

Latin Poetry from Vergil's Eclogues to the death of Ovid

Week 1: Introduction

Part 1: How does Augustan (or any classical Latin) literature get to us?

Useful works

M.L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (1973) [how-to manual]

L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* [4th ed] (2013) [cultural history of transmission plus practical examples]

L.D. Reynolds, M.D. Reeve et al., *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (1983) [standard reference for the textual transmission of all major Latin authors]

M.D. Reeve, *Manuscripts and Method: Essays on Editing and Transmission* (2011)

[collected papers of a modern master, sceptical about overriding theories, printed editions]

Tasks of an editor (West)

Collect the material (transcription of manuscripts)

Work out its nature (stemma if possible; open/closed tradition; elimination? Lachmann model?)

Setting up an *apparatus criticus* (positive or negative?)

Diagnosis and correction of problems (emendation)

Apparatus criticus: Horace *Odes* 2.1.19-24

Positive [vulgate and variants]

iam fulgor armorum fugacis

terret equos equitumque uultus. 20

audire magnos iam uideor duces

non indecoro puluere sordidos

et cuncta terrarum subacta

praeter atrocem animum Catonis.

20 *uultus* MSS; *pectus* Harrison

21 *audire* MSS; *uidere* Beroaldus

Negative [only variants]

iam fulgor armorum fugacis

terret equos equitumque uultus. 20

audire magnos iam uideor duces

non indecoro puluere sordidos

et cuncta terrarum subacta

praeter atrocem animum Catonis.

20 *pectus* Harrison

21 *uidere* Beroaldus

Issues of clarity?

Considerations when deciding between readings

E. J. Kenney, *The Classical Text* (1974) 142 n. 2: 'the fallibility of hard-and-fast rules [has been neatly demonstrated] by reducing the principles guiding choice between variants to the single tautology *lectio melior potior*.' He then asks 'Is textual criticism an art, τέχνη, or a mere knack, εμπειρία?' (143).

R. Bentley (1711) ad Hor. c. 3.27.15: '*Nobis et ratio et res ipsa centum codicibus potiores sunt, praesertim accedente Vaticanis veteris suffragio.*'

'If the sense requires it, I am prepared to write Constantinopolitanus where the manuscripts have the monosyllabic interjection o.' [Haupt apud Housman, cited approvingly by West]

A reading which is to be accepted must meet the following requirements (cf. West (1973) 48):

- i) it must correspond in sense to what the context demands;
- ii) it must correspond to the language, style, and other technical requirements (e.g. metre) of the text involved;
- iii) there must be a reasonable explanation of how it became corrupted.

Recent experience of editing Vergil and Ovid:

G.B.Conte, *Ope Ingenii: Experiences of Textual Criticism* (2013) [chapters on punctuation, interpolation, and conjecture]

G.B.Conte, *Critical Notes on Virgil* (2016) [from his Teubner *Georgics* and *Aeneid*]

R.J.Tarrant, *Texts, editors, and readers: Methods and problems in Latin textual criticism* (2016) [from his 2004 OCT of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*; 'heroic' and modest editing, interpolation, conjecture]

R.J.Tarrant in Hunter (R.), Oakley (S.P.) (edd.) *Latin Literature and its Transmission* (2016) [manifesto for new OCT of Horace]

Examples from Vergil – why was the variant chosen?

Aeneid 10.270-1 (Aeneas' helmet blazes):

ardet apex capiti tristisque a uertice flamma 270
funditur et uastos umbo uomit aureus ignis:

270 *tristisque* Faernus, Conte ; *cristisque* MSS

Aeneid 10.362-8 (Pallas urges on his men):

At parte ex alia, qua saxa rotantia late
intulerat torrens arbustaque diruta ripis,
Arcadas insuetos acies inferre pedestris
ut vidit Pallas Latio dare terga sequaci, 365
aspera quis natura loci dimittere quando
suasit equos, unum quod rebus restat egenis,
nunc prece, nunc dictis virtutem accendit amaris

366 *aspera quis* MR; *aspera quos* P; *aspera aquis* Madvig

366 *quando* MSS; *tandem* Harrison

Aeneid 10.803-10

ac uelut effusa si quando grandine nimbi
praecipitant, omnis campis diffugit arator
omnis et agricola, et tuta latet arce uiator 805
aut amnis ripis aut alti fornice saxi,
dum pluit in terris, ut possint sole reducto
exercere diem: sic obrutus undique telis
Aeneas nubem belli, dum detonet omnis,
sustinet...

