



# Durham E-Theses

---

## *Callimachus and Catullus in a Quest for Liberty*

SBERNA, DANIELE

### How to cite:

---

SBERNA, DANIELE (2017) *Callimachus and Catullus in a Quest for Liberty*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/12331/>

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

**Daniele Sberna – *Callimachus and Catullus in a Quest for Liberty***

Although studies of Callimachus's crucial influence upon Catullus abound, my thesis purports to provide new insights to an old question. I argue that Callimachus bequeaths a quest for liberty to Catullus. Each of the three chapters devotes its Greek half to one aspect of this Callimachean quest and its Latin half to the way in which Catullus Romanises such a pursuit. Specifically, in chapter 1, I submit that through the combination of two metaphors in the *Reply to the Telchines* (namely Μοῦσα λεπταλέη and σχοῖνος Περσίς) Callimachus stakes his claim to poetic freedom. Thereafter, I propose that Catullus's decided adoption of Callimachean λεπτότης through the word *lepos* does not merely amount to the espousal of a poetic tenet. Rather, it heralds his infringement of the *mos maiorum* thanks to the social overtones of *lepos* even if, as poem 16 illustrates, Catullus is aware of his contemporaries' malevolent reactions. Subsequently, in chapter 2, I set forth that Callimachus refuses to abide by the principle of τὸ πρέπον, which governs the convenient relationship between subject-matter and linguistic register. Thereupon, I propound that Catullus embraces Callimachus's rebelliousness against the criterion of τὸ πρέπον. In so doing, despite the anxieties about his own attitude, which he voices in the last stanza of poem 51, Catullus conveys his own politically charged noncompliance with two staples of Roman seemliness (*honestum otium* and *utilitas* of the written fruits of leisure). Then, in chapter 3, I maintain that Callimachus masterfully succeeds in blending encomiastic poetry in praise of members of the Ptolemaic court with assertions of his poetic excellence. Finally, I put forward that, in his *carmina* addressed to socially superior individuals, Catullus absorbs and bolsters the Callimachean heritage: he reciprocates respect with poetic gifts and retaliates arrogance by means of vitriolic abuse.

# **Callimachus and Catullus in a Quest for Liberty**

Daniele Sberna

Thesis submitted to the Department of Classics and Ancient History, Durham University,

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

30<sup>th</sup> May 2017

## Table of Contents

Abbreviations .....	3
Declaration .....	4
Acknowledgements .....	5
Dedication.....	6
Introduction... ..	7
Chapter 1: From Callimachus’s λεπτότης to multifaceted <i>lepos</i> in Lucretius, Catullus and Cicero .....	57
1.1 Introduction .....	57
1.2 Μοῦσα λεπταλή versus σχοῖνος Περσίς: Callimachus stakes his claim to poetic freedom .....	60
1.3 From Μοῦσαν λεπταλήν to <i>musaeo lepore</i> : Lucretius’s paradoxical reception of Callimachus .....	78
1.4 Catullan passion for <i>lepos</i> and proclamation of liberty.....	85
1.5 Cicero’s dismissal of <i>lepos</i> in the orations and his conditional endorsement thereof in <i>de Orat.</i> .....	96
Chapter 2: Callimachus and Catullus against appropriateness.....	114
2.1 Introduction .....	114
2.2. The Telchines’ slanderous insinuation of childishness on Callimachus’s part... ..	117
2.2.1 Aristotle and his successors on τὸ πρέπον .....	123
2.2.2 Callimachus in opposition to τὸ πρέπον.....	129
2.3 Catullus and Cicero on <i>otium</i> .....	135
2.3.1 Cicero and his obsession with <i>honestum otium</i> .....	135
2.3.2 Catullus’s <i>inhonestum otium</i> .....	145
Chapter 3: Liberty and patronage.....	161
3.1 Introduction .....	161

3.2 Callimachus vis-à-vis the Ptolemaic court.....	165
3.3 Catullus face to face with his <i>amici superiores</i> .....	187
Conclusions .....	218
Bibliography .....	230

## Abbreviations

Standard abbreviations for collections and editions of texts and for works of reference are used. The following may also be noted:

<i>AP</i>	<i>Anthologia Palatina.</i>
<i>FGE</i>	D. L. Page, <i>Further Greek Epigrams</i> (Cambridge 1981).
<i>OLD</i>	P. G. W. Glare, <i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i> (Oxford 1982).
<i>LSJ</i>	H.G. Liddell – R. Scott – H. Stuart Jones – R. McKenzie – P.G. W. Glare, <i>Greek-English Lexicon, with a revised supplement</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> ed., Oxford 1996).
<i>RE</i>	A. Pauly – G. Wissowa – W. Kroll et al. (eds.), <i>Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> (Stuttgart-Munich 1893-1980)
<i>SH</i>	H. Lloyd-Jones – P. Parsons, <i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> (Berlin-New York, 1983).

All dates are BC, unless otherwise indicated.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to begin by expressing my gratitude to my three mentors. Above all, I am profoundly grateful to Prof. Ivana Petrovic, my first supervisor, or, in Callimachus's words, a Μοῦσα λεπταλέη: through all the stages of my postgraduate journey, she has been a generous source of support, inspiration and patience. I am also truly beholden to Dr Peter Heslin, my second supervisor: he has opportunely helped me to bring my work to completion. Likewise, I am much obliged to Prof. Irmgard Männlein-Robert for her bounteous hospitality during my Erasmus placement in Tübingen.

Concerning my nearest and dearest, I am deeply indebted to all my European *dulces comitum coetus* (to borrow from Catullus), to my family, most especially, my parents.

Finally, I am really appreciative of Ms. Kate Hillier, who has painstakingly polished my English.



To my parents: without you, nothing would have ever begun.

## Introduction

Beyond doubt, my study of Callimachus's crucial and multifaceted artistic influence upon Catullus walks a well-trodden path: as the literature review reveals, from the 1930s until the present day, it has been constantly putting generations of Latinists and Hellenists to the test. For all that, aware of the most recent developments in Callimachean and Catullan scholarship, in each of the three chapters of this thesis, I provide new answers to old questions. Namely, I argue that Callimachus's quest for liberty in the aesthetic realm and in his interactions with the Ptolemaic court is fruitfully appropriated by Catullus in his own pursuit of autonomy from the *mos maiorum* (subordination of literature to the political life and usefulness of the written work to the community) and in his unflinching relationships with socially superior individuals.

In more detail, concerning Callimachus, I start by developing an idea originally advocated in my 2011 Durham MA dissertation taking on board the arguments contained in the opening chapter of Acosta-Hughes and Stephens' 2012 monograph 'Callimachus in Context'. I submit that through the combination of Μοῦσα λεπταλέη (Fr. 1.24 Harder, on whom I depend for the *Aitia*) and σχοῖνος Περσίς (Fr. 1.18 Harder) Callimachus stakes his claim to poetic freedom. To sustain the paramount programmatic value of Μοῦσα λεπταλέη, in the first place, I traverse all the other programmatic Callimachean occurrences of λεπτός-λεπταλέος: *H.* 3.242-243, Fr. 228.14 Pfeiffer, *Ep.* 27 Pfeiffer (upon whom I rely for the text of the *Epigrams* and the remaining fragments) and Fr. 54.15 Harder. In the second place, I focus on the σχοῖνος Περσίς and put forward that it does not simply refer to a disproportionately long unit of measurement. Rather, thanks to the amalgam of the

enslaving Persians with the sinister symbol of thralldom, I set forth that it alludes to aesthetic criteria clipping the poet's wings, above all Plato's and Aristotle's determination to subjugate poetry to their own agendas and legislate about proper composition. Then, I propound that Callimachus rejects the principle of τὸ πρέπον (the subjugation of style to subject matter), thus triggering his opponents' reproach that he behaves παιῖς ἄτε (line 6). My hypothesis builds upon Cozzoli's fruitful decipherment of the complex phrase in line 6, according to which Callimachus collapses any barrier between high and low registers and opts for a 'childish' mixture of solemn and common vocabulary, Homeric phrases and technical jargon, common or iambic and comic words turned into mock-epic diction.<sup>1</sup> Finally, I submit that Callimachus's relationship with members of the ruling family and eminent courtiers revolves around his acute awareness of his pivotal and active role in shaping wide-ranging royal propaganda. By consequence, while lavishing his extraordinary talent on praising his sovereigns and on turning them into deities, Callimachus consummately succeeds in blending encomiastic poetry with renewed assertions of his poetic excellence. I put forth that, when he celebrates his kings' military triumphs, he draws a parallel between their supremacy on the battlefield and his defeat of his rivals in the artistic arena; when eulogising the queens, he brilliantly co-opts them as high divine guarantors of his poetic creed.

Catullus Romanises each of these Callimachean claims.<sup>2</sup> I first discuss the way in which Catullus translates λεπτότης with the etymologically related *lepos*. In so doing, not only does he award priority to the stylistic criteria of refinement, but, thanks to the charged force of *lepos* as a marker for the preference for Hellenism and individualism, he espouses these values alongside a circle of like-minded friends, poles apart from the *mos maiorum*. Secondly, by transplanting the violation of πρέπον into his collection, Catullus feels

---

<sup>1</sup> See Cozzoli (2011): 420-421 with literature and Cozzoli (2012): 111 with literature.

<sup>2</sup> As Ledentu (2004): 281 very perceptively notes, a robust proof of the unparalleled potency of Catullus's affiliation consists in the fact that Callimachus's is the 'seul nom de poète ancien qui soit cité dans le recueil'.

entitled to compose trifles (*nugae* and *lusus*) instead of penning time-sanctioned compositions, such as an annalistic celebration of the glory of Rome, which abide by the rule of *utilitas* for society at large. These immature artistic games make *senes seueriores* (remarkably akin to the malicious and ancient Τελχῖνες) sternly frown upon the poet, all the more so insofar as they ensue from an *otium*, which shuns *honestas*: Catullus never bothers to prove that his leisurely hours do not interfere with official *negotia*, which he rejects so to retire into the private sphere away from the *forum*. In sketching this picture, however, I do not aim to erase the tensions fissuring it: suffice it to mention here *carmen* 16 and the last stanza of poem 51. Still, all his anxieties notwithstanding, Catullus never disavows his choices in favour of a more traditional conduct. Finally, through his rapports with individuals from more illustrious families, his deportment devolves proudly on their attitude towards him: if they respect him, he opts for Callimachean poems as suitable sorts of artistic presents; besides, just like his Alexandrian predecessor, he subtly mingles the granting of his dedicatees' wishes with utterly personal themes (love for Lesbia and the dejection he feels about his brother's demise). If, on the contrary, his *amici superiores* trample over him, he pays them back unremittingly with vitriolic verses. Nevertheless, even in these cases, for instance in the poems hurled at the overbearing praetor Memmius, behind the surface of Catullus's crudely sexual vocabulary, Callimachus's presence makes itself felt by way of an inversion of the erotic vocabulary he deploys for his queen Berenice II.

My thesis is part of an intense and ceaseless inquiry into the fertile relationship between Callimachus and Catullus, which stretches across the past eighty-five years and, by and large, conforms to three main perspectives: the essence of Callimachus's heritage, the specific Catullan *carmina* modelled on Callimachus, and Catullus's attitude towards Callimacheansim. To delineate the evolution of this *Forschungsgeschichte*, I split it up into four chronological blocks in view of the homogeneous traits, which each cluster shares:

from 1931 to 1959, philologists searched for Callimachean templates espoused by Catullus and tended to embrace Kroll's late-Romantic gulf yawning between Callimachus's dispassionateness and Catullus's spiritedness. Into the mix (and, from a modern viewpoint, surprisingly) they paid decidedly scant attention to Hunt's publication of *POxy 2079*, in which he spotted fragments of the *Aitia* prologue, at the close of 1927.<sup>3</sup> As I see it, this largely depended on the fact that *carmen 95* was regarded as the fundamental Catullan allegiance to Callimachus. Besides, the chief archetypes of this Catullan composition had already been identified in the two Callimachean epigrams 9.507 (*Ep. 27 Pfeiffer*) and 12.43 (*Ep. 28 Pfeiffer*) in the *AP*. As a result, in the few cases in which the *Reply to the Telchines* was considered, it was employed simply to buttress the poetological force of *carmen 95*. A more profound reason may have dwelled in the persistent underestimation of *carmen 1*, whose full status as a Callimachean manifesto was not in fact recognised until Syndikus's pivotal 1984 elucidation of the poem.<sup>4</sup>

Subsequently, from 1959 to 1990, scholars reacted to Quinn's and Wimmel's excessive endeavours (in 1959 and 1960, respectively) to downplay Catullus's indebtedness to Callimachus and conspicuously enlarged the scope of Callimachus's impact on Catullus. Concurrently, they embraced new theoretical approaches, most notably the New Criticism<sup>5</sup> and its alertness to the artistry of the poems; despite that, they failed to get rid of the above-mentioned chasm between icy Callimachus and fiery Catullus.

In fine, from 1990 to the present day, notwithstanding Newman's attempt to minimise Catullus's Callimacheanism in 1990 (to a degree along the lines of Quinn and Wimmel), scholars at last discarded Kroll's chasm between Callimachus and Catullus, addressed their

---

<sup>3</sup> For a dependable survey of the reactions to this historic discovery see Benedetto (1993): 1-26.

<sup>4</sup> 'Der programmatische Charakter des Widmungsgedichtes wurde vielfach nicht bemerkt, weil es sich so ganz locker und anspruchslos, so ganz als spontane Augenblickseingebung gibt' – Syndikus (1984) I: 76.

<sup>5</sup> Gaisser (2007): 10-11 and 14-15

relationship through the lenses of intertextuality and, by degrees, explored the depths of Catullus's reception of Callimachus.

The springboard for the philological pursuit of Catullus's debt to Callimachus manifested in the final column of Herter's 1931 entry *Kallimachos* in the fifth *Supplementband* to *RE*: 'Am fruchtbarsten war seine (*scil.* Kallimachos') Wirkung [...] in Rom: [...] im Kreise der Neoteriker tritt sie uns vor allem bei Catull greifbar entgegen'.<sup>6</sup> All the same, Herter's generic recognition of Callimachus's imprint on Catullus squarely lacked any accurate investigation thereof. One year later, Hezel endeavoured to provide it in his booklet 'Catull und das griechische Epigramm'.

In conformity with the title of the revised version of his dissertation, in subsections entitled *Literarkritik*<sup>7</sup> and *Liebe*,<sup>8</sup> Hezel dealt exclusively with a handful of Callimachean epigrams and a few Catullan polymetrics and epigrams. Under the first rubric, Hezel broached Catullus's *carmen* 95 as a reworking of Callimachus's technical creed in *Ep.* 27 Pfeiffer and *Ep.* 28 Pfeiffer. In so doing, he laid the foundations of the status of this composition as *the* Catullan declaration of Callimachean aesthetics, which was later propped time and again and persisted well into the 1980s. Similarly, when dealing with *carmen* 1, Hezel discriminatingly unearthed the reverberation of Callimachus's *Fr.* 7 Harder (as I state in the methodological section of the introduction, this is the edition to which I conform for the *Aitia*) beneath the penultimate line of the poem in question, which thereafter went unnoticed until 1967.<sup>9</sup>

On his reading, whereas in poem 95 Catullus lagged behind his master in terms of elegance and pithiness, which resulted in an overwrought composition, an instantiation of

---

<sup>6</sup> Herter (1931): 452.

<sup>7</sup> Hezel (1932): 34-39.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*: 53-56.

<sup>9</sup> See Avallone (1967): 73-74, but, in fact, his insight was ignored by Syndikus in his superb 1984 commentary, where this recognition was finally granted canonical status. Indeed, the first treatment of *carmen* 1 as programmatic, albeit not in Callimachean terms, did not appear until 1955.

his being ‘päpstlicher als der Papst’,<sup>10</sup> in programmatic poems addressed to friends such as *carmina* 14 or 35, he succeeded in making his personal touch tangible: ‘Erlebnis und Tendenz fließen zusammen, Leben und Theorie bilden eine Einheit’.<sup>11</sup>

Under the second heading, Hezel pored over the amorous poems 70, 72, 75, 83, 85 and 92,<sup>12</sup> which, he claimed, were all moulded from Callimachus’s *Ep.* 25 Pfeiffer. Regardless, Hezel’s view holds true exclusively for *carmina* 70, 72 and 92:<sup>13</sup> *carmen* 75 reworks the comic *adulescens*;<sup>14</sup> *carmen* 83 accommodates multiple hermeneutic layers,<sup>15</sup> of which Callimachus’s epigram 25 is devoid; *carmen* 85 is beholden to several other antecedents.<sup>16</sup> Overall, Hezel concluded that Catullus acquired from Callimachus ‘[i]nnere Zerrissenheit als Ergebnis grausamster Enttäuschung [...] [und] die schärfste Präzisierung gegensätzlicher Empfindungen’,<sup>17</sup> but had to resort to his own inventiveness in ‘die Fixierung des psychologisch Feinsten, die Unterscheidung von “himmlischer und iridischer Liebe”’.<sup>18</sup>

Whilst I do subscribe to Hezel’s appreciation of Catullus’s additions to his Callimachean templates, I dissent from the scholar’s grasping of the nature thereof: in general, albeit couched in fairly discreet terms, his phrasing was predicated upon an ill-conceived gulf between a cold-hearted Callimachus and a tender Catullus, which, as the abundant references encourage one to assume, ultimately went back to Kroll’s late-romantic<sup>19</sup> and

---

<sup>10</sup> Hezel (1932): 35.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*: 37.

<sup>12</sup> Incidentally, these poems failed to catch scholarly eyes until 1950, with the sole partial exception of Wheeler – see pp. 13-14 below.

<sup>13</sup> Cp. Young (2015): 182-196 with literature for a thought-provoking problematisation of the relationship between Callimachus’s *Ep.* 25 Pfeiffer and these Catullan compositions.

<sup>14</sup> Cp. Uden (2006): 19-34 with bibliography.

<sup>15</sup> See Nesholm (2012): 686-695 with literature.

<sup>16</sup> Cp. Gutzwiller (2012): 82.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*: 56.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*: 56.

<sup>19</sup> Cp. Quinn (1959): 30 for a telling parallel between Kroll’s pithy statement and Shelley’s image of the poet as a skylark.

weighty<sup>20</sup> conception of a two-faced Catullus: ‘Catull zeigt zunächst ein doppeltes Antlitz, einmal das des von schwerer Tradition belasteten Alexandriners, dann das des urwüchsigen Naturburschen. Er [...] wurde auf die alexandrinischen Vorbilder hingewiesen, unter denen Kallimachos in erster Reihe stand. Er hat das Handwerksmäßige bald bemeistert, ohne doch den Wert des Technischen zu überschätzen [...]. Aber [...] er hatte ein in Haß und Liebe leidenschaftliches Herz, das ihn in allen heftigen Stimmungen zur Schreibtafel trieb: ohne Schonung gegen sich und andere gab er allen seinen Stimmungen sofort Ausdruck, leicht reizbar und leicht versöhnlich’.<sup>21</sup> Lastly, Hezel sensed that Catullus injected an element unknown to the Hellenistic society into his amatory *carmina*, to wit ‘gleichgestellte Partner’;<sup>22</sup> despite that, Hezel failed to set Catullus’s liaison with Lesbia against the background of Roman *amicitia*,<sup>23</sup> but rather misguidedly evoked ‘die Unterscheidung von “himmlischer und iridischer Liebe”’.<sup>24</sup>

Two years later, in the United States of America, Wheeler’s 1934 volume ‘Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry’ commendably studied the impression, which previous traditions (both Greek and Roman) left upon the entirety of the Catullan corpus. The scholar’s method set the bar for several decades: scholarly interest gravitated round the *carmina docta*, which were perceived as the most patently Callimachean compositions, and one hunted down Catullus’s tokens of indebtedness to Callimachean poetic technique.

Initially, Wheeler opportunely delineated Catullus’s adherence to a Callimachean-oriented neoteric coterie, a topic which has ever since attracted scholarly attention.<sup>25</sup> Then, he distilled the school’s maxims in in the Catullan *carmen* 95 (*doctrina, breuitas* and *labor limae*), in which he, dissimilar to Hezel, did not unearth any Callimachean textual

---

<sup>20</sup> A fairer acknowledgement of the emotion imbuing Callimachus’s output came into being much later: Wimmel (1960): 71-72 did justice to the *Aitia* prologue; Gutzwiller (1998): 188-226 to the epigrams (but cp. n. 45 below on her more conventional evaluation of *Ep.* 25 Pfeiffer).

<sup>21</sup> Kroll (1922): vii.

<sup>22</sup> Hezel (1932): 56.

<sup>23</sup> Braga must be accredited with this advancement in Catullan scholarship – see p.19 below.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> See the other studies I review and cp. Hollis (2007): 1-8 with bibliography.



precedents.<sup>26</sup> Thereupon, after listing the sorts of small poems, which enjoyed Catullus's and the young poets' preference (the epithalamia, the epyllion, 'the pinnacle of artistic effort',<sup>27</sup> and the elegies), he subjected every Catullan *carmen doctum* to examination. The upshot was the detection of a Callimachean technical craft, which Catullus scrupulously respected: to wit, in the epyllion 64,<sup>28</sup> Wheeler posited that Catullus's narrative practice recalled Callimachus's *Acontius and Cydippe*. Nonetheless, this suggestion did not stand the test of time: modern scholars rather incline towards the *Victoria Berenices* or other passages.<sup>29</sup> Then, behind the elegies,<sup>30</sup> the scholar exemplarily detected Callimachus's consummate treatment of the erotic element, mastery of narrative techniques and prominent intervention of his personal voice.<sup>31</sup> Finally, he perspicaciously upheld that the Callimachean technique of the mimetic-dramatic *H.* 2, 5 and 6, where the poet featured as a master of ceremonies, helped Catullus to fashion his epithalamia<sup>32</sup> 61<sup>33</sup> and 62 – in the amoebaeon poem, however, Wheeler neglected the more pronounced influx of Theocritus's *Id.* 18.<sup>34</sup>

At the same time, Wheeler inspected Callimachus's weight upon Catullus's polymetrics and epigrams,<sup>35</sup> which, on account of a resemblance in themes and style (vulgarisms and colloquialisms), with no excessive heed to metrical differences, he treated as a whole distinct from the *carmina docta*. In cautious agreement with Kroll, Wheeler identified the main Catullan debt to Callimachus in the metrical variety, which typified the latter's

---

<sup>26</sup> Wheeler (1934): 81.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*: 120-152.

<sup>29</sup> See O'Hara (2007): 39 n. 13. While screening possible antecedents for line 111, the scholar mentioned a verse (Fr. 732 Pfeiffer), which although not attributed beyond dispute to Callimachus, can sensibly be ascribed to *Hec.*, but, unlike his modern colleagues, he did not favour it over other candidates – cp. *ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> Wheeler (1934): 153-182.

<sup>31</sup> Cp. Hunter (2013): 31-37.

<sup>32</sup> Wheeler (1934): 183-217.

<sup>33</sup> See Feeney (2013): 79-80 with literature.

<sup>34</sup> Cp. Hunter (2004): 466.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*: 218-241.

collection of *Iambi*.<sup>36</sup> In addition, he spotted some Callimachean verbal echoes in *carmina* 7, 36 and 70, but ruled out a more sweeping inspiration.

Yet, there are two facets of Wheeler's position to which I object: on the one hand, regarding the structure of the Catullan corpus, although my thesis does not tackle this knotty issue (cp. pp. 47-48 below), for all the recurrent topics and the roughly Hellenistic roots binding polymetrics and epigrams, later studies have proved that some technical patterns cleave the two portions (above all, word-choice and the different handling of the elegiac couplet in the long Callimachean elegies 65-68 and the epigrams 69-116).<sup>37</sup> Besides, with an eye to the polymetrics alone, I take metrical variety more seriously because of Catullus's noticeable sensitivity to this aspect – I shall expand on this in the methodological remarks (pp. 49-51). On the other hand, Wheeler's restricted evaluation of Callimachean resonances perplexes me: for example, his fleeting discussion of the phrase *carmina Battiadae* in *carmen* 116.2 omits its broader implications, which, by taking on board scholarly progress, I aim to spell out in chapter 3.<sup>38</sup>

After this American volume, over the following two decades, contributions to the construction of the rapport between Callimachus and Catullus emerged from continental Europe and were inaugurated by Paratore's 1942 'Catullo "Poeta doctus"', a revised version of his preparatory notes for lectures delivered at Catania University over the course of that academic year. Together with a declared and fruitful effort to locate Catullus within a neoteric movement – *de facto*, in continuity with Wheeler, whom, truth be told, Paratore never quoted – in my understanding, the most arresting novelty of this book resided in the commendable introduction of the *Reply to the Telchines* into the horizon of Catullan

---

<sup>36</sup> Cp. Fuhrer (1994): 102-106.

<sup>37</sup> This summarises the very core of Ross' 1969 monograph 'Tradition and Style in Catullus'. For a balanced and shareable evaluation of the assets and weaknesses of this book and the later literature it engendered cp. Morelli (2007): 534-541 and Feeney (2012): 47, both with bibliography. Further support to Ross's thesis is lent by Feeney (2012): 29-47, who goes by representation and textuality, and by Hutchinson (2012): 48-78 on the grounds of the picture of sexual desire.

<sup>38</sup> See pp. 197-198 below

studies. Fully aware of the poetological import of the *Aitia* prologue,<sup>39</sup> Paratore proposed that Catullus faithfully encapsulated the core programmatic tenets of this proemial elegy poetics into his *carmen* 95,<sup>40</sup> ‘manifesto letterario della nuova scuola dei νεώτεροι’;<sup>41</sup> therefore, the omission of Callimachus’s *Ep.* 27 and *Ep.* 28 Pfeiffer notwithstanding, the scholar boosted the status of this composition as the Catullan doctrinal profession of Callimachean poetics, which, as I explain below, attained its fullest range in Braga’s 1950 monograph. Lastly, in respect of methodology, foreshadowing of the tendencies to a degree, which became customary in the 1960s, Paratore investigated Catullan poetry with more regard to structure and style.

Subsequently, anew, and to a certain degree in the wake of Wheeler, Paratore submitted that Catullus’s Callimachean technique pervaded most patently in poems 63-66,<sup>42</sup> but qualified Wheeler’s evaluation with three new points. Firstly, he posited that these compositions partook in the common themes of love and marriage,<sup>43</sup> an observation to which I subscribe and which I develop in chapter 3.

Secondly, Paratore suggested that *carmen* 65 – the sole poem, which, apart from a few comments on *carmen* 68,<sup>44</sup> he extensively analysed in the final lecture<sup>45</sup> – originally opened the sequence of *carmina docta*.<sup>46</sup> In order to lend further support to his argument, Paratore attempted to enhance the Callimachean colour of the elegy by suggesting a reference to *Acontius and Cydippe* in the apple simile in lines 19-24.<sup>47</sup> Still, I find Paratore’s conjecture flawed: firstly, the thorny debate hinging on the original ordering of the Catullan collection

---

<sup>39</sup> Although the decoding of the still decidedly controversial lines 9-12 (Paratore (1942): 84-87), which took its cue from Coppola’s 1935 edition of Callimachus’s works, is out-dated by modern standards (cp. Harder (2012) II: 32-44 with bibliography), he must be credited with the estimable realisation that in the *Reply* Callimachus does not attack Apollonius (see *ibid.*: 81-84).

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*: 59-91.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*: 59.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*: 88.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*: 194-198.

<sup>44</sup> See *ibid.*: passim.

<sup>45</sup> See *ibid.*: 176-225.

<sup>46</sup> See *ibid.*: 188-193.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*: 198-221.

eludes any attempt to settle it – cp. my methodological remarks below (pp. 47-48). Secondly, although the allusion to *Acontius and Cydippe* in the coda of the poem under scrutiny enjoyed a remarkable critical fortune (as the remainder of my review shows), based on the vocabulary deployed, in chapter 3 I advance that Catullus does not drop a hint at that Callimachean elegy, but draws a contrast between his solicitude towards Hortalus's request for poetry and Lesbia's disregard for his love.<sup>48</sup>

Thirdly, Paratore appended that Catullus derived the amorous themes of the *carmina docta* from Philitas's elegies,<sup>49</sup> but this contention seems problematic because I think that the scholar overrated Catullan familiarity with Philitas: although Roman poets' acquaintance with the *Demeter* cannot be squarely ruled out,<sup>50</sup> conversance with the *Bittis* rests on shaky grounds.<sup>51</sup>

Three years later, in 1945, the third chapter of Alfonsi's 'Poetae novi: storia di un movimento poetico'<sup>52</sup> ought to be applauded on the following grounds: firstly, he reinforced Paratore's theory of a neoteric school (even without reference to his 1942 lectures) through an efficient sifting of the extant fragments ascribed to the *poetae novi*. Secondly, he uncovered the aesthetic debt, which both young Cicero and Lucretius owed to Callimachean aesthetics – as I illustrate presently, Bayet and Ferrero elaborated this in the early 1950s.

Contrariwise, what perplexes me is the fact that, in his construal of a Callimachean aura transfusing the Catullan oeuvre, Alfonsi utterly favoured second-hand access to

---

<sup>48</sup> See pp. 206-207 below.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*: 92-104, Paratore went so far as to suggest that in *carmen* 96, through a celebration of Calvus's elegies in honour of his departed beloved, Catullus signalled his embracement of Philitean topics. Even though the poem under scrutiny possibly contains an allusion to Calvus's verses in loving memory of the deceased Quintilia, Calvus is more likely to have composed *one single epicedion* (cp. Bellandi (2007): 341-384) – in truth, a handful of fragments reasonably ascribable to this composition do survive and are accurately inspected by Hollis (2007): 68-71. Lastly, if one searches for a Greek antecedent, one could concur with Hunter (2013): 30 and opt for Parthenius's three-book elegiac *epicedion* for his wife Arete.

<sup>50</sup> Hunter (2013): 29.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*: 36.

<sup>52</sup> Alfonsi (1945): 47-76.

Callimachus on the part of Catullus, with just a couple of exceptions. That is to say that, in his view, ‘la teoria delle λεπταί ῥήσιες e la callimachea preferenza per le opera di breve respiro’,<sup>53</sup> which imbued the loosely homogeneous *nugae* and epigrams,<sup>54</sup> was taught to Catullus essentially by Meleager;<sup>55</sup> similarly, Alfonsi contended that Parthenius of Nicaea initiated Catullus into the cultivation of Callimachean epyllion and learned elegies. That said, this position does not convince me: regarding Meleager, even if it is beyond a doubt that he carried weight with Catullus,<sup>56</sup> I object to Alfonsi’s dismissal of Catullus’s direct knowledge of Callimachean poetics in the short poems: my dissertation intends to validate Catullus’s engagement with several Callimachean poetological passages stemming from various works. Likewise, with respect to Parthenius, regardless of the fact that other scholars championed Parthenius’s role in the diffusion of Callimacheanism in Rome,<sup>57</sup> Alfonsi wrongly exaggerated it, particularly in the case of the epithalamia:<sup>58</sup> as Hunter conclusively established, one cannot ascribe the propagation of Hellenistic poetry to Parthenius alone, which was already known before his arrival as Cinna’s captive following the Mithridatic wars.<sup>59</sup> Consequently, I also challenge Alfonsi’s conviction that, through his elegies for his wife Arete, Parthenius prodded Catullus into penning patently personal amorous and funerary elegies: as already expounded above,<sup>60</sup> and on the basis of available

---

<sup>53</sup> Alfonsi (1945): 52.

<sup>54</sup> For the sake of accuracy, one ought to remember that Alfonsi noted a difference between the more pronouncedly spontaneous and lively *nugae* and the more detached and reflexive epigrams. On the differences between the two portions, though, see my observations above (p. 15).

<sup>55</sup> Alfonsi envisaged two unmediated Catullan appropriations of Callimachus: on the one hand, not unlike Paratore, he hailed *carmen* 95 as the neoteric school’s programme and he tracked down Catullus’s references to the *Aitia* prologue (less extensively than Paratore) and to *Ep.* 27 Pfeiffer (independently from Hezel). On the other hand, he posited a Callimachean ancestry for the *Attis*, which, according to him, Catullus chose owing to the challenging subject matter and the necessary mastery of language. For my own part, in line with Harder (2005): 65-86, I take to task the exclusive Callimachean origin championed by Alfonsi: Catullus dropped numerous hints at many more poets.

<sup>56</sup> See most recently Gutzwiller (2012): 79-111 with bibliography.

<sup>57</sup> Wheeler (1934): passim sensibly adopted a more prudent stance on this subject.

<sup>58</sup> Because of the complex parentage of the epithalamia, which I sketched in my review of Wheeler’s lectures (see p. 13 above), I find this claim by Alfonsi very hard to defend.

<sup>59</sup> See Hunter (2004): 465-466, where the scholar sensibly accords some plausibility to Parthenius’s impetus to the production of epyllia. For previous literature on this subject, cp. *ibid.*: 465 n. 96 and Nelis (2012): 6 n. 22.

<sup>60</sup> Cp. p. 16 above.

evidence, one can only speculate that Parthenius's elegiac complaint may have been reflected in Calvus's elegy for Quintilia.<sup>61</sup>

At the dawn of the following decade, in 1950, Braga put into print his praiseworthy monograph 'Catullo e i poeti greci', and dedicated the third chapter to Callimachus and Catullus.<sup>62</sup> Many valuable findings must be credited to him: above all, the discovery of lines 108-112 of *H. 2* as one of the Callimachean programmatic passages behind *carmen* 95 along with the already noted *Ep. 27* and *Ep. 28* Pfeiffer and the *Aitia* prologue.<sup>63</sup> This resulted in the decisive elevation of this poem to the rank of the quintessential declaration of Catullus's Callimacheanism, a pre-eminence that went undisputed until the mid-1980s. Similarly, utterly fertile was the fleeting apprehension of the moral components of the conflict between Callimacheanism and Roman morality, on which Bayet and Ferrero expanded a few years later: '[a]vranno concorso ad inasprire il tono delle critiche [...] anche gli sdegni degli uomini autorevoli, contrari alla nuova poesia perchè (*sic.*) di carattere leggero, di contenuto erotico, perchè aderente alla poesia ellenistica e avversa ai generi fioriti nella letteratura arcaica romana'.<sup>64</sup> By the same token, when addressing Catullus's rendition of Callimachus's *Coma Berenices*, in which he saluted 'desiderio di [...] dare al suo verso quella finitezza che adornava il distico greco',<sup>65</sup> Braga constructively counteracted (albeit inconsistently)<sup>66</sup> the tendency to highlight Callimachus's cold-heartedness: '[l]a scelta di Catullo (*scil. of the Coma Berenices*) fu certamente determinata dalla vaporosità delicata e dalla sentimentalità viva di questa elegia, dove Callimaco si

---

<sup>61</sup> See n. 49 above.

<sup>62</sup> Braga (1950): 19-50.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*: 115-123.

<sup>64</sup> Braga (1950): 115-116.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*: 128.

<sup>66</sup> Cp., for instance, the characterisation of Callimachus's essence as 'umanità superficiale' (*ibid.* 113) and the spiked jab at one of his epigrams: '[c]onvenzionalismi stucchevoli, astruserie di poeti a corto di motivi reali!' (*ibid.*: 133).

rivela [...] un poeta dalla sensibilità delicatissima, che sa effondersi in notazioni di dolce intimità'.<sup>67</sup>

Innovativeness marked Braga's classification of the three epigrammatic typologies, which Catullus inherited from Callimachus, as well: 'l'innamorato che tace';<sup>68</sup> 'l'*eros paidikos*';<sup>69</sup> 'il giuramento d'amore'.<sup>70</sup> Under the first heading, Braga concentrated to good effect on how Catullus rewrote the Callimachean *Ep.* 30 Pfeiffer in his *carmina* 6, 55 and 80 by creatively tweaking its motifs.<sup>71</sup> Under the second rubric, he dismissed the Iuventius cycle as a stilted imitation of the more impassioned Callimachean epigrams to Lysanias; at any rate, he thereby ignored the fervour igniting these Catullan poems, which Gaisser more felicitously grasped.<sup>72</sup> Under the third division, the rather aloof Callimachean *Ep.* 25 Pfeiffer was said to reverberate throughout *carmina* 70, 72, 76, 109, where Catullus enriched it with the injection of vibrant ardour and the sacrality of the semantic area of *foedus* and *amicitia*. Here, though I applaud Braga's grasping of the vocabulary of *amicitia*,<sup>73</sup> I dispute the chasm separating the detached Callimachus from the hot-blooded Catullus, which, by avowedly walking in Hezel's footsteps, Braga posited.<sup>74</sup>

Lastly, in the last-subsection of the same chapter,<sup>75</sup> Braga also categorically refuted both the Callimachean paternity of two verses in Galliambic metre, which Hephaestion attributed to him, and the impression of these lines on Catullus's *Attis*.<sup>76</sup> Subsequently,

---

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*: 125.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*: 130-136.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*: 136-138.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*: 138-145.

<sup>71</sup> In point of fact, one ought to point out that Skinner (1983): 141 traced only poems 6 and 55 back to the Callimachean epigram in question and other compositions in *AP*, but since, as Stevens (2013): 58 finely remarked, '[c]. 80 is quite similar to [...] c. 6 in theme and development', *carmen* 80 can be reasonably said to partake the same tradition. Braga's point is not invalidated even if one agrees with Campana (2012): 79-96 and, by means of some textual emendations, deciphers Gellius's activity as self-fellatio.

<sup>72</sup> See Gaisser (2009): 61-67 with literature.

<sup>73</sup> Williams (2012): 174-185 with bibliography testifies to Braga's sagacious valuation of this terminology in Catullus.

<sup>74</sup> Both Hopkinson (1988): 260 and Gutzwiller (1998): 293 confirm this appraisal of Callimachus's composition, but cp. Young (2015): 182-196 with literature for an inspiring reading of the relationship between Callimachus's *Ep.* 25 Pfeiffer and Catullus's *carmen* 70.

<sup>75</sup> Braga (1950): 145-154.

<sup>76</sup> Cp. the more judicious approach in Hunter (2004): 478 with bibliography and Nauta (2005): 87-119.

rather too radically, he confined Hellenistic patterns to mere reminiscences and labelled the *carmen* as an original Catullan creation.<sup>77</sup>

In 1953, Bayet wrote his labyrinthine essay ‘Catulle, la Grèce et Rome’<sup>78</sup> in the multi-authored volume ‘L’influence grecque sur la poésie latine de Catulle à Ovide’. I was particularly impressed by the scholar’s penetrating charting of the intellectual climate, which, in all likelihood, profited from his training as a historian.<sup>79</sup> Bayet admirably brought into light Catullus’s rebelliousness towards Roman *gravitas*<sup>80</sup> and pitted him and Lucretius against Cicero in regards to withdrawal from and participation in the political arena.<sup>81</sup> On top of that, following Braga, but more extensively, he salutarily rescued the short poems from the neglect which had enshrouded them over the previous twenty years, and went so far as to crown them as the supreme achievement of Catullus’s Callimachean<sup>82</sup> renovation of Latin literature.<sup>83</sup>

Just the same, this came about at the cost of a questionable evaluation of the *carmina docta* in keeping with what he regarded as Catullus’s chief artistic achievement and somewhat misleadingly defined ‘Atticisme’:<sup>84</sup> ‘coïncidence toute simple entre la nature de la pensée (ou du sentiment) et l’élégance non cherchée de l’expression’,<sup>85</sup> or, in other words, ‘simplicité ailée, tendue de passion’<sup>86</sup> – thereby, incidentally, he ended up fortifying

---

<sup>77</sup> See the more nuanced and prudent exposition in Harder (2005): 65-86 with bibliography.

<sup>78</sup> Bayet (1953): 3-39.

<sup>79</sup> Jal (1989) I: 502-503.

<sup>80</sup> Bayet (1953): 19-20.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*: 18-19 and 37-38.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*: 5-10 (‘Problèmes techniques du néotérisme’), with an eye on language, Bayet plausibly descried Callimachus’s spirit presiding over Catullus’s vigilant fine-tuning of the previous poetic Latin vocabulary (an amalgam of the far-fetched and rather hefty coinages of Latin tragedians and the coarse, spicy and realistic diction of Roman satirists). Likewise, in the metrical province, he pertinently perceived that Catullus surpassed Callimachus because of his superior assortment, but neglected the probable precedent set by Callimachus’s *Iambi* – cp. my methodological tenets below (pp. 49-51). In the structural realm, still, Bayet barred, erroneously in my estimation, any debt to Callimachus, but disregarded the mimetic-dramatic *Hymns* 2, 5 and 6, which frame Catullus’s epithalamium 61 – see n. 33 above.

<sup>83</sup> ‘Une révolution littéraire souvent rayonne moins par les plus ambitieuses de ses entreprises que par ses créations plus spontanées’ (Bayet (1953): 17).

<sup>84</sup> In fact, Bayet did not clearly signal that he was conforming to the criterion of ‘Atticisme’, but it seems to me that he had it already in mind when gauging the *carmina docta*.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*: 33.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*: 39.



the ‘Krollan-Hezelian’ misguided distinction between Callimachean ice and Catullan fire. This resulted in rather arbitrary assessments, such as of *carmen* 68, in which one missed adequate proofs: ‘[l]’idée de perfection formelle est exclue; celle aussi de l’unité e ton. Le charme n’en subsiste pas moins: celui d’une poésie qui se crée, et où Catulle est plus engagé que dans les *Noces*, *l’Attis* ou la *Chevelure*’.<sup>87</sup>

In 1955, partially in the same vein as Bayet, in the substantial chapter ‘La poetica di Catullo’<sup>88</sup> of his slender ‘Un’introduzione a Catullo’, Ferrero significantly contributed to the debate on trial. Many discoveries redounded to his credit: he admirably spotted *lepos* as the pivot of Catullus’s artistic creed,<sup>89</sup> studied the poetological force of *carmen* 1,<sup>90</sup> commented (not unlike Bayet) on the Catullan unconventional espousal of *otium*.<sup>91</sup> Lastly, and with far-sightedness, Ferrero pioneered the exploration of the coincidence between *Sprachstil* and *Lebensstil* in words such as *uenustas*, *urbanitas*,<sup>92</sup> which, nearly half a century later, were masterly systematised by Krostenko’s monograph ‘Cicero, Catullus and the Language of Social Performance’.

At the same time, in his turn, arguably under Croce’s guidance,<sup>93</sup> Ferrero repeatedly buttressed the discrepancy between Callimachean coldness and Catullan heat. First and foremost, Ferrero tore apart the twosome consisting of Callimachus’s λεπτός and Catullus’s *lepidus*, which now is generally taken for granted and which I purport to further reinforce in chapter 1.<sup>94</sup> One might lament this as one of the most unfortunate contentions of his: it persisted until 1972, when Latta started to counter it; however, it took another decade before it was more thoroughly secured by Syndikus (see below).

---

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*: 14-15.

<sup>88</sup> Ferrero (1955): 43-93.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*: 47-48.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*: 50-56.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*: 64-66.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*: 56-62.

<sup>93</sup> Within the chapter, Ferrero explicitly solely quoted a passage from Croce’s ‘La Poesia’ in n. 14 on page 50, but admitted to his Crocean affiliation elsewhere: see Gianotti (2013): 226.

<sup>94</sup> Cp. primarily *ibid.*: 48-49, but see also *passim*; in actuality, though, the scholar allowed for a small degree of continuity (*ibid.*: 48), in particular regarding ‘la raccolta poetica di vario stile ed argomento’ (*ibid.*: 49).

I group together a second cluster of research published between 1959 and 1990, which, in essence, opposed the two monographs, which for all their different angles and dissimilar agendas, dramatically downplayed Callimachus's impact upon Catullus: Quinn's 1959 'The Catullan Revolution' and Wimmel's 1960 'Kallimachos in Rom'.

Quinn's 1959 'The Catullan Revolution', through the professed lenses of modernism,<sup>95</sup> captivately opened with a more positive appraisal of Hellenistic poetry<sup>96</sup> and the resolve to jettison Kroll's Janus-faced Catullus.<sup>97</sup> Having said that, as the argument unfolded, not only did the scholar relapse into the customary underestimation of Hellenism,<sup>98</sup> but he also proceeded to the point of drastically and wrongly parting company with the results of the above reviewed studies. For the sake of a (in itself) not undesirable endeavour to vindicate Catullus's Latin models,<sup>99</sup> Quinn obliterated an indispensable constituent of Catullan poetics, which, as I hope to illustrate, represents a pillar of what Quinn regarded as the 'revolution': a high degree of independence and the abandonment of serviceability to the community.<sup>100</sup>

The following year, regardless of an apparently promising title, Wimmel's learned monograph 'Kallimachos in Rom' magnified the devaluation of Callimachus's significance for Catullus. His focal points, however, were different from Quinn's: methodologically speaking, Wimmel did not pledge loyalty to New Criticism, even if a

---

<sup>95</sup> The quotation from Eliot's essay 'Dante' on page 3 ushers in the critical viewpoint informing the entire monograph; after everything, as Martindale (1999): x astutely remarked, the book 'contains relatively few close readings [...]. Superficially, it appears more a work of literary history'.

<sup>96</sup> Quinn (1959): 5 slauted a 'great fresh wave of new poetry'.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*: 27-31.

<sup>98</sup> See for example *ibid.*: 50 '[W]hen Hellenistic poets made usual the fashion of writing in the first person, a coldness, a withholding of self persisted'; and *ibid.*: 59-60 'The diction of Hellenistic poetry is [...] an odd jumble of worn, pretentious literary archaism. Despite the many technical achievements of that brilliant movement, we see here a symptom of disease, the result of making poetry in a kind of literary laboratory'.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*: 7-18, where Quinn singled out three main branches: the epic-tragic, the comic-satirical and the epigrammatic.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*: 24-26.

certain enhanced responsiveness to literary issues seems to me to have manifested itself amid the decidedly philological structure of his *Habilitationsschrift*.<sup>101</sup>

In addition, as the subtitle ‘Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit’ indicates, his chief concern lay with the way in which the core of Callimachus’s apologetic poetry (the coda of *H. 2* and, more sharply, the *Reply to the Telchines*, according to Wimmel) chiefly appealed to the Augustan poets because it equipped them with suitable means to couch their *recusationes* of epic poetry solicited by imperial propaganda. Accordingly, the scholar claimed that since Catullus lacked both ‘ein eingeformtes gegnerisches Prinzip’<sup>102</sup> (‘Eines-Sein, Durchlaufend-Sein, mehrere tausend Verse, Könige und Heroen als Stoff’)<sup>103</sup> and the ‘Not, wie sie eine generation Später die Dichter bedrängte’,<sup>104</sup> he limited his Callimacheanism to a simplified mixture of *Ep. 27 Pfeiffer* and *Ep. 28 Pfeiffer* (*Kunstkritische*, according to Wimmel, but not imbued with *Apologetik*) in his *carmen 95*.<sup>105</sup> Put differently, Catullus only impugned ‘übergrosse Länge und lässiges Arbeiten [...] und allgemein schlechte Qualität des Dichtens’:<sup>106</sup> he played the role of a predecessor in charge of undertaking ‘die Schmeidigung des sprachlichen Rohstoffs und die Wahl poetisch tragender Prägungen’.<sup>107</sup>

Consequently, in three key ambits, I beg to disagree: chiefly, in line with more recent elucidations of the *Aitia* prologue, such as the one authoritatively championed by Hunter in his chapter on Callimachus in the 2004 monograph ‘Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry’,<sup>108</sup> I interpret the elegy as hinging upon matters of style, rather than genre. Secondly, in continuity with some of the precedent and ensuing contributions reviewed above and below, I posit that, to articulate his own poetics, Catullus does engage

---

<sup>101</sup> Cp. the extensive dissection of the *Reply* *ibid.*: 71-123.

<sup>102</sup> Wimmel (1960): 129.

<sup>103</sup> Wimmel (1960): 75.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*: 129.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*: 130-131.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*: 129.

<sup>108</sup> Hunter (2004): 66-76.

with the *Reply* and other programmatic passages. Lastly, Wimmel's contention that 'die jungen Leute der Bürgerkriegszeit im Grunde [...] dichten konnten, wie sie wollten'<sup>109</sup> missed the very Roman sort of 'antagonistic principle', by which any republican author belonging to senatorial or equestrian ranks was expected to abide. Any such writer had to prove the *utilitas* of his written output and demonstrate that this artistic activity did not interfere with his official *negotia*. Therefore, in chapter 2, I submit that instead of complying with this revered rule, Catullus flaunts his cultivation of a Callimachean poetry wanting in serviceability to the community over leisurely hours devoid of a single speck of *honestas*.

Against the backcloth of the harsh blow dealt to the decoding of Catullus's Callimacheanism by Quinn and Wimmel, I turn attention to such contributions, which, in harmony with the principles of New Criticism,<sup>110</sup> especially from the late 1960s, attempted to tip the scales. One of the most recurring targets was *carmen* 1, which, gradually, thanks to numerous articles, attained a thorough appreciation of its programmatic Callimacheanism. Additionally, in harmony with more wide-ranging currents in Catullan studies,<sup>111</sup> one understood Callimachus's leverage on the Catullan corpus and framed Catullus's Callimacheanism in the intellectual and historical background.

The shock caused by Quinn and Wimmel began to be absorbed due to Clausen's celebrated 1964 article 'Callimachus and Latin Poetry': even if, like Wimmel, he focused more on the Augustans, Clausen restored Catullus *carmen* 95 to its status of programmatic allegiance to Callimachus and, autonomously from Braga, stressed the resonances from the close of Callimachus's *H.* 2.<sup>112</sup> Besides, by clashing with Wimmel and Quinn, he promoted Parthenius of Nicaea as the chief sponsor of Callimacheanism in Rome upon his arrival in

---

<sup>109</sup> Wimmel (1960): 129.

<sup>110</sup> On New Criticism and Classics see Martindale (1999): vii-x.

<sup>111</sup> Cp. Gaisser (2007): 15-16.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*: 190 the scholar very tentatively appended that *carmen* 95 may have also been affected by six lines from Parthenius's eleventh Πάθημα, which narrated Byblis' incestuous love for her own father.

the capital not long after 73;<sup>113</sup> still, he qualified his statement with the insightful rider that ‘Parthenius’ teaching alone could not have produced such a renovation [...]: he spoke to listening ears’.<sup>114</sup>

Even so, aside from his extraordinary ‘ability to combine German “knowledge” with English “feeling”’<sup>115</sup> and his balanced openness to New Criticism,<sup>116</sup> the most meaningful advancement in the understanding of the relationship between Callimachus and Catullus brought about by Clausen was encapsulated here: ‘they (scil. Catullus and the neoterics) felt some artistic kinship with Callimachus; [...] like Callimachus, they were in a defensive position. Their objection to epic poetry was not, I think, merely esthetic (sic.), as it had been for Callimachus; it was moral as well’.<sup>117</sup> The scholar elucidated this inspiring contention by recourse to Virgil and Propertius. For my own part, I develop it with an eye on Catullus’s infringement of the expected *utilitas* of his poetic output: this Catullan move, as it were, amounts to defiance of a Roman sort of ‘antagonistic principle’, to borrow a phrase from Wimmel, and manifests itself in the guise of a Latinising of Callimachus’s infraction of literary appropriateness.

Three years later, Avallone published ‘Catullo e i suoi modelli Alessandrini’.<sup>118</sup> Although his methodology was still reminiscent of the philological perspective of the 1940s, Avallone embarked on a painstakingly detailed comparison between the extant portions of Callimachus’s Fr. 110 Harder and Catullus’s *Coma*,<sup>119</sup> which partook in ‘New-

---

<sup>113</sup> Clausen formulated his theory unaided by handlings of Parthenius published in the preceding decades, such as the one by Alfonsi reviewed above.

<sup>114</sup> Clausen (1964): 192. On the progressive abandonment of this scholarly stance on Parthenius see n. 47 above.

<sup>115</sup> Ross (1989): 307.

<sup>116</sup> Gaisser (2007): 13-14 overstates it.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*: 192-193.

<sup>118</sup> The core argument originally appeared between 1941 and 1947, but Avallone ceaselessly updated his book over the following thirty years. In 1964 Avallone had published ‘Catullo e i suoi modelli greci classici’

<sup>119</sup> Avallone (1967): 14-36.

critical' close reading.<sup>120</sup> Other notable novelties in comparison with anterior studies included the detection of Callimachean templates for *carmina* 4<sup>121</sup> (*Ep.* 5 Pfeiffer),<sup>122</sup> 34<sup>123</sup> (*H.* 3),<sup>124</sup> and 86<sup>125</sup> (*Ep.* 51 Pfeiffer).<sup>126</sup> Having said that, one recurrent shortfall appears lamentable: notwithstanding Avallone's efforts to set himself free from Kroll's two-faced Catullus even by dint of a more generous assessment of Callimachus's artistry,<sup>127</sup> *de facto*, already in the foreword, he could not help falling under its spell: 'quel tale dato di cultura (scil. Alexandrian), quel tale residuo erudito è divenuto in lui (scil. Catullus) elemento vivo, fremito di vita, palpito di anima'.<sup>128</sup>

In 1972, through a rewarding mixture of New Criticism<sup>129</sup> and German philology, Latta's major article 'Zu Catulls Carmen 1' seminally established the poetological correspondence between *lepidum* and λεπτόν;<sup>130</sup> nonetheless, until the late 1970s and mid-1980s, *carmen* 95 retained its station as *the* programmatic manifesto of Catullus's Callimacheanism.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> Avallone never expressly acknowledged his methodological affiliation; at the same time, the habit of not stating one's methodological allegiance practice remained customary until the final decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century – cp. Skinner (2003): xxviii.

<sup>121</sup> Avallone (1967): 61-64.

<sup>122</sup> Cp. Young (2015): 93-94 with bibliography.

<sup>123</sup> Avallone (1967): 53-64.

<sup>124</sup> Cp. Danker (1997): 139-143.

<sup>125</sup> Avallone (1967): 69-70.

<sup>126</sup> Cp. Krostenko (2007): 216.

<sup>127</sup> 'Catullo non poteva non sentir pure tutta la bellezza e la novità della poesia alessandrina: di quella poesia che, lungi dal saper tutta o solo del chiuso di biblioteca e dell'olio di lucerna, spesso era anche felice prodotto dello spirito' (Avallone (1967):11).

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*: 9.

<sup>129</sup> The bibliographic repertoire induces one to assume that this was spurred by the two influential American essays 'Catullus I, His Poetic Creed, and Nepos' (Elder (1966): 143-149) and 'Catullus, c. 1' (Copley (1969): 153-155); by contrast, Latta did not consult Alfonsi and Ferrero.

<sup>130</sup> '[L]epidum das alexandrinische Stilwort λεπτόν mitanklingen lässt' (Latta (1972): 204). To be exact, Latta made the link even more overt in the course of the concluding *Exkurs* (*ibid.*: 213): '*lepido – versus* bei Catull 6, 17 ist [...] nicht viel verschieden von den λεπταί / ῥήσιες [...] Call. Epigr. 27,3f. (Pfeiff.)'.

<sup>131</sup> Latta's recognition of Catullus's programmatic Callimacheanism in *carmen* 1 was confirmed by Wiseman (1979): 167-174, the chapter on 'The Dedication Poem' in his monograph 'Clio's Cosmetics' – cp. also the discriminating observations on the intellectual background in *ibid.*: 154-66. Afterwards, it was brought to completion in Syndikus's 1984 authoritative commentary on the poem in the first volume of his 'Catull: Eine Interpretation': *ibid.*: 72-73, not only did the scholar solidly join *lepidus* with λεπταλέος and the diminutive *libellus* with the sanctioning of the *kleine Form* in the *Aitia* prologue. These findings were recently restated and enriched in Knox (2007): 151-171. In his essay 'Catullus and Callimachus' in the *Blackwell Companion to Catullus*, with an eye on *carmina* 1, 36, 64, 65, 66, 95 and 116, Knox productively posited Catullus's full-scale commitment to the Callimachean corpus ranging from the *Aitia*, to the *Iambi*, the *Hecale* and the *Epigrams*.

For, in 1975, Buchheit's article revealingly entitled 'Catullus Litearkritik und Kallimachos' glozed over Latta's contribution<sup>132</sup> and centred afresh upon poem 95. Aside from recapitulating all previous treatments of the subject, Buchheit enriched the picture with both an expedient tinge of New Criticism<sup>133</sup> and sensible intent to anchor the composition in the historical context. Whereas this move led him to capture Catullus's infringement of the *mos maiorum*,<sup>134</sup> his line of inquiry suffered two drawbacks: on the one hand, in the trail of a position that is now no longer tenable (cp. below), Buchheit equated Catullus with Callimachus in view of their withdrawal from their similarly disintegrating political communities.<sup>135</sup> On the other hand, while endeavouring to solve the probably unfathomable<sup>136</sup> quandary which revolves around whether one ought to identify the Hortalus recipient of the translation of the *Coma Berenices* with the Hortensius pilloried in *carmen* 95,<sup>137</sup> Buchheit propounded that poem 65 constituted a subtle jibe at the addressee with the purpose of demonstrating his exclusion from the neoteric circle. However, his hypothesis failed to notice both the obligations inherent in Roman *amicitia* and Catullus's inferior social standing, which represents an indispensable starting point in the understanding of the diptych comprising *carmina* 65 and 66.

In 1982, through an effective amalgam of philology and New Criticism,<sup>138</sup> Granarolo published the learned summa of his life-long commitment to Catullus,<sup>139</sup> the overarching 'Catulle, ce vivant'.<sup>140</sup> In the first half of the insightful eighth chapter ('Poétique et

---

<sup>132</sup> Buchheit (1975): 21 n. 2.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*: 35.

<sup>134</sup> 'Die Erschütterungen in Rom seit der Gracchenzeit und besonders seit den sullanischen Wirren mit all ihren Folgen haben zu der Gegenbewegung geführt, wie wir sie [...] in der Negierung jeglicher Tradition durch die Neoteriker und in ihrer provokatorischen Verherrlichung der eigenen Welt erkennen' (Buchheit (1975): 34).

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*: 34-35.

<sup>136</sup> Contemporaneously, Latinists tend to agree on this prudent conclusion: cp. Bellandi (2007): 155-157 with bibliography and Stroup (2010): 279-280 with literature.

<sup>137</sup> To make matters worse, the complete loss of line 4 prevents one from grasping the contours of Catullus's barb; cp. Buchheit (1975): 39-43 with bibliography for an overview of preceding scholars' opinions.

<sup>138</sup> It manifested itself most conspicuously in the study of linguistic and metrical aspects.

<sup>139</sup> See the bibliography at the end of the volume that lists all his numerous studies.

<sup>140</sup> The book ranged from the poet's biography to the transmission of his work to the discussion of three sections of his output.

facture’),<sup>141</sup> Granarolo concerned himself with ‘Catulle et l’alexandrinisme’ with the purpose to ‘serrer de près la manière dont Catulle a hérité des leçons essentielles de l’alexandrinisme, et comment il a su y réagir personnellement’.<sup>142</sup> Accordingly, he aptly awarded the lion’s share to *lepos*, but unconvincingly exaggerated its compass and inappropriately broke it down into three unrelated concepts: *concininitas*,<sup>143</sup> *uariatio*<sup>144</sup> and *urbanitas*.<sup>145</sup> Furthermore, even if Granarolo purported to discard Kroll’s interpretation, by submitting that Catullus ‘[...] sait opérer la transmutation de tous les “procédés” en valeurs passionnelles’<sup>146</sup> and that ‘[c]’est en enrichissant [...] ses images au moyen de son expérience personnelle la plus directe, la plus vécue, que Catulle a su tirer le meilleur parti de la τέχνη hellénistique’,<sup>147</sup> he ended up espousing the gulf between a brisk Catullus and a stiff Callimachus.<sup>148</sup>

In 1988, the Catullan sub-section<sup>149</sup> of the mostly literary-oriented<sup>150</sup> chapter (‘Roman Poetry’) of Hutchinson’s monograph ‘Hellenistic Poetry’ was refreshingly focused upon the structural complexities of (most especially) *carmina* 63, 64 and 68: according to the scholar, in summary, Catullus appropriated Hellenistic constructional subtleties enhancing the tension between empathy and distance, and added a personal touch of extravagance. In spite of many astute observations on the conundrums in poems 63, 64 and 68,<sup>151</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> Granarolo (1982): 135-167.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*: 139.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*: 140-142.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*: 142-144.

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*: 144-147. Concerning *urbanitas*, to some extent, Granarolo foreshadowed the more solid conceptualisation of *urbanitas* and *lepos* as two distinct concepts within the framework of the ‘language of social performance’ in Krostenko (2001): 233-290.

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*: 148.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*: 160-161.

<sup>148</sup> In point of fact, already in the choice of the title of his monograph, he seems to me to have betrayed his basic dependence upon that hermeneutic paradigm.

<sup>149</sup> Hutchinson (1988): 296-325.

<sup>150</sup> For the sake of accuracy, one ought to point out that Hutchinson did not entirely neglect Catullus’s historical and cultural context (cp. *ibid.*: 26-298) and, by expounding the neoterics’ predecessors in acclimatising Hellenistic poetry into Rome, he highlighted the Callimachean essence of Cicero’s youthful poems and, sagaciously, of the more mature *Cons.* – on this cp. Volk (2013): 93-112.

<sup>151</sup> On *carmen* 64 cp. O’Hara (2007): 33-54 with literature; on poem 63 see Hunter (2004): 479-480 with bibliography; on elegy 68 cp. Leigh (2016): 194-224 with bibliography.



Hutchinson's ease in drawing a neat demarcation between sympathy and detachment strikes me as rather arbitrary. For example, to Hutchinson, *a misera assiduis quam luctibus externavit / spinosas Erycina serens in pectore curas*<sup>152</sup> (64.71-72): '[t]he tone is warm and strong, although characteristically the reference to Venus and the picturesque *spinosas* "thorny" somewhat mitigates the appearance of involvement'.<sup>153</sup> Having said that, he did not attempt to corroborate his contention regarding the force of the attribute.<sup>154</sup> Lastly, on a deeper level, throughout his analysis, still under Kroll's unremitting shadow, Hutchinson essentially conceived Hellenism as a source of technical tools and accredited the pathosto Catullus.<sup>155</sup>

In reaction to the consolidation of Catullus's Callimachean affiliation, somewhat in the same vein as Quinn and Wimmel three decades earlier, Newman's 1990 monograph 'Roman Catullus and the Modification of the Alexandrian Sensibility' purported to advocate Catullan Romanness. Through the joint lenses of ancient generic theory and Russian formalism (most especially Bakhtin's 1965 'The Literary Creation of François Rabelais and the Popular Culture of the Middle Ages and Renaissance'),<sup>156</sup> Newman spared no effort to wrest Catullus away from the Alexandrian monopoly and situate him in the Latin satiric tradition. Among the plentiful angles from which the scholar mounted his attack against a narrowly Callimachean Catullus, I pick up the lexical côté insofar as it chimes with my own methodology; therefore, I concentrate on chapter 1 'Some Terms of Art',<sup>157</sup> in which Newman reappraised established banners of Catullan Callimacheanism such as *lepos*, *doctus* and *nugae*, and vindicated their Roman (and more specifically

---

<sup>152</sup> 'Oh wretched one, whom Venus Erycina drove out of your wits through incessant sorrows by sowing thorny concerns in your bosom'

<sup>153</sup> Hutchinson (1988): 305.

<sup>154</sup> Cp. my dissection of this passage in chapter 3.

<sup>155</sup> 'The use of structure to complicate is very plainly linked with the Hellenistic poets [...]. But the extremity and extravagance which make Catullus so different might well be thought of something Roman, in a sense' (*ibid.*: 324).

<sup>156</sup> See Newman (1990): 466 for the full list of critical texts that shaped the monograph most conspicuously.

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*: 3-42.

Plautine) extraction. Even if I sympathise with Newman's emphasis on Catullus's indebtedness to Plautus,<sup>158</sup> I protest his conclusions. Broadly speaking, I think that the overstatement of the Plautine (and, more generally, comic) sway over Catullus can be imputed to the scholar's steadfast reliance on Bakhtin's book; regarding matters of detail, I explain my individual objections presently.

Apropos *lepos*, in the first place, Newman submitted that in Plautus's comedies, 'playing a game with', 'making sport of' were implied.<sup>159</sup> Although the scholar was certainly right in stressing the peculiarly Roman traits of *lepos*, he disregarded that, by the first century, *lepos* had become intimately connected with Hellenism. For, as Krostenko convincingly demonstrated, one's attitude towards *lepos* (and other lexemes of the 'language of social performance') revealed whether one attempted to reconcile Hellenism, aestheticism and individualism with the *mos maiorum* or whether one defied tradition by embracing it.<sup>160</sup> Krostenko proved that Catullus fell under the second category (with some anxieties);<sup>161</sup> besides, he urged one to decipher Catullus's embracement of Callimachean λεπτός by dint of *lepos* against this backcloth.<sup>162</sup> In my first chapter, by heeding Krostenko's argument, I enrich the picture with an ample exploration of the quest for liberty inherent in Callimachean λεπτότης and, in light of this, I re-approach Catullus's adoption thereof.

