

ON THE INTERSIGNIFICATION OF MONUMENTS IN AUGUSTAN ROME

MATTHEW ROLLER



SCHOLARS HAVE LONG RECOGNIZED THAT THE ERECTION of public monuments in Rome, from the middle Republic into the Augustan age, was an arena of intense competition. Roman aristocrats throughout this era commemorated successes, especially as magistrates and generals, by paying for and erecting temples, porticoes, honorific statues, arches, and so on. They also tended to select the location and form of their monuments to create a studied contrast with preexisting monuments. Thus, new monuments might seek to appropriate their predecessors' prestige, or alternatively, to modify, reposition, or supersede these predecessors, leaving them and their dedicators in the shadow of the later, and allegedly greater, achievement.¹ The dynamics of reference, inclusion, modification, and appropriation that mark this competition via monumental forms stand in a potentially productive relationship with the concept of "intertextuality" as developed by scholars of Roman poetry over the past three or four decades. Comparison of and interchange between these approaches may produce some cognitive gain both for literary scholars and for those interested in the symbolic dimensions of the visual and built environment.

This comparison requires terminology that can apply to both literary and architectural/iconographical sign systems, or that allows these systems to be described in parallel ways. To this end, we could perhaps broaden the range of the term "intertextuality" to make it refer to iconographical and architectural phenomena as well as literary ones. Yet we

¹For such competition in the middle Republic, see, in general, Hölkeskamp 2003, 221–26; 2004, 151–57. Specific cases: McDonnell 2006, 212–28; Hölscher 1980, 353. In the late Republic, the phenomenon is especially well documented for the era of Marius and Sulla: Hölscher 1980, 356–58, 369; 2001, 207–10; and Stein-Hölkeskamp (forthcoming). Roller 2010a, 156–63, discusses the building-and-demolition battles involving Cicero and Clodius in the 50s B.C.E. For Octavian/Augustus' use of monuments to appropriate his rivals' prestige or to outstrip them, see Zanker 1988, 37–42, 65–71. Orlin 1997, 66–72, downplays the competitive significance of temple vowing by Republican magistrates, emphasizing the consensus represented in senatorial grants of permission. Yet there are undoubtedly elements of both competition and consensus in these moves.

would have to be careful, at every point, to understand “textuality” in its broad, ecumenical, structuralist and poststructuralist sense of any interworked system of construable signs,² so as not to privilege the literary over the visual. Alternatively, we could leave the term “intertextuality” to refer only to literary phenomena and employ a different term—say, “intersignification”—to label such phenomena in sign systems beyond the literary, or in systems of signification more generally. For this article, I adopt the latter approach, which seems to minimize the potential for confusion and ambiguity.

In the following pages, I present two case studies of Augustan-era monuments that involve inclusion of, reference to, or modification of pre-existing monuments, in whole or in part. I contend that the relationship of intersignification so established between the older and newer monuments produces, in each case, an implicit narrative that carries moral and political weight. Comparing the dynamics of monumental intersignification with those of literary intertextuality will reveal both similarities and differences in the ways that these sign systems make meaning. I conclude the article with some thoughts about the characteristics of intersignification in general: how later constellations of signs in any given sign system, and also across sign systems, encounter earlier constellations of signs and produce meaning from these encounters.

Let us turn to the first case study.³ In 260 B.C.E., early in the First Punic War, the consul Gaius Duilius defeated the Carthaginians in a naval battle off Mylae, a coastal town in northeastern Sicily. The story goes that this was not only the Romans’ first naval victory ever but also their first set naval battle, in which the Romans employed their first purpose-built fleet of warships. Three contemporary or near-contemporary monuments commemorated this victory. First, Duilius celebrated a so-called “naval triumph,” itself the first of its kind.⁴ Second, like many other mid-Republican commanders, he erected a temple—in this case, to Janus in the Forum Holitorium—presumably paid for from the spoils of victory.

²This description of “textuality” is indebted to Geertz’s (1973, 14) definition of “culture.” However, this semiotic concept of “culture” as a system of signs, whose interpretation proceeds by analogy with reading a text, is widespread in structuralist and poststructuralist theory.

³This discussion derives from Roller 2009, 219–23, though expanded and with different emphasis; see 219, n. 11, for full sources.

⁴The differences between the regular triumph and the *triumphus navalis* (ten more are attested: *InscrIt* 13.1, 76–81, 548–56; list at 636) are somewhat obscure; Östenberg 2009, 46–50, provides discussion.

A major monument, this temple showed its dedicator's concern to secure the *pax deorum* (i.e., to thank and credit the gods appropriately for their support) and to adorn the city with significant buildings. But it also specifically commemorated Duilius' achievements: for it stood on the triumphal route, providing a backdrop to future triumphs and reminding later victors and spectators of this earlier victory and triumph. It also probably contained an inscription naming its dedicator and paintings illustrating the battle, thus linking the creation of the temple explicitly with this victory and victor.⁵ Third, Duilius devised a victory monument whose form was novel at the time: atop a podium stood a column, to which were affixed the bronze rams (*rostra*) of captured enemy ships; and atop this column stood a statue of the victor. The podium bore an inscription, a version of which survives; it narrates highlights of the battle, mentions the triumph, and quantifies the value of the spoils. This monument was erected near the *comitium* in the northwest corner of the Forum Romanum.⁶ Via his "naval triumph," his temple to Janus and the rostral column, then, Duilius was commemorated as an exemplary performer of a great deed, a performance though which he displayed his military valor and his piety.

Now we leap ahead two and a quarter centuries. In 36 B.C.E., Octavian and Agrippa defeated Sextus Pompeius in a naval battle off Naulochos, which lies just 15 kilometers east of Mylae on the coast of Sicily. The sprawling scale of ancient naval combat makes it likely that the later battle took place on much the same stretch of sea as the earlier one. Appian says that Octavian's victory was commemorated by a rostral column topped by a gilded honorific statue and bearing an inscription; this monument was erected in the Forum Romanum (its exact location within the forum is unspecified).⁷ Plainly, this column replicated the form of Duilius' column, while surpassing it at least one respect (namely, the gilding of the statue); and, standing in at least the same general area, it

⁵For building on the triumphal route, see Hölkeskamp 2003, 220–27; Hölscher 2001, 194–98. On the temple, see Tac. *Ann.* 2.49 (n. 12 below), with Beck 2005, 226–27; Bleckmann 2002, 122–24; Coarelli, *LTUR* 3.90–91 (1996); and Ziolkowski 1992, 61–62.

⁶On this monument, see Plin. *Nat.* 34.20; Sil. 6.663–69; Quint. *Inst.* 1.7.12; Serv. *in Georg.* 3.29; and the Forum Augustum *elogium* (n. 13 below). Discussion by Chioffi, *LTUR* 1.309 (1993); Jordan-Ruwe 1995, 58–60; Sehlmeier 1999, 117–19; Kondratieff 2004, 7–10. On its inscription, see n. 11 below.

⁷App. *BCiv.* 5.130: ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐψηφισμένων τιμῶν ἐδέχετο . . . ἐπὶ κίονος ἐν ἀγορᾷ χρύσεος ἐστάναι μετὰ σχήματος οὐδὲρ ἔχων εἰσηλθε, περικειμένων τῷ κίονι νεῶν ἐμβόλων. καὶ ἔστηκεν ἢ εἰκῶν, ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχουσα, ὅτι "τὴν εἰρήνην ἐστασιασμένην ἐκ πολλοῦ συνέστησε κατὰ τε γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν."

must have invited comparison.⁸ Precisely such a monument is depicted on a denarius of Octavian dating to 29–27 B.C.E.; this is most probably, if not certainly, the Naulochos monument.⁹ In the form and placement of his monument, then, Octavian claimed that his own naval victory bore significant comparison with the earlier one on the same battlefield—that his victory matched, indeed surpassed, its predecessor in terms of the valor displayed by the victor and the service provided to the *res publica*.¹⁰

Yet the impressiveness of this claim depends upon Duilius being remembered as a glorious victor: for the better Duilius was, the better Octavian is in surpassing him. And indeed Octavian (or rather, Augustus) took pains to secure that memory. Consider first the inscription from Duilius' column. Scholars have long recognized, from its letter forms and the *luna marble* on which it is inscribed, that it was carved no earlier than the Augustan period. In content and linguistic style, however, it clearly seeks to represent aspects of a presumed original of the third century B.C.E. Earlier generations of scholars entertained dates for this inscription as late as the reign of Claudius. In recent years, however, opinion has gravitated toward an Augustan date, with the (re)carving being understood in the context of Augustus' wide-ranging restorations of older monuments and his general reconfiguration of the west end of the Forum Romanum.¹¹ Augustus' effort to ensure the survival of Duilius' monument, and its legibility as an "old" monument in particular (complete with archaic or archaizing language on the restored inscription), has special point if, indeed, Augustus' own rostral column derived meaning

⁸For the effect produced by these columns' relative proximity, see Bleckmann 2002, 119, 121; Sehlmeier 1999, 256.