805 *arce* e; *arte* other MSS, ancient commentators

Aeneid 6.185-91

atque haec ipse suo tristi cum corde volutat 185
aspectans silvam immensam, et sic forte precatur:
'si nunc se nobis ille aureus arbore ramus

*ostendat nemore in tanto! quando omnia vere
heu nimium de te vates, Misene, locuta est.'*
vix ea fatus erat, geminae cum forte columbae 190
ipsa sub ora viri caelo venere volantes...

Conte defends *forte* (MP) at 6.186 (but note its repetition at 190 in the same metrical position) as indicating that Aeneas is 'subita ac fortuita cogitatione occupatus' seems strained – try R's *uoce* (cf. 9.403 *sic uoce precatur*) or *sponte* (an instant reaction to the situation)?

Examples from Horace – are the suggestions better than the transmitted text?

Odes 1.31.1-8 (non-offerings to Apollo):

*Quid dedicatum poscit Apollinem
vates ? quid orat de patera novum
fundens liquorem ? non opimae
Sardiniae segetes feraces,
non aestuosae grata Calabriae
armenta, non aurum aut ebur Indicum,
non rura quae Liris quieta
mordet aqua taciturnus amnis.*

5 *grata* MSS; Graia Peerlkamp, *laeta* Harrison

Odes 3.30.10-14 (Horace the bringer of Greek lyric to Italy):

*dicar, qua uiolens obstrepit Aufidus
et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium
regnauit populorum, ex humili potens
princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos
deduxisse modos.*

4-5 *Aeolios carmen ad Italum* | *deduxisse modos* Fuss, *Aeolium carmen ad Italas* | *deduxisse domos* Harrison

Epistles 1.2.9-22 (the moral lessons of Homer):

*rursus Antenor censet belli praecidere causam;
quid Paris? Ut saluus regnet uiuatque beatus* 10
*cogi posse negat. Nestor componere litis
inter Pelidem festinat et inter Atriden;
hunc amor, ira quidem communiter urit utrumque.
quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achiui.
seditione, dolis, scelere atque libidine et ira* 15
*Iliacos intra muros peccatur et extra.
rursus, quid uirtus et quid sapientia possit,
utile proposuit nobis exemplar Ulixen,
qui domitor Troiae multorum prouidus urbes,
et mores hominum inspexit, latumque per aequor,* 20
*dum sibi, dum sociis reditum parat, aspera multa
pertulit, aduersis rerum inmersabilis undis.*

18 *Ulixes* Harrison [subject of *proposuit* ?]

Odes 2.8.18-24

*adde quod pubes tibi crescit omnis,
seruitus crescit noua nec priores
impiae tectum dominae relinquunt
saepe minati.*

20

*te suis matres metuunt iuuencis,
te senes parci miseraeque nuper
uirgines nuptae, tua ne retardet
aura maritos.*

18 *crescit* MSS; *ut sit* Lehrs

[cf. 1.19.5-7 *urit me Glycera nitor* |...|*urit grata proteruitas*]

Odes 2.1.19-24

*iam fulgor armorum fugacis
terret equos equitumque uultus.* 20
*audire magnos iam uideor duces
non indecoro puluere sordidos
et cuncta terrarum subacta
praeter atrocem animum Catonis.*

20 *uultus* MSS; *pectus* Harrison

21 *audire* MSS; *uidere* Beroaldus

20 terret equos equitumque uultus: *is uultus* (a) nominative singular and a further subject of *terret* parallel with *fulgor* (for the sense-construction see e.g. 1.13.6) or (b) accusative plural and a further object of *terret*, parallel with *equos* (supported by Enn. *Ann.*256 Sk. *equorum equitumque magister*)? Like N-H I find it hard to separate *equos equitumque* as referring to two different sides in battle as (a) requires, even if (a) is partly supported by the terror-inspiring capacity of charging cavalry (cf. e.g. Livy 6.12.10, 8.39.8); this would indeed be a ‘startling zeugma’ (West), and it is hard to see how the features of horses (as opposed to those of warriors: cf. 1.2.39-40 *acer ... | uultus in hostem*) can arouse fear. This leaves (b): the features of soldiers can express terror in battle, indeed (cf. Silius 8.333 *in uultus micat undique terror*), but *uultus* makes a somewhat odd object of *terret*; we might expect something which is the seat not the vehicle of fear. It is worth considering whether *uultus* is a corruption of a similarly shaped noun. *pectus* would give precisely the right sense; for the *pectus* as the seat of fear see *Ep.* 2.1.211-12 *poeta meum qui pectus inaniter angit, | inritat, mulcet, falsis terroribus implet, TLL X.1.914.18-29*, and for *terreo* with a psychological object in a similar context cf. Livy 8.39.4 *clamor ... Samnitium terruit animos*. The reference here seems to be general rather than to any particular context of battle.

