

Hellenism, Alexandrianism, and Roman Enlightenment

MAGDA EL - NOWIEEMY, Professor of Greco-Roman Studies, Faculty of Arts, Alexandria University.

Egypt

Email: magda_now@yahoo.com

Let me start with the term Enlightenment, which plays a crucial role in both Western and Eastern history. This term immediately brings to mind, on the one side, the 18th century Enlightenment in France, England, and Italy, and on the other side the Arab Enlightenment. Apart from the complexities of Enlightenmentⁱ, the traditional interpretations of the term, deal with ideals of thought and expressionⁱⁱ.

To my mind the term could be applied to ancient Rome as well. My reasons for this view are two-fold. Two enlightening factors formulated the ideals of thought and expression in ancient Rome: Hellenism and Alexandrianism. Both factors caused a supreme revolution in the Roman outlook. The enlightenment reading of Roman literature, I suppose, is one step toward the better understanding of the historical development of Roman literature.

We usually think how the past shaped the present. In the light of this issue the idea of Rome, a city which occupied a place of unique importance in the history of Western civilization, has ever kept its fascination for all Europeⁱⁱⁱ. Later periods of Western history look to Rome for inspiration, especially in power and authority^{iv}. It is equally valid to think how the present shape our way of interpreting the past. We can draw an intellectual portrait of the past using the lens of recent intellectual developments, without imposing our ideals.

It is the aim of this paper to investigate what constitutes Roman literary enlightenment. What shape did enlightened thought take in ancient Rome? I mean how Hellenism and Alexandrianism were, in their impact on Roman culture, a most enlightening experience for a hardy race with rustic virtues, as the Romans were. My presentation will not be tied to an event-by-event account, or an author-by-author treatment of the Roman literary history. I focus, rather, on a number of key landmarks in Roman literary history. To achieve this aim I address myself to the following main points:

- 1- The spell of Hellenism.
- 2- The spell of Alexandrianism.
- 3- Selective aspects of Roman enlightenment, based on Hellenism and Alexandrianism.
- 4- The encounter between the Romans' national identity and cultural identity.

Literature is worthy to be focused on, in the present study, as it was constitutive of Roman cultural identity, and was used in the service of power to achieve national identity^v. Hence, it is equally important at first to present a twofold note that functions in the background of my argument, and paves the way for evaluating the enlightening factors coming from outside.

Firstly, Rome retained a self-assured trust in native traditions, the traditions of a mainly agricultural community. The Romans saw in their own past a living heritage. The discourse of the Roman past was strongly eminent in the Roman literary production. The Romans idealized their vision of their own past. This is the Roman preservation of tradition. Strong public ideology was firmly rooted in the past. This was a sort of the transmission of the image of the past to their own day^{vi}. At first, it was the traditional role of the *nobiles* (the nobility)^{vii} to know, transmit, and preserve the *mores maiorum* (the customs and morals of their ancestors)^{viii}. In such a way, the *nobiles* were the custodians of the Roman cultural identity. But later on, the *nobiles* declined their traditional role^{ix}. Hence, antiquarianism was given prominence in the late Roman Republic^x. Marcus Terentius Varro (116- 27 B.C.) was a key figure in antiquarianism in the late republic^{xi}. He managed in his works to preserve Roman traditions, human and divine: *Antiquitates rerum humanarum*, and *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*. According to the Christian writer of the 4th century CE, Lactantius, Varro's learning was unsurpassed among Romans and even Greeks^{xii}. The *Antiquitates* have survived only in fragments. It seems that the *Antiquitates* had been a vital source of information for ancient writers who wrote about the city of Rome. In the 4th century CE, the Christian writer Augustine, in his *De Civitate Dei*^{xiii}, pays considerable attention to Varro's writings, and treated them most seriously and critically. In such a way Varro's *Antiquitates* have survived. In the age of learning, it became the antiquarian's part to preserve Rome's past and traditions from the oblivion which threatened them. Cicero (106- 43 B.C.) praises the erudite truly Roman antiquarian Varro in these words:

"tum ego, sunt, inquam, ista, Varro; nam nos in nostra urbe peregrinantis errantisque tamquam hospites tui libri quasi domum reduxerunt, ut possemus aliquando qui et ubi essemus agnoscere..." (Academica, I.9)

"Then, I said, those things are (right), Varro; for in our own city we were aliens and wandering like foreigners, but your books led us back home, so that (at last) we were able to recognize who and where we were...".

The idea of Romans as strangers, in their own city, concerns their cultural identity at the time, as well as their national identity. The Romans became ignorant of their past^{xiv}. But Varro's books caused them to know what Rome means.

Cicero goes on to say that Varro's books revealed the age of their native land, the chronology of its history, the rules of its religion and priesthood, its civil and military discipline, the topography of its regions and places, and the names, types, functions, and causes of all Roman matters, divine and human^{xv}.

Evidently, the greatness of Rome depended mainly on the morals and traditions of their ancestors (the *mores maiorum*), and on their authorizing past. This was how to be a Roman^{xvi}.

