GRATTIUS

Hunting an Augustan Poet

EDITED, WITH TEXT, TRANSLATION,
INTRODUCTION, & APPENDIX, BY

STEVEN J. GREEN

OXFORD

GRATTIUS

Grattius

Hunting an Augustan Poet

Edited, with
Text, Translation, Introduction,
and Appendix,
by
STEVEN J. GREEN

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Oxford University Press 2018

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2018

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017948861

ISBN 978–0–19–878901–7

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

Preface

Although I had dabbled on several occasions beforehand, my attention to Grattius turned serious in 2013. I benefitted significantly from a Margo Tytus Fellowship (University of Cincinnati, summer 2014), which offered both the protected time and the impressive facilities to enable me to develop my reading of the text and my strategic thinking on what form any Grattian enterprise might take.

It became clear that a dedicated conference on our author was long overdue. This volume started its life as a two-day conference in June 2015 at University College London. I am very grateful to Gesine Manuwald and the Department of Greek and Latin at UCL for offering to host and sponsor the event, and I am pleased to acknowledge the further financial support provided by the Classical Association and the Institute of Classical Studies.

In the two-year period between this conference and delivery of the final draft of this volume, many individuals, beyond the current contributors, have kindly lent their assistance in various ways, and I am very pleased to acknowledge them here, in alphabetical order: Cedric Scheidegger Lämmle (for sharing a conference paper on Ov. *Pont.* 4.16); Christoph Leidl (for sharing a conference paper on military imagery in Grattius); Robert Maltby (for his advice on the text and translation in this volume); David Mankin (for advance preview of his own critical edition and commentary on Grattius, in progress). Valuable anonymous contributions should also be recognized: from the readers at Oxford University Press, and the audiences of my papers on Grattius delivered at the research seminar series at the University of Manchester (December 2015), and the Ancient Worlds and Literature-In-Progress research seminar series at Yale-NUS College Singapore (April 2016, March 2017).

Finally, and to end on a sad note, the volume contributors were very sorry to learn news of the passing of Professor Carin Green in July 2015. She had been a key invited speaker for the conference but had been too ill to travel. I know from earlier correspondence that she had been looking to explore the positive Augustan resonance of the poem, and I can only hope (serendipitously) to have captured some of her thoughts in my own 'Augustan' contribution to the volume. At any rate, we are honoured to dedicate this volume to Carin: as one of the most serious Anglophone enthusiasts of Grattius in recent times, she is the very essence of what the volume is all about.

Singapore SJG
May 2017

Contents

List of Contributors ix

Introduction 1

Text and Translation 13

PART I: ROMAN DIDACTIC AND EPIC INTERACTIONS

1. Grattius' *Cynegetica*: A Protean Poem at the Heart of the Roman Didactic Tradition 61
Giulia Fanti

2. '*te sociam, Ratio . . .*': Hunting as Paradigm in the *Cynegetica* 77
Monica R. Gale

3. Hunt as War and War as Hunt: Grattius' *Cynegetica* and Virgil's *Aeneid* 97
Boris Kayachev

4. *Ars Venandi*: The Art of Hunting in Grattius' *Cynegetica* and Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* 115
Christina Tsaknaki

PART II: HUNTING AND THE WORLD

5. Motion in Grattius 135
G. O. Hutchinson

6. Grattius and Augustus: Hunting for an Emperor 153
Steven J. Green

PART III: MYTHICAL HUNTERS

7. The Conditions of Poetic Immortality: Epicurus, Daphnis, and Hagnon 179
Lisa Whitlatch

8. Authorial Surrogates in Grattius' *Cynegetica* 193
Donncha O'Rourke

PART IV: GRATTIUS IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD

9. Hunting with Hounds in Neo-Latin: The Reception of Grattius from Fracastoro to Vanière 215
Victoria Moul

10. Hunting and the Seventeenth-Century English Gentleman: Christopher Wase's Translation of Grattius' *Cynegeticon* (1654) 235
Mike Waters

Appendix: Slaves, Poetry, and the Case against Transposition of Verses 61–74 257

Bibliography 259
References to Grattius 279
References to Other Authors 282
General Index 285

List of Contributors

Giulia Fanti obtained her PhD from the University of Cambridge (2017), with a dissertation on Latin didactic poetry, mainly focused on Lucretius, Manilius and the Aetna. Her research interests lie primarily in late Republican literature and Roman didactic poetry. She is currently Stipendiary Lecturer of Classics at St. John's College Oxford and Instructor of Ancient Greek and Latin at the Faculty of Classics (University of Oxford).

Monica R. Gale is Professor in Classics at Trinity College, Dublin. Her publications include *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius* (Cambridge, 1994), *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The Georgics, Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition* (Cambridge, 2000), (as editor) *Latin Epic and Didactic Poetry: Genre, Tradition and Individuality* (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2004), and (with J. H. D. Scourfield) *Texts and Violence in the Roman World* (Cambridge, forthcoming), as well as other books and articles on Greek and Roman didactic, and on the poetry of the late Republican and Augustan periods.

Steven J. Green is Associate Professor at Yale-NUS College, Singapore, and Honorary Research Fellow in the Department of Greek and Latin at University College London. He specializes in Roman literature and culture in of the first centuries BC and AD. His major publications have so far focused around Ovid, Manilius, Roman didactic poetry, the interaction between Roman literature and religious experience, and the reception of the classical world in twenty-first century Hollywood film. His latest monograph is *Disclosure and Discretion in Roman Astrology: Manilius and his Augustan Contemporaries* (Oxford, 2014).