In regards to *doctus*, in the second place, Newman launched into substantiating the Latinity of the adjective: he contested the Alexandrian colouring, which is customarily

---

<sup>158</sup>On the Catullan *persona* as a variation of the Plautine *adulescens* in love in the Lesbia poems, see literature listed in Hanses (2014): 227 n. 8; on the more general impact of Roman comedy on Catullus see bibliography catalogued in Karakasis (2014): 197 n.1.

<sup>159</sup>*Ibid.*: 12. Gunderson (2015): 127 defined Plautine *lepidus* as "'lovely" but/because also "tricky"; see *ibid.*: 127-150 for a study of the programmatic import of this word in Plautine comedies.

<sup>160</sup>Krostenko (2001): 21-34.

<sup>161</sup>*Ibid.*: 233-290.

<sup>162</sup>*Ibid.*: 256-257.

attributed to Catullus 1.5-6 (*cartis / doctis*)<sup>163</sup> and 65.2 (*doctis uirginibus*).<sup>164</sup> To corroborate his claim, Newman called firstly upon a Plautine passage (*Pseud.* 724-725),<sup>165</sup> in which, as he rightly maintained, the attribute does not mean ‘learned’, but rather ‘expert’<sup>166</sup> touching “‘streetwise” cunning’.<sup>167</sup> But this is hardly the whole story: on the one hand, Newman omitted the contextualisation of the Plautine lines: the *doctrina* at hand does not entail education because it refers to an attribute of the sort of right-hand man, whom the clever trickster-slave Pseudolus needs in order to win over the favour of the pretty Phoenician for his master Calidorus.<sup>168</sup> On the other hand, *pace* Newman,<sup>169</sup> the occurrence of *doctus* in *Pseud.* cannot be taken as illustrative of the force of the attribute in the entirety of Plautine comedy: for example, in the poetological section of *Most.* (407-415), in line 412, the attribute *docti* concerns Plautus’s activity as a poet.<sup>170</sup>

Concerning *nugae*, finally, the scholar justifiably posited that it was ‘not *prima facie* a Hellenistic term’,<sup>171</sup> but pointed rather to ‘the deceptive reality of the slave, the lover, the parasite, the comic playwright’;<sup>172</sup> in addition, Newman fruitfully compared Catullus’s labelling of his poems as *nugae* in 1.4 with Cicero’s disparaging posture towards the

---

<sup>163</sup> Although the controversy over whether Catullus compliments Cornelius Nepos on his *Chronica* in earnest or ironically wards off dissipation, a fortiori owing to the extremely meager remains of Nepos’s work, a Hellenistic *doctrina* seems to have impregnated it – cp. Stem (2012): 1-11 with literature.

<sup>164</sup> Since poem 65 introduces Catullus’s rendition of the Callimachean *Coma Brenices*, an apostrophe to the Muses as *doctae*, aside from being fairly common in Latin (cp. Moreno (2015): 15-16), appears particularly appropriate.

<sup>165</sup> *Malum, callidum, doctum.*

<sup>166</sup> Cp. *OLD s.u.* 2.

<sup>167</sup> Newman (1990): 19.

<sup>168</sup> On this passage, which illustrates the way in which cunning functions as the slave’s unique means of self-assertion in Plautine theatre, see Stewart (2012): 183.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*: 19.

<sup>170</sup> Cp. Frangoulidis (2014): 131. This cues a more sweeping comment on the significance of *doctus* in connection with poets and poetry (cp. *OLD s.u.* 3): from the first century onwards, the adjective virtually always accompanies any mention of Greek and Latin poets regarding their specific skill – see Moreno (2015): 16-18 with bibliography. So, the Ciceronian and Lucretian passages adduced by Newman to prove that ‘[w]hen *doctus* is applied to poets, [...], there is still something not quite straightforward about it’ (Newman (1990): 19) fail to satisfy. In support of my criticism, see Dyck (2003): 142 on *doctus Simonides* in *Nat. D.* 1.22.60; Chahoud (2010): 95-96 on *doctus Lucilius* in *De or.* 2.6.25; Maltby (2014): 359-362 on *ueteres Graium docti* [...] *poetae* in *DRN* 2.600, and Shearin (2015): 56-58 on *doctis* [...] *dictis* *DRN* 5.113.

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*: 7.

<sup>172</sup> *Ibid.*: 18.

word.<sup>173</sup> At the same time, on the basis of flimsy evidence,<sup>174</sup> Newman went so far as to implausibly uphold an unattested<sup>175</sup> connection between *nugae* and *mortualia*.<sup>176</sup> To boot, he laboured this last point so as to claim that Catullus's preoccupation with his brother's tragic demise, with which solely elegies 65, 66 and 68 and epigram 101 explicitly concern themselves, was harbingered from the very beginning of the collection.<sup>177</sup> Lastly, his thesis completely bypassed the bewilderingly knotty issue hinging upon the unknown editor of the present ordering of the Catullan oeuvre – cp. my methodological remarks below (pp. 47-48).

In 2004, Hunter successfully took up Newman's challenge in the third section ('*Graecia capta*'),<sup>178</sup> of the final chapter ('Roman Epilogue')<sup>179</sup> of 'Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry', the 2004 path-breaking monograph co-authored with Fantuzzi. In this sub-section, Hunter synthetically mooted the interaction between Hellenistic poetry and Latin literature from its beginnings to the Augustan age abreast of the advancement in Greco-Roman intertextuality.<sup>180</sup> Hunter very plausibly maintained that, although '[k]nowledge at Rome of some Hellenistic poetry can be established for the second century',<sup>181</sup> only in the first century and, most conspicuously, in Catullus and the 'neoteric'

---

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*: 36-37. In this connection, Newman might also have tackled the intriguing hypothesis that Catullus chose the humble designation of *nugae* to mockingly echo his opponents' scathing censure of his work – cp. for example Cairns (1951): 203; Elder (1967): 146-147; Latta (1972): 205.

<sup>174</sup> The only passage in which the two nouns occur simultaneously is *Asin.* 808, a verse delivered by a *parasitus* after he has read out the terms of a contract: *haec sunt non nugae: non sunt enim mortualia*, 'these words are not idle talk: these are not silly funeral dirges'. The line, though, does not bear witness to Newman's alleged incorporation of *nugae* into the funerary rites – on this subject see Hope (2009): 65-96 with bibliography. The punch-line, instead, hits the mark because *nugae* and *mortualia* only share the core idea of 'triviality': the former roughly translates as 'rubbish', whereas the latter means 'funeral dirges devoid of sense'. Consequently, the ironic joke emphasises that the agreement is substantial – cp. Habinek (2005): 241. Habinek also speculated about another possible interpretation of the line in question: the *parasitus* may draw a comparison between the materiality of the written support of the deal and *mortualia* as 'winding-sheets, [...] useless, disgusting pieces of cloth wrapped around the corpse'.

<sup>175</sup> Cp. *OLD s.u. nugae*.

<sup>176</sup> Newman (1990): 32-36.

<sup>177</sup> *Ibid.*: 35-36.

<sup>178</sup> Hunter (2004): 461-467.

<sup>179</sup> Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004): 444-485.

<sup>180</sup> *Ibid.*: 461 with literature.

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid.*: 462. In particular, Hunter inspected Ennius, Plautus and Terence. More recent scholarship, by contrast, inclines towards a more optimistic position (see n. 182 below).

circle, one might observe ‘clear evidence of the importance at Rome of an Alexandrian aesthetics which depended upon ideas of literary hierarchies and “canonical” texts’.<sup>182</sup> Afterwards, in ‘*Verbum pro verbo*’, the scholar praiseworthy pored over the Latin terminology designating ‘translation’ (*exprimere, conuertere, reddere*, etc.) along the spectrum of ‘a continuum of allusive, intertextual practices’.<sup>183</sup> Thereafter, in ‘Poetry or Translation?’, Hunter seminally investigated Catullus’s standpoint on this gamut of habits as ranging from *expromere* to *exprimere* in poem 65.<sup>184</sup> Finally, in ‘Catullus’ *Attis*’,<sup>185</sup> apart from discerningly<sup>186</sup> spotting allusions not just to Callimachus but also to other Hellenistic poets such as Apollonius, Theocritus, Hunter innovatively<sup>187</sup> construed the galliambics of *carmen* 63 as, inter alia, a deviation from the paradigm provided by the hexameters of *carmen* 64.<sup>188</sup>

Two years later, conforming more strongly on intertextuality,<sup>189</sup> in the second and third sections (‘Catullan and Callimachean similes’<sup>190</sup> and ‘Catullus 68’<sup>191</sup>) of the second chapter (‘Nothing like this before’)<sup>192</sup> of his outstanding monograph ‘The Shadow of Callimachus’, Hunter continued his exploration of Catullan Callimacheanism in the *carmina docta* by focusing on the similes. Accordingly, Hunter began by cogently showing that similes function as prime sites of *ars*, in which Callimachus and his Roman disciples

---

<sup>182</sup> *Ibid.*: 464. In point of fact, more recent scholarship has inclined towards a more optimistic position on the subject of the familiarity of early Latin authors with Callimachus. On Ennius (above all in the opening dream of his *Annals* and the remnants of the prologue to Book 7 (Fr. 206 Skutsch)) see Barchiesi (2011): 515-517, Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 208-210; by contrast, Fisher (2014): 32-35 dimmed the emphasis on Greekness to highlight the Italic elements. On Plautus see Barbiero (forthcoming); on Terence’s prologues see Sharrock (2009): 79-83. Still, Hunter’s prudence remains indispensable.

<sup>183</sup> *Ibid.*: 469. In her comprehensive study of Latin vocabulary designating translation, Young (2015): 6-12 underpins Hunter’s train of thought, even without quoting his monograph.

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid.*: 474-475. I expand on his penetrating remarks in my dissection of *carmen* 65 in chapter 3.

<sup>185</sup> *Ibid.*: 477-485.

<sup>186</sup> Cp. my frequent quotation of these pages in the preceding parts of my literature review.

<sup>187</sup> See Nelis (2012): 11 n. 42 and Hardie (2012): 225 n. 42.

<sup>188</sup> Hunter (2004): 483-484.

<sup>189</sup> Hunter (2006): 1-6 with literature.

<sup>190</sup> *Ibid.*: 88-108.

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*: 102-108.

<sup>192</sup> *Ibid.*: 81-114.

confront the preceding poetic tradition.<sup>193</sup> Subsequently, after tellingly broaching the rare and boldly experimental Callimachean similes,<sup>194</sup> Hunter authoritatively vetted Catullan similes and their Callimachean antecedents (64.100-111,<sup>195</sup> 65.15-24<sup>196</sup> and 68.51-66<sup>197</sup>). I only demur at his elucidation of 65.15-24: as I propose in chapter 3,<sup>198</sup> if one inspects echoes from the story of Acontius and Cydippe, one notices that, contrary to the Callimachean apple, the Catullan *malum* carries *no* inscription. Besides, by my lights, via the simile, Catullus implies that, whereas the *oblita uirgo* has failed to remember the apple and has let it drop, he has *not* let Hortalus's words slip his mind and has sent his friend the requested Callimachean translation.

Six years later, by probing the depths of reception in Hunter's footsteps, at the head of the concluding chapter ('In my end is my beginning')<sup>199</sup> of their 2012 monograph 'Callimachus in Context: From Plato to the Augustan Poets', Acosta-Hughes and Stephens spotted the whole gamut of Callimachus's production in poems 1, 5, 7, 65, 66 and 116, but they generally advocated a more problematic reception.<sup>200</sup> For instance, in their analysis of the opening poem,<sup>201</sup> by calling attention to the difference between the four books of the *Aitia* and the far smaller extension of the Catullan polymetrics, they argued that Catullus may wish to show that he can be even more Callimachean (in conciseness, elegance and newness) than the actual Callimachus.<sup>202</sup> Yet, although I concede that not even the whole collection of extant Catullan *carmina* could surpass the *Aitia* in regards to number of lines, poetologically speaking, as Acosta-Hughes and Stephens admit, it is Callimachus that sets

---

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*: passim.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*: 89-98.

<sup>195</sup> *Ibid.*: 98-100.

<sup>196</sup> *Ibid.*: 88-89 and 101-102.

<sup>197</sup> *Ibid.*: 102-108.

<sup>198</sup> See pp. 206-207 below.

<sup>199</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 204-274.

<sup>200</sup> *Ibid.*: 214-233.

<sup>201</sup> *Ibid.*: 221-225.

<sup>202</sup> In their decipherment of *carmen* 1, Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 221-225 independently reach some of the conclusions of Batstone (2007): 235-253.

the rules; in addition, the scholars left unnoticed other programmatic Callimachean *carmina* such as 95, which, as shown above, was for many decades been taken as the most explicit token of loyalty to Callimachus. Then, when studying *carmen* 116 and its threatening annunciation of venomous lines in retaliation to Gellius's mistreatment,<sup>203</sup> along with Knox,<sup>204</sup> they detected an echo of the transition from the *Aitia* to the *Iambi*. At the same time, unconvincingly, as I explain in more detail in my terminal chapter,<sup>205</sup> by following in previous Latinists' footsteps, they dimmed the Callimachean import by unearthing a novel allegiance to Ennius. Then again, I would like to highlight my agreement with their explanation that Catullus's choice of the *Lock of Berenice* was owed to the appealing themes of loss and conjugal eroticism, which permeate the Callimachean elegy.<sup>206</sup> Finally, as it were answering Hunter's questions about the intimate value of *carmina Battiadae*, they compellingly intimated that, through the expression, both in 116.2 and in 65.16, Catullus counterbalanced his emotion-driven dearth of words by recourse to Callimachus.<sup>207</sup>

Once again in 2012, in his essay 'Callimachus in Verona'<sup>208</sup> within the volume 'Callimachus: Poems, Books, Readers', after a concise review of scholarly decipherments of Callimachus, Catullus and their relationship, Nelis stressed the Ptolemaic component of Callimachus's production and propounded that Catullus did not ignore it.<sup>209</sup> As his case study, Nelis selected the epyllion 64, in which he unearthed allusions to the sinister consequences brought about by the marriage of Pompey with Caesar's daughter Julia in 59.<sup>210</sup> Now, although I am fully receptive to Nelis's quest for a Catullan response to Callimachus's court poetry and to explore it in the poems he dedicates to his *amici*

---

<sup>203</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 219-220.

<sup>204</sup> Knox (2007): 163-165.

<sup>205</sup> See pp. 200-201 below.

<sup>206</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 228-229 and 231.

<sup>207</sup> *Ibid.*: 215.

<sup>208</sup> Nelis (2012): 1-28.

<sup>209</sup> *Ibid.*: 1-11.

<sup>210</sup> *Ibid.*: 12-28.

*superiores* (10, 28, 65-66, 68 and 116), I am at variance with his construal of *carmen* 64. As Du Quesnay and Woodman remarked in their utterly stimulating ‘Epilogue’ of the same volume,<sup>211</sup> the puzzling elusiveness of *carmen* 64, even in terms of chronology, casts a doubtful shadow on the hypothesis that Catullus could have foreshadowed the ominous outcome of an ordinary political wedding.<sup>212</sup>

Most recently, Young’s 2015 monograph ‘Translation as Muse’ beneficially located Catullus’s translation practices within his contemporaries’ practice and examined all the repercussions of this activity in its capacity as a site, in which Romans negotiated their own identity *vis-à-vis* by conquering Greece.<sup>213</sup> Moreover, when ploughing through *carmen* 66,<sup>214</sup> she scrutinised it from three perspectives: as a challenging translation, as an exchange between two Roman individuals and as the beginning of an elegiac *libellus*, which, under the aegis of Callimachus, stretches until poem 116. Whilst I am at odds with the last thread of her inquiry, I find the first two more convincing, even if I have the impression that Young underestimated Hortalus’s higher social standing. In fine, I was persuaded by her construction of Callimacheanism in poems 5 and 7 as a foreign good imported by Catullus into Rome, upon which he bestows a wholly personal and remarkable value, much to the bewilderment of greedy traditionalists, who cannot convert it into exact amounts of sesterces.<sup>215</sup>

Concerning more individually the Callimachean field of studies, my dissertation above all owes much to two monumental editions of two Callimachean works with translations and elucidations, which represent the land-marking achievements of their respective authors’ life-long commitment to Callimachus: Harder’s 2012 two-volume commentary on the *Aitia* and Stephens’s 2015 commentary on the *Hymns*. Among their numerous merits

---

<sup>211</sup> Du Quesnay and Woodman (2012): 255-272.

<sup>212</sup> *Ibid.*: 260-261.

<sup>213</sup> Young (2015): 1-23.

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid.*: 139-165.

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.*: 74-88.



(such as a reliable dating in the teeth of uncertainties,<sup>216</sup> an authoritative assessment of the interactions with previous Greek literature,<sup>217</sup> an excellent treatment of metrical practices<sup>218</sup> and literary techniques or linguistic devices<sup>219</sup>), one stands out for the purposes of my argument in chapter 3: in unison with a trend, which started to develop in the 1990s and has been steadily flourishing over the past few years – I shall revert to the latest developments forthwith –, both the *Aitia* and the *Hymns* are located within the Ptolemaic framework.<sup>220</sup> Moreover, my work is beholden to Asper’s 1997 monograph ‘*Onomata Allotria: Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos*’, which, to this day, continues to shed light on the baffling Callimachean metaphors. In particular, in chapter 1, I build on Asper’s chapter 3 (‘Wassermetaphorik’)<sup>221</sup> and the sections of chapter 4 (‘Quantifizierende Antithesen’)<sup>222</sup> dedicated to the elucidation of *θύος πάχιστος* and *Μοῦσα λεπταλέη* in Fr. 1.23-24 Harder.<sup>223</sup>

In regards to the Ptolemaic context, I also reaped conspicuous benefits from four papers in the 2011 ‘Brill’s Companion to Callimachus’ (Asper’s ‘Dimensions of Power: Callimachean Geopolitics and the Ptolemaic’;<sup>224</sup> Barbantani’s ‘Callimachus on Kings and Kingship’;<sup>225</sup> Prioux’s ‘Callimachus’ Queens’<sup>226</sup> and Weber’s ‘Poet and Court’<sup>227</sup>) and

---

<sup>216</sup> Cp. Harder (2012) I: 21-23 and Stephens (2015): 16-22.

<sup>217</sup> Cp. Harder (2012) I: 23-36 and Stephens (2015): 9-12.

<sup>218</sup> Cp. Harder (2012) I: 56-63 and Stephens (2015): 29-36.

<sup>219</sup> Cp. Harder (2012) I: 41-56 and Stephens (2015): 22-29 and 36-38.

<sup>220</sup> See Harder (2012) I: 39-41 with literature in general and the specific sections of the commentary on individual fragments; likewise, cp. Stephens (2015): 14-16 with bibliography at large and the relevant portion of the commentary on each hymn.

<sup>221</sup> Asper (1997): 109-134.

<sup>222</sup> *Ibid.*: 135-208.

<sup>223</sup> *Ibid.*: 156-189.

<sup>224</sup> Asper (2011): 155-177; Asper had already enriched the field by means of his earlier 2001 journal article ‘Gruppen und Dichter: Zu Programmatik und Adressatenbezug bei Kallimachos’.

<sup>225</sup> Barbantani (2011): 178-200. Prior to this essay, as the bibliography witnesses, Barbantani has published extensively on Hellenistic poetry and its handling of Ptolemaic themes, especially with an eye on texts transmitted through papyri, inscriptions or collected in the *Supplementum Hellenisticum* both prior to this essay – see its bibliography – and afterwards – see further entries in the secondary literature listed at the end of her 2014 journal article ‘Attica in Syria. Persian War Reenactments and Reassessments of the Greek-Asian Relationship: A Literary Point of View’.

<sup>226</sup> Prioux (2011): 201-224 – see her anterior contributions in the bibliography.

<sup>227</sup> Weber (2011): 225-244 with the impressive list of his foregoing bibliographical items.

from the third chapter ('Changing Places')<sup>228</sup> of the 2012 Acosta-Hughes' and Stephens' monograph 'Callimachus in Context'. All these pieces of research ought now to be complemented by Caneva's 2016 monograph 'From Alexander to the Theoi Adelphoi: Foundation and Legitimation of a Dynasty',<sup>229</sup> which efficaciously interweaved Callimachus's crucial impulse to the foundation of Lagid ideology, architecture and iconography, and by two papers by Ivana Petrovic.<sup>230</sup> Petrovic puts forth that Callimachus actively participated in forging royal propaganda and that he staked a claim to the highest ranks in court society by reason of the extraordinary value of his input. In my third chapter I expand on her line of inquiry by maintaining that Callimachus consummately mingles Ptolemaic propaganda with self-promotion. On the one hand, I pose that he compares his kings' quashing of their combatants with his victory over his adversaries;<sup>231</sup> on the other hand, I propound that he transforms his queens into divine guarantors of his poetic creed.<sup>232</sup>

The other branch of inquiry, which has of late been thriving and has been of service to my second chapter, tackles Callimachus's interaction with contemporary (and mostly philosophically-informed) literary criticism. This approach was inaugurated by two seminal and complementary chapters: Gutzwiller's 'Literary Criticism'<sup>233</sup> in the 2010 'A Companion to Hellenistic Literature' and Romano's 'Callimachus and Contemporary

---

<sup>228</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 148-203. The scholars cogently vet Callimachus's take on the Mediterranean, Egypt, Alexandria and Attica from a Ptolemaic perspective. In particular, I profited from their reading of Callimachus's transfer of Zeus's birthplace from Arcadia to Crete in his *H.* 1 as a symbolic representation of the movement southwards (i.e. ultimately into the Ptolemaic capital) of the Greek cultural heritage (*ibid.*: 149-155).

<sup>229</sup> This book constitutes the summa of Caneva's long-lasting engagement with this subject (see the bibliography), and it efficaciously interweaves literature, architecture and iconography.

<sup>230</sup> 'Gods in Callimachus Hymns' ((2016): 164-179) and 'Royal Gods and Divine Kingship in Hellenistic Poetry' (forthcoming).

<sup>231</sup> In this respect, Giuseppeppi's 2013 monograph 'L'isola esile', the culmination of his uninterrupted engagement with *H.* 4 (see the bibliography), was immensely of service, as well.

<sup>232</sup> On the subject of Callimachus's queens, I took significant advantage of Donnelly Carney's 2013 'Arsinoë II of Egypt and Macedon', Clayman's 2014 'Berenice II and the Golden Age of Ptolemaic Egypt' and van Oppen de Ruyter's 2015 'Berenice II Euergetis'.

<sup>233</sup> Gutzwiller (2010): 335-365.

Criticism'<sup>234</sup> in the 2011 'Brill's Companion to Callimachus'.<sup>235</sup> Afterwards, in the first chapter of their 2012 monograph 'Callimachus in Context', Acosta-Hughes and Stephens persuasively demonstrated that Callimachus repeatedly took issue at Plato's views on poetry, in particular its status as τέχνη.<sup>236</sup> Besides, they cursorily emphasised that Callimachus also diverged from Aristotle's attempt to impose external criteria onto poetic art.<sup>237</sup>

The relationship between Callimachus and Aristotle was then problematised by two chapters in the 2015 'Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship': Montana's 'Hellenistic Scholarship'<sup>238</sup> and Nünlist's 'Poetics and Literary Criticism in the Framework of Ancient Greek Scholarship'.<sup>239</sup> Montana and Nünlist called attention to the Aristotelian character of the Alexandrian library, of the Alexandrian philologists attending to editions of Homer and of Callimachus's own prose. Also, Barbantani's chapter 'Unitarian poetical program and episodic narratives in Callimachus'<sup>240</sup> in the works of Callimachus' in the 2015 volume 'Tecendo narrativas: Undiade e episódio na literatura grega antiga' advocated a major aesthetic affinity between Callimachus and Aristotle. In the first place, Barbantani took up the cudgels for reconciling the thematic common threads interlocking the *Aitia* with Aristotle's concept of unity expounded in *Po.* 8 and the notion of episodes detailed in *Po.* 23. In the second place, by expanding on Romano,<sup>241</sup> she stressed the affinity between Callimachus and Neoptolemus of Parium, whom she regarded as a Peripatetic: on the controversial authority of Philodemus (*Poëm.* 5. 13.32-16.28), Neoptolemus is said to have

---

<sup>234</sup> Romano (2011): 309-328.

<sup>235</sup> These two chapters would have been impossible without Janko's 2000 edition of the first book of Philodemus's controversial, dauntingly complex (also on account of its fragmentary status), but indispensable treatise *On Poems*. In 2011, Janko put to print the third and fourth books, as well. Janko is currently working on the second book, while a team (Armstrong, Porter, Fish) is attending to the fifth book. Lastly, one also waits for Porter's forthcoming 'Literary Aesthetics after Aristotle'.

<sup>236</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 23-83.

<sup>237</sup> *Ibid.*: 16.

<sup>238</sup> Montana (2015): 60-170.

<sup>239</sup> Nünlist (2015): 706-755.

<sup>240</sup> Barbantani (2015): 269-320.

<sup>241</sup> Romano (2011): 323-325.

split poetry into three equally important constituent parts: poet (ποιητής), poem (ποίημα), which corresponds to style, and poesy (ποίησις), which comprises subject matter.<sup>242</sup> In consequence, just like Callimachus, he apparently did not put form under the yoke of content.

Despite all that, I disagree with her for several reasons: the compatibility she champions between Aristotelian and Callimachean unity does not stand up to critical examination. For the thematic bonds she proposes fall short of the pivotal causal nexus between the events, which lies at the core of Aristotle's conception of singleness – cp. *Po.* 8 (1451α32-34). In the bargain, with reference to the 'episodes', she downplayed a relevant rider: '[d]ovranno essere [...] οἰκεῖα, "appropriati", sia rispetto ai caratteri [...] sia tra loro e tra rispetto agli eventi del *mythos*'.<sup>243</sup> Over and above that, the Peripatetic affiliation of Neoptolemus rests on very shaky grounds: although both Neoptolemus and the peripatetic Andromenides<sup>244</sup> shared the tripartition of poetry,<sup>245</sup> Neoptolemus's repudiation of the Aristotelian primacy of μῦθος in *Po.* 6 (1450α38-39) and 7 (1450β23) makes it very hard to reconcile him with Aristotle.<sup>246</sup> Therefore, as I see it, whilst Callimachus's prose may display similarities with Peripatetic treatises, in the poetic province, Callimachus refused to act in accordance with Aristotle's precepts. In particular, to me, Callimachus recoils from acquiescing in τὸ πρέπον by drawing the line at harnessing language to matter.

Still in the aesthetic realm, in conclusion, two essays urged an accurate rethinking of λεπτότης: Volk's chapter 'Aratus' in the 2010 'Companion to Hellenistic Literature', and Porter's 2011 essay 'Against λεπτότης: Rethinking Hellenistic Aesthetics' in the volume

---

<sup>242</sup> See literature in *ibid.*: 323 n. 51.

<sup>243</sup> Guastini (2010): 291.

<sup>244</sup> On this aspect of Andromenides' scheme of things cp. Fr. 24 Janko [= Philod. *Poëm.* 1.132.23-27]: τὸν τε ποιητὴν, | [...] [τὸ τε πόημα] τὴν τε | [πόησιν εἶναι τι εἰ]δος [...] | τῆς τέχνης, 'Andromenides (thinks that) the poet, the poem and the poetry are a component of art' and see the elucidation in Janko (2000): 351. The identity of the originator of this division remains shrouded in mystery – see literature in Romano (2011): 323 n. 53.

<sup>245</sup> Schironi (2009): 311-312.

<sup>246</sup> Brink (1963): 146 ascribed to Neoptolemus a 'revised Aristotelianism' and Kyriakou (1997): 277-278 reinforced the message by maintaining that 'the theory seems to be unrelated to the *Poetics*' (*ibid.*: 278).

‘Creating a Hellenistic World’. Volk warned against too hasty an identification between Aratus’s λεπτότης and Callimachus’s and cautioned against overemphasising the compass of the word in the Callimachean corpus, where it rarely features. Porter held that, within the vaster orbit of Hellenistic literature, λεπτότης did not unconditionally equal refinement, but entails an aspiration to monumentality and endurance. For all that, Petrovic 2012 essay ‘Dichtung, Reinheit, Opferritual’<sup>247</sup> in the volume ‘Ästhetik des Opfers’ conclusively cemented the unity of three Callimachean poetological passages<sup>248</sup> by virtue of the constant comparison between his poetry and an offering to the gods.<sup>249</sup> By building on it, I make a case for decoding a cohesive programme of λεπτότης, which comprehends the tantalising phrase λεπτὸν ὕδωρ in line 14 of the *Apotheosis of Arsinoe*.

In contradistinction to the Callimachean field, the Catullan appears more variable. The first monograph bearing directly upon my argument is Stroup’s 2010 ‘Catullus, Cicero and a Society of Patrons’. Stroup submitted that both for Catullus and for Cicero,<sup>250</sup> *otium* came to designate time to compose literature,<sup>251</sup> and *munera* identified the exchange of the fruits of *otium* in the form of presents.<sup>252</sup> Her method commendably rested upon a comparison between these two prominent authors, who illuminate one another; therefore, in this respect, I follow in her footsteps. For all that, although she rightfully claimed that both Catullus and Cicero conceived of their leisurely hours as occasions to put pen to paper, her cursory observations on the different viewpoints of Catullus and Cicero failed to do justice to their crucial gulf.<sup>253</sup> For, whereas the former always takes pains to prove that his works

---

<sup>247</sup> Petrovic (2012a): 107-130.

<sup>248</sup> Lines 23-24 in the *Aitia* prologue, lines 108-112 in *H.* 2 and lines 68-70 in *Iamb.* 12.

<sup>249</sup> *Ibid.*: 119-127.

<sup>250</sup> De facto, Cicero takes centre stage throughout the book.

<sup>251</sup> Stroup (2010): 37-65.

<sup>252</sup> Stroup (2010): 66-100.

<sup>253</sup> Cp. for example *ibid.*: 42-43: ‘[t]heir (scil. Cicero’s and Catullus’s) semantic positioning of *otium*, generally speaking, is determined by whether the *otium* under discussion belongs to a sphere of public or private display, and whether (in the case of Cicero especially) this *otium* is *honestum* and significant of a more pervasive sense of civic well-being or *inhonestum* and indicative of mere refusal to participate in the *negotium* of the state’.

have never distracted him from his ultimate civic duties and have always abided by the time-sanctioned criterion of *utilitas*, the latter defiantly displays his otiose condition and opts for creations, which unabashedly shun serviceability to the community. Additionally, when she covered the habit of exchanging texts in the guise of gifts, beyond a doubt a custom shared by Cicero and Catullus, she soft-pedalled the fact that often the dedicatees belonged to higher social strata – one need only think of Marcus Junius Brutus in the case of Cicero, and of the praetor Memmius and of the senator Hortensius Hortalus in the case of Catullus.

Hence, the first necessary complement to this book dwells in Ledentu's 2004 helpful monograph *Studium Scribendi*, which, in harmony with its subtitle *Recherches sur les statuts de l'écrivain et de l'écriture à Rome à la fin de la République*, enlarged the range of the inquiry to include earlier authors, thereby providing a more detailed and diachronically informed picture of the intellectual climate of the first century. The second one is Baraz's 2012 outstanding monograph 'A Written Republic': even if her main interest lies in Cicero's philosophical oeuvre, thanks to her command of both the primary sources and of the massive bibliography on this subject, she proved that the pursuit of literature continued to pose serious problems to individuals belonging to the heights of society. She convincingly pored over the legitimising *apologiae* with which Cicero felt bound to equip even the philosophical dialogues created during his forced retirement from the political arena under Caesar's dictatorship. Since similar strategies may be identified even in Cicero's works (orations and in the prefaces to the juvenile treatise *Inv.* and to the more mature dialogue *de Orat.*) dating back to the early decades of the first century (i.e., as I explain below in the methodological portion of my introduction (pp. 51-52), the years

overlapping with Catullus's most plausible lifetime), in chapter 2,<sup>254</sup> I traverse these Ciceronian passages in order to enhance the significance of Catullus's unorthodox position.

On a different note, I decidedly put to good use the introduction (a compelling advocacy of the licitness of the concept of poetic autonomy in Latin poetry not vitiated by anachronisms)<sup>255</sup> and the first chapter ('First-Person Poetry and the Autonomist Turn: Lucilius, Catullus and Cicero's *De Consulatu Suo*')<sup>256</sup> of Roman's 2014 monograph 'Poetic Autonomy in Ancient Rome'. Anew even by dint of a parallel with Cicero,<sup>257</sup> specifically his poem *Cons.*, Roman posited that Catullus considerably advanced the conception of poetry as an achievement to be valued *per se*, not subordinated to traditional sets of value. All the same, he identified three respects in which Catullus's aspiration remained incomplete: the tension between his desire for the immortality of his painstakingly wrought *carmina* and his (often ironic, as Roman himself acknowledges) disparaging labelling of them as *nugae*, 'trifles';<sup>258</sup> the embrace of a private *otium*, which is occasionally troubled by disquietude and does not imply silence about corrupt politicians;<sup>259</sup> and Catullus's self-representation as a failed *uir*, whose trustworthiness, at the same time, the reader is invited to question.<sup>260</sup>

Now, while I entirely agree with Roman's recognition of the Catullan fluctuation between aspiring for the immortality of his compositions and belittling them,<sup>261</sup> in chapters 1 and 2, I contend that Catullus never expresses the intention to forsake his project in order to embark upon a more respectable and solid sort of endeavour. Touching the related matter of *otium*, by the same token, I am of the same mind as Roman in holding that Catullus does

---

<sup>254</sup> See below pp 134-144.

<sup>255</sup> Roman (2014): 1-30.

<sup>256</sup> *Ibid.*: 31-90.

<sup>257</sup> I dispense with Lucilius, who falls outside the chronological purview of my dissertation.

<sup>258</sup> Roman (2014): 42-56.

<sup>259</sup> *Ibid.*: 56-63.

<sup>260</sup> *Ibid.*: passim.

<sup>261</sup> Incidentally, Gale's 2016 subtle and challenging essay '*Aliquid putare nugas: Literary Filiation, Critical Communities and Reader-response in Catullus*' (Gale (2016): 88-107) in the volume 'Latin Literature and Its Transmission', hinged, too, precisely on the poet's anxiety about the preservation of his work.

not ignore its drawbacks as the controversial final stanza of *carmen* 51 mightily epitomises; despite everything, in chapter 2, I show that Catullus appears to worry merely about the effects of leisure upon his *personal* tranquillity. In this connection, I take advantage of Roman's solid study of Cicero's poetic celebration of his consulship, an ideal counterpart to Catullus's fashioning of his own public image:<sup>262</sup> for all its striking originality,<sup>263</sup> it by no means questions the primacy of the *forum* and stresses, with no less than the Muse Urania as a mouthpiece, that Cicero consecrated to *litterae* exclusively his spare time away from official business. Besides, with reference to the attacks which Catullus hurls at Caesar, Pompey, Mamurra or Vatinius, as Roman himself admits, his approach to politics remains that of an outsider, who does not seek any involvement, but is either content with venting his rage (most eloquently in *carmen* 29) or with expressing his desperation (most disconsolately in *carmen* 52).<sup>264</sup> To conclude, I would like to spend a few words apropos of the possibly most controversial trait of the antinomian self-portrait Catullus paints of himself: a man who lays himself open, *inter alia*, to the extremely damning accusations of *mollitia* in *carmen* 16. Even if, as Roman points out,<sup>265</sup> Catullus tries to reassert his aggressive masculinity at the beginning and end of the poem, in chapter 1, I contend the opposition the poet seeks to establish between personal integrity and effeminate verses remains blurred. In addition, Catullus never jettisons the *lepos*, which, in the same breath, causes both the charm of his poetry and the very likely perception of himself as *male marem*<sup>266</sup>(16.13).<sup>267</sup>

---

<sup>262</sup> Roman (2014): 66-84.

<sup>263</sup> Volk intriguingly labelled this Ciceronian poem Callimachean in her 2013 paper 'The Genre of Cicero's *De Consulatu Suo*' (Volk (2013): 93-112) in the volume 'Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature'.

<sup>264</sup> Roman (2014): 59-66.

<sup>265</sup> *Ibid.*: 68-69.

<sup>266</sup> 'Barely a man'

<sup>267</sup> '[T]hat this very kind of influence was natural to Catullus's contemporaries is demonstrated by Cicero, who does not hesitate (when it suits its purpose) to offer as evidence of the debauched and sybaritic lifestyle of Calpurnius Piso the epigrams of his client Philodemus' (Du Quesnay and Woodman (2012): 264).



Three further monographs were to the advantage of my thesis: in the first place, Morgan's 2010 *'Musa Pedestris'*, to which I return at greater length in the methodological part of this introduction (pp. 49-51): I wholly accord with his call to appreciate the rhythmical factors of Latin poetic art, a fortiori in the case of Catullus, who displays an unswerving care for metres. In the second place, Stevens's 2013 *'Silence in Catullus'*, thanks to the remarkably multi-faceted theoretical perspective upon which it is predicated,<sup>268</sup> scrutinised the weight of Catullan silence to good effect, be it *'sociocultural'*<sup>269</sup> or *'natural'*.<sup>270</sup> In the third place, Williams's 2012 *'Reading Roman Friendship'*, whose inaugural treatment of Roman *amicitia*<sup>271</sup> and Catullus's take on it<sup>272</sup> paved the way for the Latin half of my final chapter.

Finally, the *incontournable* anthology of essays in the volume *'What Catullus Wrote: Problems in Textual Criticism, Editing and the Manuscript Tradition'* edited by D. Kiss, one of the most talented and committed editors of Catullus (most importantly, his own *'Introduction'* and paper entitled *'The Lost Codex Veronensis and its Descendants: Three Problems in Catullus's Manuscript Tradition'*) invaluablely encompassed the latest developments of Catullan philology.

Let me now broach methodological issues<sup>273</sup> and begin by naming the critical editions, into which I put trust,<sup>274</sup> when quoting primary sources: concerning Callimachus, I follow Harder (2012) for the *Aitia* and Pfeiffer (1949-1953) for the *Hymns*, the *Iambi*, the

---

<sup>268</sup> Stevens (2013): 3-16.

<sup>269</sup> *Ibid.*: 6, Stevens defined the first sort of silence as the one *'that precede[s], structure[s] and follow[s] utterance; [...] that marks what may or may not be said according to cultural traditions and social controls'*.

<sup>270</sup> *Ibid.*: *'the ultimate natural silence, the absolute silence of death'*.

<sup>271</sup> Williams (2012): 1-62.

<sup>272</sup> *Ibid.*: 174-185.

<sup>273</sup> Since a bespoke methodological statement precedes each chapter, here I confine myself to overarching points.

<sup>274</sup> I wish to remark that since I follow various editions, I shall abide by the editors' different typographical practices. Hence, Greek texts will be virtually always quoted with subscribed iota, except for Callimachus's *Aitia*, where, in line with Harder, I use the ascribed iota. In regard to Latin, based on the editors' preference, I sometimes deploy the small *'u'* and sometimes the small *'v'*.

remaining fragments, including the ones he hesitantly called *Μέλῃ*, and the *Epigrams*.<sup>275</sup> Regarding Theocritus's *Idylls*, I depend on Gow 1950; with reference to Sotades, I follow Powell 1925. For Catullus's *carmina*, I rely on Kiss's constantly updated online edition at [www.catullusonline.org](http://www.catullusonline.org) (last accessed on 27.05.2017).<sup>276</sup> Because of the highly fragmentary status of the vast majority of Callimachus's output<sup>277</sup> and the extremely corrupt transmission of Catullus's poems,<sup>278</sup> I adhere to these editions very closely and point out the few instances (by and large, mere minutiae) in which I disagree. By contrast, on the grounds which I explain in chapter three, I depart from Kiss in a more notable way by regarding *carmen* 68 as a single composition.

A somewhat related aspect concerns the authorial arrangement of the various oeuvres: in regards to Callimachus, it seems fairly certain that he attended to the ordering of the *Aitia*,<sup>279</sup> the *Iambi*,<sup>280</sup> the succession of these two works,<sup>281</sup> probably the *Hymns*, which, at

---

<sup>275</sup> Regarding less frequently quoted Greek authors for Plato's *Ion* and *Republic*, I depend on Burnet 1909 and 1978. For Sotades's fragments, I follow Powell 1925. For Theocritus's *Idylls*, I depend on Gow 1950. For Pindar's *Odes*, I depend on Bowra 1963<sup>2</sup>. For Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*, I put trust in Ross 1959 and Kassel 1965. For Plutarch's *Contra Epicuri beatitudinem*, I follow Einarson and De Lacy 1967. For Sappho's fragments, I follow Voigt 1971. For Simonides' epigrams I rely on Page 1981. For Porphyry's *Vita Pythagorae*, I depend on Des Places 1982. For the fragments of Philodemus's *On poems*, I put trust in Mangoni 1993 for Book 5, in Janko 2000 for Book 1, in Janko 2011 for Books 3 and 4. For Andromenides's fragments, I follow Janko 2000. For Theophrastus's fragments, I rely on Fortenbaugh 2005. For the fragments of Heraclides of Pontus, I depend on Schütrumpf 2009. For the fragments of Mytilene, I follow Matelli 2012. Finally, for the new Posidippean epigrams, I depend on *New Poems Attributed to Posidippus: An Electronic Text-in-progress*, Revised and periodically updated by Francesca Angiò, Martine Cuypers, Benjamin Acosta-Hughes and Elizabeth Kosmetatou, version 13. Newly revised and updated, January 2016. <http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/displayPDF/3059> last accessed on 27.05.2017.

<sup>276</sup> Concerning Cicero, Catullus's *comprimario* in chapters 1 and 2, I depend on Wilkins 1902 for *De oratore*; Clark 1908<sup>2</sup> for *Pro Cluentio* and *in Catilinam*; on Clark 1909 for *De lege agraria contra Rullum* and *Pro Flacco*; on Clark 1911 for *Pro Sulla*, *Pro Archia* and *Pro Plancio*; on Werner 1910 for *Pro Sestio* and *De provinciis consularibus*; on Stroebel 1915 for *De Inuentione*; on Werner 1917<sup>2</sup> for *In Verrem*; on Watt 1982<sup>2</sup> for *Epistulae ad familiares*; on Courtney 1993 for the fragments of the poem *De consulatu suo*. With respect to Lucretius, the other 'supporting actor' in chapter 1, I rely on Bailey 1967<sup>2</sup>. Lastly, for *Festus's De uerborum significatione*, I follow Lindsay 1913.

<sup>277</sup> On the fragments of the *Aitia*, see Harder (2011): 63-80, Massimilla (2011): 39-62 and Harder (2012) I: 63-72; on the *Iambi* see Acosta-Hughes (2002): 17-18; on the four *Μέλῃ* see Lelli (2005): 125, 130-131, 151-152 and 195-196; cp. also Lehnus (2011): 23-28 on the history of the gradual rediscovery of Callimachean papyri. The *Hymns* and the *Epigrams*, instead, enjoyed a better preservation: the formers, sometime in the twelfth or thirteenth century, were attached to a compilation of hymns including the *Homeric Hymns*, the *Orphic Hymns* and Proclus's *Hymns* (Stephens (2015): 38-46); the epigrams, were included into the *AP* (Stephens (2011): 4).

<sup>278</sup> See Kiss (2015): xiii-27 with bibliography.

<sup>279</sup> Harder (2012) I: 2-12.

<sup>280</sup> Stephens (2011): 5-6.

<sup>281</sup> Krevans (2007): 131.

any rate, have been carefully organised,<sup>282</sup> and the *Epigrams*, whose present arrangement, nevertheless, depends on the compilers of *AP*;<sup>283</sup> more controversial, by contrast, appears the fate of the *Μέλη* – part of the book of *Iambi* or independent compositions?<sup>284</sup> The Catullan corpus, instead, continues to spark a potentially never-ending controversy: does the extant collection date back to the poet himself or to a posterior editor?<sup>285</sup>

The final kindred facet pertains to the thorny chronology of Callimachus's and Catullus's production;<sup>286</sup> consequently, in general, I steer clear as clear as possible of cavilling at dates which do not affect my argument.

Bearing this in mind, to find one's way around such a complex body of poems, principally the unfathomable disposition of the Catullan *carmina*, one needs criteria which hold true irrespective of whether the passages under discussion belong to a book or several volumes. The first one consists of lexical links: regardless of the final collocation of a certain composition, the multiple occurrences of adjectives, verbs, nouns, adverbs cannot be imputed to hazard, all the more so because Catullus and Callimachus lavished enormous amounts of energy on *labor limae*, as *carmen* 1 and *Ep.* 27 Pfeiffer famously certify. This modus operandi suits my agenda virtually from beginning to end: chapter one centres on the two poets' deployment of the couple *λεπτός / lepos* (and related words); chapter two turns on Catullus's use of *otium*, *otiosus*, *nugae* and *ludere/lusus*; chapter three, in the Greek half, traces precise verbal echoes of Callimachus's poetological utterances in his panegyric poetry; in the Latin half, it reveals Catullus's usage of the vocabulary of

---

<sup>282</sup> Stephens (2015): 12-14 and Krevans (2007): 133.

<sup>283</sup> Stephens (2012): 4-5.

<sup>284</sup> On the *status quaestionis* see Lelli (2005): 1-27.

<sup>285</sup> Adherents of the first theory include most recently Gutzwiller (2012): 79-111 and Hutchinson (2012): 48-78, both with previous literature. On the contrary, Bellandi (2007): 63-96, Gaisser (2009): 27-31, Du Quensay and Woodman (2012): 265-268 and Kenney (2014): 19-32 (each study with full bibliography) espouse the second hypothesis.

<sup>286</sup> See Harder (2012) I: 21-23 on the *Aitia*; Stephens (2015): 16-22 on the *Hymns* and Lelli (2005): 3-4 and 13 on the *Iambi*. The situation worsens when it comes to Catullus, whose exact life-span remains mysterious, except for a few datable events (cp. Skinner (2007): 2-3 and Gaisser (2009): 2-6): for some speculation, cp. Ledentu (2004): 278-279 with literature and Konstan (2007): 72-85, with literature.

*amicitia* (*munus*, *officium*, etc.) to assess his relationships with his *amici superiores*. The sole (partial) exception takes place in the Greek part of chapter 2, which devolves on Callimachus's infringement of τὸ πρέπον: although the very word never manifests itself in the extant corpus, to corroborate my idea, when looking at my case in point, the *Victoria Berenices*, I sift through the jarring juxtaposition of solemn and low registers. Accordingly, in light of the pervasiveness of comparable close readings of all the passages under examination, one might summarise my methodological tenet with the motto 'every word counts'. The last advantage, which redounds to the credit of this procedure, bears upon the fact that it enables one to bridge the gap between the heterogeneous metres, which Catullus consummately exploits.

This last metrical point leads me to the second facet of my methodology, which applies to the selection of *carmina* belonging to the so-called polymetric portion of the Catullan corpus (1-60): I privilege compositions joined by the rhythmical bond of the Phalaecian hendecasyllable, which, given Catullus's metrical awareness,<sup>287</sup> grants the solidity of this tie.<sup>288</sup> Besides, since the poems, which partake in this metre, run the gamut from espousal of *lepos* in both the poetic and the social realm, to interactions with unanimous companions, to the adoption of *otium* devoid of *honestas*, to enervating eroticism, to tormenting alertness to the drawbacks of this comportment to the ultimate refusal to forsake it, they may be regarded as a self-contained whole, which forcefully, and even programmatically, condenses the distinctive traits of Catullan poetry.

A conclusive metrical conjecture before turning attention to the final methodological principle: whilst the adhesion to Callimacheanism via elegiac distichs poses no problems insofar as Callimachus composed the majority of his works in this metre, the Phalaecian hendecasyllable strikes one as surprising. In his learned and, in my view, conclusive

---

<sup>287</sup> Morgan (2010): *passim*.

<sup>288</sup> The last Sapphic stave of *carmen* 51 and the Choliambics of poem 44 represent the two exceptions, which, nonetheless, chime in with the Phalaecian hendecasyllables due to the reflections upon *otium*.

exploration of this metre in the chapter ‘The Hendecasyllable: An Abbreviated History’ of his 2010 monograph, Morgan hypothesises that the obscure and miscellaneous origins of this rhythm (Aeolic-Sapphic; Ionic; Iambic) may have proved particularly appealing to Catullus<sup>289</sup> to accommodate his devotion to Sappho, his provocative *mollitia* and his iambic combativeness.<sup>290</sup> Morgan, in addition, reasons about the elusive Callimachean Fr. 226 Pfeiffer, one single Phalaecian hendecasyllable,<sup>291</sup> which may have been followed by verses with the same rhythm employed κατὰ στίχον, just like in Catullan examples.<sup>292</sup> After succinctly addressing the endless debate on whether this fragment belongs to the *Iambi* or, along with Frs. 227, 228 and 229 Pfeiffer, to the *Μέλη*,<sup>293</sup> he concludes that ‘in the manuscripts known to the Romans there were seventeen poems [...]. To return to Callimachus, the first thing to say is how heavily any indication of approval from Callimachus for an obscure metre would have weighted with the Roman poet [...]. Furthermore, a somewhat dubious association of the hendecasyllable with the category of iambus would be exactly the thing to “sanction” Catullus’s (in my view) playful claims for the iambic status of the form’.<sup>294</sup>

This may well give pause; still, even if the disappearance of the remainder of the text of Fr. 226 Pfeiffer (Ἡ Λῆμνος τὸ παλαιόν, εἴ τις ἄλλη)<sup>295</sup> precludes any certainty, on the authority of *Dieg. X.1-5*,<sup>296</sup> a reconstruction of the content can be attempted. Lelli, who

---

<sup>289</sup> Speed and energy represent another enticing feature of the metre (cp. Morgan (2010): 60-62); besides, this rhythm may dovetail with Catullus’s habit of defining his own poetry in diminutive verses (cp. *ibid.* 97 n. 140 with bibliography).

<sup>290</sup> The dauntingly intricate issue of Catullus’s iambic poems falls beyond the scope of this dissertation; having said that, cp. the bibliographical n. 872.

<sup>291</sup> To be precise, Phalaecian hendecasyllables feature elsewhere twice in Callimachus, but always conjunction with two other metres (iambic dimeter and ‘Archylochean asynartete’, respectively) in *Ep.* 38 Pfeiffer and *Ep.* 40 Pfeiffer – see Fantuzzi (2004): 39 n. 155.

<sup>292</sup> This estimation remains impossible to verify – cp. Lelli (2005): 125.

<sup>293</sup> See Lelli (2005): 1-27 with literature for the *status quaestionis*.

<sup>294</sup> Morgan (2010): 87. The dauntingly intricate issue of Catullus’s iambic poems falls beyond the scope of this dissertation; having said that, cp. below the bibliographical n. 872.

<sup>295</sup> ‘Formerly Lemnos, if any other...’

<sup>296</sup> Ἡ Λῆμνος τὸ παλαιόν, εἴ τις ἄλλη Πρὸς τοὺς ὠραίους φησὶν· ἡ Λῆμνος πάλαι ποτὲ εὐδαίμων γενομένη ἑκακοδαμόνησε, ἐπιθεμένων τῶν θηλειῶν τοῖς ἄρρεσιν· διόπερ καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἀποβλέπετε, “‘Formerly Lemnos, if any other’... He says to handsome boys: Lemnos, which once used to be prosperous, became unfortunate because women attacked men; hence, you, too, pay attention to the future’.

advocated the belonging of the fragment in question to the book of *Iambi*, propounds that by ascribing the origin of the ‘Lemnian deeds’ to Medea’s infatuation with Jason due to his good looks and her jealousy of Hypsipyle, the poet warns beautiful young men against dire consequences, which the green-eyed monster may unleash in the fair sex owing to their beauty. The upshot of such a contention is that, in continuity with the other *Iambi*, even here Callimachus would create a transition from the myth of the *Λήμνια κακά* and the real occasion of the poem.<sup>297</sup>

Acosta-Hughes and Stephens, who interpret the poem as an occasional lyric piece independent from the *Iambi*, instead call attention to the relatedness between the Lemnian episode and the colonisation of Cyrene, which is narrated in Pind. *Pyth.* 4.251-260. What is more, they cast doubt on the possibility that the *πρὸς τοὺς ὠραίους* has its place within the poem: it might be the diegetes’ own inference.<sup>298</sup>

Hence, the results of this short inquiry, if one agrees with Lelli, perhaps also yield an erotic proximity with Catullan hendecasyllables. Regardless, one seems unable to unearth programmatic statements in the Callimachean poem under scrutiny, which would dramatically augment its value as a model for Catullus. Yet, very cautiously, I would venture that it cannot be roundly ruled out, either: a poetological passage may lie underneath the phrase *λεπτὸν ὕδωρ* in line 14 of Fr. 228 Pfeiffer, another of the *Μέλη*, and analogous statements have been detected in Fr. 229 Pfeiffer (*Branchus*).<sup>299</sup>

My terminal methodological rule, finally, brings about a comparison between Catullus and his two contemporaries Lucretius and Cicero in the first two chapters, to better gauge Catullus’s Callimacheanism – I shall sketch the details below in the overview of the

---

<sup>297</sup> See Lelli (2005): 28-31 with bibliography. Moreover, *ibid.*: 125-126, the scholar evokes Sappho’s Phalaecian hendecasyllable in her poems about separation and, with many reservations, very tentatively wonders whether Callimachus may have reworked the same themes by writing a poem, which amounts to a playful fare-well to a young groom.

<sup>298</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 110.

<sup>299</sup> Cp. Lelli (2005): 79.

structure. On the chronological side, I fix the *terminus ante quem* as 54, the last year unambiguously identifiable in the Catullan corpus.<sup>300</sup> Hence, Lucretius fits in easily because, as Butterfield trenchantly submits, his *DRN* was no longer modified after late 55;<sup>301</sup> by contrast, I do not explore Ciceronian works<sup>302</sup> or letters<sup>303</sup> penned after 54.<sup>304</sup>

To draw this introduction to its close, allow me to elucidate the structure of my work. Each chapter falls into two sections: the Greek halves focus exclusively on Callimachus, with occasional references to Posidippus, Sotades and Theocritus, where appropriate. The first two Latin halves, instead, juxtapose Catullus with Lucretius and Cicero to grasp the intellectual climate of the first century and underline Catullus's fully-fledged Callimacheanism; the last, on the contrary, concentrates solely on Catullus and I promptly explain why I do not think Lucretius can be called upon to decode Catullus's frank rapport with his *amici superiores*.

As a matter of fact, the first two chapters are firmly interlocked because their respective spheres overlap: with respect to Callimachus, both λεπτότης and the breach against τὸ πρέπον represent two essential features of his artistic creed, which clash with the traditionally-minded Telchines and provoke their harsh debasement of the poet as childish. Likewise, Catullus's upholding of λεπτότης, which ends up almost coinciding with *lepos*, and the production of *nugae* over otiose hours sequestered from the *forum* merge into each other and are frowned upon as an indissoluble effrontery by the *senes seueriores*.

---

<sup>300</sup> Cp. Skinner (2007): 2-3.

<sup>301</sup> Butterfield (2013): 1 n. 2.

<sup>302</sup> Scholars continue to debate whether or not one is entitled to trust the written version of the orations: see Powell (2010a): 21-36, Gildenhard (2011): 14 and Vasaly (2013): 141, all with literature. On the authority of these Latinists, I trust the written accounts as reliable reproductions of the spoken speeches, but always bear in mind that certainty lies beyond our reach. For a fascinating and complementary approach, see also Gurd (2012): 49-76, who considers the revision process as conducive to the consolidation of the Republican community, even at times of danger such as Caesar's dictatorship.

<sup>303</sup> On all the difficulties that face scholars dealing with Cicero's letters, and the indispensable caution they enjoin, see McConnell (2014): 9-11 with literature.

<sup>304</sup> For the chronology of Ciceronian works, I depend on Marinone (2004<sup>2</sup>).

However, by keeping the two chapters separate, on top of all, I aim to do justice to all the scrutinised texts. Accordingly, in the Callimachean half of chapter one, I study Μοῦσα λεπταλέη in Fr. 1.24 Harder against the fabric of σχοῖνος Περσίς in Fr. 1.18 Harder (and more broadly of the remainder *Aitia* prologue) and argue that, through the combination of these two metaphors Callimachus stakes his claim to poetic freedom. In order to sustain the paramount programmatic value of Μοῦσα λεπταλέη, I shall probe all the other programmatic Callimachean occurrences of λεπτός-λεπταλέος (*H.* 3.242-243, Fr. 54.15 Harder and *Ep.* 27.3-4 Pfeiffer and) and include the phrase λεπτὸν ὕδωρ in Fr. 228.14 Pfeiffer, which has until now failed to attract scholarly attention. Afterwards, I focus on the σχοῖνος Περσίς and put forward that it does not simply refer to a disproportionately long unit of measurement. Rather, as I see it, through the mixture of the enslaving Persians with the chain, it alludes to aesthetic criteria clipping the poet's wings, first and foremost Plato's and Aristotle's determination to bring poetry under the yoke of their own philosophical systems and establish laws about proper composition. In support of my conjecture, I call upon the normally overlooked line 19 of the programmatic *Iamb.* 13: Τ[ε]ῦ μέχρι τολμᾶς; Οἱ φίλοι σε δήσουσ[ι]. After voicing his outrage at Callimachus's brazen mixture of Ionic and Doric dialect in his *Iambi*, the niggler, not unlike the Telchines, oppugns Callimachus's daring and unorthodox approach and exclaims that his friends should bind him.

In the Latin half, I analyse Catullus's *carmina* 1, 12 and 50 and their full approval of Callimachus's λεπτότης, but without turning a blind eye to his anxieties (*carmen* 16), which, for all that, never develop into a recantation, but resonate with Catullus's own torments against the backcloth of the tempestuous convulsions of the dying Republic. Subsequently, I measure Catullus's creed against Lucretius's extremely cryptic poetological statement in 1.926-934: I set forth that, although Lucretius pledges allegiance to Callimachean aesthetics, in the end he subverts the priority which Callimachus awards



to λεπτότης, and turns his *musaeo lepore* (1.934) into a means to cajole the recalcitrant disciple into swallowing the Epicurean bitter medicine. Lastly, I shall build on, and, where (in my estimation) required, revise, Krostenko's brilliant treatment of Ciceronian *lepos*<sup>305</sup> and on Vasaly's essay 'The Political Impact of Cicero's Speeches', in which she posits that each Ciceronian speech adds up to Cicero's political self-fashioning.<sup>306</sup> I traverse all the six extant occurrences of *lepos* in the orations (*Ver.* 2.3.35 and 2.5.142, *Clu.* 141, *Cat.* 2.23, *Flac.* 9, *Prov. cons.* 29) and a few instances from the rhetorical dialogue *de Orat.* (2. 220, 221, 222, 225, 227, 228, 230). I submit that, in the vast majority of oratorical passages in question, Cicero disapprovingly affixed *lepos* to his foes, whom he pilloried as devoid of Roman values. In the same breath, he propagated an image of himself as the torch-bearer of Latin morals. At the same time, from my standpoint, even in the two cases (*Clu.* 141 and *Prov. cons.* 29), in which he handled *lepos* slightly more approvingly, he never characterised himself as *lepidus* for fear for fear of his detractors. Finally, I advance that, in *de Orat.*, Cicero strove to give the stamp of approval to *lepos* as a type of acceptable humour auxiliary to *grauitas*, *auctoritas* and *dignitas*.

Thereafter, in the Greek half of chapter two, I advance that Callimachus stopped short of being dutiful to τὸ πρέπον: in the first place, I review Aristotle's and his Peripatetic successors' treatment of πρέπον, which also affected Homeric criticism at the Alexandrian library. In the second place, by expanding on Cozzoli's hypothesis that, through the multifarious phrase παῖς ἄτε in Fr.1.6 Harder, the Telchines heap scorn upon Callimachus's incongruous amalgam of inflated and plebeian vocabulary, I advance that they also savage Callimachus's non-observance of fittingness. To buttress my contention that Callimachus jibs at τὸ πρέπον, I pore over his inappropriate deployment of language in Frs. 54a-b Harder, at the opening of the *Victoria Berenices*. In the Latin half, instead, I aim to focus

---

<sup>305</sup> Krostenko (2001): 154-232.

<sup>306</sup> Vasaly (2013): 141-159.

on how, in *carmina* 5, 7, 10, 44 and 50, to the detriment of *negotia*, Catullus overtly exhibits his otiose condition. At the same time, I also address the poet's torment over his *otium* voiced in the controversial concluding stanza of *carmen* 51: without erasing the divergence with previous instances, I emphasise that in lines 13-14 the poet concentrates upon himself rather than on moral concerns. Turning to Cicero, by examining *Inv.* 4, *Sull.* 26, *Arch.* 12, *Sest.* 98, *Planc.* 66, Fr. 10.71-78 Courtney from the poem *Cons.* and *de Orat.* 1-3, along with a few samples from the epistles where appropriate, I posit that, in sheer contrast with Catullus, Cicero very seriously takes the above-mentioned concerns over the elite management of their restful hours. Accordingly, irrespective of the agenda peculiar to each case under examination, he consistently struggles to bestow legitimacy upon his written works on the grounds of their utility and absolute lack of any clash with *negotia*.

In the last chapter, the two poets are fully in the limelight, and, despite the obvious differences, I study their affinity in treating their social superiors with an unswerving cognisance of their own talent and value. Accordingly, without erasing the propagandistic aspect, I intend to submit that Callimachus deftly manages to exploit it even in pursuit of a more personal agenda. Namely, to my mind, in *H.* 4.171-175 and *H.* 1.3, he neatly draws a parallel between his king Ptolemy II's military triumphs over his enemies and his own aesthetic defeat of his detractors. On the subject of the queens, to my way of thinking, Callimachus enlists his queens Arsinoe II and Berenice II as guarantors of his original poetic creations in the *Apotheosis of Arsinoe* (Fr. 228 Pfeiffer), the *Victoria Berenices* and the *Coma Berenices*. Subsequently, I plan to shed light on the poet's laudation of his sovereigns' tolerance, which underpins the way in which he ironically handles the incestuous marriage between Arsinoe II and Ptolemy II in *Acontius and Cydippe* (Fr. 75.4- 9 Harder), as well as his treatment of the questionable sides of the queen's past (most notably her assassination of Demetrius the Fair) in *H.* 5 and *H.* 6 and in the *Lock*. Finally, I concentrate on the *Victoria Sosibii* (Fr. 384 Pfeiffer) and *Iamb.* 12 with its

important poetological points to walk on a path less trodden by scholarship, *videlicet* the fact that Callimachus does not restrict his range of patrons to kings and queens, but includes other prominent members of the lordly entourage. The Latin half of this chapter concerns itself with a group of poems (10, 28, 116, 65-66 and 68), in which Catullus apostrophises individuals belonging to higher social strata. In my judgement, never intimidated by their superior standing, irrespective of whether they sit in the senate or hail from illustrious noble families, Catullus bases his attitude towards them solely on the treatment they afford him: respect is reciprocated with Callimachean gifts; scorn is repaid with scathing invective.

A final practical note: all the Greek and Latin texts are accompanied with my own translations.

## Chapter 1: From Callimachus's λεπτότης to multifaceted *lepos* in Lucretius,

### Catullus and Cicero

#### 1.1 Introduction

In the Callimachean half of this chapter, I shall concern myself with two metaphors in the *Aitia* prologue, videlicet the Μοῦσα λεπταλή in line 24 and the σχοῖνος Περσίς in line 18, and argue that, through their combination, Callimachus asserts poetic freedom. Accordingly, although the ‘Persian chain’ presents itself before the ‘slender Muse’ in a sequential reading of Fr. 1 Harder, I shall begin with the latter for a twofold reason: on the one hand, it lies at the core of the Latin engagement with Callimachus and Hellenism; on the other hand, its poetological importance has been of late decidedly controverted by Volk.<sup>307</sup> Hence, to sustain its paramount programmatic value, I shall probe all the other programmatic Callimachean occurrences of λεπτός-λεπταλέος (*H.* 3.242-243, Fr. 54.15 Harder and *Ep.* 27.3-4 Pfeiffer) and include the phrase λεπτὸν ὕδωρ in Fr. 228.14 Pfeiffer, which has until now failed to attract scholarly attention. Subsequently, I shall focus on the σχοῖνος Περσίς and put forward that it does not simply refer to a disproportionately long unit of measurement. Rather, I shall set forth that, thanks to the amalgam of the enslaving Persians with the sinister symbol of thralldom, it alludes to aesthetic criteria clipping the poet’s wings, over which, as I shall contend in chapter 2, τὸ πρέπον (i.e. the subjection of form to subject matter) predominates. In support of my conjecture, I call upon the normally overlooked line 19 of the programmatic *Iamb.* 13: Τ[ε]ῦ μέχρι τολμᾶς; Οἱ φίλοι σε δῆσ|ουσ[ι]. After voicing his outrage at Callimachus’s brazen mixture of Ionic and Doric

---

<sup>307</sup> Volk (2010): 206.

dialect in his *Iambi*, the niggler, not unlike the Telchines, oppugns Callimachus's daring and unorthodox approach and exclaims that his friends should bind him.