21 audire ... iam uideor: N-H adopt the conjecture *uidere* (Beroaldus, Bentley independently) for *audire*, on the grounds that *uidere ... uideor* is a much more natural phrase with *magnos duces* as object, but cf. Plaut. *Aul.* 811 *uocem hic loquentis modo mi audire uisus sum*. Further, if Pollio’s historical work is to be imagined as analogous to the performance of his tragedies (17-19), the difficulty of *audire* vanishes; the synaesthesia of sound and vision is of course natural for staged drama.

Part 2: preliminaries to studying Augustan literature

KEY LITERARY EVENTS

KEY HISTORICAL EVENTS

| | |
|---|---|
| ?38 BCE Virgil's <i>Eclogues</i> published | 38-36 Renewed civil war against S.Pompey |
| 35 BCE Horace <i>Satires</i> 1 published | 32-30 Caesar fights and defeats Antony and Cleopatra at Actium and Alexandria |
| 30 BCE Horace, <i>Satires</i> 2 and <i>Epodes</i> published | 29 Triple triumph of Caesar |
| 30's - 9 BCE Livy's history published | 27 'Restoration of republic': Caesar assumes title of 'Augustus' |
| 29 BCE Virgil, <i>Georgics</i> published | 18-17 Moral legislation of Augustus |
| 20's BC Earliest elegies of Propertius, Tibullus and (later) Ovid published | 17 Augustus celebrates Saecular Games |
| ?23 BCE Horace <i>Odes</i> 1-3 published | 12 Augustus becomes <i>pontifex maximus</i> (head of state religion) |
| ?19 BCE Deaths of Virgil and Tibullus | 4 CE Tiberius becomes final heir of Augustus |
| ?16 BCE Propertius Book 4 published | 14 CE Death of Augustus, succession of Tiberius |
| 13 BCE Horace <i>Odes</i> 4 published | |
| 8 BCE Death of Horace | |
| 8 CE Ovid banished to Romania | |

Key issues emerging from historical context

1. dealing with current/recent civil wars and the emergent victor Caesar/Augustus
2. rhetoric of moral, religious and cultural renewal (cf. *Res Gestae*)
3. can poetry be apolitical even in 'apolitical' genres?
4. interaction with the Greek world (Alexandria); literature and monarchy
5. dynasty and succession to Augustus

R.A.Gurval, *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War* (1995)

J.F.Miller, *Apollo, Augustus and the Poets* (2009)

The role of Maecenas

How far was he a mediator between princeps and poets?

How far do poets' work addressed to M reflect his unusual character?

Is he eventually replaced by Augustus' own presence (NB largely absent in 20s BCE).

White, P. 1991. 'Maecenas' Retirement', *CPh* 86: 130-8.

Williams, G. 1990. 'Did Maecenas "Fall from Favor"?' Augustan Literary

Patronage', in K. Raafaub and M. Toher (eds.), *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*. Berkeley, CA/London, University of California Press: 258-75.

The iceberg effect of patchy transmission

1. Clearly we have only a small fraction of Augustan literature [for poetic losses see e.g. E.Courtney, *Fragmentary Latin Poets*, 1993]
2. particular losses: most prose except a section of Livy (~35 books of 142), Vitruvius, drama [for history see *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, 2015, for drama see e.g. J.Griffin, *Latin Poets and Roman Life*, 1985]. Latin intermediaries for Greek tragedy?
3. Amongst the poets at least we seem to have most of the leading figures [cf. Horace *Sat.*1.10.40-45; Propertius 2.34.61-94; Ovid *Amores* 1.15.19-30]

Some important lost texts: Varius, epic (*Panegyricus Augusti?* Horace *Odes* 1.6.1, *Sat.* 1.10.43-44), tragedy *Thyestes* (*Odes* 1.6.8); Varro Atacinus, *Argonautica* (Propertius 2.34.85-6, Ovid *Amores* 1.15.21-2; fragments cited by Macrobius). Important fragments of lost authors can turn up in papyri (Gallus in 1978, see later).