G. O. Hutchinson is Regius Professor of Greek at the University of Oxford. He has written the following books: *Aeschylus, Septem contra Thebas, Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford, 1985); *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford, 1988); *Latin Literature from Seneca to Juvenal: A Critical Study* (Oxford, 1993); *Cicero's Correspondence: A Literary Study* (Oxford, 1998); *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces* (Oxford, 2001); *Propertius: Elegies Book IV* (Cambridge, 2006); *Talking Books: Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry* (Oxford, 2008); *Greek to Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality* (Oxford, 2013).

Boris Kayachev is an IRC Government of Ireland Postdoctoral Fellow at Trinity College, Dublin. He is working on a new critical edition and textual commentary of the pseudo-Virgilian *Ciris*, to complement his recent book on the poem's intertextuality, *Allusion and Allegory: Studies in the Ciris* (Berlin, 2016). His other research interests include a wide range of Greek and Latin poetry in hexameters and elegiacs.

Victoria Moul is Senior Lecturer in Latin Language and Literature at King's College London. She works primarily on the relationship between Latin and English poetry in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Recent publications include *Jonson, Horace and the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, 2010; pb 2016); *George Herbert: Complete Poems* (Harmondsworth, 2015; with John Drury), and *The Cambridge Guide to Neo-Latin Literature* (Cambridge, 2017), as well as a series of articles and chapters offering the first dedicated assessment of the works of Payne Fisher, the forgotten laureate poet of the Cromwellian Protectorate.

Donncha O'Rourke is Lecturer in Classics at the University of Edinburgh. His doctoral career at Trinity College Dublin was followed by a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship, held at the University of Oxford. He is the author of articles on various aspects of Augustan poetry, especially elegy, and of a forthcoming monograph on the reception of Virgil in Propertius 4. His current research focuses on the reception of Lucretius in Latin elegy.

Christina Tsaknaki studied Classics in Athens and Oxford before heading to Peterhouse, Cambridge where she recently completed her PhD. Her thesis was a commentary on Ovid's *Tristia* 5. She now teaches Classics at Brentwood School, Essex, UK.

Mike Waters learned of Christopher Wase's 1654 translation of Grattius while preparing his PhD dissertation *The Reception of Ancient Greek Tragedy in England 1660-1760* (University College London, 2014).

Lisa Whitlatch earned her PhD at Rutgers in 2013 by engaging with Grattius as well as hunting in other Latin didactic poems ('The Hunt for Knowledge: Hunting in Latin Didactic Poets'). She has published on Lucretius and Grattius, and is currently Visiting Assistant Professor at St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota.

Introduction

Grattius: a poet, an Augustan poet, with a didactic poem whose style, manner, and rural subject matter (hunting) engage closely with Virgil's *Georgics*. Reason enough, one would think, for classical enthusiasts to be critically conversant with Grattius, or at least to have read him, or at the very least to be aware of his existence. Regrettably, there is little evidence, official or anecdotal, for any of these three scholarly scenarios at present. Grattius remains a remarkably unexplored and unknown poet, not aided—for Anglophone readers at least—by his continued relegation to the shadowy and fragmented realm of the Loeb *Minor Latin Poets* edition of 1934. Though the past hundred years have seen the publication of no fewer than three detailed commentaries on the text (Enk 1918, Verdière 1964, and Formicola 1988), these editions tend to focus on textual and (obscure) hunting matters and appear to have done little to raise the profile of Grattius with a wider audience.[1] Our author has surprisingly not been embraced by the academic tradition of any nation, and he attracts at most scant comment in contemporary standard reference points for Roman literature and studies of didactic poetry and the Augustan age.[2] The only dedicated thematic study of

---

[1] We look forward to seeing what effect David Mankin's critical edition and commentary on Grattius (in progress) will have on Grattian scholarship in due course.

[2] The *Cambridge History of Classical Literature II: Latin Literature* offers only a couple of passing sentiments on Grattius as part of a section entitled 'Minor figures' (Kenney and Clausen 1982: 480); Fantham gives him a dutiful passing glance (1996: 139); the Blackwell *Companion to Latin Literature* devotes less than a page to Grattius (Harrison 2005: 112–13), though the author of that section (Monica Gale) offers a more detailed analysis in this volume. Toohey's survey of didactic poetry offers a cursory four pages (1996: 196–9), in which the poet is (oddly) referred to as

Grattius in his own right is the stimulating 2001 contribution by John Henderson, who notes the logical consequence (2001: 1 nn. 2–5) that there is currently nothing approaching a critical *debate* on Grattius.

Obscure subject matter, nebulous phraseology, and unusual Latin idiom may be sufficient to explain why Grattius is not a ‘classic’. But they hardly warrant the current state of near oblivion, especially when one considers that the academic world has become increasingly comfortable with reading poems on equally obscure topics—even in the didactic sphere, Virgil’s farming and Aratus’ constellation-scape are hardly familiar topics for many a modern reader.

So the rallying cry of a dedicated volume on Grattius is loud and clear—but it has been heard before. In the first chapter of Christopher Wase’s 1654 edition of Grattius, the first English translation of the poem, the author cautions the reader ‘not to censure *Gratius* because hee ow’s so little to Common Fame’, and offers the reader a work designed ‘so [Grattius] may be drawn forth from a double obscurity; both that of his matter and the other of his fame’. Indeed, Wase held out the possibility of a stellar trajectory for the poet to rival his Augustan contemporaries: ‘and then why may not this Author, like some refulgent starre, after long disappearance, raise up into our Hemisphere his head incircled with its native lusture?’[3] Fast forward almost 350 years, and the star still shows no signs of shining, as John Henderson offers a stark reality check: ‘It’s no use. There is no hope, not a dog’s chance. Whatever I write in this essay, who will root out Grattius’ poem *The World of Hunting to Hounds*?’ (2001: 1). On the contrary, surmises Henderson, ‘not *every* dog has his day’ (2001: 2), and the absence of any real scholarly momentum on Grattius since 2001 would appear to confirm his prescience.