⁹Denarius: *RIC* 1² 271, with legend IMP CAESAR. For discussion of the monumental type of the rostral column in relation to this numismatic depiction, see Kondratieff 2004, 9; Sehlmeier 1999, 255–59; Jordan-Ruwe 1995, 64–66; and Palombi, *LTUR* 1.308 (1993).

¹⁰By appropriating the monuments and iconography of a famous victory over a feared external enemy, Octavian also parades his recent victory, won over Roman citizens, as a "normal" victory over foreigners—or, at the least, he occludes the distinction between civil and external war (so Bleckmann 2002, 121; Zanker 1988, 41–42). The inscription on his monument, as reported by Appian—"the peace, long disturbed by factional strife, he reestablished on both land and sea" (n. 7 above)—fully supports this effort by its vagueness, which bears instructive comparison to the Duilius inscription's precise listing of the enemy, the commander, the booty, and so on.

¹¹Inscription from Duilius' column: *CIL* I² 25 = *CIL* 6.1300 = 6.31591 = 6.37040 = *ILS* 65 = *ILLRP* 319 = *InscrIt* 3.13.69. Recent arguments for an Augustan date include Solin 1981, 111–14; Chioffi, *LTUR* 1.309 (1993); and esp. Bleckmann 2002, 118–24. For Augustus restoring past commanders' monuments, see Suet. *Aug.* 31.5: *opera cuiusque manentibus titulis restituit*.

and value from its evocation of and relation to Duilius'. Yet Augustus' efforts on behalf of Duilius do not stop there. Tacitus reports that the temple of Janus in the Forum Holitorium was restored and rededicated by Augustus and Tiberius. Tacitus names the temple's original dedicator and occasion—information that may have come from an inscription in the building itself, an inscription no doubt still legible thanks to the very restoration reported here.¹²

Beyond these restorations, Augustus also created an entirely new monument to Duilius: he included him in the gallery of “great men” (*principes viri* or *summi viri*) in the Forum Augustum, which was dedicated in 2 B.C.E. Surviving sculptural fragments indicate that the honorands were portrayed by marble statues slightly larger than life size. Beneath these statues were mounted *elogia*, inscriptions relating the achievements by which each honorand warranted inclusion in this exalted club. Duilius' *elogium* from the Forum Augustum survives in a fragmentary but substantially reconstructible state: it describes his victory at Mylae and expressly refers to other monuments that likewise attest the amplitude of this achievement.¹³ Among the monuments so mentioned is Duilius' rostral column with its statue: “for him a statue with a column was erected near the precinct of Vulcan” (n. 13, lines 5–6). The temple may also be mentioned here, if Chioffi's bravura supplement of line 7 is correct (based on placing a fragment with a single sure letter): “From the booty he built

¹²Tac. *Ann.* 2.49: [sc. Tiberius] *isdem temporibus deum aedes vetustate aut igni abolitas coeptasque ab Augusto dedicavit: . . . et Iano templum quod apud forum holitorium C. Duilius struxerat, qui primus rem Romanam prospere mari gessit triumphumque navalem de Poenis meruit* (“Around the same time Tiberius dedicated sanctuaries of the gods, destroyed by age or fire, whose restoration had been begun by Augustus: [four temples listed] . . . and the temple of Janus built in the Forum Holitorium by Gaius Duilius, who was the first to perform a military feat at sea and earned a naval triumph over the Carthaginians”). The *elogium*-like information on Duilius may have an epigraphic source—either an inscription in the temple, or perhaps the Forum Augustum *elogium* (see next note).

¹³For this *elogium*, see now the edition and discussion (with further references) by Chioffi, *CIL* 6.40952 (= vol. 6.8.3 (2000) p. 4858). Chioffi's text is roughly as follows:

[—]
 [—] navis ꝓ[toginta et Macellam]
 [oppidum c]epit. pri[m]us d[e Poeneis n]aval[em trium]-
 [phum egit. h]uic per[mis]sum est u[t ab e]pulis domum
 5 [cum tibi]ne ꝓ[t] f]unali rediret. [ei s]tatua ꝓ[um]
 [columna] ꝓ[r]ope a]ream Vulc[ani] ꝓ[os]i[t]a est].
 [aedem apud foru]m ho[litorium ex spoliis Iano fecit].

See Kondratieff 2004, 11 n. 40 for additional considerations and new suggestions for supplements in ll. 1–2.

a temple to Janus in the Forum Holitorium.” That Augustus so pointedly mentions these old monuments in this context—monuments already, or soon to be, restored—suggests not only his special interest in ensuring their survival but also his intention to anchor them firmly in the new monumental landscape that he was then creating.

This Augustan monumental landscape was, moreover, oriented toward Augustus’ own achievements. Augustus himself suggests (according to Suetonius) that he put forward the “great men” of the Forum Augustum as *exempla* for himself and other leading men to emulate; scholars further note that he himself claimed, at least implicitly and in other contexts, to have surpassed these legendary men’s achievements.¹⁴ The *elogium* for Duilius, in referring to the old rostral column/statue and (possibly) the temple of Janus, not only reminded its Augustan-era and later viewers of Duilius’ achievements and of their prior commemoration in monumental form, but also invited them to go and see those monuments for themselves: thus, Augustus places himself and these viewers on the same level as admirers and potential emulators of the exemplary hero. Furthermore, those monuments were there to be seen because they had been restored, which these viewers would no doubt notice, and ponder Augustus’ piety and reverence toward this ancient hero. But they would also notice the Naulochos monument, that close imitator of Duilius’ column, and recognize Augustus’ claim to a greater achievement. Thus the new Augustan monuments—the Naulochos column and the Forum Augustum statue and *elogium*—work together to provide a new frame for the two old (but restored) monuments and draw them into a new, teleological story. Duilius’ victory is decisively confirmed as a great achievement, but is at the same time positioned as a *precursor* (see below) to Octavian’s allegedly similar yet greater victory.

In the play of intersignification among these monuments, we can point to specific effects that resemble the intertextual strategies by which poets position themselves relative to predecessors. Let us proceed from a greater to a lesser degree of “exactness” of reference to the predecessor. We have seen that the Augustan monumental program incorporates the Duilian originals themselves, more or less unchanged (as far as restora-

¹⁴Suet. *Aug.* 31.5: *professus et edicto: commentum id se, ut ad illorum < . . . > velut ad exemplar et ipse, dum viveret, et insequentium aetatium principes exigerentur a civibus* (“and he declared in an edict that he had thought it up [the gallery of great men], so that he himself, as long as he lived, and leading men of later ages might be measured against these men’s <?standard>, as though against a paradigm, by the citizens”; cf. *RG* 8.5); discussion by Spannagel 1999, 326–44; Frisch 1980.

tion allows), while giving these originals a new frame and context. To include a predecessor in this way has an authorizing effect analogous to a later poet quoting an earlier poet's exact words, as Conte argues.¹⁵ For by inclusion and quotation, an upstart looking to enter some field of competitive endeavor shows he has selected an exemplary model; and by bringing himself into the same plane and focus as the model, he seeks to appropriate some of the model's prestige and credibility. A looser form of reference is on display when Octavian creates a new monument—the Naulochos monument—that closely reproduces the elements and form of an earlier monument. This is, perhaps, the monumental analogue of a literary situation in which a later poet reworks a particular passage of an earlier poet, incorporating particular *loci* and elements of the original structure in order to make the reference clear. In such a case, the successor is, as it were, merging his own voice with his predecessor's, but with the ultimate aim of making a different and grander claim. Most distant in form and iconography from any preceding Duilian monument is the statue and *elogium* in the Forum Augustum. Honorific statue and text are, of course, present on Duilius' rostral column, but here Augustus has eliminated the other elements—the rostra and the column—and thereby placed the two remaining elements in a completely different relationship to one another. He has also placed them in a new visual and programmatic context overall, namely, a series of other such statues and *elogia* within the gallery of *principes viri*. The semantics of honorific monumentality are entirely recognizable in the Forum Augustum statue and *elogium* honoring Duilius, but more by virtue of their participation in a genre than in their close mimesis of the elements and syntax of a particular model. Here, the literary analogue may be the author who simply chooses to write in the same genre as some predecessor.¹⁶ Hinds has argued that such intertextual strategies, whether more "exact" or less, allow poets to configure their predecessors as "precursors."¹⁷ This means that they not only create space for themselves in a poetic tradition, but also configure that tradition teleologically, to make it point to themselves

¹⁵ Conte 1986, 57–60, 69–71, analyzes direct quotation of Ennius in Ovid, and of Lucilius in Persius: "The dominant function here is the 'authentication' of a new text by an authoritative old one" 59. (And so I have just done myself, by quoting Conte: for in scholarship too, the intertextual strategies of quotation, paraphrase, and attribution are means of authentication and authorization, and such activity usually takes place in footnotes.)