Secondly, Rome's true talent lay in ruling and imposing her power on others^{xvii}. When the Emperor Augustus (27 B.C.-14 CE) personally recorded his own achievements, generally cited briefly as: *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, which means: "The achievements of the deified Augustus"^{xviii}, it has been strongly argued by scholars that the title of the original would have been similar to the preface of the surviving inscription^{xix}:

Res Gestae Divi Augusti, quibus orbem terrarum imperio populi Romani subiecit. "The achievements of the deified Augustus, by which he brought the world under the imperium^{xx} of the Roman people".

This was Augustus' real purpose in recording this document.

The military might was associated with the political power of Rome over the rest of the empire. The Romans believed in their own superiority in war and statecraft. The Roman military manpower was used first to conquer Italy^{xxi}, then to win wars against Carthage, and last but not least, Rome set out to conquer the whole of the Mediterranean basin, and the world.

During the great period of overseas growth under the republic, there was still a demand for power to be used to acquire more power. So, after the integration of Italy the military expansion of Rome proceeded with Italian assistance^{xxii}. Rome drafted the peoples of Italy into her own armies, while granting them Roman citizenship in return. Rome acquired a vast overseas empire. In one line, the poet Ovid (43 B.C. - 17 CE) epitomized Rome's expansion as follows:

Romanae spatium est urbis et orbis idem.

(Ovid, *Fasti* 2. 684)

"The space of the city of Rome is that of the world".

Ovid sees that other nations have fixed boundaries to their lands, but the limits of the city of Rome are the limits of the world.

With these two notes in mind, let us come to the Roman enlightenment. As far as the first factor of this enlightenment is concerned, we should consider the Romans' confrontation with Hellenism. A high esteem for Hellenism appears early in ancient Rome. Rome aspired to be a world power, and one of its means to achieve this ambition is to emulate Greek culture^{xxiii}, both in its intellectual and material sides, as a way of enlightenment.

Rome fell under the spell of Greek culture^{xxiv}. I have chosen only one instance as illustration that suffices to make a point here, but I certainly do not wish to suggest that by excluding particular examples, I have thought them less eminent, or less worth attention. The Romans began their literature by acknowledging the debt of the Greeks^{xxv}. Their acknowledgement reached its most influential point in one statement which has been commonly and traditionally taken to express the dominance of the Greek culture. In one of the most

famous passages in all Latin literature, the Roman poet Horace (65- 8 B.C.) acknowledged the superiority of the Greeks at the time when Rome was putting her hand over Greece:

Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artes

Intulit agresti Latio.

(Horace, *Epistles*, 2.1.156-7)

"The captive Greece has taken her rude conqueror captive, and brought arts to rural Latium".

The wording of this unforgettable statement implies highlighting the Hellenic legacy in its encounter with Roman supremacy.

"*Agresti Latio*", used by Horace, in this context, is not just "rural Latium", but it carries the idea of uncivilized Latium^{xxvi}. The Horatian example means much more than it says. In spite of all Roman pride in national character and values, Horace defines the relation between the conqueror (Rome) and the conquered (Greece)^{xxvii}. The conquered stood supreme, and had the upper hand over the conqueror, since he had the impulse of learning and culture^{xxviii}, i.e. the impulse of enlightenment. Horace's statement, one may say, is the *locus classicus* for the Hellenization of Rome, or in other words, the Hellenic enlightenment of Rome.

The Romans started their literary career by creating works so closely modeled on ancient Greek models^{xxix}. The genres of ancient Greek literature lived on, but with Roman originality^{xxx}, they were Latin in language and Roman in character^{xxxi}.

Rome's earliest literary performance of the first Latin adaptations of Greek drama appeared for the victory games of 240 B.C., by Livius Andronicus (c.284-207 B.C.), the first recognized writer in Latin literature. He was a Greek who came to Rome in 272 B.C., and earned his living as a school-teacher. For this purpose, he translated Homer's *Odyssey* into Latin, as it was a Greek school-book. He also wrote the first Latin plays based upon Greek originals.

Naevius (c. 270-201 B.C), the Campanian, represents a step forward in the development of Roman enlightenment. He adapted Greek drama to Latin in the 230s. He composed as well plays on Roman themes, and a Roman Epic, the *Bellum Punicum*, about the war in which he himself had fought.

With Ennius (239-169 B.C.), a distinctively developed Roman enlightenment began, his Greek tongue^{xxxii}, his Hellenic education, his devotion to the Greek poetic inspiration, his proclaimed position as the successor of Homer^{xxxiii}, all that enabled him to advance the Roman enlightenment through the lens of philhellenism, in spite of his expression of national self-consciousness^{xxxiv}, as exemplified in his *Annals*.