So why will this rallying cry be any more successful? It is hoped that by devoting an entire volume to Grattius—containing Latin text and a new English translation as well as interpretive papers—our poet will become accessible to a wider range of readers. We hope that the volume will become not just a primary access point for gaining a critical awareness of Grattius, but also a launch pad for further work on the poem: while the papers cover different topics and explore the

---

‘Grattian’. Galinsky (1996) and (2012) typify Grattius’ absence from ongoing standard reference points for Augustus and Augustan culture.

[3] For Wase’s edition of Grattius, see Chapter 10 by Waters in this volume.

poem within literary, intellectual, and sociopolitical frameworks, the volume makes no claims to being an exhaustive or definitive treatment.

What follows is a general introduction to Grattius and his poem for the sake of reader orientation.[4]

NAME AND REPUTATION OF THE POET

The only reference to our author in antiquity comes from Ovid's final epistle from exile, *Pont.* 4.16.34, where he appears among a list of contemporary poets: *aptaque venanti Grattius arma daret* 'and (while) Grattius was giving pliant arms to the hunter'.[5] This would appear to be a conscious echo of our poem's final programmatic verse—23 *carmine et arma dabo et venandi persequar artis*—and justifies Buecheler's simple emendation (1880: 407) of the Ovidian manuscripts (which read *gratius* or *gracius*) to bring it in line with the 'Grattius' named in the title of our poem in the Codex Vindobonesis Lat. 277.

Nothing else about our poet can be said with any certainty. In particular, the idea that he hailed from Faleria—from where he gains the contested cognomen 'Faliscus'—is based on a strong personalized reading of *nostris Faliscis* at *Cyn.* 40.[6] Grattius' use of *noster* more widely, however, advises against attributing this level of specificity. On two other occasions where the adjective is used in a geographical context, it provides little more than a contrast between Italian and foreign: cf. 137 *silvis... nostris* ('our woods', as opposed to the Thracian and Eastern locations in verses 128–36), 321 *nostris... Camillis* ('our Camilli', as opposed to the foreign nations vilified in verses 312–20). So here, in verse 40, the use of *noster* might simply distinguish the region of Faleria from the later foreign lands of Spain and Canopus (41–5) in the discussion of types of linen unsuitable for net-making. That Grattius only identifies himself in a broad Italian sense in the poem is further evidenced, perhaps, by a connection between *Italiae parentes* and *praecepimus* across the mutilated verses 539–40. Grattius' claim to have often personally witnessed a religious event in Sicily (435 *vidi*) offers no further clue to his origins, even if we are inclined to take *vidi* as more than a rhetorical strategy from a didactic poet keen to showcase his authority:[7] anyone of means in Italy could have made regular visits to nearby Sicily.

---

[4] Sections on the name and reputation of the poet, and the poem's scope and date, draw on the introductory sections of Enk (1918), Verdière (1964), and Formicola (1988), to which the reader is referred for more detailed discussion of these preliminary matters.

[5] The view that there is also an allusion to Grattius in Manilius' list of authors (2.43 *ecce alius... bella ferarum* [*refert*]) must be treated with caution.

[6] The cognomen is entertained in the editions of Enk (1918), Serra (1976), and Sestili (2011), but is rejected by Duff and Duff (1934), Verdière (1964), and Formicola (1988); for the debate, see Verdière (1964) 18, Formicola (1988) 22–3.

The contemporary reputation of our author is also difficult to recover from Ovid's epistle. On the one hand, Grattius appears somewhat indiscriminately within a list of largely unknown authors—twenty-seventh or twenty-eighth place, in fact, depending on how one interprets *Pont.* 4.16.33—which might indicate that he is distinctly subordinate in Ovid's view.[8] On the other hand, for Ovid to include Grattius within such a catalogue is itself a mark of selective memorialization. Moreover, as noted above, Ovid goes further by making conscious allusion to his final programmatic verse (*Cyn.* 23), a move which suggests at least close reading on Ovid's part and possibly, by implication, that of the wider readership of Ov. *Pont.* 4.16.[9]

SCOPE OF THE POEM

It is evident that the extant poem is missing verses from the final section on horses, but didactic closural motifs like *restat* ('it remains', 497) are frustratingly vague, leaving considerable room for debate as to whether we have lost a little from the end of the work or just the end of the first book of a longer project.[10]

---

[7] For the *vidi* motif of didactic poetry, see, e.g., S. Green (2004a) 180 on Ov. *Fast.* 1.389.

[8] For this view, see, e.g., Helzle (1989) 181, Henderson (2001) 1, C. Green (2007) 49, Martelli (2013) 226–7.

[9] Cazzaniga (1962) argues forcefully for mutual respect between Ovid and Grattius; Ovidian respect for those on his list is also implied by Syme (1978) 105–6 and Mayer (1982) 305–6. As Grattius is the only author on Ovid's list whose work survives in any form, we have no way of telling how distinctive Ovid's intertextual engagement with this author may have been. On *Pont* 4.16, see further Kayachev, Chapter 3 of this volume.

The principal codex (Vindobonesis Lat. 277) certainly lends weight to the latter view. It commences with ITEM INCIPIT GRATTI CYNEGETICON L$\overline{\text{IBI}}$, and the final word might readily be interpreted as an abbreviation for LIB I, i.e. Liber I. Moreover, the extant poem deals primarily with paraphernalia for the hunt, and offers nothing, for example, on the wide range of beasts that can be hunted. This might suggest that further books are to be envisaged, perhaps along the lines of the later, four-book *Cynegetica* of Oppian (*c.* AD 212).

