

Gonzaga University Interlibrary

IL



ILLiad TN: 33137

ILL Number: 22254800



DA

Borrower: VZS

Lending String: *WUG,VXW,VYF,PSC,SYB

Patron: Curley, Dan

Journal Title: Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London.

Volume: 23 **Issue:**
Month/Year: 1976**Pages:** 79-95

Article Author:

Article Title: Horsfall, N; The Collegium Poetarum

Imprint: [London] ; The Institute

Call #: PA25 .L8

Location: Foley General Collection

ARIEL

Charge

Maxcost: \$0IFM

Shipping Address:

Skidmore College Library

Scribner Library

815 N Broadway

Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

Fax: (518) 580-5540

Ariel: 141.222.44.128

ariel
8/15/06

will place within certain limits of time and space. With limits, we might be anxious about doing enough to determine

of our being in boundless existence. completes our earthly sojourn. Only when a life has been off by death are we able to set it in its own autonomy. It is which makes completeness possible. Therein lies judgment. The ring moment when a parent of middle-aged children dies. The on the life of the middle-aged son or daughter as well. The ss of finitude is also a glorious moment. All of our achieve- re finite but so are our failures. Our lives are finally judged g to limited possibilities. We are free to live and love and learn onfidence that the God who ordained the boundaries of life will ur finite completeness.

Reference Notes

ees, Elliot. "Death and the Mid-Life Crisis." *International Journal of Socioanalysis*, 1965, 46, p. 506.
er, Ernest. *The Denial of Death*. New York: The Free Press, 1973, pp. 11-46.
nson, Daniel J., et al. *The Seasons of a Man's Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, p. 215.
an, Eda J. *The Wonderful Crisis of Middle Age*. New York: David McKay Co., 1973, p. 10.
es, op. cit., p. 511.
us, Lily. *Death and The Family*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1970, p. 210.
ndred to Gary Johnson, my research assistant, for conducting the personal views from which some of this material was drawn and to the middle age sons daughters who shared their stories.
an, op. cit., p. 273.
an, op. cit., p. 268.
us, op. cit., p. 211ff.
ay, Nancy. *My Mother, My Self*. New York: Delacorte Press, 1977, pp. 278-281.
lin, Helm. *Separating Parents and Adolescents*. New York: Quadrangle/The New York Times Book Co., 1974, pp. 168-170.
er, op. cit., p. 146.
ly, Gail. *Passages*. New York: E.P. Dutton and Company, Inc. 1974, p. 248.
ner, Seward. *Theological Dynamics*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972, p. 185.
nell, Kenneth. "Reflections of a Middle-aged Theologian." (Unpublished manu-
(b).

THE COLLEGIUM POETARUM

by Nicholas Horsfall

The *collegium poetarum* is an enigma. Between claims that it is the answer to almost every problem of Roman literary history¹ and virtual denials that it ever existed,² let alone exerted influence, *grammatici certant et adhuc sub iudice lis est*. More so now than at any time since the days of Riese and Otto Jahn: never has there been any more than one totally explicit reference to the *collegium* (Val.Max. iii.7.11), but the number of scraps of potentially relevant information has recently risen from five to six. In the interests of chronology, I shall begin with the earliest of those scraps.

In illustration of the statement (cf. p. 89) that the *antiqui* applied the term *scribae* in its original sense³ to poets *too*, that is, in addition to the sense of 'civil service clerks' that survived, Festus (p. 446. 29 ff. L) records:

itaque cum Livius Andronicus bello Punico secundo scribisset carmen quod a virginibus est cantatum, quia prosperius respublica geri coepta est, publice adtributa est [et] in Aventino aedis Minervae in qua liceret scribis histrionibusque consistere ac dona ponere; in honorem Livi, quia is et scribebat fabulas et agebat.

[et] : sic ms.; *ei* Ursinus; seclisit Fraenkel, P.W. Suppl. v, 599–600.

"So when Livius Andronicus in the second Punic war wrote a hymn which was sung by the virgins, — because the state's affairs began to be conducted more successfully⁴ the temple of Minerva on the Aventine was officially granted, where the *scribae* and *histriones* might assemble and make offerings; in honour of Livius because he used both to write plays and to act in them." Livy (xxvii.37.7 ff.; 207 B.C.) describes the probable occasion of composition.⁵ We are nowhere given a founding date for the *collegium*; all we are told is that in or after (probably) 207 the *scribae* and *histriones* were given certain rights which are characteristic of collegiality.⁶ 200 B.C. will serve as a *terminus ante quem*; in that year a similar hymn was composed by P. Licinius Tegula (Liv. xxxi.12.10) and it is generally assumed that Livius was by now dead.

The terms of the *senatusconsultum* seem to have been preserved in a tolerably authentic form;⁷ *consistere* and *dona ponere* are regularly used in the inscriptions relating to *collegia*.⁸ The *scribae* and *histriones* have been granted an official meeting-place in a temple — where *collegia* often did meet⁹ — and the right to make offerings in that temple: the togetherness of the cult-act was fundamental to the existence of the *collegium* (Waltzing [n. 6] i.195 ff.).

There is a good deal about the grant *in honorem Livi* which suggests that the element of *honor* was very slender indeed, at least so far as the writers were concerned. The actors will be considered shortly. The wording of the *senatus consultum* leaves one important point unclear: were the government scribes to be included in the *collegium*? At a later date, they had their own *collegia* (below, p. 90), but in the late third century it is not inconceivable that they should have joined forces with writers and actors. After all, authors and government scribes shared a common name and a rare skill. The question does not admit of an answer, but the very fact of a common name should perhaps suggest to us that there was likewise a kind of parity of status or esteem.

The stories of Cn. Flavius, *libertino patre genitus, scriba*, curule aedile in 304 B.C. and target for the nobility's studied discourtesy (Val. Max. ii.5.2) and of M. Claudius Glicia, *ultima sortis homo* (Liv. Per. xix) and *coactus abdicare* when *dictator sine magistro equitum* in 249 (*Fast. Cap.*) suggest that this status will not have been high. Cicero's compliments on the *ordo scribarum* (*Verr.* iii.182, *de domo* 74) were made for a forensic purpose; to the senate, and particularly to the senate of the third century it is clear enough that the *scriba*, at least in the sense of 'government scribe' was not a man to be respected.

I do not suggest that literacy was seen as a threat, but certainly the notion that money might be earned by writing, and not just by writing official records and accounts, was new and strange.¹⁰ All those whose pens earned them money, whether governmentally or creatively, inevitably incurred the traditional Roman contempt for the *mercennarius*¹¹ and Nepos (*Eum.* i.5) emphasizes that the profession of scribe remained far less honourable than in Greece precisely because of the receipt of *merces*. The word *scriba* is itself sufficiently suggestive, for nouns in *-a* are regularly *Bezeichnungen und Leuten in untergeordneter Stellung*,¹² we may compare *cacula, lixa, scurra, verna, scubna*.

The poets' own attitude is clear: *scriba* was never, so far as we can see, used by a poet of a poet: Ennius, Plautus, Pacuvius, Terence, Luscius Lanuvinus and even Naevius all either use *poeta* or are referred to by contemporaries as *poetae*.¹³ But was *scriba* used in 207 because there existed as yet no *Sonderbezeichnung* in Latin for 'poet'?¹⁴ This is scarcely credible as an explanation: whatever the authorship of *flerent divae Camenae Naevium poetam* (cf. Suerbaum [n. 7] 33 f., etc.), even the Metelli did not deny Naevius the designation *poeta*. In Plautus, the earliest reference (?204) may be the *poeta barbarus* (i.e. Roman) of *MG* 211 and there are frequent instances over the next few years. Festus does not say that *scriba* was the only word that the *antiqui* used of poets, and even if he had, the one instance he adduces is clearly on the verge of archaism. I would suggest that the reference to the poets as *scribae* in the *senatusconsultum* may have been a designation imposed by an unsympathetic administration, quite possibly lumping authors and government clerks together in a single category.

The *ius conveniendi*, as the case of the *tibicines* (Liv. ix.30.5 ff.) shows, had to be granted by a *senatusconsultum*, if the meeting-place was in a temple (Waltzing [n. 6] i, 81), whether or not the members of the *collegium* were foreigners — as all known authors¹⁵ and, presumably, most actors at this date were. The terms of the *senatusconsultum* need not have referred to the authors by a designation which they would themselves have chosen.

There is more to suggest that the element of *honor* was distinctly ambiguous. The meeting-place of the *collegium* of *scribae* and *histriones* was the temple of Minerva on the Aventine. This associates the *scribae* with the dishonoured *mercennarii* as clearly as does their name. The 19th March was the 'birthday of Minerva' and a great festival at the Aventine temple. According to Verrius Flaccus, the 19th was *artificum dies* (*Fast. Praen.*).

