

# Table of Contents

**Editors' Preface — IX**

David O. Ross

**Prologue — 1**

Charles McNelis

**Mythical and Literary Genealogies: Aeneas and the Trojan Line in Homer, Ennius and Vergil — 3**

Leah Kronenberg

**Reading Virgil and His Trees: The Alder and the Poplar Tree in Catullus and Virgil — 17**

Peter E. Knox

**A Known Unknown in Pompeian Graffiti? — 29**

Sergio Casali

**Dido's *furtiuus amor* (Virgil, *Aeneid* 4.171–2) — 41**

James O'Hara

**"Genre, Gender, and the Etymology Behind the Phrase *Lugentes campi* at *Aeneid* 6.441" — 51**

Julia Hejduk

***Saepe stilum uertas*: Moral and Metrical Missteps in Horace's *Satires* — 63**

Hayden Pelliccia

**The reception of Horace *Odes* 2.4 in Horace *Odes* 2.5 — 75**

Barbara Weiden Boyd

***Beatus ille qui procul ... otis?*: Ovid's Rustication Cure (*Remedia amoris* 169–98) — 89**

Alexander Sens

**Envy and Closure in the Greek Anthology — 101**

**VIII — Table of Contents**

Brian W. Breed

**Some Second Poems: Theocritus, Virgil, Tibullus — 117**

Charles Martindale

**The Horatianism of Marvell's "Horatian Ode" — 131**

Thomas Palaima

**Masters of War: Virgil, Horace, Owen, Pound, Trumbo, Dylan and the Art of Reference — 147**

**Works Cited — 169**

**Notes on Contributors — 185**

**Index Locorum — 187**

**Index Rerum — 189**

Sergio Casali

## Dido's *furtiuus amor* (Virgil, *Aeneid* 4.171–2)

In this paper,<sup>1</sup> I would like to address the difficulties which are in my view contained in the narrator's words at *Aeneid* 4.171–2, *nec iam furtium Dido meditatur amorem: | coniugium uocat, hoc praetexit nomine culpam* “and Dido no longer thinks of a clandestine love-affair” (if this, as I will argue, is the right translation), “she calls it a marriage, and with this name she cloaks her *culpa*”. There are a number of unclear issues here:

- (i) what is the *culpa* of line 172?
- (ii) when Dido cloaks her *culpa* with the name of marriage, does she do so publicly, or only in her own heart?
- (iii) is Dido sincerely convinced that she is married to Aeneas? – a question with important consequences for our reading of the whole problem of Dido and Aeneas's “marriage”; and, finally, my main question,
- (iv) what is the exact meaning of *furtiuus amor* in line 171?

Whereas one cannot attain complete certainty about the “solution” to any of these issues, the third has important consequences for our reading of the whole problem of Dido and Aeneas's “marriage”, while I think at least the fourth, my chief interest here, can be satisfyingly answered, even if in a manner different from that usually given by translators and commentators.

At *Aeneid* 4.160–8, the storm foretold by Juno at 120–5 breaks out; the hunters scatter; Aeneas and Dido reach the same cave together. Earth and Juno as *pronuba* give the signal, lightning bolts flash, aether/Aether stands as a witness to the wedding, and the Nymphs howl on the mountain-top.<sup>2</sup>

Both Dido and Anna have always spoken of the potential relationship with Aeneas as a marriage (16–18, 33, 48, 59); Juno has envisioned an actual wedding

---

<sup>1</sup> For constructive criticism and advice I wish to thank Luigi Galasso, Emily Gowers, Philip Hardie, Stephen Oakley, Alessandro Schiesaro, Fabio Stok, and above all Jim O'Hara, discussion with whom helped me enormously in the construction of my argument.

<sup>2</sup> On *Aen.* 4.160–72, and the problems of Dido's “marriage”, see Quinn 1963, 37f., G. Williams 1968, 377–389, Monti 1981, 45–48, Feeney 1983, 204f. = Harrison 1990, 167f., Moles 1984, 51f., Green 1986, 411–417, Moles 1987, 155f., Cairns 1989, 47–49, Harrison 1989, 14f., Desmond 1994, 28–30, Horsfall 1995, 126–128, Bowie 1998, 68–70, Nelis 2001, 148–152, Thomas 2001, 186–189, Hardie 2012, 84–86, Seider 2013, 113f.

(125–7), and the repetition of Juno’s words at 161 and 165 f. underlines the accomplishment of the will of the goddess.<sup>3</sup> Lines 166–8 might legitimately suggest that an actual wedding has taken place (*Aen.* 4.165–8):

speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem  
deueniunt. prima<sup>4</sup> et Tellus et pronuba Iuno  
dant signum;<sup>5</sup> fulsere ignes et conscius Aether  
conubiis summoque ulularunt uertice Nymphae.

The Trojan chief and Dido come to the same cave. First Earth and Juno as pronuba give a sign; fires flashed, together with Aether, witness to the wedding, and the Nymphs screamed on the mountain-top.

Aether<sup>6</sup> is a witness “to the wedding” (*conubiis*, 167): “The word... should not be dismissed, forgotten, or ignored. It provides the greatest stumbling block for those who do not believe that a marriage of any kind took place. Modern writers can speak of a ‘marriage’, but although ancient analogies to the modern use of quotation marks may exist in speeches, it is unthinkable in narratives. Vergil seems to be emphasizing that a marriage occurred, albeit one shrouded in am-

---

<sup>3</sup> At 161 *insequitur commixta grandine nimbus* echo the words of Juno in 120 *his ego nigrantem commixta grandine nimbum*; at 165 f. *speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem* / *deueniunt* repeat Juno’s words at 124 f. (with *deuenient*). How Juno’s pronouncing the union a marriage (126, *conubio*; cf. 168) can be disregarded or even subverted by the narrator at 4.171 f. is one of the major mysteries surrounding the issue of Dido’s “marriage”.

<sup>4</sup> It is not clear whether *prima* means “first”, referring to the order of the actions (so Heyne, who also recalls Heinsius’ conjecture *primae Tellus et pr. I.*, and many translators), or “primal”, Earth being the oldest of the divinities, cf. 7.136 f. *primamque deorum* / *Tellurem* (so, after Henry 1878, 646–648, the majority of the commentators). The first possibility is more natural.

<sup>5</sup> It is not easy to decide whether Tellus and Juno “give a sign”, which *consists* in the *ignes* flashing in the sky and in the shrieking of the nymphs (168) – to be interpreted as good or bad omens; or whether they “give the signal” for the “ceremony” to begin, a signal, that is, which is to be imagined as something *different* from the *ignes* and the shrieking of the nymphs; for example, Servius thinks that Tellus gives her signal through an earthquake (an ominous event for a wedding *secundum Etruscam disciplinam*), and Juno *per tempestatem... et pluuias, quae de aere* (Juno’s element) *fiunt*. Henry, instead, imagining that “[t]he signal was either a note of the *tibia* or some such instrument, or it was the first strain of the *hymenaeus* raised by the *pronuba* to be taken up from her and continued by the whole procession”, thinks of some sort of unspecified signal given by the two goddesses, Tellus and Juno, personally present at the wedding (Henry 1878, 649).

<sup>6</sup> With Thomas 2001, 187 I would prefer to follow Henry and Page in reading *Aether* (as in *G.* 2.325), in order to underline the effective presence of another “authoritative divine witness” to the union.

biguity”.<sup>7</sup> There is Juno herself as *pronuba*, a sign “as if for the bridal procession” (Austin 1955), lightning bolts as wedding torches, Nymphs who sing the wedding song.<sup>8</sup> Obviously that would be a strange “rite”: the storm itself is an ominous setting, there are no human witnesses, and the howling of the nymphs could be a ritual cry but also a cry of horror.<sup>9</sup> But nevertheless it would be easy for the reader to understand from all this that “the gods, in a way inexplicable as if it were magic, accomplished what they had planned” (G. Williams 1968, 379).

Yet the narrator’s observations in 169–172 contradict this implication:

ille dies primus leti primusque malorum  
causa fuit; neque enim specie famaue mouetur  
nec iam furtium Dido meditatur amorem:  
coniugium uocat, hoc praetexit nomine culpam.

That day was the first of death and the first cause of sorrow; Dido is no longer influenced by what people see or hear, nor she any longer thinks of a clandestine love-affair, but calls it marriage, and with this name she cloaks her crime.

---

<sup>7</sup> Green 1986, 411.

<sup>8</sup> The union in the cave is reminiscent of the marriage of Jason and Medea in a cave in Corcyra in Ap. Rhod. 4.1128–1169; see Nelis 2001, 148f. The Nymphs and Hera also attend Jason and Medea’s wedding (Nymphs: 4.1143–1155, 1196f.; Hera: 4.1151, 1184f., 1199f.), but between the two passages there are many significant differences: see Cairns 1989, 47–49. According to Henry 1878, 644, “there is a union taking place at the same time between Dido and Aeneas and between the air and the earth” (cf. e.g. G. 2.325–327), a notion accepted by Page and O’Hara ad loc.; see Thomas 2001, 187; contra, see Pease on 160.

<sup>9</sup> The shriek of the Nymphs corresponds to the marriage song of the Nymphs on the morning after the wedding of Jason and Medea at Ap. Rhod. 4.1196f. (Virgil’s words recall also Ap. Rhod. 3.1218f., where the nymphs howl when Jason sacrifices in honour of Hecate: Nelis 2001, 148 n. 104.) Some commentators take this howling as a sinister sign (Heyne, Pease); others as a joyful song (Henry, Conington). In fact, Virgil has, in *ululo*, chosen an ambiguous word. As already noted by Servius and DServius, the verb (and the noun *ululatus*) is a *uox media* whose meaning depends on the context: it can refer to a ritual cry (DServ. ad loc.: *non nulli ita accipiunt, quod ululare ueteres etiam in sacris dicebant ex Graeca consuetudine. ergo ulularunt nymphae quasi nuptiarum sacra celebrarunt*) or to an ominous cry of sorrow or horror (cf. e.g. 667, the cries at Dido’s death). As an example of *ululo* in a non-mournful context Servius quotes Luc. 6.261 *laetis ululare triumphis*, and DServ. the howling of the Amazons in battle at *Aen.* 11.662 *magnoque ululante tumultu*; *ululatus* is also used by Virgil of cries in the worship of Bacchus (7.395); Dido herself in her curse invokes Hecate *nocturnis... triuis ululata per urbes* (4.609). (The same is true for the corresponding Greek verb ὀλολύζειν which can be a cry both of joy and of sorrow.) Ovid in *H.* 7.95f. clearly takes Virgil’s words as implying a positive ritual cry of the nymphs: *audieram uoces: nymphas ululasse putavi; | Eumenidum fati signa dedere mei* (see Knox 1995, 22f.).