¹⁶ On tighter and looser degrees of intertextual connection, see, e.g., Conte 1986, 66–67; Conte and Barchiesi 1989, 93–95; and Hinds 1998, 52–55.

¹⁷ Hinds 1998, 55–63.

as a presumptive acme.¹⁸ Augustus' engagement with Duilius produces a similar teleological effect in the arena of competition for military glory, a competition carried out first on the battlefield and then—perhaps more importantly—through the erection of monuments. The sign system that communicates this monumental meaning is not literary, however, but iconographical, architectural, and topographical.

My second case study is quite different, involving a building known as the *porticus Liviae*.¹⁹ Cassius Dio describes this monument's genesis as follows (Dio Cass. 54.23.1, 5–6):²⁰

κάν τῷ αὐτῷ τούτῳ ἔτει Οὐήδιος Πωλίων ἀπέθανεν, ἀνὴρ ἄλλως μὲν οὐδὲν μνήμης ἄξιον παρασχόμενος (καὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἀπελευθέρων ἐγεγόνει καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἵππευσιν ἐξητάζετο καὶ λαμπρὸν οὐδὲν εἰργάσατο), ἐπὶ δὲ δὴ τῷ πλούτῳ τῆ τε ὠμότητι ὀνομαστότατος γενόμενος, ὥστε καὶ ἐς ἱστορίας λόγον ἐσελθεῖν. . . . τοιοῦτος οὖν δὴ τις ὁ Πωλίων ὦν ἐτελεύτησεν . . . τῷ Αὐγούστῳ τοῦ τε κλήρου συχνὸν μέρος . . . καταλιπών, τῷ τε δήμῳ περικαλλῆς ἔργον οἰκοδομηθῆναι κελεύσας. ὁ οὖν Αὐγουστος τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ ἐς ἔδαφος προφάσει τῆς ἐκείνου κατασκευῆς, ὅπως μὴδὲν μνημόσυνον ἐν τῇ πόλει ἔχη, καταβαλὼν περιστῶνον ὠκοδομήσατο, καὶ οὐ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ τοῦ Πωλιωνος ἀλλὰ τὸ τῆς Λιουίας ἐπέγραψεν.

In that same year [15 B.C.E.] Vedius Pollio died, a man offering nothing worthy of remembrance, since he stemmed from freedmen, arrived in the equestrian order, and did no brilliant deeds, but who did gain renown for his wealth and cruelty, so as to warrant mention in a history. . . . being such a man Pollio died, . . . leaving a large portion of his estate to Augustus . . . and requesting that a work of great beauty be built for the people. So Augustus leveled his house to the ground, allegedly to prepare this work, but so that Pollio would have no monument in the city, and built a quadriporticus, inscribing not Pollio's name, but Livia's.

Having mentioned Vedius' cruelty and extravagance, Dio exemplifies it by relating the lurid anecdote (54.23.2–4) of Vedius threatening to throw a slave to the lampreys in his fishponds, for having broken a crystal drinking vessel at a dinner party Vedius was hosting. Augustus, who was present at this dinner party, saved the slave and punished Vedius in turn by ordering all of his crystal to be broken. Dio thus depicts Augustus as being repelled by Vedius' threat to consume the slave's life (and his own wealth) in so cruel a manner, and implies that such comportment justified Augustus' decision to deprive Vedius of a monument.

¹⁸ See also Hinds 1998, chap. 3 *passim*, and Edmunds 2001, 159–63.

¹⁹ This discussion derives from Roller 2010a, 163–66, with different emphasis.

²⁰ All translations are my own.

To make sense of the disposition of Vedius' house, and to grasp how the succession of structures on this site display intersignification, we must here introduce the (only) other text that addresses the origins of the *porticus Liviae*. The passage, from Book 6 of Ovid's *Fasti*, follows (6.639–46):

disce tamen, veniens aetas: ubi Livia nunc est
 porticus, immensae tecta fuere domus;
 urbis opus domus una fuit spatiumque tenebat
 quo brevius muris oppida multa tenent.
 haec aequata solo est, nullo sub crimine regni,
 sed quia luxuria visa nocere sua.
 sustinuit tantas operum subvertere moles
 totque suas heres perdere Caesar opes.

Learn, ages to come: where Livia's portico now is, was a vast house: a single house was a city-sized construction and sprawled over an area larger than many a town encloses within its walls. This was leveled to the ground . . . because it was deemed harmful on account of its *luxuria*. Caesar had the mettle to overturn so massive a structure and, heir though he was, to destroy so much of his own wealth.

Ovid draws attention here to the extraordinary size and luxurious appointments of Vedius' house (incidentally corroborating Dio's remarks about Vedius' wealth and conspicuous consumption): it was as big as a city, and its *luxuria* incurred Augustus' displeasure. But Livia's portico was equally large, since it covered the same site, and was luxurious as well. For Dio implies that the portico did indeed fulfill Vedius' stipulation that something "extremely beautiful" be built for the people; Augustus snubbed Vedius only insofar as he put Livia's name on it rather than Vedius'. Also, the fragments of the *forma urbis* depicting the portico's plan reveal an ample colonnade with niches for statuary, opening up within a densely built urban environment; the structure must indeed have been astonishingly expansive and beautiful.²¹

Yet there is a critical difference between these structures. The transition from Vedius' luxurious *domus* to Livia's luxurious portico entails the turning outward of *luxuria* into the civic sphere. Scholars reasonably suggest that the conspicuous *luxuria* in the domestic or private sphere associated with Vedius, Maecenas, and certain other triumviral/early

²¹ *FUR* fragments 10ilmnopqrs, 11a, 12; in general, see Panella, *LTUR* 4.127–29 (1999); Zanker 1987, 475–83, discusses the portico's urbanism and magnificence.

Augustan figures came to seem at odds with the conspicuous moderation that emerged as a hallmark of the Augustan regime—moderation exemplified in Augustus’ own personal style, his moral legislation, and so on.²² Augustus sought, however, not to squelch the competitive ethos that fostered these displays of domestic *luxuria*, but to harness it for the common good by channeling it into a competition to adorn the city with fine public buildings. In this he led by example. The replacement of Vedius’ house by Livia’s portico, therefore, places these two structures in a pointed, dialogical relationship: each structure comes into its distinctively Augustan meaning precisely through its contrast with the other. *Luxuria* is the vector of the comparison, the trace of the earlier structure that survives in the latter. But its vicious manifestation in the first instance as private extravagance has been transformed, in the second case, into a virtuous manifestation as civic magnificence. Thus the transition from *domus* to *porticus* on this site involves a capping or teleology—a narrative of moral improvement leading to a definitive Augustan statement of correct values. This is precisely the dynamic of intersignification we observed above in Augustus’ incorporation and capping of Duilius.²³

This second case, however, entails a complication. If we accept our sources’ suggestion that Vedius’ house was completely leveled and left no physical trace (*haec aequata solo est*, *Ov. Fasti* 6.643; τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ ἐς ἔδαφος . . . καταβάλων, *Dio Cass.* 54.23.6), then we must ask how information about this house and its allegedly vicious *luxuria* was transmitted to users of the portico such that they could recognize this latter structure’s own *luxuria* as virtuous by comparison. This is no easy question. Dio, indeed, suggests that Augustus intentionally deprived posterity of the “source” sign to which the *porticus Liviae* referred via intersignification, by seeing to it that Vedius had no urban monument. Absent such a monument, how could information about Vedius and his house persist so that later viewers—such as Dio and Ovid—could perceive the intersignification and “get” the Augustan message? In such a case, the necessary information can only be communicated through another sign

²² E.g., Syme 1961, 28–29; Flory 1984, 324–30; Edwards 1993, 164–68; Newlands 2002, 233–42.

