

Finally, Tom Habinek, representing the claims of cultural materialism, regretfully smashed our well-wrought urn, and exhorted us to wake up and smell the ideology. Habinek's ^{broader perspectives and} specific readings are persuasive ones: I find his analysis of Phaethon and Sol very attractive, both in itself and as a complement to Andrew Zissos's reading. I am *less* sure that what Habinek is doing is as much outside the mainstream of Roman intertextual studies in the 1990s as he would have us believe. His approach to the Phaethon, at the level both of plot and of broader contextualization, is very much in methodological sympathy with Philip Hardie's readings in *The Epic Successors of Virgil*. So too his characterization of the Latinist's version of 'intertextuality' as an ideologically disengaged practice may be true to many Anglo-American *appropriations* of Gian Biagio Conte's intertextuality, but it is perhaps less true to Conte's own professions, especially in *Genres and Readers*. (Conte, remember, was the first to denounce Paul Veyne's book on Augustan elegy for treating elegiac semiotics as a zone outside history.)

Remember too that one of the things against which Contean intertextuality is concerned to define itself, in Italy, is an old-fashioned academic *Marxism* which used to treat poetry as a *transparent window* on to social practice. The *strength* of Contean intertextuality, *like* the strength of Habinek's cultural materialism, is that (when done right) it respects *both* the cultural materiality of the world to which poetic texts refer, *and* the cultural materiality of poetic texts themselves — in this respect Habinek and Conte are on the same page, even if they got there as a reaction to opposite extremes.

To return to Habinek's cultural materialism. In practice, this is a method which delicately steers its way between two dangers. The first danger is that, in a proselytising zeal to situate the work of poetry within other societal discourses, the cultural critic will in practice pay only lip service to the poetic work's own discursive structures and protocols. When Habinek says 'I have no interest in engaging in a critical practice that mystifies its relationship to contemporary economic and social arrangements', let us not forget that the high Roman poetry which is the immediate *target* of his critical practice is a *poetry* that mystifies its relationship to contemporary

economic and social arrangements: see e.g. Ovid's self-mystification in **item 1**. That does not mean that we should be unreflectively complicit in the aesthetic self-mystification of the Roman *vates*,⁴ like the slumbering formalists which Habinek fears us to be. But it *does* mean that we need to spend rather more time probing the aesthetic structures and protocols of high Roman poetry than Habinek himself seems to want to spend — so that we can plot its place in history from the inside out as well as from the outside in. Ultimately, I think that is why Tom's paper *needs* the other papers on this panel — just as they need his.¹

If the first danger of the cultural materialist balancing act is that the interpreter will move *too quickly* from the structures of the poetic text to the structures of extra-poetic contexts, the opposite danger is that the interpreter will linger *too long* on the structures of the poetic text, and will get drawn into the very complicity with poetic aestheticism which the method seeks to avoid. In his commendable desire to let us down gently with a 'soft' version of cultural materialism, I think that Tom may have given us a case-study which *does* get drawn into such complicity — and ends up looking more like good old-fashioned liberal humanism than like 'hard' cultural materialism. Let me explain. Tom reads the son-to-father relationship between Phaethon and Sol as ^{in enactment} a reflection of — and even as a conscious Ovidian ^{dialogue with} meditation upon — the son-to-father-like relationship between the Roman citizen and the emperor Augustus. *I* like this reading: but, as a cultural materialist, *Tom* should perhaps be nervous about the fact that he is so emphatically reading here *with* Ovid's plot. He is accepting and reproducing Ovid's own ways of thematizing a discussion about power in Augustan Rome; he is accepting and reproducing Ovid's own ways of putting mythology to work; and he is also, I think, accepting and internalizing the idea that the epic poet has a privileged status as an interpreter of his culture.

Part of the self-mystification of epic poetry *is* that (as its legacy from Homer) it claims such cultural authority; but, if we are to accept Tom's challenge to put cultural materialism to work in the context of this panel, perhaps we should find some intertexts

which, rather than *reproducing* the self-validating structures of epic poetic discourse (as Tom's Phaethon example does), put some pressure upon them from the outside.