That was the first day of death and sorrow; Dido is no longer concerned about appearances or renown; “she no longer thinks of a *furtiuus amor*, but calls it marriage, with this name she cloaks her *culpa*” (171f.). This implies that the relationship that begins in the cave was not a *coniugium* at all, and that the whole scene is to be reconsidered as “an elemental and demonic parody of the Roman marriage ceremony” (Hardie 1993, 90).

But the narrator’s comment in 169–172 is far from being straightforward. Especially problematic are the crucial lines 171f. Let us begin with line 172: “she calls it marriage, with this name she cloaks her guilt”.<sup>10</sup> A preliminary issue to be clarified is the meaning of *culpa*. According to Pease, “In 4.19 and here the *culpa* involves unfaithfulness to the memory of Sychaeus”.<sup>11</sup> But in 19 what Dido considered as a *culpa* was exactly her being married to Aeneas, that is, what she uses here to “cloak” her *culpa*. So, from a strictly logical point of view, the *culpa* in 172 must be different from the *culpa* in 19, and must refer to a sexual relationship that was not a marriage, a “sexual misdeameanour”.<sup>12</sup> In other words, the *culpa* corresponds to the *furtiuus amor* of the preceding line: if *furtiuus amor* is, as we shall see, an illicit love–affair, then Dido no longer thinks of an illicit love–affair; she calls it marriage; with this name cloaks her misdeed (i. e. the fact of being involved in an illicit love–affair).<sup>13</sup> But one cannot altogether exclude that the line is (also?) focalized through Dido, with *culpa* suggesting “her previous sense that her marriage to Aeneas would have involved *culpa*” (O’Hara), in a contradiction with line 19 which we have to accept as such.<sup>14</sup>

It is not specified if Dido calls her relationship a marriage in public or in her own heart. In the first case, there is a slight contradiction with 170, as Dido would show some concern over her reputation after all. Furthermore, if the mar-

---

**10** For the problems of line 172, see O’Hara 2011, ad loc.: “Does the narrator condemn what she is doing, or is the line ‘focalized’ through Dido (or looked at her from her perspective or point of view), so that she is overcoming her previous sense that marriage to Aeneas would have involved *culpa*? Does Dido ‘call’ (*uocat*) the relationship a marriage openly, or only in her mind? Does she ‘cover over’ a fault, or her previous sense that her marriage to Aeneas would have involved *culpa*?”

**11** So for example also G. Williams 1968, 384, Agrell 2004, 101.

**12** See Monti 1981, 106f. n. 29, Moles 1984, 51–53, Horsfall 1995, 126–128.

**13** For *culpa* “de amore illicito” see *TLL* 4.1302.67–1303.18.

**14** See also, similarly, Harrison 2015, 167f.: “On the famous crux of *culpam* at 4.172, S[eider 2013, 113f.] takes it as the narrator’s negative moral judgement, but it is equally well worth considering it as Dido’s own exaggerated self–condemnation (neither party is currently married, and Dido’s devoted attachment to the dead Sychaeus might be excessive even from a Roman perspective)”.

riage is publicly declared as such, it is difficult to understand Aeneas' position: why did he not clarify from the beginning that he did not see their union as a marriage? On the other side, the contrast between 170f. and 172 seems to imply that Dido is indeed talking *publicly* of her relationship as a marriage. We must remain uncertain, regarding it perhaps as slightly more probable that Dido *calls* her relationship a marriage only in her own heart: what she offers to people to see and hear (170) is her cohabiting with Aeneas (never expressly characterized as such, but obviously implied by the narrative), and in any case the public parading of the relationship; for this she does not have to make open statements about its legal status. For her the relationship is a marriage, and she behaves, publicly and privately, as if it is, but she does not necessarily declare it to be such explicitly. Obviously, how Aeneas could first accept all this, and then deny that he is married to Dido, remains an open question.

Also debatable, and clearly more important, is whether Dido, when she cloaks her *culpa* with the word *coniugium*, is sincerely convinced she is married to Aeneas, i. e., is she cloaking her guilt from *her own* eyes, or is she lying?<sup>15</sup> It is again impossible to reach a definite conclusion, but the first possibility is by far the most probable; in fact, from this point on Dido always refers to her relationship with Aeneas in terms of marriage (307 *data dextera quondam*, 314–316, 324, 431, 495f., 550, 597 *en dextra fidesque*), and there is nothing in the text to suggest that she is not sincerely convinced that this is its true nature.

In fact, it is possible to think that what at the beginning is not a marriage, as stated in 172, later evolves, through prolonged cohabitation and because of Aeneas' behavior (think of his involvement in the construction of Carthage at 260 and of the word *uxorius* used by Mercury at 266), into what Dido can even *legitimately* think of as a real marriage.<sup>16</sup>

In sum, notwithstanding the narrator's explicit declaration that what happened in the cave was no *coniugium*, Dido can still be sincerely convinced

---

**15** For the first possibility see for example G. Williams 1968, 380: “the decisive fact is that Virgil always portrays Dido as really convinced that she is married to Aeneas”; for the second one, Moles 1984, 53: “at this point Dido knows that she is not married to Aeneas but pretends to the world that she is to avoid disgrace”.

**16** For this position see Monti 1981, 45–48; on the possible ambiguity of the legal status of relationships in Roman society see G. Williams 1968, 378–383, Treggiari 1981, 59f. (with reference to Dido and Aeneas). Hardly relevant for this issue is the fact that Aeneas can be seen as a proto-Roman and Dido as a *peregrina*, as maintained by Cairns 1989, 48, Horsfall 1995, 128. At 192 *cui se pulchra uiro* (“as a husband”) *dignetur iungere Dido* it is not clear whether Fama depicts Aeneas as the *real* husband of Dido (so e.g. O'Hara 2011, ad loc.: “Rumor describes the union as a marriage”), or whether *uiro* represents Dido's point of view (= *tamquam uiro* “considering him as a husband”; so e.g. Paratore 1947, ad loc.).

that she is married to Aeneas; Aeneas, on the other side, is surely right when he points out that there has been no formal ceremony (338 f. *nec coniugis umquam / praetendi taedas*); but we are not given any clue about the sincerity of his claim that on his part there has been no consent or *maritalis affectio* (339 *aut haec in foedera ueni*): we are given a peek into Dido's "consciousness", but never into Aeneas', and we do not know what Aeneas has said in the cave or during his subsequent cohabitation with Dido, or how he reacted to Dido's public presentation, or (possibly) even declaration, of their relationship as a marriage.

Let's now turn to 171, *nec iam furtiuum Dido meditatur amorem*. A translation along the lines of "and Dido does not think anymore of (or does not practice anymore) her love as a secret one" is supported by the glosses of Heyne ("nec iam clam amat, non celat amorem"), West ("no longer kept her love as a secret in her own heart"), and Hardie ("no longer kept her love a secret in her heart").<sup>17</sup>

---

17 Hardie 2012, 84, but see below. See Buscaroli 1932, ad loc.: "Didone non nutre piu segretamente in cuor suo (*furtiuum* non è, come sembra ad alcuni, attributivo!) l'amore per Enea, ma lo chiama, perché lo considera, vero e proprio connubio [...]. *Meditatur* è "cogitando persequitur" (Forbiger), 'vagheggia'" (notice, however, that Forbiger seems to intend the line in a different way: see below); La Penna / Grassi 1971, ad loc.: "'né ormai Didone coltiva l'amore nascondendolo nel suo animo'. *Furtiuum... amorem* si riferisce al precedente amore non dichiarato"; G. Williams 1968, 379: "Then he [sc. the narrator] says that Dido is now acting openly – where previously she had kept her love for Aeneas a secret known only to her sister. (It should perhaps be said explicitly that, when Virgil speaks here of a "secret love", he does not mean that Dido had been secretly making love with Aeneas, but that she had been feeling love for him and not talking about it.); he translates: "it is not a secret love she now practices". De la Cerda 1612, 411 (in his "Explicatio") explains: "Itaque non iam furtim exercet amores suos, sic explico *meditatur*, sed vocat coniugium": this evidently means that Dido no longer nourishes a feeling of love for Aeneas in the secret of her heart (i.e. the usual explanation). Those who interpret the line in this sense usually take *meditatur* in the sense of *exercet* "nourishes", "practices her love in secret" (cf. La Cerda's *exercet*, Buscaroli's "nutre", La Penna / Grassi's "coltiva"); for this sense of *meditatur* cf. already Servius: '*meditatur*': *exercet*; sic Horatius (*Carm.* 4.14.27 f.) '*et horridam [sic] cultis / diluuiem meditatur agris*'. *nec incongrue dictum: actus enim est in ipsa meditatione, nam exercitium est meditatio*. Horace's passage means that "Tiberius as river is plotting a deluge against cultivated fields", where *meditatur* "involves actual planning" (Thomas 2011, ad loc.), so perhaps it is not the best parallel for *meditor* = *exerceo* (saying that "Dido no longer secretly plans a love" with Aeneas does not seem what those who follows the usual explanation want to mean); but otherwise this seems a possible extension of the meaning of *meditor* (cf. *OLD* s.v. 5a "To rehearse, practise (an action, part, etc.)"), even if in the only other instance of the phrase, Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.23–4 *incestos amores / de tenero meditatur ungui* (a difficult passage owing to the uncertain meaning of *de tenero ... ungui*) the sense is probably "goes over in contemplation" (Nisbet in Nisbet–Rudd 2004, ad loc.). It goes without saying that "[t]o contemplate as a possible course of action, have in mind, intend" (*OLD* s.v. 2a, which so catalogues our passage) is the most natural sense of *meditor* here. But this meaning can be adapted also to the usual explanation of the line: "she no longer thinks of her love as a secret in her heart"; so,



However, *furtiuuum... amorem* clearly suggests “the secret elegiac (or iambic, lyric) liaison” (Hardie 2012, 86).<sup>18</sup> *Furtiuuus* in this erotic sense normally refers to a relationship kept secret from others but also consummated, while in this case, if we were to accept Heyne’s interpretation, it should exceptionally refer to a love kept secret *from the other partner*. I cannot find any parallel for such a meaning of *furtiuuus amor*. Clearly right is that minority of interpreters who understand: “she no longer thinks of a secret love–affair” (Green 1986, 414),<sup>19</sup> “[Dido] no longer thinks of enjoying a secret liaison” (Ahl).<sup>20</sup> This is actually the inevitable meaning of this line: “Dido is not moved by appearances or what people say; and she no longer thinks of a clandestine love–affair [i.e. no longer thinks of

---

for example, if I correctly understand, Day Lewis: “the love she brooded on now was a secret love no longer”; Lombardo: “She no longer thinks to keep the affair a secret” (where, however, the use of the term “affair” probably points towards the interpretation we will consider next). – I am not sure of how Conington interprets the line: “It is not on a concealed love that Dido’s heart is any longer set”.