Fullers, dyers, doctors, schoolmasters,¹⁶ engravers, painters and sculptors, according to Ovid's list (*F.* iii.821 ff.) met on this day. The festival was named Quinquatrus; on the lesser Quinquatrus (13th June) the *tibicines* met, also under the patronage of Minerva (*Ov. F.* vi, 651 ff.). The authors found themselves, therefore in humble, and arguably humiliating company. It would be quite wrong to suggest (with G.W. Williams, *OCD*², s.v. Livius Andronicus) that the temple of Minerva was in any way exclusively set aside for the poets' convenience.

There is, however, a rather disconcerting reference made by Ovid as the climax of his list of trades represented at the Quinquatrus; of Minerva he writes:

*mille dea est operum: certe dea carminis illa est.
si mereor, studiis adsit amica meis (F. iii.833 f.).*

Minerva is not — nor is Athena — traditionally a goddess of poetry; certainly she cannot be called *certe dea carminis* on the basis of any widely-attested patronage of literature in earlier sources. It is conceivable that Ovid might be alluding to the old status of poets as humble artisans under the patronage of Minerva.¹⁷ However, in view of the professional arrogance of the poets of Ovid's generation, such an allusion would have to be interpreted as deliberately ironic and anachronistic and it is probably enough to see here a loose allusion to Minerva's general protection of the arts and wisdom.¹⁸

Neither this connection with Aventine Minerva, nor the association of *scribae* with *histriones* is likely to have survived indefinitely. The presence of *histriones* is particularly suggestive. There is no fundamental distinction of status between actor and author in the world of the *τεχνῖται Διονύσου*.¹⁹ Likewise Livy records of Livius Andronicus *idem scilicet, id quod omnes tum erant suorum carminum* actor (vii.2.8). Festus (p. 448.3f.L.) infers that the *senatusconsultum* mentioned both writers and actors *quia is et scribebat fabulas et agebat*, though it is curious that it was not his expertise at the *ars ludicra* which prompted the grant and it is not immediately clear why actors — far less government clerks — should have benefited from Livius' talents as hymnographer.²⁰

Actors — defined for the present argument as players comparable to those elsewhere in the Hellenistic world performing plays modelled on Greek antecedents — have a complex and ambiguous status at Rome in the late third century. They have gained the valuable privilege of exemption from military service (Liv. vii.2.12), which their Greek colleagues had often secured. Perhaps, as Jory suggests, this was because their skills were exercised in honour of the gods, and if they were absent — or indeed maimed — then that honour would be reduced, or even rendered incapable of performances (n. 5, 230 ff.). The earliest actors, at least from the time that the Tarentine Livius Andronicus put on a play in 240, were likely to have been mostly Greeks, and — as Jory argues convincingly (n. 5, 229) — may well have been organised informally at Rome under the patronage of Dionysus, as elsewhere in the Hellenistic world. The stage at Rome during the last decade of the third century was increasing rapidly in popularity and importance. Public observance of foreign cults had been prohibited since 213 and it was certainly desirably that actors — of whom a fair number will have been required by the 17 or so days of drama *per annum*²¹ — should be brought under the respectable patronage of Minerva.²² The actors will hardly have regretted the benefits and comforts of formal collegiality; for them recognition as *artifices* may well have constituted the attainment of parity of status with the *τεχνῖται* of Dionysus in Greek cities.

Moreover, the advantages of collegiality will have been the more welcome on account of the deeply-felt Roman prejudice against the acting profession: *in scaenam vero prodire ac populo esse spectaculo ... apud nos partim infamia partim humilia atque ab honestate remota ponuntur*.²³ It is therefore most unlikely that the authors would willingly have clung to their connection with the widely-despised *histriones*, not least since their output had never been limited to stage-plays. No author, moreover, since Livius, is attested as having willingly performed on stage and even that attestation has been questioned (e.g. by Leo [n. 5] 56). As the second century progressed, with increased aristocratic patronage of literature and more general respect for the poet's art, I would question whether the benefits of collegiality were any longer — even supposing they ever had been — particularly welcome or attractive to the poets. The togetherness of cult-acts and dinner-parties, the prestige and solidarity of the trade (MacMullen [n. 9] 74 f.) are values more appropriate to artisans than to men of letters. The stigma of association with real *artifices* may well no longer have been tolerable, after their success, to the citizens Ennius and Accius, let alone to their patrons and less still to the haughty equestrian Lucilius.

I shall return shortly to the question of the survival of the Aventine *collegium*. We have now to

consider the sole specific reference to the *collegium poetarum*:

is (Accius) *Iulio Caesari amplissimo ac florentissimo viro in collegium poetarum venienti numquam adsurrexit, non maiestatis eius immemor, sed quod in comparatione communium studiorum aliquanto se superiorem confideret. quapropter insolentiae crimine caruit quia ibi voluminum non imaginum certamine exercebantur* (Val. Max. iii.7.11).²⁴

These encounters are probably to be dated to the 90's: C. Iulius Caesar Strabo was born ca. 130 and in 90 served as curule aedile;²⁵ unlike his elder brother Lucius, consul in 90, he was himself well-known as a writer of tragedies.²⁶ The octogenarian poet was notoriously prickly and arrogant²⁷ and well capable, as Valerius' *numquam* implies,²⁸ of repeating the apparent discourtesy.²⁹

"The incident" writes Badian "shows that Caesar was not properly a member of the guild, on the same footing as Accius.³⁰ But both he and other dilettanti nobles and senators . . . will have been *patroni* of the college. All *collegia* had eminent *patroni* of this sort."³¹ Clearly Caesar Strabo could have been one of the institution's *patroni*; clearly too there was no basis for regular social intercourse on an equal footing between him and Accius. Nor could the patrician conceivably have joined a conventional *collegium* of ordinary artisans, as the *scribae* had once been. Accius himself, to judge his character from the anecdotes that survive, was no likelier than Caesar Strabo to have joined such a body. But a *collegium* of poets, particularly in an age of widespread esteem for literary achievement, can have been no ordinary *collegium*, and I hope to be able to define its unorthodoxy more closely (below, p. 86). Caesar Strabo's membership and active participation are therefore not to be ruled out and it is by no means inconceivable that poet and patrician met on account of their *communia studia*, in the healthy rivalry of *voluminum certamina*, even though the neatness of Valerius' epigram might have seemed at first sight a basis for scepticism (cf. Carney [n. 32] 293). He is notoriously unreliable³² and one could wish better authority for asserting the existence of formal collegiality in the full legal sense among the poets of Rome. He was quite capable of saying *collegium* when he meant merely, as it might be, *sodalitium*.³³ But there comes a point beyond which unsubstantiated scepticism should not be pressed.

There is nothing to suggest that Caesar Strabo and Accius met in the temple of Minerva on the Aventine:³⁴ the story that Accius *in Camenarum aede maxima forma statuam sibi posuisse, cum brevis admodum fuisset* (Pliny, *NH* xxxiv.19) suggests that for him the temple of Minerva no longer held any practical importance or hallowed associations and points, as we shall see shortly, to a credible alternative locale.

Between the names *collegium scribarum histrionumque (vel sim.)* and *collegium poetarum* there is clearly nothing in common, and in view of what has been said of the status both of *scribae* and of *histriones*, rather an essential discontinuity³⁵ between the two institutions

The altered position of the writer and the rapidly increasing number of actors – with no corresponding improvement as yet in their status³⁶ argue strongly against the perpetuation of the Aventine *collegium* with its union of incompatibles (cf. Kuniyama [n. 2] 85 f., Badian [n. 5] 190, n. 2). We cannot say how long the actors clung to their *collegium* in the temple of Minerva, nor precisely when the authors are likely to have left it (see below, p. 86). The collegiate status of actors between 207 and the first century B.C. is a complete mystery (cf. Jory [n. 5] 237 ff., Webster [n. 19] 277). It is clearly not impossible that two *collegia* – one for actors on the Aventine and one elsewhere for the poets – coexisted for a while (cf. Tamm [n. 7] 166), but it is most unlikely that during such a period of coexistence the Aventine *collegium* catered for anybody but actors, and conceivably, I suppose, government scribes.

Indeed, the only point of similarity between the *collegia* of Livius and Accius seems to lie in the abiding association with tragic drama (cf. Tamm, *ibid.*) – an association which certainly does not require us to infer institutional continuity.

No further evidence mentions the *collegium poetarum* by name; we are compelled to infer only that the Romans practised certain forms of collective poetic activity.

