

# Seeing (not) seeing: the phenomenology of deviant standpoint as a function of gender and class in Paulinus of Nola, *Poems 18*

---

ALEX DRESSLER  
*University of Wisconsin – Madison*  
[adressler@wisc.edu](mailto:adressler@wisc.edu)

In all revolutions there are some members of the privileged class who join the revolutionary class, and some oppressed individuals who remain loyal to the privileged class... This is because nation or class are neither fatalities that subjugate the individual from the outside, nor for that matter values that he posits from within. They are, rather, modes of coexistence that solicit him – Merleau-Ponty 1945 (2012), 380.

## ***1. Introduction: phenomenology, deviant standpoint, metapoetics***

This paper examines a cluster of intertexts that coalesce in the late fourth century CE Christian poet Paulinus of Nola but range backwards through the classical Roman poets, Horace and Catullus, and the archaic Greek lyric poet, Sappho. Through this range of authors, I develop a phenomenological approach to literary history, using a passage from

Paulinus (c. 18.276-80) to wrest some Marxist and feminist possibilities from the earlier, largely patriarchal and always aristocratic tradition. I base my analysis on two well-established, literary and sociological concepts. The first is the Latinist Don Fowler's description of "deviant focalization" in Roman poetry: this describes the incursion of perspectives ostensibly opposed to that of the narrator or author – that is, moments in which the questions "Who speaks?" or "Who sees?" become complex or irresolvable<sup>1</sup>. The second is the concept of "double-consciousness" used by the Hellenist John Winkler to describe the complex experience of society expressed in Sappho's lyrics: "Because men define and exhibit their language and manners as *the* culture and segregate women's language and manners as subculture... women are in the position of knowing two cultures where men know only one"<sup>2</sup>. Combining the literary and sociological concepts of Fowler and Winkler in the more comprehensive discourse of phenomenology, or "the study of structures of consciousness as experienced from the first-person point of view"<sup>3</sup>, I use Paulinus' impersonation of a rural laborer to recover from ancient literature and history dimensions of consciousness of the poor and marginal. Drawing on the resources of Marxist and feminist social theory, I call the object of this analysis "standpoint" because it comprises socially situated knowledge and understanding, based in but not limited to sociohistorically subjugated positions<sup>4</sup>. I describe the standpoint as "deviant" because it differs from that of the dominant subject of perception and understanding in whom it appears – in this case, the author of the poem and onetime man of property, Paulinus of Nola.

The basic theoretical premise is that the combination of deviant focalization and double-consciousness in Paulinus opens the man of property to perspectives other than his own, enabling him to "take a point of view on his point of view" and recognize the contingency and tentativeness of his own sociohistorical position and role in cultural production<sup>5</sup>. There are two indications of this surprising self-knowledge in Paulinus: the unlikely and maybe even unintentional Sapphism in his prosopopoeia of the laborer in *Poems* 18 and his more general personal alignment with a subclass of fourth century aristocrats who radically challenged and changed

1 — Fowler 2000 [1991], 31-33.

2 — Winkler 1990, 174.

3 — Smith 2018.

4 — E.g., Lukács' 1971 [1923], 2000, N. Hartsock 2004 [1983], 1998, cf. Haraway 1988, with Dressler 2011, 62-5. A similar theory is implicit in the context of Hardie (forthcoming, A).

5 — Bourdieu 1991, 5, cf. Deleuze 1990, 175, Foucault 1984, 117, 2005, 293, 308, with Porter 2017, 117, cf. Bourdieu 1996, 193-205, and Adorno 1997 [1970], 130, 145, with Horkheimer 1972, 199f., 204-14.

Roman culture<sup>6</sup>. Among the wave of moderate Christians who radicalized in the late fourth century, Paulinus proceeded to revolutionize, not only Latin literature, but also the institutional history of the Latin West<sup>7</sup>. Renouncing wealth and status, Paulinus liquidated his ancestral estates in Gaul and moved to the southern Italian town of Nola where he dedicated himself to the local saint, Felix, in a series of building projects incorporating charity for the poor and in a series of poems called *Natalicia*, or “death-day” poems, which he probably performed every year for an economically mixed congregation<sup>8</sup>. Other members of the aristocracy undertook comparably “revolutionary” actions; only Paulinus fused his project with classical poetics<sup>9</sup>. In what follows, I assign classical poetics a formative role in Paulinus’ renunciation: first, as a repository of various “Others”, women and workers, constituted in the *reception* of Sappho in the earlier Roman poets; second, as a means of using the classical tradition to modify itself, so as to represent previously un-representable subjects, through *metapoetics*, the property of verbal artifacts whereby the product specially reveals its mode of production<sup>10</sup>.

As even a brief sketch of the intertext indicates, Paulinus’ Christian phenomenology of labor finds a place in Roman poetry through the classical phenomenology of erotic and above all *embodied* experience. Combining the sociological and literary concepts of Winkler and Fowler, I suggest that the peculiar markers of the intertext that we find in Paulinus’ worker derive from the “silent women of Rome”, by way

6 — Did Paulinus ever read Sappho? Or Longinus in whom Sappho is so fatefully analyzed? In fact, for theoretical reasons, Paulinus’ first-hand acquaintance with Sappho is not only irrelevant, it is positively promising: if Sappho represents the subaltern for Paulinus, and such a subaltern as she (a speaking Greek of canonical proportions) never was in the first place, *his* ignorance of *her* and *her* persistence in *him* are the very proof of her *acquired* subalternity. By this acquisition of subalternity, in the famous formulation of post-colonial theory, Sappho ceases to be able to “speak”, becomes subaltern, and thus capable of “representing” an “other” subaltern (even sub-subaltern), the rural laborer. See further n. 50, below. I thank Philip Hardie for pressing me on this point, even if this (perhaps casuistical) response may avoid the relevant empirical question.

7 — On the movement, see Cameron 1977, 6, 22, 24-6, 29f.; on Paulinus in particular, see Trout 1999, 9f., 2005, 168-71, Brown 2012, 208-40.

8 — *c.* 27.547f.: *turba frequentior hic est, / rusticitas non casa fide neque docta legendi* (“A crowd comes here rather often/ country-folk, with no mean faith, but no knowledge of reading”). See Brown 1981, 54-60, Otranto 1998, 41-3, Trout 1999, 145-58, 160-98, and Fielding (forthcoming), around n. 8; cf. Markus 1990, 98f. On the development of the poems as a project, see Kamptner 2005, 13f., and Trout 1999, 117 where note “populist interpretation of the Christian faith”; cf. Clark 2005, 28f. For a positive account of “popular” religion, especially as a site of resistance in the Roman empire, see Elsner 1997, 257f.

9 — Brown 2012, *passim*. On the specifically aesthetic aspect, see Goldhill 2012.

10 — For Paulinus’ complex attitude to that which I call for lack of a better term “the classical”, in contrast with “the Christian”, see Trout 1999, 77-89, and Mratschek 2002, 423f. On the analogous role of biblical scripture as the source of allusive metapoetics in the *Letters*, see Conybeare 2000, 111-130; see also the Introduction of Hardie (forthcoming, B).

of Catullus and Horace's responses to Sappho, fr. 31<sup>11</sup>. Appropriating their erotic appropriations of Sapphic embodiment, Paulinus develops a first-person account of labor through the eyes and mouth of another. In Sappho's famous fragment, she first sees the object of her desire, "sweetly speaking/and laughing lovely" (31.4f.) and then sees "nothing in her eyes" (11) before, paradoxically, she somehow "appears to [her]self" (16), thus "seeing (not) seeing"<sup>12</sup>. The Roman-era critic Longinus described the complex verbal expression of this phenomenon as "a congeries of vexed emotions"<sup>13</sup>. Adopting a technical term from the same critical tradition and supplementing that term with Catullus' translation of Sappho, I call it here the *synthesis* (or com-position) of "all the senses"<sup>14</sup>. This comprises the marks of first-person experience, deviant focalization, a combination of participles, and the further definition of those participles with a privileged marker of aesthetic experience in the classical tradition, "sweetness"<sup>15</sup>. Stereotyped in the receptions of Catullus and Horace, this *synthesis* of "all the senses" appears when the laborer, called *rusticus* in Paulinus, describes his cows, in fact his property (*peculium*), as "sweet to the one who sees" and "sweet to the one who labors" (c. 18.278f.)<sup>16</sup>.

In all cases, the *synthesis* illustrates the fundamental concept of phenomenology: "the body as the subject of perception"<sup>17</sup>. The difference between the classical and Christian expressions of this concept reflect the different forms of difference, or alterity, that the poet of each era uses phenomenology to express: for the classical Latin poet, "the body as the subject of perception" expresses the difference in *gender* encountered in *erotic* life; for the Christian poet, it expresses the difference in *class* encountered in *economic* life<sup>18</sup>. The *synthesis* of "all the senses" and the

11 — Finley 1968.

12 — To Catullus, c. 51, the translation of Sappho, Stevens 2013, 249 attributes "hearing (not) hearing".

13 — *De subl.* 10.3: παθῶν σύννοδος, trans. Porter 2016, 112, 120f., 126, 135f.

14 — Porter 1995, 106-12, cf. 2010, 205f., 216f., 229f., 235-42, 244-7. For Catullus' phrase, see §2, below. In the rhetorical theory of Seneca the Elder, *synthesis* (*compositio uerborum*) can bear a gender (*mollior*) and effect the speaker as it were against his will (*patri*, Contr. 2 Pref. 1).

15 — E.g., Porter 2016, 145.

16 — At n. 33, Fielding (forthcoming) notes brief precedents for Paulinus' laborer in Verg. *Ecl.* 3.17f., Stat. *Theb.* 3.45-52, Claud. *De rapt.* 3.165-9. See Fitzgerald 1996, 400f., with Carpino 2007, 357, 366-8, and Hardie (forthcoming, A), at nn. 20-22.

17 — Merleau-Ponty 2012 [1949], 234.

18 — Whether it is proper to use the term *class* of Greco-Roman society, is a big, fascinating, and probably empty question: Lukács 1971 [1923], 161 and Finley 1973, 35-61, did not think so; Ste. Croix 1981, 91-6 did; Hobsbawm 1972, 6-11, was more nuanced, while Elsner 1997, 283-6 holds that class analysis of ancient culture may unduly stress the degree of activity of the resistance of which it was capable; cf. Clark 2005, 27f. Following the Marxist sociology of Wright *et al.* 1989, 272f., I think a fundamentally relational concept such as class is valid, not by virtue of corresponding with a historical state of affairs, as the students of antiquity argue it does or does not, but by virtue of the kinds of questions that it enables us to ask of that state of affairs.

“body as the subject of perception” thus present Paulinus with a vehicle for the recognition of an Other more other than Sappho in Latin literature: the rural laborer. Through attention to this extraordinary detail of his poetry – that is, then, through a “poetic” interpretation of history – I claim that Paulinus recognized the poor in a kind of cross-class solidarity that corresponded with a real redistribution of resources in his all but unexampled public works, and that his project was progressive, consistent with certain modern ideals of feminism and Marxism<sup>19</sup>.

In terms more familiar from the interpretation of Greco-Roman literature, this phenomenological approach resolves a longstanding problem in the study of Latin literature, specifically the problem of reflexivity, or *metapoetics*, as a supplement to reference or mimesis in classical Latin poetry, and the transformation of their relationship in Christian poetry<sup>20</sup>. Where, as representative scholarship on classical Latin poetry from the 1990s everywhere demonstrated, classical Latin poetry represents representation (e.g., *ekphrasis*, poetic “self-consciousness”, metapoetics), Christian literature produced in response to that literature *intensifies* the already intensified dynamics of self-reference in classical poetry<sup>21</sup>. The result, at least in the case of the prosopopoeia of the rural laborer in Paulinus, is not more poetry about poetry (about poetry, etc...). Rather, by subtly incorporating the intensely metapoetic dynamic of Sappho’s earlier entry into Latin literature, Paulinus’ prosopopoeia of the rural laborer refers to itself (like classical poetry) but also (“like” Christian poetry), in a dynamic that some have called “realism”, begins “again” to represent a world beyond itself (mimesis)<sup>22</sup>. Thus, where classical poetry risked running aground on its self-referentiality and allusivity, especially in heightened moments of reflexivity, such as the erotic deployment of the *sunthesis* of “all the senses”, Christian poetry takes a new position relative to reality (or reference), which is marked by the economic deployment of the *sunthesis* in non-classical perspectives, perspectives of proper “Others” – such as the rural laborer.

19 — See, e.g., Fraser and Honneth 2003, 8-26, with *Anerkennung* in Honneth 2008, 21-40, 52-63. Trout 1999, 150 outlines the form that Paulinus’ proto-welfare system may have taken.

20 — See, e.g., Kennedy 1993, 46-63, and Hinds 1998, 10-16, persisting in Sharrock 2009, with further documentation in Dressler 2016b, 17-27.

21 — See, e.g., Nugent 1989, Elsner and Hernández Lobato 2017 and Kaufman 2017, and also Goldhill 2012, 89, 94f., 111f., on Paulinus himself.

22 — On the formation of Christian poetry in this period, see Vessey 2007, 29-40, cf. Fielding 2017, 50f. For realism, see Auerbach 1965, 37f., 63-5; cf. Hardie (forthcoming, A), esp. in the first paragraph and in the text at nn. 21-3, with further background in Fitzgerald 1996, 390f. On the generic and lexical basis of this new amplitude in Christian stylistics, see Fontaine 1988, 334-6, 329-30, 335, 341. Among the representatives of “classical Latin” here, we may include Paulinus’ immediate poetic predecessor and famous interlocutor, Ausonius of Bordeaux (cf. Fontaine 1981, Chapter 10, Rucker 2012, Chapter 2, Hardie [forthcoming, B], Chapter 1, Fielding 2017, Chapter 1).