The third and second centuries B.C. witnessed the identification of Roman national character, and the maturation of national culture^{xxxv} under the impact coming from outside.

ond centuries B.C. became philhellenes, though loyal to their own tradition. They admired Greek culture, and emulated it. Then, instead of the competition within the elite for power and influence, they realized at last that it was not enough to acquire power. They started to compete for literary glory^{xxxvi}. They familiarized themselves with the Greek language, which gradually became part of the equipment of the upper classes^{xxxvii}, and consequently the rapid Hellenization of Rome took place^{xxxviii}, because the Romans' bilingualism became actually biculturalism^{xxxix}. It was first and foremost an enlightening breakthrough in their literary consciousness.

This was not without conservative voices of protest against everything Greek^{xl}. The conservative trend was headed by Cato, the Elder (234-149 B.C.), a severe judge of morals, and supporter of old Roman tradition and simplicity. Cato and his like conservatives suspected the Greek style of life as softening and apt to distract from serious matters^{xli}. But Cato's nationalism and upholding of Roman tradition against the tide of Hellenism were hopeless efforts. His conservatism did not bring the philhellenism enlightening movement to an end. He could not confront Rome's increasing enthusiasm for Hellenic culture. Cato himself studied Greek^{xlii}.

It is worth mentioning that Roman attitude to Greek culture was ambiguous^{xliii}. The very legend of Aeneas and the Trojan lineage of the Romans denotes to the love-hatred relationship between the Romans and the Greeks. Trojans were opposing to the Greeks in the Trojan wars, and the Romans descended from Trojans. So we have in front of us the legacy of Troy, the Hellenic legacy, and the legacy of Rome.

In spite of everything, Roman intellectual life became Hellenized. Greek slaves were brought in increasing numbers to Rome; many other Greeks came, on their own accord, to Rome to seek their fortunes as teachers, writers, artists, physicians, etc. Even Greek-speaking scholars from the Greek world outside mainland Greece came to Rome. It became natural that education in Rome was based upon Greek teaching and Greek text-books^{xliv}.

The Romans underwent a certain cultural development as the result of this contact with the Greek world^{xlv}. It became common for Roman upper-class young men, who used to acquire power, and to go through the political and legal experiences from the family, to study rhetoric, or philosophy, or even literature, at Athens or Rhodes^{xlvi}, as a sort of continuing their advanced studies.

As the Ptolemies had done for Alexandria before, Roman aristocracy tried to make Rome the cultural center of the world, in rivalry with Alexandria. All the buildings^{xlvii}, including libraries^{xlviii}, were financed by the aristocrats, usually from the spoils of war. According to Pliny, the Elder (23 CE- 79), in his *Natural History*^{xlix}, Asinius Pollio^l(76 B.C.- 4 CE) founded the first public library at Rome^{li}, in the *Atrium Libertatis* (the Hall of Liberty). Pliny referred to the comparison with the Ptolemies. Pliny calls Pollio's library the first in the world^{lii}. Most likely, Pliny is talking about privately owned public libraries as a category different from the royal libraries of Alexandria or Pergamum.

It might be convenient, in this context, to quote the illuminating words of Elizabeth Rawson, as they have a direct bearing on my argument here:

"Afterwards, Rome was equal to Alexandria as magnet for Greek artists and intellectuals; there was patronage to be found almost nowhere else. And the Romans felt that they were, in one field after another, catching up with the Greeks."^{liii}

Both Ptolemaic Alexandria and imperial Rome became the most important cosmopoleis in the ancient world^{liv}.

Aristocrats with aesthetic taste and education also patronized the creation of a new Roman literature. We may say that Roman literature emerged for the interests of the elite of the traditional aristocracy^{lv}. It was produced by, and for elite that dominated over other sectors of the society. In other words, Roman literature emerged for political needs, and was put for political use. Although it was by the third century B.C. that we could find books and readers as existing at Rome^{lvi}, it was by the middle of the first century B.C., that literacy became more widespread than ever before^{lvii}.

At the turn of the era, almost every aspect of Roman society underwent another rapid change^{lviii}. The Roman civil wars resulted in sharp changes in political structures. Many lost their lives, or their status. There emerged a newly acquired metropolitan sophistication, rested on cultural foundations. Rich young men from well-established families, of provincial upper classes, came out to the surface of the Roman society, instead of the old Roman aristocracy, which had legitimized itself before, through its past and through might. Those elites from Italy were absorbed into the Roman elite.

Another social change, which the military expansion of Rome caused, was the great wealth that came to the hands of the upper classes and to the equestrians in particular^{lix}, so that it relieved them from the usual preoccupations of their private engagements^{lx}. Instead, they devoted themselves to what was called *otium*, which means idleness, and disengagement from political affairs^{lxi}.

As society was in transition, literature also was in transition. Social changes had their cultural consequences. In early Rome, writing poetry was considered an occupation unworthy of a Roman knight. The pursuit of poetry as a full time career was left to men of low social status, and freed slaves, who attached themselves to the household of a patron, and produced verse to meet the political needs of their benefactors^{lxii}. In such a cultural environment, the convenient place of the aristocrats was the Forum. Several decades earlier, no one of good social standing would have come to Rome for any purpose other than to join the bar, or the military career, or to occupy magistracy, with an eye on gathering political eminence.