Cicero writes that Sp. Maecius Tarpa *probavisset* the plays for the opening of Pompey's theatre in 55 (*Fam.* vii.1.1). In fact it was revivals that were *probatae* on this occasion: Accius' *Clytemnestra* and Livius' *Equus Troianus* (*ibid.* 2). Tarpa apparently was concerned with some form of *προαγών* and the existence at Rome of such occasions is probably confirmed by the story of how Luscius Lanuvinus got a sight of Terence's *Eunuchus* (*Ter. Eun.* 19 ff.).³⁷

At *A.P.* 387 Horace names Tarpa as a *iudex* and in *Sat.* i.10.37 ff. by contrast with the *turgidus* Alpinus refers to his own lighter works:

*haec ego ludo
quae neque in aede sonent certantia iudice Tarpa
nec redeant iterum atque iterum spectanda theatris*

Neque . . . sonent . . . and *nec redeant . . .* are complementary parts of one process; cf. Porphyrio: *ait se id genus carminum scribere quod Meci Tarpae arbitrio non subiciatur. nam hi fere, qui scaenae scribebant, ad Tarpam hunc velut emendatorem* [which is really not what *certantia* seems to me to presuppose] *ea adferebant*. The competition in question seems again to involve some form of *προαγών* (cf. *in aede* and *theatris* contrasted) for stage performance presided over by Tarpa (cf. Lafaye [n. 37] 36 f.).

It is clearly not enough to dismiss the *certamen* to which Horace refers as being one simply for Tarpa's approbation; the context points too specifically towards a competition held prior to actual stage performance. These competitions can hardly all have been of mimes, or indeed of revivals, for the idea of regular competitions between old plays is meaningless, and conflicts with the implication of *sonent* and *redeant* — that is, that Horace is contrasting himself with other — inescapably contemporary — writers whose work is, unlike his own, not mere *lusus*. Used as we are to talking of the death of Roman stage drama in the late second century, this evidence for plays and real competitions is at first sight disquieting. Yet Varius *post Actiacam victoriam Augusto ludis eius in scaena edidit* his *Thyestes* (*Didasc., TRF* [Klotz] p. 309) and under Claudius the consular tragedian Pomponius Secundus *carmina sua scaenae dabat* (*Tac. Ann.* xi.13.1, Klotz p. 312, Zwierlein *loc. cit.*, n. 17); then too traditional comedy was still written and acted (*Suet. Claud.* 11). Further inferences may clearly be drawn regarding the *Ars Poetica*.

There is another passage of Horace that might at first sight seem relevant to this discussion: *Ep.* ii.2.91 ff.:

*qui minus argutos vexat furor iste poetas?
carmina compono, hic (? Propertius) elegos: mirabile visu
caelatumque novem Musis opus. adspice primum
quanto cum fastu, quanto molimine circum-
spectemus vacuum Romanis vatibus aedem;
mox etiam, si forte vacas, sequere et procul audi,
quid ferat et qua re sibi nectat uterque coronam:
caedimur et totidem plagis consumimus hostem
lento Samnites ad lumina prima duello;
discedo Alcaeus puncto illius; ille meo quis?
quis nisi Callimachus? . . .*

What sort of scene is envisaged here? Does it constitute evidence for real competitions, as Tamm (n. 7, 159 f.) and Cancik (n. 34, 326 f.) suppose?

The duel of Samnites is evidently ironical, a long-drawn-out rivalry in mutual flattery between writers in different genres. One might think that 96 *quid ferat et qua re sibi nectat uterque coronam* points to actual poetic rivalry on account of the reference to *corona*; however, *quid ferat* refers simply to the piece or pieces each poet brings to a *recitatio* and *qua re sibi nectat uterque coronam* alludes to the poetry by means of which both lyric and elegiac writers aspire to the achievement of fame – an achievement expressed in deliberately inflated traditional metaphor: the struggle is cunningly inverted – not one of literary merit, but of its deadly opponent, flattery.³⁹

Scholars have tended to identify the *aedes* of *Sat.* i.10 with the *vacuam Romanis vatibus aedem* of *Ep.* ii.2.⁴⁰ But since there seem to be no grounds for assuming comparable, or even compatible activities in the two passages, we are under no compulsion to identify the locales of both without independent arguments for doing so.

There is no internal evidence. On *Ep.* ii.2.91, Ps.-Acro comments sensibly *iam ponit verba verba poetarum invicem se laudantium*; there is therefore no reason to suppose with Bentley that *mirabile visu caelatumque novem Musis opus* need refer to the *aedes* itself and it is consequently irrelevant to introduce the nine statues of the Muses in the Aedes Herculis Musarum into the argument at this point (cf. below).

On topography, the scholia are at variance: on 94 Ps.-Acro comments: *idest ut negemus in templo Apollinis ullos poetas habere carmina* and Porphyrio *significat autem aedem Musarum, in qua poetae recitabant* (cf. *ad Sat.* i.10.38).

The wider context in Horace helps towards a solution. Mutual flattery is exchanged in terms of a recognition that the poet being flattered has attained parity with the Greek masters, Alcaeus, Callimachus, etc.; this could nowhere have such point as on the Palatine, with its new Greek and Latin libraries;⁴¹ for Horace, the Latin library is envisaged as being empty as yet of (or 'for'⁴²) Roman *vates* to match the Greek classics. The authors' haughty consequence is particularly appropriate if they are in exalted surroundings, laying claim to inclusion in a permanent hall of fame.⁴³ We may compare *Ep.* ii.1.216 *si munus Apolline dignum vis complere libris*. Indeed the issue of a book's admission to or rejection from the Palatine library was of wide and general importance;⁴⁴ notably, Ovid laments the absence of his works from that bastion of official recognition (*Tr.* iii.1.59 ff.).

We have established that some form of *recitatio* was probably held in the temple of Palatine Apollo (cf. Juv. ed. Mayor i², 179), but it should be stressed (*pace* Newman [n. 40] 36 ff.) that there is no evidence whatsoever for connecting that temple with any form of *collegium* or for supposing that the *recitationes* held there were the object of special imperial favour or design.

More important, this discussion of Hor. *Ep.* ii.2.91 ff. has, I hope, shown that there is no evidence for any association of elegy and lyric – as against drama – with the *collegium poetarum* or indeed with any place with which that *collegium* may have been connected (see below, p. 87). Neither, for that matter, is there a link attested between the writing of comic drama and the *collegium*.⁴⁵

I return to the topographical problem of the *aedes* of Hor. *Sat.* i.10.38: Porphyrio comments: *in aede Musarum, ubi poetae carmina sua recitabant* and Ps.-Acro both *in aede Apollinis* (which is of course chronologically intolerable) and *in aede Musarum ubi poetae multis audientibus recitare*⁴⁶ *carmina sua solebant*.

Aedes Musarum can only be taken as referring to the Aedes Herculis Musarum.⁴⁷ The statues of the Muses which that temple contained were found by M. Fulvius Nobilior in Ambracia,⁴⁸ only Eumenius (cf. n. 48) claims that the whole temple was built by Fulvius and I am inclined to accept the arguments of Castagnoli (*Gnomon* 33 (1961) 608) and Olinder (n. 41, 60 n. 157) that Fulvius did no more than add

the statues of the Muses – and a portico – to an already-existing temple of Hercules Magnus Custos. His role should be viewed with caution, for it is far from certain that he introduced the Muses into the temple of Hercules as part of a systematic policy of Hellenisation (cf. Tamm [n. 7] 165, T. Frank, *CAH* viii, 371). Fulvius had taken Ennius to Greece in furtherance of his own *gloria*, not as a conscious *imitatio Alexandri*: the *Scipio* had shown Ennius' potential usefulness to a new patron (cf. Badian [n. 5] 188 f.) and Fulvius was clearly seeking maximum publicity through the media available. His plunder of 785 bronze and 230 marble statues revealed an attitude towards foreign culture comparable to Napoleon's or Goering's. The Ambracian legates at Rome in 187 complained particularly of *templa tota urbe spoliata onamentis*.⁴⁹ The introduction of the Muses into the temple of Hercules will have meant far more to poet than to conqueror and could easily have been regarded as a minor act of beautification undertaken at the poet's own prompting. Eumenius hints as much as one of his explanations: *non id modo secutus quod ipse litteris et summi poetae amicitia duceretur*. I find the picture of the rapacious *triumphator* seeking to establish a new Alexandria on the banks of the Tiber does not carry conviction.

But possible analogues with Greek institutions are clearly to be considered with great care for the light they may shed on the Roman temple and for their potential importance in tracing the Hellenisation and indeed the very acceptance of literature at Rome (Badian [n. 5] 190, Sihler [n. 1] 20 f.).