Throughout the paper, I use the resources of phenomenology to explain the interrelation of these processes, mimesis and metapoetics, because that philosophy alone, especially in the class- and gender-conscious interpretations of Marxist, feminist, and race critical social theory, seems able to reconcile the paradoxes of sensory experience, such as the phenomenon of “seeing (not) seeing”, with more normal and normative, above all *gendered* forms of perception in Greco-Roman culture<sup>23</sup>. Where the normal and normative modes amount to the masculine mode of objectification (vision), the gendered and deviant mode amounts to auto-affection, or the perception of the self by the self (“touching touching”)<sup>24</sup>. A leitmotif of modern and postmodern continental philosophy, this dynamic of self-reference parallels metapoetics in Latin literature and is associated, at least in the Sappho of Catullus and Horace, with “female body experience”<sup>25</sup>. Metapoetics or self-reference is thus not *opposed* to poetics proper, or simple reference (mimesis); each, rather, *presupposes* the other, just as, in phenomenology, perception is the condition of auto-affection, and auto-affection is the condition of perception: “We indubitably communicate with ourselves by communicating with the world”<sup>26</sup>. In just the same way, “masculine” and “feminine” modes of perception are not opposed to but rather presuppose one another<sup>27</sup>. The presupposition of auto-affection by “proper” perception reveals that the latter was “deviant” to begin with<sup>28</sup>.

Phenomenology thus demonstrates in a nuanced, specific, and explicitly political way *how* the reversibility of metapoetics and mimesis operates, filling the theoretical gap opened in practical criticism by the problem of self-reference<sup>29</sup>. A Marxist-feminist phenomenology reveals

23 — Phenomenology here encompasses a wide range of authors: e.g., Merleau-Ponty 2012 [1945], 244, Beauvoir 1974 [1949], 37f., Moi 1999, 56, 59-83, and Butler 2006 [1990], 119-24. On the politics and gender of perception (viz. subjectivity and objectification) in Greco-Roman literature and culture, see, e.g., Barton 2002, Frederick 2002a, 13-16, Sharrock 2002, 280-88, Morales 2006, 29-35, Burrus 2008, 10-19, 35. For an essential extension of such studies to Paulinus himself, see Goldhill 2012, 92-9, 111f.

24 — Derrida 2005, 29-35, cf. 175f., with Dressler 2016a, 186-9. The implication of physical contact in such formulations challenges the sovereignty of “the gaze” in recent decades of classical scholarship (see, e.g., Massumi 2002, 267).

25 — For the quoted phrase, see Young 2004, with Lev Kenaan 2008, esp. 103-60. On gender in Sappho’s reception, see Ancona 2002, 163f., with P. Rosenmeyer 1997, 130f., 133-6. For a related discussion of the feminine in early Christianity, see Cameron 1989, 188f.

26 — Merleau-Ponty 2012 [1945], 448, cf. 396, 416f.

27 — Frederick 2002a, 4-6, Sharrock 2002, 267-70, and esp. 280.

28 — Butler 1990, 187-9; cf. Dressler 2016a, 19-23, 136f.

29 — Hinds 1998, 13 “resolves” the issue by “refus[ing] to treat the choice [viz. between metapoetics and poetics, and thus by implication form and content] as a disjunctive one”. This is a sensible resolution from the point of view of *practical* criticism, or criticism that seeks “the richest reading” of a Latin poem (Hinds, *ibid.*), but the *theoretical* basis for the “resolution” that Hinds proposes is not clear. Phenomenology will clarify it, in addition to making a contribution to “practical criticism”,

in addition the *political* dimension of the processes in question by encouraging us to consider their constitutive dynamics, “the tenors of signification” in the poem and the processes of auto-affection in the person, in terms of class and gender. The first approach to the intertext in the next section (§2) will explore the Sapphic-Catullan background of Paulinus’ prosopopoeia to establish the relevance of gender. The section after that (§3) will explore additional connections between Horace and Paulinus to establish the relevance of class and of a particular dimension of class difference that political theorists now term “precarity”, but that actually has its roots in the very Christian tradition of poverty and charity that Paulinus was seen to embody. Finally, in §4, against the background of Paulinus’ countercultural Christian project and in the immediate context of the rest of *Poems* 18, we’ll see how Paulinus implicitly *fuses* gender and class, which enables him to adopt a new political perspective on *his own* historically privileged position and finally imagine something different.

In sum, the medium-specific capacity of poetry to refer to itself without nevertheless distinguishing itself from its subject matter makes innovation in *literary history* possible, which, aligned with the phenomena of perception and auto-affection, makes innovation in *social history* possible<sup>30</sup>. Thus, synchronically, in the context of cultural development of Christianity, the medium-specific capacity of poetry may exceed poetry and *become* political<sup>31</sup>. On the other hand, diachronically, the revision of the earlier, “classical” instances of the *synthesis* in the Christian context of Paulinus’ poem may itself transform the tradition on which it draws. If, in other words, reception exercises a *reversely determining effect* on literary history, as some of its diehard advocates suggest, then perhaps Paulinus *makes* Sappho, Catullus, and Horace “finally” progressive<sup>32</sup>. At the very least, this “progressive” re-reading of Paulinus, aided by the radical tradition of phenomenology implied in Winkler’s appropriation of the concept of “double-consciousness”, may *clarify* progressive dimensions of

---

since the poems considered here all fuse metapoetics and auto-affection in their poetic “practice”. Phenomenology thus offers a materialist (monistic) solution to the problem implied in the implicitly idealist (or dualist) distinction between “form” and “content”, “vehicle” and “tenor”, poetics and metapoetics, figure of speech and figure of thought, etc. See further Porter 1995, 98-102.

30 — See the “tradition and originality” of Williams 1968, with Basson 1999, 90-5, and Marxist discussion in Adorno 1997, 179.

31 — The phenomenological description of this “becoming political” may be more satisfying than the familiar apodictic assertion of politically committed scholarship, viz. “everything”, and therefore poetry, reading, etc., “is political”; cf. n. 61 below.

32 — Martindale 1993, 25f., 2005, 25-30, with feminist application in Liveley 2006, esp. 57-9; see also Burrus 2000, 12f. On Catullus-Sappho, see Thévenaz 2009, 61, following Rösler 1991, 271f. For more general discussion, see Pucci 1999, 45f. and Peltari 2014, 3f., through Roberts 1989, 5f. For the phenomenological background, see Hexter 2006, 23f., and n. 117, below.

these poems, and certainly of Paulinus, *Poems* 18, which would otherwise remain invisible, ephemeral, or ambiguous<sup>33</sup>.

## 2. *The intertext itself: Paulinus and Sappho-Catullus (gender)*

Based in but not limited to reflexivity in vision, deviant standpoint becomes phenomenological in the literal sense in the description of erotic paroxysm in Sappho's thirty-first fragment. The poem begins with the dilation of subjective appearances that is the ground of phenomenology (*phainetai moi*)<sup>34</sup>. It culminates with the paradoxical loss of contact with reality through the very means by which reality is supposed to be experienced, the senses (5-12 Page 1955, trans. Carson 2003):

τό μ' ἦ μὰν  
 καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν·  
 ὡς γὰρ ἔς σ' ἴδω βρόχε', ὡς με φώναι-  
 σ' οὐδ' ἐν ἔτ' εἴκει,  
 ἀλλ' ἄκαν μὲν γλῶσσα †ἔαγε† λέπτον  
 δ' αὐτίκα χρώι πῦρ ὑπαδεδρόμηκεν,  
 ὀππάτεσσι δ' οὐδ' ἐν ὄρημμ', ἐπιρρόμ-  
 βεισι δ' ἄκουαι.

oh it  
 puts the heart in my chest on wings  
 for when I look at you, even a moment, no speaking  
 is left in me  
 no: tongue breaks and thin  
 fire is racing under skin  
 and in eyes no sight and drumming  
 fills ears.

Here loss of vision and hearing (11f.) and haptic auto-affection (10) follow and paradoxically express the speaker losing her voice, even as she persists in describing her condition, thus speaking (not) speaking (7-9). In the famous turn of the final extant lines that follow these, this speaking (not) speaking finds a parallel in seeing (not) seeing: "Greener than grass/I

33 — Winkler does not mention the earlier coinage of "double-consciousness" by the Black founder of sociology (e.g., Du Bois 1903, 3, with Holt 1990, 316; cf. Newman 2011, 16-19), but its relevance to Sappho derives from the originally Hegelian background of both Marxist (esp. Lukácsian: Appiah 2014, 11-13, 37-43, , 56-61, 70f. vis-à-vis Jay 1984, 81-4, 109f.) and Du Boisian thought (Holt 1990, 309-16, Appiah 2014, 2, 17, 171f. n. 22), and from the eventual development of the former in Hartssock's 2004 [1983] feminist standpoint theory: Jameson 1988, 66-71, Appiah 2014, 60f.

34 — Porter 2010, 196-205, esp. 198f.

am, and a little short of dying/ *I appear to myself*” (14-16: χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας/ ἔμμι, τεθνάκην δ’ ὀλίγω ’πιδεύης/ φαίνομ’ ἔμ’ αὐται). With this mortal turn and with her unaccountable appearance to herself, Sappho illustrates auto-affection as it appears in the modern philosophy of phenomenology (Merleau-Ponty 2012 [1945], 426):

[T]he presence of self to self, being existence itself, is prior to every philosophy, but it only knows itself in limit situations in which it is threatened, such as in the fear of death or in the anxiety caused by another person’s gaze upon me.

Since she is not speaking at this point, and since she cannot see in the way described, Sappho’s statement of what she is seeing expresses Merleau-Ponty’s “limit situation”. Also implied in this limitation of philosophy is the limitation of speech, or *logos*, thematized in Sappho and her reception in Catullus and Horace.

Sappho’s presentation of this condition is even more intense than that of Merleau-Ponty because in fr. 31 the gaze of the other person is in fact her own. With the phrase, “I appear to myself”, the form of self-description in Sappho’s fragment requires others’ perspectives; it is, in literary critical terms, externally focalized<sup>35</sup>. But as a later poet said: “The trouble with the first person is that it cannot perceive itself”<sup>36</sup>. In confronting this problem, Sappho suggests that her experience and expression of herself already incorporate others. Another indication of this complex of identity and alterity is the precise parallelism of the last words of the above quotation and the first words of the poem: φαίνομ’ ἔμ’ αὐται (16), φαίνεται μοι κῆνος (1)<sup>37</sup>. In the first line, the parties of the expression were the first and third persons (μοι κῆνος), the not-yet (grammatically) feminine speaker (μοι) in indirect connection with “that man” (κῆνος). In the final lines, the speaker is explicitly feminine and appears as such to herself (ἔμ’ αὐται)<sup>38</sup>. If Sappho’s poetry more generally expresses “double-consciousness”, or the ability to comprise “several personal perspectives”, as Winkler suggested, Sappho here provides an anatomy of that condition: speaking (not) speaking, touching (not) touching, seeing (not) seeing, hearing (not) hearing – “all the senses”, in fact, except for smell –

35 — See now Purves 2014.

36 — Schwartz 1986, 80.

37 — Rösler 1991, 281. Purves 2014, 188-90 notes a parallel play between the lines of fr. 1.19f., juxtaposing *tis* (“who?”) and “Sappho” (as addressed by Aphrodite); cf. Taussig 1993, 129: “all identity formation is engaged in this habitually bracing activity in which the issue is not so much staying the same, but maintaining sameness through alterity”.

38 — Rösler 1991, 281-4.

become so many *sensuous interpretations* of a women's complex position in a patriarchal society<sup>39</sup>.

Where Sappho combined double-consciousness and deviant focalization in her own person(a) in fr. 31, Paulinus renders the combination an instance of deviant *standpoint* by adopting a *different* persona in c. 18. After thieves have stolen the laborer's cows, he comes to the shrine of St. Felix to seek restitution, thereby beginning the central episode of perhaps the central poem of the *Natalicia*, written in 400 CE, and offering extended descriptions of the saint's ascent to heaven and the first miracle that he commands therefrom<sup>40</sup>. After a long introductory description of the ascent, we hear the case of the stolen cows from the cowherd himself. With a complex allusion of the kind that Latinists call a "window reference"<sup>41</sup>, the rural laborer sounds the notes of Sappho through the combined background of Catullus and Horace (c. 18.276-80 Hartel and Kamptner 1999):

nunc et mea tecta uidentur  
 clausa mihi, abductis ubi desolatus alumnis  
 nil habeo, quod habere uelim, quod dulce uidenti,  
dulce laboranti, non inrita gratia praestet,  
 oblectans inopem sensu fructuque peculi.

Now even my house  
 seems closed to me where, bereft of my stolen wards, I have  
 nothing I'd like to have, which still legitimate grace presents,  
*sweet to the one who sees, sweet to the laborer*, pleasing  
 the poor in the feeling and in the fruit of property.

In the present instance, Sappho's expression of double-consciousness through deviant focalization reveals itself to be the means by which Paulinus achieves deviant standpoint, or the standpoint of the rural laborer, within the discourse of the man of property. This happens when the Christian poet transforms the processes of erotic desire that Sappho and Catullus represented only subjectively in the alienation of the senses into the concrete and objective expropriation of the cowherd of his cows<sup>42</sup>. With *uidentur* in l. 276, he too locates himself in the combined Sapphic-Catullan domain of appearances, or phenomena (*φαίνεταί, uidentur*).