Afterwards, in the Latin half of the chapter, I shall explore the *Nachleben* of Callimachus's aesthetically charged λεπτότης in first-century Rome via the possibly etymologically related noun *lepos* and adjective *lepidus*.<sup>308</sup> My inquiry shall commence with the numerous deployments of Lucretian *lepos*,<sup>309</sup> among which I shall grant pride of place to those pertaining to literary criticism. Above all, I shall turn attention to Lucretius's paradoxical reception of Callimachus in 1.921-950,<sup>310</sup> and propound that there exists a two-sided (and until now overlooked) citation of the *Aitia* prologue: *musaeo lepore* at 1.934 harks back to Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην in Fr. 1.24 Harder. To me, this allusion betokens that, on the one hand, at one with the imagery in 1.926-928, Lucretius embraces Callimachean λεπτότης; on the other hand, he overturns its substance. In other words, he turns the accusative Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην, scilicet Callimachus's supreme ideal of artistic autonomy, into an ablative, that is a medium to cajole the disciple into adopting the potentially unsavoury Epicurean message of the poem. This, in turn, will finally trigger a few comments on 1.28, Lucretius's supplication for *lepos* from Venus, whom he reveres as the principal source thereof in 1.15.<sup>311</sup>

Thereafter, I shall address first and foremost<sup>312</sup> Catullus's *carmina* 1, 50 and 16, which, apart from partaking in the programmatic rhythm of the Phalaecian hendecasyllable,<sup>313</sup>

---

<sup>308</sup> See Krostenko (2011): 64 n. 146 for a rich linguistic excursus.

<sup>309</sup> *Lepos* often denotes natural phenomena (2.502, 3.1006, 4.82, 5.1259), sometimes with emphasis placed on luminosity (cp. Krostenko (2001): 67 with n. 154), once agriculture and its effects on the landscape (5.1376). These occurrences, though, do not affect my discussion because, as stated in the introduction to the Latin half of the present chapter (n. 309 above), they refer neither to human attitudes nor to literary criticism.

<sup>310</sup> On the almost verbatim repetition of 1.926-950 in the proem to Book 4 see Butterfield (2016): 23-31 with literature.

<sup>311</sup> In due course, I shall also infrom on two usages of *lepos* (3.1036 and 4.1133), which bear just partially upon my inquiry.

<sup>312</sup> In due course, I shall briefly inquire into the other Catullan deployments of *lepos* and *illepidus*.

<sup>313</sup> See my discussion in the introduction (pp. 49-51).

shed precious light on Catullan *lepos*.<sup>314</sup> My point of departure shall be Krostenko's path-breaking analysis of the same topic<sup>315</sup> against the backcloth of first-century *lepos*, which reconstructs its semantic development from lavish entertainment and the physical form of attractive women in Plautine comedy to its later transformation into verbal dexterity or charming deportment.<sup>316</sup> Such an evolution took place within a wider transformation of several other lexemes (for example, *elegans*, *uenustus* and *facetus*) into the 'language of social performance',<sup>317</sup> a litmus test, as it were, to determine an individual's attitude towards aestheticism, Hellenism and individualism.<sup>318</sup> Obviously, I shall take issue at the aspects of Krostenko's thesis from which I dissent, and include more recent secondary literature.<sup>319</sup> I shall propose that, on the one hand, unlike Lucretius, Catullus's *lepos* betokens a sincere adoption of Callimachus's ideal of poetic freedom. On the other hand, as opposed to Cicero's, Catullus's *lepos* amounts to his espousal of the politically charged first-century *lepos* at variance with Roman values in spite of the toll this decision exacts. Even if the two sides of the word are inextricably enlaced, for the reader's convenience, I shall firstly moot *lepidus* as pledge of loyalty to Callimachean λεπτότης; secondly, I shall broach it with an eye on Roman values.

Lastly, I shall apply myself to Cicero's tackling of *lepos*. I shall build on, and where required (in my view) revise, Krostenko's view of Ciceronian *lepos*,<sup>320</sup> and on Vasaly's hypothesis that each Ciceronian speech (be it senatorial, electoral or forensic) contributes to Cicero's political self-fashioning.<sup>321</sup> I shall deal with a selection of passages, which, in

---

<sup>314</sup> In picking up these three poems as revelatory insights into Catullan *lepos*, I follow in the footsteps of Bellandi (2007): 51-62; yet, aside from occasionally differing, I always bring into play my treatment of Callimachus, Cicero and Lucretius in this chapter, along with some anticipations of chapter 2.

<sup>315</sup> See Krostenko (2001): 233-290 and the updated version in Krostenko (2007): 212-232.

<sup>316</sup> See *ibid.*: 64-72.

<sup>317</sup> See *ibid.*: 1-19 for a preliminary clarification of this concept.

<sup>318</sup> See *ibid.*: 77-87 on the political and ideological dimension of this debate.

<sup>319</sup> Cp. the introduction: *passim*.

<sup>320</sup> *Ibid.*: 154-232.

<sup>321</sup> Vasaly (2013): 141-159.

obedience with my chronological criteria,<sup>322</sup> are culled from works of his penned by 54. I shall traverse all the six extant occurrences of *lepos*<sup>323</sup> in the orations (*Ver.* 2.3.35 and 2.5.142, *Clu.* 141, *Cat.* 2.23, *Flac.* 9, *Prov. cons.* 29) and a few instances from the rhetorical dialogue *de Orat.* (2. 220, 221, 222, 225, 227, 228, 230)<sup>324</sup> and shall make a case for the fact that, in the vast majority of the oratorical passages in question, Cicero disapprovingly associated *lepos* with his resisters, whom he chastised as grievously devoid of Roman values. In the same breath, he propagated an image of himself as the champion of Latin morals. At the same time, from my standpoint, even in the two cases (*Clu.* 141 and *Prov. cons.* 29), in which he handled *lepos* slightly more tolerantly, he never styled himself as *lepidus* for fear that his enemies might have taken him to task for his unsteadiness. Finally, I shall advance that, constantly toiling to hold attackers at bay, in *de Orat.*, Cicero apologetically strove to sanction *lepos* as a type of acceptable humour ancillary to the very Roman values of *grauitas*, *auctoritas* and *dignitas*.

## **1.2 Μοῦσα λεπταλέη versus σχοῖνος Περσίς: Callimachus stakes his claim topoetic freedom**

Attuned to my introductory guidelines, I shall inaugurate my dissection of the two metaphors in Callimachus's retort to the Telchines<sup>325</sup> (Fr. 1 Harder), which, in my understanding, condense his proclamation of poetic liberty: Μοῦσα λεπταλέη in line 24 and σχοῖνος Περσίς in line 18. Still, allow me to inaugurate the discussion with the full text of the *Reply*.

---

<sup>322</sup> See pp. 51-52 above.

<sup>323</sup> Cp. Krostenko (2001): 154.

<sup>324</sup> For suppositions about the decline of the language of social performance in the ensuing rhetorical works penned in the Forties see *ibid.*: 227-229 and 291-296.

<sup>325</sup> On these mythological creatures and the aptness of their choice as representatives of Callimachus's censurers see Petrovic (2006): 26-29 and Harder (2012) II: 13-14, both with bibliography.

Πολλάκι μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀοιδῆι,  
 νήιδες οἱ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι,  
 εἶνεκεν οὐχ ἔν ἄεϊσμα διηνεκὲς ἢ βασιλ[η  
 . . . . .]ας ἐν πολλαῖς ἦνυσα χιλιάσιν  
 ἦ. . . . .]ους ἦρωας, ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἐλ[ίσσω  
 παῖς ἄτε, τῶν δ' ἐτέων ἢ δεκάς οὐκ ὀλίγη.  
 . . . . .] .[.]και Τε[λ]χῖσιν ἐγὼ τόδε· 'Φῦλον α[  
 . . . . .] τήκ[ειν] ἦπαρ ἐπιστάμενον,  
 . . . . .] . ρεην [ὀλ]ιγόστιχος· ἀλλὰ καθέλκει  
 . . . . . πολὺ τὴν μακρὴν ὄμπνια Θεσμοφόρο[ς·  
 τοῖν δὲ] δυοῖν Μίμνερος ὅτι γλυκύς, αἱ γ' ἀπαλαι[  
 . . . . .] ἢ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή.  
 . . . . .]ον ἐπὶ Θρήικας ἀπ' Αἰγύπτιοι [πέτοιο  
 αἵματ]ι Πυγμαίων ἠδομένη [γ]έρα[νος,  
 Μασσαγέται καὶ μακρὸν ὄϊστεύοιεν ἐπ' ἄνδρα  
 Μῆδον]· ἀη[δονίδες] δ' ὧδε μελιχρ[ό]τεραι.  
 ἔλλετε Βασκανίης ὀλοὸν γένος· αὔθι δὲ τέχνη  
 κρίνετε,] μὴ σχοίνωι Περσίδι τὴν σοφίην·  
 μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶτε μέγα ψοφέουσαν ἀοιδὴν  
 τίκτεσθαι· βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ Διός.'  
 Καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρώτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα  
 γούνασιν, Ἀπ[ό]λλων εἶπεν ὁ μοι Λύκιος·  
 ' . . . . .] . . . ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον  
 θρέψαι, τῆ]ν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην·  
 πρὸς δέ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἄμαξαι  
 τὰ στείβειν, ἐτέρων ἴχνια μὴ καθ' ὀμα  
 δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶν μηδ' οἶμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους  
 ἀτρίπτο]υς, εἰ καὶ στεινοτέρην ἐλάσεις.'  
 τῶι πιθόμη]ν· ἐνὶ τοῖς γὰρ ἀεῖδομεν οἱ λιγὺν ἦχον  
 τέττιγος, θ]όρυβον δ' οὐκ ἐφίλησαν ὄνων.  
 θηρὶ μὲν οὐατόεντι πανεῖκελον ὀγκήσαιτο  
 ἄλλος, ἐγ]ὼ δ' εἶην οὐλ[α]χύς, ὁ πτερόεις,  
 ἄ πάντως, ἵνα γῆρας ἵνα δρόσον ἦν μὲν ἀεῖδω  
 προίκιον ἐκ δίης ἠέρος εἶδαρ ἔδων,  
 αὔθι τὸ δ' ἐκδύοιμι, τό μοι βᾶρος ὄσσον ἔπεστι  
 τριγλώχιν ὀλοῶι νῆσος ἐπ' Ἐγκελάδωι.  
 . . . . . Μοῦσαι γὰρ ὄσους ἴδον ὄθματι παῖδας  
 μὴ λοξῶι, πολιούς οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλους.<sup>326</sup>

<sup>326</sup> 'The Telchines often murmur at me for my song, ignorant, who were not born friends of the Muse, because I did not complete a single, unbroken song on kings ... in several thousands of lines, or on... heroes, but I turn my word little by little in my mind like a child, although my decades are not few. ... to the Telchines I, in turn, say this: "... tribe, ... knowing how to waste the liver away, ... of few lines, but the fertile Lawgiver by far outweighs the long ...; and of the two, the delicate ... showed that Mimnermus is sweet, but the large woman did not. Let the crane delighting in the Pygmies' blood ... fly away from Egypt to the Thracians and let the Massagetæ shoot over a long distance at the Mede warrior: nightingales are sweeter this way. Off with you, deadly line of Jealousy, and hereafter, judge poetry by craft, not by the Persian chain; nor search after a greatly resounding song to spring from me: thundering rests not with me, but with Zeus." For when I first placed the tablet upon my knees, Lycian Apollo told me: "... singer, rear the sacrificial victim as pinguid as possible, but, my good friend, (keep) the Muse meagre; this I also command you, to walk on paths, which the wagons do not tread, not to drive your chariot in the common



In a recent companion-entry on Aratus, Volk claims that ‘the word λεπτός is hardly even found in the extant Callimachean corpus: besides the λεπταί / ῥήσιες of epigram 27.3-4 Pfeiffer, there is only the famous Μοῦσα λεπταλή [...] of the *Aetia* prologue (fr. 1.24 Pfeiffer), which employs a derivative of the adjective. As for the κατὰ λεπτὸν ῥήσιες [...] of Mimnermus putatively mentioned earlier in the same prologue (11-12), not only is ῥήσιες a conjecture of Augusto Rostagni [...], but as has recently been shown, κατὰ λεπτὸν is not in fact a possible reading of the London scholia (on which we rely for this part of the text)’.<sup>327</sup>

Nonetheless, I beg to differ almost thoroughly, with the sole exception of the confirmed impugment of κατὰ λεπτὸν / ῥήσιες in Fr. 1.11-12 Harder:<sup>328</sup> as I intend to demonstrate presently, not only does Callimachus put λεπτός to use more often than Volk maintains, but λεπτότης constitutes a staple of Callimachus’s aesthetic creed. Hence, I shall review all the Callimachean instances of λεπτός<sup>329</sup> and begin with the one in Fr. 1.23-24 Harder, which arguably exerted the most enduring influence on posterior literature.<sup>330</sup> Thereupon, by means of a mixture of thematic and chronological criteria,<sup>331</sup> I shall look at *H.* 3.240-

---

tracks of others nor on the broad way, but on unworn roads, even though you will drive in a narrower path.” I obeyed him: we sing among those who like the clear voice of the cicada, not the clamour of asses. Let another bray altogether like the long-eared beast, may I be the light one, the winged one, ah, by all means, in order that I may sing dew, feeding on dewy food from divine air, and, in turn, I may strip myself of old age, which weighs on me like the three-barbed island on wretched Enceladus. ... Muses do not disown as friends once gray-haired those to whom they did not look askance in childhood.

<sup>327</sup> Volk (2010): 206.

<sup>328</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 41-43 with full bibliography.

<sup>329</sup> A comprehensive catalogue, which omits exclusively Fr. 228 Pfeiffer, can be found in Stephens (2002-2003): 14.

<sup>330</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 62-63 with literature.

<sup>331</sup> The chronology of Callimachean works remains a thorny matter and the *Reply to the Telchines* is no exception: scholarly opinions range from c. 270 to a much later date close to Callimachus’s death sometime after 240 – see *ibid.*: 7-9 for an excellent overview of the *status quaestionis*, where Harder, to my mind plausibly, favours a time towards the end of Callimachus’s life; on the uncertainties surrounding Callimachus’s demise cp. also Stephens (2015): 6 with literature. Be that as it may, I think that the *Aitia* prologue must be granted pride of place because of its impact upon the successive centuries; besides, from our contemporary perspective, regardless of the actual compositional order, all these passages shed profitable light on each other.

243,<sup>332</sup> Fr. 54.14-15 Harder,<sup>333</sup> Fr. 228.12-14 Pfeiffer<sup>334</sup> (which, to the best of my knowledge, has thus far never been discussed in programmatic terms) and *Ep.* 27.3-4 Pfeiffer.<sup>335</sup>

Accordingly, let me start with Μοῦσα λεπταλή, who manifests itself within the metaphor at the outset of Apollo's<sup>336</sup> address to Callimachus in Fr. 1.23-24 Harder:<sup>337</sup> . . . .] . . . ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅτι πάχιστον / θρέψαι, τή]ν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην. From a syntactic viewpoint, the commencement of the god's speech exploits a perfect parallelism, which hinges on θρέψαι: the nouns τὸ θύος and τήν Μοῦσαν precede the adjectives ὅτι πάχιστον and λεπταλέην; yet, the pair μὲν ... δέ conveys a certain degree of opposition. On a very basic level, one might say that a parallel is drawn between poetry and an animal sacrifice: according to Petrovic, the point of comparison rests on the perception of both poetry and sacrificial offerings as gifts to the deity.<sup>338</sup> Consequently, Apollo states the opposite qualities he values in the animal, which will be immolated to him, and in the Muse, his attendant goddess. So, on the one hand, it does not come as a surprise that the god expects his devotee to raise a pinguid animal: a meagre victim would surely arouse his rage.<sup>339</sup> On the other hand, in his capacity as the god of medicine, Apollo is well aware that if the same criterion of abundant mass were applied to the Muse, this would be detrimental to her.<sup>340</sup> Apollo, instead, wants the Muse to comply with the opposite quality, λεπτότης, because, for her divine body, παχύτης is detrimental in both physical and intellectual respects. For, as Asper richly explains, the first aspect draws inspiration

---

<sup>332</sup> This hymn arose either before 275 or between 262 and 255 – see Stephens (2015): 20.

<sup>333</sup> This epinician ode was written around 245 – see Harder (2012) II: 390.

<sup>334</sup> This composition, also known as *Apotheosis of Arsinoe*, was brought out after the queen's death in late-June 270 – on the mystery shrouding the precise period of this event see Caneva (2016): 135-141.

<sup>335</sup> The only incontrovertible fact is that the epigram was penned after the publication of Aratus's *Phain.*, i.e. approximately 276 – see Gee (2013): 4; unless new evidence emerges, further attempts to pin down a more accurate dating are confined to speculation.

<sup>336</sup> On Apollo in Fr. 1 Harder see Petrovic (2006): 26 and Harder (2012) II: 57-60, both with bibliography.

<sup>337</sup> For an excellent survey of this distich see Harder (2012) II: 60-63 with bibliography.

<sup>338</sup> See Petrovic (2012a): 122-123 with bibliography.

<sup>339</sup> For further examples see Asper (1997): 160.

<sup>340</sup> Hunter (2004): 70.

from popular medicine, according to which leanness coincides with health.<sup>341</sup> The second *côté* hinges on the connotation of λεπταλέος in the sense of ‘intelligent’ as opposed to παχύς ‘stupid’.<sup>342</sup>

If one were to transpose all this into aesthetic terms, one might state that παχύτης refers to length, grand style<sup>343</sup> and, according to Krevans’s interpretation of Fr. 398 Pfeiffer (Λύδη καὶ παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν),<sup>344</sup> to florid language.<sup>345</sup> All this is irreparably incompatible with λεπτότης: this quality requires poetry to ‘pared down to what is strictly necessary, to an intellectual poetry where nothing is wasted and every word counts’.<sup>346</sup>

Yet, λεπτότης pertains also to the acoustic sphere.<sup>347</sup> By opting for λεπταλέος, an epic form of the more ordinary λεπτός, Callimachus alludes to *Il.* 18.571, where the adjective limns the voice of a boy, who accompanying himself on the λιγύς timbre of his instrument, sings in the vineyard scene embossed on Achilles’s shield.<sup>348</sup> The context counts because, as I explain in chapter 2, childhood forms part of the Telchines’ reprimand and, in the same breath, of Callimachus’s apologetic strategy. In addition, the connection of λεπταλέος to λιγύς in the Iliadic segment on trial matters because, in Fr. 1.29-30 Harder,<sup>349</sup> Callimachus defines the timbre of the cicada, of which he asserts to be fond, as λιγύς.<sup>350</sup>

*H.* 3.240-243<sup>351</sup> lends a meaningful confirmation<sup>352</sup> of Callimachus’s approving assessment of ‘musical’ λεπτός, but prior to analysing the salient aspects, I prefer to briefly

---

<sup>341</sup> For a full discussion see Asper (1997): 160-175.

<sup>342</sup> Asper (1997): 175-177.

<sup>343</sup> Hunter (2004): 69-70.

<sup>344</sup> ‘Lyde, inflated and garbled book’.

<sup>345</sup> Krevans (1993): 156-159. Asper (1997): 185-187 proposes a similar interpretation.

<sup>346</sup> Hunter (2004): 70.

<sup>347</sup> See Asper (1997): 177-198 and Andrews (1998): 5-8 for an exhaustive discussion. Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2002): 252 remark that ‘in Hellenistic aesthetics, sound was as significant as the visual and verbal, and certainly for Callimachus sound and the effects of sound are prevalent through his extant poetry’. Cp. also Steiner (2007): 201-204.

<sup>348</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 62; on this Iliadic scene and its broader repercussions upon Callimachus see Stephens (2002-2003): 13-28.

<sup>349</sup> I address the importance of the cicada in Fr. 1 in Sberna (2015): 210-211 with bibliography.

<sup>350</sup> Steiner (2007): 203.

<sup>351</sup> For a detailed elucidation of these lines see Stephens (2015): 153.

<sup>352</sup> The tight bond between the two passages has already been amply noted: see Stephens (2002-2003): 14-15, who remarks that apart from employing the same language of Homer (ὕπαιδω, λίγεια, λεπταλέον),

contextualise the verses. In the hymnic section stretching between line 238 and line 258, Callimachus narrates the last αἴτιον of this poem, namely the foundation of Artemis’s temple in Ephesus.<sup>353</sup> Against that backdrop, in lines 238-239, he commemorates the fact that the Amazons consecrated an image to the goddess beneath an oak trunk; thereupon, he continues:

αὐταὶ δ’ Ὀὔπι ἄνασσα, περὶ πρύλιν ὠρχήσαντο  
 πρῶτα μὲν ἐν σακέεσιν ἐνόπλιον, αὐθι δὲ κύκλω  
 στησάμεναι χορὸν εὐρύν· ὑπήεισαν δὲ λίγειαί  
 λεπταλέον σύριγγες.<sup>354</sup>

With an eye on Fr. 1.23-24 Harder, what strikes me principally is the simultaneous presence of the same elements in both excerpts: αἰοιδέ corresponds to ὑπήεισαν; λεπταλέην mirrors λεπταλέον and λίγειαί [...] σύριγγες matches λιγὸν ἦχον / τέττιγος in Fr. 1. 29-30 Harder. Considering this, I surmise that, irrespective of the relative temporal sequence, Callimachus meant these two passages to illuminate each other, thus cementing the programmatic coherence of his λεπτότης-based poetics. By the same token, in my judgement, an ulterior example of poetological consistency lurks behind another occurrence of λεπτός, which, as far as I know, has not yet been recognised: the fragmentary lines 12-14 of Fr. 228, which Pfeiffer tentatively entitled Ἐκθέωσις Ἀρσινόης:<sup>355</sup>

] .μέγας γαμέτας ὀμεύνω  
 ]αν πρόθεσιν πύρ’ αἴθειν  
 ] λεπτὸν ὕδωρ.<sup>356</sup>

---

Callimachus juxtaposes war and shields with choral dance just like in the Homeric vignette in *Iliad* 18; Harder (2012) II: 62 and Stephens (2015):153.

<sup>353</sup> See Stephens (2015): 152.

<sup>354</sup> ‘They themselves, Queen Oupis, danced the war dance, first armed with shields, then by setting the broad chorus up in a circle; shrill pipes sang delicately in accompaniment’.

<sup>355</sup> On Frs. 226-229 as part of the collection of *Iambi* see Lelli (2005): 1-27; see *contra* Acosta-Hughes (2003): 478-489. On the performative framework of the four fragments see recently Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 108-112. On Fr. 228 Pfeiffer in general see Lelli (2005): 67-71 and 151-155; cp. also Hunter (2003a): 50-53 on the interplay of Greek and Egyptian elements in it. Finally, on possible emendations to the text see Austin (2006): 57-68.

<sup>356</sup> ‘... [T]he great husband to the consort ... kindle a fire as offering ... fine water’.

The battered status of the verses notwithstanding, it seems safe to assume that the adjective λεπτός colours water in a sacrificial frame (πρόθεσις).<sup>357</sup> Let us now inspect the meaning of the phrase λεπτὸν ὕδωρ more closely. By drawing attention to scientific terminology, in which τὸ λεπτότατον τοῦ ὕδατος means ὄμβρος, in his recent commentary Lelli submits that Callimachus might be designating rain through refined wording; subsequently, he tentatively adds that rain might be particularly suitable for ‘usi lustrali’.<sup>358</sup> Here, I suggest that the phrase implies that not any variety of water can appropriately be used in such a ritual, but only carefully selected. As a result, the passage under scrutiny may intriguingly mirror the close of *H.* 2.110-112, in which Apollo proclaims: Δηοῖ δ’ οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι, / ἀλλ’ ἦτις καθαρὴ τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει / πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβάς ἄκρον ἄωτον.<sup>359</sup>

The correspondence may well end here without the ampler repercussions of the elusive, much-debated final verses of the hymn;<sup>360</sup> yet, I think that the λεπτὸν ὕδωρ in line 14 of the *Apotheosis of Arsinoe* triggers wider implications: I have at present broached two programmatic usages thereof and afterwards shall concentrate on the remaining two, to wit *Ep.* 27 Pfeiffer and *Fr.* 54.14-15 Harder. Therefore, by my lights, the λεπτὸν ὕδωρ invites the reader to transcend a mere designation of rain, and it is not unreasonable to resume the exploration of the conclusion of the end of *H.* 2. In spite of the thorny debate, one can reasonably assume that Apollo, who, just like in the *Reply*, acts as Callimachus’s divine sponsor and defends him from vexatious critics,<sup>361</sup> approves of the hymn just performed and its author on grounds of purity. How does this poetological judgement relate with the

---

<sup>357</sup> On a possible reconstruction of this tattered section of the poem along with syntactic observations, see Lelli (2005): 166-196. I follow the scholar in translating πρόθεσιν as an apposition to the rituals performed in honour of the dead queen.

<sup>358</sup> *Ibid.*: 169.

<sup>359</sup> ‘Not from everywhere do the bees fetch water to Demeter, but the one springing up pure and undefiled from the holy fountain, small stream, best of best’.

<sup>360</sup> On these bewildering lines see now also Stephens (2015): 73 and 98-99 with bibliography.

<sup>361</sup> See Petrovic (2006): 26 n. 72.

image of the bees? One might be surprised by Callimachus's choice to pair bees with water instead of honey, which usually connects these insects with poetry on account of its sweetness.<sup>362</sup> Nevertheless, variations of common *topoi* are what one should expect from Callimachus, who is ordered by Apollo to follow untrodden paths in Fr. 1.25-28 Harder.<sup>363</sup> On top of that, the bees' predilection for καθαρότης fits nicely into the terminal section of the hymn: in line 111, for example, the sort of water carried to Demeter is described as καθαρή τε καὶ ἀγράαντος – this instance of *Wassermetaphorik* finds a noteworthy reverberation in *Ep.* 28.3-4 Pfeiffer<sup>364</sup> (οὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης / πίνω).<sup>365</sup> In sum, Callimachus's target in substituting water for honey depends to a degree on an alteration of ordinary symbolism, as a consequence of which 'sweetness yields to purity'.<sup>366</sup>

Yet, how can one account for the explicit mention of Demeter as beneficiary of the bees' choicest droplets? I think that Petrovic's line of argument proves promising: she explores a trend of Callimachean work, in compliance with which parallels are drawn between poetry and a material gift to the gods because the point of comparison rests on the perception of both as offerings to the deity.<sup>367</sup> In particular, in the case of *H.* 2, by supporting the identification of the bees with Demeter's priestesses,<sup>368</sup> she decodes the metaphor as follows: 'Die Priesterinnen, die Demeter Wasser bringen, sind [...] dem Dichter vergleichbar, der einen Hymnos für Apollon verfasst hat'.<sup>369</sup>

---

<sup>362</sup> For a list of instances see Crane (1987): 400-402 and Asper (1997): 114-115.

<sup>363</sup> Crane (1987): 402; on Fr. 1.25-28 Harder see now Harder (2012) II: 63-68 with literature.

<sup>364</sup> On Callimachus as a 'water-drinker' see Crowther (1979): 1-11, Crane (1987): 403, Hunter (2004): 448-449, Sens (2015): 40-52 and Sens (2016): 230-246, all with literature.

<sup>365</sup> 'Nor do I drink from the (public) fountain'.

<sup>366</sup> Crane (1987): 403.

<sup>367</sup> Petrovic (2012a): 107-130 – on *H.* 2 see above all *ibid.*: 123-127. The other Callimachean passages she scrutinises are Fr. 1.23-24 Harder, which I studied above, and *Iamb.* 12, to which I shall return in chapter 3.

<sup>368</sup> Chamoux (1953): 267. According to ancient interpretations, priestesses can be called bees owing to the common partiality for purity – see Crane (1987): 400 n. 1 for a list of pertinent *scholia*. Crane's decision to discard possible religious connotations is not uncommon: cp. Asper (1997): 115 n. 27 for other examples.

<sup>369</sup> Petrovic (2012a): 125; for further comments on the interplay between Callimachus's hymn and sacred Cyrenian regulations see Petrovic (2011): 264-285.

Until now, I have shown that throughout his *œuvre* Callimachus endows both the adjective λεπτός and water with a notable poetological power. Now, since the two elements are explicitly juxtaposed in λεπτὸν ὕδωρ in Fr. 228.14 Pfeiffer, I infer that the phrase does not just simply designate special water as part of the sacred ceremonies in honour of Queen Arsinoe II, but could also refer to the poem itself, probably meant for an official purpose.<sup>370</sup>

To further support my claim, I will expand on an Lelli's attractive train of thought:<sup>371</sup> through λεπτὸν ὕδωρ Callimachus might be alluding to χρυσ]είου ἀπὸ κρητῆρος ἀέρσην,<sup>372</sup> the fifth line of a fragmentary poem, which, the lack of an incontrovertible proof notwithstanding, may be attributed to Posidippus (*SH* 961).<sup>373</sup> The scholar also remarks that Callimachus's reference becomes markedly pointed because Posidippus's ἀέρση occurs in a similarly ritual context, albeit of an apparently nuptial tone.<sup>374</sup> In addition, the ablution of a queen called Ἀρσινόη in line 13 leads to a comparison between her and Hera in lines 7-8 (Ἰ. ντος ἐλούσατο παρθένος Ἥρα[η / Οὐ]λύμῳ παστὸν ὑπερχομέν[η]).<sup>375</sup> both share in the same destiny of sisters/wives;<sup>376</sup> therefore, an identification of the queen with

---

<sup>370</sup> Lelli (2005a): 46 and 70-71.

<sup>371</sup> *Ibid.*: 169.

<sup>372</sup> '[D]ew (or rain) from a golden bowl'.

<sup>373</sup> Austin and Bastianini include this poem in the Posidippean collection and assign number \*114 to it – the symbol \* highlights the editors' prudence. The attribution rests on the subscription on the back of the papyrus roll, which preserves the poem: Σύμμεικτα ἐπιγράμματα[α] Ποσειδίπ[ου], 'mixed epigrams of Posidippus'. The fact that Ποσειδίπ[ου] is retracted on the line below the title has led scholars to assume that a list of names of other epigrammatists followed the genitive of Posidippus' name. Yet, after careful examination of the papyrus, Bastianini (2002): 4 comes to the conclusion that Ποσειδίπ[ου] was added by a different hand; therefore, Posidippus is credited with the entire collection. On the contrary, the Posidippean paternity is not accepted by the members of the editorial team of the constantly updated online edition.

<sup>374</sup> I note incidentally that Hadjittofi (2008): 11-12 tantalisingly traces similarities in the context of the bath between Posidippus's poem (*SH* 961) and Callimachus's *H.* 5.

<sup>375</sup> '... [A]s a virgin Hera washed herself entering the bridal chamber on Olympus'

<sup>376</sup> See Caneva (2016): 129 with n.1 on the problematic dating of Arsinoe's wedding; see also *ibid.*: 141-142 with bibliography on the incestuous nature of the marriage with Ptolemy II.

Arsinoe II is encouraged:<sup>377</sup> for, this conceit features also in other poems addressing the marriage of the Philadelphoi with specific aims.<sup>378</sup>

I agree with Lelli's hypothesis, but I think there is an issue in need of further discussion: the reason why Callimachus chooses *Wassermetaphorik* to allude to Posidippus. A fairly obvious answer seems to be provided by the numerous water images, with which *SH* 961 is studded: ἀέρσην, 'dew' in line 5, a 'fount' (κρήνης) in line 11, a ποταμός, 'river', in line 12, which presumably carries an abundant surge (δαυιλές οἶδ[μ]α φέρει, line 14), ὑετός, 'rain', in line 16 another κρήνη in line 17 and ἀγνὰ λοετρά, 'holy bathing places' in line 18. Moving in this direction through extensive supplements to the lacunae, Lasserre went so far as to claim that the author of the poem complies strikingly with the poetic programme embedded in the close of Callimachus's *H. 2*.<sup>379</sup> Yet, on account of the arbitrary

---

<sup>377</sup> Since, according to Lasserre (1959): 223, the papyrus transmitting the poem dates from the mid-third century B.C., Arsinoe III, who married approximately in 217, remains out of the question; hence, the only alternative candidate is Arsinoe I. At the same time, the parallel drawn between the queen and Hera, which is also exploited by other poems dealing with the marriage between Ptolemy II and his sister, induces one to lean towards Arsinoe II.

<sup>378</sup> One can mention in particular the opposite stance taken on the subject by Theoc. *Id.* 17.128-134 (αὐτός τ' ἰφθίμα τ' ἄλοχος τὰς οὔτις ἀρείων / νυμφίον ἐν μεγάροισι γυνὰ περιβάλλετ' ἀγοστῶι, / ἐκ θυμοῦ στέργουσα κασίγνητόν τε ποσίν τε. / Ὡδε καὶ ἀθανάτων ἱερὸς γάμος ἐξετελέσθη / οὐς τέκετο κρείουσα Ῥέα βασιλῆας Ὀλύμπου· / ἐν δὲ λέχος στόρνυσιν ἰαύειν Ζηνὶ καὶ Ἥρῃ / χεῖρας φοιβήσασα μύροις ἔτι παρθένος Ἴρις, 'both he and his comely partner, than whom no better wife embraces her bridegroom in the halls, loving wholeheartedly her brother and spouse. In this manner too was accomplished the sacred marriage of the immortals, whom queen Rhea bore as kings of Olympus: one single bed does Iris, still a virgin, make up for Zeus and Hera to pass the night, after purifying her hands with perfumes') and by Sot. *Com. Frs.* 1 (εἰς οὐχ ὀσίην τρυμαλὴν τὸ κέντρον ὤθει, 'not into a permitted hole did he thrust his point') and 16 Powell ("Ἥρην ποτέ φασιν Δία τὸν τερπικέρανον, 'they say that once upon a time Hera ... Zeus who delights in thunder'). For comparative studies of these poems see Lelli (2005a): 51-55 and add Hunter (2003a): 191-195 on the Theocritean lines. For more recent remarks on irreverent poets and irony in court poetry Prioux (2009): 115-131 and Hamm (2009): 77-104, respectively. These essays also engage with Callimachus's hint at these Sotadean fragments in his Fr. 75.4-5 Harder ("Ἥρην γὰρ κοτέ φασι – κύον, κύον, ἴσχεο, λαιδρὲ / θυμέ, σύ γ' αἰεῖσθι καὶ τὰ περ οὐχ ὀσίη, 'for they say that once upon a time Hera – dog, dog, my impudent soul, you would sing even of what is not permitted') – see also my comments in chapter 2. Finally, it is known that the specific occasion of the queen's marriage with Ptolemy II inspired also a hymn to Arsinoe-Aphrodite preserved in a second century AD papyrus (see Barbantani (2005): 135-165 and Barbantani (2008): 1-32) and a poem by Callimachus, of which only the opening line survives: Ἀρσινόης, ὃ ξεῖνε, γάμον καταβάλλοιμ' αἰεῖδεν, 'o stranger, I commit to singing of Arsinoe's marriage' (Fr. 392 Pfeiffer). Although the loss of the whole text prevents from determining its content and structure, according to Stephens (2005): 243-244, the verb καταβάλλομαι, a Pindaric allusion to the competing καταβολαί performed at the outset of sacred contests, retains some of the original competitive force, with Posidippus's poem being a likely target. This suggestion gains in strength if one ponders that just like Callimachus in his mimetic hymns 5 and 6, in *SH* 961 even Posidippus pretends to be present at the ceremony and, in his capacity as 'Master of the Revels' instructs the young cult ministers – see Barbantani (2001): 60, who also remains cautious with respect to the ascription of *SH* 961 to Posidippus. In general, on Callimachus's treatment of Arsinoe II and Berenice II see chapter 3; on Posidippus's celebration of Arsinoe II see Stephens (2004): 161-176.

<sup>379</sup> Lasserre (1959): 238-239.



nature of some conjectures, it has been easy to dismiss this reconstruction, especially his elucidation of the river in lines 13-14 as a metaphor for a rejected epic grandeur: since the poem pays tribute to the marriage of the lords of Egypt, 'ist naheliegenderweise schlicht von der Nilschwemme die Rede – ein poetologisches *double entendre* ist nicht nachzuweisen'.<sup>380</sup> In spite of this, although the fragmentary condition of the poem enjoins caution, in my opinion one aspect of Lasserre's argument ought not to be discarded: the similarities between founts and dew and the end of *H. 2*. This affinity correlates with other striking correspondences between Posidippean and Callimachean aesthetics, which have been unveiled since the publication in 2001 of poems preserved in the Milan papyrus P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309 and attributed to Posidippus:<sup>381</sup> for example, the research for refinement in the λιθικά section<sup>382</sup> and the celebration of Lysippus's statues in the ἀνδριαντοπουικά.<sup>383</sup> At the same time, this newly emerged proximity between Posidippus and Callimachus perplexes scholars in consequence of the inclusion of Posidippus among the Telchines in the so-called *Scholia Florentina*.<sup>384</sup> On that account, over the last few years several hypotheses have been proposed to disentangle the issue: a contrast between a Macedonian and an Egyptian perspective on the Ptolemaic empire,<sup>385</sup> different social circles, relationships with members of the court, attempts to win the queens' favours;<sup>386</sup>

---

<sup>380</sup> Asper (1997): 126.

<sup>381</sup> See the discussion in Gutzwiller (2005): 2-3 with literature.

<sup>382</sup> See Bing (2005): 119-140; on the Λιθικά and Ptolemaic propaganda see now Petrovic (2014): 273-300 with bibliography.

<sup>383</sup> See Sens (2005): 206-225.

<sup>384</sup> See Di Nino (2010): 71-73 for a good overview.

<sup>385</sup> Stephens (2005): 229-248.

<sup>386</sup> Lelli (2005b): 77-132.

the possibility of reconciling λεπτότης with σεμνότης;<sup>387</sup> Antimachus's *Lyde*.<sup>388</sup> Water metaphors, to my mind, can shed some light on the matter; beforehand, though, to grasp Posidippus's take on *Wassermetaphorik*, one needs to complement the tantalising remnants of *SH 961* with some of the recently discovered epigrams.

Let us start with *Ep.* 7.1-4, in which, despite the lacunae, one manages to recreate the following picture: Ἐξ Ἀράβων τὰ ξάνθ{α} ὀ[ρέων κατέρ]υτα κυλίων, / εἰς ἄλλα χειμάρρους ὤκ' [ἐφόρει ποταμ]ὸς / τὸν μέλιτι χροίην λίθ[ον εἶκελον, ὄ]ν Κρονίο[υ] χεῖρ / ἔγλυψε.<sup>389</sup> After observing that these Posidippean verses rework an Iliadic simile, in which Hector's assault on the Achaean ships is compared with a huge stone carried by a storm-swollen river (*Il.* 13.137-143), Bing notes that the passage recalls Callimachus's image of the Assyrian river at the close of *H.2*, which, incidentally, also takes its cue from an Iliadic simile comparing the rampaging Ajax to a tumid river full of dead trees and driftwood (*Il.* 11.492-497),<sup>390</sup> however, as Bing points out, for Posidippus 'the debris-carrying torrent is itself the ultimate source of the gem'.<sup>391</sup>

In my opinion, this captivating comment requires additional elaboration because, if such a delineation of the river were confirmed elsewhere in Posidippus's *oeuvre*, it would imply a pregnant difference between him and Callimachus in respect of water metaphors. In fact,

---

<sup>387</sup> Prioux (2007): 77-130. Notwithstanding some differences in the focus and in the development of the discussion, I think that Prioux's argument can be beneficially complemented by Petrovic (2006): 16-41. Finally, I think that one might benefit from Porter (2011): 282-286, where the scholar thought-provokingly invites to uncover a tension splitting Posidippus's λεπτότης between the insistence upon the smallness of the jewels and their chiselled decorations and frequent evocations of enormity. Although it seems to me that Porter pushes his contention too far, one could further investigate this aspect as an extra possible bone of dissension between Posidippus and Callimachus. By contrast, for the reasons I am substantiating in the current chapter, I cannot agree with Porter's attempt to debunk the more conventional understanding of Callimachean λεπτότης, which he never explicitly explores, but he glimpses in the *Hymns*, where Callimachus pits infant deities and their possession of full powers (*ibid.*: 293-294). For all that, touching this last respect, Ambühl (2005): 99-362 with literature develops more solidly an analogous thesis.

<sup>388</sup> See Cameron (1995): 231-232, who is followed by Di Nino (2010): 73-76.

<sup>389</sup> 'Rolling yellow (rubble) from the Arabian (mountains), the winter-flowing (river) quickly (carried) to the sea the gem resembling honey in its colour, which Cronius's hand engraved'.

<sup>390</sup> Asper (1997): 116 and Hunter (2003b): 221 with n. 23.

<sup>391</sup> Bing (2005): 127 n. 17.

the image is mirrored in two corresponding passages: in *Ep.* 15.1-2,<sup>392</sup> Posidippus explains that, contrary to expectations,<sup>393</sup> it was not a river that once held the gem described in the epigram, but the head of barbed serpent. Besides, in *Ep.* 16, Posidippus focuses on an Arabian stream lumping huge quantities of rock-crystal on the shore of the sea. The final distich of this epigram might prove significant in view of the polemics with Callimachus as Posidippus mocks the scorn, which is generally poured on the rock-crystal owing to its abundance: its splendour would be much more valued if it were scarce from the origin. To me, these verses amount to more than ‘a clever statement of the adage that men think that value is more a factor of rarity than of the beauty of the object itself’:<sup>394</sup> they may contain a pointed allusion to Callimachus’s rejection of the quantity criterion as a guarantee for (poetic) excellence in *H.* 2. 108-112.<sup>395</sup> In sum, I would deduce that *Wassermetaphorik* constitutes one bone of dissension between Callimachus and Posidippus: in evaluating inflated oriental rivers, whereas the former dismisses the Assyrian river inasmuch as its imposing stream carries debris, the latter detects a gem amidst the waste.

With this knowledge, I can return to Callimachus’s choice of λεπτόν ὕδωρ in Fr. 228.14 Pfeiffer to allude to *SH* 961.5: Posidippus’s partiality for κρῆναι and ἀέρση does not hinder him from valuing also engorged rivers in their capacity as begetters of jewels; for Callimachus, instead, the massive fluvial current bars irreparably a harmonisation with the purity of sources. Accordingly, λεπτόν ὕδωρ may contemplate unmasking a Posidippean attitude towards water metaphors by warning the reader not to get lured into trusting the purported purity of the rival’s springs: an immense river rages behind. Lastly, I admit that

---

<sup>392</sup> [Ο]ὐ ποταμὸς κελάδων ἐπὶ χεῖλεσιν, ἀλλὰ δράκοντος / εἶχέ ποτ’ εὐπώγων τόνδε λίθον κεφαλῇ / πυκνὰ φαληριώοντα, ‘it was not a river resounding in its banks, but the well-bearded head of a snake that once held this gem much patched with white’.

<sup>393</sup> Bastianini and Gallazzi (2001): 119 maintain that rivers as sources of precious stone constitute a Posidippean *topos*, which can also be traced in the remnants of *Ep.* 1 (Ἰνδὸς Ὑδάσπης ... λεπτή Ζην[, ‘Indian Hydaspes, ... the delicate ...’) and *Ep.* 10 (κύλινδρον ... χαρ]άδρης ... βαν]αύσου, ‘a cylinder ... of a mountain-stream ... of an artisan’). The former occurrence would be particularly intriguing if the attribute λεπτή referred to the gem carried by the Hydaspes.

<sup>394</sup> Fuqua (2007): 285.

<sup>395</sup> See Asper (1997): 109-120.

my interpretation of λεπτὸν ὕδωρ may be discarded as too boldly speculative; nonetheless, it attempts to decode a tantalising combination of words, which, at any event, locates the passage from the *Apotheosis of Arsinoe* in an ample compositional design, thus confirming Callimachean intratextual congruity.

The penultimate occurrence of λεπτός I shall investigate manifests itself in *Ep.* 27.3-4 Pfeiffer: [...] χαίρετε λεπταί / ῥήσιες.<sup>396</sup> The decipherment of this composition is fraught with both palaeographical and syntactic difficulties;<sup>397</sup> these uncertainties, in turn, trammel the decoding of lines 1-3: does Callimachus single out only Hesiod as Aratus's model or does he intimate that Hesiod was preferred to Homer?<sup>398</sup> Another debate hinges upon whether the poetological meaning of λεπτός<sup>399</sup> in Callimachus's λεπταί / ῥήσιες fits with the force of λεπτός in Aratus's Γ-shaped ΛΕΙΠΘΗ acrostic in *Phain.* 783-796.<sup>400</sup>

Be that as it may, a consensus of sorts appears to have been reached at least in regards to this: Callimachus compliments Aratus of Soli on the accomplishment of his *Phainomena* through an antithesis in lines 1-3.<sup>401</sup> Moreover, I think it hard to disprove Cameron, when he sets forth that Callimachus commends Aratus for painstakingly perfecting his model and expressing his admiration by way of elaborate wordplay: the juxtaposition of the

---

<sup>396</sup> '[...] [H]ail slender verses'.

<sup>397</sup> For a minute rundown see Tsantsanoglou (2009): 76-83 and Hunter (2014): 293-295, both with literature.

<sup>398</sup> For a list of advocates of this view, each individually focusing on the way in which Aratus handled Hesiod, see Gärtner (2007): 157-160-588, Stewart (2008): 58, Tsantsanoglou (2009): 79 n.43 -87 and Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 213-214. For the second position along with insightful comments on the literary-critical lexicon, with which the epigram is studded, see Hunter (2014): 294-301 with the following rider: '[...] there is indeed a contrast between Homer and Hesiod in these verses, but its force is not, as has often been thought, to congratulate Aratus for choosing Hesiod rather than Homer; rather, Callimachus emphasises Aratus's stylistic affiliation to Hesiod, by noting that there was a grander style, which he could have used, but did not' (*ibid.*: 295).

<sup>399</sup> On the dispute over whether Callimachus or Aratus coined the Hellenistic meta-literary sense of λεπτότης, which does not bear upon my inquiry, see Hansens (2014): 610 n. 3; on the relationship between Callimachus and Aratus see also more broadly Matelli (2012): 245-247.

<sup>400</sup> Aratus's adherence to Callimachean λεπτότης has been recently questioned by Tsantsanoglou (2009): 70-75 and Volk (2010): 205-208; cp. *contra* Hansens (2014): 609-614 with full bibliography.

<sup>401</sup> See Cameron (1995): 374. Only Tsantsanoglou (2009): 83-7 champions a radically different understanding: Callimachus berates Aratus for imitating the wrong portion of Hesiod's *Op.*, namely the one lacking sweetness. Yet, even Volk, who concurs with Tsantsanoglou in espousing a divergence between Aratus and Callimachus touching λεπτότης, warns: 'his (scil. Tsantsanoglou's) further claims are to be treated with caution' (Volk (2012): 227 n.63).

adjective λεπτός, which originally means ‘husked’, ‘peeled’, with the verb ἀπομάσσω, ‘skim off’, ‘wipe off’, which occurs in the same third line of the poem.<sup>402</sup>

If this supposition hits the mark, not only does one garner a corroboration of the poetological power of Callimachean λεπτότης, but one also comprehends more distinctly the way in which Callimachus construes *labor limae* as a prerequisite to its attainment.

The terminal deployment of λέπος in which I am interested, features in Fr. 54.14-15 Harder (the *Victoria Berenices*):<sup>403</sup> Κολχίδες ἢ Νείλω[ι / λεπταλέους ἔξυσαν.<sup>404</sup> Even if the fragmentary condition of the text demands prudence, one can reasonably assume that Callimachus depicts some women intent in fine knitting.<sup>405</sup> Such an activity perfectly dovetails his own exquisite spinning of the epinician ode in honour of Berenice II, a fortiori because weaving constitutes a standard metaphor for poetry.<sup>406</sup> Furthermore, the aesthetic importance of λεπταλέους stems from Callimachus’s conscious appropriation of earlier Greek poetry to bind old Greece with the contemporary world of the Ptolemies.<sup>407</sup>

The entire poetological momentousness of λεπτός in the passage under scrutiny will emerge by degrees in the following chapters, where I shall uncover supplementary programmatic aspects of this poem: in chapter 2, I shall propound that it instantiates Callimachus’s rebellion against the time-sanctioned principle of literary appropriateness; in chapter 3, I shall advance that, while eulogising his queen, Callimachus artfully co-opts her, in a manner of speaking, as guarantor of his poetics. Now, though, I am content with stressing that the presence of λεπτός at the commencement of Book 3 of the *Aitia*, apart from giving rise to an elegant pendant to the Μοῦσα λεπταλή in Fr. 1.24 Harder, testifies

---

<sup>402</sup> Cameron (1995): 374-379; cp. also Stewart (2008): 587-588.

<sup>403</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 384-393 with bibliography for a sweeping introduction to the so-called *Victoria Berenices*.

<sup>404</sup> ‘[...] Colchian women or ... Nile ... scraped fine clothes ...’.

<sup>405</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 410-412 on these enigmatic verses.

<sup>406</sup> See Stephens (2002-2003): 14, Massimilla (2010): 235-236, Prioux (2011): 209 and Harder (2012) II: 412, all with literature.

<sup>407</sup> See Stephens (2002): 251-252 with literature.

to Callimachus's unswerving allegiance to his poetic staple throughout his whole artistic life.

Prior to rounding off my perusal of Callimachus's poetological conception of λεπτός, I wish to highlight that, through the gamut of its acceptations, λεπτότης pertains solely to the province of form. In other words, Callimachus intends to proclaim the emancipation of poetry from external constraints. These restrictions are epitomised by means of the tightly intertwined metaphor of the σχοῖνος Περσίς, which partakes in the injunction to Telchines to gauge poetry (σοφίη)<sup>408</sup> against the benchmark of poetic technique,<sup>409</sup> not that of the 'Persian chain' (Fr. 1.17-18 Harder):<sup>410</sup> αὖθι δὲ τέχνηι / κρίνετε, μὴ σχοῖνοι Περσίδι τὴν σοφίην.

On the face of it, the rejected Persian chain indicates a long unit of measurement, which epitomises the Telchines' mechanical valuation of poetry just by its length,<sup>411</sup> which also makes itself visible in line 4<sup>412</sup> and in the extremely spiny segment extending from line 9 to line 16.<sup>413</sup> Yet, there is more to this expression than meets the eye: first of all, Callimachus evokes a chain, that is, according to Rosivach, an instrument imposed upon troublesome prisoners.<sup>414</sup> Another trenchant evidence of chains as sombre tokens of villeinage is offered by a presumably<sup>415</sup> Simonidean epigram (*FGE* III):<sup>416</sup> δεσμῶ ἐν

---

<sup>408</sup> On the implications of Callimachus's choice of the solemn word σοφίη see Harder (2012) II: 52. Based on this, I think that the controversy hinges neither on elegy (and, in particular Antimachus's *Lyde* as Cameron (1995): 303-338 claims) nor on contemporary epic (whose very existence is robustly ruled out by Cameron (*ibid.*: 269-302), but is instead confirmed by Barbantani (2002-2003): 29-47 with full bibliography). Hence, I agree with Hunter (2004): 69, who prudently proposes that the dispute revolves round style, rather than genre.

<sup>409</sup> On τέχνηι in the *Aitia* prologue see the illuminating comments in Petrovic (2006): 29.

<sup>410</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 51-53.

<sup>411</sup> See *ibid.*: 52-53.

<sup>412</sup> See *ibid.*: 25-26.

<sup>413</sup> See *ibid.*: 32-49 with literature, to which one ought to append Halliwell (2011): 93-154 with bibliography on the puzzling Aristophanic contest between Aeschylean and Euripidean verses in the *Ra*. 830-1475, which Callimachus reworks in Fr.1.9-12.

<sup>414</sup> See Rosivach (1999): 139-140. The scholar offers two instances: Hdt. 1.66.18-20, in which he narrates how the defeated Lacedaemonians were compelled to work the Tegeans' field whilst measuring it with the σχοῖνος in humiliating conditions; Eur. *Rhes*. 74-75, in which Hector is resolved to capture the Greeks and have them work the Phrygians' fields in bonds (δέσμοι).

<sup>415</sup> On the attribution of this poem see Petrovic (2007): 218-222 with bibliography.

<sup>416</sup> For an exhaustive linguistic commentary see *ibid.*: 214-216

τὰχυνέντι† σιδηρέῳ ἔσβεσαν ὕβριν / παῖδες Ἀθηναίων, ἔργμασιν ἐν πολέμου / ἔθνεα Βοιωτῶν καὶ Χαλκιδέων δαμάσαντες· / τῶν ἵππους δεκάτην Παλλάδι τάσδ' ἔθεσαν.<sup>417</sup> To commemorate their success over the Boeotians and Chalcidians in 507/506, the Athenians erected a bronze quadriga in the vicinity of the Propylea, upon whose pedestal they carved the poem; in addition, they hung the chains, by dint of which they held their prisoners captive, upon the walls of the Acropolis.<sup>418</sup> One facet appears salient to me: real and inscribed shackles magnified each other<sup>419</sup> reminding the beholder of the crushing burden of serfdom.

Secondly, by characterising the σχοῖνος as Περσίς, Callimachus takes advantage of deep-rooted Hellenic hostility towards the Persians, who were perceived as an impending menace to Greek liberty from the fifth century.<sup>420</sup> Besides, this theme made a conspicuous comeback during Callimachus's lifetime: on the one hand, the depiction of invading Celts as the new Medes between 275 and 262 in *H.* 4.171-175 and, maybe, in *H.* 1.3;<sup>421</sup> on the other hand, perhaps,<sup>422</sup> the sketch of the Seleucids as new Persians during the Third Syrian War (246-241)<sup>423</sup> in Fr. 110 Harder,<sup>424</sup> the σχοῖνος Περσίς in Fr. 1.18 Harder and the Assyrian river in *H.* 2.108.<sup>425</sup>

---

<sup>417</sup> 'By way of an iron (?) chain did the sons of Athens quell the insolence because, thanks to their military deeds, they subdued the peoples of Boeotia and Chalcis; hence, they dedicated these mares to Pallas as a tithe'.

<sup>418</sup> See *ibid.*: 212. The base of the monument with the text was destroyed by the Persians in 480 and built anew in the mid-fifth century – on these peculiar epigraphic circumstances and all concurrent problems see *ibid.*: 210-214 with literature.

<sup>419</sup> See *ibid.*: 217; *ibid.*: 216, Petrovic adduces a Pindaric parallel: just like in the epigram the Athenians punished their enemies for their ὕβρις by dint of irons, in Pindar's *P.* 2.40-42, the Olympians chastised Ixion for his ὕβρις through fetters.

<sup>420</sup> See Prioux (2011): 29 and Giuseppetti (2013): 152 and 154-155, both with bibliography.

<sup>421</sup> Stephens (2015): 18. In chapter 3, I shall probe Callimachus's superb ability to mingle Ptolemaic propaganda with a promotion of his own artistry by dint of an assimilation of his sovereigns' foes to his own detractors.

<sup>422</sup> See Visscher (2017): 211-232 with literature; cp. *contra* Barbantani (2014): 27-28 with bibliography.

<sup>423</sup> See Fischer-Bovet (2014): 64-66 with literature.

<sup>424</sup> The date of the *Coma Berenices* oscillates between 246 and 245 – see van Oppen de Ruiter (2015): 75-88 with bibliography. In chapter 3, I shall put forward that, in Fr. 110 Harder, Callimachus alludes to his own victory over the Telchines by narrating the catasterism of Bernice's lock as a form of triumph over the Chalybes, whom the ringlet likens to the abominable Medes.

<sup>425</sup> The dating of this hymn, though, remains highly speculative – see Stephens (2015): 18-19.

To further substantiate my theory, I call upon the normally overlooked line 19 of the programmatic *Iamb.* 13:<sup>426</sup> Τ[ε]ῦ μέχρι τολμᾶς; Οἱ φίλοι σε δήσουσ[ι].<sup>427</sup> After voicing his outrage at Callimachus's brazen mixture of Ionic and Doric dialect in his *Iambi*, the niggler,<sup>428</sup> not unlike the Telchines, oppugns Callimachus's daring and unorthodox approach (Τ[ε]ῦ μέχρι τολμᾶς;) and exclaims that his friends should bind him (Οἱ φίλοι σε δήσουσ[ι]). I admit that the verb δέω is entirely unrelated to σχοῖνος from an etymological viewpoint; in spite of that, the thrust of the verse seems to chime with the explication of my decipherment of expression σχοῖνος Περσίς in Fr. 1.18 Harder. Conservative<sup>429</sup> nit-pickers adhere to traditional standards; thus, they cannot but frown upon Callimachus's enthronement an unrestricted poetic τέχνη, which he predicates upon subtlety and refinement (Fr. 1.24 Harder: Μοῦσα λεπταλέη; λεπτὸν ὕδωρ in Fr. 228.14 Pfeiffer and *Wassermetaphorik* in *H.* 2.108-112), originality (Fr. 1.25-28 Harder:<sup>430</sup> [...] τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἅμαξαι / τὰ στείβειν, ἑτέρων ἴχνια μὴ καθ' ὀμά / δίφρον ἐλ]ᾶν μηδ' οἷμον ἀνά πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους / ἀτρίπτο]υς, εἰ καὶ στεινοτέρην ἐλάσεις), repudiation of length per se (Fr. 1.9-16 Harder) bombast and, probably, unimaginative imitation of Homer (Fr. 1.19-20 Harder:<sup>431</sup> μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶτε μέγα ψοφέουσας ἀοιδὴν / τίκτεσθαι· βροντᾶν οὐκ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ Διός), and πολυεΐδεια (*Iamb.* 13).<sup>432</sup>

On these grounds, Callimachus excoriates the Telchines for their habit of assessing poetry on the basis of enslaving aesthetic parameters, among which, as I shall argue in chapter 2, τὸ πρέπον (i.e. the subordination of the form to the content) takes the lion's

---

<sup>426</sup> On its poetological import see now Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 47-57 with literature, to which one ought to add Tsantsanoglou (2010): 77-114.

<sup>427</sup> 'How far will you have the effrontery to go? Your friends will bind you'.

<sup>428</sup> On the identity of this individual see Tsantsanoglou (2010): 104-106.

<sup>429</sup> See Hunter (2004): 75-76 and Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2002): 241.

<sup>430</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 63-68.

<sup>431</sup> See *ibid.*: 53-55, to which one should add Petrovic (2006): 24-26 with further bibliography.

<sup>432</sup> See Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 47-57.



share. On account of this, as I shall likewise illustrate in chapter 2, they chide him for his child-like conduct (Fr. 1.6 Harder:<sup>433</sup> παῖς ᾄτε).

If my argument is on the right track, to sum up, by means of the joint effect of Μοῦσα λεπταλέη and σχοῖνος Περσίς, Callimachus articulates his emancipation of his artistry from all yoking curtailments. In addition, his manifesto gains in strength if one considers that the adjective λεπταλέος is associated with the Muse, i.e., in many respects, the very personification of poetry. Such is the powerful poetics Callimachus bequeaths to his first-century Roman disciples, namely Lucretius and Catullus. Both will translate it with *lepos*; however, each adheres to Callimachus's creed in a supremely personal fashion: Lucretius, to which I shall now turn attention, only to some extent, and Catullus more thoroughly.

### 1.3 From Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην to *musaeo lepore*: Lucretius's paradoxical reception of Callimachus

In attempting to understand 1.921-950, scholars have tackled remarkably complicated questions, among which the bewildering relationship between poetry and philosophy in Lucretius particularly stands out,<sup>434</sup> all the more so in view of Epicurus's hostility to

---

<sup>433</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 28 as a preliminary elucidation of the expression.

<sup>434</sup> For a complete picture of the *status quaestionis* see Volk (2002): 94-105, Gigandet (2003): 171-182, Arrighetti (2006): 329-342 and Erler (2011): 24-26, all with literature. In connection with this, I take the chance to cursorily single out another meta-literary occurrence of *lepos*, which designates poetry in proximity with philosophy in 3.1036-1038: *adde repertoires doctrinarum atque leporum, / adde Heliconiadum comites; quorum unus Homerus / scepra potitus eadem aliis sopitu' quietest*, 'add the discoveres of doctrines and pleasures, add the companions of the Muses, who dwell on Helicon; and among them Homer, although he alone gained the sceptre, was overcome with the same sleep of death as the others' – see Florio (2008): 73-74, Kenney (2014<sup>2</sup>): 220-221 and Fratantuono (2015): 219-220, all with bibliography. These verses occur during the coda (3.830-1094) to the demonstration of the absurdity of the fear of death, with which Book 3 concerns itself entirely. Specifically, between 3.1024 and 3.1052, Lucretius shapes a consolatory harangue, which the distressed disciple should address to himself/herself to remind himself/herself that demise awaits us all and that several far more illustrious individuals have already yielded to their mortality – on this subsection in general see Kenney (2014<sup>2</sup>):218.

poetry.<sup>435</sup> I will not attempt to offer a solution,<sup>436</sup> but turn attention to Lucretius's paradoxical reception of Callimachus, which has been recognised and problematised (see below). I intend to propose that there exists another double-edged (and heretofore unobserved) citation of the *Aitia* prologue: *musaeo lepore* at 1.934 harks back at Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην in Fr. 1.24 Harder. To my mind, this allusion signifies that Lucretius embraces Callimachean λεπτότης, but he inverts its essence. In other words, he transforms the accusative Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην, i.e. Callimachus's supreme ideal of artistic autonomy, into an ablativus,<sup>437</sup> videlicet a tool to entice the disciple<sup>438</sup> into espousing the possibly puzzling Epicurean message of the poem. Still, first things first: let me begin with the full text of the passage in question:

*[n]unc age quod super est cognosce et clarius audi.  
nec me animi fallit quam sint obscura; sed acri  
percussit thyrso laudis spes magna meum cor  
et simul incussit suavem mi in pectus amorem  
musarum, quo nunc instinctus mente vigenti  
avia Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante  
trita solo. iuvat integros accedere fontis  
atque haurire, iuvatque novos decerpere flores  
insignemque meo capiti petere inde coronam  
unde prius nulli velarint tempora musae;  
primum quod magnis doceo de rebus et artis  
religionum animum nodis exsolvere pergo,  
deinde quod obscura de re tam lucida pango  
carmina musaeo contingens cuncta lepore.  
id quoque enim non ab nulla ratione videtur;  
sed veluti pueris absinthia taetra medentes  
cum dare conantur, prius oras pocula circum*

---

<sup>435</sup> Recently scholars have warned against too straightforward an acceptance of Epicurus's opposition to poetry as presented in the ancient sources: cp. Arrighetti (2006): 315-329 with bibliography. Despite that, I agree that 'there is nothing in the prior tradition to prepare us (or the first Roman readers) for Lucretius' (O'Hara (2007): 65) – Volk (2002): 95 and Arrighetti (2006): 341 come to equivalent conclusions.

<sup>436</sup> Similarly, I shall dispense with the almost unanswerable question centring upon the relationship between Lucretius and Philodemus because it has no bearing upon my inquiry – for an extremely learned and dependable view, see Arrighetti (2006): 342-370 with full literature, to which one should add Obbink (2007): 33-40 and the essays listed in Janko (2011): 230 n. 8.

<sup>437</sup> In fact, the hypothesis that *lepos* appears subordinate to the content of the lines has already been advocated by Boyancé (1947): 99-102, Elder (1954): 106-114 and Clay (1983): 93- 100; for further literature see Segal (1989): 197 n.10. Nevertheless, it has *not* been related to Lucretius's reception of Callimachus.