We cannot, first, automatically conclude (so Tamm [n. 7] 165), Badian [n. 5] 189) that the name *Aedes Herculis Musarum* renders 'Museion'. After all, the Roman temple's full name is substantially closer to an original Greek 'Temple of Heracles Musagetes'. Moreover, we shall observe fundamental dissimilarities between the two institutions. The Alexandrian Museum contained a *συσσίτιον τῶν μετεχόντων τῶν Μουσειῶν φιλολόγων ἀνδρῶν* and over the *σύνοδος* (a society for a religious purpose) there presided a priest (*ιερεὺς*) appointed by the kings (Str. xvii, 793–4). Tamm (n. 7, 166 f.) claims that Strabo's reference to a *συσσίτιον* and the common feasts of Roman *collegia* are comparable. But even supposing that the *collegium poetarum* did meet in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum* (cf. p. 86) and did indulge in the regular banqueting so dear to the artisan *collegia* (Waltzing [n. 6] i, 322 ff., MacMullen [n. 9] 77 ff., cf., however, p. 86), the banquets were essentially occasional festivities, held only as often as the finances of *collegium* and members would permit, whereas the common room of the Alexandrian Museum (Fraser [n. 43] i, 315 f.) has rather the air of a permanent institution.

The religious element was clearly strong in the Alexandrian Museum and numerous parallels with literary and philosophical societies dedicated to the Muses have been collected (Fraser [n. 43] i, 312 ff.). But what details of the cult and priesthood of the Muses in Greece are legitimately transferable to a Roman context? Was Ennius himself, for all his often-expressed and profoundly innovatory respect for the Muses (Skutsch [n. 47] 3 ff., 18 ff.) necessarily their *sacerdos*? Even though he must have been involved closely with the establishment of the Muses in the Temple of Hercules (cf. *Ann.* xv (?), Skutsch [n. 47] 19), Roman *sacerdotes Musarum* (H. *Od.* iii.1.3, etc.) are poets, the product of inherited metaphor, and priests, properly speaking, not at all.⁵⁰ Indeed the title *Aedes Herculis Musarum*⁵¹ suggests that the Muses did *not* have a separate priest; after all, what Fulvius had found in Greece was a cult of Hercules as Musagetes,⁵² the *comitem ducemque* of the Muses, in Eumenius' words (cf. Tamm [n. 7] 165). The title – and the form of the title seems unique among Roman cults – subordinates the Muses to Hercules. If Rome was not yet ready for a full-scale temple and cult of the Greek Muses, then to introduce them in Hercules' train and to grant them a toe-hold in his temple was an ideal compromise. If Ennius' priesthood is improbable, so too are the existence of a festival of the Muses during the Republic,⁵³ and the presence in the temple of a statue of Ennius, though it is virtually certain that the temple contained one of Accius.⁵⁴

There is nothing to suggest that the lavish facilities of the Alexandrian Museum were reproduced in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, or that the vast range of scientific and literary studies that the Museum probably embraced⁵⁵ was imitated at Rome. For one thing, the scale of the temple was ludicrously inappropriate. A single apparent parallel of scholarly activity between temple and Museum exists.

The Aedes Herculis Musarum contained a set of *Fasti*, with some scholarly annotation, apparently Fulvius' own work.⁵⁶ But the similarity to Eratosthenes' *Chronographiae* is illusory: one work provided a system of universal chronology (Fraser [n. 43] i, 456 f.), the other was antiquarian, and its publication at Rome very probably no novelty.⁵⁷

It is not certain, though it is highly likely, that the Aedes Herculis Musarum was the seat, for a while at least, of the *collegium poetarum*. The known connexion of Accius with both is not proof enough; the parallelism of Valerius' phrase *voluminum certamina* with Horace's localised *certantia iudice Tarpa* seems to me far more persuasive.⁵⁸ The questions of when the *collegium* began to meet there and of who secured this privilege for the poet remain uncertain. We cannot even assume 179 for the date and M. Fulvius Nobilior as the patron (*pace* Badian [n. 5] 189). Substantial parts of the temple survive on the Severan marble plan and Tamm's interpretation (n. 7, 162 ff.; cf. Badian [n. 5] 188 f.) of the enclosed courtyard as eminently suited to poetic recitation is attractive; we cannot, however, infer that the courtyard was designed for this purpose, since the extent of Fulvius' work on the building remains so very uncertain.

The most interesting parallel between the Alexandrian Museum and the Aedes Herculis Musarum is provided precisely by those literary *certamina* which Horace hints took place there. In the Museum, as for instance in the temple of the Muses at Thespieae,⁵⁹ literary competitions were held:⁶⁰ *itaque Musis et Apollini ludos dedicavit (sc. Ptolomaeus) et, quemadmodum athletarum, sic communium scriptorum victoribus praemia et honores constituit* (Vitr. vii. praef. 4). Yet even here the parallel is not as close as it might seem, for the only form of *certamen* which we may legitimately associate with the temple is apparently not one to gain a laurel crown, but purely to establish which plays shall be performed on the public stage.

There is no real evidence to enable us to set these scraps of information within a coherent tradition of literary competitions at Rome in the first century B.C. In the second century, there is no satisfactory basis for concluding that prizes were awarded to comedies and tragedies; lines such as *Casina 17 haec, quom primum acta est, vicit omnis fabulas*⁶¹ do not require that we infer the existence of a formal competition.⁶² The mime is a thing quite apart and Publilius Syrus' famous challenge to all his rivals (Macr. ii.7.7) is irrelevant to this discussion.⁶³

There will, however, have been an element of real *certamen* in the form of *πρόγγων* which it seems likely that the *collegium poetarum* did at some time undertake – presumably to help the aediles decide which plays to put on (Lafaye [n. 37] 38 f.). These *πρόγγωνες* can hardly have been less intensely fought than other ancient – and modern – literary competitions of which we know; the honour of performance and the financial rewards – if not always as great as those accorded to Varius' *Thyestes* – will have seen to that. This is a far cry from the vinous amity of the artisans' *collegia* where all are *fratres* or *sodales* and under orders *ut sine bile refrigeretis*.⁶⁴

We are left with an attested role for the *collegium poetarum* that is exceedingly limited. What its original purpose was remains entirely obscure. That this original purpose, devised conceivably by Fulvius Nobilior, or, slightly more probably by Ennius, and put into effect by his patron, was substantially wider is not unlikely. Before the Muses' arrival in the Aedes Herculis when poets were as yet active primarily as dramatic poets, it is scarcely credible that there was any *collegium poetarum* active under that name; the *collegium scribarum histrionumque* (?) on the Aventine will have just about sufficed. The concept of non-dramatic poets in a third-century *collegium poetarum*, clinging perhaps to the *aedicula Camenarum*, as suggested by Jory (n. 5, 234, 236; cf. Riese [n. 20] 163) does not carry conviction. Equally, we have found no evidence for associating non-dramatic poets with the *collegium poetarum* at any later date either (see below, p. 87)

It is generally recognised⁶⁵ that the only evidence to suggest that the *collegium poetarum* might have survived into the Empire is furnished by two passages of Martial:

- (i) *an otiosus in schola poetarum
lepore tinctos Attico sales narrat?
hinc si recessit, porticum terit† templi†
an spatia carpit lentus Argonautarum.* (iii.20.8 ff.)
- (ii) *in schola poetarum dum fabulamur* (iv.61.3 f.).

It is not certain (*pace* Jory [n. 5] 234, n. 2) either that Martial refers to the *collegium poetarum* or to the Aedes Herculis Musarum. The lapse of time and change of word between the *aedes* of H. *Sat.* i.10 and Martial's *schola* indicate a need for caution. There are three areas of possible doubt:

(i) The first epigram gives us no real topographical clue. *Templi* is hopelessly vague and altogether unidentifiable; Friedlaender's ingenious *Magni*⁶⁶ hardly advances our argument, for *hinc si recessit* does not necessarily indicate the proximity of *schola* and *porticus*, though it might be inferred from Martial's overall picture of the genial ease of Canius Rufus' life. His alternative stroll in the *porticus Argonautarum* is no help either; it cannot be used to help locate what precedes precisely because it is an alternative.

Tamm's explanation (n. 7, 167, n. 3; cf. Hug, P.W. iiA,619) that Martial's *schola* is that in the *porticus Octaviae*⁶⁷ and his *templum* the Aedes Herculis Musarum, which the *porticus Octaviae* enclosed, will not stand, given the unacceptability of *templi*. Reading *Magni*, the credibility of Tamm's explanation is further reduced on account of the distance between Pompey's theatre with its porticoes and the *porticus Octaviae* with its *schola*.