**18** Cf. Catull. 7.8, Tib. 1.5.75, and see O’Hara 2011, ad loc.: “the phrase suggests the clandestine affairs of Latin love poetry (which Dido thinks she is not pursuing); cf Catullus 7.8, Tib. 1.5.75, Ov. *F.* 6.573”, *TLL* s.v. *furtiuuus* 6.1644.42–63; for *furtum* in reference to a clandestine love affair, see Thomas 1981, 372 and n. 7 = 1999, 302 and n. 12 (with reference also to *Aen.* 4.171), Pichon 1966, 158.

**19** Green 1986, 414: “The phrase *nec iam* should be given its full force, indicating that the situation has changed in an important aspect. She no longer thinks of a secret love–affair, which is the plain sense of *furtiuuum* in such contexts”, with reference to Catullus and Tibullus quoted above. Green does not see the problem which arises from the contradiction with Dido’s previous thinking of her relationship with Aeneas always as a marriage, on which see below.

**20** See also Forbiger 1873, ad loc.: “*furtivum, celatum, tectum; vox propria de hac re. [...] meditatur, cogitando persequitur; non iam furtivo amori se indulgere putat*”; Agrell 2004, 100f. (on which see below, n. 22). I take for granted that the translation of Ahl 2007 does not refer to a love–affair that is kept “secret” from *Aeneas himself*; that would be an absurd way of expressing oneself in English. The same I would think of Seider’s translation (2013, 111): “nor does she any longer think of her love as clandestine”. Often, however, the translators reproduce the Latin text with all its ambiguity (Canali 1978 is an extreme case: “ormai non medita un amore furtivo”), so that we cannot understand how exactly they interpret the line. For example, the translations of Fairclough (“no more does she dream of a secret love”), followed by Goold, Mandelbaum (“she no longer thinks of furtive love”), R. D. Williams (“nor does she any longer think of a hidden love”), Clausen 2002, 46 (“nor thinks now of a secret love”), Scarcia (“né più quale furtivo considera il suo amore”), and Fo (“né più immagina ormai, Didone, un amore furtivo”) would seem most naturally to agree with our explanation, but in the absence of an explicit discussion one cannot be completely certain (anyway, my impression is that, when the translators do not think too much about the implications of the line, they instinctively tend to translate *furtiuuum ... amorem* in its most natural sense, that is as “clandestine love–affair”). Nor is it clear to me from Rudd’s translation (1976, 40) how he understands the line: “Nor does she engage in a clandestine love–affair”, which seems to omit *iam* (cf. Perret’s explanation in the following note).

being involved in a clandestine love–affair]; she calls it [sc. this love which in fact remains a clandestine love–affair] marriage and with this name she cloaks her crime [sc. her being involved in a clandestine love–affair, with the other possible implications we have seen above].

Nevertheless, this entails a big problem: saying the Dido “*no longer* thinks of a clandestine love–affair” implies that *at a certain point* she did think of it as such, and this contrasts with the fact that Dido has always spoken of her possible relationship with Aeneas only in terms of marriage (15–19): that she ever envisioned that relationship as a “clandestine love affair” seems out of character.<sup>21</sup>

So either we accept this anomaly (which is of course a possible decision), or we have to find a different way of explaining how Virgil can say of Dido that, after the encounter in the cave, she no longer thinks of her relationship with Aeneas as a *furtivus amor*, a clandestine love–affair. There seems to be only one way of applying the words in this meaning to the evolution of Dido’s attitude towards her relationship with Aeneas. That is, if it is true that Dido has always thought of that relationship as a (possible) marriage, there must have a moment, during, or immediately after, the love–making in the cave, when she did “think” of that union as a *furtivus amor*: making love in a cave during a storm interrupting a hunt can most plausibly be seen as a “clandestine love–affair”. It is difficult to imagine that she was thinking of her union with Aeneas as a marriage the moment *before*, or *during*, their love–making, and it is difficult to think that before, or even during, their love–making Aeneas can have said or done anything that might have made her to think of their relationship in terms of marriage. It is

---

**21** Perret, seeing this contradiction (“Il nous paraît douteux que *iam* soit ici employé pour opposer deux époques et doive être traduit: “Didon ne songe *plus* à un amour clandestine”. On ne voit pas, en effet, qu’elle y ait jamais songé: dès les premiers vers du livre (v. 16) c’est sur un mariage qu’elle s’interrogeait”, Perret 1977, 184 n.), but at the same time rightly considering that *furtivus amor* can only mean “clandestine love–affair”, vainly tries to explain away *iam* by giving it an implausible emphatic sense, so translating: “et elle ne pense certes pas à un amour furtif”. According to Paratore 1947, ad loc. the line means that Dido “non si limita più a *ricercare un’occasione* per congiungersi nascostamente a Enea” (his emphasis); this implies that Dido was actively seeking an occasion to seduce Aeneas, but of this plan of seduction on Dido’s part there is no trace in the text – which does not mean that we could not integrate the narrative in such a way; indeed, Dido’s behavior as described in lines 74–9 can legitimately imply attempts at seduction on Dido’s part. *furtivum ... amorem*, however, seems more naturally to refer to a “clandestine *relationship*” (cf. the opposition with *coniugium*), rather than to an “*occasion* for furtive love–making”. In any case, Paratore’s interpretation, which probably lies beneath at least some of the translations cited in the preceding note, is well worth considering.

only *after* her intimacy with Aeneas that she begins to think of their union as a “marriage”.<sup>22</sup>

We can imagine Dido's psychological process as hinted at by Virgil as a moment of blurring of reason (she and Aeneas in the same cave together, the love-making: the *furtiuus amor*), followed by a gaining of awareness, with *iam* marking the moment in which Dido rationalizes what just happened as a marriage, presumably helped by something that Aeneas does or says: “and she by now (already, immediately, or shortly, after the fact; when she leaves the cave) does not think of what happened in the cave as a clandestine love-affair; she calls it marriage, and with this name cloaks her guilt” – that is, her being involved in an irregular sexual relationship.

---

<sup>22</sup> Agrell 2004, 100 f., who well sees both that language cannot support the usual interpretation of *furtiuus amor*, and that *furtiuus amor* = “clandestine love-affair” contrasts with the preceding presentation of Dido's thoughts about her relationship with Aeneas, sustains that the phrase “can hardly refer to the proceedings in the cave, since the separate arrivals of Dido and Aeneas seem to rule out a planned seduction, and thereafter Dido had no doubt that she was married”. On the contrary, I think that *furtiuus amor* does refer to the proceedings in the cave, and that it covers a short phase of Dido's thoughts about herself only hinted at by Virgil. For the developing of a *furtiuus amor* in the cave there is no need of presupposing perforce “a planned seduction”: they arrive into the same cave “by chance”; they indulge in a *furtiuus amor*; and shortly after Dido is convinced that she is married to Aeneas. For this formulation I am especially indebted to discussion with Jim O'Hara.

## Works Cited

Journals are abbreviated as in *L'Année Philologique*. References to ancient authors and texts generally follow the conventions of the *OCD* (Hornblower, S. / Spawforth, A. / Eidinow, E. (eds.) (2012), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), Oxford). Other works cited by abbreviation are:

- AE = *L'Année Épigraphique*.  
CEG = Hansen, P.A. (ed.) (1983–1989), *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, Berlin.  
CIL = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.  
CLE = Bücheler, F. / Lommatzsch, E. (1895–1926), *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*, Leipzig.  
GVI = Peek, W. (1955), *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*, Berlin.  
IMEGR = Bernand, É. (ed.) (1969), *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine. Recherches sur la poésie épigrammatique des Grecs en Égypte. Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 98*, Paris.  
IosPE = Latyshev, V. (ed.) (1885–1901) *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae*, St. Petersburg.  
KL = Keil, H. (ed.) (1857–1880), *Grammatici Latini*, Leipzig.  
OLD = Glare, P.G.W. (ed.) (1968–1982), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford.  
SGO = Merkelbach, R. / Stauber, J. (eds.) (1998–2004), *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, Berlin.  
SH = Lloyd-Jones, H. / Parsons, P. (eds.) (1983), *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, Berlin.  
TLL = *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.

The following works are cited by author and date.

- Adams, J.N. (1982), *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London.  
Adams, J.N. (2003), *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge.  
Agrell, P. (2004), “Wed or Unwed? Ambiguity in Aeneid 4”, in: *PVS* 25, 95–110.  
Ahl, F. (1985), *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*, Ithaca, NY.  
Ahl, F. (trans.) (2007), *Virgil: Aeneid*, Oxford.  
Alden, M. (2000), *Homer beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad*, Oxford.  
Allen, J. H. / Greenough, J. B. (1903), *A New Latin Grammar*, Boston / London.  
Ancona, R. (1994), *Time and the Erotic in Horace's Odes*, Durham / London.  
Anderson, R.D. / Parsons, P.J. / Nisbet, R.G.M. (1979), “Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaşr Ibrîm”, in: *The Journal of Roman Studies* 69, 125–55.  
Anderson, W.S. (1981), “Servius and the ‘Comic Style’ of Aeneid 4”, in: *Arethusa* 14, 115–25.  
André, J.M. (1966), *L'otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine: des origines à l'époque augustéenne*, Paris.  
Auden, W.H. (1948), *The Dyer's Hand and Other Essays*, London.  
Austin, R. G. (ed.) (1955), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*, Oxford.  
Barber, E. A., (ed.) (1960), *Sexti Properti Carmina*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Oxford.  
Barchiesi, A. (1981), “Notizie sul ‘nuovo Gallo’”, in: *A&R* 26, 153–66.