<sup>438</sup> On the protean nature of the relationship between Lucretius and his pupil see Markovic (2008): 29-45 with literature.

*contingunt mellis dulci flavoque liquore,  
 ut puerorum aetas improvida ludificetur  
 labrorum tenuis, interea perpotet amarum  
 absinthii laticem deceptaque non capiatur,  
 sed potius tali pacto recreata valescat,  
 sic ego nunc, quoniam haec ratio plerumque videtur  
 tristior esse quibus non est tractata, retroque  
 vulgus abhorret ab hac, volui tibi suaviloquenti  
 carmine Pierio rationem exponere nostram  
 et quasi musaeo dulci contingere melle,  
 si tibi forte animum tali ratione tenere  
 versibus in nostris possem, dum perspicis omnem  
 naturam rerum qua constet compta figura.<sup>439</sup>*

At 1.926-928, Lucretius phrases his poetic achievement as follows: *avia Pieridum peragro  
 loca nullius ante / trita solo. Iuuat intergros accedere fontis / atque haurire iuuatque novos  
 decerpere flores*. Already Pfeiffer detected the Callimachean echo (Fr. 1.25-28 Harder)  
 pervading 1.926-927.<sup>440</sup>

By expanding on Pfeiffer and a few previous investigations,<sup>441</sup> in 1970 Kenney  
 confirmed this idea<sup>442</sup> in the context of his broader effort to prove that Lucretius is a *doctus  
 poeta*, who cannot be utterly foreign to the contemporary diffusion of Hellenistic poetry.<sup>443</sup>

The scholar interpreted *integros fontis* in 1.927 as a supplementary allusion to two  
 Callimachean passages: Apollo's preference for the slender river of pure water in *Hymn*

---

<sup>439</sup> 'Now, come, learn and hear more clearly the rest. It does not escape me in my mind how much it is  
 obscure; yet, great hope of praise hit my heart with sharp thyrsus and, at once, struck into my breast sweet  
 love of the Muses, wherewith now inspired with vigorous mind, I traverse the untrodden regions of the  
 Pierides, never beaten before by anyone's sole. It delights to approach pure fountains and draw and pluck  
 new flowers, and fetch an illustrious crown for my head from spots whence previously the Muses have  
 covered the temples to nobody; first because I instruct in great matters and proceed to deliver the soul from  
 the tight bonds of religion, then because about such obscure a theme I compose bright songs sprinkling  
 them all with the Muses' charm. This, besides, seems indeed to be not without reason: just as doctors, when  
 trying to administer repulsive wormwood to boys, first, all around the cups, sprinkle the brims with the  
 sweet and blonde fluid of honey, in order that the boys' improvident age may be fooled right up to the lips  
 and, meanwhile, drink off the bitter juice of wormwood and, though beguiled, it may not be trapped, but  
 rather, invigorated by such act, it may gain strength, likewise now, since this doctrine seems mostly too  
 harsh to those by whom it has not been handled, and the mass shrinks back from it, I wanted to expose our  
 doctrine to you with sweet-spoken Pierian song and, as it were, sprinkle it with the sweet honey of the  
 Muses, if by luck I might hold your mind to our lines in this way, while you see through the entire nature of  
 things, of which shape it, as it is ordered, consists'.

<sup>440</sup> Pfeiffer (1928): 323.

<sup>441</sup> See Kenney (1970): 366-368 for a survey of previous literature.

<sup>442</sup> *Ibid.*: 370.

<sup>443</sup> *Ibid.*: 368-392.

2.112 and the frequented spring rejected in *Ep.* 28 Pfeiffer.<sup>444</sup> Kenney's contribution is undoubtedly valuable for the sake of a more exhaustive cultural contextualisation of Lucretius's poem,<sup>445</sup> but he did not attempt to interpret what it means for Lucretius to engage with Callimachus.

In a 1982 article centred on the relationship between Callimachus and Lucretius, Brown tackled this issue and contended that Lucretius's allusion to the passage from the *Reply to Telchines* does not imply that he was 'Callimachean in the sense of being an aggressively modernistic poet, but he was sensitive to the invigorating winds of change which were affecting a transformation of the contemporary literature'.<sup>446</sup>

In 1993, by contrast, Donohue dedicated an entire book to the relationship between Lucretius and Callimachus and advocated a deep adherence to Callimacheanism on Lucretius's part. Considering this, he strengthened the Callimachean overtones in 1.926-928.<sup>447</sup> Nonetheless, the amplitude of the agreement which he envisaged between the two poets, rests on some assumptions, to which I find difficult to agree. For instance, as maintained by Donohue, in both the *Aitia* and the *Hymns*, Callimachus avoids 'any sense of religious dread' and that '[f]or Lucretius, Callimachus had made poetry a secular and private medium'.<sup>448</sup> These claims concerning Callimachus's debated religiosity, albeit not isolated,<sup>449</sup> appear problematic in consideration of more contemporary scholarship showing his profound interest in contemporary religious practice.<sup>450</sup>

---

<sup>444</sup> *Ibid.*: 370.

<sup>445</sup> See also the still extremely valuable Minyard (1985) for a broad study of the poem within the frame of the Late Republic.

<sup>446</sup> Brown (1982): 91. On the assessment of other Callimachean passages in the poem see Brown (1982): 82-91 with literature. For a supplementary analysis of the lines under scrutiny with valuable observations on the vocabulary and abundant bibliography, see Graca (1989):67-70.

<sup>447</sup> Donohue (1993): 38-48. The book also offers an important overview on the swan imagery in Greek and Latin literature (*ibid.*: 18-29) and a convincing interpretation of the Callimachean colouring of the swan image in 4.180-182 (*ibid.*: 29-32).

<sup>448</sup> *Ibid.*: 134.

<sup>449</sup> See Petrovic (2011): 265 with notes 1-2 for further literature.

<sup>450</sup> See *ibid.*: 265 n. 3 for more literature and 264-285 for a discussion of the interaction between Cyrenian sacred regulations and the *H.* 2 and of the connection of Callimachus's family to the cult of Apollo in Cyrene.

In 1999, instead, Knox problematised to a greater extent Lucretius's reception of Callimachus, in that the metaphoric deployment of narrow roads can be interpreted as a Lucretian reworking of some passages, which influenced Callimachus as well.<sup>451</sup> For example, the scholar emphasised the similarity between 1.926-928 and the Pythagorean precept, which Porphyry transmits as τὰς λεωφόρους μὴ βαδίζειν<sup>452</sup> in his *Pyth.* 42.<sup>453</sup> Interestingly, over and above that, he drew attention to a resemblance of the same Lucretian phrase with Epicurus's own image contained in Plutarch's *Contra Ep. beat.* 1088c:<sup>454</sup> [ἦ] δ' ἐπὶ τοῦτο (scil. τὸ μὴ πονεῖν) μετ' ὀρέξεως πορεία, μέτρον ἡδονῆς οὔσα, κομιδῆ βραχεῖα καὶ σύντομος.<sup>455</sup> In light of this evidence, the scholar concluded that 'Lucretius's adaptation of Callimachus does not signal allegiance to Callimachean poetics'.<sup>456</sup>

In 2002, apart from exploring the additional implications of the road imagery,<sup>457</sup> in tackling the issue of the 'primus motif',<sup>458</sup> Volk stressed that even though Lucretius proclaims to follow untrodden paths in 1.926-927, in 3.1-6 he defines himself as following in Epicurus's footsteps:<sup>459</sup> [e] *tenebris tantis tam clarum extollere lumen / qui primus potuisti inlustrans commoda vitae, / te sequor, o Graiae gentis decus, inque tuis nunc / ficta pedum pono pressis vestigia signis, / non ita certandi cupidus quam propter amorem / quod te imitari aueo.*<sup>460</sup> The scholar did not explicitly connect this observation with the

---

<sup>451</sup> Knox (1999): 283.

<sup>452</sup> 'Do not proceed along highways'.

<sup>453</sup> Knox (1999): 279-282 with literature. Alternatively, Lucretius's lines might be read as an allusion to Parmenides' prologue (Fr. 1.22-28 D-K) (*ibid.*: 282-283 with literature).

<sup>454</sup> *Ibid.*: 278-279 with literature.

<sup>455</sup> 'The journey to this (scil. the lack of pain) along with an appetency, which is the measure of pleasure, is entirely short and brief.'

<sup>456</sup> *Ibid.*: 283.

<sup>457</sup> Volk (2002): 88-93 with literature. She draws attention to the presentation of the student's learning process as a journey along a path, to Epicurus's own voyage beyond the ramparts of the world, to the right 'way of life' and to the passage from darkness to light.

<sup>458</sup> *Ibid.*: 114-115.

<sup>459</sup> The same observation appears in Clay (1983): 40 and in Gigandet (2003): 173.

<sup>460</sup> 'I follow you, glory of the Greek people, who first were able to raise such clear light out of so thick darkness by illuminating the joys of life, and now I set my foot securely into your imprinted traces, not so much as I desire to vie, rather because, owing to love, I long to imitate you'. On these verses see Kenney (2014<sup>2</sup>): 73-74.

issue of Lucretius's Callimacheanism, but in my opinion this supplementary ambiguity fits neatly in the heterogeneous reception of Callimachus.

In 2007, in her wide-ranging discussion of the relationship between Lucretius and the earlier poetic traditions, Gale suggested that Lucretius subtly represents himself as both heir to the previous poets and as a severe critic.<sup>461</sup> Callimachus is no exception. By making the Callimachean tone of 1.926-928 clash with the Dionysiac energy pervading the preceding lines 922-926, Lucretius collapses any distinction between the two attitudes,<sup>462</sup> which stem from the perhaps already Callimachean opposition between water and wine as symbols of inspiration.<sup>463</sup> Therefore, in Gale's words, 'Lucretius' exploitation of Callimachean language [...] need not amount to a declaration of allegiance to the Alexandrian poet's creed'.<sup>464</sup>

These contributions have valuably demonstrated that Lucretius's reception of Callimachus is all but straightforward.<sup>465</sup> Still, a further tension between Callimachus and Lucretius could be worth exploring, scilicet another reference to the *Aitia* prologue in 1.934, which to the best of my knowledge has up to now gone unnoticed: *musaeo lepore* at 1.934 hints back at Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην in Fr. 1.24 Harder and this allusion may help us to understand Lucretius's paradoxical reception of Callimachus.

On the one hand, in continuity with the imagery in 1.926-928, it professes Lucretius's aesthetic affiliation to Callimachus. On the other hand, Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην, that is Callimachus's supreme artistic ideal, an emancipation of poetry from all external restraints, subject matter included, is dramatically altered. For, it becomes an ablative (*musaeo lepore*), scilicet, literally a means with which Lucretius sprinkles his lines in the service of

---

<sup>461</sup> Gale (2007): 59-75. Specifically, *ibid.*: 61-67, Gale tackle Lucretius's treatment of epic and grants prizes of place to Hesiod (for previous comments see also Brown (1982): 80 and Clay (1983): 44-45). Lastly, *ibid.*: 67-69, Gale tackles tragedy and epigrams.

<sup>462</sup> Gale (2007): 71-72.

<sup>463</sup> See n. 364 p. 66.

<sup>464</sup> Gale (2007): 74.

<sup>465</sup> See also Brown (1982): 81-82. Not even Knox in his convincing problematised reading of the Callimacheanism of 1.926-927 succeeds in ruling out the echo of Callimachean *Wassermetaphorik* in 1.927.

the philosophical content,<sup>466</sup> to tailor it to a potentially recalcitrant Roman public.<sup>467</sup> Subsequently, the instrumental function of *musaeus lepos* is stressed to a greater extent by way of the meta-poetic<sup>468</sup> wormwood simile (1.936-950),<sup>469</sup> where poetry features anew in the ablative in 1.945-947: *uolui tibi suaviloquenti / carmine Pierio rationem exponere nostram / et quasi musaeo dulci contingere*<sup>470</sup> *melle*.<sup>471</sup>

Thence, one might infer that Lucretius tolerates *lepos* (and its Callimachean overtones) exclusively if it contributes to the promotion of the sole truthful philosophy. Otherwise, *lepos* is downright discarded as the preceding dismissal of Heraclitus's works in 1.638-644 attests:<sup>472</sup> *Heraclitus inquit quorum dux proelia primus, / clarus obobscuram linguam magis inter inanis / quamde grauis inter Graios qui uera requirunt. / Omnia enim stolidi magis admirantur amantque, / inuersis quae sub uerbis latitantia cernunt, / ueraque constituunt quae belle tangere possunt / auris et lepido quae sunt fucata sonore*.<sup>473</sup> Heraclitus, too, attempts to make his obscure teaching more palatable by means of acoustic rouge (*lepido sonore*); nonetheless, this charm partakes in a filthy deception (*fucata*)<sup>474</sup> of Heraclitus's disciples: his conviction does not correspond to the nature of things. As a result, Lucretius unhesitatingly denounces this sort of *lepos*.

On these grounds, one can better appreciate the hint which, with *musaeo lepore* 1.934, Lucretius masterly drops at the very beginning of the poem by way of a perfect

---

<sup>466</sup> Edwards (1993): 75 very briefly comments that '[s]uch a cultivation of mere art (scil. by Callimachus) is not for Lucretius'.

<sup>467</sup> For a nuanced reading of Lucretius's project in terms of 'poetics of translation' see Auvray-Assayas (2003): 165-169.

<sup>468</sup> See Hunter (2006): 84.

<sup>469</sup> On the problems posed by this simile and a possible solution see Mistis (1993): 111-128.

<sup>470</sup> The double occurrence of *contingere*, which Clay (1983): 46 n.111 identifies, stresses the strong link between these verses.

<sup>471</sup> On possible echoes of Plato's complex handling of the 'honeyed Muse' see Clay (2003): 184-196.

<sup>472</sup> On these verses see now Montarese (2012): 182-207 with bibliography.

<sup>473</sup> 'Heraclitus, their leader, first enters the fray, brilliant for his obscure speech among the vain rather than among the eminent Greeks, who search for truth. For obtuse people admire and love more all things, which they discern hidden beneath twisted words and they establish as true what can prettily impress their ears and is falsified by charmingsound'.

<sup>474</sup> See Wiseman (1979): 3-8 on *fucatio*.

*Ringkomposition*:<sup>475</sup> in 1.28 he asked the goddess Venus, whom he had fervently saluted as the prime source of life-giving *lepos*<sup>476</sup> in 1.15-16,<sup>477</sup> to grace his lines with *aeternus lepos*.<sup>478</sup> Here, since *DRN* has never swerved from the veracious path, the passage I have been analysing bespeaks that Lucretius's prayer has proved worthy of fulfilment and that he has earned poetic laurels (1.929). In the same breath, Callimachean λεπτότης has been absorbed into legitimate *lepos*; yet, it had to pay the price: it has been stripped of its original liberating scope to promote Epicureanism.

Against the background of Lucretian paradoxical Callimacheanism, let me explore Catullus's more integral commitment to Catullan λεπτότης.

#### 1.4 Catullan passion for *lepos* and proclamations of liberty

I shall commence with *carmen* 1:<sup>479</sup>

---

<sup>475</sup> Cp. Elder (1954): 111-114.

<sup>476</sup> See Porter (2006): 117-124 and Fratantuono (2015): 17 and, both with bibliography.

<sup>477</sup> [*I*]ta capta lepore / te sequitur cupide quo quamque inducere pergis, '[S]o, captured by (your) charm, each follows you eagerly whither you irresistibly lead'. In passing, I would like to linger succinctly on a deployment of *leporum*, with which Lucretius tags delights (pleasurable activities and pleasant objects), which are ruined by a pernicious erotic passion objects in 4.1132. While exposing the deleterious effects of love in 4.1121-1140 (see Brown (1987): 248-251 for a good survey) in the course of his ample assault on erotic passion in 4.1030-1287 (see *ibid.*: 47-99 with literature for an excellent overview) Lucretius warns (4.1131-1134): [*e*]ximia veste et victu convivia ludi, / pocula crebra, unguenta coronae sarta parantur, / nequiquam, quoniam medio de fonte leporum / surgit amari aliquid quod in ipsis floribus angat, '[w]ith choice garment and food are laid on banquets, entertainments, crowds of drinking-vessels, ointments, garlands and wreaths, but without avail since something bitter, which chokes one even amidst the very flowers, rises from the heart of the spring of pleasures'. On these lines see Brown (1987): 263-266, Graver (1990): 111-112, Markovic (2008): 118 and Fratantuono (2015): 290. For my own part, I would like to add the other clash between these unbridled *leporos* and Venus's natural *lepos* – for a wide-ranging comparison between the hymn to the goddess at the outset of the poem and 4.1030-1287 see also Brown (1987): 91-99. Lastly, on the portion of Book 4 in question and its elusive link with Catullus's depiction of his own grief-stricken romance see *ibid.*: 139-143.

<sup>478</sup> On the striking inconsistency of a prayer addressed to a god by an Epicurean and a survey of the attempts made to overcome it, see the learned and persuasive discussion in Arrighetti (2006): 336 and O'Hara (2007): 55-69, both with literature.

<sup>479</sup> Catullus's indebtedness to Meleager (*AP* 4.1) in *carmen* 1 falls outside the purview of my dissertation. At any rate, see Bellandi (2007): 115-118 and Mondin (2011): 659-672, both with bibliography. On more far-reaching traces of Meleager throughout the Catullan collection, see Gutzwiller (2012): 79-111 with literature.



[c]ui dono lepidum nouom libellum,  
 arida modo pumice expolitum?  
 Corneli, tibi: namque tu solebas  
 meas esse aliquid putare nugas  
 iam tum, cum ausus es unus Itolorum  
 omne aeuom tribus explicare cartis  
 doctis, Iuppiter, et laboriosis.  
 quare habe tibi, quicquid hoc libelli <est>,<sup>480</sup>  
 quaecumque quidem, <o> patrona uirgo,<sup>481</sup>  
 plus uno maneat perenne saeclo.<sup>482</sup>

The deft move by virtue of which the attributes defining the *libellus* in lines 1-2<sup>483</sup> do not relate solely to its visual aspect, but also programmatically<sup>484</sup> point to the Callimachean tenets (most importantly, originality, refinement and disowning of the aesthetic value of length *per se*) has already been exhaustively analysed.<sup>485</sup> For all that, I aim to spell out what *lepidus* exactly means for Catullus and, in conformity with the introductory scheme, I begin with its poetological bearing.

Catullus inaugurates the first distich, into which he squeezes all the essential attributes of his booklet,<sup>486</sup> precisely with *lepidus*; that being the case, the phrase *lepidum* [...]

---

<sup>480</sup>On the translation of *quidquid hoc libelli* as the sum of the parts of the *libellus*, see Gratwick (2002): 316-317 with n. 51 and n. 52.

<sup>481</sup>This line probably constitutes the *locus desperatus* par excellence in Catullan textual transmission, as Kiss's comprehensive and constantly updated critical apparatus, in which he lists all the proposed emendations, confirms.

<sup>482</sup>To whom do I give the new charming booklet, just now polished by dry pumice? To you, Cornelius: for you were accustomed to deem my trifles of some worth, already at that time when you, one amidst Italians, dared to unfold each era through three volumes, learned, by Jove, and toilsome. Hence, keep to yourself whatever this booklet amounts to, for what it is indeed worth; may it, o tutelary maiden, outlive a single generation, year on year.

<sup>483</sup>According to Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 221-222, these two Catullan lines may be modelled upon Callimachus's *Ep.* 51.2 Pfeiffer (ἄρτι ποτεπλάσθη κῆτι μύροισι νοτεῖ, '(a new Grace) has been added just now and is still wet with perfumes'). They build upon Petrovic and Petrovic (2003): 198-224, who posit that Callimachus's *Ep.* 51 Pfeiffer lends itself to several layers of interpretation, from the description of a new statue of Queen Berenice II to a celebration of the completion of the *Aitia* after the addition of Books 3-4 to Books 1-2.

<sup>484</sup>On the concept of 'programmatic' in Catullan studies, see Batstone (2007): 235, 238-240 and 250-251.

<sup>485</sup>See Skinner (1987): 22, Krostenko (2001): 254-255, Bellandi (2007): 106 n. 238, Knox (2007): 157-158, Hawkins (2012): 339 n. 28 and Gale (2016): 89 n. 1, all with bibliography.

<sup>486</sup>When Catullus reverts to a description of his *libellus* in lines 8-9, he apparently emphasises its worthlessness: *quidquid hoc libelli <est>/ quaecumque quidem*. All the same, on the crafty balance between such un-pretentious labels and Catullus's aspirations to lasting fame in line 10 see Bellandi (2007): 102-105 and 112-114 and Roman (2014): 45-46, both with bibliography.

*libellum* signals that Catullus definitely walks in Callimachus's footsteps: it renders Callimachus's hailing of Aratus's *Phain.* as *λεπταί / ῥήσιες* in *Ep.* 27.3-4 Pfeiffer<sup>487</sup> and his *Μοῦσα λεπταλέη* in Fr. 1.24 Pfeiffer, a fortiori if one joins me in interpreting the Muse as the personification of poetry. At the same time, one could contend that Lucretius does the same: he, too, expresses his Callimacheanism by translating (even more accurately, at that) *Μοῦσα λεπταλέη* into *musaeo* [...] *lepore* in 1.934. He also consigns the remainder of his fidelity to Callimachus's bid to originality and *Wassermetaphorik* to lines 926-928 (*avia Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante / trita solo. iuvat intergros accedere fontis / atque haurire, iuvatque novos decerpere flores*) – incidentally, Catullus consecrates *carmen* 95 to his version of Callimachus's poetological water imagery.<sup>488</sup>

Having said that, there is a point bespeaking Catullus's more pronounced commitment to Callimachus in comparison with Lucretius, to wit the significantly discrepant weight each attaches to the theme of their respective creations. On the one hand, as I hope to have demonstrated, not only does Lucretius turn the scale decidedly in favour of Epicurus's doctrine, which he majestically phrases in verses 931-934 (*primum* [...] *magnis doceo de rebus et artis / religionum animum nodis exsolvere pergo, / deinde* [...] *obscura de re tam lucida pango / carmina* [...] *cuncta*), but he confines Callimachean poetics to two solitary words in verse 934 (*musaeo* [...] *lepore*), which are inflected in the ablative to graphically underline their subsidiarity to the content.

On the other hand, in Catullus the ratio is categorically inverted: two full lines are consecrated to poetics, one word only in line 4 (*nugae*) to the content of his booklet.<sup>489</sup> I shall revert before long to the Roman implications of *nugae*; at this time, suffice it to say

---

<sup>487</sup>See Gale (2016): 93-96 with literature on Catullus's contemporary and associate Cinna, who, in his Fr. 11 Courtney, is also credited with the translation of Callimachus's *Ep.* 27 Pfeiffer – see the commentary in Hollis (2007): 42-45.

<sup>488</sup>See the introduction: passim.

<sup>489</sup>I shall pay here no heed to the exact compositions involved because this issue remains likely unanswerable and is immaterial to my targets; cp. the introduction (pp.47-48).

that, in their basic meaning as ‘frivolities’, ‘bagatelles’ or ‘trifles’,<sup>490</sup> one may sensibly<sup>491</sup> envisage an overlap with the Telchines’ disparagement of Callimachus’s *Aitia* as a childish product in Fr. 1.6 Harder (παῖς ἄτε).<sup>492</sup> Therefrom, I deduce that Catullus appropriates Callimachus’s aspiration to set his art free from all coercions, subject matter included.<sup>493</sup>

At this juncture, I wish to integrate my line of inquiry into that of Gale, who has very freshly and fruitfully mooted Catullus’s familiarity with his contemporaries’ proneness to the unfavourable judgement of other people’s written creations, and, in the same breath, his own keenness on animadversion, for instance in *carmina* 22 and 36.<sup>494</sup> Consequently, Catullus chooses Nepos,<sup>495</sup> a fellow-writer who is attuned to his own literary taste,<sup>496</sup> as the ideal dedicatee;<sup>497</sup> besides, he shapes the introductory poem as (to borrow Genette’s concept of ‘paratext’) both a dedication and a preface.<sup>498</sup>

Along these lines, I expand on Catullus’s litigious vein: what if *carmen* 1 had been overall influenced by the polemic tone of the *Reply to the Telchines*? Catullus, too, has enemies who ἐπιτρύζουσιν ... ἀοιδῆι (Fr. 1.1 Harder), who frown upon his *libellus* – I identify such faultfinders with the muttering *senes seueriores* at the end of *carmen* 5, whom

---

<sup>490</sup> See *OLD s.u.*

<sup>491</sup> Newman (1990): 7-12 with bibliography took to task the often unmediated understanding of *nugae* as a sort of semi-technical designation of poetry in a Hellenistic vein. To his counter-current proposal redounds the merit of having spurred Latinists to grapple with the Roman sense of *nugae*. At the same time, I demur at Newman’s conception of *nugae* as ‘mime’ (seconded by Fitzgerald (1995): 36) or *mortualia* (*ibid.*: 30-36) for the reasons I provide in the introduction.

<sup>492</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 221.

<sup>493</sup> Obviously, one must not underestimate the gulf gaping between Catullus and Lucretius with respect to both genre and extension; nonetheless, precisely on account of their arrant scantiness, the ten verses of *carmen* 1 throw into even sharper relief Catullus’s audacious commitment to Callimachus’s creed.

<sup>494</sup> Gale (2016): 98-117 with bibliography.

<sup>495</sup> Simpson (1992): 53-61 questions this traditional assumption resting on the ancient authority of Ausonius’s *Ecl.* 1.1-3: in his view, Lucius Cornelius Sisenna would be a more plausible candidate. Although the scholar is right in claiming that Catullus does not *explicitly* disclose his dedicatee’s identity, he fails to account convincingly for the fact that Catullus cites a work, which covers just *tres ... cartae*, whereas Sisenna is credited with twelve books. As a result, I think that Cornelius Nepos remains the most sensible prospect.

<sup>496</sup> A vexed question divides scholars touching on the sincerity or irony of Catullus’s praise of Nepos’s *Chronica* (on this work see Stem (2012): 1-11) in lines 3-5: see Bellandi (2007): 112 n. 255 for the partisans of mockery; cp. *contra* Batstone (2007): 249 n.256 and add Roman (2014): 46 for the champions of genuine admiration. By contrast, Bellandi (2007): 113, Gaisser (2009): 26, and Gale (2016): 92 prefer a middle course and detect no more than a slight teasing, especially in line 4.

<sup>497</sup> On Nepos’s practical assistance in the diffusion of the *libellus* in the right circles, see Bellandi (2007): 106-107 Gaisser (2009): 25-26 and Gale (2016): 89-92, all with literature.

<sup>498</sup> Gale (2016): *passim*.

I shall address in chapter 2, and with Furius and Aurelius in *carmen* 16 at the end of this chapter. Nevertheless, there exists a small group of people, οἱ Μούσης [...] ἐγένοντο φίλοι (Fr. 1.1-2 Harder), and it is precisely to one of these, Cornelius Nepos, that the author donates<sup>499</sup> his collection of poems. Moreover, in case the title of the Catullan collection were *Passer* (ἀηδών in Greek),<sup>500</sup> Nepos and the Muse<sup>501</sup> would be entreated to look after the small bird, so that its μελιχρός voice (Callimachus's Fr. 1.23 Harder)<sup>502</sup> might escape the all-snatching hand of Hades like the immortal poems of Callimachus's friend Heraclitus, which are metaphorically designated as ἀηδονίδες in *Ep.* 2.5.<sup>503</sup>

To wrap up my poetological decryption of *lepidus* in *carmen* 1, in light of my discussion and on the authority of Bellandi ('[I]a poetica catulliana è tutta **callimachea** (in bold in the original) [...]. [...] **Saffo** (in bold in the original) costituisce un modello importantissimo [...]. [...] Catullo addirittura giunge a identificarsi con lei [...]. Ma questo gesto [...] non si accompagna mai alla proclamazione di una poetica saffica'),<sup>504</sup> I cannot agree with Acosta-Hughes and Stephens, who claim that 'Catullus has a predilection for poems closer in emotional range and length to hers (i.e. Sappho's) than to poems of the length of Callimachus's *Aetia*. [...] [I]n c. 1 Catullus has created a contrast between his own poetry and that of Callimachus, but set out in Callimachus's own terms: Catullus writes even smaller, more elegant and newer poetry'.<sup>505</sup> I concede that not even the whole collection of extant Catullan *carmina* could surpass the *Aitia* in regards to number of lines; yet,

---

<sup>499</sup> For the ambiguous status of this gift, in which we 'acquiesce in our frustrated possession of these trifles in order to participate in the eternal freshness of the work' see Fitzgerald (1995): 38-42.

<sup>500</sup> See Roman (2014): 47 with literature in favour and against this speculation.

<sup>501</sup> Several scholars – see the list in Bellandi (2007): 115 n. 264, to which one ought to add Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 222-223 – have spotted in line 10 the reworking of Callimachus's Fr. 7.13-14: ἔλλατε νῦν, ἐλέγοισι δ' ἐνιψήσασθε λιπώσας / χεῖρας ἑμοῖς, ἵνα μοι πουλὸ μένωσιν ἔτος, 'be gracious now and wipe your radiant hands upon my elegies in order that, for my sake, they remain for many a year' – see Harder (2012) II: 133-137 with bibliography.

<sup>502</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 48-49

<sup>503</sup> For literature on this epigram see Männlein-Robert (2007): 206-209 and De Stefani and Magnelli (2011): 549 n. 52, both with bibliography.

<sup>504</sup> Bellandi (2007): 61.

<sup>505</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 224-225.

poetologically speaking, as Acosta-Hughes and Stephens admit, it is Callimachus that sets the rules; in addition, to me, the scholars overlook other programmatic Callimachean *carmina* such as 36 and 95, which, as I show in the introduction, has for many decades been taken as the most explicit token of loyalty to Callimachus owing to its close rendition of Callimachean *Wassermetaphorik*.

I am now in a position to usher in the Roman côté of *lepidus*; yet, to unravel its tenor, one needs to rely upon other telling instances thereof in the Catullan corpus, afresh against a Callimachean backcloth, videlicet the one in *carmen* 50.<sup>506</sup> Still, ahead of my investigation of this lengthy composition, let me point out that I shall privilege the first two blocks (lines 1-6 and 7-13)<sup>507</sup> and, even more selectively, prioritise lines 1-3 and 7-8 insofar as they appertain more than the others to mystudy:

*[h]esterno, Licini, die otiosi  
multum lusimus in meis tabellis,  
ut conuenerat esse delicatos;  
scribens uersiculos uterque nostrum  
ludebat numero modo hoc, modo illoc,  
reddens mutua per iocum atque uinum.  
atque illinc abii tuo lepore  
incensus, Licini, facetiisque,  
ut nec me miserum cibus iuuaret  
nec somnus tegeret quiete ocellos,  
sed toto indomitus furore lecto  
uersarer, cupiens uidere lucem,  
ut tecum loquerer simulque ut essem.*<sup>508</sup>

---

<sup>506</sup> For secondary literature on this poem see Landolfi (1986): 77 n. 1, Williams (2012): 181 n.13 and Roman (2014): 57 n. 65.

<sup>507</sup> On the structure of this poem see Morelli (2016): 154-157 with bibliography.

<sup>508</sup> Yesterday, Licinius, at leisure, we played much upon my writing tablets, as we had concerted to be alluring: both of us played by writing little verses in one metre, then in another while reciprocating poems over merriment and wine. And I departed from there, Licinius, inflamed by your charm and wit so much, that neither food pleased my wretched self nor could sleep cover my eyelets with repose, but wild with madness, I tossed and turned all over the bed, craving to see the light, in order to talk to you and be with you.

Accordingly, let me begin with the opening distich: Catullus recollects a day he spent with his close associate L. Calvus<sup>509</sup> leisurely (*otiosi*) absorbed with light-hearted poetry (*lusimus*).<sup>510</sup> To Roman ears, such an activity, just like *nugae* in *carmen* 1.4, would have amounted to a scandalous trespassing against the pivotal rule of *honestum otium*.<sup>511</sup> Over and above that, the orchestrated anaphora of *ludo* in lines 2 and 5 (*lusimus ... ludebat*) and the synonymical repetition in lines 2, 5 and 6 (*lusimus ... ludebat ... per iocum*), aside from magnifying the impression of loafing, disclose that the literary game availed itself of writing tablets (*in meis tabellis*),<sup>512</sup> and took the shape of an exchange (*reddens mutua*)<sup>513</sup> fuelled by wine (*per [...] uinum*).<sup>514</sup>

---

<sup>509</sup> For a nuanced dissection of this friendship see Gamberale (2012): 203-245 with bibliography. The essay falls into two main sections: *ibid.*: 204-211, Gamberale deals with Catullus's not absolute appreciation of Calvus's Atticism, but see *contra* Hawkins (2012): 329-353 with bibliography. *Ibid.*: 211-242, Gamberale champions their common poetic creed – on the fragments of Calvus's poetry see also Hollis (2007): 49-86 with literature.

<sup>510</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 268 intimate that, in tune with *nugae* in *carmen* 1.4, *lusimus* in *carmen* 50.2 may drop a hint at Callimachus's Fr. 1.6 Harder (παῖς ἄτε).

<sup>511</sup> As I shall illustrate in chapter 2 (pp. 135-145) with Cicero as the ideal counterpoint to Catullus, in order to abide by *honestum otium*, one had to firstly demonstrate that his written output never interfered with his public career, but was cultivated solely over leisurely hours. Secondly, the produced works were expected to possess *utilitas*, videlicet to prove profitable to the entire community.

<sup>512</sup> For literature on all the physical supports of Catullan writing see Feeney (2012): 9 n.4. On the report of Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 268, *in meis tabellis* may constitute a reworking of Callimachus's δέλτος in Fr. 1.21. Bellandi (2007): 17 n.14, by contrast, claims that 'il poeta greco si rappresenta nell'atto di scrivere quel che gli veniva alla mente, d'empito, ma [...] era certo previsto il trasferimento su altro materiale di quanto composto'. Pace Bellandi, at any rate, in her commentary on Fr. 1.21, Harder (2012) II: 57 notes: '[t]he word (i.e. δέλτος) is found of writing-tablets used by adult authors writing a "book" [...]. On the other hand it is also suitable for use in schools [...]. Here the word may suggest Callimachus's first attempts at writing as a child under the guidance of Apollo as his teacher as well as his production as a poet, with the same ambiguity as noticed above.'

<sup>513</sup> See Morelli (2016): 157-168 with previous literature on potential influxes from and mismatches with some Greek meta-sympotic epigrams.

<sup>514</sup> One may fruitfully compare Catullus's *carmen* 50.4-6 with Callimachus's *Ep.* 35 Pfeiffer: Βαττιάδεω παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδας εὖ μὲν αἰοιδῆν / εἰδότος, εὖ δ' οἴνω κάρια συγγελάσαι, 'you walk past the tomb of Battiades, well versed in song and in joining seasonably laughter to wine'. On this poem as self-epitaph see Meyer (2005): 170-172 and Fantuzzi (2011): 430-433, both with bibliography. On Callimachus as a 'water-drinker' see n. 364 p. 66; in this respect, I think Sens (2016): 323 comes to a sensible conclusion: '[...] [A]lthough Callimachus privileges water in poems that he calls αἰοιδάι, his self-epitaph represents wine as the appropriate source of inspiration for epigram, which he effectively characterises as the product of the symposium. At the same time, in defining that sympotic poetry via the internal adverbial accusative κάρια [...], the epigram calls attention to the temporal boundaries imposed on its occasion, while also recognizing [...] alternative modes of poetic production that do not depend on the drinking party'. In the light of this, Krostenko's discovery of an anti-Callimachean trait behind Catullus's emphasis on *uinum* (Krostenko (2001): 256-257) is eroded. Bellandi (2007): 60-61, too speciously in my judgement, interprets Catullus's allusion to Callimachus's *Ep.* 35 Pfeiffer as follows: '[q]uesta distinzione fra due versanti della propria attività poetica (scil. *nugae* and *carmina docta*) [...] ricorda probabilmente il Callimaco dell'*ep.* 35 Pf. [...], in cui in tono consapevole e non privo di una sua solennità il poeta ellenistico si dichiarava orgogliosamente abile nell'αἰοιδῆ (nel canto formale) e nel canto "παρ' οἴνον", ovvero nello scherzo estemporaneo in sede simposiale'. Personally, I prefer another, maybe boldly speculative, explanation: by devoting himself to

It is from this scene that *lepos* emerges and it is against this backdrop that one can at last attend to the unravelling of its Latin meaning in the Catullan corpus. Above all, it accompanies a human being, in line with the vast majority of its occurrences – I shall touch upon them in the footnotes and revert to them forthwith to pit Catullus against Cicero. Secondly,<sup>515</sup> its core meaning ‘charm’ denotes a verbal adroitness, which, in the poem under examination, brings about Callimachean poetry.<sup>516</sup> Thirdly, since it is paired with *facetiae*, it results in amiable conviviality.<sup>517</sup> Fourthly, it retains a tinge of erotic charge,<sup>518</sup> which Catullus enhances thanks to the past participle *incensus* normally accompanied by *amore*.<sup>519</sup>

The regular attribution to *lepos* to people on Catullus’s part cues a cursory remark on Cicero, who, too, associates it with individuals. The most patent difference, though, consists in the fact that the vocabulary with which Cicero characterises these men nearly always unquestionably displays negative overtones; what is more, in the rare cases in which *lepos* is more positively treated as a source of humour and is attributed to Cicero’s teacher

---

poetry rather than traditional *negotia*, Catullus could have been captivated by Callimachus’s exaltation of poetry as his lifetime achievement.

<sup>515</sup> What follows is modelled upon the overview in Krostenko (2001): 69-70 but aims to fortify its textual foundation.

<sup>516</sup> *Lepos* and literary criticism feature prominently afresh in *carmen* 36: in the first place, along with *iocose*, the adverb *lepide* is applied ironically to Lesbia’s vow: provided that the gods reconcile her with Catullus, in lines 6-7, she pledges to burn his own poems (*electissima pessimi poetae / scripta*, ‘the choicest writings of the worst poet’). In the second place, it limns Catullus’s own take on the divine transaction: Catullus consents to appease the squabble, but he pays Venus her due by burning Volusius’s *Annals*, the true *pessimus poeta*, wherewithal proving that his own take on the *uotum* is neither *illegidus* nor *inuenuustus* (36.17). On the poem see Marsilio (2012): 126-133. On Lesbia as a nickname for (presumably) Clodia Metelli, an intricate issue falling well beyond the scope of my dissertation, see Skinner (2011): 121-144 with literature.

<sup>517</sup> In this respect, the most telling instance is probably *carmen* 12.8-9: *est enim leporum / differtus puer ac facetiarum*, ‘the lad (scil. Pollio) is full of charms and wit’. On this composition see McMaster (2010): 357-361 with bibliography.

<sup>518</sup> This acceptation comes to the fore in the address to Ipsitilla as *meae deliciae, mei lepores*, ‘my darling, my sweetheart’ in 32.2. On the tormented decipherment of the woman’s name see Cowan (2013): 190-198 with literature. On the unparalleled *lepores* as a term of endearment akin to *deliciae* and its broader force in the poem see Krostenko (2001): 266-267 n. 85. See *ibid.*: 236-237 on the description of Varus’s girlfriend as *non sane illepidum neque inuenuustum*, ‘truly not disagreeable nor charmless’ in *carmen* 10.4; on poem 10 and *otium* see my comments in chapter 2. Lastly, a more crudely carnal and biting comic nuance is conveyed by the *lepidissima* (Gellius’s sister-in-law) and *lepidus* (Gellius’s nephew) in *carmen* 78.1-2, which targets the detestable Gellius via his two brothers’ family members. On *lepos* in this elegiac poem see Krostenko (2001): 285-286; on this poem in general see Carrubba (2002): 297-302 and Viparelli (2003): 179-196, both with literature.

<sup>519</sup> Krostenko (2001): 258-259.

Crassus, most notably in the *excursus de ridiculis* in *de Orat.* 2. 217-290, Cicero never wearies of stressing that it must always bow to *grauitas*, *dignitas* and *auctoritas*. All this shall be more lengthily shown in the last subsection of this chapter; notwithstanding, I anticipate Cicero's denigratory word picture of Catiline's youngest acolytes in *Cat.* 2.23<sup>520</sup> as *hi pueri tam lepidi ac delicati*:<sup>521</sup> from a lexical perspective, it fits remarkably well, albeit turned upside down, Catullus and Calvus as *delicati*<sup>522</sup> in *carmen* 50.3 and Catullus as *incensus lepore* in 50.7-8.

From all this, I deduce that when Catullus terms his *libellus lepidus* in *carmen* 1.1, through a decidedly bold gesture without equal either in Cicero or in Lucretius, he transfers human qualities onto an object. To borrow a pithy summary from Krostenko: 'Catullus means to characterise his poetry as performances with the same overwhelming attractiveness as the social performances dear to contemporary society'.<sup>523</sup> Further support to this theory may be lent by the phrase *lepido [...] uersu* in *carmen* 6.17. After pestering his friend Flavius to reveal the name of his beloved, lest one might suspect she is *illepida* (6.2),<sup>524</sup> Catullus wishes to *ad caelum uocare*<sup>525</sup> both of them.<sup>526</sup> The verse absorbs, as it were, its *lepos* from the human protagonists and, not unlike the *libellus* in *carmen* 1, it sets its heart on eternity.<sup>527</sup>

To summarise my argument thus far, I would like to build on Krostenko's statement:

'[...] Catullus [...] define[s] a new view of erotics, poetics, and the social world [...], [...]

---

<sup>520</sup> The parallel has long been spotted: cp., for example, Pucci (1961): 255.

<sup>521</sup> 'These boys so charming and addicted to pleasure'.

<sup>522</sup> The adjective lays the two cronies open to slurs of unmanliness: cp. Fitzgerald (1995): 35-37; see also Williams (2012): 166-168 for a meticulous catalogue of Ciceronian occurrences of this adjective in a markedly disparaging tone.

<sup>523</sup> Krostenko (2001): 256. Although, in the end, I come largely to the same conclusions as Krostenko, I think that my emphasis on the relocation of human traits into a booklet, which the scholar does not consider, does more justice to Catullus's stunning originality.

<sup>524</sup> To be exact, *lepidae* is in the plural because it qualifies the noun *deliciae* in line 1.

<sup>525</sup> 'Extol to the skies'.

<sup>526</sup> See the excellent reading of this poem in Stevens (2013): 19-46 with literature.

<sup>527</sup> Cp. Bellandi (2007): 60. I would also like to remark in passing that *lepido versu* potentially translates in the most literal way Callimachus's *λεπταί / ῥήσιες* in *Ep.* 27.3-4 Pfeiffer.



in such a way as to blur the distinctions between them'.<sup>528</sup> At the heart of this project, in my view, sits *lepos*, in its infrangible unity of the Callimachean afflatus towards self-legislating poetry and espousal of emancipated and politically charged Latin 'charm'. For all that, the last occurrence of *lepos* in *carmen* 16.7 complicates the picture:

[p]edicabo ego uos et irrumabo,  
 Aureli pathice et cinaede Furi,  
 qui me ex uersiculis meis putastis,  
 quod sunt molliculi, parum pudicum.  
 nam castum esse decet pium poetam  
 ipsum, uersiculos nihil necesse est,  
 qui tum denique habent salem ac leporem  
 si sunt molliculi et parum pudici  
 et quod pruriat incitare possunt,  
 non dico pueris, sed his pilosis,  
 qui duros nequeunt mouere lumbos.  
 uos quod milia multa basiorum  
 legistis, male me marem putastis?  
 pedicabo ego uos et irrumabo.<sup>529</sup>

Those who champion the *persona* theory and those who question it<sup>530</sup> (sometimes within more far-reaching studies and along with other poems) have often exploited this notoriously foul-mouthed poem;<sup>531</sup> regardless, this complex matter does not have any bearing upon my discussion.<sup>532</sup> Rather, I wish to elaborate on a remark set forth by Roman,

---

<sup>528</sup> Krostenko (2001): 266.

<sup>529</sup> 'I'll bugger you, I'll have you suck my cock, you, bent Aurelius, and you, limp-wristed Furius, who, by my little verses, inasmuch as they are rather somewhat unmanly, regarded me as insufficiently sexually pure. For it behoves a virtuous poet not to be promiscuous himself; it is by no means necessary for his little verses, which, only if they are somewhat unmanly and insufficiently sexually pure, then they possess charm and wit, and inasmuch as they can rouse what itches not in boys – I do not mean them –, but in these shaggy men, who are unable to move their slow loins. Do you regard me as hardly a male inasmuch as you read many thousands of kisses? I'll bugger you, I'll have you suck my cock!'

<sup>530</sup> For a list of adherents see Wray (2001): 161-203, Krostenko (2007): 225-227, Gaisser (2009): 48-49, Stroup (2010): 43-8, Feeney (2012): 43 n.70, Stevens (2013): 71-78, Roman (2014): 68 n.103 and Gale (2016): 99, all with literature. For a catalogue of dissenters see Bellandi (2007): 53-54 n. 106, which should be supplemented by Du Quesnay and Woodman (2012): 264 and McCarthy (2013): 57-70.

<sup>531</sup> On the use of obscenity here and in the remainder of the Catullan collection see Lorenz (2012): 73-97 with bibliography.

<sup>532</sup> I shall be content with noting that the practice of inferring the poet's character from his verses was common in antiquity – see Du Quesnay and Woodman (2012): 256-258 for an in-depth survey. See also Roman (2014): 67 and 69 on the way in which Cicero lambastes Piso based on the depiction of the latter's sybaritism in Philodemus's poems (*Pis.* 70) and *ibid.*: 69 on the route through which he refutes Piso's misunderstanding of his own verse in the poem on his consulship (*cedant arma togae*, 'let arms yield to the toga', Fr. 6 Soubiran)

who looks over *carmen* 16 in the course of the fifth section (‘*Scribam ipse de me*: Poetry and Self-representation’) of the first chapter (‘First Person Poetry and the Autonomist Turn: Lucilius, Catullus and Cicero’s *Consulatus Suus*’) of his thought-provoking monograph *Poetic Autonomy in Ancient Rome*:<sup>533</sup> ‘[i]t is not enough for him (scil. Catullus) to make theoretical claims for his poetry’s aesthetic autonomy; he must vigorously defend himself against those who would trample the distinction between poetic and personal morality’.<sup>534</sup>

Now, I entirely agree with Roman’s insistence on the fact that Catullus here resorts to a traditional assertion of aggressively penetrating masculinity, which effectively frames the composition (*pedicabo ego uos et irrumabo*);<sup>535</sup> yet it seems to me that Catullus solely rejects the aspersion of effeminacy (*parum pudicum* in line 4 and *male marem* 13).<sup>536</sup> Conversely, Catullus never abjures *lepos*, but throws down the gauntlet even more staggeringly: on the one hand, he poses that it stems precisely from the *impudicitia* of his *uersiculi*.<sup>537</sup> On the other hand, he intimates that his *lepos* succeeds in titillating even the most adamant guardians of morality – here, the very survival of the Catullan collection throughout the centuries until the present day staggeringly certifies the veraciousness of Catullus’s teasing statement.

---

as a token of Cicero’s boundless ambition (*Pis.* 73-74) – on this notorious verse see most recently Volk and Zetzel (2015): 204-223 with full bibliography.

<sup>533</sup>I review this book in my introduction (pp. 43-45) and revert to it in chapter 2 when considering the Catullan and Ciceronian construal of *otium*.

<sup>534</sup>Roman (2014): 68. See also the more encompassing problems encumbering Catullus’s construal of his *lepos* in Krostenko (2007): 225-228, which refresh his thesis in Krostenko (2001): 277-287.

<sup>535</sup>The most dependable treatment of the sexual vocabulary in *carmen* 16 is Williams (2010<sup>2</sup>): 181-183 against the backcloth of chapter 5 (‘Sexual Roles and Identities’) of his monograph *Roman Homosexuality* (*ibid.*: 177-245 with bibliography).

<sup>536</sup>Bellandi (2007): 54-56 puts this well; I only demur at his restricted focus on the Iuventius poems, primarily *carmen* 24 and *carmen* 99 – on these two compositions see Gaisser (2009): 60-67 with literature. Conversely, I concur with Stevens (2013): 75-76, who maintains that it does not matter whether Furius and Aurelius read the Lesbia *basia* poems (*carmen* 5 and *carmen* 7, to which I shall revert in chapter 2 to make intelligible the juxtaposition of kisses and Callimacheanism) or the Iuventius cycle. What is more, I think that the joint presence of *uersiculi* and *mollitia* in the poem on trial enables one to assume that Furius and Aurelius might have also been upset by *carmen* 50 – on Catullus’s habit of defining his poetry by means of diminutives see Morgan (2010): 97 with n. 140 for bibliography.

<sup>537</sup>See also the inspiring remarks in Morgan (2010): 92-97 with literature, who explores the connection between the themes of *carmen* 16 and its metre (the Phalaecian hendecasyllable), which, due to its possible Ionic origin, might have been perceived as redolent of the effeminacy usually imputed to the Ionians.

Therefore, I remain convinced that, despite the anxiety rightly unearthed by Roman, by his contemporary standards, Catullus's concept of *lepos* attained an unequalled degree of independence and that his thorough adoption of Callimachus's λεπτότης contributed hugely to that uniqueness. To further substantiate this hypothesis and, simultaneously, to bring this first chapter to an end, I shall examine Cicero's grappling with *lepos* over two and a half decades and the lengths he goes to steer clear of it, with the sole and highly conditional exception of its humorous variety.

### **1.5 Cicero's dismissal of *lepos* in the speeches and his conditional endorsement thereof in *de Orat.***

The first two occurrences of *lepos* in the extant Ciceronian corpus present themselves in the *Actio secunda in Verrem* (late September or early October 70), the multifaceted<sup>538</sup> second instalment of the indictment of the former Sicilian governor C. Verres in a case *de repetundis*.<sup>539</sup> I shall begin with paragraph 35 of the third macro-section (commonly referred to as *De frumento*),<sup>540</sup> in which Cicero targets one of the defendant's fraudulent edicts: *[d]einde in hoc homo luteus etiam callidus ac veterator esse vult, quod ita scribit: SI VTER VOLET RECUPERATORES DABO. Quam lepide se furari putat! Vtrique facit potestatem, sed utrum ita scripserit 'si uter volet' an 'si decumanus volet', nihil interest; arator enim tuos istos recuperatores numquam volet.*<sup>541</sup>

---

<sup>538</sup> See Tempest (2007): 1-25 for an illuminating dissection of the puzzling structure of this long work.

<sup>539</sup> See Tempest (2013): 43 n. 16 with bibliography on the raging (and, for my purposes, irrelevant) controversy over whether the *actio secunda* was uttered or just intended for reading.

<sup>540</sup> On *Ver.* 2.3 in general see Frazel (2009): 187-221 with bibliography.

<sup>541</sup> 'Then the worthless man wants to appear also clever and an old hand inasmuch as he thus writes: IF EITHER PARTY REQUIRES IT, I SHALL APPOINT ASSESSORS. How finely he thinks he plunders! He makes available the opportunity (to sue), but it does not matter whether he wrote "if either party requires it" or "if the contractor requires it": for the farmer will never require these contractors of yours'.

While stigmatising Verres's embezzlement of astronomical riches under the excuse of the corn-tithe,<sup>542</sup> Cicero picks to pieces a law that deceptively appears to grant Sicilian farmers the right to revert to a panel of assessors in case they disagree with the tithe-collectors concerning the exact amount of wheat and barley they are expected to pay to Rome. But, the prosecutor maintains, since both the board and the gatherers collude with the unprincipled Verres, the miserable local husbandmen are left at the mercy of unscrupulous officials, who, in patent contravention of the traditional norms of provincial administration,<sup>543</sup> aim solely to ensure their own (chiefly Verres's) profit.

Against this background, one ought to better grasp the damning hue enshrouding *lepos* within the exclamation *quam lepide se furari putat*: through the proximity between the adverb *lepide* and the dooming verb *furari*, Cicero presents Verres' alleged charm as an intolerable breach of the rectitude to which a Roman office-holder is expected to conform in compliance with the *mos maiorum*.<sup>544</sup> Supplementary support to my contention can be lent by the preceding sentence, in which Cicero depicts his foe as cunningly striving to cut a smart figure: *callidus ac ueterator esse uult*. Whilst the negative nuance of the *uox media callidus*<sup>545</sup> instantly begins to cloud Verres's reputation, the unequivocal derogatory sense of *ueterator*<sup>546</sup> pummels it with harsh reprehension. Besides, Cicero may further enhance his envenomed assault on his opponent's standing by tapping into the frequent association of *lepos* with tricksters in Plautus,<sup>547</sup> who designates the guileful slave (the hoaxer par excellence) exactly as *callidus*.<sup>548</sup>

---

<sup>542</sup> See *ibid.*: 198-202 on the mechanisms of Verres's peculation.

<sup>543</sup> See *ibid.*: 196-198 on the regular functioning of the acquisition of the tax.

<sup>544</sup> See Bérenger (2014) on the duties of a provincial governor. See Kenty (2016): 238 and 243-244 on Cicero's deft reliance on the *mos maiorum* in the *Verrinae* – cp. Arena (2016): 217-238 on the global malleability of the *mos maiorum*.

<sup>545</sup> Cp. *OLD s.u.* 3a.

<sup>546</sup> Cp. *OLD s.u.*

<sup>547</sup> See Gunderson (2015): 127-150 with bibliography.

<sup>548</sup> See Schironi (2013): 449-458 with literature.

Verres's flagitious brand of *lepos* is critiqued anew in paragraph 142 of the fifth macro-section of *Ver. 2* (also known as *De suppliciis*),<sup>549</sup> where Cicero ends his account (§§140-142) of the tragic destiny of C. Servilius. This wretched Roman citizen's trouble is singled out as another particularly effectual example of the governor's overweening proclivity to a merciless abuse of power. After having Servilius smitten to death by his lictors in retaliation for the latter's denunciation of his outrageous conduct, Verres remorselessly seizes his victim's possessions and dedicates a silver Cupid in the temple of Venus: *[s]ic ille adfectus illim tum pro mortuo sublatus perbreui postea est mortuus. Iste autem homo Venerius, adfluens omni lepore ac venustate, de bonis illius in aede Veneris argenteum Cupidinem posuit. Sic etiam fortunis hominum abutebatur ad nocturna vota cupiditatum suarum.*<sup>550</sup>

By sealing an effective narrative of a decidedly gruesome manifestation of Verres's abominable demeanour, Cicero masterfully gathers together three facets of tyrannical behaviour, which he repeatedly imputes to his enemy:<sup>551</sup> *auaritia*,<sup>552</sup> *crudelitas*<sup>553</sup> and *mollitia*.<sup>554</sup> The first crime manifests in the unquenchable thirst for money, the second in the savage order to bludgeon the helpless Servilius, and the third in the obsession with sexual debauchery.

With this in mind, let us moot the segment *[i]ste [...] homo Venerius, adfluens omni lepore ac venustate*, in which, in a sort of climaxing amplification of 2.3.35,<sup>555</sup> *lepos* turns

---

<sup>549</sup> On 2.5 in general see Frazel (2009): 125-185 with literature.

<sup>550</sup> 'Then, after having been debilitated in such a harmful way (scil. beaten to death at Verres' behest) and after having been taken away from that place as dead, that man (scil. the elderly member of the *conventus Panhormitanus* C. Servilius) died afterwards in a very brief time. This individual (scil. Verres), on the other hand, full of sexual desire, overflowing with charm and attractiveness, consecrated a silver Cupid in Venus's temple from that man's (scil. Servilius) possessions. Thus, he exploited even other people's wealth in repayment of nocturnal vows for his carnal appetites'.

<sup>551</sup> On the frequency of this charge levelled at Verres throughout the two *actiones* see *ibid.*: passim.

<sup>552</sup> On *auaritia* see *ibid.*: 132-136.

<sup>553</sup> On *crudelitas* see *ibid.*: 157-160.

<sup>554</sup> On *mollitia* see *ibid.*: 140-147; cp. also Langlands (2006): 289-296 for an enlightening discussion of Cicero's portrait of Verres as an *expugnator pudicitiae*.

<sup>555</sup> Krostenko draws a distinction between Cicero's disapproval of Verres' *lepos* in the two passages from *Ver. 2*: according to the scholar, 2.3.35 exemplifies Cicero's wish to 'assert the primacy of Roman values threatened by various sorts of impertinence. All such instances have to do [...] with the absence of *fides*'

out to amount to an even more pernicious perversion of Roman values. Cicero begins by fustigating Verres with the combined effect of the adjectives *Venerius*, which evokes unbridled lewdness,<sup>556</sup> and *adfluens*, which implies excess altogether;<sup>557</sup> subsequently, the juxtaposition of *lepos* and *venustas*, which reeks of lechery,<sup>558</sup> permits Cicero to ably limn Verres as entrapped in Venus's orbit.<sup>559</sup> Consequently, Cicero implies, his antagonist squarely fails to abide by the fundamental standards of restraint and control (over oneself and others) set for any Roman male citizen and, a fortiori, for all functionaries.<sup>560</sup> Finally, Cicero's tactic gains in efficacy thanks to the phonic texture: the syllable *ven* resonates through *Venerius* and *venustas* thereby reinforcing their common etymological connection with the goddess Venus,<sup>561</sup> whose name features by and by ([...] *homo Venerius, adfluens* [...] *venustate, [...] in aede Veneris*).<sup>562</sup>

Hence, with the succession of the two passages, Cicero manages adeptly to doom Verres's nefarious *lepos* as an epitome of anti-Romanness. In the same breath, Cicero succeeds in styling himself as a paragon of Roman virtue and a bulwark against Verres's abominations; lastly, he powerfully reaffirms his own profound attachment to Sicily, where (in its western part, to be exact) he served as quaestor in 75.

Cicero, his blatant castigation of *lepos* in *Ver. 2* notwithstanding, undergoes a certain mellowing four years later (in 66) in *Clu.* 141, but this conversion, which in my estimation

---

(Krostenko (2001): 164); 2.5.142, on the other hand, illustrates that 'the very qualities he (scil. Cicero) is trying to suggest were dangerous – a taste for performance and eroticism – were doubtless cultivated by the parties in question, qualities willingly assumed and paraded gladly [...]. [...] Cicero's pejorative use of *lep(idus)* [...] is an attempt to bring out the negative side of a self-imposed label' (*ibid.*: 188-189 and 190). However, I dissent from this differentiation on three counts: firstly, even in 2.3.35 Verres performs an action, namely plundering (*furari*); secondly, since he believes (*putat*) that his deed emanates charm, one might contend that he brazenly disports his *lepos*; thirdly, the dearth of *fides*, with which, according to Krostenko, Cicero reproaches Verres in 2.3.35, can certainly also be bemoaned in the governor's vileness recounted in 2.5.142.

<sup>556</sup> Cp. *OLD s.u.* 2c.

<sup>557</sup> Cp. *OLD s.u.* 1b.

<sup>558</sup> On the semantic area of *uenustas* see Krostenko (2001): 40-51.

<sup>559</sup> Cp. Krostenko (2001): 186-188 on the way in which Cicero exploits the original erotic overtones of the two nouns; see also Williams (2010<sup>2</sup>): 158-159 on Cicero pillorying Verres as a shameless philanderer.

<sup>560</sup> See Williams (2010<sup>2</sup>): 145-148 with bibliography.

<sup>561</sup> Cp. *OLD s.u.*

<sup>562</sup> In light of this, I demur at the dismissal of the Servilius case as 'clumsy' in Frazel (2009): 136.

is limited, requires an extremely elaborate manoeuvre. To fathom it, let me briefly resume the essentials of the trial and the immediate frame of reference of the passage under examination. Cicero's client A. Cluentius was charged before a *quaestio de sicariis et ueneficiis* with poisoning his stepfather Oppianicus and, possibly, bribing the jury as well.<sup>563</sup> At the outset of the final third of the speech, between § 138 and § 142, Cicero deviates from his main train of thought (i.e. the demonstration of Cluentius's innocence of barratry) to repel an accusation of inconsistency weighing upon him. In § 138, the prosecutor Attius is reported to have blamed Cicero for having previously mistrusted the court in session on account of its proneness to venality;<sup>564</sup> furthermore, as § 142 betokens, in all likelihood Attius has also taken to task Cicero's own former indictment against Cluentius in his (now lost) speech of 74 *Pro Scamandro*.<sup>565</sup>

Thus, to escape this deadlock, in § 139, Cicero cannot but concede that in a former speech of his he may indeed have disbelieved the integrity of the tribunal presided by Iunianus (§ 139). On the other hand, he contends that his opinions did not faithfully mirror his personal views, but were only bespoke to the circumstances, which induced him to take advantage of the notorious scandal caused by Iunianus's bar.<sup>566</sup> That said, Cicero is awake to the hazardousness of his move, which might tarnish his own *auctoritas* by making him look unsteady.<sup>567</sup> Therefore, in § 141, he invokes the authority of his former teacher L. Crassus,<sup>568</sup> who, in his turn, had to tackle an analogous allegation during a (to us) unknown hearing centred around a certain Cn. Plancus: [...] *in respondendo primum exposuit*

---

<sup>563</sup> See with literature; this controversy, which does not bear upon my argument, stems to a good extent from Cicero's deliberate design to muddle the issue – see Narducci (1997):107-108.

<sup>564</sup> Cp. *Ver.*1.29 and 38-39 and *Caec.* 29-30 – see Marinone (2004): 62 n. 1.

<sup>565</sup> On the remains of this oration, which heave in sight in *Clu.* 47 and 49-55, see Crawford (1994): 39-42.

<sup>566</sup> See Patino (2005): 29-63 on the judges' dishonesty as common thread to *Ver.* and *Clu.*

<sup>567</sup> For literature on this passage see Narducci (1997): 107-114, Krostenko (2001): 198-199 and van der Blom (2010): 124-128 and *ibid.*: 127 n. 181. Apropos of Krostenko's contribution, whilst I subscribe to the drift of his line of reasoning, it seems to me that he overlooks one important fact. For Cicero did *not* adopt his teacher's strategy wholesale, but, in dealing with his resister Allius, he eschews the embittered eye for an eye, which Crassus had wreaked upon Brutus – I shall moot the issue presently.

<sup>568</sup> See van der Blom (2010): 177-179 on Crassus as a paradigm here and in other early Ciceronian speeches.

*utriusque rationem temporis ut oratio ex re et ex causa habita videretur, deinde ut intellegere posset Brutus quem hominem et non solum qua eloquentia verum etiam quo lepore et quibus facetiis praeditum lacesisset, tris ipse excitavit recitatores cum singulis libellis quos M. Brutus, pater illius accusatoris, de iure civili reliquit.*<sup>569</sup>

Let us now unpack the puzzling grounds on which Cicero summons up Crassus's rebuttal of the accusation of inconsistency flung against him by Brutus: the conjuring of Crassus's profession (every oration is solely expected to match the peculiarities of each lawsuit and is not required to reflect the speaker's true persuasion) pertinently enables Cicero to ride on his mentor's coattails to underpin the jeopardous reversal of his opinions on Cluentius.<sup>570</sup> By contrast, the commendation of Crassus's charming and witty revenge on his foe (the revelation of the latter's guilty secrets through the inaugural sentences of several booklets composed by Brutus's father) flummoxes one to a degree because, in § 142, Cicero will diverge from his teacher. For, he uncovers that he will dispense with inflicting the same humiliation upon Attius; instead, 'grazie [...] all'ostentazione della propria modestia e dei propri errori, egli si accattiva la benevolenza dei giudici facendo sì che questi non lo sentano diverso da loro'.<sup>571</sup>

The key to the conundrum reposes on Cicero's cognizance of the precariousness of his position: the panel could have heeded Attius's exposure of Cicero's overarching fickleness; in that event, the impact upon his political image would have been disastrous, especially in consideration of his ambition for the consulate. By consequence, the then praetor Cicero, who doubtless did not despise the consensus he might have garnered among the inhabitants of Larinum (his client's *municipium*),<sup>572</sup> deems it more prudent to forgo picking on his

---

<sup>569</sup>In answering, to begin with, he explained the pattern of both occasions in order that the speech may seem to have been made in consequence of the matter at issue and the case; afterwards, in order for Brutus to manage to understand what sort of man – and equipped not only with a lot of eloquence, but also with a lot of pleasantry and wit – he had challenged, Crassus himself called on to stand forward three reciters, each with one of the booklets on civil law, which M. Brutus, the father of that accuser, had left behind at his death'.

<sup>570</sup>For a subtle reading of the import of this claim see Vasaly (2013): 150-152 with bibliography.

<sup>571</sup>Narducci (1997): 109, who paraphrases Kirby (1990): 31-33.