²³ Additional Augustan values are also embedded in the *porticus Liviae*. That the portico is named for Augustus’ wife, and that she dedicated a shrine to Concordia inside the portico (*Ov. Fasti* 6.637–38), have caused scholars to suggest, reasonably, that the complex also focuses attention on the emperor’s marriage. The portico and shrine present this relationship as an exemplary model of marital “concord” and so instantiate the marital and sexual mores promoted in Augustus’ familial legislation of 18–17 B.C.E. On these matters, see Flory 1984.

system altogether, one that stands apart from the system in which the original configuration of signs was assembled prior to being obliterated. Here, that “outside” sign system is verbal: presumably word of mouth at first, and later documentary or literary writing, communicating the key information about Vedius and his house.²⁴ The only such texts surviving to us are the passages of Dio and Ovid under discussion, although the relevant information was no doubt more widely available in the early to high empire. It is this verbal sign system alone that supplements the lack created in the original, architectural sign system by the demolition of the house. Only through this channel can readers and viewers learn that a preceding structure existed, that the succession of structures involves intersignification, and that an Augustan moral message can be inferred from this intersignification.²⁵

In contrast to our first case study, where we found parallels for certain kinds of intersignification in the realm of intertextuality, for the second case study, no purely (inter)textual analogues are to hand. I see two reasons for this difference. First, intersignification that takes place between two sign systems—as when architectural signs require a verbal supplement—obviously has no parallel within any single sign system. Second, even within the sign systems of architecture and monumentality, the specific monumental dynamics observed in the latter case simply do not, unlike the former case, find ready parallels within textuality. In the latter case, intersignification arises from the spatial collocation, appearance and disappearance, and temporal succession of the structures. These particular effects depend upon built structures being singular and existing within specific, circumscribed intervals of time and space. Literary texts, in contrast, lack this singularity, perishability, and spatial dimensionality. For once created, a literary text that is copied, circulated, and recopied on papyrus exists indefinitely, hence cannot easily be made to disappear altogether. And since it exists in multiple, portable copies, it has no necessarily fixed physical location relative to other texts. Hence, there is no purely textual parallel to the kind of intersignification that arises from the succession of singular structures on a given site. Yet this does not

²⁴The most general term for such an “outside” sign could be “paraseme,” on analogy with the term “paratext.”

²⁵Dio expressly raises the question of explication via alternative sign systems when he says that, although Vedius was (rightly) deprived of a built monument, he does nevertheless warrant mention in historiography (§54.23.1). Dio thus suggests that these different commemorative media have different criteria for inclusion, hence that he can monumentalize in historiographical prose what Augustus wouldn’t monumentalize in architecture. Vedius gets his monument in the end, but it is written by literary authors, not built by Augustus.

mean that monumental intersignification is inherently more varied and diverse than literary intertextuality: the latter can produce effects without parallel in the former. For example, since words have an auditory dimension that monuments lack, intertextual phenomena arising from metrical or phonetic repetition or other acoustic patterning—which have been heavily studied by scholars of intertextuality²⁶—have no monumental analogue. To draw the inevitably banal conclusion, the range of possible effects in each sign system exhibits some overlap and some divergence; in certain cases, we can observe parallels between the effects that are possible in each system, and in other cases, we cannot.

Simply to catalogue differences and similarities between the intertextuality of literature and the intersignification of built monuments is, however, surely too narrow an approach to the problem of intersignification in general. Any given sign system is uniquely anchored in culture, and its signs relate to one another in distinctive ways; therefore, similarities detected between two particular sign systems do not necessarily indicate features of intersignification that are valid in general. Nevertheless, I suspect (pending more study) that certain effects arising from intersignification occur in, and have similar functions in, many or most sign systems. For example, strategies of incorporation and imitation, including capping and teleological representations, seem likely to be found in many sign systems, as later manipulators of signs in any given system seek to define their place in relation to forebears. We observed this dynamic in both case studies and noted its occurrence in Latin poetry; it may well occur more generally.²⁷ I further suspect that “genres” exist in many sign systems—strategic assemblages of signs into structures that are differentiated from one another, creating subsystems that are to some extent distinctive and durable within the overall sign system. A rostral column, equestrian statue, and triumphal arch may each constitute a “genre” in the sign system of public monuments; and in architecture, particular building types such as temples, porticoes, basilicas, or *domus* may function likewise. Consequently, intersignification that depends on crossing or mixing genres, a topic of longstanding interest to scholars of intertextuality,²⁸ may be

²⁶ E.g., Conte and Barchiesi 1989, 101–5; Wills 1996, 18–20, with further references.

²⁷ Pasquali 1951 [1942], one of the foundational texts for the study of intertextuality (or “allusive art”) in Roman poetry, shares this suspicion: he notes in passing (12–13) that “allusive” effects like those he describes for poetry can also be observed in music, painting, sculpture, and architecture.

²⁸ Such intertextual effects were investigated in the early twentieth century under the rubric *Kreuzung der Gattungen*. For more recent studies, see Conte’s analysis of Virg. *Ecl.* 10 (1986, 100–129) and his remarks on Propertius’ and Ovid’s manipulations of genre

found in many sign systems. An example from architecture is the use of columns and pediments—characteristic elements of civic architecture, especially temples—in ostentatious elite *domus*, an appropriation that has specific ideological effects.²⁹ Finally, symbolic supplements imported from one sign system to “complete” the meaning of an ensemble of signs in another system, such as we encountered in the second case study, may also be widespread. For instance, certain mythological panel paintings from Pompeii engage with Ovidian mythological narratives, particularly in their modes of mimesis and the ways they manipulate the viewer’s gaze; thus, the poems may affect how readers/viewers perceive the paintings, and vice versa.³⁰ Also, if one hopes to understand the sexual and power relations implied in literary descriptions and visual representations of Roman dining, one must have prior knowledge of the semiotics of bodily posture and position in the Roman *convivium*.³¹ Perhaps, however, this is only to say that no sign system by itself contains the entire universe and that no constellation of signs is fully construable from the resources contained within that sign system alone. If so, then intersignification is an inevitable and universal phenomenon.³²

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
e-mail: mroller@jhu.edu

(1994, 121–28); also Farrell’s analysis of the “heroic” Homeric element in Virgil’s *Georgics* (1991, 207–72). My own understanding of genre is indebted to Conte, esp. 1994, 105–28.

²⁹Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 17–23, and chap. 2 *passim*.

³⁰See Valladares 2012.

³¹For example, the reader is on her own to deduce the exact order of reclining, and to infer the consequent status relations among diners, in Hor. *Serm.* 2.8; yet this deduction is essential to interpreting the narrator’s positionality correctly (further examples in Roller 2006, 98–123). Edmunds 2001, 144, calls such phenomena “quotations of nonliterary systems,” thus recognizing that intersignification may occur between different sign systems.

³²This article has been vastly improved by the comments and suggestions of the volume editors Yelena Baraz and Chris van den Berg, along with Alessandro Barchiesi, Carole Newlands, and an anonymous referee for *AJP*. Following oral presentation at the APA in 2012, it profited from engaged discussion by the panelists and audience. My thanks to all.

INTERTEXTUALITY



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acosta-Hughes, Benjamin. 2010. "The Prefigured Muse: Rethinking a Few Assumptions on Hellenistic Poetics." In *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*, ed. James Clauss and Martine Cuypers, 81–91. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Adamik, Tamas. 1976. "Pliny and Martial." *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestensis Sect. Class.* 4:63–72.
- Alfonsi, Luigi. 1955. "La composizione del *De senectute* ciceroniano." *Siculorum Gymnasium* 8:429–54.
- Allen, Graham. 2000. *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Arias, Paolo. 1987. "Euthymos di Locri." *ASNP* 17:1–8.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 1984a. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 1984b. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- . 1986. *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*. Ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Trans. Vern McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail, and Pavel Medvedev. 1978. *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics*. Trans. Albert Wehrle. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Baraz, Yelena. 2012. *A Written Republic: Cicero's Philosophical Politics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. 1984. *La traccia del modello: effetti omerici nella narrazione virgiliana*. Pisa: Giardini.
- . 1993. "Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*." *HSCP* 95:333–65.
- . 2001. *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*. London: Duckworth.
- Baroin, Catherine. 2010. "Ancestors as Models: Memory and the Construction of Gentilician Identity." In *Children, Memory, and Family Identity in Roman Culture*, ed. Veronique Dasen and Thomas Späth, 19–48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barrett, W. S. 2007. *Greek Lyric, Tragedy, and Textual Criticism. Collected Papers*. Ed. Martin West. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Barthes, Roland. 1977. *Image-Music-Text*. Ed. and trans. Stephen Heath. New York, N.Y.: Hill and Wang.
- . 1981. "Theory of the Text." In *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*, ed. Robert Young, 31–47. Boston: Routledge.
- Batstone, W. W. 2010a. "The Speeches of Catiline." In *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*, ed. D. H. Berry and Andrew Erskine, 227–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2010b. "Word at War: The Prequel." In *Citizens of Discord: Rome and Its Civil Wars*, ed. Brian Breed, Cynthia Damon, and Andreola Rossi, 45–72. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beck, Hans. 2005. *Karriere und Hierarchie: Die römische Aristokratie und die Anfänge des cursus honorum in der mittleren Republik*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Beecroft, Alexander. 2010. *Authorship and Cultural Identity in Early Greece and China: Patterns of Literary Circulation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berger, Adolf. 1953. *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law*. Philadelphia, Pa.: American Philosophical Society.
- Berti, Emanuele. 2007. *Scholasticorum Studia. Seneca il Vecchio e la cultura retorica e letteraria della prima età imperiale*. Pisa: Giardini.
- Beverlysluis, John. 2000. *Cross-Examining Socrates: A Defense of the Interlocutors in Plato's Early Dialogues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bicknell, Peter. 1966. "The Date of the Battle of the Sagra River." *Phoenix* 20:294–301.
- Bleckmann, Bruno. 2002. *Die römische Nobilität im ersten punischen Krieg*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Bliss, F. R. 1951. *Valerius Maximus and His Sources: A Stylistic Approach to the Problem*. Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Bloomer, Martin. 1992. *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Bodel, John. 1999. "The *Cena Trimalchionis*." In *Latin Fiction: The Latin Novel in Context*, ed. Heinz Hofmann, 38–51. London: Routledge.
- Bonanno, Daniela. 2010. *Ierone il Dinomenide: storia e rappresentazione*. Pisa: Serra.
- Bosch, Clemens. 1929. *Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Literatur der historischen Exempla*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Briggs, Charles, and Richard Bauman. 1992. "Genre, Intertextuality, and Social Power." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2:131–72.
- Brink, C. O., ed. 1971. *Horace: Ars Poetica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brownlow, Louis. 1960. *The Anatomy of the Anecdote*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- Cairns, Francis. 2000. "A Testimonium to a New Fragment of Philoxenus of Cythera? (Machon 7780 = fr. 9.1417 Gow and Hermesianax fr. 7.69–74 Powell)." *ZPE* 130:9–11.