(ii) Martial's phrase *schola poetarum* could very well denote a particular meeting-place of a *collegium* of poets,⁶⁸ though *schola* alone was apparently not used of the *collegium* itself until the fourth century (Crowther, n. 26, 577 n.10). The agreeable facilities of the *scholae* can hardly have been closed to members except on formal occasions of banquet and sacrifice (*pace* Kunihara [n. 2] 90), particularly if the *schola* was situated, as it often was, close to its members' work-places (More [n. 30] 252, Waltzing [n. 6] i, 218, MacMullen [n. 9] 70 ff.). There seems therefore to be no *prima facie* reason why poets should not have been able to use the *schola* of their *collegium* as a place for enjoying conversation and witty composition. The choice of the word *schola* is not in itself significant; it can refer to meeting-places in temples and secular edifices alike (Waltzing [n. 6] i, 224f., MacMullen [n. 9] 178, n. 73). Yet given the wide range of meanings of the word *schola* (Kunihara [n. 2] 90 f.) the survival of formal collegiality cannot legitimately be inferred simply from Martial's two expressions.

(iii) The third difficulty is that of genre. No evidence has appeared to connect the *collegium poetarum* with anything but tragedy and it is negatively significant that the references to elegy and lyric in Hor., *Ep.* ii.2.91 ff. proved not to be connected with the *collegium*. Here *lepore tinctos Attico sales* suggest clearly some form of neo-Catullan *versiculi*.⁶⁹ Of course the form and purpose of the *collegium* may have changed to admit of other genres of literature, but that is more than we can say. From Martial, therefore, no more can be inferred than that somewhere in Rome in his day there was some kind of clubroom frequented by epigrammatic poets.⁷⁰

In view of the miserable quantity of hard information surviving, it is not surprising that determined attempts have been made⁷¹ to run the *collegium* to ground in the corpus of Augustan poetry. The pursuit has proved unedifying and unsuccessful.⁷² If the sole surviving concern of the *collegium* was with stage drama, then the silence of the elegists should never have caused surprise (cf. Riese [n. 20] 165).

Only Ov. *Tr.* iii.1.69 f. need detain us even briefly:

*altera templa peto, vicino iuncta theatro:
haec quoque erant pedibus non adeunda meis.*

These lines follow the exclusion of Ovid's book from the Palatine library and Cancik (n. 34, 327) argues that the *altera templa* refer in fact to the Aedes Herculis Musarum, seat of the *collegium*: "Ovid ist – das besagt diese ebenso kunstreich wie vorsichtig und andeutende Klage – von der kaiserliche Bibliothek und seinen Dichterkollegen verstossen". This argument is only superficially ingenious: iii. 1.59–68 refer to the Palatine library and 71–2 to Pollio's in the Atrium Libertatis. It is therefore overwhelmingly probable that Ovid's reference is to the library of the *porticus Octaviae*. The *porticus Octaviae* of course lay as close as the Aedes Herculis Musarum to the theatres (*vicino iuncta theatro*) of Marcellus and Balbus (cf. Olinde [n. 41] 63, n. 170).

There remains, however, one piece of potential evidence from the very centre of the Augustan period. This inscription was discovered in 1956 in the Palazzale Labicano:

[P. Cor]nelius P(ublili) l(ibertus) Surus
[nome]nclator, mag(ister)
[[- -]linus v(icit) a(nnis) VIII]
[- -]utorum, praeco
[ab aer]ario ex tribus
[decuri]eis, mag(ister) scr(ibarum) poetar(um)
- - - - -]fecit in theatro lapidio
[ac]cens(us) co(n)s(ulis) et cens(or)s.⁷³

The chronology and topography of the inscription present interwoven difficulties: J.H. More has recently advanced ingenious and convincing arguments for a *terminus post quem* of 22 B.C. (n. 30, 256 f.). A *terminus ante quem* is perhaps to be extracted from 1. 7 *fecit in theatro lapidio* sc., as it might be *scholam* (More [n. 30] 251 f.). Jory and More both assume (n. 73, 125; n. 30, 249) that the theatre in question must be Pompey's. From its dedication in 55 till the completion of the theatre of Marcellus, the theatre of Pompey was the only stone theatre in Rome; it was called 'the theatre' or Pompey's theatre' (Platner - Ashby s.v.), but never, so far as we know 'the stone theatre', which may have been thought gratuitous or obvious. Augustus restored it and thereafter we find the description *marmoreum* (*Fast.Amit.*, Aug. 12, cf. Suet. *Aug.* 31) used. Only after this restoration would there have been adequate grounds for calling some other permanent theatre not faced, or not yet faced, with marble, *lapidium*.

Clearly Surus' stonemason could have used *theatrum lapidium* of the theatre of Marcellus at any time after its opening in time for the *ludi saeculares* of 17 B.C. (*Acta* 1.156). But *lapidium* could only have been used of the theatre of Marcellus for a very short period (cf. More [n. 30] 249) – up till 13 B.C., the probable year of its dedication. Until then it did not have a proper name, it may have lacked the marble and stucco facings on the inside and perhaps also on part of the outside that it later acquired and it did not as yet risk being confused with the *Theatrum Balbi*, begun some time after Balbus' triumph in 19. The theatre of Balbus was much the smallest and least renowned of Rome's three permanent theatres, and I find it rather hard to credit that the stonemason could – even after 13 B.C. – have called it simply 'the stone theatre'.

Surus' career is very suggestive – negatively. We cannot infer that he was a Syrian by birth, and I fear that not even More's suggestion⁷⁴ that the inscription gives the offices in order of tenure will stand (see below).

The *nomenclator* was the private servant of his master or patron, reminding the magistrate of names.

We must excise l. 3; More (n. 30, 250 f.) argues convincingly that this line has strayed in from a funerary inscription on a boy of nine.

Magister . . . utorum: Surus was on the board⁷⁵ of a guild, presumably of *adiutores* — possibly preceded by a limiting abbreviation of some three letters. It is hard to see what supplement other than *adiutorum* could stand, but no *collegium* of *adiutores* — assistants to the emperor or to a magistrate or to many administrative boards — is ever attested and, as More points out (n. 30, 246), the date is rather early for a large organised body of *adiutores*. Unfortunately, none of the lists of civil service grades contain *adiutores* (Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* i³, 355, n. 2). But it is fairly safe to infer that Surus had risen to senior status within his grade; he clearly had good organising ability and presumably a reputation as a ‘good guild man’. The post of *magister* of a guild involved control of religious acts, banquets, finance; it was onerous, honourable and financially demanding (Waltzing [n. 6] i, 390 ff., MacMullen [n. 9] 78 f.).

Praeco ab aerario ex tribus decurieiis: that is, treasury herald on the three panels — a maker of public announcements on behalf of the quaestors. *Praeco* is a very lowly grade indeed: it is bottom of the list in Cic. *Verr.* ii.2.27 and Orelli 4109; in the great Urso inscription (*ILS* 6087) only *librarius* and *tibicen* are lower.

I should like to postpone discussion of *mag. scr. poetar.*

accensus of consul and censor regularly stands next to *scriba*. The *accensus* was a confidential orderly, personally appointed by the magistrate, usually from among his own freedmen. Badian argues (n. 5, 190, n. 2) that *accensus* may be placed at the end of the list as a personal and not an official appointment; *nomenclator*, however, stands first.

We have finally to consider Surus’ second post as *magister* (cf. Jory [n. 5] 235). If, as I shall argue, this *collegium* involved *scribae* as well as poets, or even to the exclusion of poets, then we should probably infer that Surus himself served as *scriba*, the peak of the clerical grades. If it does emerge that the *collegium* contained two component groups, then the only alternative to this conclusion is to argue that Surus became *magister* because a *poeta*, though all the other evidence for his career suggests that he was a civil servant, and perfectly likely to have reached the rank of *scriba*.⁷⁵ I do not think it is a serious objection to regarding Surus as a *scriba* that *scribae* were more often *ingenui* than *liberti*, frequently indeed ending up as *equites*.⁷⁷ Enough freedman *scribae* are attested to show that for Surus to have served as *scriba* is perfectly credible, and a tribute either to his patron’s standing or to his own outstanding abilities.

There seems, unfortunately, to be general agreement to regard *scribarum poetarum* as denoting not two classes of members within a single *collegium* (cf. Waltzing [n. 6] i.344 f.), but one only — that is, with *poetarum* used adjectivally and exactly comparable to *librarius* in the familiar term *scriba librarius* (cf. Badian [n. 5] 190, n. 2). In support of this view, Jory and More (n. 5, 235 f., n. 30, 247 f.) invoke Festus p. 446.26 ff. L.:

scribas proprio nomine antiqui et poetas vocabant (cf. p. 79). *at nunc dicuntur scribae equidem librarii qui rationes publicas dicunt in tabulis.*

equidem: MSS; *et quidem* Mommsen (*St.R.* i³ 347, n. 5); *i quidem* (= *ii q.*) Havet; *ei quidem* Jory, More.

Jory (n. 5, 236) translates the paradoxical “nowadays the term *scriba* is applied, jointly with *librarius*, to official recorders”. I do not see the justification for “jointly with” and shall shortly suggest another interpretation.