That is a tall order, and I am not sure how far we can get with it. But let me leave you with a couple of intertexts which may be good to think with in this connexion — intertexts which may help us to think in a Kristevan spirit of interdiscursivity. First, how might a 'hard' cultural materialist begin to apply some sociological pressure to the whole nexus of myth, allusion, theatricality and meta-literary sensibility within which all of today's papers, and many episodes of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, find their discursive space? Rather than looking, like Tom, for culturalist parables *within* that space, let me draw your attention to a *runder* and more disturbing nexus of myth, allusion, theatricality and meta-literary sensibility — Martial's *Liber Spectaculorum*.

Item 2 presents a deadly mythological enactment in the arena, and, still more disturbing from our point of view, presents the writings of an elite poet who describes this deadly scene in *the same aestheticized vocabulary* as elite poets employ for the comfortable mythological fictions of a work like Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. This Orpheus experiences a real death in a real arena, but his poet describes his death by alluding (directly, as it happens) to the airy fictions, and airy metatheatricality, of Ovid's Orpheus in *Metamorphoses* 11; most grotesque of all, the denouement which robs this costumed prisoner of his life is metaphorized by Martial as a mere philological solecism, ~~a minor mythic variant~~, an Alexandrian footnote: to the elite poet, and to the complicit elite reader, connoisseurs ^{all} ~~of mythological narrative~~, ^{this} ~~the~~ death was ^{a minor mythological variant} ~~par'~~

historian. Martial, you will say, is a Flavian, and known for his bad taste, and Ovid an Augustan of consummately ^{to extract a good intellectual question from this news} good taste. But ^{can} we be so sure that no connexion is ever felt in the mind of the Roman consumer between the aesthetics of death and suffering in a high Augustan poem, and the death and suffering aestheticized on the bodies of slaves and ^{criminals} prisoners in the arena at ^{in the early empire} any period ^{of Rome's history?} ~~of Rome's history?~~

Another way to apply 'hard' cultural materialist pressure to the intertextual aesthetics of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (again without buying into the poem's own literary and metaliterary plots) might be to consider what the going rate is for *intertextual*

INSECT
might be interesting
I don't think
know the
...
...
Pyramus's
howling blood
...
...
...
by Alison Keill, 1.1.11

INSECT (1.1.11)

virtuosity itself, considered as a socio-economic practice, on the Roman cultural stock market. Let me instance one characteristic kind of intertextual event, the bicultural display of Roman Hellenism; and again let me offer you a Flavian text to think with: **item 3**, Statius, *Silvae* 2.2 on the villa of Pollius Felix.

Some Romans, like Pollius, amass cultural capital by building *mansions* ornamented with *marbles and statues* imported from the Greek world, which bespeak their wealth, status and taste. Other Romans, like Statius, amass cultural capital by building *poems* ornamented with *names, epithets and inflexions* imported from the Greek world, which bespeak their wealth of learning, their status and their taste. *This* particular poem, in which Statius uses *his* kind of capital to boost the value of *Pollius'* kind of capital, and also increases his own by the association, offers a wonderful opportunity for a cultural materialist to read both *with* and *against* the grain of these two discourses, and to consider how their interaction works to distribute and retain prestige and power within a moneyed and lettered elite.

The poem *also* offers us an opportunity to consider how power is *mystified* within such an elite (to revisit another of Tom Habinek's key terms). Both the conspicuous consumer of imported marbles and the conspicuous consumer of imported poetic language achieve their highest levels of cultural prestige when they *disavow* the importance of their own accumulated wealth — without, of course, giving any of it up. The true measure of Pollius' prestige is his *professed Epicureanism* — which allows Statius (and presumably Pollius himself) to deem all Pollius' material wealth inessential to the man himself. And the true measure of Statius' own prestige as a poet is the confidence which allows him to include in the prose preface of this highly wrought book of *Silvae* an apology to Pollius for the hastiness and carelessness of the poem's composition — a gesture which in turn allows prestige to circulate back to Pollius by constructing him as the kind of cultivated addressee who will recognise this for the elegant modesty-*topos* which it is.