- Barchiesi, A. (1994), "Immovable Delos: *Aeneid* 3.73-98 and the Hymns of Callimachus", in: *CQ* 44, 438-43.
- Barchiesi, A. (2005), "The Search for the Perfect Book: A PS to the New Posidippus", in: K. Gutzwiller (ed.), *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford, 320–42.
- Barsby, J. (ed.) (1999), *Terence: Eunuchus*, Cambridge.
- Beekes, R. (2010), *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, 2 vols., Leiden / Boston.
- Biles, Z.P. / Olson, S.D. (eds.) (2015), *Aristophanes: Wasps*, Oxford.
- Bleisch, P. (1999), "The Empty Tomb at Rhoeteum: Deiphobus and the Problem of the Past in *Aeneid* 6.494–547", in: *ClAnt* 18, 187–226.
- Bowie, A.M. (1998), "Exuvias effigiemque: Dido, Aeneas and the Body as Sign", in D. Montserrat (ed.), *Changing Bodies, Changing Meanings: Studies on the Human Body in Antiquity*, London, 57–79.
- Bowie, E. L. (1986), "Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival", in: *JHS* 106, 13–35.
- Bowra, C.M. (1957), "Melinno's Hymn to Rome" in: *JRS* 47, 21–8.
- Boyd, B.W. (1983), "Cydonea Mala: Virgilian Word-Play and Allusion", in *HSPH* 83, 169–74.
- Boyd, B.W. (1984), "Parva seges satis est: The Landscape of Tibullan Elegy in 1.1 and 1.10", in: *TAPhA* 114, 273–80.
- Boyd, B.W. (1997), *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the Amores*, Ann Arbor.
- Bradley, K.R. (2001), "Imagining Slavery: The Limits of the Plausible" [Review of W. Fitzgerald (2000), *Slavery and the Roman Literary Imagination*], in: *JRA* 14, 473–477.
- Bradley, K.R. (2015), "The Bitter Chain of Slavery", in: *DHA* 41, 149–76.
- Breed, B.W. (2006), *Pastoral Inscriptions: Reading and Writing Virgil's Eclogues*, London.
- Bright, D.F. (1971), "A Tibullan Odyssey", in: *Arethusa* 4, 197–214.
- Bright, D.F. (1978), *Haec mihi fingebam: Tibullus in His World*, Leiden.
- Brink, C.O. (1963), *Horace on Poetry. I: Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles*, Cambridge.
- Brink, C.O. (1969), "Horatian Notes: Despised Readings in the Manuscripts of the Odes", in: *PCPhS* 15, 1–6.
- Brown, C.G. (2016) "Warding Off a Hailstorm of Blood: Pindar on Martial Elegy", in: L. Swift / C. Carey (eds.), *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*, Oxford, 273–90.
- Brown, E.L. (1963) *Numeri Vergiliani: Studies in 'Eclogues' and 'Georgics'*, Brussels.
- Bundy, E.L. (1972), "The 'Quarrel between Kallimachos and Apollonios' Part I: The Epilogue of Kallimachos's 'Hymn to Apollo'", in: *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 5, 39–94.
- Burns, T.W. (2014/5), "Small Latin and Less Greek" [Review of C. Burrow (2013), *Shakespeare and Classical Antiquity*], in: *Claremont Review of Books* 15, 69–73.
- Burrow, C. (2013), *Shakespeare and Classical Antiquity*, Oxford.
- Burton, J.B. (1995), *Theocritus's Urban Mimes: Mobility, Gender, and Patronage*, Berkeley / Los Angeles.
- Buscaroli, C. (ed.) (1932), *Virgilio: Il libro di Didone*, Milan / Genoa / Rome / Naples.
- Busch, S. (1999), *Versus balnearum: Die antike Dichtung über Bäder und Baden im römischen Reich*, Stuttgart / Leipzig.
- Cairns, F. (1977), "Horace on other people's love affairs (Odes I 27; II 4; I 8; III 12)", in: *QUCC* 24, 121–147.
- Cairns, F. (1979), *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge.
- Cairns, F. (1989), *Virgil's Augustan Epic*, Cambridge.
- Cairns, F. (1997), "Ancient 'etymology' and Tibullus: On the Classification of 'Etymologies' and on 'Etymological Markers'", in: *PCPhS* 42, 24–59.

- Cairns, F. (2003), "The 'Etymology' in Ovid 'Heroides' 20.21–32", in: *CJ* 98, 239–242.
- Cairns, F. (2006), *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist*, Cambridge.
- Cairns, F. (2016), *Hellenistic Epigrams: Contexts of Exploration*, Cambridge.
- Cameron, A. (1995), *Callimachus and his Critics*, Princeton.
- Campbell, D.A. (1967), *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic poetry*, Basingstoke / London.
- Campbell, D.A. (ed.) (1982), *Greek Lyric*, Vol. I, Cambridge, MA.
- Canali, L. (trans.) / Paratore E. (ed.) (1978), *Virgilio: Eneide*, vol. 2, Milan.
- Carey, J. (ed.) (1969), *Andrew Marvell: A Critical Anthology*, Harmondsworth.
- Casali, S. (2006), "The Making of the Shield: Inspiration and Repression in the Aeneid", in: *Greece & Rome* 53, 185–204.
- Casali, S. (2007), "Killing the Father: Ennius, Naevius and Virgil's Julian Imperialism", in: W. Fitzgerald / E. Gowers (eds.), *Ennius Perennis: The Annals and Beyond*, Cambridge, 103–28.
- Casali, S. (2010), "The Development of the Aeneas Legend", in J. Farrell / M. Putnam (eds.), *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its Tradition*, Chichester / Malden, MA, 37–51.
- Cheney, P. / Hardie, P. (eds.) (2015), *The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature, Volume 2: 1558–1660*, Oxford.
- Clark, M.E. (1983), "Horace, *Ars Poetica* 75–78: The Origin and Worth of Elegy", in: *CW* 77, 1–5.
- Clausen, W.V. (ed.) (1994), *A Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues*, Oxford.
- Clausen, W.V. (2002), *Virgil's Aeneid: Decorum, Allusion, and Ideology*, Leipzig.
- Coleman, R. (ed.) (1977), *Virgil: Eclogues*, Cambridge.
- Conington, J. (ed.) (1884), *The Works of Virgil, vol. 2: Aeneid I–VI*, 4th ed. rev. by H. Nettleship, London.
- Connors, C. (1994), "Ennius, Ovid and Representations of Ilia", in: *MD* 32, 99–112.
- Conte, G.G. (1986), *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, C. Segal (trans.), Ithaca, NY.
- Conte, G.B. (1989), "Love without Elegy: The Remedia amoris and the Logic of a Genre", G. Most (trans.), in: *Poetics Today*, 10, 441–69.
- Conte, G.B. (2007), *The Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Vigilian Epic*, Oxford.
- Cooley, A.E. / Cooley, M.G.L. (2013), *Pompeii and Herculaneum: A Sourcebook*, London.
- Corcoran, N. (2002), "Death's Honesty", in: N. Corcoran (ed.), *Do You, Mr. Jones?: Bob Dylan With Poets and Professors*, London.
- Courtney, E. (1987), "Quotation, Interpolation, Transposition", in: *Hermathena* 143, 7–18.
- Courtney, E. (ed.) (1993), *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, Oxford.
- Courtney, E. (ed.) (1995), *Musa Lapidaria: A Selection of Latin Verse Inscriptions*, Atlanta.
- Crowther, N.B. (1978), "Horace, Catullus, and Alexandrianism", in: *Mnemosyne* 31, 33–44.
- Cunningham, I.C. (ed.) (1987), *Herodas: Mimiambi*, Leipzig.
- D'Arms, J.H. (1970), *Romans on the Bay of Naples*, Cambridge, MA.
- Damschen, G. (2004), "Das lateinische Akrostichon: neue Funde bei Ovid sowie Vergil, Grattius, Manilius und Silius Italicus", in: *Philologus* 148, 88–115.
- Danielewicz, J. (2015), "One Sign after Another: The Fifth ΛΕΠΤΗ in Aratus' *Phaen.* 783–4?", in *CQ* 65, 387–90.
- Davies, M. (1986), "Alcaeus, Thetis and Helen", in: *Hermes* 114, 257–62.
- Davies, M. (ed.) (1991), *Sophocles: Trachiniae*, Oxford.

- Davis, G. (1991) *Polyhymnia: The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse*, Berkeley / Los Angeles.
- Davis, G. (2005), "From Lyric to Elegy: The Inscription of the Elegiac Subject in *Heroides* 15 (Sappho to Phaon)", in: W. Batstone / G. Tissol (eds.), *Defining Genre and Gender in Latin Literature: Essays Presented to William S. Anderson on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, New York, 175–91.
- Davis, P. (2011), "Marvell and the Literary Past", in: D. Hurst / S. N. Zwicker (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Andrew Marvell*, Cambridge, 26–45.
- Day Lewis, C. (trans.) (1966), *The Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid of Virgil*, Oxford.
- de Grazia, M. (2010), "Anachronism", in: B. Cummings / J. Simpson (eds.), *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*, Oxford, 13–32.
- de La Cerda, I.L. (ed.) (1612), *P. Virgilii Maronis priores sex libri Aeneidos argumentis, explicationibus, notis illustrati auctore Ioanne Ludovico de la Cerda Toletano Sociatatis Iesu*. Lyon.
- de Vaan, M. (2008), *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*, Leiden / Boston.
- Degani, E. / Burzacchini, G. (1977), *Lirici greci: antologia*, Bologna.
- Desmond, M. (1994), *Reading Dido: Gender, Textuality, and the Medieval Aeneid*, Minneapolis, MN.
- Du Quesnay, I. (1979), "From Polyphemus to Corydon: Virgil, Eclogue 2 and the Idylls of Theocritus", in: D. West / A.J. Woodman (eds.) *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, Cambridge, 35–70.
- Dylan, B. (2004), *Chronicles: Volume 1*, New York.
- Edwards, M.W. (1991), *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume 5, Books 17–20*. Cambridge.
- Eliot, T.S. (1951), *Selected Essays*, 3rd ed. enlarged, London.
- Elliott, J. (2013), *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales*. Cambridge.
- Ellis, R. (ed.) (1889), *A Commentary on Catullus*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Oxford.
- Enk, P.J. (ed.) (1918), *Gratti Cynegeticon Quae Supersunt*, Zutphen.
- Ernout, A. / Meillet, A. (1939), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*, Paris.
- Erskine, A. (2001), *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power*, Oxford.
- Eskuche, G. (1890), "Die Elisionen in den 2 letzten Füßen des lateinischen Hexameters, von Ennius bis Walahfridus Strabo", in: *RhM* 45, 236–64, 385–418.
- Espey, J.J. (1955), *ezra pound's mauberley [sic]*, Berkeley / Los Angeles.
- Everett, B. (1979) "The Shooting of the Bears: Poetry and Politics in Andrew Marvell" in: R.L. Brett (ed.), *Andrew Marvell: Essays on the Tercentenary of his Death*, Oxford, 62–103.
- Fairclough, H.R. (trans.) (1916), *Virgil, vol. 1*, London / New York; rev. by G. P. Goold (1999), Cambridge, MA.
- Fantham, E. (1979), "The Mating of Lalage: Horace, Odes 2.5", in: *LCM* 4, 47–52.
- Fantham, E. (1993), "Ceres, Liber, and Flora: Georgic and Anti-Georgic Elements in Ovid's *Fasti*", in *PCPhS* 38, 39–56.
- Fedeli, P. (ed.) (1985), *Properzio: Il libro terzo delle elegie*, Bari.
- Fedeli, P. (ed.) (2005), *Properzio: Elegie Libro II: Introduzione, testo, e commento*, Cambridge.
- Feeney, D. (1983), "The Taciturnity of Aeneas", *CQ* 33, 204–19 (= Harrison, S.J. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, Oxford 1990, 166–90.