39 — Winkler 1990, 167, cf. 175f., also Stehle 1997, 290-3. On the tendentiousness of this particular canon of senses, which Paulinus will in fact supplement, see Peponi 2011, *ad fin.*, Telò 2013, and n. 103 below.

40 — On its centrality, see Kamptner 2005, 8, 18f.

41 — Thomas 1986, 188, McKeown 1987, 37-45, cf. Hinds 1998, 47-50.

42 — Cf. Uden 2009, esp. 211-13.

While the earlier poems open the way to the experience of radical embodiment that they describe with the senses feeling themselves and with the infinitesimal failure of language, I will argue in this section that they always fall short in their trajectory because of their metapoetic aspect<sup>43</sup>. In Paulinus, in contrast, the metapoetic aspect will give way to poetics proper, not representation of oneself (Catullus, Horace) nor even representation of oneself *as* another (Sappho), but representation of another *tout court*: in the man of property, the man without property. This will take place after the *sunthesis* of “all the senses” becomes an instrument for the poets to explore their relationship, not just with themselves (as lovers: auto-affection), but also with one another (as poets: metapoetics).

The metapoetic dimension that first opens in the *sunthesis* of the classical poets persists in the keywords of Paulinus’ intertext: *dulce uidentī, dulce laboranti*, “sweet to the one who sees, sweet to the one who labors”. Sappho described observing the experience of a man who observes the experience of a woman who appears “sweetly speaking/and laughing lovely” (31.4f.: ἄδν φωνεῖ/σας ὑπακούει/καὶ γελαίσας ἰμέροεν). In a marked parallel, the *sunthesis* of “all the senses” is prefigured here in a subtle paronomasia that subsequent Latin reception explicates: to Sappho’s subtle phonic combination of φαίνεται and φωνεῖσας, there corresponds in Paulinus a more patent repetition, *uidentur* and *uidentī*. In his unconventional translation, Catullus adapts the *sunthesis* to Latin literature when, addressing “Lesbia”, he observes a man “who... repeatedly/sees and hears you/sweetly laughing” (c. 51.3-5: *qui... identidem tēspectat et audit/ dulce ridentem*). With the addition of the word “repeatedly”, Catullus generalizes the process, thus marking not only his belatedness and innovation, but also his poetic process as such<sup>44</sup>. At the same time, highlighting the political implications of his repetition and variation, he deprives the object of erotic attention in fr. 31 of the voice that Sappho gave her in her poem: here we only see and hear this once articulate woman, “Lesbia”, laughing.

The pattern of repetition and explication continues when, with one more gloss on the political implications of his adaptation, Catullus describes erotic experience as that “which *steals* from miserable me/*all* my senses” (5f.): *miserō quod omnes/eripit sensus mihi*. With *eripit* (“steal”) and its object, the concrete *entirety* of the experience (*omnes sensus*), the classical poet furnishes the Christian poet with a model for the objective, explicitly material theft of the laborer’s cows, at the same time that he endows the *sunthesis*, the “all the senses” *topos*, with metapoetic and political dimen-

43 — Cf. Lowrie 1997, 193f.

44 — Hinds 1998, 120-2, cf. *identidem* (*te*) above: the *identidem* denotes repetition (“again and again”), and the *te*, echoing *-ti-*, difference (N.B. the rare rhyme, *ridentem*, where a rhyme is a precise figure of identity and difference).

sions. On the one hand, Catullus “steals” the voice of Sappho’s lovely girl who in *c.* 51 stops speaking and only laughs; in the same gesture, Catullus steals the whole erotic *topos* (“all the senses”) from Sappho. On the other hand, Catullus inserts *himself* in the position of the victim of the crime, and *Sappho* becomes the perpetrator: the pseudonymous Lesbia of *c.* 51, a largely verbatim translation of Sappho, may after all refer both to the historical Clodia and to the “the Lesbian [poet]”, Sappho herself<sup>45</sup>. Was *Sappho* then the one who robbed Catullus of “all the senses”, which now acts as a name for the trope of embodied knowledge, which in fact tropes “the body as the subject of perception” (see n. 17 above), throughout these poems of erotic subjectivity? With this implication, the poet suggests that his *aesthesis*, or the ostensible content of the *topos* “all the senses”, was in fact an *aesthetic* response – a response to reading Sappho<sup>46</sup>.

Eliminating Sappho’s paradoxical sight of herself, Catullus next displaces the dynamic of duality that Sappho represents in terms of self and other, appearing and appeared to, and male and female, into the specious unity of his own male-male relationship with himself (13): “Leisure, Catullus, is what does you in” (*otium, Catulle...*)<sup>47</sup>. But even here, as he rejects the apparently effeminate paroxysm of the earlier poem, Catullus preserves the dynamic of Sappho with the vocative and second person address of the concluding stanza<sup>48</sup>. The difference from Sappho is that Catullus remains a man in both instances<sup>49</sup>. In the privilege of patriarchy, he appears paradoxically more at home in the self-expression that Sappho pioneered, but he does not expunge the alterity to which Sappho is vulnerable as a woman. In fact, he establishes it, or at least exploits it: silencing Sappho, Catullus *makes* her into that famous subaltern of postcolonial theory, whose speech was always a question and who the archaic Greek woman, as a function of her aristocratic privilege and poetic authority, never was, or was only in part, in the first place<sup>50</sup>. This silent “Sappho”

45 — So, e.g., Segal 1970, 31 with further documentation and discussion in Thévenaz 2009, 76 n. 35. See Svenbro 1993, 150-6, with Thévenaz 2009, 77 n. 40, *pace* Miller 1993, 191f., 194f., with P. Rosenmeyer 1997, 125-30, Stehle 1997, 294f., 297f., and Calame 2013, 51. On the late antique iteration of textual self-consciousness, see Pelttari 2014, 5f.

46 — See prev. n. For the two senses of the term *aesthetic*, “sensation and perception” and “art and aesthetic experience”, see Porter 2010, 40, 244, cf. 206f., 221f., 231, 245f. Again, Catullus is only explicating (or “stealing”) what Sappho originally enacted: “the synthesis performed by the author – applied now to her art, now to her pathology, to the point of the indistinctness of both” (Porter 2016, 121). For a phenomenological analysis of the ambiguity of embodiment and sensation implied in aesthetics, see Merleau-Ponty 2012 [1945], 170f.

47 — See above all C. Clark, cited and quoted in §4 below.

48 — D’Angour 2013, 62-8.

49 — Janan 1994, 74f., with Stevens 2013, 249-56.

50 — For the application of post-colonial theory to late antiquity, see Shorrock 2013, 8, and Kaufman 2017, 170-3. For the debate on the famous category of the subaltern, see now Morris 2010, with helpful background in Chatterjee 2010 [1998], 294-6. The original, practical application of this

is the figure of radical alterity, which perhaps never existed, but which Horace and Paulinus use to understand and eventually challenge more immediate, economic differences.

### ***3. Paulinus and Horace, Odes 1.22: metapoetics and precarity (class)***

To judge by Paulinus' general practice and the repetition of *dulce* in c. 18.278f., the more immediate "source" of Paulinus' phrasing was neither Sappho nor Catullus, but rather Catullus' lyric successor, Horace, who, in two different poems, only intensifies the polyphonic play of metapoetics in the reception of Sappho by Catullus<sup>51</sup>. In this section, I review Horace's response to Sappho in the context most immediately relevant to Paulinus, but perhaps divergent from Catullus: the appropriation of the originally erotic *synthesis* of "all the senses" for understanding, not the more general difference of gender or of subjects and objects, but the more specific, above all social, political, and economic form of difference that we call "class"<sup>52</sup>. Here I will show that Paulinus' appropriation of Horace's appropriation (of Catullus' appropriation, etc.) functions in two related ways: first, metapoetically to reveal the conditions of production of poetry; second, politically, to highlight the more specifically exploitative dimension of that form of production and of Paulinus' own socio-historical position within it. This is the *precarious* condition of the cowherd's existence, which he (the cowherd) declares (via metapoetics) as a distinct challenge to Paulinus.

The first instance of Horace's reception of Catullus' Sappho is the so-called *Lalage* ode, where the poet-lover appears as pseudo-exile, musing on desire and language, in his big Sabine backyard (Horace, c. 1.22.1-12, Wickham and Garrod 1901):

Integer vitae scelerisque purus  
non eget Mauris iaculis neque arcu

concept (see Green 2002, 16-18 but also Cherniavsky 2011, 151, 157) is uncannily close to the very world of Paulinus' rural laborer of Nola; it denotes "slaves, peasants, religious groups, women, different races, and the proletariat" (Green 2012, 2; cf., e.g., Gramsci 1992, 288-91), and in particular, in Gramsci 1978, 454-56, *southern Italian peasants* (Green 2012, 10): "groups that are undeveloped or unorganized socially or politically are harder to research in historical records... A group of unorganized peasant farmers could perhaps represent an example in this instance, in which the farmers are not conscious, individually or collectively, of their position within the prevailing social relations".

51 — Hartel and Kamptner 1999, 487 find seven allusions to Catullus in Paulinus; to Horace, in contrast, they record three pages: 491-3; see also Nazzaro 1993, 495-7. For discussion of the logics of these allusive dynamics in Late Antique Latin poetry, see Pelttari 2014, 26-30, 116, 122, 126, 129, 133, with further background in Pucci 1999, 70-8, and Hardie (forthcoming, B, esp. the Introduction and Ch. 8). On Horace's debt to Catullus, see Putnam 2006.

52 — See n. 18, above.

nec veneratis gravida sagittis,  
 Fusce, pharetra,  
 sive per Syrtis iter aestuosas  
 sive facturus per inhospitalem  
 Caucasum vel quae loca fabulosus  
 lambit Hydaspes.  
 namque me silva lupus in Sabina  
 dum meam canto Lalagen et ultra  
 terminum curis vagor expeditis  
 fugit inermem...

One clean of life and without touch of sin,  
 will need no Moorish bow or javelin  
 or quiver full of arrows dipped  
 in venom, Fuscus, my friend,  
 although he wanders through hot shoals  
 of Lybia or incommodious  
 Caucasus or banks where laps  
 the storied river Hydaspes.  
 For wandering in the Sabine woods  
 beyond the line and worry free,  
 unarmed I sang of Lalagé and found  
 a wolf flee me...

Due to the moral capacity of the word “sin” (*scelus*) in the first line of this ode and Horace’s more general expurgation of erotic elements, the poem was a favorite among later Christians<sup>53</sup>. Paulinus will mine it elsewhere for his fantasy of evangelizing the Basques: “Whoever goes spotless of sin and clean of life...”<sup>54</sup>. This image of dubious but triumphant immersion in alterity in Paulinus’ Basque fantastic makes the poet-lover of the classical tradition the model for what Christians will come to call the “sign of contradiction”<sup>55</sup>. In Horace’s case, this figure of power in weakness (*uirtus in infirmitate*: see prev. n.) resorts once again to the phenomenology of Sappho and Catullus (Hor. *c.* 1.22.21-4):

pone sub curru nimium propinqui  
 solis in terra domibus negata:  
dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo,  
dulce loquentem.

53 — Newman 2011, 12 compares “the story of St. Francis... and the ravenous wolf”. Cf. Ancona 2002, 177-80, 182f, Putnam 2006, 37, and Newman 2011, 20.

54 — *c.* 10.212: *quisquis agit purus sceleris uitam integer*; cf. Cat. *c.* 76.19, and Fielding 2017, 42.

55 — Wotjyla, Pope John Paul II 1979, 124. See also Paul, 2 Cor. 12.9 with Paulin. *Ep.* 5.18: *uirtus in infirmitate perficitur*, 38.3: *uirtus in infirmitate carnis*. For further variations (e.g., *gloriari in passionibus tuis*, 37.7), see Hartel and Kamptner 1999, index 1, s.v. Paul, *ibidem*.

Put me under the course of the sun  
 too near to a land denied to homes:  
 still, Lalage *sweet in laughing* will I love,  
 and *sweet in speaking*.

Here again repetition figures allusion. Where Sappho described the object of her desire “sweet in laughing... and lovely in speaking” and Catullus marked his own belatedness with *identidem* (“*again and again* he sees and hears you/sweetly laughing”), Horace stereotypes the belatedness in the more patent repetition of his formulation: “*sweet* in laughing...*sweet* in speaking”. At the same time, now that the woman has been more firmly restored to the position of the object (above all by means of Horace’s use of the third person), she may again begin to speak, like her Sapphic counterpart, where the woman in Catullus only laughed.

In phenomenological terms, in the transition from Sappho to Horace, auto-affection and metapoetics coincide. Where Sappho “see[s] nothing in the eyes” (11: ὀπτάτεσι δ’ οὐδὲν ὄρημι), in Catullus the “nothing” acquires substance and appears, so to speak, as night<sup>56</sup>. A reference to doubling, the now familiar signpost of allusion in classical Latin, additionally marks this acquisition and appearance (11f.): “the lights of my eyes are closed/in double night” (*gemina teguntur/lumina nocte*)<sup>57</sup>. In his response to Sappho and Catullus, Horace once more makes auto-affection explicitly poetic: where the earlier poets draw attention to the medium of their experience through vision (οὐδὲν, *gemina...nocte*), Horace uses speech itself, the medium of poetry, to describe as herself speaking his probably unreal lover whose name in Greek suggests speaking (*la la la*), thus (himself) speaking (not) speaking (c. 1.22.23f.): *Lalagen...loquentem*<sup>58</sup>. With this speaking name, Horace thematizes the inarticulate dimension of the intertext, the dimension in which I would suggest Sapphic alterity

56 — On the verge of a panic attack, the philosopher Seneca has a similar experience in “the prison of the Naples underpass” (*Ep.* 57.2, with Henderson 2004, 35): *non ut per tenebras videamus, sed ut ipsas* (“so we saw not *through* the shadows but [the shadows] *themselves*”). Cf. *clausa* in Paulin. c. 18.277, above. See also Rimell 2015, 150, 165, and Merleau-Ponty 2012 [1945], 416: “this is enough to ensure that we are not determined... I can close my eyes and plug my ears, but I cannot stop seeing, even if only the blackness before my eyes, even if only the silence”.