But one must be wary of attaching too much significance to an interpretation of manuscript annotation. It is worth recalling that the central remit of Grattius' work as far as Ovid is concerned, drawing on *Cyn.* 23, is that it 'gives arms' to the hunter. If one subscribes to a narrow interpretation of *arma* as referring only to the hunter's equipment and armaments, one might argue that Grattius actually fulfils this pledge within the extant poem, but for the concluding verses of the final section: the pledge to supply 'arms', both material and animate, is met fully by the discussion of nets, traps, spears, dogs, and horses. Grattius promises no more than this, in contrast to the more expansive agenda of Oppian (*Cyn.* 1.35–40), and it might instead be Nemesianus' *Cynegetica* (AD 283–4) which provides a more meaningful comparison, a single 325-verse Latin poem that deals with dog care (103–239), horses (240–98), and nets and traps (299–320), before concluding with an exhortation to enter the hunt (321–5).[11] Intertextual argumentation might also be advanced to support the case for a single-book production. In particular, if one accepts the similarities in theme and ordering principles between Grattius' poem and the third and fourth books of Virgil's *Georgics*, it is reasonable to posit that both authors intended to feature an episode of divine salvation of animals (Aristaeus' bees at Virg. *G.* 4.315–558, Vulcan's cave at *Cyn.* 430–64) towards the end of their respective works.

---

[10] The proximity of *restat* ('there remains') and *finire* (which can mean 'to finish') gestures towards conclusion, and a similar didactic motif can be found towards the end of the single-book Latin didactic poem, *Aetna* (386 *superant*). Such motifs, however, can equally well signal the close of just one book of a longer project; cf. Virg. *G.* 3.286 *superat*, Ov. *Ars* 1.771 *pars superat coepti.* Enk (1918: I.4–5) and Verdière (1964: 57–9) believe this to be just the first book. Formicola (1988) does not address this issue but subconsciously leans towards a single-book production. Henderson (2001: 3) remains open-minded on the question. On a related note, no uniformity of poem name (*Cynegeticon* or *Cynegetica*) has been imposed in this volume.

[11] I see no reason to assume that Nemesianus' poem is unfinished simply because he does not deal with the hunt itself. To my mind, the exclusive focus on the preparation of hunting equipment in *both* Nemesianus *and* Grattius reinforces the impression that both are single-book productions, complete and near complete respectively.

DATE OF THE POEM

There is broad consensus that AD 8 can be regarded as the *terminus ante quem* for the poem. Ovid speaks about Grattius in the context of poets who were active at the time when he 'was being numbered among the living' (*Pont.* 4.16.4 *cum vivis adnumerarer*), by which he clearly means a time before his own exile in AD 8, a fate regularly equated with death in his exilic output. A *terminus post quem* is more difficult to ascertain but is facilitated by what appears to be very conscious and sustained engagement with Virgil. There is very broad agreement that Grattius draws on the *Georgics*, especially Books 3 and 4, which would offer date parameters for the poem of *c.*29 BC–AD 8.[12] This view is strengthened, perhaps, if we maintain that the fall of Egypt, to which Grattius gives pride of place in his discourse against luxury (312–14), is influenced by the recent demise of Cleopatra in 30 BC. If, as some argue, Grattius also draws on the *Aeneid*, the date parameters may be narrowed further to *c.*19 BC–AD 8.[13]

Either way, it seems clear that the poem was produced at some point during the Augustan age, a fact which should in itself make Grattius worthy of serious scholarly attention. In general, the papers in this volume do not tackle head-on the issue of dating, but rather work in the spirit of exploring the potential of Grattius' text to engage meaningfully with Augustan society and contemporary Augustan authors. If the reader does not leave this volume with a clearer sense of the poem's date, it is hoped that he/she will at least gain a greater sense of its 'Augustan flavour', in terms of its imperial sensitivity, religious outlook, and engagement with contemporary literary aesthetics.

---

[12] See most convincingly Henderson (2001) 13–19; also Enk (1918) I.10–19, Formicola (1988) 27–9; see also O'Rourke, Chapter 8 of this volume.

[13] See Verdière (1964) 32–44. Kayachev in this volume offers a more focused discussion of the engagement between Grattius and Virgil's *Aeneid*, but remains open-minded as to their relative chronology.

SUBJECT MATTER AND GENERIC AFFILIATION

The poem's primary topic, hunting, would have been a familiar activity for its readers, associated with, but not exclusive to, the upper classes.[14] C. Green (1996a: 226) wisely reminds us that hunting would have been undertaken as both a leisure activity and a practical requirement (food and defence), depending on one's means and environment, and Grattius appears to embrace both eventualities in his poem: though he starts out with a primeval mandate to defend mankind against feral onslaught (21–3), the rest of the poem speaks implicitly to the interests of the leisured hunter, who preys on harmless animals (199–201) and has the means to source from abroad a wide range of linen, wood for spears, dogs, and horses (34–49, 127–36, 154–212, 501–40).

The poem exhibits the (albeit modern scholarly) criteria for a 'didactic' poem.[15] It is composed in hexameters and consists of an instructional mode that is interspersed with panels of a more illustrative nature, often tentatively referred to as 'digressions'. More specifically, it is a poetic work in which a single authorial voice offers direct instruction to an implied student audience. But in this central feature of a didactic work, one must accept a higher degree of artificiality than is the case with, for example, the relatively 'plausible' one-to-one lesson dramatized in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*. Grattius' didactic persona is a versatile character who is, at one time, a channel of information from outside sources (divine and mortal) and, at another, an active practitioner of the art.[16] The identity of the implied student audience is even more difficult to envisage. First, it can oscillate between a singular and plural entity.[17] Secondly and more importantly, evidence from within and without the poem makes it clear that the ancient hunting expedition involved a variety of individuals, with different duties and differing status, and one gets the impression that Grattius is eliding into one overarching lesson instructions that would more naturally be directed towards different personnel. For example, the second person addressee for the section on net-making (24–60) is not sufficiently distinguished from the addressee(s) of later sections, even though we know that maintenance of nets was specifically the duty of a slave.[18] Elsewhere, Grattius brings into view two distinct individuals—a master of hounds and the higher-ranked hunter who has elected him—but fails to make clear to whom the subsequent instructions are being directed.[19] In an attempt to preserve the dramatic illusion, one might, perhaps, envisage Grattius as speaking in the presence of the entire hunting team, offering instructions into the air to be caught by the relevant member of the audience. But if the constitution of the implied audience is obscure, it may not be unprecedented, if one considers the complexity of the addressees of Varro's *De Re Rustica* and Virgil's *Georgics*, works which deal with an activity (agriculture) that also requires a diverse 'workforce'.[20]

---

[14] For differing accounts of Roman hunting, see Aymard (1951), Anderson (1985) 83–100, C. Green (1996a), Badel (2009).