- Feeney, D. / Nelis, D. (2005) “Two Virgilian Acrostics: Certissima Signa?”, in *CQ* 55, 644–46.
- Feeney, D. (2007), *Caesar’s Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley / Los Angeles.
- Feldherr, A. (1999), “Putting Dido on the Map: Genre and Geography in Vergil’s Underworld”, in: *Arethusa* 32, 85–122.
- Finglass, P.J. (ed.) (2011), *Sophocles: Ajax*, Cambridge.
- Fitzgerald, W. (2000), *Slavery and the Roman literary imagination*, Cambridge.
- Fo, A. (trans.) (2012), *Publio Virgilio Marone: Eneide*, Turin.
- Fogarty, H. (2016), “‘Dubad nach innsci’: Cultivation of Obscurity in Medieval Irish Literature”, in: M. Boyd (ed.), *Ollam: Studies in Gaelic and Related Traditions in Honor of Tomás Ó Cathasaigh*, Lanham (Maryland), 211–224.
- Forbiger, A. (ed.) (1873) *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, 4th ed., vol. 2, Leipzig.
- Fordyce, C. J. (1961), *Catullus: A Commentary*, Oxford.
- Fowler, D. P. (1983), “An Acrostic in Vergil (Aeneid 7.601–4)?”, in: *CQ* 33, 298.
- Fraenkel, E. (1950), *Aeschylus, Agamemnon*, 3 vols., Oxford.
- Fraenkel, E. (ed.) (1957), *Horace*, Oxford.
- Franklin, J.L., Jr. (1991), “Literacy and the Parietal Inscriptions of Pompeii”, in J.H. Humphrey (ed.), *Literacy in the Roman World*, 77–98.
- Franklin, J.L., Jr. (1996/7), “Vergil at Pompeii: A Teacher’s Aid”, in: *CJ* 92, 175–84.
- Fraser, P.M. (1972), *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 3 vols., Oxford.
- Freis, R. (1983) “The Catalogue of Pindaric Genres in Horace ‘Ode’ 4.2”, *ClAnt* 2, 27–36.
- Freudenburg, K. (1996), “Verse-Technique and Moral Extremism in Two Satires of Horace (*Sermones* 2.3 and 2.4)”, in: *CQ* 46, 196–206.
- Froula, C. (1983), *A Guide to Ezra Pound’s Select Poems*, New York.
- Fuhrer, T. (1988), “A Pindaric Feature in the Poems of Callimachus”, in: *The American Journal of Philology* 109, 53–68.
- Fulkerson, L. (2004), “*Omnia Vincit Amor*: Why the *Remedia* Fail”, in: *CQ* 54, 211–23.
- Gagliardi, D. (1993), “Orazio e gli amori ancillari: per l’interpretazione di *Carm.* II, 4”, in: G. Bruno (ed.), *Letture orazione*, Venosa, 91–97.
- Galinsky, G. K. (1969), *Aeneas, Sicily and Rome*. Princeton.
- Garrod, H. W. (1910), “On the Meaning of Ploxinum”, in: *CQ* 4, 201–4.
- Gerber, D. E. (1997), “Elegy”, in: Gerber, D. E. (ed.), *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets, Mnemosyne*, 89–129.
- Geymonat, M. (2004), “Capellae at the End of the *Eclogues*”, in *HSPH* 102, 315–18.
- Gigante, M. (1979), *Civiltà delle forme letterarie nell’antica Pompei*, Naples.
- Gigante, M. (1995), *Philodemus in Italy: The Books from Herculaneum*, D. Obbink (trans.), Ann Arbor.
- Gildenhard I. (2007), “Virgil vs. Ennius, or: The Undoing of the Annalist”, in: W. Fitzgerald / E. Gowers (eds.) *Ennius Perennis: The Annals and Beyond*, Cambridge, 73–102.
- Giordano, C. (1966), “Le iscrizioni della casa di M. Fabio Rufo”, in: *Rendiconti dell’Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti di Napoli* 41, 73–89.
- Goldberg, S. (1999). [Review of J. Barsby (ed.) (1999), *Terence: Eunuchus*], in: *BMCRev* 1999.06.23.
- Golden, M. (2011), “Slavery and the Greek family”, in K. R. Bradley / P. Cartledge (eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*, vol. I: *The Ancient Mediterranean World*, Cambridge, 134–52.



- Goldschmidt N. (2013), *Shaggy Crowns: Ennius' Annales and Virgil's Aeneid*. Oxford
- Gomme, A. W. (1957), "Interpretations of Some Poems of Alkaios and Sappho", *JHS* 77, 255–66.
- Goold, G.P. (ed.) (1977), *Ovid I: Heroides and Amores*, Cambridge, MA.
- Goold, G.P. (ed.) (1983), *Catullus*, London.
- Gover, R. (1961), *One Hundred Dollar Misunderstanding*, New York.
- Gow, A.S.F. (ed.) (1950), *Theocritus*, 2 vols., Cambridge.
- Gow, A.S.F. / Page, D. L. (eds.) (1965), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols., Cambridge.
- Gow, A.S.F./ Page, D. L. (eds.) (1968), *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip*, 2 vols., Cambridge.
- Gowers, E. (2002), "Blind Eyes and Cut Throats: Amnesia and Silence in Horace *Satires* 1.7", in: *CPh* 97, 145–61.
- Gowers, E. (2012), *Horace: Satires, Book I*. Cambridge.
- Gray, M. (2006), *The Bob Dylan Encyclopedia*, New York / London.
- Green, R.P.H. (1986), "Conubium in the *Aeneid*", in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IV*, Bruxelles, 393–421.
- Grishin, A.A. (2008), "*Ludus in undis*: An Acrostic in *Eclogue* 9", in: *HSPH* 104, 237–40.
- Grishin, A.A. (2009), *Acrostics in Virgil's Poetry: The Problem of Authentication*, MA Thesis, Harvard University.
- Günther, H.-C. (2013), "The First Collection of Odes: *Carmina* I–III", in: H.-C. Günther (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Horace*, Leiden, 211–406.
- Gutzwiller, K. (1996) "The Evidence for Theocritean Poetry Books", in M.A. Harder / R.F. Regtuit, / G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Theocritus, Hellenistic Groningana* 2, Groningen, 119–48.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. (1998), *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*, Berkeley / Los Angeles.
- Halperin, D.M. (1983), *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*, New Haven.
- Hammond, P. (2006), *The Making of Restoration Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Harder, A. (ed.) (2012), *Callimachus, Aetia: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, 2 vols., Oxford.
- Hardie, P. (1993), *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*, Cambridge.
- Hardie, P. (1998), *Virgil*, Oxford.
- Hardie, P. (2012), *Rumour and Renown: Representations of 'Fama' in Western Literature*, Cambridge.
- Harris, W.V. (1989), *Ancient Literacy*, Cambridge, MA.
- Harrison, E.L. (1989), "The Tragedy of Dido", in *EMC* 33, 1–21.
- Harrison, S.J. (ed.) (1990), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid*, Oxford.
- Harrison, S.J. (ed.) (1991), *Vergil, Aeneid 10: With Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford.
- Harrison, S.J. (2002), "Ovid and genre: evolutions of an elegist", in: P. Hardie (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge, 79–94.
- Harrison, S.J. (2007), *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*, Oxford.