57 — See n. 44 above; also, e.g., c. 10.67f., with Hardy (forthcoming, B: Chapter 1, end of first section).

58 — Porter 2010, 228-30 equates such effects (Gr. *dunameis*: Porter 2010, 236) with “Shklovskian ‘roughening’” – a phenomenon already operative in Sappho (Stehle 1997, 293): “The separation of speaker and singer effected by the poem means that a woman who sang the poem could simultaneously hear it as another’s voice”. Similar is the famous hiatus of the Greek (“tongue breaks”: γλώσσα ἤγαγεῖ) that “phenomenalizes” transgression of at least poetic principles: Prins 1999, 33-5, cf. Rösler 1991, 281, with Payne 2016, 90. Deleuze and Guattari 1986, 22 call such features of language “tensors” or “intensive”: “the accents that are interior to words, their discordant function”, and they associate these with subversive “minor literatures”. See, e.g., Rosenmeyer 1997, Lardinois 2001, 88.

subsists, as all but immediate experimentation in *my* speaking here and now: say *dulce...dulce...* (Catullus) *dulce* (Horatius), etc.<sup>59</sup>. Along with the participles of laughter, speaking, and eventually labor (*dulce laboranti* in Paulinus: more “la-la-la”), this *dulce* becomes both sign and specimen of phenomenology and of the ambivalence of embodiment and sensation, to say nothing of aesthetics as such, in the tradition (see n. 14, above). At the same time, the allusive figure of repetition itself figures that specific form of repetition, which we call “habit”, in first-person experience: the ground against which new experiences – erotic paroxysm, erotic poetry, or heightened political consciousness – are the figure<sup>60</sup>.

This proliferation of complexity in the discourse of the *sunthesis* of “all the senses” culminates in metapoetics, or the implicit complexity of poetry about poetry, and this proves more political than that simple withdrawal from the shared life of concrete reference associated with lyric poetry, by a number of canny Latinists, on the basis of Adorno’s famous essay<sup>61</sup>. Joseph Pucci has suggested that Horace’s ode is concerned with making originary song, or the bare sound of modulated voice, “emblemized”, as Gregson Davis writes, “in the vocable ‘Lalage’”, into poetic composition<sup>62</sup>. Horace’s poem is therefore literally metapoetic: it is not only an imaginative flight of literary erotomania but also, and maybe primarily, a representation of poetic production<sup>63</sup>. This metapoetic dynamic Paulinus recapitulates in the prosopopoeia. Where Horace follows Catullus and focalizes the erotic object through the erotic subject, Paulinus focalizes the laboring subject *through the laborer himself*. Paulinus thus *restores* the first-person elaboration of experience and the paradox of seeing (not) seeing from Sappho’s fragment. The withdrawal from the position of masculine dominance effected by Paulinus’ prosopopoeia of the rural laborer is therefore not *just* a passive withdrawal from political life, à la Catullus, Horace, Adorno; it is also an active reengagement with a new, non-dominant political position.

Who, after all, is the subject of the substantive participles: “nothing do I have that I would like to have/that grace would not render in vain, sweet *to one/me seeing* [*uidenti*], sweet *to one/me working* [*laboranti*]?” Is it, in the paradoxical Sapphic fashion, the worker seeing himself seeing, and hence seeing (not) working? Is it the worker perhaps seeing workers *as a class*? Or is the impossible perspective of the worker seeing himself (and perhaps his

59 — On such “hearing in reading”, or *hupokrisis*, see Porter 2016, 315-19, 326f., 339-41, 355-7.

60 — See, e.g., Merleau-Ponty 2013 [1945], 144f., 147f.

61 — Adorno 1991 [1958], with Kennedy 1992, 34, in Lowrie 2007, 82, Roman 2014, 7f., and Rimell 2015, 82: “Horace’s lyric detachment is itself socio-political in nature”.

62 — Pucci 2005, 14-16, Davis 1987, 78.

63 — See also Ancona 2002, 162; cf. Calame 2013, 46-8.

class) an improbable product of *his* expropriation of *Paulinus'* perspective? In other words, is the laborer not here seeing himself through Paulinus' sight of him (the laborer)? If so, we encounter a mimesis of mimesis that may well characterize colonial encounters, of more or less the kind that we find in Paulinus' contact with the rural poor, in general: like the participants in the drama of colonial "first contact", Paulinus the nobleman is imitating the "savage" laborer who is in turn imitating the "noble" Paulinus<sup>64</sup>. The impossibly sensuous identity-in-difference that Sappho attained in her poetic strength-in-weakness is somehow simultaneously suspended and extended in a now *mimetic* paroxysm<sup>65</sup>.

In this constellation of interfacing mimeses, the phenomenology of erotic paroxysm becomes more and more explicitly political, even materialist. With the appearance of a new participle (*laboranti*), Paulinus' cowherd suggests that the fullness of the worker's experience (*sensu fructuque*) derives from material property (*peculi*)<sup>66</sup>. In the classical representation of manual labor, in Vergil's *Georgics* for instance, the whole process of labor, not least the laborer himself, is confined to a grammatical construction devoid of agency: "the bull... with the driven plow"<sup>67</sup>. In contrast with the allusive appropriation of the classical poets, Paulinus' prosopopoeia of the rural labor thematizes the fullness of the laborer's experience, his own relationship to the means of production, and the very *theft* of that experience (which is what his relationship to the means of production may always become). At the same time, with the restoration of the Sapphic paradox of self-perception and in the context of the insecure material conditions of the Nolan "proletariat", the narratological questions of "who speaks?" and "who sees?" are translated in Paulinus' prosopopoeia into the preeminent question of Marxism: who enjoys the worker's work<sup>68</sup>?

Paulinus raises this question subtly. The cowherd raises the question more forcefully when he seeks redress from his patron saint in the remainder of the prosopopoeia. In both cases, the question, "Who enjoys the worker's work?" highlights the vulnerability, and indeed precarity, of the cowherd's existence: the answer is not necessarily, and never forever, the worker himself. Originally a term of art in Roman Catholic socialism, *precarity* is defined by Judith Butler as "that politically induced condition in which certain populations suffer from failing social and economic net-

64 — Taussig 1993, 79-81. On this "postmodern fragmentation" of perspectives, see Sharrock 2002, 270f, 273-6.

65 — Taussig 1993, 66f., 255, with Dressler 2016b, 10 n. 2.

66 — The polar expression *sensu fructuque peculi* seems to denote objective (*fructus*) and subjective (*sensus*) dimensions of the experience of the external (*peculium*); cf. the "disposition" (*sensus*) of the convert, in Paulinus, c. 10.130, with Conybeare 2000, 150.

67 — Verg. *Georg.* 1.45: *depresso incipiat iam tum mihi taurus aratro*, with Fitzgerald 1996, 395.

68 — Cf. Fitzgerald 1996, 393f.



Just divide with me  
 what's yours and mine. On your part, let my interest remain  
 unharmed. With your mercy you can then reclaim  
 your share. You can let *your* judgment be  
 well-balanced. Free the culprits for yourself. To me, return the cows.  
 Now we have a deal. Don't let the delay of your humble servant  
 be an excuse. Just hurry up and free me from my care!

These lines offer an unusual glimpse into patron-client relations of the period, the desperation that probably characterized it, and the aberrance of identification or deviant standpoint that facilitated Paulinus' achievement of such a "realistic" representation of these relations<sup>71</sup>. The precarity of that situation becomes not only literal, but also etymological when the laborer acknowledges the contingency of the cows, his only property, on the saint's dispensation, *praying* (*precor*) for their return: "praying [*precantem*] all day without end,/the martyr heard him.../and he [the cowherd] put no limit on his prayers [*precibus*] and tears"<sup>72</sup>. Is "prayer" here a spiritual or a political process? The use of "prayers" in the definition of precarity in the *Digest* does not resolve the question<sup>73</sup>.

In view of the modern extension of the term precarity from a condition of religious vocation to a condition of political-economic insecurity, Paulinus' prosopopeia confounds spiritual and political dimensions of ancient experience. As a result, the aggressiveness of the cowherd's "prayer" to Felix, his patron, is at least as "political" as Paulinus' renunciation of his wealth and installment of himself in Nola<sup>74</sup>. At least since Peter Brown wrote *The World of Late Antiquity*, it is a commonplace of historicist and sociological studies to recognize Paulinus' habitual identification of himself with Felix: both are, or have been (or will be), after all, *patrons*<sup>75</sup>. If this recognition is valid, then the cowherd here entertains the possibility of *legally prosecuting* his patron as though they were engaged in an actually economic (as opposed to patronal or indeed "precarious") relation<sup>76</sup>. Is

71 — See Hardie (forthcoming, A): "The *rusiticus* is a far more realistic character than the herdsman of bucolic, not least because he is a small businessman, hiring out his animals (233 *sub aratra aliena locatis*). His commercial cast of mind comes out in his prayer to Felix, in which he attempts to strike a bargain with the saint". For theoretical background, see Fitzgerald 1996, 390f., with Williams 1985, 257-63, and now Jameson 2013, 26.

72 — c. 18.314-16, 320: *totoque die sine fine precantem/audiuit... martyri.../ nec precibus dabat ille modum nec fletibus*. Note here too the accusative participle *precantem*, an analogue of *uidentem*, *ridentem*, and *loquentem* in the *synthesis*: the cowherd in the saint's perspective.

73 — On some of the legal background, see Griffin 2013, 57-8. By treating the precarity of his gift from the saint as property, the cowherd may be "comically" misconstruing the patron-client relationship as a financial transaction, or he may be seeing through the façade of "official" moral discourse (Bourdieu 1990, 105-7, 126-9, cited in Griffin 2013, 54 n. 103).

74 — Cf. Fitzgerald 1996, 391f.

75 — Brown 1971, 37. See also Mratschek 2002, 416f., with Brown 1981, 53, 62-4.

76 — Carpino 2007, 364: "The suppliant becomes an anti-suppliant, and the patron (*protet-*

this not an implicit criticism of Paulinus of Nola? In the tradition of Roman Catholic socialism from which the modern term precarity derives, this criticism becomes explicit (Day 1952):

Nowadays communities are good, I am sure, but they are mistaken about poverty. They accept, admit on principle, poverty, but everything must be good and strong, buildings must be fireproof. Precarity is rejected everywhere, and precarity is an essential element of poverty.

Isn't this the very consideration that plausibly nullifies the *progressively* revolutionary character of Paulinus' renunciation of property and status, viz. that he did not adopt a *precarious* position<sup>77</sup>? With the representation of the standpoint of the rural laborer, Paulinus himself poses this challenge to my interpretation of his renunciation as a progressive process of recognition and redistribution<sup>78</sup>. I advocate this interpretation in part *because* Paulinus poses such a challenge to himself.

In view of recent politically committed classical scholarship, we should not underestimate the significance of this metapoetic challenge that the cowherd presents to Paulinus<sup>79</sup>. It is a commonplace of studies of Greco-Roman culture that men of property, as poets, expropriate the experience of a variety of subalterns – an argument familiar from post-Marxist and feminist criticism, which is to say, all sophisticated *critical* criticism of Roman poetry since historicism became “new” and “new historicism” became common sense in the 1990s<sup>80</sup>. At the same time, we dismiss any incursion of subalternity or simple alterity in the poetic productions of dominant subjects (e.g., Catullus, Horace, Paulinus) as merely figurative, symbolic, and in effect inessential: giving “voice” to a woman in Roman poetry makes no difference to the experience of real women because “Ariadne was never there in the first place” and/or all *puellae* are *scriptae*<sup>81</sup>. Stated more strongly, giving a voice to a woman in a poem may even amount to *taking* it from the real women who (never) spoke for them-

*torē*) becomes the accused”.

77 — This, at least, struck one of the reviewers of this article as a pressing question. See also Clark 2005, 32f., cf. Mratschek 2001, 515f.

78 — See n. 19, above.

79 — Of an explicit self-criticism in Paulinus' *Letters* (*Ep.* 5.4), the sociological interpreter Mratschek 2002, 425 writes: “The accusation of *falsa praeconia* in Paulinus was...more a modesty-*topos*, to demonstrate Christian piety, than a genuine self-criticism”. A true and accurate evaluation of one dimension of Paulinus' work, Mratschek's insistence on the topical or generic character of Paulinus' “self-criticism” nevertheless misprizes the specificity of literature and the materiality of consciousness: it presumes that consciousness aided by such technology is somehow false or inauthentic and that knowledge, to be genuine, cannot admit mechanical supplements such as tropes and figures. See Derrida 1981, 149-55.

80 — See, e.g., Gallagher 1989.

81 — Gold 1993 and Wyke 1987, with further documentation in Dressler 2016a, 85f.; cf. Uden 2009, 215, 217 n. 25.

selves, as Catullus himself implies with his first figurative theft of “all the senses” from Sappho.