[15] For the debate over whether ancient poets were consciously thinking in terms of a specific genre for didactic, and for the distinctive features of the group of poems labelled 'didactic', see esp. Toohey (1996) 2–5, Volk (2002) 34–43.

[16] For didactic speaker as channelling divine instruction, cf. 13–23; channelling mortal instruction/human tradition, cf., e.g., 75–6 (*sunt quibus*), 92–3 (*quid*

From a different literary angle, Grattius represents the second extant work, in either prose or poetry, to take the dedicated form of instruction on hunting—the so-called *Cynegetica* or *Cynegeticon*. The father figure would appear to be Xenophon (Greek prose, 391 BC), and Grattius is succeeded by Arrian (Greek prose, AD 130–40), Oppian (Greek hexameter, AD 212), and Nemesianus (Latin hexameter, AD 283–4).[21] Although there would appear to be little evidence of

---

qui... venator), 231 (*lex*); cf. also Grattius' frequent use of the 'experiential' third person plural (n. 7 attached to the translation in this volume). For didactic speaker as practitioner, cf., e.g., 32 and 278 (*velim*), 193 (*miscebo*), 267 (*iungam*).

[17] Cf. 55–6 *oppande... reponite*, 125 *relinquite*, 377–8 *averte... superabitis*.

[18] See further the Appendix to this volume.

[19] Cf. 328–43 with n. 66 attached to the translation of verse 337.

[20] For Varro and Virgil oscillating between singular and plural recipients of farming instruction, cf. Virg. *G.* 1.100–1 *orate... agricolae* and 3.420 *cape... pastor* with Volk (2002) 123–4; Var. *RR* 2.2.3 *observate... habeas* with Hine (2011) 631–5; for the more complex audience of Virgil's *Georgics*, see also Rutherford (2008).

[21] This is not to mention the *Cynegetica* that have not survived, such as that of Nicander of Colophon (*fl. c.*130 BC; see *OCD* s.v. Nicander).

direct engagement between these works, with the notable exception of Arrian's conscious 'updating' of Xenophon, any serious study of Grattius would profit from careful consideration within this 'generic' context as well.[22]

SUMMARY OF PAPERS

So much for introductions. The current volume of new papers is organized under four broad headings, which should be viewed principally as a means of helping the reader to navigate through the contributions. Some papers could just have easily been placed in other sections, and meaningful interaction between papers is achieved through extensive cross-referencing.

The volume opens with a section that focuses on Grattius' intertextual engagements with contemporaries in the Roman epic and didactic traditions. With particular reference to Lucretius and Manilius, Giulia Fanti assesses aspects of Grattius' didactic technique—his persona, envisaged addressee(s), and attitude to teaching—and argues for a protean poem that refuses to be pinned down on the 'earnestness' of the lesson and the nature of the target audience. Monica Gale also investigates Grattius' close engagement with Roman didactic predecessors—this time, Lucretius and Virgil's *Georgics*—to explore the poet's use of hunting as both metaphor for intellectual enquiry and emblem of cultural development and civilization. Grattius, it is argued, takes on Lucretius' confidence and authority and redeploys it in a post-*Georgic*, Augustan world: in contrast to both Lucretius and Virgil, our poet offers an optimistic vision of both cultural progress and the contemporary world, in which expertise and toil, underpinned by the benevolence of the gods, yield fine rewards. Turning to Virgilian epic, Boris Kayachev argues for a deeper intellectual engagement between Grattius and the *Aeneid* than has previously been considered, located within key hunting passages and hunter figures in the epic. Kayachev remains open-minded about the relative chronology of the two works and the consequent readings generated by this interaction. Finally in this section, Christina Tsaknaki explores thematic affinities between Grattius and Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, focusing on the connection between lover and hunter, the importance of mental skill as a complement to pure physical exertion, and the art of hunting as a civilizing force. It is argued, moreover, that the interplay between brawn and brains, articulated in Grattius as a contrast between *arma* and *ars*, allows our author to engage with the 'Callimachean' aesthetic literary debate as played out in Augustan poetry and in Ovid in particular: Grattius' opening sections on thinly wrought nets and deceptive snares can be seen to offer significant potential for metapoetic readings.

---

[22] For Arrian's direct engagement with Xenophon, cf. Arr. *Cyn.* 1–2, 16.6–7, Stadter (1976). For recent studies of *Cynegetica* as a group, see, e.g., Paschalis (2000), Hutchinson (2009) 205–8, and Moul, Chapter 9 of this volume.