As for Mommsen’s “are called *scribae* and indeed *librarii*” I do not see any advantage in separating

the two terms so often linked, or in emphasizing *librarii* (cf. Jory [n. 5] 236).

More (n. 30, 247, n. 20) translates the text as emended by Havet, Jory and himself "but nowadays are called *scribae* those *librarii* indeed who write down the public accounts in record books". This is not in keeping with Latin usage (cf. R.F. Rossi, *Diz. Epigr. s.v. Librarius*, iv.2.956): *scriba librarius* is a senior secretary, often called *scriba* for convenience. *Librarius* denotes a mere clerk, and *scribae librarii* are — predictably — called *librarii* very seldom. The full formal term *scriba librarius* — and by extension, *s.l. quaestorius*, *s.l. aedilium curulium*, *s.l. aedilium plebis*, *s.l. tribunicus* — must come from the official terminology of a period when all who wrote were called *scribae* and there was an absolute necessity of sharper definition.

I see no objection to translating the paradosis: "But now we actually call *scribae librarii* those who write down the public accounts in the records". *Equidem*⁷⁸ points to the retention of the term *scriba* in a sense paradoxical by comparison with its old use as 'poet', which is what Festus goes on to discuss.

I very much doubt whether *scriba poeta* is credible as an exact parallel to *scriba librarius*, as a formal designation of poets, redolent of archaism.⁷⁹ In the terminology of *collegia*, for which there is surabundant evidence, modifiers in titles are adjectives proper and usually in the *-arius* form — e.g. *exoneratores calciarii*, *fabri soliarum baxiarum*, *mensores et mercatores frumentarii*. Nor are the parallels cited by More⁸⁰ for modification by means of a noun in apposition all that pertinent. It becomes still clearer that *poetarum* should not be taken as a noun modifier when we consider that asyndeton in the titles of *collegia* is very common: cf. *CIL* v. 5128 *coll. fabrorum centonariorum dendrophorum*, Orelli 4106 *coll. liticinum cornicinum*, *CIL* vi.95 *brattiarum* (gold-beaters) *inauratores* (gilders), *Bull. Comm.* 1888, 83 *saccarii salarii*. Stylistically, *scribarum poetarum* is *asyndeton bimembre* and literary parallels such as *reges tetrarchae* (*Sall. Cat.* 20.7), or *nautae milites* (*Liv.* xxi.28.2) are easily come by.⁸¹

If, therefore, the collegium was intended for both *scribae* and *poetae*, there is, so far as I can see, no need to suppose that Surus was a poet, or indeed anything other than what the rest of the evidence suggests, that is, a senior government clerk.⁸²

But what of the *poetae* of the Surus inscription?

The association with government *scribae* and the fact that the one attested member seems to be a *scriba* not evidently inspired by the Muses makes me most reluctant to identify Surus' *collegium* with Accius', that is, with the *collegium poetarum* proper (cf. More [n. 30] 248). On the other hand, Surus' *collegium* is no likelier to have been Livius Andronicus'.

Badian (n. 5, 190, n. 2; cf. More [n. 30] 248, Jory [n. 5] 236) asserts that Surus' title as *magister scribarum poetarum* gives us "the fact that the guild preserved its ancient name". But I can see no identity between a *collegium* of *scribae* and poets and one of *scribae* and actors. In the old Aventine *collegium scribae* signified primarily 'authors', though government scribes may have been included; in the Surus inscription there are no actors — who by now had their own organisations — and it is overwhelmingly probable that the *scribae* are now government clerks. No evidence has been produced to show that the Aventine *collegium* was likely to have survived into Surus' days; even if it did, its membership would by now have been most probably limited to actors.

Topographical arguments are no more helpful. If the *theatrum lapidum* had been that of Pompey⁸³ the identification might have served as an indication of the low status of the *collegium*: we know of a guild of ladies' bootmakers — *fabri soliarum baxiarum* — with a *schola* under (*sub*) the theatre of Pompey (*ILS* 7249). But that identification of *theatrum lapidum* has been shown to be unlikely. It has also been suggested (More [n. 30] 252) that the *schola* (?) of the inscription must have been some kind of

subordinate accommodation for the *collegium* whose chief centre was the Aedes Herculis Musarum: I can find no evidence for the existence of such subordinate *scholae* (cf. Waltzing [n. 6] i, 211 ff.) and the essential dissimilarity between Accius' *collegium* and Surus' has already been discussed.

If this analysis is not excessively sceptical, we are faced with the problem of who the *poetae* of the Surus inscription actually are and why they should be linked with government *scribae*. It is conceivable that the answer does lie within the sphere of Festus' notice on *scribae*: a private *collegium* of government *scribae*, aware that their name had once denoted 'poet' could well have added the by-now highly respectable 'and poets' to the title of their *collegium*, not least if one of the purposes of their collegiality was a little mild versifying. This explanation would clearly be more appropriate to a private *collegium*, as Surus' apparently was (Jory [n. 5] 235) rather than to one of the official *decuriae*.

Or were there other poets who might find themselves associated with government *scribae*? It is clear enough (*pace* More [n. 30] 260) by now that Surus is not likely to have been a crony of Propertius, Ovid, Tibullus and Maecenas. But there were other poets. The writing of formal verse *elogia*⁸⁴ or epitaphs may not have been a full-time activity, but the *Carmina Latina Epigraphica* provides ample evidence for a mass of more or less incompetent versifiers at Rome.⁸⁵ Again, perhaps, on account of an ancient parity between government scribes and authors, these 'poets' may have sought and attained a share in the collegiality of government *scribae*.

The mystery remains complete, but it should be now have become clear that neither the precise wording of the Surus inscription, nor the little that we know of the *collegium poetarum* with which Accius and Tarpa were associated justify us in opening a new chapter in the history of *la littérature Latine inconnue* headed, as it might be 'Sure et son cercle'. If we eschew speculation, it will emerge that the overall history of the *collegium poetarum* simply cannot, in the present state of our knowledge, be traced. That is not to deny that the *collegium* existed.⁸⁵

University College London / Colgate University, Hamilton, NY

NOTES

- 1 E.G. Sihler, *AJP* 26 (1905) 1 ff.
- 2 K. Kunihara, *Ann. Istit. Giappon. di Cultura* (Roma) 1 (1963) 85 ff.
- 3 *proprio nomine* = *κυρίως*, cf. Gell. vi.6, xii.13, ii.20, xvi.11.
- 4 E. Fraenkel, P.W. Suppl. v. 599 (with further refs.), after H. Diels, *Sibyll. Blätter* (Berlin 1890) 90, n. 3.
- 5 Cf. Fraenkel (n. 4) 599 f., Schanz - Hosius i.48 f., E. Badian, *Entretiens Fond. Hardt* 17 (1972) (Ennius) 159 f., E.J. Jory, *Hermes* 98 (1970) 226, n. 4.
- 6 Cf. Jory (n. 5) 227, J.-P. Waltzing *Etude Historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains* i (Louvain 1895) 82.
- 7 C. Jahn, *Ber. sächs. Gesell. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.* 8 (1856) 294 f., Fraenkel (n. 4) 601, R. Till, *NJhb.* 3 (1940) 166, B. Tamm, *Opusc. Rom.* 3 (1961) 166, Jory (n. 5) 226, W. Suerbaum, *Unters. z. Selbstdarstellung ält. röm. Dichter, Spudasmata* 19 (Hildesheim 1968) 260.
- 8 *consistere*: *ILS* 7249, *CIL* xiii.1954; cf. Varr. *LL* vi.17. *dona ponere*: cf. *CIL* vi.630, ii.4498. Cf. Waltzing (n. 6) i.520, ii.178, iv.446 f., 553.
- 9 Waltzing (n. 6) i.210 ff.; cf. R. MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations* (New Haven 1974) 178, n. 83.