20C Scholarship on Augustan literature: a partial survey

A prophetic work

W.Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (1924)

| | | |
|--|-----------------|------|
| 1. Romans and Greeks | Williams | 1968 |
| 2. Poetic creation (including Callimachus) | Williams | 1968 |
| 3. The material of poetry | | |
| 4. The moralising conception of poetry | Williams | 1968 |
| 5. Grammatical/rhetorical theories | | |
| 6. Poets and critics | | |
| 7. Imitation | everyone | |
| 8. Didactic poetry | | |
| 9. The crossing of genres | Conte, Harrison | |
| 10. The poetic book | | |
| 11. Poetic language | Williams | 1968 |
| 12. Incapacity in observation [realism] | Williams | 1968 |
| 13. Scholarship and pseudo-scholarship | | |
| 14. Historiography | | |

Allusion and intertextuality – the rehabilitation of ‘unoriginality’

G.Pasquali, ‘Arte Allusiva’, *L’Italia che scrive*, XXV (1942), pp. 11-20

[republished 1951 in his *Stravaganze quarte e supreme*]. Mario Citroni, ‘Arte Allusiva: Pasquali and Onward’ in *Brill’s Companion to Callimachus* (2011), 566-86:

‘Pasquali’s “Arte allusiva” presupposes the contemporary philological debate, especially in Germany, about the originality of Latin poetry. The theoretical aspect of the question, i.e. that works admittedly modelled on other works may possess their own artistic quality, had been widely discussed by the Italian school of aesthetics [Benedetto Croce]. Pasquali’s article combines these debates in an original approach. He grants to allusion the full dignity of an artistic process with its own specific prerogatives: allusion evokes a different, more ancient world in a modern text, and thus confronts tradition, recovering and reforming it for a contemporary setting. Allusion appears as peculiar to a production that confronts its own present with a past of artistic traditions possessing a marked significance for authors and public, typically the case for Hellenistic poetry and all Latin literature. Recent theories of intertextuality, and the intertextual analysis conducted today on ancient texts often make reference to Pasquali, reinterpreting the positions that he elaborated in different paths, which are here identified and briefly described.’

Some more key works

E.Fraenkel, *Horace* (1957)

Greek influence; Biographical interpretation; dialogue with Wilamowitz (*Sappho und Simonides*, 1913). Political admiration for Augustus (contrast Syme, *Roman Revolution*, 1939).

W.Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (1960).

Makes use of the rediscovery of Callimachus in the first half of the 20C via Oxyrynchus papyri (R.Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* (1949, 1953). Callimachean aesthetics and poetics moves to the centre of the study of Augustan literature (big e.g. in Williams 1968).

G.W.Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (1968)

Dialogue with Fraenkel (e.g. on Horace’s *Epistles*); close readings of poems. Key issues at start (29-30):

1. what is the significance of form in Roman poetic writing?
2. how much material did real life supply and how much was imaginary?
3. Roman poetry often makes considerable demands on its readers to supply a dramatic setting
4. how far do Greek and Roman blend in Roman poetry?
5. interest in moralising
6. apparent autobiographical revelation
7. the poet's view of his [sic] own activity.

The literary turn of the 1960s

Rudd, N. ed. (1972), *Essays on Classical Literature*, vii-xviii (previous gaps filled by Kenney, Nisbet, D.West, P.G.Walsh [Livy], J.P.Sullivan). Good examples of this kind of work, sometimes influenced by New Criticism: e.g. K.Quinn, *Latin Explorations* (1963), N.Rudd, *Lines of Enquiry* (1979), J.P.Sullivan (ed.), *Critical Essays on Roman Literature : Elegy and Lyric* (1962), D.West, *Horace* (1967), *The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius* (1969).

US contributions

The work of Michael Putnam: 'to explore the formal perfection and the anguished humanity of central works of Latin literature' [MD 52 (2004) 11]: e.g. *The Poetry of the Aeneid* (1965), *Essays on Latin Lyric, Elegy and Epic* (1982), *Virgil's Aeneid : Interpretation and Influence* (1995).

The work of David O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry* (1975), 'Augustan poetry as a natural growth in the soil prepared by Catullus' (163); transition from neoteric literature and interest in reconstructing Gallus, particular intensity of the Augustan period.