<sup>572</sup>Cp. *ibid.*: 107.



opponent – in other words, he waives a direct claim to *lepos*.<sup>573</sup> As a matter of fact, one might have descried his more restricted flightiness over *lepos* between *Ver.* 2.5.142 and *Clu.* 141 despite his travails to set the two passages apart.<sup>574</sup> the mutation of the adjective/present participle governing the ablative *lepore* (*adfluens* connotes immoderation, *praeditus* denotes endowment with a beneficial attribute);<sup>575</sup> the substitution of the concomitant noun *uenustas* with *facetiae* (*lepos* is rescued from the disreputable dominion of bawdiness and is anchored in the more acceptable sphere of irony);<sup>576</sup> the arrant opposition Crassus’s and Verres’s innermost quiddity (the former is saluted as *sapientissimus* in *Clu.* 141; the latter is proscribed as *luteus* in *Ver.* 2.3.35).

Turning attention to the passage chronologically posterior to *Clu.* 141 and dating back to 63, that is to say *Cat.* 2.23,<sup>577</sup> which will also prove particularly convenient to shed retrospective light on Catullus’s position on *lepos* in his similarly phrased, but differently minded, *carmen* 16 and *carmen* 50: [*i*]n his gregibus omnes aleatores, omnes adulteri, omnes impuri impudicique versantur. Hi pueri tam lepidi ac delicati non solum amare et amari neque saltare et cantare sed etiam sicas vibrare et spargere venena didicerunt. Qui nisi exeunt, nisi pereunt, etiam si Catilina perierit, scitote hoc in re publica semiarium *Catilarum futurum*.<sup>578</sup>

---

<sup>573</sup>When addressing this prototypal episode afresh in *de Orat.* 2.222, I shall show that Cicero provided further grounds to account for Crassus’s justifiably furious counteraction: hate and scarce esteem for Brutus.

<sup>574</sup> Although this surmising of mine is not unequivocally borne out by the text of *Clu.*, by 66 the whole of *Ver.* was surely consultable without difficulty thanks to Cicero’s toils to circulate the entire text soon after the triumphal outcome of the trial (in late 70) in order to capitalise on it as much as possible – see Frazel (2004): 138-142.

<sup>575</sup> Cp. *OLD* s.u. 1.

<sup>576</sup> On the semantic area of *facetiae* see Krostenko (2001): 59-64. Hence, in *Clu.* 141, I have translated *lepos* as ‘pleasantry’, a sense destined to become predominant in *de Orat.* – see pp. 109-113 below. Krostenko, instead, (*ibid.*: 198) prefers ‘charm’.

<sup>577</sup> I shall not broach possible alterations of the text prior to publication insofar as the matter does not affect my argument – see Dyck (2008): 10-12 with literature.

<sup>578</sup> ‘All gamblers, all adulterers, all the morally foul and unchaste individuals pass their time in these (scil. Catiline’s) bands. These boys so charming and addicted to pleasure have learnt not only how to love and be loved or how to dance and sing, but also how to shoot daggers out and spatter poisons. And you may rest assured that if these thugs do not flee or perish, even if Catiline perishes, this gang will be a nursery of Catilines in this commonwealth’.

In addressing the people in a *contio* in the aftermath of *Cat.* 1,<sup>579</sup> Cicero is primarily concerned with those of Catiline's adherents, who, at odds with his own expectations, have not followed their leader into exile, but have remained in Rome. Therefore, he splits them up into distinct groups: to those whom he still deems reformable,<sup>580</sup> he holds out the hand of reconciliation. On the contrary, he sunders those he regards as beyond redemption from the remainder of the community;<sup>581</sup> it is to this second category that belong criminals and the profligate lads, whom Cicero unrelentingly and satirically chastises in the passage under examination.

Cicero unleashes his searing offensive against these ruffians on top of all by reducing them to spineless sheep (*in his gregibus*), who mindlessly toe their boss's line. Aside from its intrinsic efficacy, this expression enables Cicero to consummately forge a connection between the second and the first *Catilinarian*.<sup>582</sup> In *Cat.* 1.30, Cicero hammers into the senators' heads that, unless Catiline banishes himself from Rome along with his shipwrecked henchmen, the republic will never be cleansed of the plague which the conspirators embody;<sup>583</sup> in *Cat.* 2.25, Cicero wishes to instil the same concept into the minds of the members of the popular assembly, whom he aspires to rally round himself.<sup>584</sup> Thereupon, Cicero commences to enumerate the aspects in which the traitors fail to live up to the numerous standards of Roman masculinity,<sup>585</sup> which, as I cursorily outlined above with respect to Verres, consists largely in the uncompromising adherence to the insertive

---

<sup>579</sup> This paragraph is indebted to Dyck (2008): 124.

<sup>580</sup> These people range from wealthy debtors to politically ambitious, Sullan veterans and ne'er-do-wells.

<sup>581</sup> Riggsby (2010): 95 sagaciously observes that this catalogue of Catiline's accomplices empowers Cicero to strike a balance between conflicting goals: on the one hand, Cicero wavers between indiscriminately inciting the audience against all the confederates and wresting some of them from Catiline's heinous sway. On the other hand, he fluctuates between delineating the conspiracy as Damocles's sword and fostering hope – cp. also *ibid.*: 93-96

<sup>582</sup> *Ibid.*: 156, Dyck remarks that the link originates primarily from etymology: *grex* constitutes the origin of the verb *aggrego*, with which Cicero designates the Catilinarians in *Cat.* 1.30 (*ceteros undique conlectos naufragos aggregarit*).

<sup>583</sup> See Gildenhard (2011): 130-132 on *Cat.* 1.31-32, where Cicero fleshes out the impressive image.

<sup>584</sup> At the close of *Cat.* 2.23, Cicero ominously forewarns that if the plotters bide, the capital runs the risk of becoming a *seminarium Catilinarum* – on the metaphorical usage of *seminarium* in the Ciceronian corpus see Dyck (2008): 157.

<sup>585</sup> See Williams (2010<sup>2</sup>): 137-139 for a helpful overview.

part in any penetrative act and self-discipline.<sup>586</sup> Accordingly, in the first place, Cicero heaps scorn on them by stripping them of their virility by depicting them as boys instead of fully-fledged men.<sup>587</sup> In the second place, he scoffs at them as indulging in forbidden *adulteria*<sup>588</sup> and, in the same breath, as *impuri* (they befoul their mouths owing to oral-genital contact by engaging either in fellatio or cunnilingus)<sup>589</sup> and *impudici* (they lost their sexual integrity, their *pudicitia*,<sup>590</sup> by consenting to anal penetration).<sup>591</sup> In the third place, they are held up to shame as generically un-manlike (*delicati*)<sup>592</sup> and ridiculed by reason of one facet of their unmanliness, videlicet being well versed in dancing and singing.<sup>593</sup> In the fourth place, Cicero condenses their execrable carnal intemperateness in the striking sequence of infinitives *amare et amari*, which stresses with its morphology the repellent mingling of active with passive sexual roles.<sup>594</sup> Finally, through the subsequent pair of infinitival phrases *sicas vibrare et spargere venena*, Cicero turns to good account a recurrent motif of his word-paintings of bestiality: youthful erotic dissoluteness leads to innumerable transgressions of probity in adulthood.<sup>595</sup>

With this knowledge, one can deduce that, in the segment under scrutiny, *lepos* experiences the acridest onslaught at Cicero's hands: along the lines of the virulent impugnments in the passages from *Ver.* studied above, Cicero belabours *lepos* as the

---

<sup>586</sup> See n. 560 above.

<sup>587</sup> See Williams (2010<sup>2</sup>): 166.

<sup>588</sup> See *ibid.*: 122-125. *Ibid.*: 166, Williams plausibly intimates that here Cicero pillories the fact that '[t]hese "soft and delicate boys" depend on the kindness of their women, a reversal that highlights the distance between their behavior and that of real men'.

<sup>589</sup> See *ibid.*: 218-224 with bibliography.

<sup>590</sup> On *pudicitia* as sexual inviolability of freeborn Roman citizens of both sexes and its crucial importance see *ibid.*: passim.

<sup>591</sup> See *ibid.*: 191-193 with bibliography. For all that, one might concur with Dyck (2008): 156, who regards *impuri impudicique* as a synonymic repetition: if the *impurus* fellow performs an act of fellatio, he is likely to be perceived as the receptive (i.e. penetrated) partner, who, as a result, annihilates his *pudicitia*, as well – cp. Williams (2010<sup>2</sup>): 191.

<sup>592</sup> See *ibid.*: 139-144 on various signifiers of effeminacy referable to softness and grooming.

<sup>593</sup> This sort of misconduct falls under the category of lack of self-possession – *ibid.*: 153-154; see also *ibid.*: 151-156 on other instantiations thereof.

<sup>594</sup> See *ibid.*: 166.

<sup>595</sup> See Langlands (2006): 284 with n. 16, where the scholar perceptively remarks that the same pattern typifies also Cicero's biography of Verres.

quintessence of all things un-Roman, but with a vengeance. For, in his capacity as consul, Cicero hankers after the title of second Romulus<sup>596</sup> and regularly asseverates divine assistance while squelching Catiline's revolt.<sup>597</sup> Accordingly, he dilates the immense chasm gaping between his own camp and the *lepidi* 'bodkinned hooligans'<sup>598</sup> to such an extent that reconciliation seems impossible.

A meaningful and articulate substantiation of the aversion which Cicero continues to harbour to *lepos* manifests four years later (in 59), when Cicero undertook another *casade repetundis*. This time, though, he acted as the protector of the influential L. Flaccus,<sup>599</sup> who was arraigned for defalcation during his term as governor of Asia in 62. Aware of the crushing weight of the counts tossed against his patrician client,<sup>600</sup> Cicero decides to impeach the reliability of the Greek witnesses summoned by the prosecution, in keeping with a fairly recurrent chicanery of his.<sup>601</sup> Here are his words in *Flac. 9*: [*a*]t quos testis? *Primum dicam, id quod est commune, Graecos; non quo nationi huic ego unus maxime fidem derogem. Nam si quis umquam de nostris hominibus a genere isto studio ac uoluntate non abhorrens fuit, me et esse arbitror et magis etiam tum cum plus erat oti fuisse. [...]* *Verum tamen hoc dico de toto genere Graecorum: tribuo illis litteras, do multarum artium disciplinam, non adimo sermonis leporem, ingeniorum acumen, dicendi copia, denique etiam, si qua sibi alia sumunt, non repugno; testimoniorum religionem et fidem numquam ista natio coluit, totiusque huiusce rei quae sit uis, quae auctoritas, quod pondus, ignorant.*<sup>602</sup>

---

<sup>596</sup> Goldenhard (2011): 378-380 with literature.

<sup>597</sup> See *ibid.*: 272-292 with bibliography.

<sup>598</sup> Krostenko (2001): 187.

<sup>599</sup> For a concise biography of this illustrious aristocrat see Pappas (2015): 67-68.

<sup>600</sup> For a dependable summary see *ibid.*: 68-69 with bibliography, to which one should add Lintott (2008): 105-107.

<sup>601</sup> *Ibid.*: 77 Pappas insightfully points out that Cicero likewise discredited foreign testifiers in two other speeches (*Font.* (69) and *Scaur.* (54)), in which he similarly represented Roman officials; on Cicero's handling of the far-reaching problems posed by deponents see also Powell (2010a): 26-36 with literature.

<sup>602</sup> 'What sort of witnesses? In the first place, I shall say what they have in common: they are Greek; not that especially I, alone, subtract trustworthiness from this people. For if there has ever been anyone among us, who has not shunned this kind out of inclination and will, I think am that one, and was that one even more,

Cicero commences his breakdown of Greekness, i.e. the common denominator of the depositors, by pillorying their appalling deficit in creditworthiness – parenthetically, he also rounds off the paragraph in question on that note, thus superbly going full circle. Then, at first blush somewhat surprisingly, Cicero avows his bent to Greece. Why? In my opinion, this acknowledgement empowers Cicero to turn a likely insinuation of immoderate Philhellenism on his part into a precious asset: precisely since his erstwhile exhibit of his penchant for Hellas,<sup>603</sup> he cannot be suspected of prejudice against the Greek testifiers. Undoubtedly, such an aspersion does not emerge explicitly here, but is attested in several Ciceronian epistles.<sup>604</sup> Besides, it would nicely dovetail with the global defamatory campaign, which, according to Cicero, the chief prosecutor Laelius unleashed against him to politically obliterate him in retaliation for his suppression of Catiline’s conspiracy with Flaccus’s coercion.<sup>605</sup> If this convinces, incidentally, one will grasp more readily the pregnancy of Cicero’s rider that his cultivation of Hellenic culture has taken place uniquely over his spare hours, without tampering with the paramount observance of his civic duties.<sup>606</sup>

Shortly thereafter, Cicero enlarges upon the dichotomy between the merits and infirmities of Hellenicity and commences enumerating its intellectual attainments through a climaxing *distributio*: with *tribuo*, Cicero forthrightly bestows the laurel wreath on the Greeks in the domain of literature; then, by means of *do*, he grants them remarkable training

---

when there was more leisure. [...] Nevertheless, I maintain this concerning the entire kind of Greeks: I ascribe them credit for literature, I attribute them training in various crafts, I do not deny them charm of speech, intellectual penetration, command of oratory and, finally, if they claim the possession of other qualities, I do not protest; this people, though, has never observed honesty and scrupulous regard for testimonies and ignores the essence, the authority and the solemnity of this matter’.

<sup>603</sup> Among Cicero’s preceding orations, one might have targeted for example *Arch.* (62), on which see my comments in the Latin half of chapter 2.

<sup>604</sup> See Pappas (2015): 74.

<sup>605</sup> Cp. *ibid.*: 71-72 and Lintott (2008): 108; see also n. 776 in the Latin moiety of chapter 2 on Cicero’s unswerving promotion and defence of his consulship.

<sup>606</sup> I shall not delve now more thoroughly into Cicero’s strenuous efforts to sanction his pursuit of Greek and Latin literature over his leisurely moments because I address this multifaceted question in the Latin half of chapter two.

in several disciplines. In the end, Cicero terminates his list by dint of a pair of litotes (*non adimo* and *non repugno*), in my estimation thereby signifying that he cannot but deny his admiration for Greek excellence in respect of linguistic appeal (*sermonis lepos*), acumen, oratory and other related provinces. One may well wonder in befuddlement to what effect Cicero sings the praises of the same people whose name he ultimately seeks to besmirch. In my understanding, such a step serves a shrewd double purpose in harmony with the antecedent sentence. On the one hand, Cicero guards against retracting his fondness for Greece, thus forestalling any libel over hypocrisy, which would have been particularly baleful at a time when, as remarked above, his detractors were raking him across the coals in the aftermath of his quashing of Catiline's cabal. On the other hand, he renders to the Hellenes their due in order to be able to sling mud ulteriorly at them without sounding jaundiced. Hence, in the second half of the period under scrutiny, Cicero is in a position to objectively withhold *fides* from the Greeks through the power of the *amplificatio quae uis, quae auctoritas, quod pondus*, which solemnly highlights that he never loses sight of the superiority of Roman values.<sup>607</sup>

At this point, one may canvass similarities and discrepancies between *Flac.* 9 and *Ver.* 2.3.35 and 2.5.142: indubitably, in all these passages *fides* collides with *lepos*. Having said that, one should be alert to Cicero's dissimilar outlook on the individuals displaying *lepos*: as far as Verres is concerned, Cicero can easily create an unbridgeable gulf between the quondam Sicilian governor as embodiment of debased *lepos* and himself as an archetype of Roman uprightness. Apropos of the Hellenes, instead, matters thicken: firstly, the sort of *lepos* in which they excel pertains to a far less controversial orbit than Verres's, to wit linguistic pleasingness. Secondly, Cicero cannot claim to be every inch alien thereto lest he should incur allegations of flagrant insincerity. However, as I proposed, Cicero

---

<sup>607</sup> On the rest of Cicero's debunking of Greek dependability see Pappas (2015): 79-87 with literature.

brilliantly makes the best of his familiarity with Greece to validate his traducement of Hellenic witnesses as empty of tendentiousness; moreover, he succeeds in convincingly keeping their *lepos* at arm's length to remain under the wing of Latin *fides*.<sup>608</sup>

My concluding oratorical passage – in point of fact, the last appearance of *lepos* in all extant Ciceronian orations – is taken from *Prov. cons.*, the deliberative speech of 56, in which Cicero was publicly freighted for the first time with the sudden destruction of his post-exile expectations of restored political independence in the wake of the freshly revitalised alliance between Caesar, Pompey and Crassus.<sup>609</sup> Hence, he perforce acquiesced to plead for the extension of Caesar's pro-consular command in Gaul. To convince the senators to second his proposal, in § 29 (the beginning of the second *confirmatio* stretching between § 29 and § 35),<sup>610</sup> Cicero submits that Caesar is driven exclusively by national interest: *[n]am ipse Caesar quid est cur in prouincia commorari velit, nisi ut ea quae per eum adfecta sunt perfecta rei publicae tradat? Amoenitas eum, credo, locorum, urbium pulchritudo, hominum nationumque illarum humanitas et lepos, victoriae cupiditas, finium imperi propagatio retinet.*<sup>611</sup>

Cicero alleges that what truly counts for Caesar is the common good, which, with a potent combination of polyptoton and rhyme,<sup>612</sup> is called *ea quae per eum adfecta sunt perfecta*. To back this contention, Cicero lists a series of five absurd and self-invalidating answers to the rhetorical question *quid est cur in prouincia commorari velit*: neither natural

---

<sup>608</sup> My approach chimes roughly with Krostenko (2001): 169 and 181-182. Still, whereas the scholar maintains that here Cicero 'depicts himself and the audience as outsiders: inexperienced in [...] the aestheticism or aesthetics that the language of social performance describes' (*ibid.*: 169), I think one must not overlook the fact that Cicero labours to come across as a stranger to the Greeks *in defiance* of his palpable conversance with them.

<sup>609</sup> For a more detailed chronology of this traumatic stage in Cicero's life see pp. 140-144 below.

<sup>610</sup> Cp. Grillo (2015a): 217.

<sup>611</sup> 'For what other reason should Caesar himself wish to remain in the province, except for the purpose of handing over to the republic in a state of completion the operations, which have been advanced by him? Presumably, the amenity of the places, the beauty of the cities, the civilisation and charm of those individuals and peoples, the yearning for victory and the extension of the boundaries of Roman power detain him.'

<sup>612</sup> *Ibid.*: 219.

or urban treasures nor the locals' sophistication nor an exorbitant ache for power.<sup>613</sup> Along with irony, which obviously permeates each of these fictive motifs, in regards to *hominum nationumque illarum* [...] *lepos*, Krostenko and Grillo claim that Cicero strikes a loyal note by pitting the civilised Romans against the uncouth locals.<sup>614</sup> Yet, as I see it, subterranean tension flustered Cicero: on top of all, it did not escape him that he was advocating a bill conducive to a subversion of Republican order;<sup>615</sup> in addition, the (conservative) opponents of this treacherous piece of legislation presumably loathed the prospect of being 'patriotically' tagged as *lepidi* by somebody who had animadverted upon several *lepidi* shady characters over the antecedent decades.

Be that as it may, beyond a shadow of a doubt, after this demeaning Senatorial session, Cicero was forced to restrain from active participation in political life and limit himself to defending their minions in court.<sup>616</sup> Consequently, he had to endure a formidable spate of abuse as his poignant epistolary self-justification (*Fam.* 1.9) sent in 54 to L. Spinther (one of the craftsmen of his recall from exile in late 57) certifies.<sup>617</sup> Under these dismal circumstances, Cicero penned *de Orat.*, his dialogue<sup>618</sup> on the ideal orator<sup>619</sup> set in the year 91<sup>620</sup> and completed in November 55. In consideration thereof, I shall build to some extent on Krostenko's decoding of Cicero's dialogue as an *apologia pro facetiis suis*,<sup>621</sup> and advance that, in the so-called *excursus de ridiculis* (2.217-290),<sup>622</sup> Cicero returned to his

---

<sup>613</sup> See *ibid.*: 219-220 with bibliography on all the rhetorical devices to which Cicero resorts to underpin his argument.

<sup>614</sup> Cp. *ibid.*: 219 with bibliography, to which one should add Krostenko (2001): 193-194.

<sup>615</sup> On the political consequences of the speech see *ibid.*: 10-12 with literature.

<sup>616</sup> I broach this plight of Cicero's more extensively in chapter 2.

<sup>617</sup> See my comments in chapter 2.

<sup>618</sup> On Cicero's renovation of Greek philosophical dialogue see Mankin (2011): 19-23 and Gildenhard (2013): 225-275, both with bibliography.

<sup>619</sup> On the Greek theoretical background and Cicero's Roman touches see *ibid.*: 5 and 35-41 with literature.

<sup>620</sup> On the historical backdrop see *ibid.*: 23-28.

<sup>621</sup> See Krostenko (2001): 223-229; all the same, I disagree in two important respects: firstly, whereas Krostenko concentrates more broadly on Cicero's partiality for τὸ γελοῖον (*ibid.*: 223-226), I focus more narrowly on his oscillation relating to *lepos*. Secondly, Krostenko (*ibid.*: 225) claims that 'Cicero might construct *lepos* and *facetiae* as an addendum, but that construction [...] asserts that those qualities really can exist in harmony with *grauitas*. Indeed, that harmony is something of a minor theme'. On the contrary, for my own part, I contend that this consonance constitutes a *sine qua non*.

<sup>622</sup> On this section of *de Orat.* cp. *ibid.*: 8 with bibliography.



unique partially favourable deployment of *lepos* in *Clu.* 141, equipped it with extra rationale, and strove more broadly to carve out one admissible niche for *lepos*: the department of humour,<sup>623</sup> provided that it remained subservient to *dignitas*, *grauitas* and *auctoritas*.

To substantiate my hypothesis, I traverse the significant portions of §§ 220, 221, 222, 225, 227, 228 and 230, in which C. Strabo (the leading collocutor) and M. Antonius<sup>624</sup> crown in concert<sup>625</sup> Crassus master of a proper brand of facetious *lepos*: STRABO: '[220] [...] *non enim fere quisquam reperietur praeter hunc in utroque genere leporis excellens: et illo, quod in perpetuitate sermonis, et hoc, quod in celeritate atque dicto est.* [221] *Nam haec perpetua contra Scaevolam Curiana defensio tota redundavit hilaritate quadam et ioco; dicta illa breuia non habuit; parcebat enim adversari dignitati, in quo ipse conservabat suam.* [...] [222] [...] *Sed ut in Scaevola continuit ea Crassus atque in illo altero genere, in quo nulli aculei contumeliarum inerant, causam illam disputationemque elusit, sic in Bruto, quem oderat et quem dignum contumelia iudicabat, utroque genere pugnavit.* [...] [225] *Quis est igitur qui non fateatur hoc lepore atque his facetiis [...] refutatum esse Brutum [...]?* [...] [227] *Sed haec tragica atque divina; faceta autem et urbana innumerabilia vel ex una contione meministis; nec enim maior contentio umquam fuit nec apud populum gravior oratio quam huius contra conlegam in censura nuper, neque lepore et festivitate conditor.* [...] ANTONIUS: '[228] [...] [*S*]ed cum omnium sit venustissimus et urbanissimus, omnium gravissimum et severissimum et esse et uideri, quod isti contigit uni, [*i*d] mihi uix ferendum videbatur. [...] [230] [...] [*E*]rat autem tanta

---

<sup>623</sup> Regarding this, I follow Krostenko (*ibid.*: 204): the scholar fittingly poses that '*lepos* is clearly serving as a superordinate term for "humor"; *ibid.*: 211, he also puts forward that *lepos* may correspond to the Greek concept of χάρις 'goodwill (to the audience)'. Lastly, see *ibid.*: 95 with n.17 and 213 for other employments of *lepos* in *de Orat.*

<sup>624</sup> On this and the other *dialogi personae* see *ibid.*: 28-35.

<sup>625</sup> In view of Cicero's Academic dialogic technique, this consensus between the interlocutors can be reasonably taken to contain his own opinion, even if, aside from the three proems, he never speaks *in propria persona* – see Mankin (2011): 2 with bibliography.

*in Domitio gravitas, tanta auctoritas, ut, quod esset ab eo obiectum, lepore magis levandum quam contentione frangendum videretur.*<sup>626</sup>

Strabo distinguishes two kinds of jocosity in which Crassus outshone the others: both a jesting mantling the whole oration, and single fulminating wisecracks. Then, he adduces one example for each kind: on the one hand, the apology for Curius, which was seasoned with a certain amount of raillery, but abstained from barbs at the expense of the prosecutor Scaevola, wherewith safeguarding both Crassus's and Scaevola's standing. On the other hand, Strabo recounts the Plancus trial, which Cicero commemorated in *Clu.* 141, but appends vital details. This information enables one to understand how, although Crassus did not hesitate to put the defendant Brutus relentlessly on the griddle, in Strabo's eyes, Crassus managed to preserve *lepos* (*hoc lepore atque his facetiis [...] Brutum refutatum esse*) and reap applause (*haec tragica atque divina*). In my opinion, the unravelling sits in the fact that, as opposed to Scaevola, Brutus inspired hate and possessed no *dignitas* to give umbrage to, but was only *dignus contumelia*.<sup>627</sup> Besides, as Antonius points out

---

<sup>626</sup>STRABO: '[220] [...] Apart from this man (scil. Crassus), virtually no one else will be found, who excels in both sorts of pleasantry: both in that one, which lies in the whole thread of the speech, and in this one, which resides in rapidity and abusive utterance. [221] For this entire defence of his on behalf of Curius against Scaevola abounded throughout in a certain light-heartedness and sport; (instead,) it contained no concise abusive utterances. For he showed consideration towards his adversary's status, thereby preserving his own. [...] [222] [...] But just as in the speech against Scaevola Crassus restrained abusive utterances and disposed adroitly of the extenuating plea and of the argument in that kind of humour, in which no spikes of insulting language were present, so, equally, he contended against Brutus, whom he hated and deemed worthy of insulting language, with both sorts of humour. [...] [225] Therefore, who would not declare that Brutus was refuted by this pleasantry and this wit [...]?' [227] But these jests are superlative and sublime! Yet, you could mention innumerable witty and elegant jests even from one single oration: for there has never been a more important public speech, an address to the people more august or more flavoured with pleasantry and wit than the one recently (delivered) by this man (scil. Crassus) against his colleague in censorship. [...] ANTONIUS: '[228] [...] [B]ut it seemed to me hardly endurable that, although he (scil. Crassus) was the most charming and sophisticated of all orators, he both was and was thought to be the gravest and the most austere of all – a faculty granted to him alone. [...] [230] [...] Furthermore, no great dignity, so great authority inhered in Domitius, that it seemed proper to lessen his charges through jocularly rather than crush them through dispute.

<sup>627</sup> To further augment the abyss between Crassus's competitors, Strabo puts to use polyptoton and word play: since Crassus respected Scaevola's *dignitas* (*parcebat [...] aduersari dignitati* in § 220), he avoided *aculei contumeliarum* (§ 222). By contrast, inasmuch as Brutus was *dignum contumelia* (§ 222), Crassus locked horns with him inexorably (*utroque genere pugnavit* in § 222) – by implication, one might intimate that Crassus indeed hurled *aculei contumeliarum* against Brutus.

slightly later (§ 230), since Crassus was counter-striking Brutus, his reaction appeared more admissible.

Thereafter, Strabo pinpoints another one of Crassus's speeches (the one against his fellow-censor Gnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus in 92), which, more patently than the previous examples, encapsulates the cardinal principle to which, as the dialogue spells out unequivocally,<sup>628</sup> *lepos* must always adhere so to meet with acceptance: it must unfailingly be married to *grauitas*, *dignitas*, *auctoritas* and *humanitas*.<sup>629</sup> More to the letter, Strabo brings to the fore the subsidiary role *lepos* is expected to play in relation to the superior Roman virtues and spotlights its collaterality even morphologically with the ablative case (*lepore et festiuitate conditior*). Finally, to seal the subject, in line with a theme of the dialogue,<sup>630</sup> Strabo compares *lepos* to a seasoning of the optimal speech.

Thereupon, Antonius verifies Strabo's idea by voicing his sham jealousy of Crassus's unrivalled ability to meld precisely *grauitas* with *urbanitas*; the utterance is graphically intensified through the perfect parallelism *cum omnium sit venustissimus et urbanissimus, omnium gravissimum et severissimum et esse et videri*. Then, Antonius, too, comments on the oration against D. Ahenobarbus, but goes one step forward: he maintains more momentously that through *lepos* one can successfully stave off attacks coming from an

---

<sup>628</sup> Cp. for instance 2.340 (ANTONIUS: *Nulla autem loco plus facetiae prosunt et celeritas et brue aliquod dictum nec sine dignitate et cum lepore*, ANTONIUS: 'Moreover, on no other occasion (i.e., a popular assembly), are wit, nimbleness and a concise abusive utterance, but not without dignity and with jocularity, more advantageous') and 3.29 (CRASSUS: *Quae est pura sic ut Latine loqui paene solus uideatur, sic autem grauis ut in singulari dignitate omnis tamen adsit humanitas ac lepos*, CRASSUS: 'It (scil. Catulus's eloquence) is so pure, that he (scil. Catulus) seems practically the only one who speaks in good Latin; besides it is so thoughtful, that, in his uncommon dignity, the whole of culture and charm are all the same present').  
<sup>629</sup> On the limits which Cicero envisages for humour in *de Orat.* and later works, see most recently Cortés Tovar (2013): 249-258. On *grauitas*, *dignitas*, *auctoritas* and *humanitas* in Cicero see Schofield (2009): 199-213 and Gildenhard (2011): passim.

<sup>630</sup> See for instance 1.159: CRASSUS: [...] [*L*]ibandus est etiam ex omni genere urbanitatis facetiarum quidam lepos, quo tamquam sale perspargatur omnis oratio, CRASSUS: '[...] [*F*]rom every sort of refinement a certain amount of jocularity must be selected, with which every speech should be sprinkled, as though with salt'. For an exhaustive list of analogous passages see Krostenko 2001: 209-210. In passing, I quickly illustrate one minor divergence of mine from Krostenko touching the translation of the phrase *lepos quidam*: whereas the scholar (*ibid.*: 209) renders it as 'a kind of' (*cp. OLD s.u.* 3a), on the basis of this sentence and of my broader line of interpretation, I find it more accurate to construe it as 'a certain amount of' (*cp. OLD s.u.* 4a).

estimable rival, and bolsters his bold point by means of the mighty anaphora of *tanta* ((e)rat *tanta in Domitio gravitas, tanta auctoritas*).

I would conclude that this exchange contains the peak of Cicero's more than decennial engagement with *lepos*; here, he lays down the ineludible requirements it must implement to be granted full Roman citizenship. One fails to discover whether these efforts sufficed to Cicero to exculpate himself from any hostile insinuation of inconsistency in his handling of *lepos*, even though – it is worth repeating it – he never straightforwardly claimed possession. For all that, one cannot ignore the immense lengths to which Cicero went in order to prove that he never dallied inordinately with *lepos*, but always approached it with Roman ethics firmly before his eyes.

## Chapter 2: Callimachus and Catullus against appropriateness

### 2.1 Introduction

The purpose of the Greek half of this chapter lies in proposing a further facet of Callimachus's quest for poetic liberty: his refusal to abide by the principle of τὸ πρέπον,<sup>631</sup> which, after Aristotle's authoritative conceptualisation thereof, governed the suitable relationship between subject-matter and linguistic register.<sup>632</sup> To substantiate my claim, given the absence of Callimachean occurrences of the word and of ancient scholia testifying to this feature of Callimachus's technique, in the first place I shall review Aristotle' and his Peripatetic successors' treatment of πρέπον, which also influenced Homeric criticism at the Alexandrian library. In the second place, by expanding on Cozzoli's hypothesis that, through the multifarious phrase παῖς ἄτε in Fr. 1.6 Harder, the Telchines pillory Callimachus's incongruous amalgam of high and low vocabulary, I shall claim that they also savage Callimachus's non-observance of fittingness. In the third place, I shall inspect Callimachus's deployment of language in Frr. 54b and c in the *Victoria Berenices* through the lenses of πρέπον and submit that whilst traditional-minded critics may indeed have regarded it as a grievous breach of propriety, Callimachus invests this attitude with programmatic force. In the fourth place, I shall suggest that, when it comes to sacred topics beyond the pale (for example Zeus' and Hera's sexual intercourse in Fr. 75.4-9 Harder or Demeter's plights in *H.* 6.17-22), Callimachus humorously shies away from spinning these ineffable yarns at the very last minute.

---

<sup>631</sup> This notion is by and large conveyed by forms of the active present participle of the verb πρέπω, chiefly by way of the substantivised neuter form τὸ πρέπον; alternatively, one encounters the synonym προσήκω, again mostly in the forms of the active present participle

<sup>632</sup> On the problems weighing upon the distinction between 'form' and 'content' in antiquity and ancient terminology employed see Porter (1995): 97-147; despite all cautionary remarks, at 125 n. 83 he puts the principle of πρέπον as 'subject matter dictates expression'.

Subsequently, in the Latin half of this chapter, I intend to propose that Catullus appropriates Callimachus's rebelliousness against τὸ πρέπον to reinforce his own more politically charged noncompliance with one of the staples of Roman seemliness, namely the *negotium-otium* hierarchy.<sup>633</sup> In a nutshell, abidance by this norm requires senators and *equites* to attend to the common good over the vast majority of their lives by opting for one of the career paths traditionally available to them. Always pursuant thereto, they are also expected to account for their conduct during spare moments, even more so when they bring about literature, which necessitates notable justification by reason of its associations with Greece. To overcome this hurdle, one invokes the *utilitas*, the general profitability of one's compositions,<sup>634</sup> and insists upon the fact that the production of one's creation has never conflicted with official occupations.

With this background in mind and an eye on metrical affinities (Phalaecian hendecasyllable beats time in the bulk of the poems I have selected), I focus on how, in *carmina* 5, 7, 10, 44 and 50, to the detriment of *negotia*, Catullus overtly exhibits his otiose condition (replete with poetry, love and even worldly discussions of his expedition to Bithynia) and refuses to prove the utility of his poems. At the same time, I shall also address the poet's torment over his *otium* voiced in the controversial concluding stanza of *carmen* 51: without erasing the divergence with the previous instances, I purport to emphasise that in lines 13-14 the poet concentrates upon himself, rather than on moral concerns: namely, he highlights his physical detriment (*otium, Catulle, tibi molestum*) and excessive restlessness (*otio exsultas nimiumque gestis*), perhaps thereby ironically implying that he fails to benefit from the tranquillity which, by definition, *otium* should engender.

Yet, prior to turning to Catullus, just as in the previous chapter, I shall attempt to illuminate his markedly untraditional stance by comparing him with Cicero. For, upon

---

<sup>633</sup> This paragraph follows closely in the footsteps of Braga (1950): 115-116, Bayet (1953): 19-20, Ferrero (1955): 84-86 and all the other scholars listed, and effectively summarised, by by Gildenhard (2007): 45-46.

<sup>634</sup> On this line of reasoning see Ledentu (2004): *passim*.

inspection of the surviving compositions published by 54,<sup>635</sup> the last year unambiguously alluded to in the extant *carmina*, one cannot but conclude that, except for the opening of the *Rhet. Her.*, already satisfactorily scrutinised by Baraz,<sup>636</sup> only the Ciceronian corpus offers another explicit and articulate reflection upon its status as a product of *otium*.<sup>637</sup>

Specifically, by examining segments from the juvenile treatise *Inv.*, relevant extracts from four orations (*Sull.*, *Arch.*, *Sest.*, *Planc.*), a fragment of the poem *Cons.* and the preface to *de Orat.*, along with a few samples from the epistles, I aim to argue that, in sheer contrast with Catullus, Cicero takes very seriously the above-mentioned concerns over elite Romans' management of their restful hours. Accordingly, irrespective of the agenda peculiar to each case under examination, he consistently struggles to bestow legitimacy upon his written works on the basis of their serviceableness and absolute lack of any clash with *negotia*.<sup>638</sup>

---

<sup>635</sup> Decidedly lamentable, for example, appears the substantial loss of Varro's immense contribution to the cultural and philosophical landscape, on which see most recently Zetzel (2016): 53-55 and 58-62 with literature. The prologue to *De Re rustica* constitutes one noteworthy exception to the shipwreck; regardless, the mention of the author's extremely advanced age induces Kronenberg (2009): 73 n. 2 to date it, possibly along with the whole dialogue, to circa 37, that is well beyond 54. Notwithstanding, it deserves a rapid mention insofar as it engages with *otium*: here Varro apologises for the lack of polish of his work, which stems from his dearth of spare time owing to the imminence of death in concomitance with his eightieth year. These proemial characteristics have encouraged Dietrich (2007): 180 n.1033 to interpret it as an ironic polemic against Cicero's long-winded preface to *De Orat.* On the other hand, as Ledentu (2004): 351-352 pertinently remarks, one ought not to underestimate the parallel emphasis on *utilitas*. Analogous chronological reasons lead me to omit discussions of Sallust's prologues to his monographs, brought to completion roughly between 42 and 33 according to Lefèvre (2004): 12; in fine, Baraz (2012): 22-36 has thoroughly and authoritatively commented on them by highlighting similarities to and differences from Cicero's apologetic strategies.

<sup>636</sup> Baraz (2012): 36-42.

<sup>637</sup> On these grounds, as opposed to the preceding chapter, I have decided not to investigate Lucretius's *DRN*, no longer modified after late 55 (Butterfield (2013): 1 n. 2): even though keen on accentuating the *utilitas* of his poem (Holmes (2005): 527-585, *passim*), Lucretius never engages with the relationship between leisure and literature, possibly because of the Epicurean recommendation that the sage eschew politics – for a dependable problematisation of Epicurean views on politics and its Roman elaborations see McConnell (2010): 178-198 and Fish (2011): 72-104, both with literature. What is more, the only occurrence of *otium* at 5.1387 (*per loca pastorum deserta atque otia dia*), albeit embedded in the reconstruction of the origins of music (ll. 1379-1435) persuasively discussed by Gale (2009): 210-213, and not devoid of echoes of the programmatic declaration of poetics at 1.926-928 detected by Buchheit (1984): 157-158, designates only the *places* in which the forefathers whiled away their restful hours.

<sup>638</sup> As a matter of fact, these *apologiae* never cease to introduce Cicero's later philosophical works with due adjustments to the circumstances under which he pens them; nevertheless, they fall beyond my temporal boundaries and have been outstandingly treated by Gildenhard (2007): 48-63 and Baraz (2012).

## 2.2. The Telchines' slanderous insinuation of childishness on Callimachus's part

In conformity with the introductory guidelines, I shall vet the enigmatic turn of phrase ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἐλ[ίσσω / παῖς ἄτε, τῶν δ' ἐτέων ἢ δεκάς οὐκ ὀλίγη (Fr. 1.5-6 Harder) against the backcloth of the inaugural six lines of the *Aitia* prologue.

Πολλάκι μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀοιδῆι,  
νήιδες οἱ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι,  
εἴνεκεν οὐχ ἔν ἄεισμα διηνεκές ἢ βασιλ[η  
. . . . . ]ας ἐν πολλαῖς ἤνυσσα χιλιάσιν  
ἢ. . . . . ]ους ἥρωας, ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἐλ[ίσσω  
παῖς ἄτε, τῶν δ' ἐτέων ἢ δεκάς οὐκ ὀλίγη.<sup>639</sup>

What do the Telchines exactly reprove Callimachus for? The disappearance of the main verb in line 5 notwithstanding,<sup>640</sup> based on the Greek habit of ascribing limited mental faculties to children,<sup>641</sup> one can assume that, in the first place, through παῖς ἄτε, Callimachus's fault-finders imputed him a puerile conduct at odds with his advanced age.<sup>642</sup>

---

<sup>639</sup> 'The Telchines often murmur at me for my song, ignorant, who weren't born friends of the Muse, because a unitary, unbroken song either ... kings... or heroes... in several thousands of lines I did not complete, but turn one line in my mind a little like a child, although my decades are not few.'

<sup>640</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 26, to which one ought to add Ambühl (2005): 386-392. Both scholars ultimately opt for Hunt's conjecture ἐλίσσω; still, they differ regarding the rendition: the former (*ibid.*: 26-27) translates the verb metaphorically as 'to turn in one's mind', 'to revolve' (cp. *LSJ s.u.* I 5) inasmuch as this acceptation dovetails with ἔπος in the sense of 'a poet's word' or 'line' (cp. *LSJ s.u.* IV c). The latter, by contrast (*ibid.*: 390-391 with literature, to which one ought to append Pretagostini (2006): 12-20 and 26), favours 'to roll', 'to wind round' (cp. *LSJ s.u.* I 4): according to her, '[d]ie Pointe des Bildes könnte darin liegen, dass das Kind zu Kurze Arme hat und die grosse Buchrolle daher beim Lesen jeweils nur ein kleines Stück abwickeln kann' (*ibid.*: 391). Even so, since ἔπος is nowhere attested as equivalent word for 'book' – cp. Harder (2012) II: 27 –, I concur with Harder's decipherment.

<sup>641</sup> See Ambühl (2005): 386-388 and Harder (2012) II: 28, both with literature.

<sup>642</sup> Cp. *ibid.*: 28. In *ibid.*: 385-408, Ambühl penetratingly tackles the interplay between old age, youth and childhood in the *Reply*. In summary, she distils three hermeneutic levels: the historical-autobiographical; the literary-intertextual and the metaphorical-poetological. Under the first heading, Ambühl explores Callimachus's precocious initiation into poetry as a mark of his foreordained destiny as a poet, and the Muses' unwavering favour towards him. Under the second rubric, she investigates the way in which Callimachus interacts with previous *Dichterweihen* and earlier authors' pining for rejuvenation – on this see also Sbardella (2012): 53-82 with bibliography. Under the third headline, Ambühl distances herself from romantically-slanted readings of the *Reply*, according to which Callimachus rebels against the weight of tradition. Rather,



In the second place, with an eye on ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθόν, Callimachus's mischievous detractors probably reprimanded him for failing to compose a poem on an adequately large scale, which is quantified in several thousand of lines in Fr. 1.4 Harder (ἐν πολλαῖς [...] χιλιάσιν).<sup>643</sup> This hypothesis, albeit fundamentally plausible, by my lights requires a few clarifying observations: in point of fact, on the authority of *Dieg.*<sup>644</sup> and other criteria (page-numbers, stichometric numbers, evidence of the text and external evidence),<sup>645</sup> the extent of the *Aitia* is likely to have attained roughly 5,000 verses.<sup>646</sup> Therefore, in spite of Callimachus's sustained rejection of length as a valid aesthetic tenet throughout the *Reply*, above all in the bewildering lines 9-16,<sup>647</sup> the derogators' critique cannot have targeted the extent of the poem *sic et simpliciter*. To me, to shed light on the exact import of ἐπὶ τυτθόν, one must bring into play the adjective διηνεκές in line 3. Also, the discussion of the remainder of line 3, first and foremost of the adjective ἔν, will conveniently usher in Callimachus's relationship with Aristotle and his first successors. This aspect, in its turn, will in due course empower me to set forth that, by dint of παῖς ἄτε, the depreciators lambast Callimachus for trespassing against the Peripatetic principle of τὸ πρέπον.

Accordingly, let me dissect the attribute ἔν, which Callimachus's belittlers deny to his ἄεισμα.<sup>648</sup> in the footsteps of previous scholars,<sup>649</sup> Hunter<sup>650</sup> proposed a reference to Aristotle's conception of unitary plot, which the philosopher illustrates in *Po.* 8 (1451a16-

---

she submits that Callimachus deploys tradition as a fruitful starting point for his experiments. I take on board Ambühl's warnings. At the same time, I agree with Männlein-Robert (2009): 45-54 and 56-59, who persuasively shows that in Fr. 64 Harder (the so-called *Sepulchrum Simonidis*) Callimachus disrespectfully desecrates the relics of Simonidean poetry, imposes new meaning to the fragments and waves them into the fabric of his own poem. Besides, as I hope to demonstrate below, Callimachus does altercate with the philosophers' aspiration to legislate about poetry.

<sup>643</sup>Cp. Hunter (1993): 192 for thought-provoking observations on the gulf between ἔν and ἐν πολλαῖς χιλιάσιν and add Ambühl (2005): 387 and Harder (2012) II: 27.

<sup>644</sup>On the *Dieg.* see bibliography in Harder (2012) I: 70 and Barbantani (2015): 285 n.60, both with literature.

<sup>645</sup>See Harder (2012) I: 12-14 with literature.

<sup>646</sup>See *ibid.*: 14-15.

<sup>647</sup>See Harder (2012) II: 32-49 with literature.

<sup>648</sup>On the implication of this designation of the *Aitia* see Harder (2012) II: 20.

<sup>649</sup>See *ibid.*: 18 for a list of supporters.

<sup>650</sup>Hunter (1993): 190-193, to which one might add Harder (2012) II: 21.

19) touching tragedy<sup>651</sup> and in *Po.* 23 (1459a18-19) concerning epic.<sup>652</sup> At the same time, still in Hunter's view,<sup>653</sup> Callimachus's maligners ask simultaneously for a διηνεκές poem, that is the contrary of Aristotelian unity (ἕν). For such a composition lacks the necessary selection of events conducive to wholeness; as a result, they turn out to be gross ignoramuses (νήιδες).<sup>654</sup>

Whereas I sympathise with the first half of Hunter's argument insofar as the *Aitia* do fall short of Aristotelian unity,<sup>655</sup> I dissent from the second half of his elucidation mostly because I concur with Petrovic: 'depicting his (scil. Callimachus's) critics as hopeless amateurs and total bad guys would [...] be a mistake – why even engage in a critical discussion with someone who is totally worthless?'<sup>656</sup>

Secondly, as Hunter himself admits,<sup>657</sup> Aristotle did not avail himself of διηνεκές; hence, although the related adverb διηνεκέως, first and foremost when paired with verbs such as ἀγορεύειν, stands indeed for 'from the beginning to the end',<sup>658</sup> in my judgement, if the

---

<sup>651</sup> Μῦθος δ' ἐστὶν εἷς οὐχ ὥσπερ τινὲς οἴονται ἐὰν περὶ ἓνα ἦ· πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἄπειρα τῷ ἐνὶ συμβαίνειν, ἐξ ὧν ἐνίων οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἓν· οὕτως δὲ καὶ πράξεις ἐνὸς πολλαὶ εἰσιν, ἐξ ὧν μία οὐδεμία γίνεται πρῶξις, 'the plot is unitary not, as someone believe, if it concerns itself with a single individual: for, to one single individual, several and unlimited events befall, from some of which no unity ensues; by the same token, (since) a single individual's actions are numerous, no unitary action stems therefrom'. For the commentary see Guastini (2010): 203-206 with literature; on Aristotelian unity see now also Heath (2015): 383-388 with bibliography.

<sup>652</sup> [...] [Δ]εῖ τοὺς μύθους καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς τραγωιδίαις συνιστάναί δραματικούς καὶ περὶ μίαν πρῶξιν ὅλην καὶ τελείαν, 'it is necessary for the plot to be composed in a dramatic fashion, just like tragedies, and about a single action (endowed with) unity and wholeness' – see Guastini (2010): 334-335 with bibliography.

<sup>653</sup> Hunter (1993): 192-193.

<sup>654</sup> *Ibid.*: 193.

<sup>655</sup> Barbantani (2015): 296-300 and 303-310 has recently endeavoured to present Callimachus's adoption of thematic *files rouges* as his personal take on Aristotelian unity; she has additionally put forward that these recurring motifs might be regarded as a collection of original Aristotelian ἐπεισόδια, which Aristotle analysed in *Po.* 23. All the same, I disagree with her because of two reasons: firstly, in my opinion, the compatibility she champions between Aristotelian and Callimachean integrity does not hold water. For the thematic bonds, she proposes fall short of the pivotal causal nexus between the events, which lies at the core of Aristotle's conception of singleness – cp. *Po.* 8.1451a31-34: γρή [...] οὕτω καὶ τὸν μῦθον, ἐπεὶ πράξεως μίμησις ἐστὶ, μᾶς τε εἶναι καὶ ταύτης ὅλης, καὶ τὰ μέρη συνεστάναι τῶν πραγμάτων οὕτως ὥστε μετατιθεμένου τινὸς μέρους ἢ ἀφαιρομένου διαφέρεσθαι καὶ κινεῖσθαι τὸ ὅλον, 'likewise also the plot, since it is an imitation of one action, it must be a representation of a unitary and complete action; furthermore, it must organise the parts consisting of the events to such an extent that, if any of them is transposed or removed, the entire aggregate is altered and disturbed'. Secondly, with reference to the 'episodes', from my standpoint, she overlooks a relevant rider, by which they must abide: 'dovranno [...] essere [...] οικεῖα, "appropriati", sia rispetto ai caratteri [...] sia tra loro e rispetto agli eventi del *mythos*' (Guastini (2010): 291).

<sup>656</sup> Petrovic (2006): 26.

<sup>657</sup> Hunter (1993): 193.

<sup>658</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 20-21 for some examples; at the same time, one ought not to overlook that, in *Od.* 4.836, one of the occurrences she adduces, the adverb expresses rather 'distinctly, positively'.

learned Callimachus had wished to allude to Aristotle just like in the case of ἔν, he would have opted for a genuinely Aristotelian term.

Thirdly, if one concentrates on the primary sense of the adjective, videlicet ‘continuous’, ‘unbroken’,<sup>659</sup> one will realise that Callimachus’s censurers take to task a real feature of the *Aitia*, to wit the absence of exhaustive narratives and the concomitant fragmentariness.<sup>660</sup> In other words, ‘[w]hen one looks at the *Aitia* the claim of discontinuity and lack of completeness and chronological order seems to work in several ways and on several levels’:<sup>661</sup> for example, in the *Victory of Berenice*, to which I shall return shortly, ‘the episode of Molorchus and his mousetraps is prominent, whereas the reader seems to be referred to other sources for the – expected – story of Heracles killing the Nemean lion’.<sup>662</sup>

Thence, I infer that, on the one hand, Callimachus’s backbiters coherently embrace the Aristotelian principle of unity<sup>663</sup> and, by implication, fuss at Callimachus’s infringement thereof. On the other hand, διηλεκές has nothing to do with Aristotle but, by means of it, his traducers peck at the unquestionable disjointedness and patchiness of the *Aitia*. Still, the relationship between Aristotle and Callimachus turns out to be more complex considering recent contributions<sup>664</sup> which have unearthed Aristotle’s influence upon the organisation of the Alexandrian Museum and Library,<sup>665</sup> on the development

---

<sup>659</sup> Cp. *LSJ s.u.*

<sup>660</sup> Therefrom I would tentatively deduce that Callimachus makes διηλεκές reverberate through ἐπὶ τυτθόν.

<sup>661</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 21.

<sup>662</sup> *Ibid.*: 22; cp. also *ibid.*: 21-22 for extra cases in point.

<sup>663</sup> On these grounds, I reject the decoding of ἔν as ‘one single’, as endorsed by Harder (2012): 19-20 with literature.

<sup>664</sup> Barbantani (2015): 269-271 with literature is premised upon this; so, regardless of my objections, to my way of thinking, her point of departure redounds fully to her credit.

<sup>665</sup> See Montana (2015): 76-89 with literature; on the library and its impact on scholars-poets see also Harder (2013): 96-108.

of Hellenistic textual criticism,<sup>666</sup> above all in the case of Homer,<sup>667</sup> and on Callimachus's own prose works.<sup>668</sup>

For all that, to me,<sup>669</sup> Callimachus did revolt against the philosophers' (most especially, Plato<sup>670</sup> and Aristotle<sup>671</sup>) pretension to legislate poetry.<sup>672</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens<sup>673</sup> have lately lent ulterior support to this supposition by dissecting the sustained polemic which Callimachus mounts against Plato chiefly, but by no means exclusively,<sup>674</sup> in the

---

<sup>666</sup> See *ibid.*: 90-99, *ibid.*: 102-105 on Zenodotus and *ibid.*: 111-118 on Eratosthenes.

<sup>667</sup> In this respect, the Aristotelian tenet of τὸ πρέπον, which I shall particularise presently, became an indispensable tool: see the bibliography in Montana (2015): 129 and in Nünlist (2015): 712 n. 28, which should be supplemented with Schironi (2009): 279-303 *passim*. Truth be told, Schironi concentrates mostly on Aristarchus, whose lifespan falls beyond Callimachus's, who expired approximately after 240 – *cp.* Stephens (2015): 6. Despite that, as the scholar herself states *ibid.*: 304, she privileges Aristarchus inasmuch as he represents the vertex of the Alexandrian philology and is better documented than his predecessors, who, at any rate, shared Aristarchus's philological leanings. On Zenodotus's Homeric criticism see Montana (2015): 103-105 and on his usage of πρέπον *cp.* Nünlist (2009): 250-252 with literature.

<sup>668</sup> See Romano (2011): 312-313 and *append* Montana (2015): 107-109, both with bibliography.

<sup>669</sup> My Durham MA dissertation, which was submitted in September 2011, contains the kernel of this conjecture.

<sup>670</sup> The bibliography on Plato's engagement with poetry is immense; as a result, I shall limit myself to the most recent entries: see Heath (2013): 9-55 and 138-150 with earlier literature for a comprehensive treatment and add on single topics Bartles (2012): 133-158 (objective aesthetics of seniors in *Leg.*); Halliwell (2012): 35-41 (philosophical revaluation of μουσική); Peponi (2012): 128-153 (μουσική and desire in *Rp.*); Rocconi (2012): 113-132 (aesthetic value of μουσική); Hunter (2015) II: 680-681 (Plato on Homer); Murray (2015): 158-176 (divine inspiration); Novokhatko (2015): 44-47 (Plato's approach to literature); and the 2016 collection *Reflections on Plato's Poetics: Essays from Beijing*.

<sup>671</sup> Secondary literature on Aristotle's dealings with poetry overwhelms one; therefore, I confine myself to a few items: for an exhaustive study see Heath (2013): 56-103 with previous bibliography and supplement it with Janko (2011): 315-541 (on the fragments of the lost dialogue *Περὶ ποιητικῆς καὶ ποιητῶν*); Jones (2012): 152-182 (specifically on musical pleasure in *Pol.*); Boucharde (2012): 183-213 (focused on audience, poetic justice and aesthetic value in *Po.*); Zoran (2014); Hunter (2015): 684-685 (concentrated on Homer); Novokhatko (2015): 51-54 and Curran (2016).

<sup>672</sup> As a matter of fact, Ford (2015): 146-151 with bibliography claims that the powerful sentence οὐχ ἡ αὐτὴ ὀρθότης ἐστὶν τῆς πολιτικῆς καὶ τῆς ποιητικῆς οὐδὲ ἄλλης τέχνης καὶ ποιητικῆς, 'correctness in the art of poetry is not the same as in the art of politics, nor is (the correctness) of another art the same as (the correctness) of poetic art' in *Po.* 25 (1460β13-15) constitutes 'the most explicit claim for poetic autonomy in antiquity' (*ibid.* 147). All the same, Guastini (2010): 348-349 puts one on one's guard against such a reading: '[m]a qual è per Aristotele l'errore per se stesso dell'arte poetica? Lo dice qui per l'ultima volta in modo chiaro ed esplicito: non raggiungere "il fine che si è detto". Ossia l'effetto di sorpresa [...] che è il fine proprio della mimèsi poetica. [...] [N]ei capitoli 4 [...] e 9 [...], Aristotele stabiliva la distinzione tra narrazione storica e narrazione poetica nei termini di una differenziazione di "cose accadute" e imitazione di cose "che potrebbero accadere secondo probabilità o necessità". E su questa base "allargata" di realtà si decide anche la valutazione d'insieme che Aristotele dà dell'arte poetica e la valenza filosofica che le riconosce [...]. È proprio questa considerazione, infatti, a spostare la questione della *orthotes* poetica dal piano meramente esegetico-letterario, capace di valutare solo il lato formale ed esteriore, "letterale", del testo poetico, al piano filosofico ed etico, pienamente riconosciuti da Aristotele all'arte poetica'.

<sup>673</sup> See Romano (2011): 325 and add Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 23-83 with literature, which includes their previous contributions to this topic. More lately, each of the scholars has further expanded on this line of enquiry: Stephens (2013): 371-391 inspects Callimachus's reaction to Plato's *Leg.*; Acosta-Hughes (2015): 5-24 on Callimachus's stance on Plato's *paideia*.

<sup>674</sup> Männlein-Robert (2009): 54-56 scrutinises the way in which Callimachus's polemises with Plato's *Prt.* 338ε6-347α5 (Protagoras' and Socrates' interpretation of Simonides' *skolion* in honour of the Thessalian prince Skopas).

*Reply* and in *Iamb.* 13 and predominantly regarding the status of poetry as a τέχνη and the role of divine inspiration. For my part, aside from having hopefully substantiated this proposition by demonstrating that Callimachus takes issue at one of Aristotle's precepts about unity, forthwith, I purport to further corroborate it by positing that, afresh by means of παῖς ἄτε, the Telchines cast aspersions on him because he flouts the Aristotelian and Peripatetic tenet of τὸ πρέπον.<sup>675</sup>

Prior to embarking thereon, though, I find it methodologically sound to concisely survey philosophers' reflections on literary τὸ πρέπον until the time of Callimachus's death sometime after 240.<sup>676</sup> In addition, owing partly to the general shipwreck virtually befalling to the entire works of the early Hellenistic philosophers<sup>677</sup> and partly to Aristotle's prominence in Alexandria, which I delineated above, and his crucial systematic definition of τὸ πρέπον,<sup>678</sup> I shall grant pride of place to the Peripatetic school and the Homeric criticism modelled upon it. For too little survives of Plato's initial successors (Heraclides of Pontus is the only, unquestionably sui generis, exception) and of the initial exponents of Stoicism; the loss appears particularly unfortunate insofar as they all seem to have

---

<sup>675</sup> The *incontournable* and most overarching discussion is to this very day Pohlenz (1933): 53-92; see Asmuth (1992): 579-588, Rutheford (1994): 423-434) and the foreword to the Italian translation of Pohlenz's essay in Lundon (1997): 1-11 with literature (cp. above all n. 10 for more recent discussions).

<sup>676</sup> Although euphonic critics did not concern themselves with τὸ πρέπον, Callimachus interacted with them as the profusion of sonorous elements in the *Aitia* prologue and elsewhere confirm – see Gutzwiller (2010): 346-354, who examines also other Hellenistic poets, and Romano (2011): 317-322, both with literature.

<sup>677</sup> Partial compensation for this severe impingement may emerge from the carbonised Herculaneum papyri preserving the remnants of Philodemus's treatise *Περὶ ποιημάτων*, currently edited and commented through the 'Philodemus Translation Project' under the aegis of D. Blank, R. Janko and D. Obbink. Hitherto, Janko has published two volumes dedicated to the treatise: the former devoted to Book 1 (2000) and the latter consecrated to Books 3 and 4. Unfortunately, several difficulties loom large over this enterprise: the precarious state of the papyri (cp. Janko (2000): 190-193 with literature on Book 1; Janko (2011): 65-66 (on Book 3) and 222-239 with literature (on Book 4)) paired with Philodemus's pervasively polemical tone in presenting and, predominantly, refuting his opponents' theories. This predicament enjoins circumspection, a fortiori when one attempts to reconstruct their doctrines (see Janko (2000): 120-189 with literature for the theorists refuted in Books 1 and 2; Janko (2011): 50-64 (on those contested in Book 3) and 208-221 with literature (on the ones countered in Book 4)). Notwithstanding these quandaries, and in spite of the lack of consensus (See Asmis (2002): 383-394), this new edition remains a reference point. Lastly, one ought also to take into account the relevant issues of the 'Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities'.

<sup>678</sup> 'Aristoteles ist, wie es scheint, der erste, der innerhalb des rhetorischen Unterrichts die Lehre von der λέξις als Sondergebiet abgegrenzt hat, und in dieser hat er dem πρέπον mit bewußter Verengung, aber dafür scharfer Präzisierung des Begriffs einen wesentlichen Platz zugewiesen' (Pohlenz (1933): 58).

concerned themselves with poetry, especially the Stoics, as to its moral usefulness.<sup>679</sup> Respecting Epicurus, apart from the scantiness of the extant fragments, one must tackle the hostility he seems to have nursed for poetry, even if, truth be told, recent scholarship tends to downplay the extent of that antagonism.<sup>680</sup> Be that as it may, one fails to retrieve anything resembling a fully-fledged poetics; the same applies to his pupil Metrodorus, albeit credited with a *Περὶ ποιημάτων*.<sup>681</sup>

### 2.2.1 Aristotle and his successors on τὸ πρέπον

The theory of germaneness reaches its accomplishment at the hands of Aristotle in Book 3 of his *Rhetoric*.<sup>682</sup> Although the full illustration of πρέπον is only provided in chapter 7, its salient features begin to emerge already during the long chapter 2<sup>683</sup> (1404β1-3):<sup>684</sup> [...] ὠρίσθω λέξεως ἀρετὴ σαφῆ εἶναι [...], καὶ μήτε ταπεινὴν μήτε ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀξίωμα, ἀλλὰ πρέπουσαν.<sup>685</sup>

By contrasting ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀξίωμα to ταπεινή, Aristotle already hints at the proportional essence of πρέπον, which, as we shall see in chapter 7, must neither fall short of the subject matter nor magnify it. Later on in the same chapter, (1404β15-18) Aristotle appends: [...] ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐνταῦθα, εἰ δοῦλος καλλιεποῖτο ἢ λίαν νέος, ἀπρεπέστερον, ἢ περὶ λίαν μικρῶν· ἀλλ' ἔστι καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἐπισυστελλόμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον τὸ πρέπον.<sup>686</sup> This carries

---

<sup>679</sup> On the early academy and poetry see Dillon (2003): 232-233; on the Stoics see Gutzwiller (2010): 354-356 with bibliography, to which one ought to append Romano (2011): 316 with further literature.

<sup>680</sup> On the *status quaestionis*, see Arrighetti (2006): 315-325 with full bibliography.

<sup>681</sup> See Janko (2000): 133.

<sup>682</sup> On Book 3 and its peculiarities see Gastaldi (2014): 24-28.

<sup>683</sup> Since it does not affect my inquiry, I shall omit the articulate and complicated scrutiny of appropriate metaphors and epithets, which Aristotle addresses both in *Rhet.* 3.2-4 and 10-11 (cp. Gastaldi (2014): 547-560 and 578-593 passim with literature) and in *Po.* 21-22 (cp. Guastini (2010): 313-332 with bibliography).

<sup>684</sup> See *ibid.*: 545-547 on the correspondence between *Rhet.* 3.2 and *Po.* 22.

<sup>685</sup> '[...] Let it be determined that the excellence of style consists in being clear (for since speech is a sort of sign, in case it does not signify anything, it does not accomplish its task) and neither mean nor above the worth of the subject, but appropriate'.