- Campbell, David, ed. and trans. 1993. *Greek Lyric*, vol. 5. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Carozza, Valerio. 2007. "Resti di abitazioni alle pendici del Cispio." *The Journal of Fasti Online*. Rome: Associazione Internazionale di Archeologia Classica.
- Casali, Sergio. 2007. "Killing the Father: Ennius, Naeivius and Virgil's Julian Imperialism." In *Ennius Perennis: The Annals and Beyond*, ed. William Fitzgerald and Emily Gowers, 103–28. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
- Clauss, J. J. 1997. "'Domestici Hostes': The Nausicaa in Medea, the Catiline in Hannibal." *MD* 39:165–85.
- Clayton, Jay, and Eric Rothstein, eds. 1991. *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Coffee, Neil, et al. 2012. "Intertextuality in the Digital Age." *TAPA* 142:383–422.
- Connolly, Joy. 2007. *The State of Speech: Rhetoric and Political Thought in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Connor, Robert. 1987. "Tribes, Festivals and Processions; Civic Ceremonial and Political Manipulation in Archaic Greece." *JHS* 107:40–50.
- Connors, C. M. 1997. "Field and Forum: Culture and Agriculture in Roman Rhetoric." In *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*, ed. W. J. Dominik, 71–89. London: Routledge.
- Conte, G. B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- . 1994. *Genres and Readers*. Trans. Glenn Most. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Conte, G. B., and Alessandro Barchiesi. 1989. "Imitazione e arte allusiva: modi e funzioni dell'intertestualità." In *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica*, vol. 1, ed. Guglielmo Cavallo, Paolo Fedeli, and Andrea Giardina, 81–114. Rome: Salerno.
- Costabile, Felice. 1991. "Culti e miti delle divinità fluviali: Euthymos, il Kaikinos ed Acheloos." In *I ninfei di Locri Epizefiri. Architettura, culti erotici, sacralità delle acque*, ed. Felice Costabile, 195–226. Catanzaro: Rubettino.
- Craig, C. P. 1993. *Form as Argument in Cicero's Speeches: A Study of Dilemma*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- Criatore, Raffaella. 2001. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Crowley, Tony. 1989. "Bakhtin and the History of Language." In *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*, ed. Ken Hirschkop and David Shepherd, 68–90. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Culler, Jonathan. 1981. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Currie, Bruno. 2002. "Euthymos of Locri: A Case Study in Heroization in the Classical Period." *JHS* 122:24–44.
- . 2004. "Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes." In *Oral Performance and Its Context*, ed. Christopher Mackie, 49–69. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2005. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Curtius, E. R. 1953. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Damon, Cynthia. 2010. "Déjà vu or Déjà lu? History as Intertext." *PLLS* 14:375–88.
- Damschen, Gregor, and Andreas Heil, eds. 2004. *Epigrammaton liber decimus*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Dasen, Veronique, and Thomas Späth, eds. 2010. *Children, Memory, and Family Identity in Roman Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Caria, Francesco. 1974. "Cicerone *Cato Maior* 6–8 e Platone *Rsp.* 328e–330a." *Vichiana* 3:219–26.
- De Sensi Sestito, Giovanna. 1981. "I Dinomenidi nel basso e medio Tirreno fra Imera e Cuma." *MEFRA* 93:617–42.
- . 2009. "Temesa e Terina. Evoluzione storica e dinamiche territoriali nel *sinus ingens Terinaeus*." In *Dall' Oliva al Savuto. Studi e ricerche sul territorio dell' antica Temesa. Atti del convegno Campora San Giovanni (Amantea, CS), 15–16 Settembre 2007*, ed. Gioacchino La Torre, 103–17. Pisa: Serra.
- Détienne, Marcel, and Jean-Pierre Vernant. 1978. *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*. Trans. Janet Lloyd. Hassocks: Harvester Press.
- Dugan, John. 2005. *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eco, Umberto. 1992. *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. Ed. Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edmunds, Lowell. 2001. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . Forthcoming. "Pliny the Younger on His Verse and Martial's Non-Recognition of Pliny as a Poet." *HSCP* 107.
- Edwards, Catherine. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairweather, Janet. 1981. *Seneca the Elder*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Farrell, Joseph. 1991. *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History*. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press.
- Feeney, Denis. 1994. "Beginning Sallust's Catiline." *Prudentia* 26:139–46.
- . 2005. "The Beginnings of a Literature in Latin." *JRS* 95:226–40.
- . 2006. Review of Sander M. Goldberg, *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic: Poetry and Its Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. In *BMCR* 2006.08.45.
- . 2010. "Crediting *Pseudulus*: Trust, Belief, and the Credit Crunch in Plautus' *Pseudulus*." *CPh* 105:281–300.
- Finkelpearl, E. D. 1998. *Metamorphosis of Language in Apuleius: A Study of Allusion in the Novel*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Fischer-Hansen, Tobias, Thomas Nielsen, and Carmine Ampolo. 2004. "Sikelia." In *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis: An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation*, ed. Mogens Hansen and Thomas Nielsen, 172–248. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Fitzgerald, William. 2007. *Martial: The World of the Epigram*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- Flory, M. B. 1984. "Sic exempla parantur: Livia's Shrine to Concordia and the Porticus Liviae." *Historia* 33:309–30.
- Ford, Andrew. 2002. *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York, N.Y.: Pantheon Books.
- Fowler, Don. 1997. "On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies." *MD* 39:13–34.
- . 2000. *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press.
- Fowler, Don, and Julia Haig Gaisser. 1995. "Threads in the Labyrinth: Competing Views and Voices in Catullus 64." *AJP* 116:579–616.
- Freudenburg, Kirk. 2002. "Writing to/through Florus: Sampling the Addressee in Horace *Epistles* 2.2." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 47: 33–55. Rpt. *Oxford Readings in Horace: Satires and Epistles*, ed. Kirk Freudenburg, 416–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2009.
- Frisch, Peter. 1980. "Zu den Elogien des Augustusforums." *ZPE* 39:91–98.
- Gallagher, Catherine, and Stephen Greenblatt. 2000. *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- Gamberini, Federico. 1983. *Stylistic Theory and Practice in the Younger Pliny*. New York, N.Y.: Olms.
- Gazda, Elaine. 1995. "Roman Sculpture and the Ethos of Emulation: Reconsidering Repetition." *HSCP* 97:121–56.
- , ed. 2002. *The Ancient Art of Emulation: Studies in Artistic Originality and Tradition from the Present to Classical Antiquity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Gebhardt, U. C. J. 2009. *Sermo iuris: Rechtssprache und Recht in der augusteischen Dichtung*. Leiden: Brill.
- Geertz, Clifford 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York, N.Y.: Basic Books.
- Genette, Gerard. 1997. *Palimpsests*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Gibson, Roy, and Ruth Morello. 2012. *Reading the Letters of Pliny the Younger: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gilula, Dwora. 2000. "Stratonice, the Witty Harpist." In *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, ed. John Wilkins and David Braund, 423–33. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Giudice, Filippo. 1989. *Vasi e frammenti "Beazley" da Locri Epizefiri e ruolo di questa città lungo le rotte verso l'Occidente*. *Catalogo a cura di S. Valastro e F. Caruso*, vol. 1. Catania: Università di Catania.
- Goldberg, S. M. 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2005. *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic: Poetry and Its Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Goldhill, Simon. 1991. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2009. "The Anecdote: Exploring the Boundaries between Oral and Literate Performance in the Second Sophistic." In *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, ed. William Johnson and Holt Parker, 96–112. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gotter, Ulrich. 1996a. "Cicero und die Freundschaft: Die Konstruktion sozialer Normen zwischen römischer Politik und griechischer Philosophie." In *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt: Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewußtsein*, ed. Hans-Joachim Gehrke and Astrid Möller, 339–60. Tübingen: Narr.
- . 1996b. "Der Platonismus Ciceros und die Krise der Republik." In *Hellenismus. Beiträge zur Erforschung von Akkulturation und politischen Ordnung in den Staaten des hellenistischen Zeitalters*, ed. Bernd Funck, 543–59. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Gow, A. S. F., ed. 1965. *Machon: The Fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graziosi, Barbara. 2002. *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of the Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gunderson, Eric. 2000. "The History of Mind and the Philosophy of History in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*." *Ramus* 29:85–126.
- . 2003. *Declamation, Paternity, and Roman Identity: Authority and the Rhetorical Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2009. "The Rhetoric of Rhetorical Theory." In *Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*, ed. Erik Gunderson, 109–25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliwell, Stephen. 2002. *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Hardie, P. R. 1993. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Helm, Rudolf. 1940. "Beiträge zu Quellenforschung bei Valerius Maximus." *RM* 89:241–73.
- Henderson, J. G. W. 2001. "On Pliny on Martial on Pliny on Anon . . . : (*Epistles* 3.21 / *Epigrams* 10.19)." *Ramus* 30.1:56–87.
- . 2002. *Pliny's Statue: The Letters, Self-Portraiture, and Classical Arts*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Henle, Paul. 2009. "Language, Thought and Culture." In *Theory in Anthropology*, ed. R. A. Manners and David Kaplan, 421–31. Chicago, Ill.: Aldine.
- Hexter, Ralph. 2006. "Literary History as a Provocation to Reception Studies." In *Classics and the Uses of Reception*, ed. Charles Martindale and R. F. Thomas, 23–31. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Higham, Thomas. 1958. "Ovid and Rhetoric." In *Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide*, ed. N. I. Herescu, 32–48. Paris: Belles Lettres.