Latinists have in fact long been accustomed to reading the *Silvae* in social-historical terms, for the simple reason that they have not been distracted by any high

regard for the *Silvae* as aesthetic productions. And let me end here with another plug for the aesthetes. In these last few years professional Latinists have become rather better at reading Statius than they used to be; and the fact is that most of that progress has been achieved in the realm of detailed, formalist criticism. It is my belief that the Statius whom the formalists are now handing back to the social historians is a Statius who is better to think with than the old Statius was. In Statian studies, as in Ovidian studies, we need *both* the intertextual work of the formalist *and* the intertextual work of the culturalist; as long as we can constitute panels like today's which mix both tendencies, we have a healthy basis for discussion.

¹ Cf. Roman historians doing much better with Ovid's *Fasti* now than they did 20 years ago — because of all the work on its internal protocols done in mainly formalist analyses of questions of allusion, intertextuality and genre. Now its 'thickness' is better respected; now it can better be read as a construction of time, history, mythology and cultural authority worth reading in dialogue, and in competition, with Augustus' constructions of same.

response to panel: Stephen Hinds (Univ. of Washington)

(1) IDEOLOGY, AESTHETICS, INTERTEXTUALITY

Quid mihi, Livor edax, ignavos obicis annos,
ingeniique vocas carmen inertis opus;
non me more patrum, dum strenua sustinet aetas,
praemia militiae pulverulenta sequi,
nec me verbosas leges ediscere nec me
ingrato vocem prostituisse foro?
Mortale est, quod quaeris, opus. mihi fama
perennis
quaeritur, in toto semper ut orbe canar.

Ergo, cum silices, cum dens patientis atrati
depereant aevo, carmina morte carent.
cedant carminibus reges regumque triumphii,
cedat et auriferi ripa benigna Tagi!

OVID, *AM. 1.15.1-8*, 31-4

WHY, biting Envy, dost thou charge me with slothful years, and call my song the work of an idle wit, complaining that, while vigorous age gives strength, I neither, after the fashion of our fathers, pursue the dusty prizes of a soldier's life, nor learn garrulous legal lore, nor set my voice for common case in the ungrateful forum?

⁷ It is but mortal, the work you ask of me; but my quest is glory through all the years, to be ever known in song throughout the earth.

³¹ Yea, though hard rocks and though the tooth of the enduring ploughshare perish with passing time, song is untouched by death. Before song let monarchs and monarchs' triumphs yield—yield, too, the bounteous banks of Tagus bearing gold!

Quidquid in Orpheo Rhodope spectasse theatro
dicitur, exhibuit, Caesar, harena tibi,
reperunt scopuli mirandaque silva cucurrit,
quale fuisse nemus creditur Hesperidum.
adfuit inmixtum pecori genus omne ferarum
et supra vatem multa pendit avis,
ipse sed ingrato iacuit laceratus ab urso:
haec tantum res est facta παρ' ἱστορίων.

Whatever Rhodope is said to have seen on the Orphic stage, Caesar, the amphitheatre has displayed to you. Cliffs crept and a marvellous wood ran forwards such as was believed to be the grove of the Hesperides. Every kind of wild beast was there, mixed with the flock, and above the minstrel hovered many birds; but the minstrel fell, torn apart by an ungrateful bear. Only this one thing happened contrary to the story.

παρ' ἱστορίων Housman: ita pictoria H, T

MARTIAL, *LIB. SPECT. 21*

ac primum attonitas etiamnum voce canentis
innumeras volucres anguesque agmenque ferarum
maenades Orphei titulum rapuere theatri;
inde cruentatis vertuntur in Orphea dextris
et coeunt ut aves, si quando luce vagantem
noctis avem cernunt, structoque utrimque theatro
ceu matutina cervus periturus harena
praeda canum est, vatemque petunt

OVID, *MEF. 11. 20-7*

First away went the multitudinous birds still snellbound by the singer's voice, with the snakes and the train of beasts, the glory of Orpheus' audience, harried by the Maenads; then these turned bloody hands against Orpheus and flocked around like birds when in the day they see the bird of night wandering in the daylight; and as when in the amphitheatre in the early morning of the spectacle the doomed stag in the arena is the prey of dogs. They rushed upon the bard

Non, mihi si cunctos Helicon indulgeat amnes
et superet Pimplea sitim largeque volantis
ungula sedet equi reseretque arcana pudicos
Phemonoe fontes vel quos meus auspice Phoebos
altius immersa turbavit Pollius urna,
innumeras valeam species cultusque locorum
Pieris aequare modis.