<sup>686</sup> '[...] Even in that field (scil. poetry) if a slave or an excessively young man used fine language or (if fine language were deployed) about too trivial matters, that would be inappropriate at the most; for even in these works appropriateness consists of contraction and amplification'.

weight with my line of reasoning: chiefly, poetry is to submit to this rule just like prose; in the same breath, Aristotle anticipates his reflection on aptness with respect to the words put in the mouth of the character represented.<sup>687</sup> In fine, he alludes once again to the need to attune language to the subject matter at hand and further refine it by introducing the polarity between amplification and contraction.<sup>688</sup>

Mindful of this, one can deal with chapter 7 (1408a10-16 [...]1408a25-32):<sup>689</sup> [τ]ὸ δὲ πρέπον ἔξει ἢ λέξις, ἐὰν ἦ παθητικὴ<sup>690</sup> τε καὶ ἠθικὴ καὶ τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις πράγμασιν ἀνάλογον. τὸ δ' ἀνάλογόν ἐστιν ἐὰν μήτε περὶ εὐλόγων αὐτοκαβδάλως λέγεται μήτε περὶ εὐτελῶν σεμνῶς, μηδ' ἐπὶ τῷ εὐτελεῖ ὀνόματι ἐπὶ κόσμος· εἰ δὲ μὴ, κωμωδία φαίνεται, οἷον ποιεῖ Κλεοφῶν· ὁμοίως γὰρ ἔνια ἔλεγε καὶ εἰ εἶπειεν [ἄν] 'πότνια συκῆ'. [...] καὶ ἠθικὴ δὲ αὕτη ἢ ἐκ τῶν σημειῶν δεῖξις, ὅτε ἀκολουθεῖ ἢ ἀρμόττουσα ἐκάστῳ γένει καὶ ἔξει. λέγω δὲ γένος μὲν καθ' ἡλικίαν, οἷον παῖς ἢ ἀνήρ ἢ γέρον, καὶ γυνή ἢ ἀνήρ, καὶ Λάκων ἢ Θετταλός, ἔξεις δὲ, καθ' ἃς ποιός τις τῷ βίῳ· οὐ γὰρ καθ' ἅπασαν ἔξιν οἱ βίοι ποιοῖ τινες. ἐὰν οὖν καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα οἰκεῖα λέγη τῇ ἔξει, ποιήσει τὸ ἦθος· οὐ γὰρ ταῦτα οὐδ' ὡσαύτως ἀγροῖκος ἄν καὶ πεπαιδευμένος εἶπειεν.<sup>691</sup>

<sup>687</sup>This Aristotelian facet of πρέπον, as Hunter (2012): 104 compellingly puts forward, is indebted to Plato's *Ion*. For throughout his debate with the rhapsode Ion, Socrates ceaselessly challenges his interlocutor to pinpoint fields in Homer, the rightness of which he may claim credit for gauging with competence. Hence, after being persistently goaded by Socrates into admitting that every area (namely, charioteering, medicine, fishing and prophecy) necessitates appraisal on the basis of a specific technical expertise (538β-540β2), Ion tries to counter his challenger's constant endeavours to atomise the contents of epic verses. His reply runs as follows: [ἄ] πρέπει, οἷμαι ἐγωγε, ἀνδρὶ εἰπεῖν καὶ ὅποια γυναικί, καὶ ὅποια δούλῳ καὶ ὅποια ἐλευθέρῳ, καὶ ὅποια ἀρχομένῳ καὶ ὅποια ἄρχοντι, 'those things, I think, which it is fitting for a man to say and what for a woman and what for a slave and what for a free man and what for a subject and what for someone in command' (540β3-5). See also *ibid.*: 89-108 with literature for an excellent appraisal of the momentousness of the *Ion* and of this passage within ancient literary criticism; for a dependable overview of Plato's kaleidoscopic engagement with πρέπον see Pohlenz (1933): 53-57.

<sup>688</sup>In other words, language must become either more refined or less ornate going by the circumstances – see Gastaldi (2014): 547.

<sup>689</sup>On this chapter see *ibid.*: 565-568 with literature.

<sup>690</sup>I shall dispense with the sort of aptness ensuing from the conveyance of emotions, which is explained in 1408a16-25, because, chiefly by virtue of the bond with persuasiveness established in 1408a19-25, it pertains to oratory rather than poetry – see *ibid.*: 565-566.

<sup>691</sup>'Language will possess appropriateness if it expresses passions and characters and is proportionate to the subject matter. There is proportion if neither one talks slovenly about weighty themes nor majestically about paltry, and if an ornament is not attached to a trivial noun; otherwise, comedy manifests itself, the sort of thing Cleophon does: some things he used to say (sounded) just the same as if he had said 'madam fig'. [...] Proof from signs will be expressive of character when an appropriate (language) is consistent with each genus and each habit. By 'genus', I mean, with respect to age, for example child or man or old man, and (I mean)

This fundamental section significantly clarifies the essence of *πρέπον* chalked out in chapter 2: in the first place, it ratifies the subsidiarity of words to the subject matter which is predicated upon *ἀναλογία*; in the second place, it particularises the import of the adequate characterisation of each character’s speech acts<sup>692</sup> by the joint standards of *γένος* and *ἔξις*; in the third place, through examples culled from poetry, it confirms that poetry, too, must comply with these rules.

Such is the conceptualisation of *πρέπον* which Aristotle handed down to his heirs<sup>693</sup> and it is with Theophrastus’s handling of fittingness that I shall start. In the course of his enunciation of the virtues of style<sup>694</sup> in Fr. 684 Fortenbaugh, presumably picked from the lost treatise *Lex.* (i.e. Cic. *Orat.* 79), Theophrastus maintains:<sup>695</sup> *[s]ermo purus erit et Latinus, dilucide planeque dicetur, quid deceat circumspicietur. Vnum aberit, quod quartum numerat Theophrastus in orationis laudibus: ornatum illud suaue et adfluens.*<sup>696</sup> What strikes one is the ascertainment that Theophrastus shatters the privileged Aristotelian bond between *σαφήνεια* and *πρέπον* as excellence of style in *Rhet.* 3.2: by turning a unitary concept into a series of distinct parameters (*ἑλληνισμός*, *σαφήνεια*, *πρέπον* and *κατασκευή*),<sup>697</sup> he deprives *πρέπον* of its centrality and puts it on a par with other factors endowed with equal value.<sup>698</sup>

---

man or woman, along with Laconian or Thessalian; by ‘habits’ (I mean) principles by which anyone appears of a certain kind in one’s life: for ways of life are not of such kind in accordance with each habit. So, if the speaker utters the words appropriate to the habit, he will create a sense of character: for a rustic and a learned man would not say the same things nor speak in the same way’

<sup>692</sup> Cp. the analogous statement in *Po.* 15 (1454a22): *δεύτερον δὲ τὸ ἀρμόττοντα· ἔστι γὰρ ἀνδρείον μὲν τὸ ἦθος, ἀλλ οὐχ ἀρμόττον γυναικὶ οὕτως ἀνδρείαν ἢ δεινὴν εἶναι*, ‘(concerning characters) the second relevant feature is appropriateness: there might be manly character, but it is not appropriate for a woman to be manly and clever in the way a man is brave’ – see Guastini (2010):275.

<sup>693</sup>For dependable surveys see Kyriakou (1997): 277-279, Schironi (2009): 310-312 and Novokhatko (2015): 55-59, all with literature.

<sup>694</sup> On his poetics see Novokhatko (2015): 55-56 with bibliography, which should be supplemented with Janko (2011): 361, the items listed in Arrighetti (2006): 355-356 n. 3 and with the acute remarks in Kyriakou (1997): 278-280.

<sup>695</sup> On all the issues related to this fragment see Fortenbaugh (2005): 266-273 with bibliography.

<sup>696</sup> ‘Language will be pure and Latin, will be spoken clearly and plainly, appropriateness will be considered. Yet one feature, which Theophrastus enumerates among the virtues of speech, will be missing here (scil. in the treatment of plain style): that sort of pleasant and abundant ornamentation’.

<sup>697</sup> On the reconstruction of Theophrastus’s Greek terminology see *ibid.*: 268.

<sup>698</sup> Milanese (1989): 22-23. *Ibid.*: 268, Fortenbaugh agrees touching Theophrastus’s separation of *ἑλληνισμός* from *σαφήνεια*, but he dissents (*ibid.*: 269) by claiming that ‘Aristotle may have listed propriety before



All the same, Theophrastus followed more strictly in his master's footsteps in his somewhat tangential definition of *πρέπον* in Fr. 686 Fortenbaugh (that is Demetr. *Eloc.* 114.8-14), still probably culled from the lost treatise *Lex*:<sup>699</sup> [...] ὀρίζεται δὲ τὸ ψυχρὸν Θεόφραστος οὕτως, 'ψυχρὸν ἐστὶ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τὴν οἰκείαν ἀπαγγελίαν', οἷον ἀπυνδάκωτος οὐ τραπεζοῦται κύλιξ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπύθμενος ἐπὶ τραπέζης κύλιξ οὐ τίθεται. τὸ γὰρ πρᾶγμα σμικρὸν ὄν οὐ δέχεται ὄγκον τοσοῦτονλέξεως.<sup>700</sup>

Another Peripatetic who lived in the third century and was interested in *πρέπον* is Andromenides.<sup>701</sup> His notion of appropriateness presents itself in Frs. 9 Janko [= Philod. *Poëm.* 1 (Fr. 160B.15-20 Janko)]<sup>702</sup> ([...] καθ[ήγη]ται [συνή]θειάν τιν[α κο]ινοτέ[ραν] ἢ 'πρέπον θεοῖς καὶ π[αι]σιν θεῶν' περιέχε[ιν, μό]νον δὲ <τὸ> τὴν ἀκοήν [γαρ] | γαλίζον),<sup>703</sup> 25 Janko [= Philod. *Poëm.* 1 (Fr. 169B.15-18 Janko)]<sup>704</sup> ([...] λαμ]π[ρ]ὰν [φωνήν] λαμβάνειν καὶ τὰ τῶν πραγμάτων οἰκεῖα ῥήματα),<sup>705</sup> 29 Janko [= Philod. *Poëm.* 1 (Fr. 170.13-19 Janko)]<sup>706</sup> (ο[ὔτ]ε τ[ῶν χ]ρυσῶν [λη]κύθων [οὔτ' ἀ]ργυρῶν, | οὐδὲ τὰ [λαμ]πρὰ τῶν Βάκτρων, ἀλλὰ τὸ δ[η]λούμηνον πρᾶγμα, [ὡς] ἤρωσι κα[ὶ] βασιλε[ῦσι]

---

ornamentation [...] because he wanted to emphasise the unifying role of propriety. It helps mediate between the claims of clarity and ornamentation [...]; besides, *ibid.* 267, Fortenbaugh advances a tripartite notion of *λέξεως ἀρετή* in *Rhet.* 3.2: 'it is a matter of being clear, and neither low nor excessively elevated, but appropriate'. Nonetheless, *pace* Fortenbaugh, his alleged second and third virtues of language amount to a single concept – see Gastaldi (2014): 545-546. By implication, once the *σαφήνεια-πρέπον* unity is shattered, if one trusts the Ciceronian text, nothing points to a hierarchy between the four *laudes orationis*.

<sup>699</sup> See Fortenbaugh (2005): 278-281 with literature for the elucidation of this fragment and its relationship with Aristotle's handling of *ψυχρότης* in *Rhet.* 3.3, on which cp. also Gastaldi (2014): 553-557 with literature.

<sup>700</sup> [...] Theophrastus defines frigidity as follows: "frigidity is what exceeds the proper mode of expression", for example "an unbottomed chalice is not tabled", instead of 'a chalice without base is not placed upon a table'. For the subject matter, since it is trivial, does not admit such a loftiness of diction'.

<sup>701</sup> For an overview of his fragments, which are mostly extracted from Philodemus and, as a result, must be handled with vigilance, and a summary of his poetics see Janko (2000): 143-154 with bibliography.

<sup>702</sup> For exegetical notes see *ibid.*: 371.

<sup>703</sup> [...] He (i.e. Andromenides) has indicated a language too common to comprise "what is apt for the gods and sons of gods", but only (that which) titillates the hearing'. Incidentally, according to Fortenbaugh (2005): 281-286 with bibliography, the preoccupation with pleasing sounds can be traced back to Aristotle via Theophrastus's Frs. 687-688. Schironi (2009): 312, instead, tones down Aristotle's role and highlights Theophrastus's.

<sup>704</sup> For explicatory observations see Janko (2000): 387.

<sup>705</sup> [...] The poet must adopt splendid language and words suitable to the actions'

<sup>706</sup> For elucidatory remarks see *ibid.*: 389.

πρεπωδέστερον)<sup>707</sup> and 32 Janko [= Philod. *Poëm.* 1 (Fr. 18A.1-4 Janko)]<sup>708</sup> (οἰκειότα) || τα τοῦ πρά[γ]ματος ἐγλ[έγεσ]θαι τὰ ῥήμαθ' ἵνα προ[σαρμόση] καὶ τὸ πιθα[νὸν ἔχη].<sup>709</sup>

One identifies Andromenides' obedience to Aristotle's doctrine of *πρέπον*:<sup>710</sup> at one with *Rhet.* 3.7 (1408a11) (τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις πράγμασιν ἀνάλογον), Andromenides ties vocabulary to subject matter in Frs. 25 Janko (τὰ τῶν πραγμάτων οἰκεῖα ῥήματα), 32 Janko (οἰκειότα) || τα τοῦ πρά[γ]ματος ἐγλ[έγεσ]θαι τὰ ῥήμαθ'), 9 Janko ('πρέπον θεοῖς καὶ π[αι]σὶν θεῶν') and 29 Janko ([ὡς] ἥρωσι κα[ὶ] βασιλε[ῦσι] πρεπωδέστερον).<sup>711</sup>

The third philosopher, Heraclides of Pontus, whose exploration of *πρέπον* is extant, continues to spark controversy over his affiliation to the Peripatos;<sup>712</sup> however, in Fr. 115A Schütrumpf [= Philod. *Mus.* 4., PHerc. 1497, col. 49.3-4], one reads: ἐν οἷς | [περὶ πρ]έ{ι}ποντος μέλους καὶ | [ἀπρεπο]ῦς καὶ περὶ ἠθῶν ἀρσέ- | [νων κα]ὶ μαλακῶν καὶ περὶ | [πρά[ξ]ε]ων ἀρμοττουσῶν κα[ὶ] | ἀ[ναρμ]όστων τοῖς ὑποκειμέ- | [νοις πρ]οσώποις.<sup>713</sup> Pohlenz<sup>714</sup> unearthed the indebtedness of Heraclides's conception of appropriate and inappropriate melody to Plato's *Rp.* 2 (399a5-γ1).<sup>715</sup> As I see it, when Heraclides talks

<sup>707</sup> '(Poetry needs the pomp) neither of the golden nor of the silvery oil-flasks nor even the splendours of Bactrians, but content, which is clearly depicted, as (this is) more appropriate to kings and heroes'.

<sup>708</sup> For elucidative comments see *ibid.*: 209.

<sup>709</sup> 'Choose the words most suitable to the subject matter in order for them to be appropriate and persuasive'.

<sup>710</sup> All the same, Janko (2000): 151-152 with literature spots what Andromenides borrowed from Theophrastus as well.

<sup>711</sup> In Frs. 9 and 29 Janko, presumably under Theophrastus's influence (see *ibid.*: 150), by 'kings and heroes' Andromenides means epics and tragedy (see *ibid.*: 389 n. 1) – by the bye, τὸ δ[η]λούμηνον πρᾶγμα in Fr. 29 Janko, albeit differently phrased is reminiscent of Aristotle's preoccupation with σαφήνεια in *Rhet.* 3.2.

<sup>712</sup> Mejer (2009): 27-40 regards him as one of Plato's disciples; by contrast, Janko (2000): 134-138, Schironi (2009): 311 and Romano (2011): 316 consider him a pupil of both Plato and Aristotle.

<sup>713</sup> 'In which (sci. works), he (wrote) about appropriate and inappropriate melody, about masculine and effeminate characters, and about deeds fitting or unfitting to the characters at hand'.

<sup>714</sup> Pohlenz (1933): 55.

<sup>715</sup> Οὐκ οἶδα, ἔφην ἐγὼ, τὰς ἀρμονίας, ἀλλὰ κατάλειπε ἐκείνην τὴν ἀρμονίαν, ἢ ἐν τε πολεμικῇ πράξει ὄντος ἀνδρείου καὶ ἐν πάσῃ βιαίῳ ἐργασίᾳ πρεπόντως ἂν μιμήσαιτο φθόγγους τε καὶ προσφθίας, καὶ ἀποτυχόντος ἢ εἰς τραύματα ἢ εἰς θανάτους ἰόντος ἢ εἰς τινα ἄλλην συμφορὰν πεσόντος, ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις παρατεταγμένως καὶ καρτερούντως ἀμυνομένου τὴν τύχην· καὶ ἄλλην αὖ ἐν εἰρηνικῇ τε καὶ μὴ βιαίῳ ἄλλ' ἐν ἐκουσίᾳ πράξει ὄντος, ἢ τινὰ τι πείθοντός τε καὶ δεομένου, ἢ εὐχῇ θεῶν ἢ διδαχῇ καὶ νουθετῆσει ἀνθρώπων, ἢ τούναντίον ἄλλῳ δεομένῳ ἢ διδάσκοντι ἢ μεταπειθόντι ἑαυτὸν ἐπέχοντα, καὶ ἐκ τούτων πράξαντα κατὰ νοῦν, καὶ μὴ ὑπερφάνως ἔχοντα, ἀλλὰ σωφρόνως τε καὶ μετριῶς ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις πράττοντά τε καὶ τὰ ἀποβαίνοντα ἀγαπῶντα, 'I ignore the modes', I said, 'but leave me the mode, which would appropriately imitate the tones and voice-modulations of someone who is courageous in warfare and in every enforced business, or who has not succeeded or runs into wounds or death or has fallen into some other misfortune, and in all these circumstances defends himself against ill fortune steadily and strongly. Leave me further also another mode, (which would appropriately imitate the tones and voice-modulations) of someone who is engaged in a peaceful action, not enforced but voluntary, either persuading somebody of something and imploring

about ‘deeds fitting or unfitting to the characters at hand’, he may have adopted Aristotle’s view in *Po.* 15 (1454a22).<sup>716</sup>

Finally, the Peripatetic Praxiphanes from Mitilene employed *πρέπον* in two fragments: in Fr. 24.57.21-23 Matelli [= Demetr. *Eloc.* 57.21-23] ([...] καὶ ποιόν τί ἐστίν, ὡς αὐτός φησι, τὸ ‘καὶ νύ κ’· ‘ὄδυρομένοισιν’ ἔπρευσεν ἔμφασίν τινα ἔχον οἰκτροῦ ὀνόματος),<sup>717</sup> and in Fr. 28A.7-9 Matelli [= Procl. ad Hes. *Op.* 22aW.7-9] (καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο πρέπον ἦν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἀνδρὶ γράφειν ἄνευ σκηνῆς ποιητικῆς ἐγχειροῦντι καὶ πρὸ θυρῶν ὄγκον <οὐκ> ἐπιδεικνυμένῳ περιττόν).<sup>718</sup> The first fragment does not have much bearing upon my argument: Praxiphanes expands the scope of Aristotle’s theory of the appropriate position of particles in *Po.* 20 (1457a3)<sup>719</sup> by bestowing upon them the force of stylistic devices capable of arousing emotions – the sequence καὶ νύ κ’ occurs in *Il.* 23.154, *Od.* 16.220 and 21.226 to voice a lament.<sup>720</sup> By contrast, the second occurrence (Fr. 28A Matelli) testifies to Praxiphanes’s allegiance to Aristotle’s principle of congruousness concerning the subject matter.<sup>721</sup>

Praxiphanes conveniently rounds off my excursus on Peripatetic constructions of *πρέπον* and facilitates my return to Callimachus, because he is listed among the Telchines in Σ *Flor.* 7.8 (Fr. 1b Harder) (Πραξιφάνηι τῶι Μιτυ- | λεναίωι).<sup>722</sup> Regardless of the prudence with which these scholia must be treated, on their authority one feels tempted to interpret

---

someone – whether it be a god, through prayer, or a human being, by instruction or admonition – or, contrariwise, who holds himself back when another begs him or tries to instruct him or change his mind, and, consequently, who in all these circumstances acts intelligently and does not behave arrogantly, but acts temperately and moderately and is pleased with the outcome’. On this complex and often neglected section, see Brancacci (2008): 81-100 and Schofield (2010): 229-248.

<sup>716</sup> See n. 692 above.

<sup>717</sup> ‘The “and now”, as he (scil. Praxiphanes) maintains, has a certain quality to it: it fitted “those who were bewailing” insofar as it suggests a pitiable word’.

<sup>718</sup> ‘This (scil. the lack of the prologue in the manuscript of *Op.* retrieved by Praxiphanes) befitted, as it seemed, a man who undertook to write without poetic fiction and who did not make a display of superfluous loftiness beforebeginning’.

<sup>719</sup> [...] [“H]ν μὴ ἀρμόττει ἐν ἀρχῇ λόγου τιθέναι καθ’ αὐτήν, οἷον μὲν ἦτοι δέ, [...] it is not appropriate to locate it (scil. a conjunction) at the beginning of a speech, for instance *men, etoi, de*’.

<sup>720</sup> See the full commentary of Fr. 24 in Matelli (2012): 286-294 with literature.

<sup>721</sup> See the full analysis of Fr. 28A in *ibid.*: 306-315 with literature, above all 306-310.

<sup>722</sup> See *ibid.*: 253-257.

in a polemical vein Callimachus's lost Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην. That said, too little survives to assess it adequately, except for the fact that Callimachus eulogised Aratus and, possibly, pitted him against Antimachus.<sup>723</sup> Additional light might be shed by the missing Praxiphanean dialogue *De Isocrate et Platone de poetis disserentibus* (Fr. 22 Matelli), where Plato might have expressed his admiration for Antimachus, *sed nihil pro certo*.<sup>724</sup> I wish to conclude with a wary speculation, which unless new discoveries further our understanding of Praxiphanes, is bound to rest on utterly shaky grounds: either in the Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην or in the *De Isocrate et Platone de poetis disserentibus* πρέπον could have constituted one of the bones of contention.

### 2.2.2 Callimachus in opposition to τὸ πρέπον

Due to the absence of an explicit link between πρέπον and παῖς ἄτε in Fr.1.6 Harder (as a matter of fact, with Callimachus at large), one needs a link, which, to my way of thinking, is provided by Cozzoli's exploration of Callimachus's approach to language: upon her reading, Callimachus collapses any barrier between high and low registers. For he opts for a 'childish' mixture of solemn and common vocabulary, Homeric phrases and technical jargon and even goes so far as to turn common or iambic or comic words into mock-epic diction.<sup>725</sup> Against the joint fabric of this conjecture, which Cozzoli corroborates in her study of *Hec.*,<sup>726</sup> and of the Peripatetic theories hinging upon πρέπον, which I dissected above, through an analysis of a few sections of Frs. 54b and 54c Harder of the *Victoria*

---

<sup>723</sup> For a summary of the disparate interpretations of the title and the degree of Callimachus's hostility see Romano (2011): 314-315, Matelli (2012): 257-259 and Harder (2012) II: 91. Although some convergences between Callimachus and Aristotelian philosophy have been spotted and Matelli rightly calls attention to them, the inclusion of Praxiphanes within the Telchines induces me to ascribe a polemic tone to the Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην.

<sup>724</sup> On this dialogue see *ibid.*: 281-284 with literature.

<sup>725</sup> See Cozzoli (2011): 420-421 with literature and Cozzoli (2012): 111 with literature.

<sup>726</sup> On *Hec.* as an example of this technique see Cozzoli (2009): 157-182.

*Berenices*,<sup>727</sup> I contend that Callimachus rebels against *πρέπον*. A somewhat indirect substantiation of my theory may be lent by the remains of the doctrine of Neoptolemus of Parium: on the (as usual controversial) authority of Philodemus (*Poëm.* 5. (Fr.13.32-16.28 Mangoni)), he split poetry into three equally important constituent parts: poet (ποιητής), poem (ποίημα), which corresponds to style, and poesy (ποίησις), which comprises subject matter.<sup>728</sup> In consequence, just like Callimachus, he refused to put form under the yoke of content.<sup>729</sup> If this reconstruction is on the right track, Neoptolemus's affiliation to the Peripatos loses cogency.<sup>730</sup> In my opinion, on the basis of Schironi's<sup>731</sup> comparison between Andromenides and Neoptolemus as exponents of the Peripatos, who shared the tripartition of poetry<sup>732</sup> but diverged apropos of *πρέπον*, Neoptolemus's repudiation of the Aristotelian primacy of *μῦθος* in *Po.* 6 (1450α38-39)<sup>733</sup> and 7 (1450β22-23)<sup>734</sup> makes it very hard to reconcile him with Aristotle.

Striking features emerge immediately if one inspects the words uttered by Molochus to explain to his guest Hercules the sort of hospitality he will succeed in offering once the abominable Nemean Lion has been slaughtered (Fr. 54b.24-25 Harder): ...]μενον δυερῆτι μηδὲ σὺν ἀξυλίηι / ...]α νυν, δρεπάνου γὰρ ἀπευθέα τέρχν[ε]α.<sup>735</sup> Through the choice of the rare adjective *δυερός*, a variant of the epic noun *δύη*,<sup>736</sup> the adjective *ἀπευθής*, attested

<sup>727</sup> For a thorough analysis see Harder (2012) II: 420-438 with literature.

<sup>728</sup> See literature in Romano (2011): 323 n. 51 with literature.

<sup>729</sup> See *ibid.*; cp. also *ibid.*: 324-325 on how one may possibly map Neoptolemus's tripartition of poetry onto Callimachus's imagery in the *Aitia* prologue.

<sup>730</sup> Brink (1963): 146 ascribed to Neoptolemus a 'revised Aristotelianism' and Kyriakou (1997): 277-278 reinforced the message by maintaining that 'the theory seems to be unrelated to the *Poetics*' (*ibid.*: 278)

<sup>731</sup> Schironi (2009): 311-312.

<sup>732</sup> On this aspect of Andromenides' scheme of things cp. Fr. 24 Janko [= Philod. *Poëm.* 1 (Fr. 132.23-27)]: [...] τὸν τε ποιητήν, | [...] [τὸ τε πόημα] τὴν τε [ποίησιν εἶναι τι εἰδος [...] | τῆς τέχνης, '(Andromenides thinks that) the poet, [...] the poem and the poetry are a component [...] of art' and see the elucidation in Janko (2000): 351. The identity of the originator of this division remains shrouded in mystery – see literature in Romano (2011): 323 n. 53.

<sup>733</sup> [A]ρχὴ μὲν οὖν καὶ οἶον ψυχὴ ὁ μῦθος τῆς τραγωδίας, 'the plot is the first principle and, so to speak, the soul of tragedy' – see the commentary in Guastini (2010): 182.

<sup>734</sup> [...] [T]οῦτο (scil. ἡ σύστασις τῶν πραγμάτων) καὶ πρῶτον καὶ μέγιστον τῆς τραγωδίας ἐστίν, '[...] this. (scil. the composition of events, which is synonym with *μῦθος*) is the prime and most important element of tragedy' – see the commentary in *ibid.*: 191-193 with bibliography.

<sup>735</sup> '[...] And not with miserable lack of wood [...] for the young wood is ignorant of the sickle'.

<sup>736</sup> See *ibid.*: 432.

twice only in Homer, and the noun *τέρχνεα*, maybe a Cyprian gloss,<sup>737</sup> the farmer proves himself remarkably knowledgeable. In addition, this impression is reinforced by the battered line 33: [...] οὐκ ὡς ὑδ<έ>ουσιν.<sup>738</sup> Although the precarious state of the papyrus at this point calls for supplementary prudence, thanks to the available scholion, one might conjecture that by means of this turn of phrase, Molorchus plunges into mythological speculation on the origins of the Nemean lion from a stone possibly born from Rhea.<sup>739</sup>

How discordant does such a choice of *λέξις* appear with Aristotle's recommendations in *Rhet.* 3.7 (1408a31-32) quoted above? For in that section the philosopher remarks that 'a rustic and a learned man would not say the same things nor speak in the same way'. Callimachus, on the contrary, visibly disregards this norm and almost turns a farmer into a fellow scholar. In view of this, I find it highly plausible that Aristotelian-minded critics would burst into outraged censure for such a flagrant violation of the valued principle of convenience.

The same poetic attitude also coherently marks the subsequent mousetrap scene (Fr. 54c.5-11 Harder):<sup>740</sup> ἀστὴρ δ' εὔτ' ἄρ' ἔμελλε βοῶν ἄπο μέσσαβα [λύσειν / αὔλιος], ὃς θυμὴν εἶσιν ὑπ' ἡελίου / ] ὡς κείνος Ὀφιονίδησι φαεῖν[ει / ]θεῶν τοῖσι παλαιότεροις, / ]τηρι θύρη· ὁ δ' ὄτ' ἔκλυεν ἠχ[ήν, / ὡς ὀπὸτ' ὀκν]ηρῆς ἴαχ' ἐπ' οὔς ἐλάφου / σκ]ύμνος, [μέ]λλ[ε] μὲν ὄσσον ἀκουέμεν, ἦκα δ' ἔλ[εξεν].<sup>741</sup> The very elaborate simile,<sup>742</sup> redolent with epic time-indication and adorned with the learned allusion to Titans and Cronus as Ophion's offspring, apparently corresponds to Molorchus's troubled reaction upon

<sup>737</sup> See *ibid.*: 433.

<sup>738</sup> '[...] Not as they sing.'

<sup>739</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 437 for ulterior details.

<sup>740</sup> See *ibid.*: 438-463 with literature for a full comment.

<sup>741</sup> 'When the star, that bids the shepherd fold, which rises at the time of the setting of the sun, was about to loosen the leathern strap of the oxen, [...] when he (scil. the sun) is shining upon Ophion's descendants, [...] the older of the gods, [...] at the door; and when he (scil. Molorchus) heard the sound, as when a lion's cub cries at the ear of a timid deer, he stopped for a moment to listen, then he spoke softly'

<sup>742</sup> On the peculiarities of this simile see also Hunter (2006): 90 with literature; cp. also *ibid.*: 89-98 on the other rare Callimachean similes and their idiosyncratic experimentations.

perceiving alarming sounds at his door;<sup>743</sup> yet the noun σκύμνος, emphatically placed at the beginning of a new verse by dint of a strong run-on-line, starts to deflate tension: it is not a terrifying beast that groans, but a far smaller creature, whose exact nature will only be disclosed in line 16. Still, the sheer lack of proportion between the language displayed and the animals involved already suffices to overturn τὸ πρέπον.

The same imbalance becomes even sharper when Molorchus designates the intruders as ξ]είνοις κωκυμούς<sup>744</sup> in line 14: not only does the phrase represent a variation on the Hesiodic locution (*Th.* 329) πῆμ' ἀνθρώποις,<sup>745</sup> which pointedly designates the Nemean Lion, but the noun κωκυμός, attested only here, springs from the basis of the tragic expression κώκυμα.<sup>746</sup> Moreover, it persists in the exaggerated narrative of the havoc wreaked on the farmer's property by the rodents, which, *inter alia*, mimics the epic climactic structure, in which the fourth evil crowns those previous.<sup>747</sup>

These examples, which can be multiplied by looking at the single lemmata in Harder's commentary, should substantiate my claim concerning Callimachus's infraction of appositeness. In so doing, in my view, the poet unbinds another link in the σχοῖνος Περσίς (Fr. 1.18 Harder), which, as I advanced in chapter 1,<sup>748</sup> Callimachus depicts the chain as an instrument of oppression: he refuses to abide by the enslavement of language to the subject matter. The Telchines may well bear a grudge against him and condemn his irreverence for πρέπον as another confirmation of his contemptible child-like conduct; regardless, Callimachus transforms what they find intolerable into an effective artistic tool to assert his own programme.

---

<sup>743</sup> See *ibid.*: 441-444 for a comprehensive scrutiny.

<sup>744</sup> 'Sources of wailing for guests'.

<sup>745</sup> 'Calamity for human beings'.

<sup>746</sup> See *ibid.*: 446.

<sup>747</sup> See *ibid.*: 451.

<sup>748</sup> See pp. 75-77 above.

Before concluding, I intend to propose a final speculation: I aim to link Callimachus's disrespect for τὸ πρέπον in Molorchus's *recherché* language with the programmatic value of the mousetrap scene persuasively proposed by Ambühl. According to the scholar, Molorchus's defeat of the nefarious mice does not function simply as a parody of the far more demanding struggle which will set Hercules against the Nemean lion;<sup>749</sup> it displays a meta-poetic value.<sup>750</sup> For the farmer's subtly cunning strategy involving the traps celebrates the resources of intellect at the expense of brute muscular prowess; hence, following in his host's footsteps, Hercules probably tackles the monster by resorting primarily to his intellect – a refined echo of Callimachean manners.<sup>751</sup>

In extra support of Ambühl's hypothesis, I call upon the presence of the adjective λεπταλέους in Fr. 54a.15 Harder, whose poetological relevance I started to advocate in chapter 1.<sup>752</sup> In addition, if the suggested programmatic force of the *Victoria Berenices* holds, in chapter 3 I shall pose that, in paying tribute to his patroness Berenice II by means of this composition, Callimachus subtly co-opts her, as it were, as a guarantor of his poetic creed.

Prior to rounding off the Greek half of the chapter, I wish to cursorily highlight that when Callimachus, *in propria persona*, comes face to face with sacred themes which nobody is allowed to divulge, he refrains from doing so, not without irony, at the very last minute.<sup>753</sup> This happens, for instance, in the section of the Acontius and Cydippe story (Fr. 75.4-9 Harder), in which Callimachus nearly blurts out illicit details of Zeus and Hera's

---

<sup>749</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 438-463 *passim* with relevant literature for parodic elements scattered throughout the scene.

<sup>750</sup> Ambühl (2005): 82-87.

<sup>751</sup> See also *ibid.*: 92-96 on the poetological value of the frugal dinner Hercules must content himself with at Molorchus's in spite of his traditional attributes.

<sup>752</sup> See pp. 74-75 above.

<sup>753</sup> I am beholden to my supervisor for exhorting me to take this into account.



sexual intercourse,<sup>754</sup> which I addressed in chapter 1.<sup>755</sup> What interests me here relates to the image of the child holding a knife. Taken at face value, this image suggests that the poet likens his unbridled knowledge to a young man who runs the risk of hurting himself with the knife he holds. Yet, as Ambühl aptly notes, Callimachus *does* manage to curb his garrulity; hence, he stops just before overstepping the threshold of decency.<sup>756</sup> In other words, with an eye on the image of the child in the *Aitia* prologue, one might say that, by means of an effective self-ironic mockery, Callimachus purges his childishness of intemperate traits by counterbalancing it with a rather mature sense of limit.

Such is, in my view, Callimachus's proclamation of his independence from τὸ πρέπον, which, in my estimate, Catullus adopted under the guise of his own mutiny against *honestum otium* and *utilitas*, the sine qua non of literary pursuits in Rome on the part of members of upper classes. I shall also submit that Catullus fashions his own libellers as new Telchines who grump about his puerile basking in poetic *lusus* and indulging in innumerable kisses. At the same time, I shall not turn a deaf ear to Catullus's perturbation over his *otium* in the final stanza of *carmen* 51, but argue that, ultimately, Catullus awards

---

<sup>754</sup> Ἥρην γάρ κοτέ φασι – κύον, κύον, ἴσχεο, λαιδρὲ / θυμέ, σύ γ' αἰείσι καὶ τά περ οὐχ ὅση· / ὄναο κάρτ' ἔνεκ οὐ τι θεῆς ἴδες ἱερὰ φορικτῆς, / ἐξ ἂν ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν ἥρυγες ἱστορίην. / Ἡ πολυιδρεΐη χαλεπὸν κακόν, ὅστις ἀκρατεῖ / γλώσσης· ὡς ἐτεὸν παῖς ὄδε μαῦλιν ἔχει, 'for they say that once upon a time Hera – dog, dog, my impudent soul, you would sing even of what is not permitted; lucky for you that in no wise you saw the rites of the shudder-giving goddess, because (otherwise) you would have belched out information on these topics, too. Truly much doctrine is a grievous evil for whoever lacks command over his tongue: verily this man is a child holding a knife'

<sup>755</sup> See n. 378 above. Likewise, one might single out near-infraction of decorous tales concerning a deity in *H.* 6.17-22: μὴ μὴ ταῦτα λέγωμες ἃ δάκρυον ἄγαγε Διοῦ· / κάλλιον, ὡς πολίεσσιν ἐαδὸτα τέθμια δῶκε· / κάλλιον, ὡς καλάμαν τε καὶ ἱερὰ δράγματα πρᾶτα / ἀσταχῶν ἀπέκοψε καὶ ἐν βόας ἦκε πατήσαι, / ἀνίκα Τριπτόλεμος ἀγαθὰν ἐδιδάσκετο τέχνην· / κάλλιον, ὡς (ἴνα καὶ τις ὑπερβασίας ἀλέηται), 'Let us not, let us not speak things that bring a tear to Deo: (it is) better (to tell) how she gave fair laws to cities; better, how she first cut off stalks and holy sheaves of corn ears and placed them for oxen to thread upon, when Triptolemus was instructed in the beneficial art; better, how (in order that one may also avoid transgressions)' – see the commentary in Stephens (2015): 279-280 with literature. What binds these two pieces together is the concealment of members of the Ptolemaic dynasty behind the Olympians: Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II in Fr. 75 and, if Clayman's decoding of *H.* 6 hits the mark (Clayman (2014): 84-89 with literature), Berenice II. Cp. also the delicate balance which, as I expound in chapter 3, Callimachus strove to strike between his active contribution to the divinisation of the members of the ruling house and his contemporary self-promotion as absolute master of poetry. This obviously required a certain degree of tolerance on the part of kings and queens, which, as I shall demonstrate, they vouchsafed to Callimachus; having said that, he had never to forget that royal wrath could bring about fatal consequences, and the tragic destiny of Sotades, stood as a powerful memento.

<sup>756</sup> Ambühl (2005): 388.

pride of place to the repercussions of his emotionally-charged *otium* upon himself, rather than to its moral impact. Beforehand, though, to illustrate the pressure of the above-mentioned constraints upon Catullus's contemporaries, I shall pore over Cicero's constant justification of all the scraps of spare time he consecrates to writing.

## 2.3 Catullus and Cicero on *otium*

### 2.3.1 Cicero and his obsession with *honestum otium*

My chief target in this exploration consists in proving that whenever Cicero devotes his restful hours to literature, without fail he feels bound to screen his works from criticism. Hence, without disregarding obvious nuances dictated by generic constraints or other contingent needs, I propound that, apart from a few partial epistolary deviations,<sup>757</sup> he consistently resorts to two chief arguments: he has always granted pride of place to his *negotium*; far from interfering with his services to the commonwealth, all his creations redound to the benefit of the state.

An entry point which encompasses an early articulation of both strategies sits in a section of § 4 of the introduction of the first Book of his juvenile treatise *Inv.* (§§ 1-9),<sup>758</sup> which was presumably brought to completion roughly between 86 and 83:<sup>759</sup> [...] *Quare mihi uidentur postea cetera studia recta atque honesta per otium concelebrata ab optimis*

---

<sup>757</sup> These passages ranging from 61 to 55 conceive of intellectual endeavours (mostly of a philosophical nature, but sometimes generally referred to as *litterae* or *studia*) as potential alternatives to the national arena at difficult times. Baraz (2012): 67-73 convincingly interprets them in terms of rather ephemeral flirtations with a tempting perspective, which is never seriously adopted. McConnell (2014): 44-55, by contrast, who concentrates on some of the same segments, submits that until 54 Cicero considers the development of literature and, above all, philosophy over spare hours as strongly dissociated from politics, almost a refuge from it.

<sup>758</sup> For a dependable prolegomenon to these paragraphs see Schwameis (2014): 10-51 with bibliography.

<sup>759</sup> On this chronological conundrum see *ibid.*: 170-172 with literature.

*enituisse, hoc uero a plerisque eorum desertum obsoleuisse tempore, quo multo uehementius erat retinendum et studiosius adaugendum.*<sup>760</sup> By elaborating on his immediately preceding idea that the manipulators in charge of the helm of the state due to their eloquence had forced the most talented to seek a harbour of peace sheltered from the political strife,<sup>761</sup> Cicero straight away points out their advocations brimmed with rectitude and nobility (*studia recta atque honesta*). Besides, he appends that those pastimes were undertaken exclusively over unoccupied hours (*per otium concelebrata*), that is, as the succeeding passage on trial will clarify, after public duties had been properly implemented. Against this background, by means of an adroit move, in the last segment of the extract under examination and in § 5, for all the damage it has caused, eloquence is said to be able to prove particularly useful to the Republic on condition that it is exerted by upright men, including, by implication, Cicero himself.<sup>762</sup> Differently put, Cicero masterly heralds the *utilitas* of his own brand of intellectual pursuits, which he will define more explicitly in *Arch.* 12 and in the other excerpts which I shall analyse below.

However, an intermediate stage between *Inv.* and *Arch.* needs inspecting because, in it, almost two decades later (in mid-62),<sup>763</sup> Cicero spelled out the import of the motto

---

<sup>760</sup>Hence it seems to me that afterwards (scil. after eloquence had been led astray by skilled but unscrupulous individuals, who had also managed to seize power) the other right and honourable intellectual activities, which were cultivated by the best men over their spare time, were shining; at the same time, this practice (of eloquence), after having been abandoned by many of those excellent individuals, fell into disuse at a time when it ought to have been kept in existence much more strenuously and increased much more zealously’.

<sup>761</sup>Cp. Schwameis (2014):97.

<sup>762</sup>Cp. *ibid.*: 98-114 with literature.

<sup>763</sup>I should like to concisely touch on a slightly anterior instance of *otium* (dating back to 63), which, as Stroup (2010): 49 suggests, bestrides the sense of social and political tranquillity, with which I do not concern myself in this chapter, except for a few comments below on the same side of the analogous phrase *otium cum dignitate* in *Sest.* 98, and that of time on one’s hands. This occurrence manifests itself in the conational speech against Rullus’s agrarian bill (*Agr.* 2.9), in which Cicero, in his capacity as consul, spared no effort to curry favour with the people by styling himself as the true *popularis* – on the political implications see Hodgson (2017): 111-120 with bibliography: [...] [*quid tam populare quam otium? quod ita iucundum est ut et vos et maiores vestri et fortissimus quisque vir maximos labores suscipiendos putet, ut aliquando in otio possit esse, praesertim in imperio ac dignitate*, ‘[...] what is as popular as tranquillity? It is so delightful that both you and your ancestors and any most valiant man believes that one ought to undertake the most demanding efforts in order to be able to enjoy tranquillity occasionally, especially (when) in command and of high rank’. What pertains mostly to my discussion is Cicero’s unflagging accent on the preponderancy of *negotia*, especially for those ‘in command and of high rank’ (*in imperio ac dignitate*) like himself: only provided that one has carried one’s duty through, is one entitled to take pleasure in recreation ‘from time to time’ (*aliquando*).

*honestum otium* for the first and last time in his oratorical corpus,<sup>764</sup> videlicet *Sull. 26*:<sup>765</sup> *[e]go, tantis a me beneficiis in re publica positis, si nullum aliud mihi praemium ab senatu populoque Romano nisi honestum otium postularem, quis non concederet?*<sup>766</sup> Two points are noteworthy: on the one hand, Cicero avers that the respectability of his relaxation (*honestum otium*)<sup>767</sup> emanates from his erstwhile services to the commonwealth (*tantis a me beneficiis in re publica positis*). On the other hand, he does not dare to stake a direct claim to his *otium*, but, by way of precaution, reverts to a mere rhetorical question: as the remainder of the paragraph makes plain, he portrays himself as nigh incapable of abstaining from his work.<sup>768</sup>

The climaxing process, by dint of which the first unambiguous Ciceronian connection between *honestum otium* and the intellectual domain comes into being, manifested slightly later the same year,<sup>769</sup> when, while pleading for the entitlement of the Greek poet Archias, a former mentor of his,<sup>770</sup> to Roman citizenship,<sup>771</sup> Cicero took the chance to passionately solicit the integration of Hellenic culture within Roman society.<sup>772</sup> To accomplish his goal, Cicero locates it firmly in the province of *otium* and assigns it to the refreshment of the statesman from the gruelling uproar of the forum; in addition, he intimates that learning provides him with copious materials for his discourses.<sup>773</sup> Thereupon, in § 12 he continues:

---

<sup>764</sup>See Stroup (2010): 49 n. 27 for a list of some of the remaining occurrences of the catchphrase in Ciceronian dialogues and epistles.

<sup>765</sup>On the background of this trial see Berry (1996): 14-41.

<sup>766</sup>'Should I, after having devoted so many services to the commonwealth, ask for myself no other reward but an honourable leisure from the senate and the Roman people, who would not grant it to me?'

<sup>767</sup>*Ibid.*: 192 Berry claims that 'this type of *otium* differs from *cum dignitate otium*: *honestum otium* involves separation from affairs of state, while *cum dignitate otium*, with reference to an individual, refers to leisure within an active political career'. Yet, I demur at this alleged discrepancy on account of my decoding of *cum dignitate otium* in *Sest.* 98 below.

<sup>768</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>769</sup>On the controversy surrounding the date of the trial see Coşkun (2010): 26-27.

<sup>770</sup>On the aesthetic influence exerted by Archias on his pupil see Knox (2011): 197.

<sup>771</sup>On the legal frame see *ibid.*: 32-59.

<sup>772</sup>See *ibid.*: 73-77 with literature, to which one ought to add Gildenhard (2011): 215-216 and Steel (2013a): 163-165, both with supplementary bibliography.

<sup>773</sup>Until paragraph 13, he stresses that he has managed to enhance his oratorical skills and has garnered many examples of heroic demeanour to emulate – see Baraz (2012): 68 with literature. Besides, Knox (2011): 198 insists on the prominence Cicero grants to the civic utility with which Archias has endowed his poetic output in paragraphs 19 and 21.

[...] [*e*]go uero fateor me his studiis esse deditum. Ceteros pudeat, si qui ita se litteris abdidit ut nihil possint ex eis neque ad communem adferre fructum neque in aspectum lucemque proferre; me autem quid pudeat qui tot annos ita uiuo, iudices, ut a nullius unquam me tempore aut commodo aut otium meum abstraxerit aut voluptas auocarit aut denique somnus retardarit?<sup>774</sup>

As soon as he avows his commitment to *studia*, he launches into a twofold vindication of his posture: firstly, he pits it against a different attitude, which he imputes to other unidentified members of the leading orders and disapprovingly denounces as a ‘burial into literature’. Through this image and the remainder of the sentence, he stigmatises a sequestered fostering of *litterae*, which constitutes an end instead of yielding advantage for the state at large. For not only does this comportment fail to meet the politician’s answerability for his *otium*, but it falls short of substantiating the profitability of his written works.

Secondly, he hastens to emphasise that his literary pursuits have never tampered with his obligation to the republic and scores his point in an effective way by means of a very carefully crafted sentence structure. Primarily, he grants pride of place to his fellow citizens’ needs, which, in his capacity as senator and lawyer, must remain his unswerving priority; afterwards, he places *otium* at the beginning of a climaxing list of potential disturbances to his *officium*, which the triple anaphora of *aut* leads to the culminating element, *somnus*. Therefore, the speaker implies, if not even the vital necessity of sleep has succeeded in averting him from his duties, how can *otium*?

---

<sup>774</sup> ‘[...] I certainly confess that I am devoted to these intellectual pursuits. Let others be ashamed of themselves if they have buried themselves so deeply into books, that they could neither contribute anything to the common advantage out of those works nor bring them into view nor publish them. Why ought I instead to be ashamed, who have been living for so many years in such a way, that neither has my leisure ever dragged me away nor has pleasure ever diverted me nor has even slumber detained me either from the need or the advantage of anybody?’

I deem it appropriate now to include a few remarks on the way in which Cicero's construal of an acceptable leisure continues to develop in his *Cons.*, which, towards the end of 60,<sup>775</sup> caps a strenuous campaign in praise of his consulship,<sup>776</sup> launched as early as late 63.<sup>777</sup> Several traits of the poem recommend it as a suitable foil to Catullan *carmina*: it shares a 'self-representational' vein<sup>778</sup> and boasts originality redolent of Callimacheanism.<sup>779</sup> The lines I am interested in (Fr. 10.71-78 Courtney) conclude Urania's long discourse<sup>780</sup> to the consul by broaching his intellectual achievements:

*haec adeo penitus cura uidere sagaci*  
*otia qui studiis laeti tenuere decoris*  
*inque Academia umbrifera nitidoque Lyceo*  
*fuderunt claras fecundi pectoris artis.*  
*e quibus ereptum primo iam a flore iuuentae*  
*te patria in media uirtutum mole locauit.*  
*tum tamen anxiferas curas requiete relaxans,*  
*quod patria[e] uacat, id studiis nobisque sacrasti.<sup>781</sup>*

---

<sup>775</sup> As Volk (2013): 95 wisely suggests, on the basis of several letters to Atticus, one can assume that the poem announced in March achieved its completion by December 60.

<sup>776</sup> See Steel (2005): 49-63 on Cicero's painstakingly orchestrated exaltation of his consulship; cp. also Gildenhard (2011): 292-293 and Volk (2013): 94-95 for an overview of his enormous efforts to achieve this goal. Dugan (2014) follows in their footsteps and turns to Cicero's compulsion to praise, or have other eulogise, his consulate.

<sup>777</sup> Gildenhard (2011): 292; Knox (2011): 200 underscores the dramatic increase in unease over Cicero's handling of the Catilinarian conspiracy palpable in *Arch.* while Hall (2013): 217 n.8 situates the peak of the promotional campaign in July 61.

<sup>778</sup> I borrow the term from Roman (2014): 66-84. A concise formulation can be found on p. 83, where, after summarising the discrepancies with Catullus, which I shall explore in the section below, the scholar claims that 'both sought ways to present themselves effectively before their elite peers in a highly competitive, adversarial cultural climate'.

<sup>779</sup> Volk (2013): 93-112 offers an excellent interpretation of the poem and teases out all its innovative energy; Gildenhard (2011): 297 and Roman (2014): 73 perceive its novelty albeit from different perspectives.

<sup>780</sup> Gildenhard (2011): 294-296 conveniently summarises its dizzily multifaceted contents.

<sup>781</sup> 'Such principles were thoroughly ascertained with acute attention by those who joyously directed their leisure hours to fitting studies, and who, in the shady Academy and in the bright Lyceum, poured forth the glorious theories of their fruitful spirits. But in the thick of onerous acts of value did your fatherland set you, who had been snatched away from these endeavours from the very prime of your youth. Yet then, by relaxing with recreation distressing concerns, you have consecrated to these studies and to us whatever time is free from the fatherland'.

Within the first four verses the Muse confers legitimacy upon Cicero's philosophical leanings by way of domestication, in a manner of speaking, of the Academia and the Lyceum. She begins by crediting Plato's and Aristotle's disciples with the discovery of proper pious practice and the decipherment of divine omens, two pillars of Roman religion concisely evoked by *haec*. Then, in furtherance of the implied *utilitas* permeating the undertakings of these institutions, she graces *studiis* with the epithet *decoris*, thereby allaying anxieties about the compatibility of this learning with the high rank of the (Roman) followers.

Only on the strength of these premises, which guarantee the acceptability of the *otium* necessary to promote these studies can she style Cicero as a practitioner, who, in addition, has never failed to grant pride of place to politics and has only allotted his spare moments to culture.<sup>782</sup>

The next tessera composing the mosaic of Ciceronian leisure is embedded in *Sest.*, pronounced in March 56, still in the wake of an ultimately ill-fated and short-lived anticipation of a fully restored station in the senate,<sup>783</sup> to discharge a debt of gratitude he owes to Publius Sestius,<sup>784</sup> the former tribune of the plebs and one of the promoters of his recall from exile.<sup>785</sup> A phrase pertains particularly to the purposes of my inquiry, *cum dignitate otium*, which occurs in paragraph 98, within a long excursus running from paragraph 96 to paragraph 143:<sup>786</sup> [*i]d quod est praestantissimum maximeque optabile*

---

<sup>782</sup> Roman (2014): 74.

<sup>783</sup> Enthusiasm imbues above all *Att.* 4.1 dating back to September 57, but, as Lintott (2008): 184-185 aptly remarks, Clodius's continuing attacks, his financial dire straits and his conflicting loyalties to Pompey and the *boni* cast into sharp relief the precariousness of his position. In any case, the events in late April 56 outlined below will thwart all his expectations; on that account, one might conclude along with the scholar (*ibid.*: 185) that Ciceronian attempts to act again in the name of meaningful political independence before the civil war come to an end after the winter of 57-56 – on his actions over this season see *ibid.*: 185-194.

<sup>784</sup> On the facts leading to this trial see Kaster (2006): 14-22.

<sup>785</sup> On the chronology of these nearly 18 months of utmost distress between March 58 and August 57 see Kaster (2006): 396-401 and cp. Lintott (2008): 175-182 for a more comprehensive narration; Corbeill (2013): 19-20 focuses on the causes underlying the lack of literary output apart from epistles.

<sup>786</sup> See Kaster (2006): 31-37 with literature for a full analysis of this chunk alert to all scholarly issues.

*omnibus sanis et bonis et beatis, cum dignitate otium. Hoc qui volunt, omnes optimates, qui efficiunt, summi viri et conservatores civitatis putantur; neque enim rerum gerendarum dignitate homines efferri ita convenit ut otio non prospiciant, neque ullum otium amplexari quod abhorreat a dignitate.*<sup>787</sup>

According to commentators, who lean on the explanatory clause ensuing almost directly after the formula under scrutiny, *otium* straddles the private and the public orbits because, ultimately, for the true patriot, the two ambits coincide.<sup>788</sup> For, in the former domain, it designates a personal ease, which must neither submit entirely to seriousness (excessive absorption into the political fray to the detriment of peace of mind) nor betray it (philosophical quietism or indulgence in luxury far from politics); in the latter, instead, it denotes domestic tranquillity, which must neither be endangered by a boundless aspiration for personal glory nor be pursued at the expenses of valorous resistance to reproachable abuse of power.

The very same phrase presents itself anew approximately one and a half years later in the prologue to *de Orat.*, this time with enhanced pregnancy for the present inquiry: not only does it explicitly designate individual leisure<sup>789</sup> thanks to the juxtaposition of *negotium*, but it occurs within the earliest extant instance of Ciceronian apologia for his rhetorical-philosophical pursuits in prose. Here are his words in §§ 1-3: *[c]ogitanti mihi saepe numero et memoria vetera repetenti perbeati fuisse, Quinte frater, illi videri solent, qui in optima re publica, cum et honoribus et rerum gestarum gloria florerent, eum vitae cursum tenere potuerunt, ut vel in negotio sine periculo vel in otio cum dignitate esse possent; ac fuit cum mihi quoque initium requiescendi atque animum ad utriusque nostrum*

---

<sup>787</sup> 'It (scil. the purpose) is the most outstanding and especially desirable for all those who are sane, honest and prosperous: tranquillity with seriousness of purpose. All those wishing this are deemed adherents of the best men, and those who accomplish it uppermost men and preservers of the city. For it is not fitting that people either get so carried away by serious pursuits deriving from involvement in government that they do not provide for tranquillity, or embrace any kind of tranquillity, which is remote from seriousness'.

<sup>788</sup> Throughout this paragraph, I wholly repose trust in Kaster (2006): 322-323.

<sup>789</sup> Lintott (2008): 198 n. 57.



*praeclara studia referendi fore iustum et prope ab omnibus concessum arbitrarer, si infinitus forensium rerum labor et ambitionis occupatio decursu honorum etiam aetatis flexu constitisset. [...] [3] Nam prima aetate incidimus in ipsam perturbationem disciplinae veteris, et consulatu devenimus in medium rerum omnium certamen atque discrimen et hoc tempus omne post consulatum obiecimur eis fluctibus, qui per nos a communi peste depulsi in nosmet ipsos redundarent. Sed tamen in his vel asperitatibus rerum vel angustiis temporis obsequar studiis nostris et quantum mihi vel fraus inimicorum vel causae amicorum vel res publica tribuet oti, ad scribendum potissimum conferam.*<sup>790</sup>

An evocation of the ideal functioning of the republic dominates the opening sentences: statesmen used to discharge their political duty to the commonwealth without running any personal risk and, subsequently, precisely on account of their civic merits, enjoy well-deserved leisure in full recognition of their standing.<sup>791</sup> In view of this, Cicero continues, he trusted that he, too, could conform to the same pattern and envisaged a fully legitimate return to his studies, which he had been cherishing ever since boyhood.<sup>792</sup>

Nonetheless, the perfect tense of most verbs despondently bespeaks that this now belongs to an irretrievable past: over roughly eighteen months elapsing between the

---

<sup>790</sup> ‘When, on many occasions, I ponder and return with memory to the days of old, Quintus, my brother, those men usually seem to me to have been very fortunate, who, in the best periods of the republic, as they were abounding with honours and glory of their feats, could hold a course of life of such a sort, that they were able to either participate in political life without risk or enjoy leisure with dignity. There was a time when I believed that also to me the beginning of rest and time to turn the spirit towards those illustrious studies dear to both of us would be rightful and, as it were, permitted by everybody if the boundless toil of forensic activities and the business of canvassing halted owing to the completion of my posts and the decline of age. [2] Yet both mishaps in public circumstances and several personal misfortunes disappointed the hope concerning plans and intentions: for in that time, which seemed filled with repose and tranquillity to the highest degree, the most imposing piles of vexations and most turbulent storms arose; besides, the enjoyment of leisure has not been granted to us, who were longing for it and desiring it greatly, for the purpose of engaging in and cultivating anew between ourselves those arts, to which we have been devoted since we were children. [3] For, in my prime of youth, I fell into that very perturbation of pristine custom and, during my consulship, I reached the heart of the strife and critical moment for everything, and over the whole period after my consulship I have been opposing these billows, which streamed over myself after being deterred from (causing) general ruin by me. Nevertheless, amidst these adversities of conditions and these straits of time, I shall devote myself to my studies and shall direct above all to writing as much of leisure as both enemies’ trickery and ties of friendship and the state grant’.

<sup>791</sup> This train of thought also informs several early letters to Atticus – see McConnell (2014): 49 for a list of passages.

<sup>792</sup> The idea is exploited in other *apologiae* – see Baraz (2012): passim for an illuminating explanation of this strategy.

successful outcome of the *Sest.* and the publication of this dialogue in November 55,<sup>793</sup> historical developments have cast a pall over Cicero's hopes of a fully restored station to no small extent. For, as Cicero himself discloses in 54 in an apologetic epistle to another advocate of his summoning back from banishment, the ex-consul Spinther (*Fam.* 1.9.9-10),<sup>794</sup> after the conference at Luca in late April 56,<sup>795</sup> during which Caesar, Pompey and Crassus breathed new life into their agreement,<sup>796</sup> he has been gradually forced to support the interests of the coalition between the three influential men.<sup>797</sup>

Much to his dismay, these constraints gave him no respite in 55, during which *de Orat.* was penned,<sup>798</sup> and several items from his correspondence reflect his mounting despair.<sup>799</sup> In particular, in my opinion, *Fam.* 1.8.4 effectively captures Cicero's feelings in terms capable of shedding light onto the prologue under scrutiny: he bewails that the new order obliges one to forget about *dignitas* and singularly hope for tranquillity,<sup>800</sup> which those who have seized power seem willing to vouchsafe provided that opposition is quelled ([...] *otium nobis exoptandum est, quod ii qui potiuntur rerum praestaturi uidentur, si quidam*

---

<sup>793</sup> The date can be garnered from several Ciceronian letters and *Div.* 2.4 – see the complete catalogue in Mankin (2011): 327-328.

<sup>794</sup> On this important letter see McConnell (2014): 35-44 with literature; on *Fam.* 1 as a collection see Grillo (2015b): 655-668.

<sup>795</sup> The exact date remains elusive: see Kaster (2006): 404 for discussion of available evidence.

<sup>796</sup> See Steel (2013b): 176 for the agenda of the meeting: in compliance with the terms of their pact, while Pompey and Crassus exert consular authority for the second time in their lives, Caesar prolongs his Gallic campaigns.

<sup>797</sup> See Lintott (2008): 201-211 for a careful reconstruction of the growing pressure exerted upon Cicero in the aftermath of the renewed bargain between 56 and 55; cp. also Grillo (2015a): 9-16 for a more recent and detailed assessment of the events in 56 geared towards *Prov. cons.*

<sup>798</sup> As Fantham (2004): 13-15 prudently concludes, one lacks sufficient evidence to conjecture exactly when Cicero begins working on *de Orat.*

<sup>799</sup> See Lintott (2008): 209 with n. 94 and Grillo (2014): 216 n.10 for a comprehensive catalogue. *Pis.* bears supplementary testimony to Cicero's political insignificance at the end of September in the same year – see Lintott (2008): 211 and Gildenhard (2011): 190. In view of all this, there can be little room for doubts concerning the severe restriction of Cicero's autonomy although, as Steel (2013b): 177 maintains, 'the wider political landscape proved surprisingly resistant'.

<sup>800</sup> According to Lintott (2008): 215 here *otium* means 'tranquil life'; by contrast, on the report of McConnell (2014): 50, *otium* signifies 'life of intellectual pursuits'. I find Lintott's translation more satisfactory because Cicero insists on the potential conflict between those who have taken possession of command and some inflexible *optimates* such as Cato, who refuse to yield to them. On the basis of analogous arguments, I cannot agree with McConnell's later claim (p. 56) that 'the *otium* he wishes for and possesses is that which has arisen from political success on the *cursus honorum*': in the immediately ensuing sentence, Cicero repeats that consular dignity is now irreparably forlorn.

*homines patientius eorum potentiam ferre potuerint. dignitatem quidam illam consularem fortis et constantis senatoris nihil est quod cogitemus).*<sup>801</sup>

In the third paragraph of the same missive, Cicero also confesses that, among the options available to him under such dire circumstances, a return to his literary interests remains the most appealing and he will certainly attend to them if his obligations to Pompey allow ([...] *id quod mihi maxime libet, ad nostra m<e> studia referam litterarum; quod profecto faciam, si per eiusdem amicitiam licebit*). In the light of this phrasing, one should better understand the force of *causae amicorum* in the concluding sentence of the prologue of *de Orat.* In pledging that he will dedicate only his spare time to his literary projects, Cicero allays conceivable criticisms: politics will remain his undisputed priority. Upon closer inspection, though, one realises that the state has been altered: prominent individuals weigh upon Cicero's *res publica* along with the constant threats from formidable enemies such as Publius Clodius.

I would like to draw my Ciceronian survey to a close with a passage from *Planc.* 66, delivered by September 54, which, despite its chronological location on the fringes of Catullus's assumed lifespan, pithily recapitulates Cicero's attitude towards *otium*:<sup>802</sup> [...] *feci ut postea cotidie praesentem me viderent, habitavi in oculis, pressi forum; neminem a congressu meo neque ianitor meus neque somnus absterruit. Ecquid ego dicam de occupatis meis temporibus, cui fuerit ne otium quidem umquam otiosum? Nam quas tu commemoras, Cassi, legere te solere orationes, cum otiosus sis, has ego scripsi ludis et feriis, ne omnino umquam essem otiosus.*<sup>803</sup>

---

<sup>801</sup> Kaster (2006): 323 perceptively grasps the progressive deterioration of the slogan *otium cum dignitate* in *Fam.* 1.7.10 (July 56), where safety must accompany worthy standing, and *Fam.* 1.8.3-4 (February 55).

<sup>802</sup> Stylistically speaking, *Arch.* and *Planc.* partake in the abundant hyperbata, which highlights Cicero's notable personal involvement in both trials – cp. Powell (2010b): 181.

<sup>803</sup> 'Afterwards I saw to it that they would see me daily in their presence: I dwelt in their eyes, I frequented the forum; neither my porter nor sleep has ever deterred anybody from meeting me. Ought I, who never even had an otiose leisure, to say anything about my busy hours? For, Cassius, I penned these orations, which you recall that you are accustomed to read as you are free from statal matters, over festivals and over holidays so as never to be at leisure at all'.

Cicero summarises the self-image he has regularly sought to promote,<sup>804</sup> namely his never-ending adherence to republican service, which he conveys with the powerful metaphor *forum pressi*. In addition, later in the same paragraph, Cicero quotes a Catonian maxim from the *Origines* ‘*clarorum virorum atque magnorum non minus oti quam negoti rationem exstare oportere*’,<sup>805</sup> which he relentlessly observed.<sup>806</sup> As a result, it will provide a perfect counterpoint to Catullus’s self-description in terms of idle lingering in the forum until a friend leads him away in *carmen* 10, with which I plan to begin the inquiry into his own antinomian approach to *otium*.

### 2.3.2 Catullus’s *inhonestum otium*

As indicated above, Cicero’s last powerful self-depiction in terms of continuous presence in the forum will make an ideal (heretofore, to the best of my knowledge, neverexploited) counterpoint to *carmen* 10 and a suitable inaugural piece for my treatment of Catullus’s unashamedly insubordinate attitude towards leisure. Chronological considerations, furthermore, recommend the comparison: for, although the poem frustrates any endeavour to pin down its exact date, it can be ascribed with certainty to the aftermath of the poet’s expedition to Bithynia among Memmius’s retinue between 57 and 56.<sup>807</sup>

Preliminary methodological remarks, in any event, seem necessary: since my chief interest lies in *otium*, I shall defer a detailed discussion of Catullus’s stormy relationship with his praetor at the heart of the composition under scrutiny to the next chapter, which hinges on patronage. On analogous grounds, the semantic area of *lepos* and *uenustas*, with

---

<sup>804</sup> See van der Blom (2010): 290-291 plausibly interprets this segment as unequivocal indication for the importance Cicero attached to staying as close as possible to Rome so as to nurture his public image.

<sup>805</sup> ‘It is demanded that no less an account of leisure time than of work time of great and illustrious men be on record’.

<sup>806</sup> On this apophthegm and Cicero’s appropriation thereof see Sciarrino (2011): 185-187 with literature.