- 10 Cf. Ter. *Eun.* 20 *postquam aediles emerunt*; Suet. *vit. Ter.* p. 29 Reiff.; Hieron. *Chron. ann. Abr.* 1863 (Pacuvius) *fabulas venditavit*.
- 11 Till (n. 7) 164, F. de Robertis *Lavoro e Lavoratori*, Bari 1963, 67.
- 12 Leumann - Hofmann - Szantyr i.203; cf. Till (n. 7) 164, H. Bardon *St. Rom.* 3 (1955) 514 f.
- 13 Till (n. 7) 162, Bardon (n. 12) 516, Suerbaum (n. 7) 33 f., 260.
- 14 Till (n. 7) 161, J.H. Waszink, *Act. Phil. Aenip.* 1 (1962) 71.
- 15 W.J. Watts, *GR* 18 (1971) 91 ff.
- 16 I doubt whether the story that Livius was at one point a schoolmaster (Suet. *Gramm.* 1, cf. Jahn (n. 7) 294, Suerbaum (n. 7) 11, etc.) is relevant here.
- 17 Cf. Jahn (n. 7) 297, Jory (n. 5) 227, Waltzing (n. 6) i.199 f., Till (n. 7) 166 f. See p. : the only genre of *carmina* which may have been associated with a *collegium* at the date of the *Fasti* was, anyway, tragedy; cf. O. Zwierlein, *Die Rezitationsdramen Senecas*, *Beitr. z. kl. Phil.* 10, Meisenheim 1966, 158, for *carmina* in the sense of 'tragedy', quoting, e.g., *Ecl.* viii.10.
- 18 Domitian's Quinquatria at his Albanum, held in honour of Minerva, and including contests of oratory and poetry, are probably not relevant to this discussion; Jahn (n. 7) 299, Suet. *Dom.* 4.4, Cass. Dio lvii.1.
- 19 Jory (n. 5) 224, G. Sifakis, *Studies in the history of Hellenistic Drama* (London 1967) 24 ff., 92 ff., T.B.L. Webster, *Hellenistic Poetry and Art* (London 1964) 274.
- 20 Jory (n. 5) 226, Fraenkel (n. 4) 601, A. Riese, *Verhandl. 24 Versamml. Deutscher Philol. u. Schulmänner* (1866) 166.
- 21 G.E. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton 1971) 77 f.
- 22 Cf. the senate's grants to *peregrini*: Liv. xxviii.39.18, xxxvi.38.12, Jory (n. 5) 229.
- 23 Nep. praef. 5; cf. Liv. vii.2.12, R.W. Reynolds, *CQ* 37 (1943) 38 n. 5, D. Van Berchem, *Mus. Helv.* 5 (1948) 144.
- 24 Cf. below, p. 82 and Jory (n. 5) 234, n. 3 for a further possible connexion between Accius and the *collegium poetarum*. We are in no position to say whether he was ever a magister of the *collegium* or not (cf. p. 89); Jahn (n. 7) 298, W. Krenkel, *Wiss. Ztschr. Rostock* 7 (1957-8) 252 f.
- 25 Diehl, P.W. s.v. Iulius, 135; Drumann - Groebe iii, 114; Valerius' *maiestatis* might suggest that Caesar Strabo was in office.
- 26 Cic. *Brut.* 177, Schanz - Hosius i.138, Leo (n. 5) 386, N.B. Crowther *Latomus* 32 (1973) 576, Sihler (n. 1) 15 f., E. Bickel, *RM* 100 (1957) 34 ff.
- 27 *Auct. Herenn.* i.24, Quint. v.13.43; Schanz - Hosius, i.132.
- 28 Badian (n. 5) 190, n. 1, G. Bernhardt, *Grundriss d. röm. Lit.*⁵ (Braunschweig 1872) 78.
- 29 Even if Caesar Strabo were aedile, was Accius under the necessity of rising if the occasion was not public and official? (cf. Bernhardt, *loc. cit.*; Mommsen, *St. R.* i³ 398, O'Brien Moore, P.W. *Suppl.* vi.706). Accius had reached such years and eminence that many would rise to him out of simple courtesy.
- 30 Cf. L. Müller, *Q. Ennius, Eine Einleitung . . .* (St. Petersburg 1884) 31, Sihler (n. 1) 16, J.H. More, *Grazer Beiträge* 3 (1975) 252, n. 34.
- 31 (n. 5) 190; cf. Sihler (n. 1) 16, Waltzing (n. 6) i, 425 f.
- 32 Cf. R. Helm, P.W. viii A.i.100 ff., T.F. Carney, *RhM* 105 (1962) 292 ff., a reference for which I am indebted to Mr Y. Maslakov.

- 33 Cf. (?) H. *Sat.* i.2.1, Apul. *Met.* iv.5, *TLL* iii.3, 1598, 25 ff.
- 34 Jory (n. 5) 234, 236, Kunihara (n. 2) 85, Crowther *loc. cit.* (n. 26), H. Cancik, *Röm. Mitt.* 76 (1969) 327.
- 35 Cf. Jory (n. 5) 233, n. 4; it will not do to assume with Till (n. 7) 161, n. 2 that Valerius has casually altered the name from *scriba* to *poeta*; he is capable of that, but the difference between the *collegia* is clearly more than one of name.
- 36 Cf. W. Beare, *The Roman Stage*³ (London 1964) 166, C. Garton, *Personal Aspects of the Roman Theatre* (Toronto 1972) 140 ff., O. Ribbeck, *Die röm. Tragödie* (Leipzig 1875) 670 ff.
- 37 Cf. too the story of Terence and the *Andria: cum aedilibus daret, iussus ante Caecilio recitare* (Suet. *Ter.* 2). Cf. Beare (n. 36) 93, Duckworth (n. 21) 58 f., A. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals*² (Oxford 1968) 84. However, the story may, if authentic, suggest merely that Terence submitted his plays to the senior poet for improvement – without any preliminary staging. Porph. *ad Hor. Sat.* i.10.38 describes Tarpa as *emendator*. Cf. too G. Lafaye, *De poetarum et oratorum certaminibus apud veteres* (diss. Paris 1884), 36 f.
- 38 Against the *fable convenue* that H. ridiculed the *magister* Tarpa and his *collegium* (cf. Sihler [n. 1] 18 ff., T. Frank, *AJP* 46 (1925) 74 and even N. Rudd, *Satires of Horace* (Cambridge 1966) 120) see Crowther (n. 26) 577 ff. In H. *Sat.* i.10.37 f. there is no criticism voiced of Tarpa or of a *collegium*. No reason exists why Horace's opponents should form a coherent body, let alone belong to a single institution, which in some way determined Horace's attitude.
- 39 Cf. D. Flach, *Das lit. Verhältnis von Horaz u. Properz* (diss. Marburg 1967) 94 f.
- 40 J.K. Newmann, *Augustus and the new poetry*, *Coll. Latomus* 88 (Brussels 1967) 39 ff. distinguishes the two; however, Comm. Cruq. *ad. Sat.* i.10.38 *aedes Apollinis sive Musarum* provides an illusory foundation for further elaborate deductions; the Commentator preserves no independent ancient information: Nisbet - Hubbard, *Hor. Odes* i, li.
- 41 Cf. Juv. vii.37 *Musarum et Apollinis aedes* which probably refers to the Palatine complex: temple of Apollo with its libraries under the Muses' patronage and (?) containing their statues (cf. Cic. *Fam.* vii.23.2, C. Callmer, *Opusc. Arch.* 3 (1944) 152). The conventional interpretation refers *Musarum* to a library dedicated to the Muses and attached to the temple of Divus Augustus also on the Palatine (cf. Platner - Ashby, s.v. Augustus, Divus, Templum and Bibliotheca Templi Divi Augusti); but Mart. xii.3.7 f. is insufficient evidence for the dedication (cf. Tamm [n. 7] 159, B. Olinder *Porticus Octavia in Circo Flaminio*, *Acta Inst. Rom. Regn. Sueciae* 11 (Stockholm 1974) 63, n. 170)..
- 42 Cf. Flach (n. 39) 93 n. 1: 'of' and 'for' come to the same thing.
- 43 There is no positive evidence that the new temple of Palatine Apollo and its libraries were used for *recitationes*. But note that at Pergamum, at Alexandria and in the Stoa of Hadrian at Athens there seem to have been small rooms ideally suited to the sort of exclusive literary gathering envisaged by Hor.: Callmer (n. 41) 152, 153, 172 ff., P. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* i (Oxford 1972) 325, Mayor on Juv. iii.9, *ad init.*
- 44 Cf. Newman (n. 40) 39, Mayor on Juv. viii.38, Calp. Sic. iv.158 f.
- 45 The argument that the attacks upon Terence originated from within the *collegium* is an old one: Sihler (n. 1) 8 ff., Duckworth (n. 21) 65, E.L. Minar, *TAPA* 76 (1945) xxxvi^f, Crowther (n. 26) 576. It rests upon a tissue of hypothesis and misinformation: cf. Ter. *HT* 16 with Beare (n. 36) 95. The alleged connexion of Lucius Lanuvinus with the *collegium* has found no favour with leading Terentian scholars: e.g. E. Fraenkel, *Sokrates* 72 (1918) 315, H. Haffter *Mus. Helv.* 10 (1953) 7.
- 46 Which alone fails to account for Tarpa's judicial function and Horace's *certantia*.
- 47 Cf. Frazer, ed. *Ov. Fasti* iv.344 ff.; a popular topic of late: Badian (n. 5) 188 ff., Tamm (n. 7) 157 ff., Cancik (n. 34) 323 ff. and *Silvae, Festschr. E. Zinn* (Tübingen 1970) 7 ff., Jory (n. 5) 234, Olinder (n. 41) 58 ff., O. Skutsch, *Studia Enniana* (London 1968) 18 ff.
- 48 Nobilior triumphed in 187. Cf., however, Eum. (*Pan. Lat.* 5) 7 and Liv. xl.51.4 f., *porticum ad fanum Herculis* (among the *opera censoria* of M.F.N.; cf. J. Suolahti *Roman Censors* [Helsinki 1963] 65). Despite *ILS* 16, referring to Fulvius' capture of Ambracia and found near the site of the Aedes Herculis Musarum, I prefer the later date.