- Hinds, Stephen. 1997. "‘Proemio al Mezzo’: Allusion and the Limits of Interpretability." *MD* 39:113–22.
- . 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2010. "Between Formalism and Historicism." In *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies*, ed. Alessandro Barchiesi and Walter Scheidel, 369–85. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hirschkop, Ken. 1986. "Bakhtin, Discourse and Democracy." *NLR* 160:92–113.
- Hock, Ronald, and Edward O’Neils, eds. 1986. *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, vol. 1. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- Hoffer, S. E. 1999. *The Anxiety of Pliny the Younger*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- Hölkeskamp, Karl-Joachim. 2003. "Ikonen der *virtus*: exemplarische Helden (-taten) im monumentalen Gedächtnis der römischen Republik." In *Modelli eroici dall’antichità alla cultura europea*, ed. Alberto Barzanò et al., 213–37. Rome: Bretschneider.
- . 2004. *Senatus populusque Romanus: Die politische Kultur der Republik: Dimensionen und Deutungen*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Hollerbach, Hans-Rainer. 1964. *Zur Bedeutung des Wortes chreia*. Cologne: Gouder & Hansen.
- Hölscher, T. A. 1980. "Römische Siegesdenkmäler der späten Republik." In *Tainia: Festschrift für Roland Hampe*, ed. H. A. Cahn and Erika Simon, 351–71. Mainz: von Zabern.
- . 2001. "Die Alten vor Augen: politische Denkmäler und öffentliches Gedächtnis im republikanischen Rom." In *Institutionalität und Symbolisierung*, ed. Gert Melville, 183–211. Cologne: Böhlau.
- Hordern, James. 2000. "Machon and Philoxenus." *ZPE* 133:42.
- Howell, Peter. 1998. "Martial’s Return to Spain." In *Toto notus in orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation*, ed. Farouk Grewing, 173–86. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Hubbard, Thomas. 2004. "The Dissemination of Epinician Lyric: Pan-Hellenism, Reperformance, Written Texts." In *Oral Performance and Its Context*, ed. Christopher Mackie, 71–93. Leiden: Brill.
- Huelsenbeck, Bart. 2009. *Figures in the Shadows: Identities in Artistic Prose from the Anthology of the Elder Seneca*. Ph.D. diss., Duke University.
- Innes, D. C. 1977. "‘Quo usque tandem patiemini?’" *CQ* 27:468.
- Janan, Micaela. 2009. *Reflections in a Serpent’s Eye: Thebes in Ovid’s Metamorphoses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jauss, Hans. 1982. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Trans. Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Jenny, Laurent. 1982. "The Strategy of Form." In *French Literary Theory Today: A Reader*, ed. Tzvetan Todorov, trans. R. Carter, 34–63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jordan-Ruwe, Martina. 1995. *Das Säulenmonument: zur Geschichte der erhöhten Aufstellung antiker Porträtstatuen*. Bonn: Habelt.

- Juvan, Marko. 2005. "Generic Identity and Intertextuality." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 7.1: <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol7/iss1/4>.
- . 2008. *History and Poetics of Intertextuality*. West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press.
- Kaster, Robert. 1998. "Becoming 'CICERO'." In *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*, ed. Peter Knox and Clive Foss, 248–63. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- . 2001. "Controlling Reason: Declamation in Rhetorical Education at Rome." In *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, ed. Yun Lee Too, 317–37. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2005. *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2010. *Studies on the Text of Macrobius' Saturnalia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kenney, Edward. 1969. "Ovid and the Law." *YCS* 21:241–63.
- Klotz, Alfred. 1942. "Studien zu Valerius Maximus und den Exempla." *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften* 5. Munich: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Kondratieff, Eric. 2004. "The Column and Coinage of C. Duilius: Innovations in Iconography in Large and Small Media in the Middle Republic." *SCI* 23:1–39.
- Kraus, C. S., and A. J. Woodman. 1997. *Latin Historians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1969. *Sēmeiōtikē: Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Seuil.
- . 1980. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Ed. Leon Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, Leon Roudiez. New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press.
- . 1986. "Word, Dialogue, and Novel." In *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. Toril Moi, 34–61. New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press.
- Kroll, Wilhelm. 1924. *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Kunkel, Wolfgang. 1967. *Die römischen Juristen: Herkunft und soziale Stellung*. Köln: Böhlau.
- Kurke, Leslie. 1991. *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- . 2002. "Gender, Politics, and Subversion in the *Chreiai* of Machon." *PCPS* 48:20–65.
- Laird, Andrew. 1999. *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation and Latin Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- Langlands, Rebecca. 2008. "'Reading for the Moral' in Valerius Maximus: The Case of *Severitas*." *Cambridge Classical Journal* 54:160–87.

- . 2011. “Roman *Exempla* and Situation Ethics: Valerius Maximus and Cicero *De Officiis*.” *JRS* 101:100–122.
- La Penna, Antonio. 1968. *Sallustio e la “rivoluzione” romana*. Milan: Feltrinelli.
- La Torre, Gioacchino. 2002. *Un tempio arcaico nel territorio dell’ antica Temesa. L’edificio sacro in località di Campora san Giovanni*. Rome: Bretschneider.
- . 2009. “Venticinque anni dopo *Temesa e il suo territorio*. Nuovi dati e prospettive di ricerca.” In *Dall’ Oliva al Savuto. Studi e ricerche sul territorio dell’ antica Temesa. Atti del convegno Campora San Giovanni (Amantea, CS), 15–16 Settembre 2007*, ed. Gioacchino la Torre, 9–37. Pisa: Serra.
- Lawson, J. C. 1926. “*Peri Alibantōn*, Part II.” *CR* 40:116–21.
- Leeman, Anton. 1982. “Rhetorical Status in Horace, *Serm.* 2.1.” In *Rhetoric Revalued*, ed. Brian Vickers, 159–63. Binghamton, N.Y.: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies.
- Lefèvre, Eckard. 1989. “Plinius-Studien V: vom Römertum zum Ästhetizismus: Die Würdigungen des älteren Plinius (3,5), Silius Italicus (3,7) und Martial (3,21).” *Gymnasium* 96:113–28.
- . 1997. “Die künstlerische Bedeutung der Platon-Nachfolge in Ciceros *Cato* 6–9.” In *Beiträge zur antiken Philosophie: Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann*, ed. Hans-Christian Günther, 287–95. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- . 2007. “Der *Tithonos* Aristons von Chios und Ciceros *Cato*.” *Hermes* 135:43–65.
- . 2009. *Vom Römertum zum Ästhetizismus. Studien zu den Briefen des jüngeren Plinius*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Lefkowitz, Mary. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. London: Duckworth.
- LeVen, Pauline. Forthcoming. *The Many-Headed Muse: Tradition and Innovation in Late Classical Greek Lyric Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levene, David. 2010a. *Livy and the Hannibalic War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2010b. Introduction to Sara Rubinelli, *Ars Topica: The Classical Technique of Constructing Arguments from Aristotle to Cicero*, xvii–xxii. New York, N.Y.: Springer.
- Lorenz, Sven. 2004. “Waterscape with Black and White: Epigrams, Cycles, and Webs in Martial’s *Epigrammaton liber quartus*.” *AJP* 125:255–78.
- Luce, T. J. 1989. “Ancient Views of the Causes of Bias in Historical Writing.” *CP* 84:16–31.
- Luraghi, Nino. 1994. *Tirannidi arcaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia da Panezio di Leontini alla caduta dei Dinomenidi*. Florence: Olschki.
- . 2009. “The Importance of Being λόγιος.” *CW* 102:439–56.
- Mack, Burton. 1987. *Anecdotes and Arguments: The Chreia in Antiquity and Early Christianity*. Claremont, Calif.: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity.
- Mackie, Christopher, ed. 2004. *Oral Performance and Its Context*. Leiden: Brill.
- Maddoli, Gianfranco, ed. 1982. *Temesa e il suo territorio. Atti del colloquio di*