<sup>807</sup> Atkinson (1975): 38-53 surveys all the relevant background to the Bithynian expedition.

which my previous chapter concerns itself, will not be explored; likewise, I shall not examine the dynamics of social interaction between Catullus, Varus<sup>808</sup> and the *scortillum*, over which scholars have already exhaustively pored from several viewpoints.<sup>809</sup> Rather, I shall limit myself to analysing the bold consequences of the incorporation of the Bithynian enterprise into the fashionable setting of the girl's residence.

*Varus me meus ad suos amores  
uisum duxerat e foro otiosum,  
scortillum, ut mihi tum repente uisum est,  
non sane illepidum neque inuenustum.  
huc ut uenimus, incidere nobis  
sermone uarii, in quibus, quid esset  
iam Bithynia, quomodo se haberet  
et quonam mihi profuisset aere.*<sup>810</sup>

The opening hendecasyllable immediately casts into sharp relief the solid friendship binding Catullus and Varus together by way of the word order (the name *Varus* and the possessive adjective *meus* warmly enfold the personal pronoun *me* designating the poet) and the alliteration *me meus*. Then, the place adjunct *ad suos amores* induces the reader to imagine that Varus intends to bring his crony into contact with his titillating girlfriend.

But, insofar as the verse breaks masterfully at this point, the whole picture emerges progressively in the successive line. Namely, in the first hemistich, the phrase combining the supine *uisum* and the main verb *duxerat* reveals that Varus indeed wishes to lead his companion to his girlfriend's secluded dwelling to introduce her. The crucial element, though, is disclosed only in the second hemistich: to follow his associate, the poet dares to

---

<sup>808</sup> On this character's identity see Stroup (2010): 43 n. 17.

<sup>809</sup> On this poem see Gaisser (2009): 51-55, who reveals the mechanisms of a social comedy staging Catullus in the role of 'the braggart'; Stroup (2010): 42-48, who privileges the sorts of theatrical display opened by the space of *otium*; Stevens (2013): 205-206, who expounds the role of silence. For a dependable review of previous secondary literature see Roman (2014): 80 n. 132.

<sup>810</sup> My Varus led me, idle, out of the forum to check up on his darling, a little tart, as she then seemed to me in an instant, truly neither disagreeable nor charmless. When we arrived hither, various conversations fell upon us, among which how Bithynia was at present, what its situation was, and to what extent it was gainful in terms of money.

abandon the space quintessentially given over to politics (*e foro*), where he dares to appear dawdling – the metrical position of *otiosum* at the end of the hendecasyllable emphasises it enormously.<sup>811</sup>

Such a self-portrayal contrasts conspicuously with Cicero's persona in *Planc.* 66-67 in several respects: primarily, whereas the orator predicates his unremitting efforts to remain in full view through his constant attendance of the communal square and his uninterrupted absorption into business, the poet, in his fleeting occupancy of the same place, departs himself dallyingly. More blatantly, while the former bows to Cato's dictate enjoining to justify both *otium* and *negotium* by proclaiming that he has kept busy, even over holidays, the latter does not bother to legitimise his leisure, but defiantly announces his withdrawal into the intimate sphere to enjoy the charms of his companion's mistress.

On top of all, in the following verses Catullus pits his newly found eloquence under cover of eroticised intimacy (*incidere nobis / sermones uarii*, ll. 5-6) against his silent inaction in the forum,<sup>812</sup> which fails to instil the customary reverence in him. In addition, by grafting the discussion of his Bithynian mission (ll. 7-8), a serious topic worthy of the rostra, into the frivolous setting of the tart's abode, Catullus robs it of its lustre and turns it into a mere ruse to impress her<sup>813</sup> – the cursory allusion to profit condensed in line 8 foreruns an extended boast running from l. 16 to l. 20 and starting with *ut puellae / unum me facere beatiorum*, 'in order to make myself outstanding among those who were quite successful in the girl's eyes'. As a result, he accomplishes a supreme denaturation of a

---

<sup>811</sup> Stroup (2010): 46 neatly interprets the adjective as 'the hinge that both closes the door to the forum and opens the door to the home'.

<sup>812</sup> *Ibid.*: 45.

<sup>813</sup> At *Ibid.*: 47, the scholar notices that Catullus puzzlingly ranges from the posture of a man of business to that of a man of leisure, but, in my opinion, does not do justice to the breach of opportuneness underlying this move.

vital stage in the career his equestrian family could have expected him to undertake,<sup>814</sup> thereby crowning the subversion of propriety enacted in the *carmen*.<sup>815</sup>

The same adjective *otiosus*, which features again exclusively here in a likewise noticeable position (at the close of the first line instead of the second), and the identical metre lead me to *carmen* 50, the next poem I consider. Yet, ahead of my analysis, a few prolegomena concerning my approach: I restrict myself to the first six lines, which bear more directly on my argument, and in continuity with the procedure adopted above, shall not repeat my remarks on *lepos* and *facetiae*;<sup>816</sup> the relationship between this poem (inclusive of the more sombre mood impregnating its second half) and the *otium* stanza of *carmen* 51 will instead be undertaken in the next sub-section.

*Hesterno, Licini, die otiosi  
multum lusimus in meis tabellis,  
ut conuenerat esse delicatos;  
scribens uersiculos uterque nostrum  
ludebat numero modo hoc, modo illoc,  
reddens mutua per iocum atque uinum.*<sup>817</sup>

My main claim consists in construing this polymetric as a pursuance of the poet's rebellious outlook on leisure, which I have started to sketch above. For the disengagement from respectable practice gains in scope: while in the previous poem it enables fashionable intimate conversation away from the *forum*, here it hosts written entertainment, which ostentatiously shuns both *utilitas* and subordination to *negotium*.

---

<sup>814</sup> See Cairns (2003): 165-167 with literature on the poet's family trade of fish-sauce in the Black Sea.

<sup>815</sup> In consequence, I must dissent from the premises of her argument expressed in Stroup (2010): 43-44. She submits that Varus's intervention aims to put an end to the outrageous ostentation of lack of propriety on Catullus's part: one cannot give in to *otium* for all to see, least of all in the forum, but needs to confine it to the personal ambit. For this reason, by escorting his comrade to the secrecy of a home, the fitting place for leisure, the former hastens to restore propriety.

<sup>816</sup> See pp. 90-92 above.

<sup>817</sup> Yesterday, Licinius, at leisure, we played much upon my writing tablets, as we had concerted to be alluring: both of us played by writing little verses in one metre, then in another while reciprocating poems over merriment and wine.

The curtain raises and unveils the privacy of an encounter between Catullus and his loving friend, the orator and fellow poet Lucius Licinius Calvus. The vocative *Licini* interrupts the sequence *hesterno ... die* and imbues the whole shared lapse of time with the latter's presence. Besides, the plural *otiosi* foreruns the main verb *lusimus*, which is postponed to the commencement of the succeeding verse through a deft enjambment, blends the two compeers into one indestructible first-personplural.

As the hendecasyllables unfold, the picture comes into sharper focus: Catullus and Calvus gave the preceding day over to a blithe (*lusimus*)<sup>818</sup> exchange (*reddens mutua*)<sup>819</sup> of refined and delightful *uersiculi*<sup>820</sup> attuned to their common aesthetic creed.<sup>821</sup> On the one hand, the terminology qualifying the poetic activity shrewdly bespeaks a commitment to painstaking formal polish redolent with Callimacheanism.<sup>822</sup> On the other hand, in harmony with the analogous strategy behind the *nugae* in *carmen* 1,<sup>823</sup> the mockingly belittling labels pay lip service to probable blame from traditionalist quarters outraged at the sheer lack of any reputable content. Over and above that, by interrupting the flux of his thoughts after *otiosi*, Catullus might for a while lure the reader into believing that his leisure resulted in an entirely different kind of creation, such as a sanctioned epic in praise of the ancestors. The ensuing verse, though, ruthlessly dismantles this illusion: the two companions indulged protractedly (*multum*) in light-hearted and ephemeral littleverses.

Although scholars have already expounded part of the mutinous import of the sequence under scrutiny,<sup>824</sup> a comparison with Cicero will hopefully shed more light onto the significance of Catullus's infringement of propriety. It will take its cue anew (albeit with a

---

<sup>818</sup> On the programmatic force of *lusimus* see Landolfi (1986): 79-82 with literature.

<sup>819</sup> *Carmen* 14 testifies to the enduring nature of this interchange: cp. Barbaud (2006): 155-156, Stroup (2010): 233, McMaster (2010): 371-374, Starr (2012): 114-125 and Gale (2016): 102-103, all with literature.

<sup>820</sup> On Catullus's habit of defining his poetry by means of diminutives see n.289.

<sup>821</sup> See above n. 509.

<sup>822</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 268 marks the shadow of Callimachus's δέλτος in Fr. 1.21 Harder even underneath Catullus's *tabellae*.

<sup>823</sup> See Stroup (2010): 229-234 on eroticism and *otium*, to which one ought to append Williams (2012): 182.

<sup>824</sup> Most notably Pucci (1961): 249-256 and Segal (1970): 25-31.



slightly different focus) from the orator's self-portrayal in *Planc.* 66-67, but will also include other passages, notably his exposition of the acceptable relationship between literature and official business in *Arch.* 12 and the hexameters from *Cons.*

In my last sample of Ciceronian illustration of his admissible cultivation of literature, he professes that he has composed his orations even over festive periods, thereby never interrupting his services to the commonwealth. Earlier, in the poem in praise of his consulship, the Muse herself compliments him on prioritising *litterae* over politics without fail, and on attending to intellectual training useful for the community at large. Finally, in his speech on behalf of Archias, Cicero defends his own commitment to Greek literature by assuring that it has never interfered with his career and by claiming that it has proven highly profitable in enhancing his rhetorical skills.

Nothing of the sort, by contrast, appears in Catullus: not only does he abstain from proving that he has engaged in a poetic session only after ministering to *negotia*, but he shamelessly presents the fruits of his efforts as tantamount to inane trifles devoid of any serious trace of a subject matter valuable for his fellow citizens. In other words, to borrow Cicero's terminology, he brazenly endorses an *otium cum uoluptate*.

No serious treatment of Catullan attitudes towards *otium* can sidestep the unavoidable last stanza, which draws his rendition of Sappho's ode 31 Voigt<sup>825</sup> to a close: its polyptotic anaphora of the word<sup>826</sup> in the three trochees at the front of each hendecasyllable unquestionably signals that it contains substantial material.

*[O]tium, Catulle, tibi molestum est,  
otio exultas nimiumque gestis,  
otium reges prius et beatas*

---

<sup>825</sup> Awaiting Yatromanolakis's forthcoming full commentary on the poetess's extant works, one might consult Bellandi (2007): 193-216. In regards to interpretative essays, I confine my references to two recent entries in the immense bibliography pertaining to this ode: Wiater (2010): 23-49 and D'Angour (2013): 59-71, both with previous literature.

<sup>826</sup> Bellandi (2007): 247.

*perdidit urbes.*<sup>827</sup>

Since the study of this single strophe involves in itself a considerable number of aspects worth unpacking, I shall organise it as follows: after dispensing with a couple of issues which do not affect my argument, I propose to examine the suitable translation of *otium* and discuss the syntactic structure of the stave with an eye in particular on the verb *perdidit*, which actuates the powerful and, to some extent, bewildering merging of the individual and the public. Lastly, I shall endeavour to fathom the (ultimately) elusive import of Catullus's avowal of the dark side of his leisure; for the sake of clarity, I shall start by broaching the private dimension.

In line with my schedule, I shall forgo both a detailed account of Catullus's departures from his model in the first three staves<sup>828</sup> and the debate hinging upon whether or not *carmen* 50 constitutes a cover letter for the poem at hand.<sup>829</sup> Rather, I need to clearly state that my investigation rests on the assumption that the terminal strophe belongs to poem 51, a viewpoint, which, at the end of an intense dispute, currently tends to be accepted by the scholarly community.<sup>830</sup>

Let me now tackle the accurate rendition of *otium*, the first hurdle hampering interpretive efforts: it has sometimes been decoded as equivalent to the Greek *τρυφή* with the concomitant panoply of luxury;<sup>831</sup> on the other hand, in relation to the erotic symptomatology pictured in the previous strophes, it has been deciphered either as a

---

<sup>827</sup> Leisure disorders you, Catullus, in leisure you revel and exult exceedingly; leisure formerly destroyed kings and prosperous cities.

<sup>828</sup> See the detailed and fascinating treatment in Young (2015): 168-178 and the items listed on p. 222 n. 15; cp. also Thévenaz (2009): 72-74. On Lucretius's partial, nigh-contemporaneous version of the same ode in 3.152-158 with the purpose to illustrate the psychological effects of fear, see Gale (2007): 68; on earlier adaptations see Barchiesi (2009): 322 n.2 and Fontaine (2010): 192-197 on Plautus.

<sup>829</sup> Supporters of what has become by and large *communis opinio* are listed by Hawkins (2012): 341 n. 32; see *contra* Feeney (2012): 34.

<sup>830</sup> Finamore (1984): 11 n. 1 and n. 2 provides detailed references, to which one ought to add the pieces listed in Bellandi (2007): 243 n. 574 and in Young (2015): 231 n. 15. Besides, I sympathise with those who salute the strophe as bearing the unmistakable Catullan mark: Lefèvre (1988): 328-329; Bellandi (2007): 248 and Young (2015): 172-173.

<sup>831</sup> Bellandi (2007): 250 lists the adherents of this belief.

maiming exhaustion stemming from it<sup>832</sup> or as a synonym with *quies*, the repose a physician might prescribe to a patient in need of recovery.<sup>833</sup> Be that as it may, *otium* more likely indicates time on one's hand, the kernel of the present pages.<sup>834</sup>

Having established this, I would like to turn attention to the linguistic construction of the strophe under examination: in general terms, it consists of three statements, which are expressed through indicative tenses and are linked firstly by an asyndeton and subsequently by a polysyndeton. It commences with a bold assertion: leisure is harmful.<sup>835</sup> Then, conceivably on the strength of an implied *nam*,<sup>836</sup> the ensuing hendecasyllable contains the essence of such a threat: owing to leisure and, in parallel, during leisure,<sup>837</sup> the sequence *exultare – gestire*, attested only here,<sup>838</sup> certifies that the poet is subjugated by his uncontrollable emotions.<sup>839</sup> Finally, without any linker,<sup>840</sup> the terminal hendecasyllable and Adonic enlarge the perspective to ponder broodingly over the ruinous consequences of *otium* not just on Catullus, but also on kingdoms and cities.

But how does the coda manage to comport with the remainder of the stave as the syntax, albeit abruptly, induces one to believe? For even though *reges* and *beatas urbes* constitute the sole direct objects of the perfect indicative, the sudden transition *et ... et* intimates that the outcomes of the verb also extend to the poet himself. My answer subsists in the capability of *perdo* to accommodate both a psychological breakdown and a concrete damage thanks to a shared underlying notion of lack of measure. A couple of other instances over the length and breadth of the Catullan corpus support this claim: the moving

---

<sup>832</sup> Lefèvre (1988): 329.

<sup>833</sup> Woodman (2006): 610-611 – see below for a partial adaptation of this to *carmen* 44.

<sup>834</sup> Bellandi (2007): 251 convincingly buttresses this position.

<sup>835</sup> Lefèvre (1988): 332 and Bellandi (2007): 246-247 prop this translation by persuasively discarding others.

<sup>836</sup> Reasonably, I think, Bellandi (2007): 247 implies a *nam*.

<sup>837</sup> See *ibid.*: 247 for this understanding of the causal and temporal function of the ablative.

<sup>838</sup> *Ibid.*: 247.

<sup>839</sup> See *ibid.*: 247-250 for an excellent analysis of the psychic condition captured by these verbs and Cicero's reprimand on those who succumb to it in *Tusc.* 5.16-17.

<sup>840</sup> One might wonder with Bellandi (*ibid.*: 252-252) whether Catullus omits either *nedum* or *ita* or *item*.

depiction of Ariadne on the shores of Naxos after being forsaken by Theseus in 64.69-71<sup>841</sup> – which will be inspected presently – and the desolate sight of the devastation of everything in 29.23-24 by Caesar and Pompey for the sake of their henchman Mamurra.<sup>842</sup>

[...] [*T*]oto ex te pectore, Theseu, / toto animo, tota pendebat perdita mente, / a misera!<sup>843</sup> Through the polyptotic anaphora *toto ... toto ... tota*<sup>844</sup> the poet emphasises how the heroine's desperate clinging to her man saturates her whole downcast self and highlights her inability to curb her tumultuous feelings through *perdita*. On top of that, and this makes this parallel even more felicitous, in order to designate the anguish brought to pass by her impotence in the face of the assault of tempestuous emotions, Catullus chooses *misera*, the identical adjective he selects for himself in 51.5<sup>845</sup> and in 50.9,<sup>846</sup> thus strikingly aligning himself with her.<sup>847</sup> This word 'does not correspond to a male, active state of mind',<sup>848</sup> evocative, if anything, of the fickle comic *adulescens* chastised by Cicero in *Tusc.* 4.67-68 and 72-73;<sup>849</sup> into the bargain, it entails a lack of resolve, which, from a traditional frame of reference, reeks of failure in self-control, one of the bedrocks of quintessentially masculine *uirtus*.<sup>850</sup>

[*E*]one nomine [...] <sup>851</sup> / socer generque, perdidistis omnia?<sup>852</sup> This pure iambic consummating a long vituperation of Caesar and Pompey linked even by familial ties between 59 and 54 comprehends the other deployment of *perdo* I am interested in. The

<sup>841</sup> On the full scene, which runs from line 60 to line 71, see Gaisser (2009): 115-118 with literature.

<sup>842</sup> On this Caesarian officer often targeted by Catullan invective see passim Konstan (2007) and Tatum (2007).

<sup>843</sup> [...] Lost, she hung upon you, Theseus, with her whole heart, with her whole soul, with her whole mind. Oh, wretched one!

<sup>844</sup> Thomson (1997): 403.

<sup>845</sup> Bellandi (2007): 231 acutely observes that *misero* gains in prominence by occupying the inaugural trochees of line 5.

<sup>846</sup> See Finamore (1984): 14 and Bellandi (2007): 232 with further literature in n. 548.

<sup>847</sup> Daniels (1967): 352, who, in point of fact, concentrates on *carmen* 8.

<sup>848</sup> Lavigne (2010): 82.

<sup>849</sup> Uden (2006): 23-24.

<sup>850</sup> *Ibid.*: 31-32; see also Frank (1968): 237 and Edwards (1993): 96.

<sup>851</sup> The vexed question of the proper restoration of the second hemistich of line 23 does not impinge upon my argument – see the full critical apparatus in Kiss' online edition.

<sup>852</sup> Was it for the sake of this individual [...] that you, father-in-law and son-in-law, ruined everything?

aspect deserving of prominence in this not entirely unprecedented comparandum for *carmen* 51<sup>853</sup> relates to the fact that the bemoaned universal annihilation stems from the pivotal theme of the invective: an absence of restraint in greed and sexual appetite on the part of the two powerful generals and, even more, their minion, in whose interest they wreaked havoc on the entire world.<sup>854</sup>

In light of this, at last, I am ready to attempt to crack part of the enigma wrapping the significance of the stanza. On the basis of my discussion, one might infer that Catullus lets a rather traditional voice resound rather sternly throughout the last stave to deplore the feminising<sup>855</sup> consequences of overindulgence in leisure and Hellenisation:<sup>856</sup> a sort of personal vulnerability to emotions, akin to exposure to hazards for kings and commonwealths because of immoderate basking *in rebus prosperis*. In this connection, I interpret the mention of *reges* and *urbes* in terms of a powerful counterpoint to the individual case of the poet and suggestive of a wide-ranging historical law.<sup>857</sup>

Still, does this mean a full rejection of his poetic activity<sup>858</sup> owing to a realisation of his disregard of his *officia*<sup>859</sup> and compromise of his career?<sup>860</sup> I beg to differ: as I see it, in spite of his awareness of the troubles begotten by his life-style, the poet never *explicitly*

---

<sup>853</sup> Bellandi (2007): 253.

<sup>854</sup> A few divergences notwithstanding, Konstan (2007): 77-78 and Tatum (2007): 339-344 agree in this respect.

<sup>855</sup> Stevens (2013): 253-254.

<sup>856</sup> Young (2015): 178-181.

<sup>857</sup> The content of this paragraph is indebted to Bellandi (2007): 252-252; at the same time, I would not go so far as to squarely discard some Latinists' conjecture (listed in n. 595, to which one should add Gale (2012): 211 n.79 and Feeney (2013): 80) that Catullus draws a parallel between his stealthy romance with Lesbia and Paris's adultery with Helen, which, likewise, takes place in the realm of *otium* in 68.103-104: *ne Paris abducta gausius libera moecha / otia pacato degeret in thalamo*, 'in order that Paris might not spend idle leisurely hours / in his peaceful bedroom by rejoicing in his abducted paramour.'

<sup>858</sup> Bickel (1940): 209.

<sup>859</sup> Frank (1968): 237-238; Wray (2001): 97 and Stroup (2010): 56 n.40 synthetically restate the same concepts.

<sup>860</sup> According to Wiseman (1969): 33-35 and (1985): 155, *carmina* 52-53-54 and 57 might represent a return to the rule of discipline; see contra Hubbard (2005): 269 n. 69.

disavows it,<sup>861</sup> but vents the unresolvable tension between his behaviour and traditional expectations.<sup>862</sup>

The last explicit union between *otium* and literature I scrutinise manifests itself in *carmen* 44, where, somewhat through an ironic inversion of the situation at the back of ode 51, leisure functions as a cure for Catullus's ill-advisedly self-inflicted artistic and bodily cold. This agenda licenses me to waive a few issues: the social implications of the appellation of the estate and of Catullus's desire to be Sestius's guest,<sup>863</sup> along with the various philological uncertainties.<sup>864</sup> Instead, in the middle of the section, I shall take a slight detour to make sense of the choice of the limping rhythm.

*O funde noster, seu Sabine, seu Tiburs,  
nam te esse Tiburtem autumnant, quibus non est  
cordi Catullum, laedere; at quibus cordi est,  
quouis Sabinum pignore esse contendunt,  
– sed seu Sabine siue uerius Tiburs:  
fui libenter in tua suburbana  
uilla, malamque pectore expuli tussim,  
non immerenti quam mihi meus uenter,  
dum sumptuosas appeto, dedit, cenas.  
nam, Sestianus dum uolo esse conuiuia,  
orationem in Antium petito rem  
plenam ueneni et pestilentiae legi.  
hic me grauido frigida et frequens tussis  
quassauit usque, dum in tuum sinum fugi,  
et me recurauit otioque et urtica.  
quare refectus maximas tibi grates  
ago, meum quod non es ulta peccatum.<sup>865</sup>*

---

<sup>861</sup> Bellandi (2007): 245 summarises well: 'la sua non è una vera auto-exhortatio ad negotium, ma solo la constatazione inquieta di una situazione senza sbocchi evidenti'.

<sup>862</sup> Segal (1970): 30; Skinner (1981): 82; Finamore (1984): 17-18; Miller (1994): 137-138; Platter (1995): 218-219; Fowler (2000): 25; Greene (2007): 140-141; Roman (2014): 58.

<sup>863</sup> On this facet see most recently Hansen (2011): 419-426 with previous literature.

<sup>864</sup> See the full critical apparatus in Kiss's online edition.

<sup>865</sup> 'My estate, whether Sabine or Tiburtine – for those to whom it is not pleasing to afflict Catullus assert you are Tiburtine; but those to whom it is, take any bet that you are Sabine), but whether Sabine or, more truly, Tiburtine, I was with pleasure in your suburban country-house and drove out a nasty cough, which my belly gave me – I was not undeserving – while I was striving eagerly for luxurious meals. For, as I wanted to be Sestius's guest, I read his oration against the candidate Antius, which was filled with poison and pest. Hereupon a chilling cold and a constant cough shook me violently until I fled into your bosom and cured myself with leisure and nettle-broth. Hence, reinvigorated, I give you utmost thanks because you did not take vengeance on my fault'.

With the purpose to secure an invitation to a sophisticated dinner, the poet has stooped to read<sup>866</sup> one of his Sestius's<sup>867</sup> orations.<sup>868</sup> Its rhetorical frigidity<sup>869</sup> collides arrestingly with Catullan poetics and oratorical preference for the stylistically akin Atticism championed by Calvus.<sup>870</sup> Besides, it has had bodily repercussions upon him,<sup>871</sup> not unlike the gruelling emotions in *carmina* 50 and 51: it has provoked persistent coughing, which has been cured by means of a mixture of tranquillity and nettle provided by the poet's forbearing villa in spite of his (literary) fault.

These aesthetic considerations prompt a cursory deviation to elucidate Catullus's adoption of the Hipponactean verse in this creation.<sup>872</sup> For even though they are circumscribed to an execration of Sextian ψυχρότης and, probably, its indirect lampooning in the solemn tone pervading some sections of the creation at hand<sup>873</sup> (or, conversely, because of the subtlety and conciseness of this kind of satire), it seems reasonable to propose that Catullus imitates the similarly scazontic and more patently programmatic Callimachean thirteenth iambus.<sup>874</sup> This point gains in plausibility if one bears in mind that the same metre beats the time also in the more pronouncedly programmatic *carmen* 22,<sup>875</sup> in which Catullus stakes a claim to his poetic principles by relying once again upon an

---

<sup>866</sup> Bellandi (2007): 385-386 and Stroup (2010): 158-159 survey the habit of sending copies of one's *oratio* to friends after its delivery in tribunal in order to improve it before publication.

<sup>867</sup> For a prudent assessment of the association between the two men, see Bellandi (2007): 386 n. 884

<sup>868</sup> On the baffling essence of the speech see Bellandi (2007): 385 n. 881 with literature. Cp. also Thomson (1997): 314 for a possible identification of Antius with the promoter of a *lex sumptuaria* aiming to curb polling corruption even by prescribing that dishes served at electoral *convivia* consist exclusively of vegetables. If one accepts this hypothesis, the scholar continues, one might spot a layer of irony behind Catullus needle-based diet.

<sup>869</sup> See Bellandi (2007): 386 n. 884 and 392 n. 899.

<sup>870</sup> See bibliography in chapter 1.

<sup>871</sup> Fordyce (1961): 205 acutely describes the pun, but reduces the poem to 'a vehicle' for it.

<sup>872</sup> I shall not enter the fray over Catullan iambic heritage – see Cowan (2015): 39-40 with full bibliography; on limping polymetrics see all studies listed *ibid.*: 33 n. 4.

<sup>873</sup> See Hansen (2011): 421 n. 8 for a wide-ranging catalogue of contributions hinging upon this matter.

<sup>874</sup> See my treatment of this momentous poem in chapter 1.

<sup>875</sup> Morgan (2010): 123 notes that the two poems share the element of criticism; I would append the tag 'literary'.

opposition to a rival, who succeeds in measuring up to neoteric standards only superficially.<sup>876</sup>

I can now return to the heart of this chapter and concentrate on *otio* in line 15, which, in line with *otiosum* in 10.2 and *otiosi* in 50.1, is anew escorted by no sanctioning attribute. In addition, Catullus might self-mockingly and, in conservative eyes, outrageously insinuate that since his cultivated leisure triggers either enervating excitement or physical disorders, it ends up loosening its defining role as giver of recuperation.<sup>877</sup> Thereby, it almost turns itself into a supremely personal sort of occupation, from which he must rest by means of supplemental relaxation. Hence, one might infer that Catullus's rebellion against legitimate management of his spare hours has attained one of its pinnacles.

*Carmina* 5 and 7, which I shall treat as a pair following in several scholars' footsteps<sup>878</sup> and with which I shall bring the present chapter to an end, do not comprehend any unambiguous mention of *otium*. Nonetheless, I think they fit with the poems discussed before because, aside from metrical homogeneity between 5, 7, 10 and 50 (Phalaecian hendecasyllable), they share a challenge to the primacy of *negotia*<sup>879</sup> in favour of a personal orbit replete with love and Callimachean poetry.

The *basia* diptych has been approached from several perspectives;<sup>880</sup> however, my starting point dwells in Young's excellent dissection of the mechanism by virtue of which

---

<sup>876</sup> Gale (2016): 104-105 perceptively unearths authorial anxieties concerning potential similarities between himself and Suffenus, which creep into the entire creation, but come to the fore in a particularly unsettling way in the last four lines.

<sup>877</sup> This train of thought to some degree reworks the construal of *otium* in ode 51 by Woodman (2006): 610-611 mentioned above.

<sup>878</sup> Ferrero (1955): 173-174; Janan (1994): 58-62; Fitzgerald (1997): 53-55 and Nappa (2001): 53-56, albeit more implicitly and in connection with poem 16; Dyson Hejduk (2007): 257-259; Greene (2007): 134-136; Young (2015): 74-88. Wray (2001): 143-160 proposes instead a joint reading of 5, 6 and 7 and focuses on Mediterranean 'wicked tongues and evil eyes'; Tesoriero (2006): 10-18, who interprets the poems as a phallus against jinxes, and Stevens (2013): 47-56, who emphasizes the contrast between sexualized silence and despicable rumormongering, proceed along these lines. Finally, Ingleheart (2014): 66-68 buttresses and develops previous attempts (one should also include the last-mentioned monograph, which appeared too late to be incorporated into her ample bibliography) to solve the innuendo concealed in the speaking name *Lesbia* and in *carmina* 5 and 7.

<sup>879</sup> Segal (1970): 28.

<sup>880</sup> For illuminating comments on the structure of both poems, see Fry (2004): 852-855, who also analyses the acoustic texture of 5, an aspect also approached in Young (2015): 79 and 85. Gaisser (2009): 111-113



Catullus makes his own and Lesbia's exclusive amatory province expand until it clashes with the elderly guardians of tradition (5.1-3 and 10-13; 7.11-12).

*Viuamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus  
rumoresque senum seueriorum  
omnes unius aestimemus assis.  
soles occidere et redire possunt:  
nobis cum semel occidit breuis lux,  
nox est perpetua una dormienda.  
da mihi basia mille, deinde centum,  
dein mille altera, dein secunda centum,  
deinde usque altera mille, deinde centum,  
dein, cum milia multa fecerimus,  
conturbabimus illa, ne sciamus,  
aut ne quis malus inuidere possit,  
cum tantum sciat esse basiorum.*<sup>881</sup>

*Quaeris, quot mihi basiationes  
tuae, Lesbia, sint satis superque.  
quam magnus numerus Libyssae harenae  
lasarpiciferis iacet Cyrenis  
oraculum Iouis inter aestuosi  
et Batti ueteris sacrum sepulcrum;  
aut quam sidera multa, cum tacet nox,  
furtiuos hominum uident amores:  
tam te basia multa multa basiare  
uesano satis et super Catullo est,  
quae nec pernumerare curiosi  
possint nec mala fascinare lingua.*<sup>882</sup>

---

concentrates on the structure of 7, whose darkening tone in comparison with 5 is often discerned: see Tesoriero (2006): 16 n. 22 and Young (2015): 77-78, 82 and 86, both with bibliography. In fine, see Morelli (2012): 105-126 on Catullus's renovation of fairly hackneyed *topoi* (for example, brevity of life and invitation to delectation along with transience of human existence as opposed to the perpetual cycle of natural seasons) and Schwindt (2016): 117-133 on the 'magic of counting', both with literature.

<sup>881</sup> Let us live, my Lesbia, and let us love and let us consider all the murmuring of too stern old people worth a single penny! Suns can set and return; we, when our brief light is set just once, must sleep a single uninterrupted night. Give me a thousand kisses, then a hundred, then a second thousand, then a further hundred, then, without interruption, another thousand, then a hundred. Then, when we have produced many thousands of kisses, we shall mix them up, in order that we might not know their number or a wicked man might not regard us with envy as he knows that so many kisses exist.

<sup>882</sup> You ask, Lesbia, how many of your kisses are enough and to spare for me? As the huge number of Libyan sand grains lying in silphium-bearing Cyrene, between the oracle of burning Jove and the sacred tomb of old Battus, or as the many stars which, when night is silent, look at the furtive loves of men, with so many kisses it is enough and to spare for insane Catullus that you kiss him; so many kisses, that meddlers do not manage to count out nor to bewitch with wicked tongue.

Young suggests that Catullus flouts them by means of an impressive amalgam between the deprecated act of kissing, its designation through a disreputable, (conceivably) Transpadane noun *basium*, and Callimacheanism.<sup>883</sup> Moreover, according to the scholar, the poet enhances his provocation against his greed-driven<sup>884</sup> disparagers by bestowing the undisputed pecuniary value of much-coveted silphium,<sup>885</sup> which is conjured in 7.4, upon his remarkable blending of items, whose value his detractors always dismiss.

Building on this, I would like to claim that the poet remains liable to the *senes'* reproaches in all the poems I have been surveying. For whenever they partake of written pursuits, whether more openly Callimachean in 5, 7 and 50, or Sapphic in 51, they look to be constantly steeped in eroticism and devoid of any speck of *utilitas*, which, as Cicero never wearies of repeating in the passages scrutinised before, constitutes the sine qua non for licit compositions by the elite. Besides, even in case they picture other activities, such as urban converse in 10, which hinges, with added effrontery, upon official business, or kissing in 5 and 7, the poet's behaviour never adheres to *decorum*.

Therefore, by the same token, in my opinion it stands to reason to deduce that even the reprimand reverberates throughout all the lyrics, tacitly in 10 and 50 and transparently in the final self-address of 51. Here, to some degree, Catullus interiorises the scolding to articulate his cognisance of the irreconcilability between his indecorous espousal of *otium* and socially endorsed values; yet he never explicitly disavows it with the intention of embracing a more creditable production under the aegis of *honestas* and *utilitas*.

My reasoning leads me finally to elaborate on the affinity between Catullus's aged and muttering censors and the Telchines, which, albeit occasionally detected,<sup>886</sup> has not been

---

<sup>883</sup> See Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 218-219 and Young (2015): 74-88, both with bibliography.

<sup>884</sup> On Catullus's denigration of the limits of such a scheme of things see literature in Young (2015): 213 n. 45.

<sup>885</sup> On all the deployments of this priceless plant see *ibid.*: 80-81 and 85.

<sup>886</sup> Cairns (1973): 19 and Heyworth (1994): 71-72. Upon the latter's reading, Catullan emphasis on numbers amounts to a 'denial of his master (scil. Callimachus) in aesthetics'; notwithstanding, I concur with Greene (2007): 135, who without concerning herself with aesthetics, contends that this insistence amounts to an

entirely expanded. As I advocate in the first half of this chapter, Callimachus's mythical adversaries discountenance his infringement of literary *πρέπον*; by the same token, Catullus's decriers critique his frivolous poetics on the grounds that it shuns *honestum otium* and *utilitas*. But, in Rome, absence of aesthetic appropriateness instantly merges with social and moral issues: not content with rejecting respectable usefulness, Catullan poetry limns unabashedly a scandalous sluggishness, which teeters on the edge of a lack of self-control and a resultant devastating impression of effeminacy.

Thus, if my argument manages to persuade, both in its latest developments and in its general scope, once again, in continuity with the trend explored in chapter 1, Callimachus's quest for artistic independence paves the way for Catullus's more comprehensive proclamation of liberty, which he refuses to renounce, despite his consciousness of the disquietudes it triggers in him owing to its heterodoxy.

---

assault on the faultfinders and serves rather to expose their foolish effort to render 'human worth accountable'.

## Chapter 3: Liberty and patronage

### 3.1 Introduction

The roots of my methodological approach in the Callimachean half of this chapter lie in recent scholarship on Callimachus's court poetry.<sup>887</sup> I shall distance myself from modern bias against exaltation of kings as undignified adulation under the influence of 'the essentially romantic notion of artistic freedom'.<sup>888</sup> On the contrary, I shall be guided by the assumption that, a far cry from regarding himself as a mere tool of Ptolemaic ideology, Callimachus, who consistently elects subtlety over overt eulogy,<sup>889</sup> plays a decidedly active role in forging it,<sup>890</sup> expressly when attending to the incorporation of his sovereigns into the Greek pantheon<sup>891</sup> owing to his prominent expertise in cultic matters.<sup>892</sup>

Accordingly, without erasing the propagandistic aspect, I intend to submit that Callimachus deftly manages to exploit it even in pursuance of a more personal agenda. Namely, in the first half of this section, I shall set forth that, in *H.* 4.171-175 and *H.* 1.3, he neatly draws a parallel between his king Ptolemy II's military triumphs over his enemies and his own aesthetic defeat of his detractors. Concerning the queens, in the second part, I

---

<sup>887</sup> Asper (2011): 155-177; Prioux (2011): 201-224; Weber (2011): 225-244; Acosta-Hughes (2012): 155-170; Coppola (2012): 439-452; Cozzoli (2012b): 171-186 Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 148-203, Köhnken (2012): 37-44; Stephens (2012): 137-152; Depew (2013): 325-340; Barbantani (2014): 21-32 all her previous contributions on this issue, which are listed in her comprehensive bibliography; Harder (2014): 259-271; Strootman (2014): 323-339; Caneva (2016): 129-178 with his anterior essays listed in his massive bibliography; Petrovic (2016): 164-179; Petrovic (forthcoming).

<sup>888</sup> Petrovic (forthcoming).

<sup>889</sup> Barbantani (2010): 228.

<sup>890</sup> This perspective stems from enlightening conversations with my supervisor and thought-provoking papers of hers (Petrovic (2016): 164-179 and Petrovic forthcoming), to whom I owe a debt of gratitude for kindly sharing it with me before its publication. I have considerably benefitted from her insights into Hellenistic monarchies as 'works-in-progress' and into Callimachus's claims to the status of king's φίλος, on a par with the admiral Callicrates – for literature on this central figure, amidst which pride of place must still be granted to Bing (2002-2003): 243-266, see now Hauben (2013): 39-65.

<sup>891</sup> For an authoritative presentation of this extremely complex issue alert to all relevant aspects, see Caneva (2015): 95-101, Caneva (2016): 141-173 and Petrovic (2016): 164-179, all with literature.

<sup>892</sup> Petrovic (forthcoming). Regarding the impressive scope of this project, I think the scholar pertinently ascribes programmatic force to *H.* 1.65 (ψευδοίμην, ἄγοντος ἃ κεν πεπιθοίεν ἀκουήν, 'oh that I could tell lies capable of convincing the ear of the listener'): Callimachus must persuade his audience to assent to his poems, 'in which divine Olympians resemble the court, and the human kings acquire Olympian splendour'.

propose that Callimachus enlists his queens Arsinoe II and Berenice II as guarantors of his original poetic creations in the *Apotheosis of Arsinoe* (Fr. 228 Pfeiffer), the *Victory of Berenice* and the *Lock of Berenice*.

Subsequently, I plan to shed light on the poet's laudation of his sovereigns' tolerance, which underpins the way in which he ironically handles the incestuous marriage between Arsinoe II and Ptolemy II in *Acontius and Cydippe* (Fr. 75 Harder, lines 4-9), as well as his treatment of the questionable sides of the queen's past (most notably her assassination of Demetrius the Fair) in *H. 5* and *H. 6* and in the *Lock*. Finally, I shall concentrate on the *Victoria Sosibii* (Fr. 384 Pfeiffer) and *Iamb. 12* with its important poetological points, in order to walk on a path less trodden by scholarship, *videlicet* the fact that Callimachus does not restrict his range of patrons to kings and queens, but includes other prominent members of the lordly entourage.<sup>893</sup>

The Catullan half of this chapter, on the other hand, will concern itself with a group of poems (10, 28, 116, 65-66 and 68) in which Catullus apostrophises individuals belonging to higher social strata.<sup>894</sup> I shall set forth that, never intimidated by their superior standing, irrespective of whether they sit in the senate or hail from illustrious noble families, the poet bases his attitude towards them solely on the treatment they afford him: whereas respect is reciprocated with Callimachean gifts, scorn is repaid with scathing invective. Yet I need to premise a few words about Catullus's own social status, which enables him to act in the way briefly sketched above, and on the mechanisms regulating Roman *amicitia*, which

---

<sup>893</sup> I am very grateful to my supervisor for reminding me of the importance of this facet and inviting me to examine it.

<sup>894</sup> In grouping these poems together with an eye on social interactions I follow Tatum (2007): 344-350; cp. also Du Quesnay and Woodman (2012): 261. I shall, instead, omit poem 61, which has recently been excellently studied by Feeney (2013): 70-97, because it does not contain any explicit reflection upon the rapport between the poet and the eminent dedicatee.

underlie all the relationships under scrutiny and, to the best of my knowledge, have not heretofore been systematically applied to this group of poems.<sup>895</sup>

Although the biographical facts elude us,<sup>896</sup> one can safely assume that Catullus belonged to a wealthy Cisalpine equestrian household, which was acquainted even with Julius Caesar.<sup>897</sup> Hence, he did not need support from a wealthy patron who expected the poet to repay his liberality with celebratory compositions. Nevertheless, as a young provincial living in the capital, he could not neglect networking entirely: 'to remain independent was to remain outside'.<sup>898</sup> Therefore, even though he quickly forsook a fully-fledged political career,<sup>899</sup> he had to forge alliances to take the first steps in the public arena, thereby entering that complex net of ties called *amicitia*.<sup>900</sup>

In spite of the scholarly disagreement concerning its definition,<sup>901</sup> one seems to tread on safe ground in maintaining that this quintessentially Roman sort of bond resting chiefly upon loyalty<sup>902</sup> and reciprocity, which is put into effect via a continuous exchange of gifts of various kinds.<sup>903</sup> One of the chief bones of contention relates to the extent to which in moderately uneven connections between *amici superiores* and *inferiores*, for instance knights and senators, the former were supposed to show deference towards the latter.<sup>904</sup> The question is further complicated because Catullus makes sparing use of *amicus* in

---

<sup>895</sup> Habinek (2015): 68-80 illustrates how this terminology negotiating roles between poets and *amici superiores* evolves in the course of Latin literature, but spends only a very limited amount of words on Catullus (*ibid.*: 71) without getting into details.

<sup>896</sup> Along these lines, by reason of the even scater biographical data of Lucretius, I shall dispense with unearthing the indefinable contours of his association with Memmius, the dedicatee of *DRN*: this rapport, which is also embedded in the generic conventions of the teacher-disciple rapport in didactic epic, continues to spark potentially unsolvable controversy – Volk (2002): 69-110 with full literature review remains indispensable; for more recent literature see Fratantuono (2015): 17-18.

<sup>897</sup> Wiseman (2007): 57-71 with his previous contributions listed in the bibliography.

<sup>898</sup> McKie (2009): 247-248.

<sup>899</sup> Du Quesnay and Woodman (2012): 262.

<sup>900</sup> Williams (2012): 1-62 offers an utterly dependable overview with elucidation of the main scholarly perspectives.

<sup>901</sup> See *ibid.*: 17-23 and 26-35 on the impossibility of properly translating *amicitia* into modern languages – in line with the scholar's conclusions on p. 35, I shall mostly leave the Latin word untranslated or opt for the English 'friendship' and its synonyms 'always with [...] a constantly monitored linguistic self-awareness'.

<sup>902</sup> See *ibid.*: 14-15.

<sup>903</sup> See *ibid.*: 23 n. 46 with literature.

<sup>904</sup> *Ibid.*: 44-54 with bibliography, which one should supplement with Verboven (2011): 11-13.

regards to these rapports: the acrimoniously ironic phrase *pete nobiles amicos* in 28.13, in which he denounces provincial governors' imperiousness towards their staff, and the warmly affectionate *me quoniam tibi dicis amicum* in 68.9, where the addressee of the composition bestows the title upon the poet.

In my opinion, still, with all due caution enjoined by the lack of comprehensive information on Catullus's life and 'without supposing that the poems which claim to represent reality or to express the genuine emotions of the poet are "simply" literary constructs',<sup>905</sup> the texts on trial are able to shed valuable light onto his personal views on these matters. Accordingly, I intend to submit that Catullus pays homage to his *amici superiores* exclusively on condition that they behave fairly towards him; by contrast, when he believes that they trample him, he hits back by dint of venomous verses.

Against this backcloth, I shall explore the way in which Callimacheanism intertwines with these relationships: I intend to submit that Catullus favours *carmina Battiadae* with the first category of *amici superiores*; with the second typology, instead, the rather poisonous character of his verses notwithstanding, as I see it, they do not lose all contact with Callimachus's poetics. In particular, in the case of Caius Memmius, with which I plan to begin my discussion, since the poet feels belittled out of the latter's abuse of power, which entails a breach of the cardinal principle of mutuality, he does not hesitate to do the same and even the score. To achieve this goal, Catullus chooses the crude image of oral rape, which, as I shall argue, may amount to a reversal of Callimachus's original usage of erotic terminology in his compositions addressed to queen Berenice II.<sup>906</sup>

Afterwards, the stormy *amicitia* with Gellius will perfectly illustrate the transition from amity to hostility: until the aristocratic dedicatee<sup>907</sup> deported himself civilly towards his proud *amicus inferior*, he received *carmina Battiadae*, perhaps in an encomiastic vein, just

---

<sup>905</sup> Du Quesnay and Woodman (2012): 272.

<sup>906</sup> I am much obliged to my supervisor for encouraging me to investigate this aspect.

<sup>907</sup> See below n. 1076 below on the identification of this individual.

like the translation of Fr. 110 Harder dispatched to Hortalus and introduced with the same turn of phrase. But, when he starts despising Catullus, he is repaid with bellicose lines, which, for all that, in my opinion, do not ensue from a wholesale rejection of Callimacheanism.

Subsequently, I shall tackle the diptych 65-66 addressed to the worthy *amicus superior* Hortalus,<sup>908</sup> to whom the poet sends a Latin rendition of the *Coma Berenices* as a token of his affection. I shall also canvass Catullus's pick of this specific Callimachean piece and propose that it discreetly permits the poet to address his love for Lesbia and his despair at his brother's premature death.

To conclude, I shall claim that in *carmen* 68, probably the most comprehensive illustration of Catullus's stance on *amicitia* with a benevolent member of the senatorial ranks, the poet thankfully rewards a truly deserving friend with a complex mythical narration à la Callimachus, which, once again, interweaves with Lesbia and his *frater*.

### 3.2 Callimachus vis-à-vis the Ptolemaic Court

Pursuant with the plan delineated in the introduction, I start with Callimachus's treatment of kings and, in particular, with *H.* 4.171-175. These verses, which partake in the second prophecy issued by the not-yet-born Apollo in lines 162-190<sup>909</sup> right at the core of the poem,<sup>910</sup> seem to provide a convenient commencement to my argument. For on the one hand, they contain the most manifest mention of Ptolemy II<sup>911</sup> within Callimachus's encomiastic production; on the other hand, they offer a telling instance of the poet's

---

<sup>908</sup> See below n. 1121 on the identification of this person.

<sup>909</sup> On this key oracle see Giuseppetti (2013): 137-164 with literature and Stephens (2015): 206-211 for a dependable line-by-line commentary.

<sup>910</sup> *Ibid.*: 12.

<sup>911</sup> Barbantani (2011): 182.



decidedly original attitude towards tributes to his regal patrons. To wit, I suggest that by means of the characterisation of the monarch's Galatian foes as both 'late-born Titans' and barbarians, Callimachus echoes his own image of his detractors as Telchines with Persian associations in the *Reply*. In so doing, he draws a subtle parallel between his king's success on the battlefield and his own defeat of his antagonists in the artistic arena, which resonates in Fr. 75.64-69 Harder, as well. The correspondence, moreover, gains in strength because the same god Apollo presides over both achievements.<sup>912</sup>

καί νύ ποτε ξυνός τις ἐλεύσεται ἄμμιν ἄεθλος  
 ὕστερον, ὀππότεν οἱ μὲν ἐφ' Ἑλλήνεσσι μάχαιραν  
 βαρβαρικὴν καὶ Κελτὸν ἀναστήσαντες Ἄρηα  
 ὀψίγονοι Τιτῆνες ἀφ' ἐσπέρου ἐσχατόωντος  
 ῥώσωνται [...].<sup>913</sup>

I begin with the mythical face of the depiction of the Gaulish hordes expressed by ὀψίγονοι Τιτῆνες in line 174. Through this appellation, Callimachus locates the Celts into the mythical realm on a par with his critics, whom he transforms into malevolent demons<sup>914</sup> thanks to an analogous literary expedient. More importantly for the sake of my inquiry, he makes both sorts of folkloric creatures partake in the correspondingly doomed enmity against the younger Olympians, whose rout of deities belonging to anterior generations also features in other passages of the poet's oeuvre,<sup>915</sup> including the hymn in honour of Zeus, which will be addressed in the next sub-section. Specifically, whereas, in the poem under scrutiny, Apollo and Ptolemy vanquish the giants during a ξυνός ἄεθλος, in Fr.

---

<sup>912</sup> On Apollo as sponsor of Callimachean vein, see chapter 1; on the relationship between the god and the king in *H.* 4 see Giuseppetti (2013): passim; on a possible ulterior bond between Apollo and Philadelphus in *Aitia* Fr. 114 Harder (*Statua Apollinis Delii*), see *ibid.*: 25-26 and 145, and Harder (2012) II: 892-902 for a detailed commentary.

<sup>913</sup> 'And forthwith, at some later time, a common struggle will come to us, when against the Hellenes late-born Titans will rush on from the extreme west, by raising a barbarian knife and Celtic / war [...].'

<sup>914</sup> On the Telchines see chapter 1 with bibliography.

<sup>915</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2002): 241 and 245-246; for a far-reaching exploration of young deities in Callimachus, see now Radke (2007): 150-181 and 212-234 with previous literature. On the whole, cp. chapter 2 on Callimachus as a child.

75.64-69 Harder<sup>916</sup> Zeus and Poseidon destroy the envious dwarves by way of lightning and earthquake respectively. One might object, though, that the affinity remains imperfect insofar as Apollo does not personally wreak havoc on the resentful imps in this episode from the third book of the *Aitia*; nevertheless, the impression of a partial analogy lessens if one considers that in Fr. 1.22 Harder the poet qualifies Apollo with the epithet Λύκιος, likely on the authority of a legend, according to which the divine guaranty of Callimachean poetics mauls the envious fiends under the guise of a wolf.<sup>917</sup>

On that note, one might suppose one has exhausted the legendary side of the portrayal of Brennus's soldiers and start broaching the ethnic component conveyed by βαρβαρικός, which, despite its vagueness, I decipher as a hint at the Persians in line with the scholarly consensus.<sup>918</sup> Still, one last aspect of the above-mentioned annihilation of the Telchines, i.e. their ὕβρις, deserves further exploration insofar as, in my opinion, it cements the two *côtés* of Callimachus's delineation of the formidable attackers. Although the exact nature of their effrontery defies interpretive efforts,<sup>919</sup> the tribe's chief Demonax is imputed with unforgivable disregard for the immortals, an accusation often made against Xerxes.<sup>920</sup>

In light of this, I can now raise the subject of the ethnic facet of the description of Philadelphus's adversaries (μάχαιραν / βαρβαρικήν in lines 172-173,<sup>921</sup> metonymically embracing the whole people), which, as already stated, evokes the Medes along with

---

<sup>916</sup> Ἐν δ' ὕβριν θανάτῳ τε κεραύνιον, ἐν δὲ γόητας / Τελχίνας μακάρων τ' οὐκ ἀλέγοντα θεῶν / ἠλεῖα Δημόνακτα γέρων ἐνεθήκατο δέλτοις, 'in his writing-tablets, the old man (scil. Xenomedes) put outrage and death by the thunderbolt and those wizards, the Telchines, and Demonax, who, foolishly, did not care for the blessed gods' – see Harder (2012) II: 645-651 for a thorough commentary with bibliography.

<sup>917</sup> Cp. Petrovic (2006): 26 with literature.

<sup>918</sup> See Barbantani (2014): 21-32 substantiates this via her excellent sifting of existing documents of Ptolemaic propaganda, which invariably characterise the Galatian wars as a re-enactment of the Persian wars by taking advantage of Greek and Egyptian subjects' continuously vivid hostility towards the Achaemenids. Stephens (2015): 208 reaches a similar conclusion.

<sup>919</sup> On several facets of this ὕβρις, including aesthetic respects, see Petrovic (2006): 25-29 with literature.

<sup>920</sup> Giuseppetti (2013): 155 with literature.

<sup>921</sup> Callimachus employs again the adjective βαρβαρικός and the noun Ἕλληνας just in a fragment of his *Galatea*, Fr. 379 Pfeiffer, which shares its subject matter with this section of *H.* 4: οὗς Βρέννος ἀφ' ἐσπερίοιο θαλάσσης / ἤγαγεν Ἑλλήνων ἐπ' ἀνάστασιν, '(the Galatians), whom Brennos led from the western sea to the destruction of the Hellenes' – see Giuseppetti (2013): 160 and Stephens (2015): 208.

overtones of enslavement and foreignness.<sup>922</sup> This bears a striking resemblance with the Persian traits, which Callimachus ascribes to his critics, above all their *σχοῖνος Περσίς* in Fr. 1.18 Harder. For, as I claim in chapter 1, this image epitomises their ill-fated will to evaluate poetry by subordinating it to enchaining and alien parameters instead of paying attention exclusively to *τέχνη*, the only legitimate aesthetic criterion in Callimachus's view.

In sum, if one embraces my exegesis, one might conclude that in subsuming his critics under royal archenemies, in *H.* 4 Callimachus discretely integrates a celebration of his aesthetic excellence<sup>923</sup> into the primarily panegyric agenda, by dint of a device which I shall also try to bring to light in the other passages enumerated in the introduction. However, one may contend that this interpretation instantiates an excessive tendency to decipher portions of the text in poetological terms, against which Giuseppetti prudently warns;<sup>924</sup> nonetheless, I hope to have avoided this pitfall by complying with the scholar's criteria: a careful assessment of the lexicon deployed with an eye on the function of the passage within the broader structure of the hymn.<sup>925</sup>

Finally, I would pause for a while to investigate Callimachus's emphasis on Asteria's independence,<sup>926</sup> beginning with line 35: *σὲ δ' οὐκ ἔθλιψεν ἀνάγκη*.<sup>927</sup> The same idea is forcefully echoed again in line 36, by the agency of the adjective *ἄφετος*, 'wandering freely'; furthermore, even the etymology of very name Asteria has been decoded along these lines as resulting from the combination of privative *ἀ-* with the verb *στηρίζω* and the cognate attribute *στερεός*, which, in contrast, evokes firmness.<sup>928</sup> As a result, the moment

---

<sup>922</sup> *Ibid.*: 154-155 and 162-164.

<sup>923</sup> My point tallies with one of the Callimachean accomplishments singled out by Giuseppetti: 'l'*Inno ellenistico* si pone come la celebrazione definitiva, ultima, ovvero come il canto che riassume, e nell'atto stesso supera, tutti i canti che lo hanno preceduto' (*ibid.*: 228).

<sup>924</sup> *Ibid.*: 19-20 with literature.

<sup>925</sup> See *ibid.*: 46-58. His convincing explanation (*ibid.*: 53-54) of the *παίγνια* invented (*εὔρετο*) by the *Δηλιάς νόμῳ* Asteria in lines 323-324 (immediately preceding the close of the poem) as a mirror of *H.* 4 effectively exemplify his approach.

<sup>926</sup> See *ibid.*: passim for brilliant comments.

<sup>927</sup> 'But necessity did not oppress you'.

<sup>928</sup> *Ibid.*: 96 with literature.

in which the island's golden foundations come into being in line 260 in conjunction with Apollo's birth, depends solely on the heroine's brave and autonomous decision to give shelter to the labouring Leto.<sup>929</sup>

This portrayal prompts me to speculate that Callimachus might construe the heroine as an embodiment of his own quest for poetic liberty and, more loosely, as a mirror of his own experience:<sup>930</sup> a native of Cyrene, he moved of his own will to Alexandria. Chronological uncertainties enshroud the exact date in which he reached the new capital of the kingdom, as well as the details of possible movements between his native town and the court because of the war which the two cities were waging on each other between 275 and 246.<sup>931</sup> Be that as it may, throughout his poetic output, he stresses more than his contemporaries his rootedness in the new heart of the Ptolemaic empire and, possibly in polemic with Posidippus, who insists on his Macedonian origin,<sup>932</sup> he never travels to other localities, except for a dream-visit to Mount Helicon in *Aitia* Fr. 2 Harder (*Somnium*).<sup>933</sup>

Before taking my leave of male sovereigns to canvass the poet's handling of their female counterparts, in a brief coda to the picture which I have sketched above I wish to suggest that an artifice of the same ilk enables Callimachus to shape his tribute to the monarch in *H.* 1<sup>934</sup> so that it might accommodate recognition of his own poetic victory as well. In particular, I shall focus on Πηλαγόνων ἐλατῆρα in line 3 and advocate that in it the poet combines legend and history anew to stress the similarity between, on the one hand, Zeus, the king and himself and, on the other, the god's opponents, the enemies of the kingdom and the Telchines.

---

<sup>929</sup>Cp. Apollo's words to his mother about Asteria in line 195 (κείνην γὰρ ἐλεύσεαι εἰς ἐθέλουσαν, 'you will come to her with her consent') with *ibid.*: 106 and Asteria's own courageous invitation to Leto in line 204 (πέρα, πέρα εἰς ἐμέ, Λητοῖ, 'come, come to me, Leto') with *ibid.*: 103.

<sup>930</sup>I am obliged to my supervisor for encouraging me to walk down this hermeneutic path.

<sup>931</sup>See the persuasive account in Stephens (2015): 5, where she points out that exchanges between Cyrene and Alexandria are likely never to have come to a complete halt and inclines towards Callimachus's presence in Alexandria at the time of Arsinoe's death – see below.

<sup>932</sup>Stephens (2005): 229-248.

<sup>933</sup>Stephens (2012): 151.

<sup>934</sup>For a recent discussion of the poem see Stephens (2015): 47-51.

Even if the decryption of the epithet has caused much ink to flow, these days, at least in regards to the mythical compass, scholars tend to concur in explicating it as a reference to Zeus's crushing of the Giants.<sup>935</sup> By contrast, the dispute in human ambit remains: does Callimachus allude to Ptolemy I or his son? In spite of the uncertainties intrinsically clouding the ultimate meaning of these baffling verses, I agree with Barbantani's contention that the Philadelphus suits the context better, even in view of a conceivable foreshadowing of the Galatian emprise in *H.* 4.<sup>936</sup>

In support of this viewpoint, I can adduce my supposition that even in *H.* 1 the poet capitalises on the celebratory parity he creates between his patron and the chief deity to write himself into the self-same glorious destiny. The grounds on which he is entitled to wreath the laurels of poetic fame lie in his sensible choice to follow an uncommon trail in compliance with Apollo's orders rather than foolishly and arrogantly incurring divine wrath like his nemesis, who, apart from being fashioned like the Giants as members of an age group bound to succumb to the denizens of Olympus, 'lost in their delusions of grandeur, in an attempt to thunder like Zeus produced nothing better than the "braying of asses"'.<sup>937</sup>

It is now time to turn attention to Callimachus's commendatory handling of Arsinoe II and Berenice II. Broadly speaking, I shall endeavour to demonstrate that instead of artfully superimposing his written attainments on his masculine emperors' martial deeds, the poet, always awarding priority to the celebration of queenly qualities in harmony with the programme of each creation of his, opts for enlisting, so to speak, his patronesses as guarantors of his distinct artistry. Thus, I shall commence with the so-called *Apotheosis of Arsinoe* (Fr. 228 Pfeiffer)<sup>938</sup> to propound that in it the poet pursues a twofold agenda: on

---

<sup>935</sup> Stephens (2015): 57.

<sup>936</sup> Barbantani (2011): 187-188; Stephens (2015): 57, instead, leans towards the Soter.

<sup>937</sup> Petrovic (2006): 25.

<sup>938</sup> See Müller (2009): 327-335 for a contrast between the version of the queen's funerary ceremony in Fr. 228 Pfeiffer, in which Callimachus arguably brings up incineration in conformity with Greek practice, and

the one hand, he fosters the divine standing of the recently deceased female monarch with a high degree of originality;<sup>939</sup> on the other hand, he turns her into a protector of his poetics; for the sake of clarity, I prefer to begin with Callimachus's strategy in bestowing divinity upon Arsinoe.

In spite of the fragmentary preservation of the opening section of Fr. 228 Pfeiffer, references to a ritual setting abound: *πρόθεσιν πύρ' αἴθειν*, 'kindle a fire as offering' (line 13), *λεπτὸν ὕδωρ*, 'fine water' (line 14), *Θέτ]ιδος τὰ πέραια βωμῶν*, 'the shore in front of the altars of Thetis' (line 15). One additional detail has caught my eye: in line 12, the king himself appears absorbed into offering his deceased wife oblations (*μέγας γαμέτας ὀμεύνω*, 'the great husband to the consort'). In my opinion, to better grasp the religious pregnancy of this vignette, one should consider that it partakes in a much more comprehensive devotional machinery, which Ptolemy set into motion with the purpose to spread the adoration of his beloved wife across all society by availing himself of the contribution of several categories of people, including artists and poets.<sup>940</sup>

Among Caneva's numerous case studies culled from the fine arts, which, however, the scholar does not liken to the poem under examination, I would like to single out a couple of roughly contemporary Egyptian stelai: one currently kept in Moscow and the other belonging to a private collection in Leuven.<sup>941</sup> In both artefacts, while the smoke wafts through the air, the monarch, in line with a traditional conception of the pharaoh in terms of mediator between mortals and gods,<sup>942</sup> is sculpted in the act of sacrificing to his divinised wife in the proximity of an altar, which sanctions the sacrality of the events.<sup>943</sup> The pronounced likeness between the iconography of these reliefs, which, it ought to be

---

the one in the Mendes stele, which probably instead reflects mummification in accordance with Egyptian customs.

<sup>939</sup> On the thorny debate revolving around the date of the queen's death see Caneva (2016): 135-141.

<sup>940</sup> Caneva (2013): 303-322.

<sup>941</sup> *Ibid.*: 303-309.

<sup>942</sup> *Ibid.*: 306-307.

<sup>943</sup> *Ibid.*: 303.

remarked, pertain to Arsinoe's epiclesis as 'Philadelphos', and the scene sketched in Callimachus's poem leads me to deduce that, in interacting with other illustrations of the freshly-established cult, the poet may have picked the traits most suitable to convey the new super-human condition of his sovereign's spouse (above all, the king, the altar and the smoke out of the immolation). In the same breath, owing to his mentioning of the affection binding the royal couple together, which apparently emerges from the meagre text of the *Apotheosis*, he might have likewise decided to celebrate the goddess because of her fondness for her husband. This would also tally with the foundation of the Arsinoeum near the Emporium in the capital, a shrine consecrated by Ptolemy to his deified 'brother-loving' bride,<sup>944</sup> which, on the authority of *Dieg.*,<sup>945</sup> takes place in the coda of the poem.

At the same time, with a typical sleight of hand, by enriching his composition with references to the Dioscuri and the island of Pharos, he also alludes to Arsinoe's fusion with a morally rehabilitated Helen;<sup>946</sup> in so doing, given the traditional assimilation of Menelaus's wife with Aphrodite,<sup>947</sup> he might additionally advert to the queen's association with the goddess of love,<sup>948</sup> whose worship revolves around a specific holy place erected by the admiral Callicrates at the Zephyrion Cape, between Alexandria and Canopus.<sup>949</sup>

On the basis of my account of the divinisation of Arsinoe, I wish to expand on an idea, which I put forward in chapter 1: *λεπτόν ὕδωρ* in line 14 cloaks a programmatic statement, which, resonates with other poetologically charged deployments of the adjective *λεπτός* and tallies with equivalent instances of *Wassermetaphorik*, perhaps with traces of a literary

---

<sup>944</sup> On this sanctuary and the astonishing floating statue of the queen, due to the action of a mighty magnet see Caneva (2015a): 55-57 with literature.

<sup>945</sup> *Dieg.* X 11-13.

<sup>946</sup> On these aspects see Caneva (2014): 38-40 with bibliography; on the Dioscuri see Acosta-Hughes (2012): 166-168.

<sup>947</sup> Prioux (2011): 221.

<sup>948</sup> On this association see Caneva (2014): 36-42 with n. 56 on pp. 36-37 with comprehensive references.

<sup>949</sup> On Arsinoe's cult at this temple with comments on epigrams referring to it by Callimachus and Posidippus see Caneva (2015b): 106-110 with bibliography.

dispute with Posidippus.<sup>950</sup> If one assents to my equation between ‘fine water’ and Fr. 228 Pfeiffer itself and endorses the proposed alignment between the deceased imperial consort and Apollo at the end of *H. 2*, one might gather that, in her capacity as receiver of such a (poetic) offering, the now deified Arsinoe II lends her approval to the essence of the poet’s style typified by λεπτός. Therefore, once again, by consummately discharging his duties of extoller of the Ptolemaic cause, in the same breath Callimachus dexterously profits from the occasion to further his self-promotion.