The next section, 'Hunting and the World', brings together two papers which argue that, through his choice and repetition of diction, Grattius uses hunting as a medium through which to offer wider observations about the conceptual and political world in which it is practised. Gregory Hutchinson views motion as important to this as to other didactic poems. The presentation of hunting itself is less astir with lively motion than might have been expected; rather, verbal networks connect hunting with wider worlds, and a larger ethical and pragmatic vision is conveyed. Humans interact not just with animals but with the divine and with the forces of disease; hierarchies and power struggles are involved. Yet for all the expansion of the poem's universe, the purposeful and rational ethos of the poem is embedded in its treatment of the primary subject matter. Focusing on the poem's potential for political resonance, Steven Green argues that the craft of hunting is, through extensive use of anthropomorphic language, subtly configured to promote Augustan-style leadership and to celebrate the Roman Empire, albeit set within a divine framework that plays out the implications of Augustus' (at times radical) programme of religious reform.

The third section, 'Mythical Hunters', brings together those contributions that focus on the metaphorical and metapoetic charge of the two 'inset' stories of Dercylos and Hagnon for a wider appreciation of the poem. Lisa Whitlatch focuses on Grattius' praise of Hagnon, through which the poet reaches back to Theocritus, via Virgil's *Eclogues* and Lucretius, to locate positive associations for hunting. By means of such intertextual dialogue, as well as pointed use of conjugal language, Grattius promotes hunting as an eternal symbiotic relationship between man, god, and nature, which ensures its sustainability. Donncha O'Rourke shows how the stories of

Dercylos and Hagnon are configured to speak for the poet himself. By means of language which consistently emits a metapoetic charge, Grattius can be seen to use these obscure figures to explore his own (equally obscure) identity and role as teacher of hunting. Moreover, through conscious engagement with Lucretius and (especially) Virgil's *Georgics*, Grattius speaks through Dercylos and Hagnon to project a supremely confident *praeceptor* figure who executes his pedagogical mission with no misgivings.

In the final section, we turn to Grattius' posthumous reception. As the section subtitle 'Grattius in the Early Modern Period' might imply, there is little tangible evidence of our author's influence on his immediate classical successors.[23] The Renaissance, however, ushered in a period of significant interest in Grattius. Victoria Moul explores the wide-ranging imitation and appropriation of Grattius in Europe during the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries following the rediscovery of the text, and shows how authors were attracted to him for his focus on (animal) medicine and his celebration of human skill, agility, and ingenuity. It was also during this period of revival that Christopher Wase produced an edition of Grattius with the first ever English translation (1654), as discussed by Mike Waters. Waters assesses the turbulent life of this individual and shows how his personal, academic, and professional circumstances converged to make Grattius an ideal subject of study and dissemination.

---

[23] But note Slater (2007), who detects Grattian aesthetics in Petronius' *Satyricon*. This may suggest that there is further fruitful research to be conducted in the area of his immediate reception.

STRUCTURE OF THE EXTANT POEM

1–23	Proem: invocation to Diana
24–149	*Instruction on the preparation and use of (inanimate) weaponry and equipment*
24–60	making nets
61–74	‘digression’: invocation to the art of the hunt
75–94	making traps and snares
95–126	‘digression’: eulogy to the hunter Dercylos and his innovative hunting spears; legacy of spears
127–49	selecting and cultivating the tree for spears
150–496	*Instruction on the breeding and care of dogs*
150–212	types and selection of dogs
213–62	‘digression’: eulogy to the hunter Hagnon and his *metagon*
263–78	mating of dogs
279–89	caring for the pregnant bitch
290–300	choosing the best puppies
301–9	feeding the puppies
310–25	‘digression’: the effects of luxury on humankind
326–36	the master of hounds
337–43	the hunter’s dress
344–65	curing a dog’s light wounds
366–82	canine diseases
383–407	rabies and its remedies
408–29	mange and its remedies
430–64	‘digression’: visit to the cave of Vulcan in Sicily
465–79	*robur* and its remedies; coughs and lethargy
480–96	‘digression’: sacrifice at the grove of Diana at Aricia
497–c.540	*Instruction on the breeding and care of horses (?) (incomplete)*
497ff.	types and selection of horses[24]

[24] For differing articulations of the poem’s structure, see, e.g., Enk (1918) I.25, Duff and Duff (1934) 145, Formicola (1988) 29–31, and Toohey (1996) 197. Any structure is offered tentatively, for the purposes of reader orientation, as it inevitably oversimplifies the clarity of transition from one specified ‘topic’ to another. In similar cautionary vein, the term ‘digression’ is used to denote those episodes that might be considered illustrative rather than primarily instructional.

Text and Translation

What follows is not a new critical edition of the Latin poem: no independent review of the manuscripts has been conducted, and no apparatus criticus is included. For the manuscript tradition of Grattius, the reader is referred to Reeve (1983) and (2016), and Formicola (1988) 31–42. The text here is based on the critical editions of Baehrens and Vollmer (1911), and Enk (1918), unless otherwise stated (see below). The new English translation offered here does not claim for itself any particular artistic merit, nor does it arise from a pressing need to offer significant 'correction' to any existing published translation.

The primary reason for including a text and translation in this volume is one of accessibility.[1] It is hoped that these will acquaint new audiences with the poem, set the contributions of this volume in context, and allow the reader to engage more critically with Grattius' poem and its issues.

The translation is, however, underpinned by a conscious methodological approach. Up till now, the primary concern of translators has been to clarify the specifics of Grattius' hunting instruction. This has led to some heavy interpretation rather than translation, in places—several of them—where the text is far more ambiguous and suggestive, especially when it gestures towards both the minutiae of the hunting art and the human world. This is particularly evident in extended passages (cf., e.g., 279–300, on dog mating and the rearing of young) where cynegetic language is relegated and anthropomorphic language brought to the fore: in such cases, it is the wider context, rather than the specific diction, that lends it any sort of cynegetic colouring. The new translation, then, strives for a more appropriate balance between translation and interpretation where possible, motivated by a desire not to force a cynegetic reading on sections that admit anthropomorphic possibilities. This should, in turn, reveal to readers a more intricate, multilayered text that is worthy of their attention.