And since poets traditionally belonged to the lowest classes of the Roman society before, they had economic need of a patron. Poets gathered around wealthy Roman aristocrats. There emerged the Roman client-patron

system^{lxiii}. The poet-clients received bounty and protection. In return, patrons obtained fame, glory, and immortality from those poets.

At the end of the second century B.C., fundamental change in the social position of poetry at Rome had taken place, with the emergence of a new group of poets, financially independent and socially prominent. As the transition in the status of poetry took place, there was also a transition in the nature of patronage. Patronage continued, but its nature changed^{lxiv}. The coterie fashion emerged as a sort of equals, grouping together, without any need to monetary sustenance. The role of poet as client continued in immortalizing the patron. Unlike their predecessors, the upper-class poets were no longer dependent economically on a patron, but obtained encouragement and publicity from a litterateur.

Ancient Alexandria and its library have exercised such a hold on men's imagination down the ages, as marking a stage on the highway of human enlightenment, with dreams of universality^{lxv}. And although the main center of cultural and literary activity shifted from Athens to Alexandria, in the third century B.C., what is called the Alexandrian age of Roman literature began in the first century B.C. This was the second factor, from outside, which constitutes Roman literary enlightenment.

The Mithridatic wars in the East caused Greek refugees and captives to come to Rome including learned men^{lxvi}. A Greek poet and mythographer, named Parthenius, was brought to Rome as captive in 65 B.C. He stimulated a new movement in Rome^{lxvii}, which had its roots in Alexandria, and stood firmly in the tradition of Callimachus (c. 305- 240 B.C.), the professional poet and scholar of Alexandria, in particular.

The Romans became the direct descendants of Alexandrian tradition. The new poetical Alexandrian-Roman production contributes to the power of learning and cultural enlightenment in the Roman world.

A group of poets, referred to as the *poetae novi*, "new poets", or *neoterici*, "neoterics"^{lxviii}, shared a general adherence to Alexandrian principles of technical polish, learning, brevity, wit, etc. Only the Roman poet Catullus (c. 84-54 B.C.), stands before us as the first true Alexandrian, as none of the work of his colleagues survives except in fragments.

Catullus and his group of the "new poets" exploited their social and financial independence, in an unprecedented way. They had no need to earn their living by the pen. All of them never argued a case in a court, never aspired to military or political status, quite unlike the ideology of the traditional Roman life. And instead of public accomplishments in the political sphere, and instead of governmental and legal affairs, the "new poets" sought personal commitment, and artistic elegance. Consequently, new aesthetic terms, which evoke the learned Alexandrian style, such as *venustus* "refined", and *doctus* "learned", began to prevail and dominate in connection with the principles of Alexandrian poetry. The framework of learning became Alexandrian, with Roman attitudes sometimes intruding. The Roman poets acknowledged their debt to the Alexandrians^{lxix}, both explicitly and implicitly^{lxx}. And just as the Alexandrians practiced new perspectives in using ancient Greek models in order to revive tradition, the Romans did the same with the Alexan-

drian models^{lxxi}. They selected their best features and competed with them, because they considered themselves their heirs^{lxxii}.

I would like to conclude by sharing the Roman writer Vitruvius (flor. B.C. 10) his admiration of and his thanks to the Alexandrians. He explains, in his history of architecture, in the first century of the Common Era, that the Alexandrians, wisely and usefully, developed written records in order to transmit their ideas to their successors, so that they should not perish. And being increased in every age, and published in book form, their ideas should come gradually, in the course of time, to a complete and accurate body of knowledge. Then Vitruvius adds:

"And so for that reason thanks, not moderate but endless, should be rendered to them (i.e. the Alexandrians), because they did not let (ideas) go in jealous silence, but they cared that meanings of every kind should be transmitted for the record in writing"^{lxxiii}.

Thus, culture in ancient Rome was embedded in a network of political, social, economic, and regional relationships. The momentous historical changes led to the transformation of the city of Rome, from an Italian town to the status of being the Mistress of the world^{lxxiv}, in rivalry with Alexandria, the leading city of Hellenism. The Roman enlightenment, as we have seen, depended on factors from both inside and outside: Romanness with openness to Hellenism and Alexandrianism.

After all, this was but another stage in the high way of human enlightenment: Hellenic legacy and Roman supremacy. A more thorough enlightenment reading of Roman literature, building on that understanding, could shed light on a number of recurrent issues of intellectual orientation.

ⁱ - For exploring the complexities of the Enlightenment and presenting a comprehensive vision of this movement, see Porter, Roy, *The Enlightenment: Studies in European History*, (2nd edn.) Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.

ⁱⁱ - For an analysis of the guiding ideas of the Enlightenment, see Louis Dupre, *The Enlightenment and the Intellectual Foundations of Modern Culture*, New Haven & London, 2004.