- 49 Liv. xxxviii.43.6; cf. Plin. xxxv.66; the cry was taken up by Fulvius' enemy, M. Aemilius Lepidus, cos. 187: Liv. xxxiv.4.11 f.; contrast the argument of Liv. xxxviii.43.9 ff.
- 50 O. Falter, *Der Dichter u. sein Gott* (Würzburg 1934) 74 ff., etc.
- 51 Serv. *ad Aen.* i.8 and Plut. *QR 59* suggest erroneously a title 'Herculis et Musarum'; see Platner - Ashby s.v.
- 52 A rare cult: against Klügmann, *Commentationes Mommsen* (Berlin 1877) 262 ff., cf. Gruppe, *Gr. Myth.* i.500, Olinder (n. 41) 59, n. 156, Bömer on Ov. *F.* vi.800.
- 53 The evidence for a festival of the Muses at Rome is as tenuous as that for a priesthood: an independent festival may well only date back to – e.g. – Marcus Philippus' restoration of the temple in (?) 33 B.C.: cf. F.W. Shipley *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 9 (1931) 29 f., 48, Cancik (n. 34) 324, (n. 47) 10, Olinder (n. 41) 62 f.
- 54 Plin. *Nat.* xxxiv.19 with Cancik (n. 47) 9 f. The epigram *aspicite, o cives, senis Enni imaginis formam.* (*Varia* 15 V²) is certainly not evidence and may well have belonged to a first century book-illustration (Suerbaum [n. 5] 335 f.; cf. too E. Brandt, *Philol.* 83 (1928) 331 ff.) (or even to a statue of Ennius at Rudiae (Hier. *Chron. ann. Abr.* 1849, O. Jahn, *Herm.* 2 (1867) 243); cf. further Suerbaum (n. 7) 208 ff., 333 ff., T. Dohrn, *Röm.Mitt.* 69 (1962) 78 f., H. Dahlmann, *Studien z. Varro de Poetis, Abh. Akad. Mainz* 10 (1962) 68 f.
- 55 Fraser (n. 43) i.317, R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1968) 96 ff.
- 56 Cf. Macr. i.12.6, Schanz - Hosius i.235, *Inscr. It.* xiii.2 xx^f, A.K.L. Michels *Calendar of the Roman Republic* (Princeton 1967) 124 f.
- 57 Klügmann (n. 52) 264. Cf. the *fasti* of Cn. Flavius (supra, p. 80); their large scale and evident political purpose suggest a modicum of explanation, even if not of a particularly scholarly kind (Liv. ix.46.5, Val.Max. ii.5.2, Michels [n. 56] 108, n. 49), Badian (n. 5) 189, n. 2.
- 58 Jory (n. 5) 234, Sihler (n. 1) 19, Badian (n. 5) 189, Crowther (n. 26) 577 f., etc.
- 59 Fraser (n. 43) i.313, G. Roux, *BCH* 78 (1954) 42 ff.
- 60 Vittr. vii. praef. 4; cf. Fraser (n. 43) i, 316, and *Eranos* 68 (1970) 119 ff.
- 61 Cf. Hor. *Ep.* ii.1.180 f., *valeat res ludicra si me / palma negata macrum, donata reducit opimum.* It would clearly be unwise to infer an exact reference to current Roman practice from such a passage.
- 62 Ribbeck (n. 36) 669 f., F. Ritschl, *Parerga Plautina* (Leipzig 1845) 229, Lafaye (n. 37) 35 ff., Mommsen *R.G.*⁹ i.885, ii.442, Marquardt *St. V.*² iii.542.
- 63 But cf. the competition of *greges* and individual actors implied by *Poen.* 36, *Amph.* 69 ff., Cic. *Att.* iv.15.6, which accords with Hellenistic practice elsewhere: Lafaye (n. 37) 34, Sifakis (n. 19) 14, etc.
- 64 *CIL* xiv.3323; cf. Waltzing (n. 6) i,322 ff., MacMullen (n. 9) 78.
- 65 Sihler (n. 1) 16 f., Kuniyama (n. 2) 90 f., Crowther (n. 26) 577, Olinder (n. 41) 98 ff., Tamm (n. 7) 167, Jory (n. 5) 234, n. 2.
- 66 Cf. ii.14.6, xi.1.10, H. Jordan, *Topographie* i.3.574.
- 67 Plin. xxxv.114, xxxvi.22, Kuniyama (n. 2) 92.
- 68 Cf. – e.g. – More (n. 30) 251 f., Waltzing (n. 6) iv.437 ff., *schola fontanorum* (*Bull.Com.* 1876, 139), *schola medicorum* (*CIL* vi.29805), *schola viatorum* (*CIL* vi.1936).

- 69 Cf. Cat. 16.7, Plin. *Ep.* i.16.5, v.3.5, Schanz - Hosius ii.546, D.O. Ross, *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Harvard 1969) 31 f.
- 70 MacMullen (n. 9, 179, n. 78) is clearly right to compare the FILOSOFI LOCULUS in the baths of Cuicul in Numidia (*CIL* x.10890).
- 71 Notably by P. Boyancé, *Entretiens Fond. Hardt 2* (1953) 153 ff.; cf. Newman (n. 40) 38 f.
- 72 Cf. Riese (n. 20) 163, Kunihara (n. 2) 90 for firm expressions of scepticism. The correct interpretation of (e.g.) *Ov. Tr.* iv.10.41 f. and *Ex. P.* iii.4.67 f. in terms of inherited Greek metaphor was seen clearly by Otto Jahn (n. 7, 299f.). Full consideration of the literary antecedents should likewise have precluded Boyancé's discovery of a poetic 'thiasos' in Augustan invocations of Bacchus (*loc. cit.*); cf. Newman (n. 40) 38.
- 73 Photo, squeeze and transcript: More (n. 30) 242 ff.; see also Jory (n. 5) 234 f., and *BICS* 15 (1968) 125 f.; More 241, n. 2 for earlier bibliography.
- 74 More (n. 30) 253. More's discussion of Surus' career is invaluable.
- 75 *Magister* meant 'member of the board' rather than 'president'; there could be up to ten at a time in a single *collegium*: Waltzing (n. 6) i, 388.
- 76 In view of *CIL* vi.103 (early third century A.D.) which refers to a *collegium* of *scribae librarii* and *praecones aedilium curulium*, Surus could conceivably have been *magister* of a *collegium* of *scribae* though only a *praeco*, but the idea is clearly unattractive.
- 77 Cic. *Verr.* ii.3.185, S. Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen during the late Republic* (Oxford 1969) 154.
- 78 Cf. F. Hand, *Tursellinus* ii (Leipzig 1832) 432.
- 79 Cf. 'The Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen' and More (n. 30) 248, n. 23.
- 80 (n. 30) 248, n. 22, Cic. *Phil.* xi.39, Plaut. *Poen.* 1094.
- 81 Leumann - Hofmann - Szantyr 828 f., A. Draeger, *Hist. Syntax* (Leipzig 1881) ii, 193 f.
- 82 *Pace* More (n. 30) 242, 253, etc., and, by implication, Jory (n. 73) 125.
- 83 It would have been tempting to link the inscription with *Mart.* iii.20.8 ff., reading *Magni* in 10 as Friedlaender suggested (above, p. 87); then we could have supposed that Canius Rufus had passed simply from the *schola* in the theatre of Pompey (i.e. the *schola* of the inscription, thereby hinting at institutional continuity) to the adjoining portico. But since the theatre is *not* likely to be Pompey's the connexion should probably be rejected.
- 84 Cf. H. Roth, *Unters. über die Lat. Weihgedichte auf Stein* (diss. Giessen, 1935) 13 ff.
- 85 Cf. F.F. Abbott, *Society and Politics in Ancient Rome* (London 1912) 182 ff., *id.*, *The Common People of Ancient Rome* (London 1912) 95 ff.
- 86 I am particularly grateful to Adrian Gratwick for much stimulating discussion, notably of the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*; dissent will not be confused with ingratitude. I wish also to thank Professors E.W. Handley, R.G.M. Nisbet, E. Wisstrand, O. Skutsch and G.P. Goold for illuminating individual problems.