When we come to Paulinus, we add to the first, figurative theft (the appropriation of women’s voice) a second, literal theft (the theft of the cows from the cowherd), which together constitute a third theft, both literal *and* figurative, the twofold theft of *Poems* 18: the real expropriation that underlies the unequal conditions of cultural production in the ancient world *and* the symbolic, figurative, or cultural “theft” of each poet from the other that masks the first, *literal* theft of writers’ work from others’ labor<sup>82</sup>. Unmasking all these thefts through one and the same complex intertext, Paulinus’ perspective on the worker becomes analogous to our own, literary critical and literally critical (sociological/Marxist-feminist) insight<sup>83</sup>. What Stephen Hinds has influentially described as “the dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry” reveals its basis in the expropriation of real property, along with the subjective consequences of this expropriation for its victims<sup>84</sup>.

#### **4. Paulinus and Horace, Odes 1.13: comedy and class-consciousness**

Horace’s second intervention in Sappho’s Roman reception uses the *synthesis* of “all the senses” to express the category of class, and usually enters discussions of *Poems* 18 in the form of a question: “Is Paulinus’ presentation of the rural laborer supposed to be funny?”<sup>85</sup>. The assumption appears to be that, if it is, then the poet is once more expropriating the experience of a real or virtual subaltern. In this section, with the aid of the more familiar *irony* of Horatian self-fashioning, I will argue that Paulinus manages to achieve something similar to the classical lyric poet both for himself *and* for the cowherd<sup>86</sup>. In other words, Paulinus does indeed present the cowherd ironically, but he also “uses” the cowherd to ironize *his own* position, which once again implicitly valorizes the cowherd himself and, because of commonalities of gender and class in Roman antiquity, once more, and on Paulinus’ own presentation elsewhere in *Poems* 18 (that is, then, also intratextually), endows the poet’s treatment of the two conditions of marginality with a degree of solidarity<sup>87</sup>.

82 — On work and labor between classical and Christian thought, see Arendt 1958 [1997], 79-93, with Fitzgerald 1996, 392f. For Paulinus’ related aesthetic attention to building projects, see *c.* 21.788-821 with Clark 2005, 41-3, also Verg. *Georg.* 1.43-6 with Fitzgerald 1996, 395.

83 — Cf. Fitzgerald 1996, 391, with Hardie (forthcoming, B), on “The poet and the *rusticus*”, *passim*.

84 — Hinds 1998.

85 — See nn. 102-6, below.

86 — See n. 90, below.

87 — The treatment of the cowherd in two excellent forthcoming pieces derives from this:

According to the classicist Christina Clark, Catullus in *c.* 51 omits the description of his own appearance that Sappho impossibly incorporates (seeing (not) seeing) for sociopolitical reasons: it is not appropriate for a Roman man to *show* himself losing control<sup>88</sup>. Where Sappho saw herself, seeing (not) seeing and the rest, Catullus omits the details of his appearance to others in the poem: no sweat, no green complexion. In contrast, Clark notes, Horace's adaptation of the Sapphic background elsewhere in Book 1 of the *Odes* reverses Catullus' elite squeamishness (1.13.5-8):

tum nec mens mihi nec color  
certa sede manent, umor et in genas  
furtim labitur, arguens  
quam lentis penitus macerer ignibus.

Then neither mind nor complexion  
stay in set place and moisture in secret steals  
across my cheeks, which proves  
how intimately I'm scorched by dragging fire.

As if correcting Catullus' omission, Horace explicitly marks the transition between inside and outside, first with the inner word *mens* and the outer word *color*, then with the participle of evincing, *arguens*<sup>89</sup>. In both instances, the poet is more comfortable with self-exposure<sup>90</sup>. Clark writes (2008, 274f.):

Perhaps he feels able to have his speaker do so not only because of the new imperial political reality (and hence the problematization of the performance of masculinity) but also because Horace himself was the son of a freedman, less constrained by (or able to participate in) the elite construction of Roman masculinity.

While Clark offers her explanation as a suggestion, I suggest that, from the point of view of the reception of Paulinus, it is absolutely true. Through the repeatedly "othered" feminine standpoint of Sappho, the men of property take up increasingly "other" perspectives: first, a *man* of property (Catullus), as compared with Sappho, a woman; second, a man

Fielding sees the cowerd as the butt of the joke, even if the joke is meant to appeal to a popular audience, and Hardie (forthcoming A, esp. the section "*Rusticus* and Saint") sees rather a "sympathetic comedy". Both are persuasive.

88 — In one precedent for Paulinus' treatment, Stat. *Theb.* 3.50, the laborer is called ugly (*informis*) whereas in Paulinus he is described in contrast as "unhappy" (*c.* 18.238: *infelix*); see also Fitzgerald 1996, 402-4.

89 — On Horace's Catullus, see Ancona 2002, 166f., with more at Putnam 2006, esp. Chapter 2 where note, at 34, Hor. *c.* 1.22.24 (*dulce loquentem*), along with *c.* 1.13.

90 — On Horatian *integritas*, see Ancona 2002, 185f. For possible extensions of Horatian irony in Paulinus, see Szepessy 1989, 96, 98f., Carpino 2007, 368-71; cf. Conybeare 2002, 184.

of property whose *father had been* property (Horace); third, the Christian radical “as” a rural laborer, or *a man without property*.

Expanding the ambit beyond the cowherd in this section, I will insist on the significance of this diachronic trajectory of allusion by adducing some synchronic intratextual aspects of *Poems* 18 and other *Natalicia*. These clues mainly from elsewhere in the same poem highlight the appearance of the material substrate and political dynamics of allusion studies, suggested at the end of the previous section. On the strength of these parallels, I will argue that Paulinus does in fact identify in an aberrant and hence deviant way, not only with the rural laborer, but also, as we’ll see, with generally oppositional *feminine* figures – a poor old lady and a female sex worker. These broader intertextual references to effeminacy amplify and echo the otherwise subtle Sapphism of Paulinus’ worker<sup>91</sup>.

At the beginning of *c.* 18, Paulinus catalogues the luxuries that the super-rich devotees of Felix are bringing to the shrine, alongside those of their poor counterparts, “each with whatever resources of talent, tongue, and money that he can” (13: *qua quis possit ope ingenii linguaeque rei*). In contrast (40-61):

cedo equidem et uacuo multis potioribus auro,  
 quis grauis aere sinus releuatur egente repleto,  
 qui locuplete manu promptaria ditia laxant  
 et uariis animam sponsantes dotibus adstant,  
 mente pares, ope diuersi; nec segnius illi  
 ferula opima cibus, ceras aulaea lucernas,  
 larga quidem sed muta dicant: ego munere linguae,  
 nullus opum, famulor de me mea debita soluens  
 meque ipsum pro me, uilis licet hostia, pendo.  
 nec metuam sperni, quoniam non uilia Christo  
 pauperis obsequii libamina, qui duo laetus  
 aera, piae censum uiduae, laudata recepit.

I for my part do yield to those who are mightier in feckless gold,  
 whose cloaks are unfurled, heavy with coin, when the needy are filled.  
 They throw open their ready resources with magnanimous hand  
 while, betrothing their soul with various dowries, near they stand,  
 matched in attitude and distinct in capacity. With no less alacrity,  
 tables fat in food, paintings, tapestries, candelabra,  
 they dedicate – magnificent, silent. In contrast, with my tongue’s  
 office  
 zero in riches, I indenture myself in my debt’s service

91 — Gender burlesque underlies Paulin. *c.* 18.261 vis-à-vis Verg. *Aen.* 4.323, noted by Fielding (forthcoming), at nn. 50-8, where note also parallels between the cowherd and Pasiphae, as well as other mythological heroines. In generic terms, the cowherd is acting like a woman, as Paulinus and Ausonius do when they “complain” to one another: Fielding 2017, 25, 27f. See also Knight 2005.

and, cheap offering though I am, myself for myself I pay.  
 I don't fear rejection, because not cheap to Christ was  
 the outlay of devotion of the poor. Happy, with praise,  
 two coins, the pious widow's net worth, he received.

The entire passage bears on the present discussion, not just because of the obvious “salvation economics”, whereby Paulinus explores his own personal exemplification of Christ's injunction to sell what he has and give to the poor<sup>92</sup>. Rather, the point of the present passage is that all these equations of works and deeds, and people and debts, highlight the fundamental role of *poetry* in “salvation economics”<sup>93</sup>. Not only the coin in which Paulinus pays his debt, poetry is the medium of correspondences, even itself the *economy*, in which such equivalences are established<sup>94</sup>. On analogy with Christ, poetry unifies otherwise disparate individuals with one another and themselves; it makes innovation in the latter, otherwise determinative identity (“the self”) possible. Such innovation occurs precisely when Paulinus identifies with the poor and acts in a way inconsistent with his class-position<sup>95</sup>. This is, in the words of Merleau-Ponty from the epigraph of this paper, the “solicitation” of Paulinus of Nola.

As an economic, aesthetic, and theological medium of correspondences, poetry allows Paulinus to make the appropriate identification when, in the quotation above, he explicitly equates himself with the so-called “widow of the mites”<sup>96</sup>. Later, about to relate the case of the stolen cows, Paulinus recalls exactly this image of the widow, with the addition of the worker, and another possible signpost of the repetitive, even “geminate” character of allusion (213-26):

et memores uiduae primo sermone relatae,  
 quam deus e pretio mentis, non munere cernens,  
 antetulit multum mittentibus, omnia dantem,  
 me quoque ferte leui dicentem magna relatu.  
 et mea namque illis sunt aemula uerba minutis,  
 quis pretium pietas et uilibus aurea fecit.

92 — Matt. 19.21, epigraph of Brown 2012, cf. Brown 2016, 80f.; see Giardina 1996, 160-3. For the phrase, and phenomenon, of “salvation economics”, see Trout 1999, 133-59.

93 — Conybeare 2000, 99. Cf. c. 20.32-61, esp. 32 and 41f., 27.46f., 81-102.

94 — Paulinus, *Ep.* 32.21 with Brown 2016, 86-8, at 87. On the temporal dimension of Paulinus's symbolic exchange, see Kamptner 2005, 20, with Bourdieu 1990, 98-111, through Engberg-Pedersen 2008, 18f.

95 — Based on recent developments in subaltern studies, Cherniavsky 2011, 151 describes this as learning, or leaning to learn, from below, where learning denotes “the possibility of a relation between elites and subalterns in which the terms of exchange are set (at least partially) by subalterns themselves”; cf. 158-60. For such a dialectic in practice, see Trout 1999, 177: “Paulinus encouraged indigenous religious assumptions and forms of piety at the same time that he sought to Christianize them”; see also Fielding (forthcoming) at n. 62.

96 — Mark 12.41-4.

quidam homo re tenuis, plebeius origine, cultu  
 rusticus e geminis angustam bubus alebat  
 pauperiem mercede iugi...

If you remember the widow detailed in the first part of my story,  
 whom, telling her apart, not from her resources, but the cost of her  
 thought,  
 as she was giving her all, God preferred to those who gave a lot,  
 then bear me too as I speak things great in a slight account,  
 for my words also compete with those her mites,  
 which piety endowed with value and made gold cheap:  
 There once was a person, slender in means, plebeian in origin, in  
 upbringing rural, fostering on twin cattle his poverty, lean  
 in the value of the pair...

Where the first three lines of the quotation recall the earlier episode, the next three lines present Paulinus himself (*me quoque...*) as parallel to the widow through their joint participation in divergent economic regimes of real and symbolic value: “for my words also compete with those her mites”<sup>97</sup>. She is poor in resources (*munere*) but rich in intent (*mentis*), while he is poor in poetic form (*leui dicentem... relatu*) but rich in content (*dicentem magna*); the laborer himself meanwhile presents “twin cattle” on analogy with Catullus’ “twin night”.

In the same passage, we also see the extent to which “classical” meta-poetics is the condition of Paulinus’ (Christian) poetics. The buzzwords of Alexandrian, neoteric, and later Augustan poetics, “slight” and “narrow” (*leuis* and *angustam*), establish the symbolic correspondence or exchange between Paulinus *qua* widow and the rural worker: with *quidam homo re tenuis... angustum pauperiem* (“a person *slender* in means” in “poverty *lean*”), Paulinus equates himself through his “slight” and therefore (curiously) Alexandrian song, with the man who is himself slight (*tenuis*) in his substance – poet as widow as worker as Christian radical<sup>98</sup>. Thus,

97 — See Mark 12.42, trans. *NRSV*: “A poor widow came and put in two small copper coins [*duo minuta*, whence ‘mites’], which are worth a penny”.

98 — Cf. Fielding (forthcoming) at nn. 29, 33, and 34, where note esp. Fontaine 1981, 170f. For the Alexandrianisms in general, see, e.g., Verg. *Ecl.* 1.23, with Roberts 1989, 22f., Hor. c. 1.6.9, and Prop. 2.1.40, with Lyne 1995, 100f. Cf. Paulinus, c. 21.545-50 at 553, with Hor. c. 1.6.9, with Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, 86, and Verg. *Georg.* 4.176 through Ov. *Trist.* 1.6.28; the biblical epyllion, Paulinus, c. 6 (*Laus Sancti Iohannis*), refers to itself with the phrase: *sed licitum magnis tenues impendere curas*. See also Paulinus, c. 27.320-2, cf. *Ep.* 2.1: *ingenio tenues*. On the proto-ascetic (“Epicurean”) dietary regimen of Alexandrian poetics in Rome, especially in Horace (c. 2.16.14, 38), see Mette 2009 [1961]. The poetics is fully politicized (cf. Fowler 2009 [1995], 254-6), against the biblical background of 1 Kings 2.5, not to mention Verg. *Aen.* 6.853 (*parcere subiectis et debellare superbos* “spare the conquered, battle down the proud”) at Paulinus, c. 27.265, trans. Walsh 1975, 279: “for God supplies *plenty to the needy* and *deprivation to the proud*” (*dilatante deo tenues, tenuante superbos*), where note also Catullus’ Alexandrian poetics of friendship and gushing water: Paulinus, c. 27.266-8, 327f., vis-à-vis Catull. c. 68.53, 57-66. See further Conybeare 2000, 60-8, esp. 66-8, on Paulinus, *Ep.*

where poverty furnished a model for *poetry* in Catullus and Horace (classical aestheticism), poetry furnishes a model for *poverty* in Paulinus (Christian asceticism)<sup>99</sup>. The aesthetic buzzwords of the bygone age, “slight” and “lean”, now find themselves in the very contemporary idiom of virtually statistical specificity: resources, cost, value, means, “plebeian in origin”, poverty, worth<sup>100</sup>. Just as paraphrasing Sappho proves the condition of the recognition of the cowherd, the austerity of Alexandrian poetics proves the condition of identifying (with) the poor. Once again, the earlier poets’ representation of their poetry *precedes and proves the condition of* the later poet’s representation of poverty; metapoetics precedes poetics.