ⁱⁱⁱ - In the words of Jasper Griffin, in his Introduction to the illuminating volume of *The Oxford History of the Roman World*, ed. J. Boardman et al., Oxford, 1991, p. 1: "The idea of Rome has given to the West several distinct myths, each full of resonance. There is the image of the stern and upright generals and consuls of the Republican period, great conquerors devoted to the service of their country." Cf. Florence Dupont, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, trans. C. Woodall, Blackwell, 1993, p. 76: "Rome was the city of power, of temples, of pleasures and social life, of wealth, culture and refinement". See P. Jones & K. Sidwell (eds.), *The World of Rome. An Introduction to Roman Culture*, Cambridge, 1998, p. 317, under the heading of: "Rome refuses to die", it is argued that "some entities seem too powerful to die. They leave not just their physical traces behind them, but their ghosts too. The World of Rome is like that. Its body is the city of Rome itself, the *urbs aeterna*, which still lives on, a modern city and once again the capital of Italy".

^{iv} - For the different receptions of Rome, including the later ones, see Catharine Edwards, *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*, Cambridge, 1996. This study considers the manner of viewing Rome as a place where the past is irresistibly present. Cf. H. T. Rowell, *Rome in the Augustan Age*, Norman, 1962, pp. 229ff.

^v - Roman intellectuals did not detach themselves from political life in Rome. Take for one, Marcus Terentius Varro, who was one of Rome's most eminent intellectuals, at the 1st century B.C., was at the same time one of Rome's greatest politicians, experienced in both military and administrative life. See A. B. Breebaart, *Clio and Antiquity: History and Historiography of the Greek and Roman World*, Hilversum, 1987, pp. 71 ff., who poses the question: Were there intellectuals at Rome? He mentions some picturesque examples, like Varro and Pliny the Elder. Then, he points out that even if such men were not representative of the wide spectrum of Roman intellectuals, it cannot be denied that they are specimina of those typically Roman upper-class *homines literati*, whose intellectual activities were subordinate to the duties and obligations of political life. For a detailed exploration into the cultural and political values of literature, see T. Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: the Politics of Imitation*, Oxford, 2004.

^{vi} - See Thomas Habinek, *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*, Princeton, 1998, p. 5, who argues that it is not the tradition itself that defines our politics or our morality, but the use we make of it.

^{vii} - Nobility in ancient Rome was hereditary until the middle of the fourth century B.C. Later on, nobility necessitated being wealthy, and occupying at least one superior office. See Harriet Flower, "Spectacle and Political Culture in the Roman Republic", in Harriet Flower (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic*, Cambridge, 2004, pp. 324f., who points out to the fact that Roman patricians were defined purely in terms of birth and family wealth and that the political elites were defined by merit and achievement, in terms of publicity and self re-presentation.

^{viii} - For an elaborate and well-documented study on Roman moralistic discourse, see Catharine Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge, 2002.

^{ix} - Cf. Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, 2.9 -10; *De Republica*, 5.1-2.

^x - This is the case described as "a collapse of the authority of the Republican ruling class, a shift in the control of knowledge from social leaders to academic experts", see Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, "Mutatio Morum: The Idea of a Cultural Revolution", in: T. Habinek, et al. (eds.), *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge, 1997, p. 12.

^{xi} - See Thomas Tarver, "Varro and the Antiquarianism of Philosophy", in J. Barnes & M. Griffin (eds.), *Philosophia Togata II*, Oxford, 1997, pp. 135ff.

^{xii} - Lactantius, *Institutiones Divinae*, I.6.7.

^{xiii} - Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 6.2 & 4.

^{xiv} - Denis Feeney, *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs*, Cambridge, 1998, p. 140, interprets Cicero's reaction to Varro's work by saying that there was no one Roman religious system existing essentially, inherently meaningful, waiting to be participated in. That is why Cicero up till then had the impression that he had been wandering around like an ignorant stranger in his own city.

^{xv} - Add to this Varro's erudition in literature, language and philosophy. Edwards (1996) p. 17 comments on Cicero's account by saying: "this system of erudition plays the part of a metaphysical street map of the city".

^{xvi} - For a satisfactory discussion of culture, morals, and politics, see Wallace-Hadrill, (1997) pp. 7ff. For tradition as the focus of a power struggle, see in particular pp. 13ff; Edwards (2002) pp. 24ff.

^{xvii} - For an analysis of the legend of the "Mission of Rome" to rule the world, see S. E. Smethurst, "The Growth of the Roman Legend", *Phoenix*, vol. 3, No. 1(1949) pp. 1-14. Smethurst, examining certain aspects of the legend, sketches how this legend came into being.

^{xviii} - The *Res Gestae* is the most important inscription which has come down to us from classical antiquity. The account of Augustus was originally engraved on bronze tablets set up before his mausoleum at Rome. The original has been lost, but copies have survived in Asia Minor.

^{xix} - P. A. Brunt & J. M. Moore (eds.), *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, with an introduction & commentary, Oxford, 1967, p. 1.

