



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Review of
Naerebout, F.G.

Citation

Naerebout, F. G. (2002). Review of . *Mnemosyne*, 55,
755-758. Retrieved from
<https://hdl.handle.net/1887/8023>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License:

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/8023>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final
published version (if applicable).

and was adorned with imagery of an upward journey” (p. 141). C. deals thoroughly with the matter in ch. 2 of his introduction (“Il *carmen Licentii* e il problema dell’ enciclopedia agostiniana”, pp. 23-53). He chooses an entirely different path: using several Ciceronian expressions, Licentius describes his perplexity as a specimen of scepticism. His reference to Varro should be understood “in chiave simbolica” (46); this type of encyclopedical learning does not create any confidence “nella possibilità di percepire l’ordine dell’ universo” (47). One cannot help feeling that C. is overstating a good case here. For his explanation the rather unlikely ‘symbolic’ Varro is not necessary.

In conclusion: Michele Cutino’s well-equipped edition of Licentius’ verse epistle is a fine achievement. He explains his conservative text with skill and verve in the long introduction and the commentary proper. His explanations are usually worthwhile, here and there improbable, quite often persuasive, at times definitely convincing. It is to be hoped that the use of his mother tongue will not cause his book to become an *arcantum iter*.

2311 WB LEIDEN, Commanderiepoort 4

J. DEN BOEFT

F. GASSER, *Germana Patria*. Die Geburtsheimat in den Werken römischer Autoren der späten Republik und der frühen Kaiserzeit (Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 118). Stuttgart/Leipzig, Teubner, 1999. 260 p. Pr. DM 89,-.

In Federico Fellini’s film *La strada* (1954) the *ingénue* Gelsomina asks the strongman Zampanò: “Zampanò, ma voi di dove siete?”. Zampanò evades answering this question about his roots, and thus confirms his essential rootlessness as a travelling player and as an apparently sub-human creature. It is a passing moment in the story of the film, but crucial all the same for the characterization of Zampanò: an ordinary civilized person has a native place.

It seems to be an almost universal characteristic of human society to express an interest in the place of origin of one’s fellow beings, where they were born, grew up and are now established. People commonly feel a strong attachment to their place of origin. In the book under review, a 1998 Zürich dissertation, Franziska Gasser seeks to establish the nature of this attachment in a number of Roman authors. In as many chapters she discusses Cicero and Arpinum, Catullus and Transpadania, Sirmio in particular, Vergil and Mantua, Horace and Apulia and Lucania, Venusia in particular, Propertius and Assisi, Ovid and Sulmo, Livy and Padua, Statius and Campania, Naples in particular,

Martial and Bilbilis, and Plinius Minor and Comum. Some other prose authors whose works have to offer but little of relevance, are hidden away in a long digression in the final, summarizing chapter.

Cicero sets the tone, because he is the only one to put the *germana patria* (*patria naturae*, *patria loci*) explicitly in opposition to the *patria civitatis* (*patria iuris*). Now if with Cicero we consider the authors under discussion to have two *patriae*—and to be confronted by that fact, for all of them left their place of birth for Rome and for a share in the “grosser Welt” (p. 147)—what is the exact position of the *germana patria*? Do they in fact feel an attachment for their place of origin, a *Heimatverbundenheit* (p. 11), and if so, what form does this attachment take? And with these questions we plunge *in medias res*, without much discussion of how *Heimat*, and the feelings it evokes, should be understood. The author refuses any definition: “Eine Definition des Begriffes ‘Heimat’ würde den Zugang zu den Nuancen des Verhältnisses der einzelnen Dichter zum Ort ihrer Herkunft erschweren, ja verwehren” (p. 50). I cannot possibly see why this should be the case. If, however, this is true, than G. has no privileged access to her sources either, because she obviously makes use of definitions, albeit implicit ones, as when she states: “Ohne Bedenken lässt sich aber feststellen, dass ein Herkunftsort dann zur ‘Heimat’ im engeren Sinne wird, wenn eine gefühlsmässige Binding zu ihm besteht” (p. 50), or when she repeatedly stresses that the German romantic overtones of the concept of *Heimat* are not appropriate when dealing with ancient sources.

The author expressly wants to put her analysis of the sources into a historical context. She is after *Lokalpatriotismus*, *campanilismo*, as a historical, and not a purely literary phenomenon. To that end she provides an introductory chapter about the juridical status of communities and their inhabitants within the Roman empire, and spends much energy on issues of *Dichtung und Wahrheit* (we will come back to that). She does a good job, but I think she would have reached even better results when she *would* have provided some discussion of *Heimat*, *Geburtsheimat*, *Wahlheimat*, *Ziehheimat*, *Lokalpatriotismus* and whatever jargon, preferably with reference to some theoretical and empirical social science studies (on issues of local or regional identity and culture, sense of community, multiple or contested identities, and so on). There is neither a generalized background nor any comparative material, which might be considered problematic in much historical research, but is especially so when the sources are as difficult to interpret as in the present case.