Not if Helicon were to grant me all her streams, or Pimplea quench my thirst, or the hoof of the flying steed^a abundantly assuage it: not if mystic Phemonoe^b were to unlock her pure springs or those wherein my Pollius, under the auspices of Phoebus, hath plunged his deep-immersed urn—not even so could I equal in Pierian strains the countless charms and beauties of the place.

Quid referam veteres ceracque aerisque figuras,
si quid Apellei gaudent animasse colores,
si quid adhuc vacua, tamen admirabile, Pisa
Phidiacae rasere manus, quod ab arte Myronis
aut Polycliteo iussum est quod vivere caelo,
aeraque ab Isthmiacis auro potiora favillis,
ora ducum ac vatium sapientumque ora priorum,
quos tibi cura sequi, quos toto pectore sentis,
expers curarum atque animum virtute quicquam
compositus semperque tuus?

Why should I tell of ancient forms in wax or bronze, or of aught that the colours of Apelles rejoiced to animate, or the hand of Phidias carved, though Pisa still was empty,^a yet wondrously withal, or what was bidden live by Myron's art or Polyclethus' chisel, the bronzes, from the funeral fire of Corinth,^b more precious than gold, countenances of chieftains and prophets and sages of old time, whom it is thy care to follow, whose influence thou dost feel in all thy being, untroubled and steadfast in thy tranquil virtue, and ever lord of thy own heart?

hic Graeis penitus delecta metallis
saxa; quod Eoae respersit vena Syenes,
Synnade quod maesta Phrygiae fodere secures
per Cybeles lugentis agros, ubi marmore pieto
candida purpureo distinguitur arca gyro;
hic et Amyclaei caesum de monte Lycurgi
quod viret et molles imitatur rupibus herbas,
hic Nomadam lucent flaventia saxa Thasosque
et Chios et gaudens fluctus spectare Carystos:
omnia Chalcidicas turres obversa salutant.
macte animo, quod Graia probas, quod Graia¹
frequentas
arva;

STATIUS, *SILV. 2.2. 36-42*

(17-72 05-96)

here are marbles chosen from the heart of Grecian quarries; ^a the stone of Eastern Syene, splashed with veining, and that which Phrygian axes hew in mournful Synnas o'er the fields of wailing Cybele, whereon the white expanse is bordered by a rim of purple; here too are green blocks quarried from the hill of Lycurgus at Amyclae, where the stone counterfeits the grass; here gleam the tawny rocks from Numidia, Thasian marble too and Chian, and Carystian stone that joys to behold the waves: ^a all turn to salute the Chalcidian towers. ^b A blessing on thy heart, that thou approvest what is Greek and hauntest Grecian land;

Lowell EDMUNDS "Intertextuality in the Metamorphoses: Expanding the Theoretical Model"

Classics has for the most part worked with a model of intertextuality that derives from Pasquall's essay of 1942, "L'Arte allusiva." Gian Biagio Conte refined the notion of allusion, removing it from issues of intentionality, and construing it in terms of the rhetorical figure. But Conte preserved the kernel of Pasquall's idea: allusion, no matter how subtle and complex, is a matter of delimitable passages that hark back to delimitable passages in earlier works. This principle is retained in Conte's thinking about genre: an allusion plays a double role. It "denotes a specific meaning" and "it also functions as the connotator of a literary manner, a genre or a subgenre" (Conte, *Genres and Readers* [1994] 135). Joseph Farrell's *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History* (1991) was a new departure, taking up the problems of interpreting large-scale, continuous allusion with structural or systemic as well as local functions. Ovid's *Metamorphoses* provides an opportunity for continuing the discussion of this kind of large-scale allusion.