^{xx} - *Imperium* has been a much debated term. There is overwhelming mass of scholarship concerned with *imperium Romanum*, see, for example, E. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, California, 1986, pp. 273ff.; Elizabeth Rawson, "The Expansion of Rome", in J. Boardman et al. (eds.), *The Oxford History of the Roman World*, Oxford, 1991, pp.55ff. For a full investigation of this term, see A. Lintott, *Imperium Romanum. Politics and Administration*, Routledge, 1993, passim. Lintott capably considers how the Romans understood the concept of *imperium* and could reconcile it with considerable flexibility both in the formal relationships between themselves and their allies and in administrative practice. He also considers how the empire worked, and makes an attempt to assess the nature of the relationship between Rome and her allies and subjects.

^{xxi} - In 368 B.C., Rome conquered, and subjected all other Latin towns, after overrunning their land.

^{xxii} - For the Italian element in Roman History, see Elizabeth Rawson, *Intellectual life in the Late Roman Republic*, Duckworth, 1985, pp. 19ff.; M. Crawford, "Early Rome and Italy", in J. Boardman et al. (eds.), *The Oxford History of the Roman World*, Oxford, 1991, pp. 13ff.

^{xxiii} - For the openness of Roman culture to outside influences, see: Harriet Flower (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic*, Cambridge, 2004, pp. 7ff.

^{xxiv} - Paul Veyne, *Roman Erotic Elegy: Love, Poetry, and the West*, trans. David Pellauer, Chicago, 1988, p. 16, goes so far as to believe that it is not enough to say that Hellas had an influence on Rome, which borrowed from it. He denied that the Roman Empire was a vessel in which Greece and Italy were united in a mixture that we might even call original and savory. What must be said, in Veyne's view, is that Rome was a people whose culture was that of another people, Greece.

^{xxv} - Habinek (1998) p. 34 rejects the Hellenocentric approach to the commencement of Latin literature.

^{xxvi} - Jennifer Roberts, *Athens on Trial: The Antidemocratic Tradition in Western Thought*, Princeton, 1994, pp. 97f. , explains that the Romans' relationship with Greece was a two-way street. They were well aware that Greeks called them *barbaroi*. For this reason the Romans were quick to denigrate contemporary Greece. Fearful of being perceived as boorish thugs and anxious about how they measured up against classical Greece, the Romans hastened to dub Greeks with whom they came into contact *Graeculi*, "Greeklings", to distinguish them from their illustrious ancestors.

^{xxvii} - The conquest of mainland Greece was completed victoriously in 146 B.C.

^{xxviii} - The opposition between 'power' and 'culture' is extremely problematic. In the words of Habinek (1998) p. 25: "Greece triumphed over Rome because it better served the needs of intellectuals, especially those who saw themselves as the spokesmen for emerging or embattled national identities. Cf. Whitmarsh (2004) p. 17, who classified scholarly opinion as such: "on the one side stood 'power', collocated with politics, Rome, the imperial household; on the other, 'culture' with literature and Hellenic identity. The two were conceived of as 'autonomous terrains', opposed yet complementary. According to such commentators, this culture-power polarity is a sign of Greek submission to Roman dominance".

^{xxix} - Habinek (1998), pp. 6f., believes that Latin literature despite its youth and poverty with respect to Greek, had a more significant part to play in the spread of Roman power than did Greek literature and culture in the aftermath of Alexander's imperial conquests.

^{xxx} - Veyne (1988) p. 17, advocates the idea that the Romans were clearly original when they added something to Greece, when they improved techniques known before they came along. The problem of originality is not the problem of origins. The Romans were themselves in everything they did, with no inferiority complex. See also E. Gruen, *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*, California, 1996, p. 1.

^{xxxi} - See for example, Naevius' epic, the *Bellum Punicum*, Ennius' *Annales*, and Cato's *Origines*, all of which were the earliest examples of native Roman literature. For the introduction of literature into Roman public life, see Elaine Fantham, "Literature in the Roman Republic", in Harriet Flower (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic*, Cambridge, 2004, pp. 272ff.