- Perugia e Trevi (30–31 maggio 1981)*. Taranto: Istituto per la storia e l'archeologia della Magna Grecia.
- . 1996. "La dedica degli Ipponiaty a Olimpia (*SEG XI 1211*) e il suo contesto storico." In *L'incidenza dell'antico. Studi in memoria di Ettore Lepore*, vol. 2, ed. Luisa Breglia Pulci Doria, 193–202. Naples: Luciano.
- Malcolm, D. A. 1979. "Quo usque tandem . . . ?" *CQ* 29:219–20.
- Mal-Maeder, Danielle van. 2007. *La fiction des déclamations*. Leiden: Brill.
- Maltby, Robert, ed. 2002. *Tibullus: Elegies: Text, Introduction, and Commentary*. Cambridge: Cairns.
- . 2008. "Verbal and Thematic Links between Poems and Books in Martial." *PLLS* 13:255–68.
- Marchesi, Ilaria. 2008. *The Art of Pliny's Letters: A Poetics of Allusion in the Private Correspondence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, Elaine. 2011. "Intertextuality: An Introduction." *The Comparatist* 35:148–51.
- Martindale, Charles. 1993. *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, John. 2006. "Roman Law and Roman History." In *A Companion to the Roman Empire*, ed. D. S. Potter, 477–91. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Mayer, Roland. 1991. "Graecia capta: The Roman Reception of Greek Literature." *PLILS* 8:289–307.
- McClure, Laura. 2003. "Subversive Laughter: The Sayings of Courtesans in Book 13 of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*." *AJP* 124:259–94.
- McDonnell, Myles. 2006. *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGill, Scott. 2005. "Seneca the Elder on Plagiarizing Cicero's *Verrines*." *Rhetorica* 23:337–46.
- . 2010. "Plagiarism or Imitation? The Case of Abronius Silo in Seneca the Elder's *Suasoriae* 2.19–20." *Arethusa* 43:113–31.
- . 2012. *Plagiarism in Latin Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGinn, Thomas. 2001. "Satire and the Law: The Case of Horace." *PCPS* 47:81–102.
- McGushin, Patrick. 1977. *C. Sallustius Crispus: Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Méthy, Nicole. 2007. *Les lettres de Pline le Jeune: Une représentation de l'homme*. Paris: Presses de l'Université Paris-Sorbonne.
- Moeser, Marion. 2002. *The Anecdote in Mark, the Classical World and the Rabbis*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. 1993. *The Development of Greek Biography*. 2d. ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Montrose, Louis. 1989. "Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture." In *The New Historicism*, ed. Harold Aram Veenser, 15–36. New York, N.Y.: Routledge.
- Morales, Helen. 1996. "The Torturer's Apprentice: Parrhasius and the Limits of Art." In *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, ed. Jaś Elsner, 182–209. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Morales, Helen, and Alison Sharrock. 2000. *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moretti, Gabriella. 1998. "The Poet in Court. Judiciary Model in Literary Criticism: The Case of Tiberius Claudius Donatus." In *Studi di retorica oggi in Italia, 1997*, ed. Adriano Pennaccini, 59–71. Bologna: Pitagora.
- Morgan, Teresa. 1998. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morrison, Andrew. 2007. *Performances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes*. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- Most, Glenn. 1993. "A Cock for Asclepius." *CQ* 43:96–111.
- Muecke, Frances. 1995. "Law, Rhetoric and Genre in Horace, *Sat.* 2.1." In *Homage to Horace*, ed. S. J. Harrison, 105–20. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nagy, Gregory. 1996. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Nauta, R. R. 2002. *Poetry for Patrons: Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian*. Leiden: Brill.
- Newlands, Carole. 2002. "Contesting Time and Space: *Fasti* 6.637–48." In *Ovid's Fasti: Historical Readings at Its Bimillennium*, ed. Geraldine Herbert-Brown, 225–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Newton-de Molina, David, ed. 1976. *On Literary Intention*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- O'Gorman, Ellen. 2009. "Intertextuality and Historiography." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, ed. Andrew Feldherr, 231–42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oliensis, Ellen. 2009. *Freud's Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Orlin, Eric. 1997. *Temples, Religion, and Politics in the Roman Republic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Orr, Mary. 2003. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Östenberg, Ida. 2009. *Staging the World: Spoils, Captives, and Representations in the Roman Triumphal Procession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parise, N. F. 1982. "Crotone e Temesa. Testimonianze di una monetazione d'impero." In *Temesa e il suo territorio. Atti del colloquio di Perugia e Trevi (30–31 maggio 1981)*, ed. Gianfranco Maddoli, 103–18. Taranto: Istituto per la storia e l'archeologia della Magna Grecia.
- Pasquali, Giorgio. 1951 [1942]. "Arte allusiva." In *Stravaganze quarte e supreme*, 11–20. Venice: Neri Pozza.
- Patterson, Annabel. 1995. "Intention." In *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, 135–46. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- Pelling, Christopher. Forthcoming. "Intertextuality, Plausibility, and Interpretation." Currently accessible online as a working paper at <http://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/documents/2011WP02PellingIntertextualityPlausibilityandInterpretation.pdf>.
- Peretz, Daniel. 2006. "The Roman Interpreter and His Diplomatic and Military Roles." *Historia* 55:451–70.

- Perry, Ellen. 2005. *The Aesthetics of Emulation in the Visual Arts of Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pitcher, R. A. 1999. "The Hole in the Hypothesis: Pliny and Martial Reconsidered." *Mnemosyne* 52:554–61.
- Polleichtner, Wolfgang. 2010. *Livy and Intertextuality: Papers of a Conference Held at the University of Texas at Austin, October 3, 2009*. Trier: WVT.
- Poncelet, Roland. 1957. *Cicéron traducteur de Platon. L'expression de la pensée complexe en latin classique*. Paris: Boccard.
- Powell, J. G. F., ed. 1988. *Cicero: Cato Maior de Senectute*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1995. "Cicero's Translations from Greek." In *Cicero the Philosopher*, ed. J. G. F. Powell, 273–300. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Prauscello, Lucia. 2011. "Digging Up the Musical Past: Callimachus and the New Music." In *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, ed. Benjamin Acosta-Hughes, Luigi Lehnus, and Susan Stephens, 289–308. Leiden: Brill.
- Pucci, Joseph Michael. 1998. *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Puelma, Mario. 1980. "Cicero als Platon-Übersetzer." *MH* 37:137–78.
- Putnam, Michael C. J. 2006. *Poetic Interplay: Catullus and Horace*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Quint, David. 1989. "Repetition and Ideology in the Aeneid." *MD* 23:9–54.
- Rawson, Elizabeth. 1985. *Intellectual Life in the Roman Republic*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Redfield, James. 2003. *The Locrian Maidens: Love and Death in Greek Italy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Reeve, C. D. C. 2005. "Philosophy, Craft, and Experience in the *Republic*." *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 43:20–40.
- Reiff, Arno. 1959. *Interpretatio, Imitatio, Aemulatio: Begriff und Vorstellung literarischer Abhängigkeit bei den Römern*. Ph.D. diss., University of Cologne.
- Rehman, Robert. 1976. "A Traditional Pattern of Imitation in Sallust and His Sources." *CPh* 71:97–105.
- Riginos, Alice Swift. 1976. *Platonica: The Anecdotes Concerning the Life and Writings of Plato*. Leiden: Brill.
- Robbins, Vernon. 1988. "The Chreia." In *Greco-Roman Literature and The New Testament: Selected Forms and Genres*, ed. David Aune, 1–23. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- Robinson, O. F. 1997. *The Sources of Roman Law: Problems and Methods for Ancient Historians*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge.
- Roller, Matthew. 1997. "Color-Blindness: Cicero's Death, Declamation, and the Production of History." *CPh* 92:109–30.
- . 1998. "Pliny's Catullus: The Politics of Literary Appropriation." *TAPA* 128:265–304.
- . 2006. *Dining Posture in Ancient Rome: Bodies, Values, and Status*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