- Harrison, S.J. (2013), “Author and Speaker(s) in Horace’s Satires 2”, in: A. Marmorodoro / J. Hill (eds.), *The Author’s Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 153–71.
- Harrison, S.J. (2015), [Review of D. Seider (2013), *Memory in Vergil’s Aeneid: Creating the Past*], in: *Mnemosyne* 68, 166–70.
- Harrison, S.J. (2017) *Horace, Odes Book II*, Cambridge.
- Harvey, A.E. (1955), “The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry”, in: *CQ* 5, 157–175.
- Hawkins, S. (2014) “Catullus 60: Lesbia, Medea, Clodia, Scylla”, in: *AJPh* 135, 559–67.
- Headlam, W. / Knox, A.D. (eds.) (1922), *Herodas, The Mimes and Fragments*, Cambridge.
- Helbig, W. (1868), *Wandgemälde der vom Vesuv verschütteten Städte Campaniens*, Leipzig.
- Henkel, J.H. (2009), *Writing poems on trees: Genre and metapoetics in Vergil’s Eclogues and Georgics*, Dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Henkel, J.H. (2014), “Vergil Talks Technique: Metapoetic Arboriculture in *Georgics* 2”, in: *Vergilius* 60, 33–66.
- Henry, J. (1878), *Aeneidea*, vol. 2, London.
- Heylin, C. (2009), *Revolution in the Air: The Songs of Bob Dylan, 1957–1973*, Chicago.
- Heyne, C.G. (ed.) (1832), *P. Virgilius Maro varietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustratus a C.G. Heyne. Editio quarta curavit G. P. E. Wagner*, vol. 2, Leipzig / London.
- Heyworth, S.J. (2007a), *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius*, Oxford.
- Heyworth, S.J. (ed.) (2007b), *Sexti Properti Elegi*, Oxford.
- Hill, D.L. (ed.) (1980), *The Renaissance; Studies in Art and Poetry: The 1893 Text, Walter Pater*, Berkeley / Los Angeles.
- Hilton, J. (2013), “The Hunt for Acrostics by Some Ancient Readers of Homer”, in: *Hermes* 141, 88–95.
- Hinds, S. E. (1983), “Carmina Digna. Gallus P. Qaşr Ibrîm 6–7 Metamorphosed”, in: *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4, 43–54.
- Hinds, S. E. (1987), *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the self-conscious Muse*, Cambridge.
- Hinds, S. E. (1992), “Arma in Ovid’s *Fasti* Part 1: Genre and Mannerism”, in: *Arethusa* 25, 81–112.
- Hinds, S. E. (2000), “Essential Epic: Genre and Gender from Macer to Statius”, in: M. Depew / O. Obbink (eds.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge, MA, 221–44.
- Hollis, A.S. (ed.) (2007), *Fragments of Roman Poetry c. 60 BC–AD 20: Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford.
- Horsfall, N. (1986), “The Aeneas legend and the *Aeneid*” in: *Vergilius* 32, 8–17.
- Horsfall, N. (1991), *Virgilio: l’epopea in alambicco*, Naples.
- Horsfall, N. (ed.) (1995), *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*, Leiden.
- Horsfall, N. (ed.) (2006), *Virgil, Aeneid 3: A Commentary*. Leiden.
- Horsfall, N. (ed.) (2013), *Virgil: Aeneid 6*, Berlin.
- Horsfall, N. (2016), *The Epic Distilled: Studies in the Composition of the Aeneid*, Oxford.
- Höschele, R. (2016), “Unplumbed Depths of Fatuity?” Philip of Thessaloniki’s Art of Variation”, in: R. Sistikou / A. Rengakos (eds.), *Dialect, Diction, and Style in Greek Literary and Inscribed Epigram*, Berlin, 105–118.
- Hunter, R.L. (1996), *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Hunter, R.L. (ed.) (1999), *Theocritus: A Selection*, Cambridge.

- Huskey, S.J. (2005), "In Memory of Tibullus: Ovid's Remembrance of Tibullus 1.3 in *Amores* 3.9 and *Tristia* 3.3", in: *Arethusa* 38, 367–386.
- Hutchinson, G. O. (2008) *Talking Books: Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry*, Oxford.
- Huyck, J. (1987), "Vergil's Phaethontides", in: *HSPH* 91, 217–28.
- Jacques, J.-M. (1960), "Sur un acrostiche d'Aratos (*Phén.* 783–787)", in: *Revue des Études Anciennes* 62, 48–61.
- James, S.L. (2003), *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy*, Berkeley / Los Angeles.
- Janko, R. (ed.) (1994), *The Iliad: A Commentary: Volume 4, Books 13–16*. Cambridge.
- Janko, R. (ed.) (2011), *Philodemus, On Poems, Books 3–4: With the Fragments of Aristotle, On Poets*, Oxford.
- Jocelyn, H.D. (1980), "Horace, Odes 2.5", in: *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 5, 197–200.
- Kania, R. (2016), *Virgil's Eclogues and the Art of Fiction: A Study of the Poetic Imagination*, Cambridge.
- Kannicht, R. (1969), *Euripides: Helena*, 2 vols., Heidelberg.
- Katz, J.T. (2000), "Egnatius' Dental Fricatives (Catullus 39.20)", in: *Classical Philology* 95, 338–48.
- Katz, J.T. (2016) "Another Vergilian Signature in the Georgics?", in: P. Mitsis / I. Ziogas (eds.), *Wordplay and Powerplay in Latin Poetry*, Berlin, 69–86.
- Kayachev, B. (2016a), *Allusion and Allegory: Studies in the Ciris*, Berlin.
- Kayachev, B. (2016b), "Catullus 64.291: A Textual Note", in: *CQ* 66, 790–4.
- Keegan, P. (2014), *Graffiti in Antiquity*, London.
- Keith, A.M. (1992), "Amores 1.1: Propertius and the Ovidian Programme", in: C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VI*, Brussels, 327–44.
- Keith, A.M. (2000), *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*, Cambridge.
- Keith, A.M. (2008), *Propertius: Poet of Love and Leisure*, London.
- Keith, A.M. (ed.) (2011), *Latin Elegy and Hellenistic Epigram: A Tale of Two Genres at Rome*, Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Kennedy, D.F. (1983), "Shades of Meaning: Virgil, *Eclogue* 10 .75–7", *LCM* 8, 124.
- Kennedy, D.F. (1993), *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy*, Cambridge.
- Kenney, E.J. (1958), "Nequitiae Poeta", in: N.I. Herescu (ed.), *Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide, publiées à l'occasion du bimillénaire de la naissance du poète*, Paris, 201–9.
- Kenney, E.J. (ed.) (1961), *P. Ovidi Nasonis: Amores, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1994, Oxford.
- Kenney, E.J. (1962), "The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid's *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria*, and *Remedia Amoris*", in: *CQ* 12, 1–31.
- Kenney, E.J. (1983), "Virgil and the Elegiac Sensibility", in: *ICS* 8, 44–59.
- Kiessling, A. / Heinze, R. (eds.) (1930), *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Oden und Epoden*, Berlin.
- Kirstein, R. (2002), "Companion Pieces in the Hellenistic Epigram", in: R.F. Retguit / G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Hellenistic Epigrams*, Groningen, 117–121.
- Knox, P.E. (1984), "Sappho, fr. 31 LP and Catullus 51: A Suggestion", in: *QUCC* 46, 97–102.
- Knox, P.E. (1986), *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Knox, P.E. (ed.) (1995), *Ovid's Heroides: Select Epistles*, Cambridge.

- Knox, P.E. (2014), "Ovidian Myths on Pompeian Walls", in: C. Newlands / J. Miller, (eds.), *A Handbook to the Reception of Ovid*, Chichester, 36–54.
- Knox, P.E. (2015), "Virgil's Catullan One-Liner", in H.-C. Günther (ed.), *Virgilian Studies: A Miscellany Dedicated to the Memory of Mario Geymonat*, *Studia Classica et Mediaevalia*, Nordhausen, 287–320.
- Koch, J.T. (2006), *Celtic Culture: A Historical Encyclopedia*, 5 vols., Santa Barbara, CA.
- Köhnken, A. (1981), "Apollo's Retort to Envy's Criticism: (Two Questions of Relevance in Callimachus, Hymn 2, 105FF.)", in: *AJPh* 102, 411–22.
- Korenjak, M. (2009), "ΛΕΥΚΗ: was bedeutet das erste 'Akrostichon'?", in: *RhM* 152, 392–6.
- Krevans, N. (1993), "Ilia's Dream: Ennius, Virgil and the mythology of seduction" in: *HSPH* 95, 257–71.
- Kronenberg, L. (2009), *Allegories of Farming from Greece and Rome: Philosophical Satire in Xenophon, Varro, and Virgil*, Cambridge.
- Krostenko, B.A. (2001), *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance*, Chicago.
- Kyriakou, P. (1996), "A Variation of the Pindaric Breakoff Formula in Nemea 4", in: *The American Journal of Philology* 117, 17–35.
- La Penna, A. / Grassi, C. (eds.) (1971), *Virgilio: Le opere: Antologia*, Florence.
- Leach, E.W. (1964), "Georgic Imagery in the *Ars amatoria*", in *TAPhA* 95, 142–54.
- Leach, E.W. (1978), "Vergil, Horace, Tibullus: Three Collections of Ten", *Ramus* 7, 79–105.
- Lee-Stecum, P. (1998), *Powerplay in Tibullus: Reading Elegies Book 1*, Cambridge.
- Lee-Stecum, P. (2013), "Tibullus in First Place", in T.S. Thorsen (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*, Cambridge, 68–82.
- Leishman, J.B. (1966), *The Art of Marvell's Poetry*, London.
- Leumann, M. / Hofmann, J.B. / Szantyr, A. (1965), *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, Munich.
- Levitan, W. (1979), "Plexed Artistry: Aratean Acrostics", in: *Glyph* 5, 55–68.
- Lindo, L.I. (1971), "Tyrtaeus and Horace, *Odes* 3.2", in *CPh* 66, 258–60.
- Lissberger, E. (1934), *Das Fortleben der Römischen Elegiker in den Carmina Epigraphica*, Tübingen.
- Lombardo, S. (trans.) (2005), *Virgil: Aeneid*, Indianapolis / Cambridge.
- Lowrie, M. (1994), "Lyric's *Elegos* and the Aristotelian Mean: Horace, C. 1.24, 1.33, and 2.9", in: *CW* 87, 377–94.
- Ludwig, W. (1957), "Zu Horaz, C. 2,1–12" in: *Hermes* 85, 336–45.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1978), *Ciris: A Poem Attributed to Vergil*, Cambridge.
- MacKinnon, J.K. (1971), "Heracles' Intention in His Second Request of Hyllus: *Trach.* 1216–51", *CQ* 21, 33–41.
- Maiuri, A. (1964), *Pompei ed Ercolano fra case e abitanti*, Milan.
- Mallory, J. P. / Adams, D. Q. (1997), *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*, London.
- Maltby, R. (1991), *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Leeds.
- Maltby, R. (1993), "The Limits of Etymologising", in: *Aevum(ant)* 6, 257–75.
- Maltby, R. (ed.) (2002), *Tibullus: Elegies: Text, Introduction and Commentary*, Cambridge.
- Mandelbaum, A. (trans.) (1971), *The Aeneid of Virgil*, New York.
- Mankin, D. (ed.) (1995), *Horace: Epodes*, Cambridge.
- Martindale, C. (2013), "Reception—A New Humanism? Receptivity, Pedagogy, the Transhistorical", *Classical Receptions Journal* 5, 169–183.
- Mayer, R. (2012), *Horace: Odes Book I*, Cambridge.