- ^{xxxii} - Ennius was a Calabrian, speaker of Oscan, Greek, and Latin.
- ^{xxxiii} - In book 1 of his *Annales* (I. 1-13), Ennius dreamed that Homer appeared to him, and then followed his reincarnation.
- ^{xxxiv} - Ennius is considered the first poet to give expression to Roman nationalism, see Smethurst (1949) p.13.
- ^{xxxv} - See Flower (2004) p. 323, who argues that Roman identity was defined by a series of encounters with "the other" in the Mediterranean world and beyond.
- ^{xxxvi} - Class distinctions in the Roman society became sharp and based on culture as well as birth and wealth; see C. Starr, *Civilization and the Caesars: the Intellectual Revolution in the Roman Empire*, New York, 1954, pp. 203 ff. For the education of the aristocrats, see R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford, 1989, pp. 346ff.
- ^{xxxvii} - Greek became a lingua franca for intellectuals.
- ^{xxxviii} - Hellenism at Rome has received considerable attention; see, for example, Gruen (1986) pp. 250ff.; isdem (1996) passim; Rawson (1991) pp. 68ff.
- ^{xxxix} - On bilingualism at Rome, See Elaine Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius*, Baltimore & London, 1999, pp. 24 ff.
- ^{xl} - For the conviction of Greek influence, see Gruen (1986) pp. 260 ff.; Roberts (1994) pp. 99f.
- ^{xli} - See Rawson (1991) pp. 69ff.
- ^{xlii} - See E. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*, Duckworth, 1993, pp. 55ff. & 61ff., who argues against the notoriety which Cato earned as a fierce foe of Hellas and a stalwart opponent of infection by Greek culture. Gruen believes that Cato by no means resisted the allure of Greek Learning.
- ^{xliii} - For the complexity of Roman attitudes to the Greek world and Greek attitudes to Rome, see M. H. Crawford, "Greek Intellectuals and the Roman Aristocracy in the First Century B.C.", in P. Garnsey & C. Whittaker (eds.), *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, 1982, pp. 193ff.
- ^{xliv} - On the Hellenic character of Roman higher education, see E. J. Kenney, "Books and Readers in the Roman World", in E. J. Kenney & W. V. Clausen (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. II, part 1, *The Early Republic*, Cambridge, 1983, pp. 5ff.; Gruen (1996) pp. 190ff.
- ^{xlv} - As Roberts (1994) p. 97, makes clear, being aware of the perceived cultural superiority of Hellas and of their enormous cultural debt to Greeks of earlier centuries, the Romans were constantly seeking to schematize the relationship between Greek and Roman civilization in a way that would place their own culture in a flattering light.
- ^{xlvi} - Cicero studied in both Athens and Rhodes, as did his brother, his close friend Titus Pomponius (Atticus), and Julius Caesar.
- ^{xlvii} - The Physical aspects of Rome were well described by the geographer Strabo, in his *Geographica*, 58.
- ^{xlviii} - Aemilius Paullus, the Roman aristocrat, brought the royal library of Perseus of Macedon to Rome, as booty by conquest in 167 B.C., for the education of his sons. It was the first Greek library that came to Rome. See Plutarch, *Aemilius*, 28. It is worth mentioning as well that after a long journey, the great library of Aristotle's Lyceum settled eventually in Rome, in 86 B.C., see Strabo, *Geographica*, 13C. 609. On books and libraries at Rome, see Rawson (1985) pp. 39ff.
- ^{xlix} - Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, 35.10.
- ¹ - Asinius Pollio, consul of 40 B.C., was believed to be a leading literary force at Rome, see Florence Dupont, "Recitatio and the Reorganization of the Space of Public Discourse", in T. Habinek, et al. (eds), *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 45f.; Fantham (1999) pp. 68ff.

- ^{li} - Most likely, Pollio's library may have preceded the great Palatine library of Augustus by almost a decade.
- ^{lii} - Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, 7.115.
- ^{liii} - Rawson (1991) p. 71.
- ^{liv} - See Ovid's response to the cosmological city of Rome in his erotic context: *haec habet ... quicquid in orbe fuit*, "whatever has been in the world... is here" (*Ars Amatoria*, I. 56). See T. Habinek, "The Invention of Sexuality in the World-City of Rome", in T. Habinek, et al. (eds.), *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge, 1997, p. 26. He summarizes the situation briefly by saying: "Rome had become the world in large part because the world now had to come to Rome".
- ^{lv} - Habinek (1998) p. 3, argues that Latin literature of the classical period advances the interests of Rome's elites in many ways. He places emphasis on the aristocratic dimension of Roman literature.
- ^{lvi} - See F. G. Kenyon, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Chicago, 1980, pp. 73ff.; L. Reynolds, N. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, Oxford, 1992 (repr.), pp. 18ff.
- ^{lvii} - See P. E. Easterling, "Books and Readers in the Greek World: The Hellenistic and Imperial Periods", in P. E. Easterling et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, Vol. I, Part 4, *The Hellenistic Period and the Empire*, Cambridge, 1989, pp. 169ff.; Rosalind Thomas, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge, 1992, pp. 158ff. argues the case in favour of Rome. It is admittedly true, as she points out, that Roman society in the late Republic and Empire was far more dominated by books and documents than classical Greece. Latin literature inherited the learned weight of Hellenistic scholarship. Writing in various forms, as Rosalind Thomas indicates, was surely much more deeply integrated into life by the first century B.C. than it had been in classical Greece. Evidences of this phenomenon are the spread of the written poetry book, and the emergence of an organized publishing industry, by the middle of the first century B.C., following the Alexandrian style. See on this matter P. A. Miller, *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness: The Birth of a Genre from Archaic Greece to Augustan Rome*, Routledge, 1994, pp. 120ff.
- ^{lviii} - Habinek (1998) p. 35, states that Latin literature took the particular form it did in the late third and early second centuries B.C. in response to two contemporaneous yet countervailing developments in Roman society: the transformation of Rome from a city-state to a traditional aristocratic empire, and the crisis of identity provoked in Rome's rulers by that very transformation.
- ^{lix} - The equestrian rank came second only to the senators in the social class structures of the Roman society. On the Roman social hierarchy, see Edwards (2002) pp. 12ff.
- ^{lx} - To be admitted to the equestrian rank one needed to have been of free birth, and to have possessed a capital worth 400,000 sesterces, in order to be able to live independently without obligations.
- ^{lxi} - Nearly all the great poets of the late republic and Augustan age belonged to this rank.
- ^{lxii} - See R. O. A. M. Lyne, "Augustan Poetry and Society", in J. Boardman et al. (eds.), *The Oxford History of the Roman World*, Oxford, 1991, pp. 216ff.; Miller (1994) pp. 133ff.
- ^{lxiii} - See P. White, "Amicitia and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome", *JRS*, vol. 68 (1978) pp. 74- 92; Lyne (1991) pp. 218ff.; Fantham (1999) pp. 67ff.
- ^{lxiv} - For specialized studies of patronage in ancient Rome, see Richard P. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*, Cambridge, 1982; B. K. Gold (ed.), *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*, Austin, 1982; David Konstan, "Patrons and Friends", *CPh*, vol. 90 (1995) pp. 328- 341.
- ^{lxv} - This idea has been well analyzed in the rich flow of articles in Christian Jacob & Francois de Polignac (eds.), *Alexandria, Third Century BC: The Knowledge of the World in a Single City*, trans. Colin Clement, Harpocrates Publishing, Alexandria, 2000; A. Hirst & M. Silk, (eds.), *Alexandria Real and Imagined*, The American Univ. in Cairo Press, 2006, esp. Chap. 19, M. Silk, "Alexandrian Poetry From Callimachus to Eliot", pp. 353-372.
- ^{lxvi} - For the Mithridatic wars as a turning point in the intellectual life at Rome, see Rawson (1985) pp. 7ff.