---

[1] There is no dedicated Oxford Classical Text, and no Teubner edition of the poem since Baehrens and Vollmer's *Poetae Latini Minores*, vol. II.1 (1911). The most recent critical editions and commentaries are those of Formicola (1988), Verdière (1964), and Enk (1918). The editions of Formicola (1988) and Verdière (1964) also contain translations, in Italian and French respectively; the most recent English translation is to be found in Duff and Duff's (1934) Loeb volume, *Minor Latin Poets*.

The footnotes, attached to the translation rather than the Latin text, focus on issues of interpretation. They also offer, where relevant, short comments of clarification and discussion of passages where the Latin is more poetically rich or playful than any one translation will allow: evidence of Grattius' skill as poet, an aspect that has been sadly overlooked in critical treatments of the author to date.

Finally, it is important to make clear that this text and translation have not been 'imposed' upon the individual contributing papers. On the contrary, they represent one point in a live scholarly debate, a debate fuelled by Grattius' penchant for strange phraseology and obscure sentiment. Contributors have been free to follow their own judgement on text and nuance of translation, and any significant variants in text or meaning are signalled in the footnotes. In order to strike a balance between accessibility and avoidance of undue repetition, translations for extended passages of Grattius within individual papers are only given where they differ from the translation offered at the front of the volume.

NOTATION AND TEXTUAL VARIANTS

< > brackets are used in cases where entire words, or substantial parts of words, are objectionable conjectures owing to the state of the MSS. I have not used brackets for uncontested additions to words that are only marginally mutilated.

Differences in reading between this edition and the editions of either Baehrens and Vollmer (1911) or Enk (1918) are as follows:

17	comma after *centum* (cf. Verdière) for colon
24	sense break after *prima* (cf. Formicola)
64	*ire freta* for †*iret freta* (Vollmer), *caeli iter* (Enk)
68	strong punctuation after *ingens* (cf. Verdière, Formicola)

69	words part of main sentence (cf. Verdière, Formicola) rather than in parentheses
72–3	original verse order assumed (cf. Formicola) rather than transposition and/or lacuna proposed
129–30	no assumed loss of a single verse after 129 (cf. Duff and Duff, Verdière, Formicola)
163	*Venus* (cf. Duff and Duff, Verdière, Formicola) for *venus*[2]
178	*pronuis* (cf. Verdière, Formicola) for *pronis*
180	*Mavors* (cf. Duff and Duff, Verdière, Formicola) for *mavors*
182	<*gentes*> (cf. Duff and Duff, Formicola) for blank space
202	*Petronios (haec fama) canes* (cf. Duff and Duff, Formicola) for *Petroniost haec fama cani*
203	*falsa* (cf. Verdière, Formicola) for †*falsa*
211	sense break after *volgo* (cf. Formicola)
267	*secundae* (cf. Verdière, Formicola) for *secunda*
281	*Veneris* (cf. Verdière, Formicola) for *veneris*
339	<*sit pell*>*is* (cf. Duff and Duff, Verdière, Formicola) for blank space
340	<*mantica curta chlamys*> (cf. Verdière, Formicola) for *i* . . .
361	<*retecto*> (cf. Formicola) for <*reperto*>
362	*p*<*raecordia olivis*> (cf. Verdière, Formicola) for *p* . . .
388	*longa* (cf. Duff and Duff, Formicola) for *longe*
408	*deformi* (cf. Duff and Duff, Formicola) for *deformis*
410	heavy punctuation after *una* (cf. Formicola)
519	*g*<*enus. ille vigebit*> *(*Duff and Duff, Formicola) for *g* . . .
528–30	*o quantus . . . sufficient!* (cf. Verdière, Formicola)
537	<– *haut ocior Eurus* –> (cf. Verdière, Formicola) for *et a* . . .
539	<*o quan*>*tum* (cf. Duff and Duff, Verdière, Formicola) for . . . *tum*
540	<*praestant*> (cf. Duff and Duff, Verdière, Formicola) for blank space
541	*Mati*<*na*> (cf. Verdière, Formicola) for *mati* . . .

---

[2] *Mars/mars* and *Venus/venus* are used regularly in Grattius with different levels of personification. I have had to make a judgement call as to whether the level of personification is strong enough to justify capitalization.

TEXT

dona cano divom, laetas venantibus artis,
auspicio, Diana, tuo; prius omnis in armis
spes fuit et nuda silvas virtute movebant
inconsulti homines vitaque erat error in omni.
post alia, propiore, via meliusque profecti
te sociam, Ratio, rebus sumpsere gerendis;
hinc omne auxilium vitae rectusque reluxit
ordo et contiguas didicere ex artibus artis
proserere, hinc demens cecidit violentia retro.
sed primum auspicium deus artibus altaque circa
firmamenta dedit; tum partis quisque secutus
exegere suas tetigitque industria finem.
tu trepidam bello, vitam, Diana, ferino
qua primam quaerebat opem, dignata repertis
protegere auxiliis orbemque hac solvere noxa.
adscivere tuo comites sub nomine divae
centum, omnes nemorum, umentes de fontibus omnes
Naides, et Latii <satyri> Faunus<que subibant>
Maenaliusque puer, domitrixque Idaea leonum
mater, et inculto Silvanus termite gaudens.
his ego praesidibus nostram defendere sortem
contra mille feras et non sine carmine iussus
carmine et arma dabo et venandi persequar artis.