- McCallum, S.L. (2015) “*Heu Ligurine*: Echoes of Vergil in Horace *Odes* 4.1”, in: *Vergilius* 61, 29–42.
- McCartney, E. S. (1927), “Modifiers That Reflect the Etymology of the Word Modified, with Special Reference to Lucretius”, *CPh* 22, 184–200.
- McKeown, J. C. (1987), *Ovid: Amores: Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in Four Volumes, Vol. 1: Text and Prolegomena*, Liverpool.
- McNelis C. / Sens A. (2016), *The Alexandra of Lycophron*. Oxford.
- Meyer, E.A. (2009), “Writing Paraphernalia, Tablets, and Muses in Campanian Wall Painting”, in: *AJA* 113, 569–97.
- Michalopoulos, A. (2001), *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid’s Metamorphoses: A Commented Lexicon*, Leeds.
- Milnor, K. (2014), *Graffiti and the Literary Landscape in Roman Pompeii*, Oxford.
- Mitsis, P. (2010), “Achilles Polytropos and Odysseus as Suitor: *Iliad* 9.307–429”, in: P. Mitsis / C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Allusion, Authority, and Truth: Critical Perspectives on Greek Poetic and Rhetorical Praxis*, Berlin, 51–76.
- Moles, J.L. (1984), “Aristotle and Dido’s *hamartia*”, *G&R* 31, 45–55.
- Moles, J.L. (1987), “The tragedy and guilt of Dido”, in: M. Whitby / P. Hardie / M. Whitby (eds.), *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, Bristol, 153–61.
- Monti, R. (1981), *The Dido Episode and the Aeneid: Roman Social and Political Values in the Epic*, Leiden.
- Morgan, L. (2011), *Musa Pedestris: Metre and Meaning in Roman Verse*, Oxford.
- Most, G.W. (2003), “Epinician Envy”, in D. Konstan / K. Rutter (eds.), *Envy, Spite and Jealousy: The Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece*, Edinburgh, 123–42.
- Most, G.W. (2013), “Horace”, in: A. Grafton / G.W. Most / S. Settis (eds.), *The Classical Tradition*, Cambridge, MA, 454–460.
- Mouritsen, H. (2011), *The Freedman in the Roman World*, Cambridge.
- Munari, F. (ed.) (1951), *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores. Testo, Introduzione, Traduzione e Note*, Florence.
- Murgatroyd, P. (1980), “Horace’s Xanthias and Phyllis”, in: *CQ* 30, 540.
- Myers, M.Y. (2013), “Vergil’s Underworld and the Afterlife of Love Poets”, paper delivered at the *Symposium Cumanum*, “Aeneid Six and Its Cultural Reception”, Villa Vergiliana, Cumae and the University of Naples Federico II, Italy, 6/25/2013.
- Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.) (1958), *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*, Oxford.
- Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.) (1969), *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Oxford.
- Nadel, I.B., (ed.) (2005), *Ezra Pound: Early Writings: Poems and Prose*, New York.
- Nagel, A. / Wood, C.S. (2010), *Anachronic Renaissance*, New York / Cambridge, MA.
- Nagle, B.R. (1980), *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid*, Bruxelles.
- Nappa, C. (2005), *Reading after Actium: Vergil’s Georgics, Octavian, and Rome*, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Nappa, C. (2007), “Catullus and Vergil”, in: M.B. Skinner (ed.), *Blackwell’s Companion to Catullus*, Malden, MA / Oxford, 377–98.
- Nelis, D. (2001), *Vergil’s Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*, Leeds.
- Neri, C. (2003), *Erinna: Testimonianze e Frammenti*, Bologna.
- Newton, J.M. (1972), “What Do We Know About Andrew Marvell?”, in: *The Cambridge Quarterly* 6, 33–42, 125–143.

- Nilsson, N.O. (1952), *Metrische Stildifferenzen in den Satiren des Horaz*, Uppsala.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. / Hubbard, M. (eds.) (1970), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I*, Oxford.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. / Hubbard, M. (eds.) (1978), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II*, Oxford.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. / Rudd, N. (eds.) (2004), *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book III*, Oxford.
- Norbrook, D. (1999), *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics 1627–1660*, Cambridge.
- Norden, E. (ed.) (1981), *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*, 7th ed., Stuttgart.
- Notopoulos, J.A. (1939), “The Name of Plato”, in: *CPh* 34, 135–45.
- Notopoulos, J.A. (1942), “Plato’s Epitaph”, in: *AJPh* 63, 272–93.
- Nünlist, R. (1998), *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Stuttgart / Leipzig.
- O’Brien, Tim (1973), *If I Die in a Combat Zone, Box Me Up and Ship Me Home*, New York.
- O’Hara, J.J. (1990), *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil’s Aeneid*, Princeton.
- O’Hara, J.J. (1993), “Medicine for the Madness of Dido and Gallus: Tentative Suggestions on *Aeneid* 4”, in *Vergilius* 39, 12–24.
- O’Hara, J.J. (1996a) *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, Ann Arbor, MI. Expanded edition, 2017.
- O’Hara, J.J. (1996b), “Vergil’s Best Reader? Ovidian Commentary on Vergilian Etymological Wordplay”, in: *CJ* 91, 255–76 (= Knox, P.E. (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Ovid*, Oxford 2007, 100–22).
- O’Hara, J.J. (ed.) (2011), *Virgil: Aeneid Book 4*, Newburyport, MA.
- Oliensis, E. (1998), *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*, Cambridge.
- Page, D.L. (ed.) (1941), *Select Papyri, Volume III: Poetry*, Cambridge MA.
- Page, D.L. (ed.) (1955), *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Lesbian Poetry*, Oxford.
- Page, D.L. (ed.) (1981), *Further Greek Epigrams*, Cambridge.
- Page, T.E. (ed.) (1894), *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books I–VI*, London.
- Page, T.E. (ed.) (1920), *Q. Horatii Flacci Carminum, Liber II*, London.
- Palaima, T.G. (2000), “Courage and Prowess Afoot in Homer and the Vietnam of Tim O’Brien”, *Classical and Modern Literature* 20, 1–22.
- Palaima, T. / Tritle, L. (2013), “The Legacy of War in the Classical World”, in: B. Campbell / L. Tritle (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Warfare in the Classical World*, Oxford, 726–742.
- Palmer, A. (1883), *The Satires of Horace*. London / New York.
- Paratore, E. (ed.) (1947), *Virgilio: Eneide, libro quarto*, Roma.
- Paschalis, M. (1997), *Virgil’s Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names*, Oxford.
- Pasquali, G. (1920), *Orazio lirico*, Florence.
- Pease, A.S. (ed.) (1935), *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*, Cambridge, MA.
- Pelliccia, H. (2011), “Unlocking *Aeneid* 6.460: Plautus’ *Amphitryon*, Euripides’ *Protesilaus* and the Referents of Callimachus’ *Coma*”, in: *CJ* 106, 149–219.
- Pelliccia, H. (2017) “What Counts as a Wife?”, in: K.M. Coleman (ed.), *Albert’s Anthology*, Cambridge, MA, 151–54.
- Perkell, C. (1997), “The Lament of Juturna: Pathos and Interpretation in the *Aeneid*”, *TAPhA* 127, 257–86.
- Perret, J. (ed.) (1977), *Virgile: Énéide, livres I–IV*, Paris.
- Pichon, R. (1966), *Index verborum amatorium*, Hildesheim (= Paris, 1902).

- Pierce, K.F. (1997), "The Portrayal of Rape in New Comedy", in: S. Deacy / K.F. Pierce (eds.), *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, London, 163–184.
- Platnauer, M. (1951), *Latin Elegiac Verse: A Study of the Metrical Usages of Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid*, Cambridge.
- Porter, J.I. (2017), "Reception, Receptivity, and Anachronism in Marius the Epicurean" in: C. Martindale / S. Evangelista / E. Prettejohn (eds.), *Pater the Classicist: Classical Scholarship, Reception, and Aestheticism*, Oxford, 149–162.
- Potter, R. (2012), *Modernist Literature*, Edinburgh.
- Pound, E. (1920), *Hugh Selwyn Mauberley*, London.
- Prettejohn, E. (2017), *Modern Painters, Old Masters: The Art of Imitation from the Pre-Raphaelites to the First World War*, New Haven / London.
- Putnam, M.C.J. (1986), *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes*, Ithaca, NY.
- Putnam, M.C.J. (2005), "Virgil and Tibullus 1.1", in: *CPh* 100, 123–41.
- Quinn, K. (1963), *Latin Explorations: Critical Studies in Roman Literature*, London.
- Ramírez de Verger, A. (ed.) (2003), *P. Ovidius Naso: Carmina Amatoria*, Munich.
- Ramsay, W. (1859), *A Manual of Latin Prosody*, Oxford.
- Rancière, J. (1996), "Le Concept d'anachronisme et la vérité de l'historien", *L'Inactuel: Psychanalyse et Culture* 6, 53–68.
- Reckford, K.J. (1999), "Only a Wet Dream? Hope and Skepticism in Horace, Satire 1.5", *AJPh* 120, 525–54.
- Reed, J.D. (1997), "Ovid's Elegy on Tibullus and Its Models", *CPh* 92, 260–69.
- Richmond, J.A. (ed.) (1962), *The Halieutica Ascribed to Ovid*, London.
- Ricks, C. (2003), *Dylan's Visions of Sin*, New York.
- Rogovoy, S. (2009), *Bob Dylan: Prophet, Mystic, Poet*, New York.
- Ross, D.O. (1975), *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*, Cambridge.
- Rudd, N. (1976), "Dido's culpa", in: N. Rudd, *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry*, Cambridge, 32–53 (= Harrison, S.J. (ed.) *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel*, Oxford 1999, 145–66).
- Rudd, N. (1980), "Achilles or Agamemnon? A Note on Horace *Epistles* 1.2.13", in: *CPh* 75, 68–69.
- Rudd, N. (1989), *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*, Cambridge.
- Rüpke, J. (2012), *Religion in Republican Rome: Rationalization and Ritual Change*, Philadelphia.
- Rutherford, I. (1997), "Odes and Ends: Closure in Greek Lyric Poetry", in: D.H. Roberts / F.M. Dunn / D.P. Fowler (eds.), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*, Princeton, 43–61.
- Sassoon, S. (1920), *Poems by Wilfred Owen with an Introduction by Siegfried Sassoon*, London.
- Saylor, C. (1986), "Some Stock Characteristics of the Roman Lover in Vergil, *Aeneid* IV", in: *Vergilius* 32, 73–77.
- Scarcia, R. (trans.) (2002), *Virgilio: Eneide*, Milan.
- Schlegel, C. (2010), "Horace and the Satirist's Mask: Shadowboxing with Lucilius", in: G. Davis (ed.), *A Companion to Horace*, Malden, MA / Oxford, 253–70.
- Schmid, W. (1974), *Catullus: Ansichten und Durchblicke*. Göttingen.