Certainly Paulinus’ alignment of himself with the poor and downtrodden is questionable<sup>101</sup>. Rich Paulinus, voluntarily “poor”, offers “poor” song instead of riches. Relatedly, we may feel that Paulinus’ introduction of the cowherd is somehow *comical*<sup>102</sup>. So, of the cowherd’s illimitable despair and lovelorn haunting of the stables of his missing “wards”, the poet writes: “Stench doesn’t stink to a lover”<sup>103</sup>. Can this imposition of the barbed wisdom of classical arts of love, above all Lucretius and Ovid, be anything but a joke at the cowherd’s expense<sup>104</sup>? The question imposes itself again when we see how the saint reacts to the cowherd’s plea (18.313-16, cf. 253):

talia uoce quidem querula sed mente fideli  
 plorantem totoque die sine fine precantem  
 audiuit laetus non blando subpllice martyr  
 et sua cum domino ludens conuitia risit.

And thus he actually complained, with an irritable tone  
 but a faithful mind, and the one who prayed all day without end  
 the martyr heard, happy with the unpleasant supplicant,  
 and making a joke with the Lord, he smiled at the rebuke.

11. For the “Alexandrianism” of later Latin poetry, see Fontaine 1981, 60f., Charlet 1988, 74, and Hardie (forthcoming, B), Chapter 8, *pace* Peltari 2014, 4; cf. Goldhill 2012, 98f.

99 — Cf. Hardie (forthcoming, A) at n. 30.

100 — Brown 2012, 190, cf. Mrozek 1984, 397f.

101 — Cf. Cherniavsky 2011, 155: “Indeed, *whose* jubilant emancipation if not our own is inscribed in this vision of a (non)subject without a will to domination”.

102 — For documentation and discussion, see Evenepoel 1995, 509f. For additional context, see Paulinus, c. 20.389-436 and 27.552-72, with Otranto 1998, 45-8, and of course Fielding (forthcoming); cf. Kirsch 1993, 333.

103 — c. 18.346: *nec fetor fetat amanti*. With this verse, writes Evenepoel 1995, 514, “Paulinus crosses a line”; cf. Conybeare 2002, 197f., Harvey 2006, 204, 213-21, Brown 2012, 220f.

104 — Lucr. *DRN* 4.1157-70, Ov. *Ars* 2.647-62, where note the smell of goats and bulls, with background in Plat. *Rep.* 5.474d and Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.38-40, with Newman 2011, 53f., cf. Fielding (forthcoming), at nn. 41-3. Note also the divergent responses that Lucretius’ treatment of women has elicited from feminist, and even simply humane, readers: e.g., Nussbaum 1994, 178-85, and Brown 1987, 123f. On an analogous (critically) Christian Ovidianism, see Uden 2009, 216.

Sharing a joke with God, Felix appears to confirm that we should find the cowherd funny – but what kind of “funny?”<sup>105</sup>. Here, too, intertextuality undoes the obviousness of the possible value judgment. Paulinus elsewhere attributes exactly the same “unpleasant” manner of all-too-human irritability with God and saint to himself: “Even my Felix himself, I confess, I began/to accuse in an irritable tone [*querula... uoce*]”<sup>106</sup>.

The attribution of ambiguity to Paulinus’ comic presentation of the cowherd is supported by another consideration: his investment in an ambiguous *self*-presentation. After the explicit equation of himself and the widow of the mites, it’s not surprising that Paulinus elsewhere allusively equates himself with a marginal woman, the “symbolic harlot” (more or less his words: *meretrix sed mystica*, c. 26.143), named Rehab in the book of Joshua. Here is Paulinus on his choice to renounce his wealth (c. 15.10-14):

sic uoluit ditare pater bonus, ut male dites  
 criminiibus uersa in melius uice diuitiarum  
 pro cunctis opibus cunctisque affectibus et pro  
 nobilibus titulis et honoribus omnia uanis  
 Felicem caperemus opes patriamque domumque.

Our good Father willed us to be rich on the condition  
 that our riches badly trafficked in our sins, in trade for better  
 riches in exchange for all wealth and all ambitions  
 and noble rank and empty offices – for them, we take  
 Felix as *all* wealth and *fatherland and house*.

And here he is on Rehab’s apparent betrayal of her city on behalf of the angels (26.139-41):

uitam patriamque domum  
 praelato contempta deo mox cuncta benigno  
 reperit in domino.

Her life, *fatherland, and house*  
 disdained in preference to God, as *all* she found

105 — Fitzgerald 1996, 397: “How, then, are we expected to respond to the disjunction... with sympathy or laughter?”. See, on Paulinus, also Evenepoel 1995, 513f., Fielding (forthcoming), at nn. 45 and 47. For further bibliography and discussion of late antiquity, see Conybeare 2013, 47-50, 59f., 69f., esp. 72-5, where note the relevant blurring of the distinction between active and passive, inclusive and exclusive laughter, and 77f. For the ancient theoretical background, see Carpino 2007, 343f., 371f.

106 — c. 21.655f.: *ipsum etiam, fateor, querula iam uoce solebam/Felicem incusare meum*; cf. 26.12, and Stat. *Theb.* 3.51: *questibus*. On the ambiguity of *querula* and *queror*, see Kamptner 2005, 258, with Evenepoel 1995, 518. For the self-ironizing, see Hor. c. 3.27.67f., with Szepessy 1989, 96, 98f., Carpino 2007, 368-71; cf. Conybeare 2002, 184. On the changing function of irony in post-classical culture, see Goldhill 1995, 72-8.

soon enough in our good Lord.

With the repetition of the phrase *patriamque domum*, Paulinus not only speaks to the dispossession of the prostitute in the Roman imagination, but also to that imagination's representation of *his own* choice to renounce his possessions as a choice for effeminization<sup>107</sup>.

In the present context, this interpretation finds further support in the self-consciously countercultural connotation of the opening of the first quotation. In context, Paulinus is surely talking about "our good *Father*", God, but with the antithesis between the good father and the bad riches, it's hard to avoid thinking of Paulinus's biological, and more importantly, legal parent – the traditional source of the wealth and status that the son renounced<sup>108</sup>. More concretely, in his verse correspondence with Ausonius, the elder man of property, styled "father" by his protégée, insinuates that Paulinus was radicalized into monasticism at the suggestion of his wife, Therasia<sup>109</sup>. Ausonius, in their correspondence, in fact, compares Therasia to Tanaquil (Aus. *Ep.* 22.30-1 Green), a view subsumed in Paulinus' description of Rehab as "treacherous with a good trick, deceptive with an honest soul" (26.137: *fraude bona fallax, animo mentita fideli*)<sup>110</sup>. Paulinus' description of this "whore with a heart of a gold" is another instance of double-consciousness, or the ability to comprise "several personal perspectives" in individual utterances: is the harlot good or bad, or "bad" because she is good or good because she is "bad?"<sup>111</sup>. In the context of this discussion, such formulations, paradox or oxymoron, reveal their basis in the narratological function of deviant focalization, while their consistent alignment with the poor and marginal and broader use by Paulinus to reflect on class difference make them instances of deviant standpoint. The next representative of this standpoint, the "mystical" prostitute, opts not to "have fallen embroiled in the ruins of the fatherland" (142: *patriis cecidisset mixta ruinis*), and instead "took her own salvation as her fatherland

107 — Cf. *Ep.* 5.2: *et populi et paternae domus oblita* ("forgetting her people and her father's house").

108 — Cf. c. 10.193f., with Conybeare 2000, 152.; see also Paulin. *Ep.* 5.5: *Tu frater dilectissime... oneribus patrimonii leuior* ("You, my most beloved brother, [are] even freer from the burdens of patrimony"). Contrast Sen. *Ep.* 60.1: "Even now do you ask for what your nanny or school teacher or mother asked for?". See further Newman 2011, 13-15, 22.

109 — On the accuracy of such "insinuations of womanly influence", see Cooper 1992, 156. For a variety of positions on the issue, see Trout 1999, 59f., 67-72, Conybeare 2000, 81-5 (cf. 2002, 186 n. 42) with further background in Cameron 1989 and McKechnie 1999 [1996], 41-3.

110 — Cooper 1992, 163: "there were those who viewed ascetic proposals as a wholesale betrayal of *romanitas*"; cf. Brown 2016, 82-4, 92f.

111 — Winkler 1990, 167; cf. Stehle 1997, 290f. For the commonplace deviant focalization of Christian subculture, see, e.g., Paulin. c. 10.134f.: *falsi caligine cernens/sulta deo sapiens* "astute in the darkness of untruth/and wise in foolishness to God".

wasted away” (146: *excepitque suam patria pereunte salutem*)<sup>112</sup>. In view of the possibility that Paulinus is alluding to his own choice to renounce his riches, the wasting away of the prostitute’s fatherland intimates the withering away of patriarchy<sup>113</sup>.

### 5. Conclusion: past empiricism, redeeming Paulinus

Of course, Paulinus’ total project – the poetry, the epistles, the public works – admits of multiple interpretations. I have claimed that his recognition of the poor, combined as it was with a form of redistribution in his Christian works, was progressive in nature<sup>114</sup>. One could just as easily (and more safely) claim that he was simply adopting a new strategy of self-promotion to consolidate his more or less traditional position in the quickly shifting terrain of aristocratic ideology in the late fourth century CE<sup>115</sup>. With the role that I suggest that Sappho’s femininity plays in his work, one could likewise argue that he was maintaining his masculine prerogatives by promoting “a virility that borrows from the feminine only what it needs in order to move beyond a merely carnal manhood”<sup>116</sup>. Using a phenomenological approach to the literary history of the intertext, I have isolated those moments when, in spite of the “facts” that support these interpretations, things may have *appeared* otherwise<sup>117</sup>. Is an interpretation based on such appearances “correct”, in the sense of reflecting all the factors of Paulinus’ project or the immediate context of its reception? Does it give a satisfying impression “of a certain kind of vividness or... social-historical ‘full-bloodedness’”, or even account for all the details of Paulinus, *c.* 18<sup>118</sup>? These are different questions. The value of the present effort does not derive from its historical accuracy, correctness, or exhaustiveness but from the extent to which it helps reclaim or repair the past, through poetry, for a certain Marxist and feminist position (a political concern), and to the extent that it allows us to describe the expe-

112 — In contrast, in Joshua 2.12f., Rehab specifically intercedes on behalf of her father, her family, and their property: *cum domo patris mei... patrem meum et matrem/fratres ac sorores meas et omnia quae eorum sunt* (“with the home of my father... my father and mother,/my brothers and my sisters and all that is theirs”). On the changing values attached to property in Rome, see Garnsey 1980b, 36f.

113 — Cf. Conybeare 2002, 180-2, 189-92. For Paulinus’ possible ambivalence toward the end of civilization, see Paulin. *c.* 25.189f., with Trout 1999, 118-20, and *c.* 26.27f. with Consolino 1997, 211f.

114 — See n. 19 above.

115 — See, e.g., Burrus 2000, 137-9, Mratschek 2001, 512-14, 528-31, 539-47, Clark 2005, esp. 32f., 36, Hunter 2007, 77-80.

116 — Burrus 2000, 28 (cf. 5f., 139f., 190), with Conybeare 2002, 200-2, Clark 2005, 37f. For the case against the critical sociological privileging of context, see Brown 1981, 54f., cf. Markus 1990, 36-43, and again Clark 2005, 40f., 43f.

117 — Cf. the sixth of the “Theses on History” of Walter Benjamin 1968, 255, with Taussig 1993, 39f.

118 — Vessey 1998, 382f., quoted in Burrus 2000, 199.

riential specificity of isolated moments with a quantity of precision (an aesthetic theoretical and phenomenological concern)<sup>119</sup>. If this reparation *also* evinces alternative possibilities and excluded experiences in the past, so much the better.

On such a reconstruction, the appearance of deviant standpoint in the figure of the cowherd in Paulinus is the *expression*, in the discourse of the man of property, of an *intentional* dimension of the experience of real women and workers, viz. their constitutive incompleteness in a patriarchal system<sup>120</sup>. *Was* that intentional dimension of the experience of women or workers somehow a part of the experience of men of property such as Paulinus? *Was* it even a part of the experience of the women and workers themselves? These are also different questions. It *appears* in Paulinus in the application of aesthetic technology, which here promotes the dilation of the appearances that, in consciousness, replace being with phenomena: φαίνεται μοι...<sup>121</sup>... The result may not be the consciousness that “really” or “authentically” inhered in the socially subjugated historical subject, say the woman or worker of archaic Greece, classical Rome, or late antiquity; it is, rather, the *kind* of consciousness that *may* have inhered in such a subject.