All this said, I come back to my praise of this work as “a good job”. G. provides us with a very thorough commentary on a number of relevant texts. She gives full credit to her predecessors, and castigates

them when she feels they have disregarded the evidence (especially M. Bonjour, *Terra natale. Études sur une composante affective du patriotisme romain* [Paris 1975], is singled out for much, deserved, criticism). These heavily annotated discussions may look somewhat dull on the page, but when one starts reading one is easily captivated by the pleasant style of this remarkably well-written book—at least I was. Though with a somewhat unattractive typography, the book is very well-produced, with hardly any misprints.

Because of the task that G. has set herself, she is constantly forced to ask herself whether any mention of a place that can be connected with an author's biography is there because of real heart-felt feeling, or for some other reason (as a literary *topos*, or, more prosaic, in order to please a patron, and so on). I give some examples of her soul-searching: on Horace: "Neben den Bildern und Vergleichen finden wir eigentliche Erinnerungen an die Heimat oder zumindest das, was der Dichter als solche darstellt" (p. 79); on Ovid: "Wo bleibt neben so viel künstlerischem Wollen, ja beinahe rhetorischem Gespür für das rechte Wort am rechten Platz das wahre Empfinden für die Landschaft der Heimat?" (p. 105); on Statius: "In diesem Gedicht werden Gefühle ausgedrückt, wie sie der rommüde Dichter für die *germana patria* hegte, und zwar trotz des Suasoriencharakters im Grunde wohl authentische" (p. 146); on Martial: "Wer möchte aber entscheiden, was davon letztlich noch mit dem eigenen Fühlen in Einklang steht?" (pp. 182-3). On the one hand, I want to stress that she handles these questions in an excellent manner, reaching conclusions that are quite persuasive; on the other hand, it is obvious that usually no conclusive answers are possible at all.

How authentic is these authors' interest, or more than that, in their native place? One might say that something can be read from the very fact that they do mention the place at all. G. in her striking honesty sometimes manages to cast doubt on even that simple argument. Still, it is two prose authors, Cicero and Pliny—not Livy, in whose work there is no room for any panegyric of his place of birth—who seem to show, with all necessary reservations, some of the realities of *Heimatverbundenheit*, especially Pliny with whom we enter a different realm, that of epigraphy, attesting the role played by the "important sons" of a community who after having prospered in the wider world return to favour their place of origin. Even here, with what one might call her trump card, G., ever cautious, warns of idealism overrated and opportunism underrated, but in the end she comes down, rightly I think, on the side of genuine feeling.

G. not only seeks to establish whether we are dealing with genuine feelings, she also tries to pinpoint what those feelings are. Some of this

is not very remarkable, e.g., that Roman authors show no romantic love for scenery of wildness and grandeur, and in doing so make no exception for their birthplace, is nothing new. But otherwise the texts are carefully analyzed, and G. hands out well-considered labels like Cicero's nostalgia and pride in his ancestry, Catullus' newly discovered sense of home, Martial's dream of the good life, and so on. As G. perceptively remarks, these characterizations of the authors' *Heimatverbundenheit* look more or less like characterizations of the authors and their work in general (p. 225). She explains this from the intimate and personal nature of the feelings concerned, but also from the fact that we do not have an opportunity to look at these feelings "objectively"—we can only see them as part and parcel of the individual works concerned, and they take on the colour of their surroundings. This is another example of G.'s commendable sense of the limitations of her own work. Nevertheless, we can agree with her, I think, that we have some testimonies on our hands which show something of the importance of the *germana patria* to Roman society, that strange, but strong feeling, that *nescio quid*, as Cicero puts it, which one feels for one's native place. Even if a true historical assessment of these testimonies is still standing out, we have G. to thank for laying some firm foundations.

NL-2253 LJ VOORSCHOTEN, Welterdreef 85

F.G. NAEREBOUT

THOMAS GÄRTNER, *Klassische Vorbilder mittelalterlicher Trojaepen* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 133). Stuttgart und Leipzig, B.G. Teubner, 1999. 580 pp. Pr. DM 178.—

Imitation was a fact of poetic life as much for medieval Latin poets as it was for writers in ancient Rome. Classical authors were expected to re-write their models in creative ways, aware, even before Quintilian's famous remark, that imitation alone was not sufficient (*Inst.* 10.2.4). The comparative studies of Stephen Hinds and others have recently uncovered new levels of complexity in the literary effects that Roman epic poets achieved by inserting citations from earlier poets into their own narratives. The Latin epic poetry of the middle ages offers similar opportunities for this kind of comparative analysis. By the twelfth century the language of Latin epic was a kaleidoscope, made to a marked degree from fragments of ancient and medieval poetry, which poets constantly shifted into different patterns to suit their own particular ideological purposes. Thus some medieval poets coloured their works with phrases, hemistichs and entire lines from classical poetry in