- Scodel, R. (2003), "Two Epigrammatic Pairs: Callimachus' Epitaphs, Plato's Apples", in: *Hermes* 131, 257–68.
- Seider, A. (2013), *Memory in Vergil's Aeneid: Creating the Past*, Cambridge.
- Sens, A. (ed.) (1997), *Theocritus: Dioscuri (Idyll 22)*, Göttingen.
- Sens, A. (2003), "Asclepiades, Erinna, and the Poetics of Labor", in: P. Thibodeau / H. Haskell (eds.), *Being There Together*, Afton, MN, 78–87.
- Sens, A. (2005), "The Art of Poetry and the Poetry of Art: The Unity and Poetics of Posidippus' Statue-Poems", in: K.J. Gutzwiller (ed.), *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford, 206–225.
- Sens, A. (ed.) (2011), *Asclepiades of Samos: Epigrams and Fragments*, Oxford.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.) (1985), *Horatius: Opera*, Stuttgart.
- Sharland, S. (2009), "Soporific Satire: Horace, Damasippus and Professor Snore (Sertinius) in *Satire 2.3*", *ACD* 113–31.
- Shorey, P. (ed.) (1900), *Horace: Odes and Epodes*, Boston.
- Sider, D. (ed.) (1997), *The Epigrams of Philodemus*, New York.
- Simeone, W. (1952), "A Probable Antecedent of Marvell's Horatian Ode", in: *Notes and Queries* 197, 316–18.
- Skinner, M. B. (2003) *Catullus in Verona. A Reading of the Elegiac Libellus, Poems 65–116*, Columbus, OH.
- Skutsch, O. (1956), "Zu Vergils Eklogen", in *RhM* 99, 193–201.
- Skutsch, O. (1985), *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford.
- Smith, K.F. (ed.) (1913), *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus*, New York.
- Smith, N. (ed.) (2003), *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, London.
- Smith, P. (1981), "Aineiadaei as Patrons of *Iliad* XX and the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*", *HSPH* 85, 17–58.
- Solin, H. (1975), "Die Wandinschriften im sogenannten Haus des M. Fabius Rufus", in: B. Andreae / H. Kyrieleis (eds.), *Neue Forschungen in Pompeji*, Recklinghausen, 243–72.
- Solodow, J.B. (1986), "*Raucae, tua cura, palumbes*: Study of a Poetic Word Order", in *HSPH* 90, 129–53.
- Somerville, T. (2010), "Note on a Reversed Acrostic in Vergil *Georgics* 1.429–33", in: *CPh* 105, 202–09.
- Spal, A. (2016), *Poesie, Erotik, Witz: Humorvoll-spöttische Versinschriften zu Liebe und Körperlichkeit in Pompeji und Umgebung*, Berlin.
- Stroh, W. (1971), *Die römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung*, Amsterdam.
- Sutherland, E.H. (1997), "Vision and desire in Horace, *C. 2.5*", in: *Helios* 24, 23–43.
- Sutherland, E.H. (2002), *Horace's well-trained reader: Toward a Methodology of Audience Participation in the Odes*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Syfret, R.H. (1961), "Marvell's 'Horatian Ode'", *The Review of English Studies* 12, 160–72.
- Syndikus, H.P. (2001), *Die Lyrik des Horaz: eine Interpretation der Oden, Band I: erstes und zweites Buch*, Darmstadt.
- Szemerényi, O. (1964), *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the Nature of Indo-European Accent*, Naples.
- Tarán, L. (1984), "Plato's Alleged Epitaph", in: *GRBS* 25, 63–82.
- Tarrant, R.J. (2016), *Texts, Editors, and Readers: Methods and Problems in Latin Textual Criticism*, Cambridge.



- Terkel, S. (2005), *And They All Sang: Adventures of an Eclectic Disc Jockey*, New York / London.
- Thomas, R.E. (1983), "Pound and Horace's Ode 3.30", *Helix* 13–14, 57–59.
- Thomas, R.F. (1979), "On a Homeric Reference in Catullus", in: *AJPh* 100, 475–76.
- Thomas, R.F. (1981), "Cinna, Calvus, and the Ciris", *CQ* 31, 371–4 (=Thomas, R.F., "Intertextuality Observed", *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality*, Ann Arbor, MI 1999, 300–3).
- Thomas, R.F. (1982), "Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (Poem 64.1–18)", in: *AJPh* 103, 144–64 (=Thomas, R.F., "Preparing the Way: Catullan Intertextuality", in: *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality*, Ann Arbor, MI 1999, 12–32).
- Thomas, R.F. (1983), "Virgil's Ecphrastic Centerpieces", in: *HSPH* 87, 175–84 (= Thomas, R.F., "Intertextuality Observed", in: *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality*, Ann Arbor, MI 1999, 310–20).
- Thomas, R.F. (1986), "Virgil's Georgics and the Art of Reference", *HSPH* 90, 171–98 (=Thomas, R.F., *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality*, Ann Arbor, MI 1999, 114–41).
- Thomas, R.F. (ed.) (1988), *Virgil: Georgics*, 2 vols., Cambridge.
- Thomas, R.F. (1992), "The Old Man Revisited: Memory, Reference, and Genre in Virg., *Geo.* 4.116–48", in: *MD* 29, 35–70 (=Thomas, R.F., *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality*, Ann Arbor, MI 1999, 173–205).
- Thomas, R.F. (1995), "*Vestigia ruris*: Urbane Rusticity in Virgil's Georgics", in *HSPH* 97, 197–214 (=Thomas, R.F., *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality*, Ann Arbor, MI 1999, 229–45).
- Thomas, R.F. (1998). "Voice, Poetics, and Virgil's Sixth Eclogue", in J. Jasanoff / H. Melchert / L. Oliver (eds.), *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, Innsbruck, 669–76 (= Thomas, R.F., *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality*, Ann Arbor, MI 1999, 288–96).
- Thomas, R.F. (1999), *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality*, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Thomas, R.F. (2001), *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*, Cambridge.
- Thomas, R.F. (ed.) (2011), *Horace: Odes Book IV; and Carmen Saeculare*, Cambridge.
- Thomas, R.F. (2017), *Why Bob Dylan Matters*, Dey Street Books.
- Thomson, D.F.S. (ed.) (1997), *Catullus*, Toronto.
- Tomlinson, C. (1993), "Some Aspects of Horace in the Twentieth Century", in: C. Martindale / D. Hopkins (eds.), *Horace Made New: Horatian Influences on British Writing from the Renaissance to the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge, 240–57.
- Trager, O. (2004), *Keys to the Rain: The Definitive Bob Dylan Encyclopedia*, New York.
- Tränkle, H. (1960), *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der Lateinische Dichtersprach*, Wiesbaden.
- Treggiari, S. (1981), "Concubinae", *PBSR* 49, 59–81.
- Treggiari, S. (1985), "*Iam proterva fronte*: Matrimonial Advances by Roman Women", in: J.W. Eadie / J. Ober (eds.), *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester Starr*, Lanham MD, 343–352.
- Trumbo, D. (1939), *Johnny Got His Gun*, Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott.
- Trumbo, D. (1959a), *Johnny Got His Gun*, New York: Lyle Stuart.
- Trumbo, D. (1959b), *Johnny Got His Gun*, New York: Ace Star Books.

- Vandiver, E. (2010), *Stand in the Trench, Achilles: Classical Receptions in British Poetry of the Great War*, Oxford / New York.
- Vandiver, E. (forthcoming), "Classics, Empire, and War", in: K. Haynes (ed.), *Oxford History of Classical Receptions in English Literature vol. 5: 1880-*, Oxford.
- Varone, A. (2002), *Erotica Pompeiana: Love Inscriptions on the Walls of Pompeii*, Rome.
- Vaughn, J.W. (1981), "Theocritus Vergilianus and Liber Bucolicon", in: *Aevum* 55, 47–68.
- Vlassopoulos, K. (2010), "Athenian slave names and Athenian social history", in: *ZPE* 175, 113–144.
- Voigt, E.-M. (ed.) (1971). *Sappho et Alcaeus*. Amsterdam.
- Wachter, R. (1998), "'Oral Poetry' in ungewohntem Kontext: Hinweise auf mündliche Dichtungstechnik in den Pompejanischen Wandinschriften", *ZPE* 121, 73–89.
- Walde, A. / Hofmann, J.B. (1938), *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- Watson, L.C. (ed.) (2003), *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford.
- Webb, R.H. (2009), *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*. Aldershot.
- West, D. (trans.) (1991), *Virgil: The Aeneid*, London.
- West, D. (1998), *Horace Odes II: Vatis Amici*, Oxford.
- West, M. L. (1974), *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin.
- Wheeler, A.L. (1911), "Erotic Teaching in Roman Elegy and the Greek Sources. Part II", *CPh* 6, 56–77.
- White, S.A. (1994), "Callimachus on Plato and Cleombrotus", in: *TAPA* 124, 135–161.
- Whitman, C. H. (1958), *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*, Cambridge, MA.
- Wilentz, S. (2010), *Bob Dylan in America*, New York.
- Wilhelm, J.J. (1990), *Ezra Pound in London and Paris 1908 • 1925*, University Park / London.
- Williams, G. (1968), *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*, Oxford.
- Williams, G. (1995), "Libertino patre natus: True or False?", in: S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*, Oxford, 296–313.
- Williams, R.D. (ed.) (1972), *The Aeneid of Virgil*, London.
- Wills, J. (1997), [Review of J.J. O'Hara (1996), *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*], in: *BMCRev* 97.12.17.
- Wilson, A.J.N. (1969), "Andrew Marvell: An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland: The Thread of the Poem and its Use of Classical Allusion", *Critical Quarterly* 11, 325–41.
- Wiseman, T.P. (1969), *Catullan Questions*, Leicester.
- Wiseman, T.P. (1979), *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature*, Leicester.
- Wolfe, D.M. (ed.) (1953–82), *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, 8 vols., New Haven, CT.
- Worden, B. (1987), "Andrew Marvell, Oliver Cromwell, and the Horatian Ode", in: K. Sharpe / S.N. Zwicker (eds.), *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, Berkeley / Los Angeles, 147–80.
- Wordsworth, C. (1837), *Inscriptiones Pompeianae, or Specimens and Facsimiles of Ancient Inscriptions Discovered on the Walls of Buildings at Pompeii*, London.
- Zetzel, J.E.G. (1980), "Horace's *Liber Sermonum*: The Structure of Ambiguity", in: *Arethusa* 13, 59–77.