The 'Harvard-School' on Vergil – see *Classical World* special issue (2017): Putnam, Wendell Clausen, Adam Parry, others. Anti-imperialistic pessimism, some politics.

The UK in the 1970s

R.G.M.Nisbet, *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* (1995)

R.O.A.M.Lyne, *Collected Papers on Latin Poetry* (2007)

Woodman, A.J. and West. D.A., eds.

Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry (1974) [literary value Ok to write about]

Creative Imitation and Latin Literature (1979) [value of allusion]

Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus (1984) [political engagement]

Some New Critical readings, but predominantly historicist; cast includes Nisbet, Williams, Kenney, Lyne, Cairns, Du Quesnay as well as the editors.

A bold enterprise: F.Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (1972; revised edition 2008). 'Genres of content' retrojected from imperial rhetorical handbook (e.g. *propemptikon*). Some influence, but too schematic/dogmatic? See e.g. Galinsky, K. ed. *The Interpretation of Roman Poetry: Empiricism or Hermeneutics?* (1992) [critical retrospect by several hands on 1970s and 1980s].

Commentaries

Vergil, *Aeneid*

1,2,4,6 R.G.Austin (Oxford, 1971,1964,1955,1977)

3,5 R.D.Williams (Oxford, 1962,1960)

7&8 C.J.Fordyce (Oxford,1977)

Horace

Odes Nisbet and Hubbard 1 (1970), 2 (1978)

Epistles 2 + Ars Brink (1959-82) [reviving the Berlin of Jaeger and Wilamowitz]

Cambridge 'Orange' series [1965-] 'Green and Yellow' series [1970-]

Continental examples:

Franz Bömer [austere]

P. Ovidius Naso, *Die Fasten*, 1957–1958 [2 vols.]

P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen [9 vols] 1969–2006

Paolo Fedeli [not austere]

Sesto Propertio: Il primo libro delle Elegie, 1980

Propertio. Elegie Libro II. Introduzione, testo e commento, 2005

Sesto Propertio. Il libro terzo delle Elegie, 1985

Propertio, Elegie libro IV [with Rosalba Dimundo, Irma Ciccarelli], 2015

Metacommentary:

G.W.Most (ed.), *Commentaries – Kommentare* (1999)

R.K.Gibson and C.S.Kraus (eds.), *The Classical Commentary* (2002)

C.S.Kraus and C.A.Stray (eds.), *Classical Commentaries* (2016).

G.B.Conte and the 1980s (genre, intertextuality; cf. Pasquali, above)

(1974), *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario* (2nd ed. 1985; largely translated in Conte 1986]

(1980), *Virgilio : il genere e i suoi confini* (2nd ed. 1985; largely translated in Conte 1986]

(1986), *The Rhetoric of Imitation : Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* [tr. C.P.Segal]

(1994), *Latin Literature : A History* [with J.Solodow, G.W.Most, D.P.Fowler; Italian 1987]

(1994), *Genres and Readers* [tr. C.P.Segal]

(2007), *Virgil: The Poetry of Pathos* [ed. S.J.Harrison, tr. G.W.Most and E.Fantham]

Conte students/associates in 1980s/90s (e.g.):

Alessandro Barchiesi (*The Poet and the Prince* 1997, *Speaking Volumes* 2001, both Ovid)

Alessandro Schiesaro (*Simulacrum et imago* 1990 [Lucr.], *The Passions in Play*, 2003 [Sen.Trag.]),

Stephen Hinds (*Allusion and Intertext*, 1998)

Don Fowler (*Roman Constructions* 2000)

Stephen Harrison (*Generic Enrichment* 2007)

Journal: *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* (1978-)

Zanker, Galinsky and the generation of Augustan culture

P.Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (1988; German 1987)

G.K.Galinsky, *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction* (1996)

T.Habinek and A.Schiesaro, eds. *The Roman Cultural Revolution* (1997).

Inclusion of archaeological and art-historical material (esp. buildings – same?)

Influence of Fascism (Zanker b.Konstanz 1937)

Are literary patronage and building design similar?

Does Augustan material move out from the *princeps* and his circle to wider culture?

Does bottom-up movement combine with top-down?

How does the traditional role of Maecenas (above) fit into this model (not really in Zanker)?