TRANSLATION

[1] I sing of the gifts of the gods, the arts delightful to hunters, under your auspices, Diana. [2] In former times all hope lay in arms, and uneducated men stirred the woods with brute courage, and there was aimlessness in all (areas of) life. [5] After this, having made a better start on another, more direct path,[1] they took you, Reason, as companion in performing their tasks. [7] From here came every aid in life, and righteous order shone out its light, and from (existing) arts men learned to produce connected arts; from here mindless ferocity fell behind. [10] But first of all a deity gave its auspices and all round deep-rooted support to the arts; then each man followed and worked on his own part to completion, and determined effort reached its end result. [13] When life was distressed by the warfare with wild beasts,[2] where it was seeking aid first, it was you, Diana, who deigned to offer protection with your helpful discoveries, and to release the world from this harm. [16] Under your name a hundred goddesses[3]—all the Nymphs from the groves, all the Naiads dripping wet from the fountains—adopted companions, and Latium's <satyrs> and Faunus and the Arcadian youth[4] <were coming close>, and the Idaean mother, tamer of lions,[5] and Silvanus rejoicing in his wild olive bough. [21] By these guardians have I been ordained—and not without song—to defend our common lot against a thousand wild beasts, and through song shall I give arms and pursue the arts of hunting.

---

[1] Grattius here employs a spatial motif (*propiore via* = 'a nearer path') which, though awkward to reproduce in English, connects with 'nearer paths' in other spheres; cf. 218, 465. For the spatial and motional dynamics of the poem, see Hutchinson, Chapter 5 of this volume.

[2] *bello . . . ferino* might indicate a warfare initiated by humans (i.e. hunting) or the instinctive warfare conducted against humans by the wild beasts themselves.

[3] Commentators are divided as to whether to take *centum* with *comites* (Enk, Duff and Duff) or with *divae* (Verdière, Formicola). Moreover, adopting heavy punctuation after *centum* (Vollmer, Enk, Duff and Duff, Formicola) leaves obscure the identity of the *divae*. I follow Verdière in taking *centum* with *divae* and in avoiding strong punctuation, so as to allow the identity of the goddesses to be revealed in verses 17–18 as the Nymphs of the woods and waters.

[4] Pan.

[5] Cybele, the Magna Mater.

armorum casses, plagiique exordia restis
prima. iubent tenui nascentem iungere filo
limbum et quadruplicis tormento adstringere limbos:
illa operum patiens, illa usus linea longi.
tunc ipsum e medio cassem quo nascitur ore
per senos circum usque sinus laqueabis, ut omni
concipiat tergo, si quisquam est plurimus, hostem.
at bis vicenos spatium praetendere passus
rete velim plenisque decem consurgere nodis;
ingrati maiora sinus impendia sument.
optuma Cinyphiae, ne quid cunctere, paludes
lina dabunt; bonus Aeolia de valle Sibyllae
fetus et aprico Tuscorum stuppea campo
messis contiguom sorbens de flumine rorem,
qua cultor Latii per opaca silentia Thybris
labitur inque sinus magno venit ore marinos.
at contra nostris inbellia lina Faliscis
Hispanique alio spectantur Saetabis usu.
vix operata suo sacra ad Bubastia lino

[24] Purse nets are the beginning of our equipment, and cordage is the first beginning of net work.[6] [25] (Experts)[7] give instruction to join the growing yarn with a thin fibre and to draw tight the fourfold yarns using a twisting device: a cord of that type is enduring of activities[8] and long usage. [28] Next, at the central mouth that it had when it was made, you will entangle the purse net itself all around with six pouches, so that with its entire outer layer it may capture the enemy, even if it is very big in size. [31] But as for the long net, I would want it to stretch out forty paces in length and to rise up ten full meshes in height. [33] Ungratifying[9] are the long nets that use up greater expenditure. [34] The best stuff comes from Cinyps[10]—do not hesitate at all—the thread that will be offered by its marshes. [35] Good produce comes from the Aeolian valley of the Sibyl,[11] and there is the flax harvest on the sunny plain of the Tuscans, drinking in the neighbouring moisture from the river, where Tiber, the cultivator of Latium, glides through the silent shades and comes into the bays of the sea with its huge mouth.[12] [40] But on the other hand our Falerians have threads that are unfit for warfare, and those of the Spanish Saetabes are considered remarkable through a different use.

---

[6] For different types of ancient hunting nets, and the difficulties in interpreting verses 24–60, see Enk II.16–23, Verdière 204–7, Formicola 123–4; further Aymard (1951) 207–18, Capponi (1958) 672–86, Richmond (1968).

[7] Grattius is fond of employing an unspecified third person plural ('they') to introduce exemplary hunting practice; cf. also 58 *vetant*, 90 *iussere*, 362 *mulcent*, 363 *signant*, 393 *recidunt*, 418 *lavant*, 498 *admittant*, possibly 537 *legunt*; for this manner of didactic instruction, see further Gibson (1997) 74–5, 76–7, 80–1, and Fanti, Chapter 1 of this volume. In all cases I translate by the generic term 'experts': indeed, it remains unclear what human personnel and/or divine benefactors the poet has in mind.

[8] *operum* is translated here as 'activities'. *opus*, used 21 times in the extant poem, is an extremely versatile term that can be used to refer to the specific operation of the hunt as well as to tasks more generally. No uniformity of translation is possible.

[9] This translation of *ingrati* attempts to uphold the possibility that the poet intentionally puns on his own name (i.e. 'unworthy of Grattius / un-Grattius-like'). Cf. also *gratia* (74) with Henderson (2001) 8; *plurima . . . gratia* (215–16) with Tsaknaki, Chapter 4 and O'Rourke, Chapter 8 of this volume; 429 *gratos . . . prendere finis* (= 'to take in the explanations of Grattius'?).

[10] A small river in Libya.

[11] Cumae in Italy.

[12] Verses 38–9 repeat *sinus* (cf. 29, 33) and *ore* (cf. 28) from the earlier discussion of nets, and no translation can do justice to their potential for poetic wit: Tiber is depicted as if he were an unsuspecting woodland beast that, on travelling through silent shady regions, becomes caught in the 'net' of the sea ('comes into the pouches of the sea with its great cavity').