^{lxvii} - It is worth noting that Alexandrian poetry was already known and imitated at Rome before Parthenius. See M. Fantuzzi & R. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge, 2004, p. 466. The authors believe that the broad cultural movements cannot be laid at the door of any one traveller from the east.

^{lxviii} - In addition to the poet Catullus, we have the names of Calvus, Cinna the poet, Cornificius, Valerius Cato, and Bibaculus. For the so-called Neoteric movement, see R. O. Lyne, "The Neoteric Poets", *CQ*, vol. 28 (1978) pp. 167- 187; W. V. Clausen, "The New Direction in Poetry", in E. J. Kenney & W. V. Clausen (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. II, part 2, *The Late Republic*, Cambridge, 1983, pp. 4 ff; R. Nisbet, "The Poets of the Late Republic", in J. Boardman et al. (eds.), *The Oxford History of the Roman World*, Oxford, 1991, pp.137ff.; Lyne (1991) pp. 217ff.

^{lxix} - As stated in the words of D. A. Russell, "De Imitatione", in D. West & T. Woodman (eds.), *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, Cambridge, 1979, p. 1: "One of the inescapable features of Latin literature is that almost every author, in almost everything he writes, acknowledged his antecedents, his predecessors- in a word, the tradition in which he was bred. This phenomenon, for which the technical terms are *imitatio* or (in Greek) *mimesis*, is not peculiar to Latin".

^{lxx} - See Magda El-Nowieemy, "Alexandrian Implications in Tibullus I.1," in: *Bulletin of the Center of Papyrological Studies and Inscriptions*, Ain Shams University, vol. 13 (1996) 79-93; eadem, "Alexandrian Influences in the Poetry of Propertius", *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Ancient Library of Alexandria & its Cultural Role in Africa*, Cairo, 2005, pp. 115-128; eadem, "Callimachus and the Roman Poets", *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Alexandria University*, vol. 58 (2008) pp.525-547.

^{lxxi} - Fantuzzi & Hunter (2004) p. 446, explain that Hellenistic poetry was indeed written in the expectation of being examined, commented upon, and criticized, much as some of these poets themselves were 'critics' of the poetry of earlier ages.

^{lxxii} - See the learned discussion of Florence Dupont, *The Invention of Literature: From Greek Intoxication to the Latin Book*, trans. J. Lloyd, Baltimore & London, 1999, pp. 97f. Her argument has been made that the Romans were to find themselves having to manage a monstrous quantity of books, preserving it, extending it, and reproducing it. From this point on, knowledge was a matter of accumulation, and poetic culture was a matter of citation; and for both, books were necessary.

^{lxxiii} - Vitruvius, *De Architectura*, VII. Praef. 1-2.

^{lxxiv} - Dupont (1993) p. 76 rightly states that the two main poles of the Romans' mental universe were the city and the world: *urbs et orbis terrarum*. The city -that is, Rome- was the centre of the world. Rome was the city *par excellence*, the domain dedicated to *Jupiter Optimus Maximus* (the best, the greatest) whose temple stood at the top of the Capitol. For the transformation of Rome to a "world capital", and "center of the universe", see Habinek (1997) pp. 26f.