As to the “different questions”, if Paulinus can help us gain access to the consciousness of women and workers in the ancient world in this way, then we may ask: Were women and workers conscious of themselves – and did they thus have *class-consciousness* – in the way that Paulinus was conscious of himself and of his class *through* them<sup>122</sup>? For important reasons, in the primary Marxist accounts of standpoint theory, the individuals involved, the proletariat for instance, need not *themselves empirically* experience the consciousness that theory ascribes to them<sup>123</sup>.

119 — On such “reparative reading” (Sedgwick 2003), see Dressler 2016a, 249-55.

120 — In the French tradition of literary interpretation derived from existential phenomenology, this intentional dimension of experience, called a “theme”, is the object of *la critique thématique*: it “results from a formalization of experience [*mise en forme de l’expérience*], revelatory of a manner of being in the world that relates to the style of the writer in the same way as his manner of handling words” (Collot 1997, 32, with Iser 1989, 36f.). Far from being the guarantor of the poem that it once was rejected as being (Wimsatt and Beardsley 1946, 472-4, 481f., with Iser 1985, 226 n. 8), such intentionality, or the theme, “is connoted, not denoted” (Collot 1988, 82). The flaw in the “supposed fullness of the object” (Merleau-Ponty 2012 [1945], 348, cf. Wimsatt and Beardsley 1946, 477f., Iser 1985, 208f.), the intention of literary works appears not least in the dimension of reception, time (Merleau-Ponty 1968, 59): “The productions of the past, which are the data of our time, themselves once went beyond anterior productions towards a future which we are, and in this sense called for (among others) the metamorphosis which we impose upon them”; cf. 2012 [1946], 345-9, and Jaus 1982, 88f., and Compagnon 2004, 63-5.

121 — Rösler 1991, 292f., with the theoretical terminology of Merleau-Ponty 2012 [1945], 310 in 308-11; cf. 347f. See also n. 32, above.

122 — See again n. 18, above.

123 — Hartsock 1998, 237. On “imputed class consciousness” (more presently), see Lukács 1971 [1923], xviii-xix, and 2000, 65f., 74-8, 81-5, with Hobsbawm 1972, 5-7, and Žižek 2000,

In a similar way, the class-consciousness that emerges in Paulinus may be a proper instance of what Georg Lukács, the Marxist who first formulated standpoint theory, called *imputed* (Lukács 1971 [1923], 51):

Now class consciousness consists in fact of the appropriate and rational reactions ‘imputed’ [*zugerechnet*] to a particular typical position in the process of production. This consciousness is, therefore, neither the sum nor the average of what is thought or felt by the single individuals who make up the class. And yet the historically significant actions of the class as a whole are determined in the last resort by this consciousness and not by the thought of the individual – and these actions can be understood only by reference to this consciousness.

In the case of Paulinus’ cowherd, I think this peculiar form of consciousness, which need not exist in any actual person, is, as a consequence of the ambiguity of embodiment and sensation (*aisthêsis*), a distinctive mark of literature (or the aesthetic)<sup>124</sup>. “Literature” thus appears as the mode of imputation of consciousness *par excellence*. If this is so, then the “master-trope” of literature, qua imputation, is none other than prosopopoeia, which is just what we find in Paulinus’ impersonation of the rural laborer<sup>125</sup>. Whereas Lukácsian modernity achieves this progressive imputation of consciousness in critical theory, Paulinan late antiquity achieves it in poetic practice. That practice is “literary” or “aesthetic” to the extent that its effects do *not* inhere in a given way in any historical subject. “An effect of artistry that is momentary and ephemeral”<sup>126</sup>, this “imputed consciousness”, or deviant standpoint, appears in complex and overlapping structures of different social positions combined in the first-person of the poet and produced in prosopopoeia.

### ***Bibliography***

Adorno T., (1991 [1958]), “On lyric poetry and society”, in *Notes to Literature*, New York.

(1997 [1970]), *Aesthetic Theory*, Minneapolis.

Ancona R., (2002), “The Untouched Self: Sapphic and Catullan Muses in Horace, *Odes* 1.22”, in *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, Edited by E. Spentzou and D. Fowler, Oxford, 161-86.

Appiah K., (2014), *Lines of Descent: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Emergence of Identity*, Cambridge, MA.

---

167-70.

124 — On these two faces of the aesthetic, see n. 46 above.

125 — See de Man 1986, 48, with Paxson 1994, 33f., and Dressler 2016a, 69.

126 — Porter 2016, 242.

- Arendt H., (1958), *The Human Condition*, Chicago.
- Auerbach E., (1965), *Literary Language & Its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages*, Princeton.
- Barton C., (2002), "Being in the Eyes: Shame and Sight in Ancient Rome", in Frederick 2002c, 216-35.
- Basson A., (1999), "Tradition and originality in Late Latin literature: classical literary genres in Paulinus of Nola", *Scholia* 8, 79-95.
- Benjamin W., (1968), *Illuminations*, New York.
- Beauvoir S. de, (1974 [1949]), *The Second Sex*, New York.
- Bourdieu P., (1990), *The Logic of Practice*, Cambridge.
- (1991), "Introduction à la socioanalyse", *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 90, 3-5.
- (1996), *The Rules of Art*, Stanford.
- Brown P., (1971), *The World of Late Antiquity*, New York.
- (1981), *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*, Chicago.
- (2012), *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth in the Making of the Western Church*, Princeton.
- (2016), "Commercium Spirituale ('A Spiritual Exchange'): Paulinus of Nola and the Poetry of Wealth", in *Medieval Paradigms, Vol. 1: Essays in Honor of Jeremy deQuesnay Adams*, Edited by S. Hayes-Hesley, New York, 79-98.
- Brown R., (1987), *Lucretius on Love and Sex: A Commentary on de Rerum Natura IV, 1030-1287, with Prolegomena, Text and Translation*, Leiden.
- Burrus V., (2000), "Begotten, Not Made": *Conceiving Manhood in Late Antiquity*, Stanford.
- (ed.), (2005), *Late Antique Christianity: A People's History*, Minneapolis.
- (2008), *Saving Shame: Martyrs, Saints, and Other Abject Subjects*, Philadelphia.
- Butler J., (1986), "Sex and Gender in Simone de Beauvoir's *Second Sex*", *Yale French Studies* 72, 35-49.
- (1990), *Gender Trouble*, New York.
- (2004), *Precarious Life*, London.
- (2006 [1990]), "Sexual Difference as a Question of Ethics: Alterities of the Flesh in Irigaray and Merleau-Ponty", in Olkowski and Weiss 2006, 107-26.
- (2015), *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly*, Cambridge, MA.
- Butler S. and Purves A. (eds.), (2013), *Synaesthesia and the ancient senses*, Abingdon.

- Calame C., (2013), "La poésie de Sappho aux prises avec le genre: polyphonie, pragmatique et rituel (à propos du fr. 58B)", *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 104.2, 45-67.
- Cameron Alan, (1977), "Paganism and Literature in Late Fourth Century Rome", *Fondation Hardt Entretiens* 23:1-30.
- Cameron Averil, (1989), "Virginity as Metaphor: women and the rhetoric of early Christianity", in *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History*, A. Cameron (ed.), London, 184-205.
- Carpino T. P., (2007), "Il ridere e sorridere in Paolino di Nola", in *Riso e comicità nel cristianesimo antico*, C. Mazzucco (ed.), Orso, 343-72.
- Carson A., (2003), *If Not, Winter: Fragments of Sappho*, New York.
- Charlet J.-L., (1988), "Aesthetic Trends in Late Latin Poetry (325-410)", *Philologus* 132.1, 74-85.
- Chatterjee P., (2010 [1998]), "A Brief History of Subaltern Studies", in *Empire and Nation: Selected Essays*, New York, 289-301.
- Cherniavsky E., (2011), "The canny subaltern", in *Theory after 'Theory'*, J. Elliott and D. Attridge (eds.), London, 149-62.
- Cho S., Crenshaw K. and McCall L., (2013), "Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications, Praxis", *Signs* 38.4, 785-810.
- Clark C., (2008), "The Poetics of Manhood? Nonverbal Behavior in Catullus 51", *CP* 103, 257-81.
- Clark E., (2005), "Asceticism, Class, and Gender", in *Burrus* 2005, 27-45.
- Collot M., (1988), "La thème selon la critique thématique", *Communications* 47, 79-91.
- (1997), "L'œuvre comme paysage d'une expérience", in *Simon and Castin* 1997, 23-37.
- Compagnon A., (2004), *Literature, Theory, and Common Sense*, Princeton.
- Consolino E. E., (1997), "Cristianizzare l'epitalamio: il carme 25 di Paolino di Nola", *Cassiodorus* 3, 199-213.
- Conybeare C., (2000), *Paulinus Noster: Self and Symbol in the Letters of Paulinus of Nola*, Oxford.
- (2002), "The Ambiguous Laughter of Saint Laurence", *JECS* 10.2, 175-202.
- (2013), *The Laughter of Sarah*, New York.
- Cooper K., (1992), "Insinuations of Womanly Influence: An Aspect of Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy", *JRS* 82, 150-64.
- D'Angour A., (2012), "Love's Battlefield: rethinking Sappho fragment 31", in *Eros in Ancient Greece*, Edited by E. Sanders, C. Thumiger, C. Carey and N. Lowe, Oxford, 59-72.

- Davis G., (1987), “*Carminal Iambi: The Literary-Generic Dimension of Horace’s Integer Vitae* (C. I, 22)”, *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, n.s., 27.3, 67-78.
- Day D., (1952), “Poverty and Precarity”, *The Catholic Worker* (May), 2, 6.
- Deleuze G., (1990), *The Logic of Sense*, New York.
- Deleuze G. and Guattari F., (1986), *Kafka: Towards a Minor Literature*, Minneapolis.
- Derrida J., (1981), *Dissemination*, Chicago.  
(2005), *On Touching – Jean-Luc Nancy*, Stanford.
- De Man P., (1986), *The Resistance to Theory*, Minneapolis.
- De Ste. Croix G. E. M., (1981), *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*, Ithaca.
- Dressler A., (2011), “The Sophist and the Swarm: Feminism, Platonism and Ancient Philosophy in Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Clitophon*”, *Ramus* 40.1, 33-72.  
(2016a), *Personification and the Feminine in Roman Philosophy*, Cambridge.  
(2016b), “Plautus and the Poetics of Property: Reification, Recognition, and Utopia”, *MD* 77, 9-56.
- Du Bois W. E. B., (1903), *The Souls of Black Folk*, Chicago.
- Elsner J., (1997), *Roman Eyes*, Princeton.
- Elsner J. and Hernández Labato J., (2017a), “Introduction: Notes towards a Poetics of Late Antique Literature”, in Elsner and Hernández Labato 2017b, 1-22.  
(eds.), (2017b), *The Poetics of Late Latin Literature*, Oxford.
- Engberg-Pederson T., (2008), “Gift-giving and Friendship: Seneca and Paul in Romans 1-8 on the Logic of God’s *Xáρις* and Its Human Response”, *Harvard Theological Review* 101.1, 15-44.
- Evenepoel W., (1995), “Saint Paulin de Nole, Carm. 18.211-468: Hagiographie et humour”, in *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum (La Narrativa cristiana antica)* 50, 507-20.
- Fielding I., (2017), *Transformations of Ovid in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge.  
(forthcoming), “Performing miracles: the *Natalicia* of Paulinus of Nola as popular entertainment”, *Helios*.
- Finely M. I., (1968), “The Silent Women of Rome”, in *Aspects of Antiquity*, London, 129-42.  
(1973), *The Ancient Economy*, Berkeley.
- Fitzgerald W., (1996), “*Labor* and the Laborer in Latin Poetry: The Case of the *Moretum*”, *Arethusa* 29.3, 389-418.
- Fontaine J., (1981), *Naissance de la poésie dans l’Occident chrétien*, Paris.

- (1988), "L'esthétique littéraire de la prose de Jérôme jusqu'à son second départ en Orient", in Y. M. Duval (ed.), *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient*, Paris, 323-42.
- Foucault M., (1984), *The Use of Pleasure*, New York.
- (2005), *The Hermeneutics of the Subject*, New York.
- Fowler D., (2000), "Deviant Focalization in Vergil's *Aeneid*", in *Roman Constructions*, Oxford, 40-63.
- (2009 [1995]), "Horace and the Aesthetics of Politics", in Lowrie 2009, 247-70.
- Fraser N. and Honneth A., (2003), *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange*, London.
- Frederick D., (2002a), "Introduction: Invisible Rome", in Frederick 2002c, 1-30.
- (2002b), "Mapping Penetrability and Impenetrability in Late Republican and Early Imperial Rome", in Frederick 2002c, 236-64.
- (ed.), (2002c), *The Roman Gaze*, Baltimore.
- Ferguson E. (ed.), (1999), *Recent Studies in Early Christianity, vol. 1*, New York.
- Gallagher C., (1989), "Marxism and the New Historicism", in *The New Historicism*, Edited by A. Veveser, New York, 37-48.
- Giardina A., (1996), "Il tramonto dei valori ciceroniani (*ponos* ed *emporia* tra paganesimo e cristianesimo)", in *La parte migliore del genere umano*, Torino, 141-63.
- Gold B., (1993), "'But Ariadne Was Never There in the First Place': Finding the Female in Roman Poetry", in Rabinowitz and Richlin 1993, 75-101.
- Goldhill S., (1995), *Foucault's Virginité*, Cambridge.
- (2012), "Forms of Attention: Time and Narrative in Ecphrasis", *PCPS* 58, 88-114.
- Gramsci A., (1978), "Some Aspects of the Southern Question", in *Selections from the Political Writings, 1921-1926*, London, 441-462.
- (1992), *The Prison Notebooks, Volume 1*, New York.
- Green M., (2002), "Gramsci Cannot Speak: Presentations and Interpretations of Gramsci's Concept of the Subaltern", *Rethinking Marxism* 14.3, 1-24.
- Griffin M., (2013), *Seneca on Society: A Guide to De Beneficiis*, Oxford.
- Haraway D., (1988), "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective", *Feminist Studies* 14.3: 575-599.
- (1991), "The Cyborg Manifesto", in *Cyborgs, Simians, and Women*, New York.
- Hardie P., (forthcoming), A. "Saints, Cowherds, and Letter-Carriers: Paulinus of Nola, *Poems* 18 and 24", in S. Matzner (ed.), *Complex Inferiorities: The Poetics of the Weaker Voice in Latin Literature*, Oxford, Chapter 7.