Song, performance and audience

Thomas Habinek, *The World of Roman Song: From Ritualized Speech to Social Order* (2007)

‘for the Romans, "song" encompassed a wide range of ritualized speech, including elements of poetry, storytelling, and even the casting of spells’ [publisher’s blurb]

Michèle Lowrie, *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome* (2009)

‘Song has links to the divine through prophecy, while writing offers a more quotidian, but also more realistic way of presenting what a poet does. In a culture of highly polished book production where recitation was the fashion, to claim to sing or to write was one means of self-definition. Lowrie assesses the stakes of poetic claims to one medium or another’ [ditto]. Concern with posterity and long-term audience.

T.P.Wiseman, *The Roman Audience; Classical Literature as Social History* (2015)

'Who were Roman authors writing for? Only a minority of the population was fully literate and books were very expensive, individually hand-written on imported papyrus. So does it follow that great poets and prose authors like Virgil and Livy, Ovid and Petronius, were writing only for the cultured and the privileged? It is this modern consensus that is challenged in this volume' [ditto].

Anglophone Ovidian renaissance since mid-1980s

3 companions (NB companion/handbook phenomenon generally) and one anthology:

P.E.Knox, *A Companion to Ovid* (2009; Blackwell)

P.Hardie, *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid* (2002; Cambridge)

Barbara Weiden Boyd, *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. (2002)

Peter E. Knox, *Oxford Readings in Ovid* (2006) [NB same for Vergil, Horace, Propertius]

General

A.Barchiesi, *Speaking Volumes* (2001)

Katharina Volk, *Ovid* (2010)

Francesca Martelli, *Ovid's Revisions; The Editor as Author* (2013)

Thea Thorsen, *Ovid's Early Poetry* (2014)

L.Fulkerson, *Ovid* (2016)

Amores etc

Barbara Weiden Boyd, *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the Amores* (1997)

Rebecca Armstrong, *Ovid and His Love Poetry* (2005)

Victoria Rimell, *Ovid's Lovers: Desire, Difference, and the Poetic Imagination* (2006)

[male and female worlds; Medusa and Narcissus as poetic symbols]

Heroides

Florence Verducci, *Ovid's Toyshop of the Heart: Epistulae Heroidum* (1985)

Sara H. Lindheim, *Mail and Female: Epistolary Narrative and Desire in Ovid's Heroides* (2003).

Efrossini Spentzou, *Readers and Writers in Ovid's Heroides. Transgressions of Genre and Gender* (2003).

Laurel Fulkerson, *The Ovidian Heroine as Author. Reading, Writing, and Community in the Heroides* (2005)

Fasti

Alessandro Barchiesi, *Il poeta e il principe: Ovidio e il discorso augusteo* (1994; Eng.tr 1997)

Geraldine Herbert-Brown, *Ovid and the Fasti: An Historical Study* (1994)

Carole Newlands, *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti* (1995)

Emma Gee, *Ovid, Aratus and Augustus: Astronomy in Ovid's Fasti* (2000)

Metamorphoses

S.E.Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone* (1987)

J.Solodow, *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses* (1988)

G.Tissol, *The Face of Nature: Wit, Narrative, and Cosmic Origins in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (1997)

Alison.M.Keith, *Play of Fictions: Studies in Ovid's Metamorphoses Book 2* (1992).

K.Sara Myers, *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses* (1994)

S.Wheeler, *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (1999)

Elaine Fantham, *Ovid's Metamorphoses* (2004).

Patricia J. Johnson, *Ovid Before Exile. Art and Punishment in the Metamorphoses* (2008)

Micaela Janan, *Reflections in a Serpent's Eye: Thebes and Rome in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (2009)

Barbara Pavlock, *The Image of the Poet in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (2009)

Andrew Feldherr, *Playing Gods: Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Politics of Fiction* (2010)

Exile poetry

Williams, G., *Banished Voices. Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry* (1994)

Claassen, J-M. *Ovid Revisited: The Poet in Exile* (2008)

European Augustan Network and e-journal *Dictynna*; trending areas

<http://reseau-poesie-augusteenne.univ-lille3.fr/membres-responsables.html>

J-P.Schwindt, ed. (2005) *La représentation du temps dans la poésie augustéenne / Zur Poetik der Zeit in augusteischer Dichtung*. [time]

P.Hardie, ed. (2009), *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture*

M.Labate and G.Rosati, eds. (2013), *La costruzione del mito augusteo*.

J. Farrell and D.P. Nelis, eds. (2013), *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*.

P.Hardie, ed. (2016), *Augustan Poetry and the Irrational*

M.Gale and A.Chahoud, eds., *The Augustan Space* (2019)