New York: Harper & Row.
- MOST, G. W. (1999), *Commentaries/Kommentare*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- RAWSON, E. (1978), 'The Introduction of Logical Organization into Roman Prose Literature', *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 46: 12–34.
- (1985), *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- (1991), *Roman Culture and Society: Collected Papers*, ed. Fergus Millar, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- REYNOLDS, L. D. and WILSON, N. G. (1991), *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*³, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SALLMANN, K. (ed.) (1997), *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, vol. 4: *Die Literatur des Umbruchs: Von der römischen zur christlichen Literatur, 117 bis 284 n. Chr.*, Munich: C. H. Beck.
- SUERBAUM, W. (ed.) (2002), *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, vol. 1: *Die archaische Literatur von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod*, Munich: C. H. Beck.
- TAYLOR, D. J. (1974), *Declinatio: A Study of the Linguistic Theory of Marcus Terentius Varro*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1974.

- THILO, G. and HAGEN, H. (1878–81), *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, vol. 1: *Aeneidos librorum I–V commentarii*, Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- ZETZEL, J. E. G. (1975), 'On the History of Latin Scholia', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 79: 335–54.
- (1980), 'The Subscriptions in the Manuscripts of Livy and Fronto and the Meaning of *Emendatio*', *Classical Philology*, 75: 38–59.
- (1981a), 'On the History of Latin Scholia II: The *Commentum Cornuti* in the Ninth Century', *Mediaevalia et Humanistica*, 10: 19–31.
- (1981b), *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity*, New York: Arno Press.
- (2005), *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance: The Commentum Cornuti and the Early Scholia on Persius*, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 84, London: Institute of Classical Studies.