- (forthcoming), B. *Classicism and Christianity in Late Antique Latin Poetry*.
- Hartel G. and Kamptner M., (1999), *Sancti Pontii Meropii Paulini Nolani Carmina*, Leipzig.
- Hartsock N., (1998), “The Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited”, in *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited and Other Essays*, Boulder, 227-48.
- (2004 [1983]), “The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism”, in *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader*, Edited by S. Harding, New York, 35-54.
- Harvey S., (2006), *Scenting Salvation: Ancient Christianity and the Olfactory Imagination*, Berkeley.
- Henderson J., (2004), *Morals and Villas in Seneca's Letters*, Cambridge.
- Hexter R., (2008), “Literary History as a Provocation to Reception Studies”, in Martindale and Thomas 2008, 23-31.
- Hinds S., (1998), *Allusion and Intertext*, Cambridge.
- Hobsbawm E., (1972), “Class consciousness in history”, in Mézaros 1972: 5-21.
- Holt T. C., (1990), “The Political Uses of Alienation: W.E.B. Du Bois on Politics, Race, and Culture, 1903-1940”, *American Quarterly* 42.2, 301-23.
- Honneth A., (2008), *Reification*, Oxford.
- Horkheimer M., (1972), *Critical Theory*, New York.
- Hunter D., (2007), *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity*, Oxford.
- Iser W., (1985), “Feigning in Fiction”, in *Identity of the Literary Text*, M. J. Valdés and O. Miller (eds.), Toronto, 204-28.
- (1989), “Interaction between Text and Reader”, in *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology*, Baltimore, 31-40.
- Jameson F., (1988), “History and Class Consciousness as an ‘Unfinished Project’”, *Rethinking Marxism* 1.1, 49-72.
- (2013), *The Antinomies of Realism*, London.
- Janan M., (1994), *When the Lamp Is Shattered: Desire and Narrative in Catullus*, Carbondale.
- Jauss H., (1982), *Toward an Aesthetics of Reception*, Minneapolis.
- Jay M., (1984), *Marxism and Totality*, Berkeley.
- Kamptner M., (2005), *Paulinus von Nola Carmen 18: Text, Einleitung und Kommentar*, Wien.
- Kaufman H., (2017), “Intertextuality in Late Latin Poetry”, in Elsner and Hernández Labato 2017b, 149-75.
- Kennedy D., (1992), “‘Augustan’ and ‘Anti-Augustan’: Reflections on Terms of Reference”, in *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, Edited by A. Powell, London, 26-58.

- (1993), *Arts of Love*, Cambridge.
- Kirsch W., (1983), "Die Natalicia des Paulinus von Nola als Mittel ideologischer Beeinflussung", *Klio* 65, 331-6.
- Knight G., (2005), "Friendship and erotics in the Late Antique Verse Epistle: Ausonius to Paulinus revisited", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 148, 361-403.
- Lardinois A., (2001), "Keening Sappho: female speech genres in Sappho's poetry", in *Making Silence Speak*, Edited by L. McClure, Princeton, 75-92.
- Larmour D., Miller P. A. and Platter C. (eds.), (1998), *Rethinking Sexuality: Foucault and Classical Antiquity*, Princeton.
- Lev Kannan V., (2008), *Pandora's Senses*, Madison.
- Livelyly G., (2006), "Surfing the Third Wave? Postfeminism and the Hermeneutics of Reception", in Martindale and Thomas 2006, 55-66.
- Lowrie M., (1997), *Horace's Narrative Odes*, Oxford.
- (2007), "Horace and Augustus", in *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, Edited by S. Harrison, Cambridge, 77-90.
- Lowrie M. (ed.), (2009), *Horace: Odes and Epodes*, Oxford.
- Lukács G., (1971 [1923]), *History and Class Consciousness*, MIT: Cambridge, MA.
- (2000), *A Defense of History and Class Consciousness: Tailism and the Dialectic*, With a Postface by S. Žižek, London.
- Lyne R. O. A. M., (1995), *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry*, New Haven.
- Markus R., (1990), *The End of Ancient Christianity*, Cambridge.
- Martindale C., (1993), *Redeeming the Text*, Cambridge.
- Martindale C. and Thomas R. (eds.), (2008), *Classics and the Uses of Reception*, Malden.
- Massumi B., (2002), *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*, Durham.
- McKechnie P., (1999 [1996]), "Second-Century 'Women's Religion'", in Ferguson 1999, 31-53.
- McKeown J., (1987), *Ovid, Amores: Text and Prolegomena*, Ann Arbor.
- Merleau-Ponty M., (1968), *Signs*, Evanston.
- (2012 [1945]), *The Phenomenology of Perception*, Abingdon.
- Mette H. J., (2009 [1961]), "'Slender Genre' and 'Slender Table' in Horace", in Lowrie 2009, 50-55.
- Mézaros I. (ed.), (1972), *Aspects of history and class consciousness*, New York.
- Miller P. A., (1993), "Sappho 31 and Catullus 51: The Dialogism of Lyric", *Arethusa* 26.2, 189-99.
- Moi T., (1999), *What is a Woman? And Other Essays*, Oxford.

- Morales H., (2008), *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*, Cambridge.
- Morris R. (ed.), (2010), *Can the Subaltern Speak? Reflections on the History of an Idea*, New York.
- Mratschek S., (2001), "Paulinus of Nola and the Gradual Rise of Nola as a Center of Christian Hospitality", *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9, 511-47.  
 (2002), *Der Briefwechsel des Paulinus von Nola: Kommunikation und soziale Kontakte zwischen christlichen Intellektuellen*, Göttingen.
- Mrozek S., (1984), "Les phénomènes économiques dans les métaphores de l'Antiquité tardive", *Eos* 72, 393-407.
- Nazzaro A., (1994), "Orazio e Paolino", *Impegno e dialogo* 10, 239-52.
- Nicastri L., (1999), Paolino di Nola, lettore di Ovidio, in *Ovid. Werk und Wirkung. Festgabe für Michael von Albrecht zum 65. Geburtstag*, W. Schubert (ed.), ii, 865-910, Frankfurt.
- Newman J., (2011), *Horace as Outsider*, Olms.
- Nugent S. G., (1989), "Ausonius' 'Late-Antique' Poetics and 'Post-Modern' Literary Theory", *Ramus* 19, 26-50.
- Nussbaum M., (1994), *The Therapy of Desire*, Princeton.
- Obbink D. (ed.), (1995), *Philodemus and Poetry*, Oxford.
- Otranto G., (1998), "Paolino di Nola e il Cristianesimo dell'Italia Meridionale", in *Anchora Vitae: Atti del II Convegno Paoliniano nel XVI Centenario del Ritiro Paolino a Nola*, Edited by G. Luongo, Naples, 35-58.
- Page D., (1955), *Sappho and Alcaeus*, Oxford.
- Payne D., (2016), "Aetna and Aetnaism: Schiller, Vibrant Matter, and the Phenomenal Regimes of Ancient Poetry", *Helios* 43.2, 89-108.
- Paxson J., (1994), *The Poetics of Personification*, Cambridge.
- Pelttari A., (2014), *The Space that Remains: Reading Latin Poetry in Late Antiquity*, Ithaca.
- Peponi A. E., (2011), "Review: J. Porter, *The Origins of Aesthetic Thought in Greece*", Bryn Mawr Classical Review (2012.01.11), Accessed April 12, 2018.
- Porter J., (1995), "Content and Form in Philodemus: The History of an Evasion", in Obbink 1995, 97-147.  
 (2010), *The Origins of Aesthetic Thought in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.  
 (2016), *The Sublime in Antiquity*, Cambridge.  
 (2017), "Time for Foucault? Reflections on the Roman self from Seneca to Augustine", *Foucault Studies* 22, 113-33.
- Prins Y., (1999), *Victorian Sappho*, Princeton.
- Pucci J., (1999), *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition*, New Haven.

- (2005), "Originary Song, Poetic Composition, and Transgression: A Reading of Horace, Odes 1.3 and 1.22", *Ramus* 34, 1-21.
- Purves A., (2014), "Who, Sappho?", in *Defining Greek Narrative*, Edited by D. Cairns and R. Scodel, 175-96, Edinburgh.
- Putnam M., (2006), *Poetic Interplay: Catullus and Horace*, Princeton.
- Rabinowitz N. S. and Richlin A. (eds.), (1993), *Feminist Theory and the Classics*, London.
- Rimmel V., (2015), *The Closure of Space in Roman Poetics*, Cambridge.
- Roberts M., (1989), *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity*, Ithaca.
- Roman L., (2014), *Poetic Autonomy in Ancient Rome*, Oxford.
- Rosenmeyer P., (1997), "Her Master's Voice: Sappho's Dialogue with Homer", *MD* 39, 123-49.
- Rösler W., (1991), "Realitätsbezug und Imagination in Sapphos Gedicht ΦΑΙΝΕΤΑΙ ΜΟΙ ΚΗΝΟΣ", in *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen*, Edited by W. Kullmann and M. Reichel, Tübingen, 271-87.
- Rücker N., (2012), *Ausonius an Paulinus von Nola: Textgeschichte und literarische Form der Briefgedichte 21 und 22 des Decimus Magnus Ausonius*, Göttingen.
- Schwartz D., (1986), *Portrait of Delmore: Journals and Notes, 1939-1959*, New York.
- Sedgewick E., (2003), *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*, Durham.
- Sharrock A., (2002), "Looking at Looking: Can You Resist a Reading?", in Frederick 2002c, 265-95.
- (2009), *Reading Roman Comedy*, Cambridge.
- Shorrock R., (2013), *The Myth of Paganism*, London.
- Segal C., (1970), "Catullan *otiosi*: The lover and the poet", *G&R* 17, 25-31.
- Simon A. and Castin N. (eds.), (1997), *Merleau-Ponty et la littérature*, Paris.
- Smith D., (2018), "Phenomenology", in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2018 Edition), Edited by E. Zalta, forthcoming URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/phenomenology/>>.
- Ste. Croix G. E. M., (1981), *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*, Ithaca.
- Stehle E., (1997), *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece*, Princeton.
- Stevens B., (2013), *Silence in Catullus*, Madison.
- Svenbro J., (1988), *Phrasikleia*, Ithaca.
- Szepessy P., (1989), "Miracle et ironie: Le 6<sup>e</sup> Natalice de Pauline de Nole", *Acta classica Universitatis scientiarum Debreceniensis* 25, 91-100.
- Taussig M., (1993), *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses*, New York.

- Telò M., (2013), "Aristophanes, Cratinus, and the smell of comedy", in Butler and Purves 2013, 53-70.
- Thévenaz O., (2009), "Procès d'intentions: Le cas de Sappho traduite par Catulle (Fragment 31 Voight – Poème 51)", in *Jeux de voix: énonciation, intertextualité et intentionnalité dans la littérature antique*, Edited by D. van Mal-Maeder, A. Burnier and L. Núñez, Bern, 57-88.
- Thomas R., (1986), "Vergil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference", *HSCP* 90, 171-98.
- Trout D., (1999), *Paulinus of Nola: Life, Letters, and Poems*, Berkeley.  
(2005), "Saints, Identity, and the City", in Burrus 2005, 165-87.
- Uden J., (2009), "The Elegiac 'Puella' as Virgin Martyr", *TAPA* 139.1, 207-222.
- Vessey M., (1998), "The Demise of the Christian Writer and the Remaking of 'Late Antiquity': From H.-I. Marrou's Saint Augustine (1938) to Peter Brown's Holy Man (1983)", *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6.3, 377-411.  
(2007), "*Quid facit cum Horatio Hieronymus?* Christian Latin Poetry and Scriptural Poetics", in *Poetry and Exegesis in Premodern Latin Christianity*, Edited by W. Otten and K. Pollman, Leiden, 29-48.
- Wickham E. and Garrod H. (eds.), (1901), *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*, Oxford.
- Williams G., (1968), *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*, Oxford.
- Williams R., (1985), *Key Words*, New York.
- Wimsatt W. K. and Beardsley M. C., (1946), "The Intentional Fallacy", *The Sewanee Review* 54.3, 468-88.
- Winkler J., (1990), *The Constraints of Desire*, New York.
- Wright E. et al., (1989), *The Debate on Classes*, London.
- Wojtyła K., Pope John Paul II, (1979), *Sign of Contradiction*, New York.
- Wyke M., (1987), "Written Women: Propertius' *Scripta Puella*", *Journal of Roman Studies* 77, 47-61.
- Young I. M., (1990), *Throwing Like a Girl, and Other Essays in Feminist Philosophy and Social Theory*, Bloomington.
- Žižek S., (2000), "Postface: Georg Lukács as the Philosopher of Leninism", in Lukács 2000, 151-82.