- . 2009. “The Exemplary Past in Roman Historiography and Culture.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Historiography*, ed. Andrew Feldherr, 214–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2010a. “Demolished Houses, Monumentality, and Memory in Roman Culture.” *CA* 29:117–80.
- . 2010b. “Culture-Based Approaches.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies*, ed. Alessandro Barchiesi and Walter Scheidel, 234–49. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2012. “Between Unique and Typical: Roman *exempla* in a List.” University of Chicago, The Franke Institute for the Humanities. Chicago: 9 March 2012.
- Roscalla, Fabio. 2006. “Storie di plagi e di plagari.” In *L'autore e l'opera. Appropriazioni, appropriazioni, apocrifi nella Grecia antica*, ed. Fabio Roscalla, 69–102. Pisa: ETS.
- Rosenmeyer, Patricia. 1997. “Her Master’s Voice: Sappho’s Dialogue with Homer.” *MD* 39:123–49.
- Ross, D. O. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Russell, Donald. 1979. “*De Imitatione*.” In *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, ed. D. A. West and A. J. Woodman, 1–16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rutledge, Steven H. 2001. *Imperial Inquisitions: Prosecutors and Informants from Tiberius to Domitian*. London: Routledge.
- Rutter, N. K. 1997. *The Greek Coinages of Southern Italy and Sicily*. London: Spink.
- Schmitz, Thomas A. 2007. *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts. An Introduction*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Schulz, Fritz. 1946. *History of Roman Legal Science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schwartz, Eduard. 1897. “Die Berichte über die Catilinarische Verschwörung.” *Hermes* 32:554–608.
- Scodel, Ruth. 2001. “Poetic Authority and Oral Tradition in Hesiod and Pindar.” In *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*, ed. Janet Watson, 109–37. Brill: Leiden.
- Sehlmeyer, Markus. 1999. *Stadtrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Seo, Mira. 2000. “Plagiarism and Poetic Identity in Martial.” *AJP* 130:567–93.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R., ed. 1993. *Martial: Epigrams*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Sherwin-White, A. N. 1966. *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skidmore, Clive. 1996. *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Sklenář, Robert. 1998. “*La République des Signes*: Caesar, Cato, and the Language of Sallustian Morality.” *TAPA* 128:205–20.
- Skutsch, Otto, ed. 1985. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Solin, Heikki. 1981. "Analecta Epigraphica." *Arctos* 15:101–23.
- Spannagel, Martin. 1999. *Exemplaria Principis: Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums*. Heidelberg: Archäologie und Geschichte.
- Starr, Raymond. 1991. "Vergil in the Courtroom: The Law and Tiberius Claudius Donatus' *Interpretationae Vergilianae*." *Vergilius* 37:3–10.
- Stazio, Attilio. 1982. "Temesa. La documentazione numismatica." In *Temesa e il suo territorio. Atti del colloquio di Perugia e Trevi (30–31 maggio 1981)*, ed. Gianfranco Maddoli, 93–102. Taranto: Istituto per la storia e l'archeologia della Magna Grecia.
- Stein-Hölkeskamp, Elke. Forthcoming. "Macht, Memoria und Monumente: Marius, Sulla, und der Kampf um den öffentlichen Raum." *Klio* 95.
- Stemplinger, Eduard. 1912. *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Stewart, S. A. 1991. *Crimes of Writing: Problems in the Containment of Representation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strati, Roberta. 2000. "Il proemio del *Cato Maior* di Cicerone. Funzioni, stile e struttura." *Lexis* 18:193–212.
- Sussman, L. A. 1972. "The Elder Seneca's Discussion of the Decline of Roman Eloquence." *CSCA* 5:195–210.
- . 1978. *The Elder Seneca*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1995. "Sons and Fathers in the Major Declamations Ascribed to Quintilian." *Rhetorica* 13:179–92.
- Syme, Ronald. 1958. *Tacitus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1961. "Who Was Vedius Pollio?" *JRS* 51:23–30.
- Thomas, J. A. C. 1976. *Textbook of Roman Law*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Thomas, Richard. 1986. "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference." *HSCP* 90:171–98.
- Thomas, Rosalind. 2007. "Fame, Memorial, and Choral Poetry: The Origins of Epinikian Poetry—An Historical Study." In *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: From Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, ed. Simon Hornblower and Catherine Morgan, 141–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tissol, Garth. 2002. "Heroic Parody and the Life of Exile: Dialogic Reflections on the Career of Ovid." In *Bakhtin and the Classics*, ed. Robert Bracht Branham, 137–57. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.
- Trinacty, Christopher. 2009. "Like Father, Like Son? Selected Examples of Intertextuality in Seneca the Younger and Seneca the Elder." *Phoenix* 63:260–77.
- Valladares, H. N. 2012. "*Fallax imago*: Ovid's Narcissus and the Seduction of Mimesis in Roman Painting." *Word & Image* 27:378–95.
- van den Berg, C. S. 2008. "*Omnis malignitas est virtuti contraria*: *Malignitas* as a Term of Aesthetic Evaluation from Horace to Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus*." In *Kakos: Badness and Anti-Value in Classical Antiquity*, ed. Ineke Sluiter and Ralph Rosen, 399–432. Leiden: Brill.
- Vatin, Claude. 1996. "Le Quadrige de Théron d'Agrigente." In *L'incidenza*

- dell'antico. Studi in memoria di Ettore Lepore*, vol. 2, ed. Luisa Breglia Pulci Doria, 181–92. Naples: Luciano.
- Verdenius, Willem. 1988. *Commentaries on Pindar*. Vol. 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Volosinov, Valentin. 1986. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trans. Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- von Albrecht, Michael. 1969. "Ein Pferdegleichnis bei Ennius." *Hermes* 97:333–45.
- Vretska, Karl. 1976. *De Catilinae Coniuratione*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. 1994. *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- . 2008. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Webb, Ruth. 2006. "Fiction, Mimesis, and the Performance of the Greek Past in the Second Sophistic." In *Greeks on Greekness: Viewing the Greek Past under the Roman Empire*, ed. David Konstan and Suzanne Said, 27–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wells, James. 2009. *Pindar's Verbal Art: An Ethnographic Study of Epinician Style*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- White, J. B. 1973. *The Legal Imagination*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1985. *Heracles' Bow: Essays on the Rhetoric and Poetics of the Law*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- White, Peter. 1975. "The Friends of Martial, Statius, and Pliny and the Dispersal of Patronage." *HSCP* 79:265–300.
- Widmann, Susanne. 1968. *Untersuchungen zur Übersetzungstechnik Ciceros in seiner philosophischen Prosa*. Ph.D. diss., Tübingen.
- Wilkins, John. 2000. *The Boastful Chef: The Discourse of Food in Ancient Greek Comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, Craig, ed. 2004. *Martial: Epigrams, Book II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wills, Jeffrey. 1996. *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1998. "Divided Allusion: Virgil and the *Coma Berenices*." *HSCP* 98: 277–305.
- Winterbottom, Michael. 1964. "Quintilian and the *vir bonus*." *JRS* 54:90–97.
- Wiseman, T. P. 2002. "History, Poetry, and *Annales*." In *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, ed. D. S. Levine et al., 331–62. Leiden: Brill.
- Woodman, Anthony. 1992. "Nero's Alien Capital: Tacitus as Paradoxographer (*Annals* 15.36–37)." In *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*, ed. Anthony Woodman and Jonathan Powell, 173–88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1998. *Tacitus Reviewed*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Woodmansee, Martha, and Peter Jaszi, eds. 1994. *The Construction of Authorship:*

- Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Woolf, Greg. 2003. "The City of Letters." In *Rome the Cosmopolis*, ed. Catharine Edwards and Greg Woolf, 203–21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, David. 1983. "Pindar *Pythians* 2 and 3: Inscriptional ποτέ and the 'Poetic Epistle.'" *HSCP* 87:31–48.
- Zanker, Paul. 1987. "Drei Stadtbilder aus dem augusteischen Rom." In *L'Urbs: Espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C. -IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*, 475–89. Rome: École française de Rome.
- . 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Trans. Alan Shapiro. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ziolkowski, Adam. 1992. *The Temples of Mid-Republican Rome and Their Historical and Topographical Context*. Rome: Bretschneider.