Though my goal is to make some reflections on the theoretical model or models of intertextuality now in use in the field of Classics, my remarks are based on a particular passage, Ovid's miniaturization and revision of the *Aeneid* in *Met.* 13.399-14.580. This passage illustrates characteristic features of Ovidian intertextuality: (1) It can have a summary, negative function (e.g. *Met.* 14.535 summarizes and replaces the fuller expression of Cybele's concern for the ships at *Aen.* 9.79-92; cf. Andrew Zissos on *Met.* 2.333-34). (2) It exploits its scale to include narrative that is not in the model: the Hecuba and Scylla episodes (*Met.* 13.481-575, 13.730-14.74); the metamorphosis of Anius' daughters (13.643-74); the stories told by the Sibyl, by Achaemenides, and by Maecaeus; and the stories within Maecaeus' story (14.129-53, 160-440). (3) This suppletive or substitutional intertextuality prompts a rethinking of the model, and thus has an expansive critical function (cf. Ingo Gildenhard on the Narcissus and Echo episode in *Met.* 3). (4) Intertextuality in the *Met.* is highly self-conscious and calls attention to itself as a device. The metamorphosis of earlier literature is the mode in which the mind of Ovid is moved: *in nova... mutatas dicere formas / corpora*. While the *Met.* is densely and systemically intertextual, as are the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, the comparison between Vergil and Ovid shows that intertextuality has vastly different functions in different periods. Vergil's is "classical"; Ovid's "modern." Theories of intertextuality based solely on classical Roman literature are inadequate.

Likewise, most post-Kristeva theorizing (the most important works and collections are cited at the end of this abstract) has failed to take account of important intertextual phenomena found in the *Met.* After Kristeva, theory, i.e. outside of Classics, found itself faced with the problem of recovering a basis for a specifically literary intertextuality. (Kristeva had extended the concept of text to a general semiotics of culture in which everything was text and thus everything was intertextual with everything else.) The re-entrenchment has taken the form of typology (notably in Genette) and preoccupation with the marking of intertextuality. The functions of large-scale, systemic intertextuality, long familiar to Classicists, have been for the most part neglected.

Works Cited: Broich, U. and M. Pfister, eds. 1985. *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Tübingen: Clayton, J. and E. Rohssein, ed. 1991. *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*. Madison and London: Genette, G. 1982. *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré*. Paris: Lachmann, R. 1982. *Dialogizität*. Munich: Plett, H.F., ed. 1991. *Intertextuality: Research in Text Theory*, vol. 15. Berlin and New York.

Tom HABINEK

"The Lost Ideologue"

This paper examines intertextuality as a mode of reading Latin literature within the broader framework of classical studies and literary theory. It proposes a return to Kristeva's concept of the "ideologue" as a means of restoring to intertextuality its original role as a type of political and social analysis. For Kristeva, the ideologue is "both an organizing function within a text and a function that indicates the text's implication in a wider social and historical context" (*Encyclopedia of Literary Theory*, p. 556). This double aspect of intertextual study has been lost in recent years, with the result that intertextuality sometimes seems little different from other classical interpretive techniques such as source criticism and the study of allusion.

Kristeva's notion of the ideologue can be illustrated in the passages of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* analyzed by earlier speakers on this panel. For example, in the story of Phaethon we might regard the father/son dispute over a son's fitness for and access to his patrimony as an ideologue that connects the episode both with other literary texts (e.g. Roman comedy, *Aeneid* 9, the Brunus episode in Livy) and with familial, legal, and political controversies in Augustan Rome. Similarly, the generic tension cited by all three localized readings can be taken both as "an organizing function within the text" and as an indicator of the text's interconnection with broader debates over the public versus private nature of literature (cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.1) and the competition between visual and verbal modes of social control (a recurrent theme in Livy, as documented by Feldherr, *Spectacle and Society*).

There are pitfalls to such an approach, to be sure, chief among them the need to identify and articulate intertexts outside the confines of a narrowly conceived and easily regulated poetic tradition. But such an enterprise is no more perilous than the radical compression of the range of potential intertexts that characterizes most of the work in the field heretofore, and it is more flexible, because potentially more localized, than is exclusive reliance on a Foucauldian notion of "discourse."