CHAPTER I

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 Pelttari (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.