In addition, my construction of the phrase at hand underpins the presence of Ptolemy II’s wife both at the opening and at the close of the *Aitia*. First of all, the caution enjoined by the battered conditions of the passage notwithstanding, her identification with the tenth Muse in one of the inaugural segments of the *Somnium*,<sup>951</sup> Fr. 2a.1 Harder (... δεκάς),<sup>952</sup> becomes stronger owing to her endorsement of Callimachus’s creed, all the more so assuming one espouses my speculation about the polemical import of λεπτόν ὕδωρ against the backcloth of the literary rivalry with Posidippus. By the same token, her appearance in the *Epilogue*,<sup>953</sup> Fr. 112.2 Harder (μοιαδ’ ἀνάσσης) under the guise of the living princess Berenice II’s (adoptive) mother<sup>954</sup> gains similarly in probability: she would aptly frame the entire poem, granting it her inestimable aesthetic favour. The mention of both Arsinoe II and Ptolemy III’s bride in such a momentous part of the *Aitia* smoothly effects the transition to the second Callimachean pivotal patroness. After a few preliminary observations, I shall begin with the *Victoria Berenices*, subsequently analyse the *Coma Berenices* and end with the *Epilogue*.

---

<sup>950</sup> See chapter 1 for more references.

<sup>951</sup> Harder (2012) II: 93-119.

<sup>952</sup> *Ibid.*: 106-108 with the scholar’s cautious remarks.

<sup>953</sup> *Ibid.*: 855-870.

<sup>954</sup> *Ibid.*: 858-859.



Upon her arrival in Alexandria at some point in the early months of 246 in time for her marriage with Ptolemy III,<sup>955</sup> Berenice II had to mould a suitable public image, most importantly regarding two issues: a convenient handling of her tempestuous past, above all her assassination of her lecherous first husband Demetrius the Fair, and her inclusion into the legitimate Ptolemaic dynastic line.<sup>956</sup> Predictably, then, the achievement of these capital goals necessitated cooperation from every quarter and her fellow countryman Callimachus did not let her down.

Against this backdrop, I now intend to trace the signally peculiar fashion in which, in continuity with his unconventional treatment of the demands of other members of the royal household, the poet undertakes his written efforts in furtherance of the queen's desiderata. This angle, in its turn, will permit me to broach the same female monarch's forbearance towards Callimachus's often ironic, if not outright irreverent word painting of her turbulent history.<sup>957</sup> Ultimately, I shall illuminate the mechanism by which, in a manner of speaking, he appoints her as a sponsor of his poetics.

Let me consider the *Victoria Berenices* (Fr. 54 Harder)<sup>958</sup> and argue that, except for her insertion into her groom's family line, of which he takes masterful care with the apt apostrophe κα[σιγγή]των ἱερὸν αἷμα θεῶν,<sup>959</sup> in line 2,<sup>960</sup> the poet attains the other above-listed targets in the mythical portion of his elegy, especially Molochus's battle against mice. My approach is premised upon Kampakoglou's essay, as a result of which this

---

<sup>955</sup> See the chronological table in van Oppen de Ruiter (2015): 147.

<sup>956</sup> Clayman (2014): 146-147.

<sup>957</sup> *Ibid.*: 79-89 passim draws attention to the female sovereign's magnanimity towards Callimachus's bold image of her in *H.* 5 and *H.* 6 under the guise of Athena and Demeter while exacting a righteous revenge on the trespassing young men Tiresias and Erysichthon. Obviously, Callimachus imagines this as an acquitting innuendo to his queen's just murder of her disloyal husband; yet, he does put her lenity to the test.

<sup>958</sup> For a comprehensive introduction to the elegy see Harder (2012) II: 384-393; see Barbantani (2012): 40-41 for Callimachus's stance toward the Epinician heritage (the remainder of her learned essay usefully explores the reception of this genre in the Hellenistic age); finally, for some other speculations about performative settings see Kampakoglou (2013): 134-138.

<sup>959</sup> 'Holy blood of the sibling gods'.

<sup>960</sup> The intimation of the Philadelphoi's incestuous wedlock, one of the signature habits of the Ptolemies, anticipates her own fashioning as sister-bride in the *Coma* thanks to her renewed virginity redolent of Hera and conducive to her own projection onto Olympus – see Clayman (2014): 99.

episode stands on an equal footing with Hercules's Nemean labour.<sup>961</sup> It also originates from a blend between this fascinating theory and Ambühl's stimulating interpretation: in the extermination of the pestering rodents, Callimachus celebrates the humble farmer's intelligence inasmuch as it contrives the successful traps and provides Hercules with a rewarding tactic to defeat the lion instead of mere reliance upon brute muscular intrepidity.<sup>962</sup>

In view of this, I propose that in acclaiming the faculties of intellect in the battle against mice, the poet may also artfully touch upon the female monarch's slaughter of her unfaithful husband, which in like manner required not just Herculean attributes such as courage and might,<sup>963</sup> but also ingeniousness. Support for my idea may derive from Justin's account of how, at the apex of Demetrius the Fair's exasperation of the Cyrenian court, the queen engineered the assassination of her lustful groom by entrapping him into her mother Apame's chamber: *insidiae Demetrio comparantur, cui, cum in lecto socrus concessisset, percussores immittuntur* (*Epit.* 26.6).<sup>964</sup> Even though the historian makes it clear that armed guards materially implemented the assassination of the lewd man, he intimates that the ambush would not have been efficacious without Berenice's clever planning of the ensnarement of Demetrius (*insidiae* even means 'trap'), which capitalises on his incapability to resist erotic temptations.

Therefore, provided that one trusts Justin's narration,<sup>965</sup> one might tentatively infer that Callimachus crafts a certain degree of humorous kinship between Molochus's and

---

<sup>961</sup> *Ibid.*: 120-127 the scholar cements the importance of the humble farmer and presents a compelling case for raising him almost to the same heroic prestige as Hercules. Besides, he interprets the former's battle with mice, which, in his opinion, display marks reminiscent of Seth and are tantamount to a real plague in Egyptian eyes, in terms of a re-enactment of the topical never-ending struggle opposing the forces of order to those of chaos.

<sup>962</sup> Ambühl (2005): 82-87.

<sup>963</sup> Kampakoglou (2013): 113-120 with bibliography on all the implications of Hercules in the poem; see also Cozzoli (2012): 171-186 on the hero's fortune in contemporary political discourse in surviving Hellenistic poetry.

<sup>964</sup> 'A plot was being contrived at the expenses of Demetrius, against whom assassins were dispatched after he had retired into his mother-in-law's bed'

<sup>965</sup> On Justin's dependability see Heckel (1997): 15-19.

Berenice's strategies. In so doing, I speculate that the poet simultaneously commends the dedicatee of the elegy in view of her open-mindedness vis-à-vis this potentially insulting parallel and the comic disproportion between Hercules, who slays a terrifying lion, and a humble farmer, who gets rid of mere nagging gnawers:<sup>966</sup> others might have taken offence and royal wrath can be fatal for imprudent courtiers.<sup>967</sup> Berenice's leniency, on the other hand, presumably stems from her appreciation of Callimachus's precious contribution to the furtherance of her agenda after her coronation: the queen needed assistance in branding her questionable past more favourably and in forging an appealing popular persona to curry favour with her new subjects;<sup>968</sup> hence, she had to call upon gifted collaborators, above all Callimachus, the paragon of subtlety.

In return, the poet discreetly expects his patroness, whose ascent into Heaven through the power of his poetry is sketched here via an allusion to the analogous fate of her illustrious mythical ancestor,<sup>969</sup> to champion his style, which, as suggested in chapter 2, hinges, *inter alia*, conspicuously upon his daring violation of the principle of appropriateness. My hypothesis gains in strength if one considers that aesthetics motivate the meaningful choice of *λεπταλέους* to describe a stunning veil woven by Egyptian women at the opening of the ode in line 15 (a pertinent metaphor for the unfolding poem).<sup>970</sup> In addition, it becomes even more pointed if the artefact is meant to be embroidered precisely with Hercules's killing of the monster and adorn a statue dedicated on the royal Nemean victory.<sup>971</sup>

It is now time to approach the *Coma Berenices* (Fr. 110a Harder);<sup>972</sup> first, though, I wish to state straightforwardly that I shall pass over several of the copious complex issues

---

<sup>966</sup> Kampakoglou (2013): *passim*.

<sup>967</sup> See above n. 378 for literature on the case of Sotades and the risks of irony.

<sup>968</sup> Clayman (2014): 103-104.

<sup>969</sup> *Ibid.*: 113-114 with literature.

<sup>970</sup> Both Prioux (2011): 202 and Harder (2012) II: 412 spot the programmatic force of the attribute.

<sup>971</sup> See Clayman (2014): 147 with literature.

<sup>972</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 793-801 for a comprehensive survey.

surrounding the poem because they have no bearing upon my argument. These range from, but are by no means limited to, the performative contours,<sup>973</sup> possible discrepancies between a former version circulating autonomously and the version currently merged into the fourth book of the *Aitia*<sup>974</sup> and the reliability of Catullus's rendition of the elegy in his *carmen* 66 as a source to reconstruct the missing portions of the Greek text.<sup>975</sup> Therefore, I shall limit myself to the one matter of importance for lines 44-50, which I intend to canvass: the speaking lock's recurring utterance of grief.

The peevishness of the garrulous βόστρυχος when it vents its annoyance ensuing from its separation from the queen's head strikes one as noteworthy within the limited quantity of extant text. Some scholars have gone so far as to claim that by dint of this ironic touch the poet undermines the seriousness of the elegy.<sup>976</sup> But this seems too extreme a position: although a certain colouring of playfulness permeates these verses, an outright desecration of a constituent trait of Ptolemaic ideology would certainly exasperate even a tolerant monarch like Berenice.<sup>977</sup> Rather, van Oppen de Ruiter has cogently explicated the lamentations as part of the ritual mourning preceding deification, which foreshadows the fate of the queen herself.<sup>978</sup> Moreover, Harder has observed that afterwards the curl 'develops "constructive" ideas [...] to make the separation less sad'<sup>979</sup> and compensate for her inability to enjoy the pure oils with which young Berenice used to sprinkle her hair: it sets itself up as guardian of the marital bed by instructing lawfully married and devoted wives to pour a libation of scented perfumes to worship it prior to intercourse with their husbands; by contrast, it dismisses gifts from women who do not conform with these

---

<sup>973</sup> See van Oppen de Ruiter (2015): 75-88 and 110.

<sup>974</sup> See Kampakoglou (2013): 127 with literature.

<sup>975</sup> Given the immense literature on this subject, I am content with indicating the latest in-depth critique in Young (2015): 129-165.

<sup>976</sup> Bechtold (2011): 92-95 favours such an alternative; see also Harder (2012) II: 797 for further supporters.

<sup>977</sup> Clayman (2014): 103-104.

<sup>978</sup> See van Oppen de Ruiter (2015): 104-109 with literature; see also *ibid.*: 88-109 with literature for an authoritative overview of all relationships between the position of the lock in the firmament and the resulting assimilation of Berenice with several goddesses.

<sup>979</sup> Harder (2012) II: 795.

criteria. Yet, one ought to heed a rider: since the Greek text breaks off here (Fr. 110a.78), the scholar must base her contention on lines 79-88 of Catullus's translation of the *Coma*,<sup>980</sup> but the controversy about whether these verses constitute a Catullan interpolation or correspond to the Callimachean original continues to rage.<sup>981</sup>

Against this background, let me analyse lines 45-50 to propose that they may conceal an allusion to the Telchines, which empowers the poet to assert his triumph over them once again, right at the end of the *Aitia*, in an ideal pendant to the *Reply*.

βουπόρος Ἀρσινόης μητρὸς σέο, καὶ διὰ μέ[σσου  
Μηδείων ὀλοαὶ νῆες ἔβησαν Ἄθω.  
τί πλόκαμοι ῥέξωμεν, ὅτ' οὔρεα τοῖα σιδή[ρῳ  
εἴκουσιν; Χαλύβων ὡς ἀπόλοιτο γένος,  
γείοθεν ἀντέλλοντα, κακὸν φυτόν, οἷ μιν ἔφηναν  
πρῶτοι καὶ τυπίδων ἔφρασαν ἐργασίην.<sup>982</sup>

Leaving aside the thorny debate revolving around the correct decoding of lines 43-45, which does not affect my discussion, I agree with Harder's reconstruction of the gist of the passage:<sup>983</sup> Callimachus draws a comparison between the cutting of the queen's ringlet and two far more impressive excision enterprises, i.e. the quarrying of an obelisk in the end destined to adorn the Arsinoeum at Ptolemy II's behest and the perforation of the Athos peninsula at the hands of Xerxes's soldiers. By evoking the overwhelming force of σίδηρος, suitable for destroying bulky mountains, the speaking curl wonders despondently to what avail it may withstand the instrument which severed it from Berenice II's head. This rhetorical question cues subsequently an execration of the inventors of the iron manufacture.

---

<sup>980</sup> For a meticulous commentary on these lines see Du Quesnay (2012): 162-175.

<sup>981</sup> See *ibid.*: 163 with full bibliography for an accurate review of all scholarly positions on this intricate matter. One ought to add Rossi (2000): 299-312 to the list of supporters of the Callimachean paternity of these verses and Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 231-232 to the proponents of the Catullan interpolation.

<sup>982</sup> 'The ox-piercer of your mother Arsinoe and the destructive ships of the Medes sailed through Mount Athos. What can we locks do when such mountains yield to iron? May the race of the Cahalybes perish, who first revealed it, rising from the earth, an evil growth, and thought the work of the hammers'.

<sup>983</sup> Harder (2012) II: 814-817 with bibliography.

If one inspects the lexicon and the tone, one might discover similarities linking the Chalybes to the Telchines. Of course, prudence must be exerted: whereas the former are an actual ancient tribe inhabiting the regions around the Black Sea, the latter belong to a mythical race dwelling predominantly in Cos and Rhodes. Nevertheless, apart from sharing the self-same designation via γένος and a chronological dimension located in a remote past, they partake in a craftsmanship in working metals and bear the marks of the poet's equally damning portrayal: both groups incur his execration expressed by the desiderative optative ὡς ἀπόλοιτο in Fr.110.47 Harder and the imperative ἔλλετε in Fr.1.17 Harder.

Over and above, I detect an ulterior correlation by means of the Persians, who cast their baleful shadow over the passage under examination, albeit, *stricto sensu*, somewhat indirectly. Nonetheless, since the episode encapsulated in line 45 epitomises the ὕβρις marking that nation in Greek minds,<sup>984</sup> by extension arrogance redounds upon the Chalybes, thereby intensifying their affinity with the spiteful magicians muttering against Callimachus in Fr. 1.1-2 Harder. Furthermore, the adjective ὀλοαί, which loathes the threatening vessels in Fr.110.45 Harder, in like manner accurses the poet's envious critics in Fr. 1.17 Harder.<sup>985</sup>

The last layer of similitude I set forth relates to the polarity between hugeness and smallness, in which the latter will in the end prevail: in the *Coma*, it is embodied by the Chalybes's iron tools adequate to penetrate mountains and by the lock respectively; in the *Reply*, it manifests itself in all the metaphors opposing Callimachus to the Telchines.<sup>986</sup> In both poems, in the end, littleness will prevail: the curl will be turned into a constellation and the poet will eternally enjoy the Muses and Apollo's benevolence.

I would like to round off this sub-section with a few thoughts on the subject of Berenice's tolerance: even here, the female monarch demonstrates a high degree of equanimity. For,

---

<sup>984</sup> Giuseppetti (2013): 184-185.

<sup>985</sup> Harder (2012) II: 818 notes the parallel, but does not follow through.

<sup>986</sup> See chapter 1 with bibliography.

not only, if my analysis hits the mark, is she expected to tolerate that her lock acts as a sponsor of Callimachean aesthetics, but she is also required to bear that her deification is narrated from the potentially desecrating perspective of a rather polemical ringlet, which complains considerably before acquiescing to its new godlike status.<sup>987</sup>

If one subscribes to my argumentation, Callimachus's terminal homage to Berenice II in Fr.110.2-3 Harder becomes more well-grounded: the living queen (ἀνάσσης / ...]τερης) and guarantor of his creed joins forces with her mother Arsinoe in proclaiming permanently and afresh the poet's supreme artistry.<sup>988</sup> This tallies neatly with Callimachus's decision to place the whole second half of the poem under her protection,<sup>989</sup> a choice towards which the poet might be imagined to gesture if, by sympathising with Petrovic and Petrovic's last understanding of *Ep.* 51 Pfeiffer, one decrypts Χαρίτων in line 2 of the *Epilogue* as a reference to the addition of Books 3 and 4 to Books 1 and 2 of the *Aitia* as 'The Charites'.<sup>990</sup> In the concluding sub-section of the Greek half of this chapter, I shall explore two poems for courtiers not belonging to the royal family, to wit *Victoria Sosibii* (Fr. 384 Pfeiffer), with which I intend to begin, and *Iamb.* 12, to submit that even here Callimachus masterfully fuses propaganda with the promotion of his excellence.

The *Victoria Sosibii* (Fr. 384 Pfeiffer), Callimachus's only surviving epinician ode in elegiac couplets along with *Victoria Berenices*, poses a bewildering array of interpretive difficulties, such as the identity of the *laudandus*,<sup>991</sup> the reconstruction of the structure,<sup>992</sup> the exact number of Sosibius's victories adverted to in lines 23-27<sup>993</sup> and the insertion of an epigram towards the end of the poem.<sup>994</sup> Still, my objectives in this chapter free me from

---

<sup>987</sup> For further remarks along the same lines, see Clayman (2014): 103-104.

<sup>988</sup> Harder (2012) II: 858-860.

<sup>989</sup> *Ibid.*: 391-392 with literature.

<sup>990</sup> Petrovic and Petrovic (2003): 194-204.

<sup>991</sup> Barbantani (2012): 41 with n. 25.

<sup>992</sup> Fuhrer (1992): 149-150.

<sup>993</sup> Lelli and Parlato (2008): 59-65.

<sup>994</sup> Meyer (2005): 238-241.

entering these debates and urge me to sooner contemplate the poet's impressive ability to do justice to his patron's encomium without renouncing his artistic creed.

With this goal in mind, I select lines 28-34 as a telling case study: I intend to propose that while engaging in the patriotic aggrandisement of North Africa to the rank of new centre of the world and heir to Hellenic prestige,<sup>995</sup> these verses enact a sophisticated assertion of his poetics.

‘καλὰ μοι θρεπτὸς ἔτεισε γέρα  
... [... οὐ] γάρ πώ τις ἐπ[ι] πτόλιν ἤγαγ’ ἄεθλον  
]. ταφίων τῶνδε πανηγυρίων  
... κ]αὶ πουλύς, ὄν οὐδ’ ὄθεν οἶδεν ὀδεύω  
θητὸς ἀνήρ, ἐνὶ γούν τῶδ’ ἕα λιτότερος  
κε[ίνω]ν οὐς ἀμογητὶ διὰ σφυρὰ λευκὰ γυναικῶν  
κ[αὶ πα]ῖς ἀβρέκτω γούνατι πεζὸς ἔβη’.<sup>996</sup>

At first sight, one notices the Nile's praise of his nursling because he has repaid it for bringing him up by dint of his sportive triumphs, which have empowered Sosibius to erase the unique blemish on the Nile's reputation: want of Egyptian prize-winning athletes used to shame it in front of incomparably less illustrious rivers, which, however, could boast of victorious champions raised on their banks.<sup>997</sup>

Yet, in my view, there is more to these verses than meets the eye at a cursory glance, scilicet programmatic force, in order to unearth which, I shall build on one of Stephens's inspiring remarks on these lines within her wide-ranging and seminal quest for Egyptian elements informing Hellenistic poetry.<sup>998</sup> She posits that Callimachus is indebted to North African tropes depicting a low Nile and echoes the technical deployment of the adjective ἄβροχος in documents from the third century onwards, where it denotes poor flooding.

---

<sup>995</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 167-168.

<sup>996</sup> ‘My nursling has repaid me with a beautiful reward: nobody had yet brought a prize to the city from these sepulchral festivals ... (Although I am ...) and mighty, I, concerning whom no mortal man knows whence I travel, at least in this particular respect was more insignificant than those rivers, across which the white ankles of women step without effort and a child on foot (steps) without wetting his knee’.

<sup>997</sup> For acclaim of Sosibius's εὐεργεσία, which emulates the sovereigns' munificence, in lines 53-58 see comments in Barbantani (2011): 189, Weber (2011): 236 and Barbantani (2012): 42 with n. 32 for literature.

<sup>998</sup> Stephens (2003): 98-100.



Consequently, inasmuch as the poet portrays other rivers with a terminology ordinarily characterising the Nile, the scholar deduces that Callimachus phrases the speech in question in mocking terms. This suggestion seems in a position to yield additional results if one brings into play the poet's *Wassermetaphorik* and the sense of λιτός in *H.* 2.10 – in the service of perspicuity, I shall approach the former topic in the first place.

As proposed in chapter 1 and concisely touched upon above, when Callimachus clothes programmatic statements in watery garb, without fail he awards his preferences to superior sorts of bodies of water: λεπτὸν ὕδωρ in Fr. 228.14 Pfeiffer (*Apotheosis of Arsinoe*) and the choicest drops bubbling up from an undefiled source in *H.* 2.110-112. Without delving into the disputed elucidation of the finale of this hymn,<sup>999</sup> I think it fit to recall its gist to clarify the verses under scrutiny in *Victoria Sosibii*. One has probable reason to discern poetological import behind Apollo's reversal of Envy's endorsement of the poet 'who does not sing even as much as the sea' in line 106. In his rejoinder from line 107 to line 112, the god advocates rather Callimachus's preference for quality over quantity, here embodied by ὀλίγη λίβας ἄκρον ἄωτον in line 112: in lines 108-109 he claims that a major river may well boast of imposing streams (μέγας ῥόος), but the very same current is defiled by a huge amount of συρφετός and λύματα γῆς.

If one goes by these hermeneutic lines, one might set out to collate the two passages: even the Nile appears to stigmatise the defects of its massive flow, notably dearth of lustre resulting from the absence of prize-winning Egyptian athletes in the prestigious games taking place in mainland Greece.

Admittedly, though, one has to acknowledge the differences: lines 31-34 in Fr. 384 Pfeiffer omit any mention of refuse soiling the waters, which would strike one as jarringly incongruous on account of the vital function of silt in assuring the fertility of the whole of

---

<sup>999</sup> See chapter 1 with bibliography.

Egypt. Furthermore, since the head of line 31 is missing owing to a lacuna, one must not overlook that a constituent of the picture remains unknown. Nevertheless, the general thrust of the Nile's speech induces one to conjecture a concessive clause.<sup>1000</sup> In addition, the occurrence of the attribute *πουλύς* in line 31, which closely mirrors *μέγας* in *H.* 2.108 (again in relation to masses of water), shores up the notion of a contrast between the Nile's grand eddies and the scarcity of fame.

At this point, an inspection of *λιτότερος* in line 32 of Fr. 384 Pfeiffer should prove beneficial and contribute ulterior corroboration to my hypothesis. Elsewhere, when Callimachus employs *λιτός* to denote non-human entities, for instance the ointments deployed by young Berenice in Fr. 110.78 Harder<sup>1001</sup> and Athena in *H.* 5.26,<sup>1002</sup> the adjective translates as 'simple' with positive overtones.<sup>1003</sup> In *H.* 2.9-10, instead, the poet establishes a polarity between *ἔσθλοί* and *λιτοί*: the happy few worthy of assisting to Apollo's epiphany and the commoners to whom the deity does not deign to reveal himself.<sup>1004</sup> Although the *Victoria Sosibii* does not involve any discrepancy between categories of people, I maintain that in applying the adjective *λιτός* to a personified river and in consideration of the substance of its words, the poet wants the adjective to carry the similarly charged meaning of 'common', 'insignificant'.

So, in line with one of the staples of his poetics, I contend that Callimachus intimates that magnitude per se is not tantamount to real excellence: far more negligible rivers have achieved notoriety thanks to victorious competitors nursed along their banks and immortalised by prominent poets. To blot out its inferiority in this ambit, river Nile necessitated Sosibius's triumphs and, even more importantly, Callimachus's epinician ode:

---

<sup>1000</sup> See D'Alessio (2001<sup>3</sup>) II: 685 n. 20 for some supplements.

<sup>1001</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 845.

<sup>1002</sup> See Stephens (2015): 250.

<sup>1003</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 765 for the probable aesthetic acceptance of *λιτόν* in Fr. 100.4 Harder, where, provided that one approves of Vossius's emendation of the manuscripts' reading *λίθον* into *λιτόν*, the attribute, which here accompanies a statue of Hera of Samos, signifies 'unadorned'.

<sup>1004</sup> Stephens (2015): 84; see also Petrovic (forthcoming) for a construal of the antithesis in regards to class: the king's *φίλοι* against masses.

notwithstanding, or rather precisely due to, its shortage of rambunctious grandeur – after all, it is made of small drops – it is the only sort of poetry qualified to impart genuine and enduring brilliance.

The Greek half of this chapter will close with *Iamb.* 12, an instantiation of the otherwise unattested, but in all probability fairly popular γενεθλιακός λόγος.<sup>1005</sup> Its place within the same sub-section as *Victoria Sosibii* is warranted by the fact that, according to *Dieg.* X.26-28, it is dedicated not to a member of the ruling family, but to the daughter of Leon, who is termed rather generically as γνώριμος τοῦ ποιητοῦ, ‘acquaintance of the poet’. The matter, nonetheless, turns out to be even more baffling:<sup>1006</sup> the sole other source providing supplemental information, P.Lips. Inv. 290v, Fr. b,<sup>1007</sup> equally succinctly labels him as συγγενής, ‘a relative’, in line 5, thus forcing one to assay to reconcile the discrepancy between the two appellations.<sup>1008</sup>

Be that as it may, pending fresh papyrological discoveries shedding more light on Leon’s mysterious biographical details, one can still legitimately concentrate on the core of the piece,<sup>1009</sup> i.e. the correspondence between Callimachus’s own μέλος in honour of Leon’s daughter and Apollo’s ὕμνος in laudation of Zeus’s daughter Hebe, both meant to celebrate

---

<sup>1005</sup> For bibliography on this genre see Ambühl (2005): 296 n. 308.

<sup>1006</sup> Ambühl (2005): 295 n. 307 goes so far as to suppose that Leon may not have existed.

<sup>1007</sup> Colomo (2009): 1-20 offers the first critical edition with commentary of this papyrus.

<sup>1008</sup> In *ibid.*: 7-10, the philologist proposes three accounts: firstly, Callimachus phrased the contours of his relationship with Leon in an ambiguous manner, for example by means of φίλος or οἰκεῖος, which led the diegetes to interpret it as γνώριμος and the scholiast to decode it as συγγενής. Alternatively, one might imagine that the author of P.Lips. Inv. 290v, Fr. b employed συγγενής as synonym with γνώριμος, a possibility borne out by some attestations. Thirdly, but only on the basis of a conjectural reconstruction of the lost bits of the papyrus in lines 5-6, one could surmise that the scholiast sought to support his explanation of the rapport between Callimachus and Leon in terms of a familial bond by maintaining that the latter married the former’s sister. At the moment, it exists no confirmation of such a theory: the *Suda* entry Καλλίμαχος (κ 227 and 228) registers only one sister by the name of Μεγατίμα, who is reported to have wedded a Στασήνωρ. As a result, one would have to assume either a second marriage on the part of Μεγατίμα or a second sister altogether. Finally, to corroborate the marriage scenario, Colomo intimates that the poet lauds his friend in an extraordinary manner ‘durch den Vergleich zwischen Leons Familienfest [...] und der von Kallimachos selbst geschaffenen mythischen Episode der Amphidromia der Hebe, Tochter von Hera und Zeus, des höchsten Paares im Olymp’ (*ibid.*:9).

<sup>1009</sup> I shall leave aside the vexed (but immaterial for the purposes of my inquiry) question of the name of the truthful man mentioned in lines 13-15 – Giuseppetti (2006): 211-213 tentatively speculates that Callimachus may call to mind Epimenides.

the seventh day after the birth of the two addressees.<sup>1010</sup> To do so, one must accept that the two girls tend to fade into the background as rather passive dedicatees:<sup>1011</sup> in the first 20 lines, Leon's daughter features as the recipient of Callimachus's εὐχαί and μέλος.<sup>1012</sup> By analogy, in lines 21-70,<sup>1013</sup> in the context of a competition announced by Zeus and Hera for the most beautiful gift to their daughter,<sup>1014</sup> Hebe is pictured as the receiver of splendid presents from several deities, among which the victorious Apollinian hymn.<sup>1015</sup> Besides, Apollo enhances Hebe's marginalisation even more strikingly: the god never actually *sings* a fully-fledged hymn in honour of the new-born goddess, maybe complete with a prophecy on the subject of her future deeds and mirroring the glorious fate of Leon's daughter.<sup>1016</sup> Rather, Apollo *incorporates* the ὕμνος in the lengthy monologue he delivers

---

<sup>1010</sup>With respect to Leon's daughter this chronological detail emerges from the intricate web, which stretches out across the (sometimes) evanescent traces of lines 1-20 and joins together invocations to Artemis and the Moirai and the mention of a heath. Giuseppetti (2006): 207-214 masterfully unravels the problem and infers that Callimachus evokes the Amphidromia, a festivity held on the seventh day after a child's birth, which marks the official admission of the new-born into the community in concomitance with the choice of the infant's name. See also D'Alessio (2001<sup>3</sup>) I: 634 n. 129 on the place enjoyed by the ἰστίη in the unfolding of the ritual; lastly, for several restorations of the first 5 lines in light of her discovery of the Scholia transmitted in P.Lips. Inv. 290v, Fr. b, see Colomo (14-20). In regards to the feast on Mount Olympus, instead, the text of *Iamb.* 12 explicitly mentions ἐβδόμην Ἡρ[η] θ[υ]γατρὸς ἡμέρην, 'her daughter's seventh day' (line 22).  
<sup>1011</sup> Ambühl (2005): 296 summarises well: 'Der Schwerpunkt des 12. *Iambos* liegt [...] weniger auf den beiden neugeborenen Mädchen, die nur als passive Empfängerinnen von Geschenken in Erscheinung treten, als vielmehr auf den Gratulanten und ihren exquisiten Präsenten'.

<sup>1012</sup> See above n. 122.

<sup>1013</sup>D'Alessio (2001<sup>3</sup>) II: 637 n. 139 observes that Callimachus effectuates the transition from reality to fable in lines 19-23 by means of a rather tortuous syntactic juncture, which centres precisely on the announcement of song in celebration of the little girl.

<sup>1014</sup> See Giuseppetti (2006): 214-216 for the articulations of this part of the text, in which Callimachus spins a tale of his own invention – on the novel mythological narration see also Ambühl (2005): 296. The Swiss scholar (*ibid.*: 301) also moots Zeus's careful apportioning of divine prerogatives to Hebe without triggering the other gods' jealousy. I would append that once this interesting observation is read against the backcloth of the gathering of all gods and goddesses, who, at the behest of the supreme rulers of Olympus, compete for the best present for Hebe, it accords nicely with Callimachus's wide-ranging attempt to make the celestial court reflect the welter of rules and rivalries defining Ptolemaic etiquette and hierarchies – see Petrovic (2016): 164-179 and Petrovic (forthcoming).

<sup>1015</sup> *Dieg.* X. 29-31.

<sup>1016</sup> Ambühl (2005): 298-300 suggests that Callimachus may have desisted from such a praise of Hebe out of an awareness that Hebe's marriage with her half-brother Hercules exclusively suits the royal couple, an episode the poet could have inserted in his lost poem glorifying the wedding of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II (Fr. 392 Pfeiffer). In addition, even though the poem lasts twenty more lines (Giuseppetti (2006): 217-218) and the poor preservation of the coda hampers any assumption – line 79 (εἶκ', ἄναξ) is the solitary factor offering some guidance, which, on the face of it, perhaps signals that the poet requests Apollo to give way to him – it seems unlikely that Callimachus crammed a fully-fledged hymn into such a scarce space.

Ambühl, moreover, acutely points out that if one espouses this position, one ought to note that in *Iamb.* 12 Callimachus distances himself from the pattern, to which he conforms in other hymns of his, most perceptibly *H.* 4. At the same time, *ibid.*: 300-301, she remarks that *Iamb.* 12 does display some characteristic features of the hymnic genre: the initial invocation of Artemis, the assemblage of the gods and Apollo's prophetic

(lines 55-70),<sup>1017</sup> which concerns itself markedly with a double-edged poetological utterance in lines 65-70 to sanction the superiority of his donation, i.e. his ὕμνος. For, on the one hand, by insisting on the artistry imbuing Hephaestus's and Athena's gifts,<sup>1018</sup> the god highlights that not only poetry exhibits the supreme signs of τέχνη in like manner (a confirmation of the poet's assertion of poetic technique as legitimate criterion of aesthetic judgement in Fr.1.17-18 Harder), but also that it surpasses other artefacts on technical grounds.<sup>1019</sup> On the other hand, by depicting poetry as an offering to the gods surpassing all the others due to its eternal integrity, a point reinforced through a hint at the ancient etymology of ὕμνος as 'ever-lasting', Apollo chimes in with and reinforces other capital programmatic statements of his in the Callimachean corpus, which are premised on the same conceptual analogy: Fr. 1.21-24 Harder and *H.* 2.105-112.<sup>1020</sup>

What can one deduce from my account of *Iamb.* 12? In my estimation, one can profitably view the poem as a summa of the Callimachean encomiastic technique,<sup>1021</sup> which I have been endeavouring to unearth; so, the following remarks serve to recapitulate the main threads of my argument. Above all, to consummately bolster the divinisation of the ruling family, Callimachus broadly maps the Alexandrian court onto the Olympian hall and pays special attention to female members of the household.<sup>1022</sup> Subsequently, the poet elects the hymn as the most coruscating offering to deities and their royal hypostases and,

---

vaticination of the never-ending splendour of his poetic gift in contrast to the corruptibility of golden objects contaminating humankind.

<sup>1017</sup> Lines 58-64, which configure themselves as an invective at the subversion of upright moral values caused by gold and the greed it inspires and anchor the poem into the iambic tradition will not be investigated further because it does not pertain to the scope of these pages – on this issue see Ambühl (2005): 300 and 304-305; Morrison (2007): 209-210 and Giuseppetti (2006): 219-225.

<sup>1018</sup> I note in passing that Woodard (2014): 186-189 tentatively propounds that by lines 65-67 (τὴν Ἀθηναίης δὲ καὶ ἑτέρων δόσιν / καίπερ εὖ σμίλησιν ἠκριβωμένην, / ὁ πρόσω φοιτέων ἀμαυρώσει χρ[ό]νος, 'time moving forward will obscure the gift of Athena and the others, even though it is consummately made with chisels'), Callimachus may evoke epic poetry metaphorically engraved on cold metal, which, unlike his untarnishable poetic offering, will corrode over time.

<sup>1019</sup> Ambühl (2005): 302-304.

<sup>1020</sup> Petrovic (2012a): 119-127.

<sup>1021</sup> I am beholden to my supervisor for helping me to clarify some doubts about this perspective.

<sup>1022</sup> Cp. my paragraphs above on the compositions for Arsinoe II and Berenice II.

simultaneously, the most effective vehicle of eulogy.<sup>1023</sup> Finally, whenever Callimachus attends to panegyric poetry, he never fulfils a slavish drudgery: conscious of the fundamental role he plays in furthering Ptolemaic propaganda, he lavishes his extraordinary talent to meet his patrons' and patronesses' expectations. Furthermore, he succeeds in discreetly and elegantly sprinkling the passages I discussed with programmatic strength and, even more remarkably, in appointing them, as it were, as guarantors of his poetics. This clearly presupposes a conspicuous degree of tolerance on the part of kings and queens, but I think they have been copiously rewarded for their (financial) generosity: thanks to Callimachus's poetry, their names will live forever.

### 3.3 Catullus face to face with his *amici superiores*

In accordance with my blueprint, I shall begin with Catullus's strained relation with Caius Memmius, whom he escorted to Bithynia, where, by decree of the senate, the latter had been appointed governor between 57 and 56.<sup>1024</sup> This land was of considerable importance for Catullus and his family: not only did it cover the body of his prematurely deceased brother, but it also played a pivotal role in the familial enterprise of *garum* trade.<sup>1025</sup> So, it appears not implausible to suppose that Catullus's family attempted to persuade Memmius to include the poet into his retinue.<sup>1026</sup> In order to achieve this goal,

---

<sup>1023</sup> This dovetails tremendously with two Theocritean passages: 17.7-8 (αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Πτολεμαῖον ἐπιστάμενος καλὰ εἰπεῖν / ὕμνοι δὲ καὶ ἀθανάτων γέρας αὐτῶν, 'I, who know how to commend, shall sing of Ptolemy: hymns are the meed even of the immortals') and 22.223 (γεράων δὲ θεοῖς κάλλιστον ἀοιδαί, 'songs are the most beautiful of gifts for the gods') – see Petrovic (2012b): 171-173 with literature for comments.

<sup>1024</sup> Cairns (2003): 165 with literature.

<sup>1025</sup> *Ibid.*: 165-166.

<sup>1026</sup> *Ibid.*: 166.

probably, as it was customary,<sup>1027</sup> they relied on a recommendation letter,<sup>1028</sup> which might have been written by Hortensius Hortalus.<sup>1029</sup>

If one accepts this scenario, one can infer that by virtue of the epistle the poet was bound to honour both his *commendator* Hortalus, to whom he offers the diptych of *carmina* 65-66, which will be researched in due course, and his praetor Memmius.<sup>1030</sup> Something sorely disappointed Catullus, though, who wreaked vengeance on his superior in two poems of his, to wit 10.5-13, which I shall address first, and 28.9-13, both in Phalaecian hendecasyllables; here are his words:

*huc ut uenimus, incidere nobis  
sermones uarii, in quibus, quid esset  
iam Bithynia, quomodo se haberet,  
et quonam mihi profuisset aere.  
 respondi id quod erat, nihil neque ipsis  
nec<sup>1031</sup> praetoribus esse nec cohorti,  
cur quisquam caput unctius referret,  
praesertim quibus esset irrumator  
praetor, nec faceret pili cohortem.<sup>1032</sup>*

After narrating<sup>1033</sup> the events occasioning a chatty meeting with Varus and his new sweetheart, which I scrutinised in the previous chapter,<sup>1034</sup> at the behest of his two interlocutors (above all of the little tart, as the second half of the composition lays bare) Catullus focuses on his recent stay in Bithynia. Since interest appears to lie particularly in

---

<sup>1027</sup> Verboven (2002): 292-293: '[r]equests directed to provincial governors for the protection of the interests of the *commendati* were quite common'

<sup>1028</sup> On this practice in general see *ibid.*: 339-340 and 343-344.

<sup>1029</sup> Du Quesnay (2012): 156 and 160-162 on Hortalus as intermediary between the two parties – the scholar, however, does not envisage the recommendation letter.

<sup>1030</sup> Verboven (2002): 318.

<sup>1031</sup> On the philological uncertainties surrounding the head of line 10 see the full apparatus in Kiss's online edition.

<sup>1032</sup> When we arrived hither, various conversations fell upon us, among which how Bithynia was at present, what its situation was, and to what extent it was advantageous for me in terms of money. I replied with the truth: there was not anything by now neither for the praetors themselves nor for the staff, by virtue of which anybody could come back richer, especially for those having a mouth-raping hector of a praetor, who does not value his cohort a straw!

<sup>1033</sup> See McCarthy (2013): 51-70 on the complex interplay between Catullus the narrator and Catullus the character.

<sup>1034</sup> See pp. 145-147 above.

the financial benefits he may have garnered, Catullus draws a portrait of a severely impoverished region, where no one managed to line one's pockets, a fortiori those under the orders of a 'fucker of a praetor' (line 12-13),<sup>1035</sup> who did not give a damn about his *cohors*.

In pursuit of the agenda of this chapter, the lion's share of attention will go to the damning description of Memmius as *irrumator praetor*. The crude *nomen agentis* labels a man who forces someone else to fellate him and, in so doing, hugely degrades the receptive partner's reputation.<sup>1036</sup> Why does Catullus opt for such a charged designation? The impossibility of reconstructing the *Realien* of Memmius's term notwithstanding, I cannot concur with Braund in surmising that via *irrumator* Catullus obliquely praises the praetor's endeavours to comply with the duty<sup>1037</sup> incumbent on any governor to prevent his *comites* from rapaciousness at the expense of the inhabitants of the region under his responsibility.<sup>1038</sup> Apart from the fact that no surviving sources bear out his conjecture, his assertion that '*irrumatio* was an acceptable metaphor for the assertion of rank'<sup>1039</sup> overlooks the stigma characterising this sexual practice.<sup>1040</sup>

Rather, I agree with scholars who argue that *irrumator* here hints at the domineering fashion in which Memmius wields his praetorial authority over his staff.<sup>1041</sup> Besides, insofar as other available documentation confirms Catullus's allegation that in mid-first century Bithynia found itself in strained circumstances,<sup>1042</sup> I would add that the poet denounces Memmius's tendency to assert complacently his supremacy by persistently and

---

<sup>1035</sup> On the obscenity culled from ordinary speech in this poem see Jocelyn (1999): 369.

<sup>1036</sup> See Stevens (2013): 56-58 with full bibliography.

<sup>1037</sup> On the difficulties with which this official post was fraught see now Bérenger (2014).

<sup>1038</sup> Braund (1996): 51-53.

<sup>1039</sup> *Ibid.*: 53.

<sup>1040</sup> See n. 560 above. On analogous grounds, I cannot concord with Fitzgerald (1995): 69: 'Catullus's thorough description of the leisurely *irrumatio* causes the language of aggression to teeter over into the language of pleasure, so that the usual distribution of roles is smudged as the poet speaks the aggressor's pleasure'.

<sup>1041</sup> Cairns (2003): 179-181; Tatum (2007): 345-346 and Williams (2010<sup>2</sup>): 171.

<sup>1042</sup> Cairns (2003): 177-178.



indiscriminately thwarting his subordinates' interests, who, one ought to remember, counted on some profits from their service.<sup>1043</sup>

Further backing for my idea may be lent by *carmen* 28, in which Catullus draws a comparison between his mistreatment at the hands of Memmius and the analogous mishap befalling his friends Veranius and Fabullus because of their praetor Piso's mishandling.<sup>1044</sup>

In particular, I turn attention to lines 9-13:

*o Memmi, bene me ac diu supinum  
tota ista trabe lentus irrumasti.  
sed quantum uideo, pari fuistis  
casu: nam nihilo minore uerpa  
farti estis. pete nobiles amicos!*<sup>1045</sup>

The poet particularises Memmius's indulgence in coercing him to perform fellatio on him: to begin with, Catullus highlights that the oral intercourse was carried out thoroughly and lengthily while he was he was staying in a prone position, a strikingly graphic image of the praetor's arrogance. Subsequently, he specifies that he was compelled to accommodate the entirety of his superior's phallus into his mouth; afterwards, he amplifies the duration of the humiliating *irrumatio* by stressing that the governor penetrated his mouth slowly. Finally, in an equal number of lines, through the pervasive harsh alliterations of /r/ and /t/, he underlines the similar outrage betiding both Veranius and Fabullus, who were 'stuffed by no smaller penis'.

Such a picture, as I see it, invites us to detect a coherent pattern: both contemptuous praetors, drunk with the dominance accrued to them by their station and magistracy, unabashedly grinded their inferior attendants. But this conduct flagrantly transcends not

---

<sup>1043</sup> See *ibid.*: 279 and the above-mentioned recommendation letters on behalf of businessmen (n. 12).

<sup>1044</sup> The debate on the identification of Piso and, by implication, the specific province assigned to him and his trail rages on; nonetheless, inasmuch as it does not affect my argument, I limit myself to mentioning the reliable account of the *status quaestionis* in Shapiro (2014): 391-394 with literature.

<sup>1045</sup> 'O Memmius, completely and for a long time did you mouth-fuck me at ease as I was flat on my back with the whole of your shaft. But, so far as I can see, you two were in an equal plight: for you were stuffed by no smaller penis. Seek noble friends!'

just their prerogatives, but also the norms of *amicitia*, as the simultaneously embittered and sarcastic *pete nobiles amicos* memorably encapsulates in line 13.<sup>1046</sup>

On such grounds, I conclude that Catullus felt entitled to set himself free from the concomitant obligations of friendship with Memmius and, as I attempt to demonstrate in the next subsection, with Gellius, and blames these unworthy *amici superiores* for infringing the pact in the first place. In view of this, I would like to round off this initial segment of my investigation with a comment on a point made by Braund at the end of his own essay: '[w]hen he (scil. Memmius) invited Catullus to join his *cohors* in Bithynia, he may well have expected that his poetic friend would write something. [...] The demands of *amicitia* could be expected to influence the poet's work'.<sup>1047</sup> I concur with the scholar's assumption, but I reverse his evaluation of the essence of the compositions which Memmius received. They did not amount to a 'proactive defence'<sup>1048</sup> of the *amicus superior's* actions, but, I propose, to a Callimachean composition such as *carmen* 116 (partially) and the diptych 65-66 (more transparently). On the contrary, poems 10 and 28 vented Catullus's indignation at his governor's intolerable brutishness by dint of an apt retribution for his transgression against the codes of friendship: since Memmius contravened the accord, the poet gave him precisely what he deserved.

Before concluding this first subsection, I think that the Catullan deployment of sexual vocabulary to delineate his relationship with a socially superior individual prompts speculation about possible Callimachean antecedents. For the sake of clarity, I shall commence by listing and briefly contextualising the three passages I have in mind; subsequently, I aim to comprehend their function. Regardless of the fact that Callimachus never employs as explicit a terminology as Catullus, in point of fact, he does avail himself of a sensual lexicon when addressing Berenice II. The first instance manifests in the *Coma*

---

<sup>1046</sup> Cp. also Roman (2014): 61.

<sup>1047</sup> Braund (1996): 54.

<sup>1048</sup> *Ibid.*: 54.

*Berenices* (Fr. 110.75-78 Harder),<sup>1049</sup> where the speaking lock bewails its dismemberance from the queen's head, which prevents it from relishing womanly fragrances:

οὐ τάδε μοι τοσσήνδε φέρει χάριν ὄσ[σο]ν ἐκείνης  
ἀ]σχάλλω κορυφῆς οὐκέτι θιζόμεν[ος  
ἦς ἄπο, παρ[θ]ενίη μὲν ὅτ ἦν ἔτι, πολλὰ πέπωκα  
λιτά, γυναικείων δ' οὐκ ἀπέλαυσα μύρων.<sup>1050</sup>

By means of the antithesis hinging upon μὲν ... δέ,<sup>1051</sup> the curl pits the λιτά (μύρα), which it often drank during Berenice's maidenhood, against the γυναικεῖα μύρα, which instead fall within the province of married women acquainted with the carnal pleasures of the marital chamber,<sup>1052</sup> and which it was not able to enjoy (οὐκ ἀπέλαυσα)<sup>1053</sup> because it was detached from the female monarch's head soon after her matrimony in order to be offered to the gods.

Μύρα mantle Berenice once more in *Ep.* 51 Pfeiffer, even with a more patent voluptuous ring to them:

[τ]έσσαρες αἱ Χάριτες· ποτὶ γὰρ μία ταῖς τρισὶ τήναις  
ἄρτι ποτεπλάσθη κῆτι μύροισι νοτεῖ.  
εὐαίων ἐν πᾶσιν ἀρίζηλος Βερενίκα,  
ἄς ἄτερ οὐδ' αὐταὶ ται Χάριτες Χάριτες.<sup>1054</sup>

Among the manifold constructions (and, for that reason, various placements within the generic subcategories)<sup>1055</sup> to which this epigram deliberately lends itself,<sup>1056</sup> an erotic

---

<sup>1049</sup> For a comprehensive commentary on these lines see Harder (2012) II: 843-846.

<sup>1050</sup> 'These things do not bring me as much pleasure as distress, because I no longer touch that head, from which, when she was still a maiden, I drank many simple ointments, but did not have enjoyment of women's perfumes'.

<sup>1051</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 844 for the irregular word order.

<sup>1052</sup> See *ibid.*: 845-846.

<sup>1053</sup> On the erotic colouring of ἀπολαύω see the learned n. 120 in Pelliccia (2010-2011): 190-192.

<sup>1054</sup> Four are the Graces: for beside those three another has been added just now and is still wet with perfumes. Happy Berenice and admired among all, without whom not even the Graces themselves are Graces.'

<sup>1055</sup> See Petrovic and Petrovic (2003): 181-185 for the classification of the text as a dedicatory epigram and *ibid.*: 191-194 for its classification as epeidictic.

<sup>1056</sup> See *ibid.*: 179.

reading – which prevailed in the *AP* and led to the insertion of this poem into the fifth book amidst kindred compositions<sup>1057</sup> – is encouraged by the joint presence of perfumes, *charis* and statues along with variations of these motifs.<sup>1058</sup>

Lastly, the *Coma* may provide one insight into Ptolemy III and Berenice II's wedding night and into the bride's longing for her husband after his departure for the East:

*dulcia nocturnae portans uestigia rixae,  
quam de uirginis gesserat exuuiis. [...]  
et tu non orbem luxti deserta cubile,  
sed fratris cari flebile discidium.*<sup>1059</sup>

These two scenes emerge only in Catullus's translation (*carmen* 66), at lines 13-14 and 21-22, respectively; therefore, one cannot be sure that Callimachus composed them, especially the second couplet; independent Greek sources, though, appear to buttress Callimachean authorship of the first distich.<sup>1060</sup>

One should now attempt to fathom Callimachus's purpose beneath such aphrodisiac terminology: in regards to the emphasis on passionate conjugal love in these two couplets,<sup>1061</sup> commentators discern both a distinctive trait of the Euergetai's propaganda<sup>1062</sup> and a supplementary concern with dynastic legitimacy,<sup>1063</sup> coupled with a will to obliterate the queen's questionable past.<sup>1064</sup>

With respect to the fragrances in Fr. 110.75-78 Harder, on the one hand, Harder highlights the queen's role in their production in Alexandria;<sup>1065</sup> on the other hand,

---

<sup>1057</sup> See the entire article for a compelling substantiation of this hypothesis.

<sup>1058</sup> See *ibid.*: 185-191.

<sup>1059</sup> 'Carrying (scil. Ptolemy III) the sweet traces of the nocturnal brawl, which he had fought over the maidenly spoils. [...] And, left alone, you were not grieving over the empty bed, but over the lamentable separation from the dear brother'.

<sup>1060</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 807-808.

<sup>1061</sup> See broadly *ibid.*: 799 with literature for an apt comparison with the similar Theocritean take on Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II's connubial intercourse in 17.38-39.

<sup>1062</sup> Gutzwiller (1992): 368-369 and 377-379; Clayman (2014): 98-100; van Oppen de Ruiter (2016): 90.

<sup>1063</sup> Gutzwiller (1992): 362-363; Clayman (2014): 103; van Oppen de Ruiter (2016): 91.

<sup>1064</sup> Clayman (2014): 103-104.

<sup>1065</sup> Harder (2012) II: 846.

Clayman stresses that since they were mostly manufactured in Cyrene, they supplied the queen with her dowry,<sup>1066</sup> whilst van Oppen de Ruiten underlines that they amounted to noticeable constituent of Lagid cult.<sup>1067</sup>

Finally, concerning *Ep.* 51 Pfeiffer, whereas Clayman remarks that '[f]ragrant skin is a feature of divinity, particularly of Isis, but here it is also an acknowledgement of an important source of her (scil. Bernice's) wealth',<sup>1068</sup> Petrovic and Petrovic maintain that '[b]y pronouncing Berenice as a fourth Charis, the poet gives her the respect which is her due'.<sup>1069</sup> Besides, the two scholars intriguingly submit that the epigram subtly commemorates the accomplishment of the *Aitia* through Books 3 and 4, which are framed by poems dedicated to Berenice: '[i]nasmuch as Berenice as the fourth Charis completes and perfects the three Charites [...], so the *Aitia* I and II are completed and perfected by the additions of books III and IV'.<sup>1070</sup>

In conclusion, one may put forward that Callimachus's deft utilisation of clusters of words contributes to the advancement of panegyric topics dear to his compatriot and lavish patroness Berenice; moreover, if one subscribes to the foregoing elucidation of *Ep.* 51, one finds a further validation of the poet's artful co-opting of the queen as a guarantor of his poetics, as I advocate in the first half of this chapter.

Bearing this in mind, let us return to Catullus. Is there a connection between his exploitation of harsh sexual language and Callimachus's? I set forward that *carmina* 10 and 28 instantiate an inversion of the court poetry model: whereas the Hellenistic poet masterfully enlists sensual lexicon in the service of the promotion of his generous female monarch, Catullus's indignant recourse to *irrumatio*, a sorely disgracing sexual

---

<sup>1066</sup> Clayman (2014): 102-103.

<sup>1067</sup> See van Oppen de Ruiten (2016): 89-90.

<sup>1068</sup> Clayman (2014): 103.

<sup>1069</sup> Petrovic and Petrovic (2003): 197.

<sup>1070</sup> *Ibid.*: 204 – see the full argument *ibid.*: 194-204.

practice,<sup>1071</sup> vividly limns his superior's infringement of acceptable demeanour towards his subordinates. By this, I obviously do not mean to downplay Catullus's indebtedness to late-republican invective traditions;<sup>1072</sup> yet, his salacious vocabulary also owes something to Callimachus's, albeit after subjecting it to a complete reversal due to Memmius's misconduct.

It is time to broach poem 116; still, before embarking on its study, one must remind oneself of the five main problems that beset all its interpreters. Luckily, I can waive some because they are not relevant to my inquiry: the linkage between the poem at hand and other Callimachean epigrams featuring the same addressee<sup>1073</sup> and the quandary about whether or not the passage under examination was meant to draw the elegiac collection starting with *carmen* 66 to its close.<sup>1074</sup> That being said, the three remaining matters touch on my exploration to some extent: the corrupted preservation of the text hinders the exact identification of the man behind the name Gellius and the archaisms with which the composition is studded (above all *uti* in line 2, *qui* in line 3 and the suppression of the final *s* of *dabis* in line 8). In consideration of the broader significance of the third and fourth issues and, at the same time, their rather limited impact on the decipherment of the poem, I shall concisely moot them here. On the contrary, the archaisms will be tackled where they occur as my dissection unfolds.

In spite of the philological controversy over the correct restoration of lines 1 and 7,<sup>1075</sup> the global sense of the composition is not jeopardised; by the same token, although scholars

---

<sup>1071</sup> See Williams (2010<sup>2</sup>): 469 *s.u. irrumator / irrumare* for a list of pages of his monograph providing an authoritative treatment.

<sup>1072</sup> On this see most recently Ingleheart (2014): 51-72 with bibliography.

<sup>1073</sup> According to Campana (2012): 58-60 and 119-120 with n. 110 (a list of scholars championing his viewpoint), poem 116 functions as the proem of the 'Gellius-cycle', which comprises *carmina* 74, 80, 88, 89, 90 – *ibid.*: 103-107 he explains why he excludes 91 from the series; see *contra* McKie (2009): 179-188 with literature, who contends that the poem completes the cycle.

<sup>1074</sup> The most recent treatment backing this proposition is Young (2015): 156-165 with previous literature, which one ought to supplement with items listed by Breed (2013): 38 n. 2, who also holds with this theory; see *contra* Campana (2012): 56 and 120.

<sup>1075</sup> For an excellent overview of the palaeographical vexed questions see Campana (2012): 109-120 with literature, to which one ought to add McKie (2009): 173-179.

dissent as to the specific man whom Catullus calls Gellius, they concur in maintaining that he belonged to a prominent *gens* of consular dignity.<sup>1076</sup> In the end, before traversing the passage, I wish to signalise that, in compliance with the methodological premises of this chapter, I plan to pore over the sphere of *amicitia* and Callimacheanism.

*Saepe tibi studioso animo uenante †requires  
carmina uti possem mittere Battiadae,  
qui te lenirem nobis, neu conarere  
tela infesta <meum> mittere in usque caput,  
hunc uideo mihi nunc frustra sumptum esse laborem,  
Gelli, nec nostras hic ualuisse preces.  
contra nos tela ista tua euitabimus †amitha  
at fixus nostris, tu dabis supplicium.*<sup>1077</sup>

The initial distich concentrates on the poet's strenuous toils aimed at sending his friend polished Callimachean pieces. With an eye on vocabulary pertaining to the realm of *amicitia*, I find *studioso* a particularly pregnant lexical choice on Catullus's part: the adjective, which bespeaks warm attachment to, devotion to someone,<sup>1078</sup> allows the poet to cast the friendship binding him to Gellius into sharp relief – I submit that the alliterating sounds /s/ and /t/, which reverberate distinctly throughout the entire couplet, further reinforce their ties.

Besides, even though, as explained above, obscurity covers Gellius's identity, if one imagines that the recipient shares Catullus's literary tastes,<sup>1079</sup> the depth of the relationship increases even more: after all, as Campana remarks,<sup>1080</sup> the sheer fact that the poet opts for

---

<sup>1076</sup> See Campana (2012): 15-42 with bibliography.

<sup>1077</sup> 'Often with devoted spirit [...] so as to be able to send you the Battiades' poems, in order that by this means I might dispose you favourably towards me and in order that you might not try to hurl inimical missiles right at my head. Now I realise that I have undertaken this labour in vain and that at this point my requests, Gellius, have achieved no result. I will dodge these missiles of yours [...]; you, instead, transfixed by mine, will pay the penalty'. In my translation, I have omitted both the second hemistich of line 1 and the last word of line 7 insofar as I agree with Campana's contention that these portions are too damaged (*ibid.*: 109-111 and 114-118 with some emendations); similarly, I follow in the scholar's footsteps in putting a full stop between line 4 and line 5 (*ibid.*: 115) and in construing *contra* as a preposition instead of an adverb (*ibid.*: 119). Finally, with respect to the minor dispute revolving around whether one should elect *hic*, *hinc* or *huc*, personally, I favour *hic* (cp. *ibid.*: 111 n.87 and McKie (2009):177-178).

<sup>1078</sup> See *OLD s.u.* 3.

<sup>1079</sup> Campana (2012): 52-56.

<sup>1080</sup> *Ibid.*: 53.

Callimachus instead of another author encourages this assumption; in addition, Callimachus's presence makes itself abundantly felt also by dint of verbal traces: *saepe tibi* could be read as the Latin rendition of *πολλάκι μοι* in Fr. 1.1 Harder.<sup>1081</sup> Therefore, if this hypothesis is on the right track, one might detect a further layer of meaning in *studiosus*, namely engagement in learning,<sup>1082</sup> which, in the present context, coincides with affection.

Afterwards, in lines 3 and 4, Catullus discloses the reason why he decided to *mittere carmina Battiadae* to Gellius: he sought to clear the air between them lest the latter attacks him with *tela infesta*. In order to better grasp the import of this elegiac couplet, I shall pay fresh attention to *amicitia*, in particular to the mutuality it entails, which, in my opinion, is underscored again by the alliteration of /s/ and /t/. Aware of having ill-used his fellow in some way, the poet aspires to atone: he knows that his offence may lead to a legitimate reprisal (ultimately, as exhibited above, he assails Memmius on analogous grounds). Accordingly, he presents his companion with refined Callimachean poetry, which, regardless of the infeasibility of divining its substance, could display some encomiastic traits. Support to this could be lent by the fact that even in poem 65, which is likewise dedicated to an *amicus superior*, Catullus designates the attached translation of one of Callimachus's panegyric compositions, scilicet *The Lock of Berenice*, with the almost identical phrase *mitto / haec expressa tibi carmina Battiadae* (lines 15-16).<sup>1083</sup>

With knowledge of this, I shall take a look at the archaisms distinguishing line 3 (its holospondaic rhythm and the final-instrumental adverb *qui*): they have prompted some commentators to posit an incompatibility between these stylistic features and Callimachus<sup>1084</sup> and to propound that Catullus imitates rather Ennius, his unique Latin

---

<sup>1081</sup> Barchiesi (2005): 334; Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 219 perceptively point out that 'the lack of a modifier like *expressa* for *carmina* [...] encourages identification of the two poets, since the reader cannot determine whether Catullus intends a poem written *by* Callimachus or a translation *of* Callimachus'.

<sup>1082</sup> See *OLD s.u.* 2.

<sup>1083</sup> The equivalence has long been spotted: see Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 215 with literature.

<sup>1084</sup> They are listed in Campana (2012): 46 n. 4.



predecessor<sup>1085</sup> utilising this extremely unusual sort of hexameter.<sup>1086</sup> This stance needs refinement, all the more so because these technical peculiarities, along with the equally old-fashioned *uti* in line 2, literally encircle the *carmina Battiadae*. Let me begin with the morphological *côté*: even if the undeniably antiquated flavour of *qui*<sup>1087</sup> and *uti*<sup>1088</sup> may smack of traditionalism, one ought not to overlook Callimachus's own fondness for rare words culled from the past.<sup>1089</sup> Additionally the composite meaning of *qui*, which mingles the functions of *ut* with those of *quibus*, eases the transition from the first to the second distich with an affectation.

With regard to the metrical province, a riddle immediately rises: in his epigrams Callimachus never surpasses four spondees.<sup>1090</sup> All the same, this rate of spondees appears neither negligible nor irreparably removed from six;<sup>1091</sup> then again, one must guard against too confidently comparing elegiac hexameters with Ennius's epic hexameters.<sup>1092</sup> Be that as it may, it seems to me advisable to consider the expressivity of the holospondaic verse, which always distinguishes this peculiar sort of hexameter.<sup>1093</sup> Hence, by relying another time on my leitmotiv of *amicitia*, I would tentatively advance that, on the one hand, Catullus emphasises his enormous commitment in creating poems capable of pleasing Gellius, thus reiterating the identical nuance permeating *possem* in line 2.<sup>1094</sup> At the same time, as I see it, the poet warns his associate not to violate the almost sacred institution of

---

<sup>1085</sup> *Ibid.*: 46-49 surveys the Ennian instances.

<sup>1086</sup> *Ibid.*: 46 n. 5 enumerates the six Homeric occurrences.

<sup>1087</sup> *Qui* as adverb is a Catullan hapax.

<sup>1088</sup> *Vti* occurs also at 67.69, where it accompanies the likewise archaic *fac* in Cybele's enrages exclamation – cp. McKie (2009): 179 with n. 579.

<sup>1089</sup> See Harder (2012) I: 47-48 for a useful summary.

<sup>1090</sup> For statistics on Callimachus preferences regarding dactyls and spondees see *ibid.*: 37-38 for the *Aitia*, Hollis (2009<sup>2</sup>): 17-19 for the *Hecale*, Stephens (2015): 29-30 for the *Hymns* and Fantuzzi and Sens (2006): 107-113 for the *Epigrams* against the backdrop of other Hellenistic poets and inscribed epigrams.

<sup>1091</sup> Campana (2012): acutely notes that Catullus's poetry, in general, tends to adopt spondaic rhythms; he also cautiously intimates that Euphorion's preference for spondees may have influenced the Latin poet.

<sup>1092</sup> *Ibid.*: 50 with n. 13 for literature; *ibid.*: 46-50, after reviewing the holospondaic Ennian verses in existence, the scholar prudently concludes that Catullus's solitary holospondaic does not share either the solemnity or the syntactic autonomy which these lines normally enjoy in Ennius's poetry.

<sup>1093</sup> Oniga (2014): 34.

<sup>1094</sup> Campana (2012): 115.

Roman comradeship: such a comportment would be tantamount to a grievous breach, which is powerfully conveyed by the inversion of the sense of *mitto* in *tibi ... / carmina ... mittere Battiadae* in lines 1-2 and *tela infesta <meum> mittere in usque caput* in line 4<sup>1095</sup> and the usual alliteration of /s/ and /t/.

This admonition, moreover, might intertwine with an ulterior resonance from the *Reply*, which would amplify the likely adaptation of πολλάκι μοι (Fr. 1.1 Harder) with *saepe tibi* in 116.1 and impart further Callimachean savour to the poem: Μασσαγέται καὶ μακρὸν οἴστεύοιεν ἐπ’ ἄνδρα / Μῆδον]<sup>1096</sup> (Fr. 1.15-16 Harder).<sup>1097</sup> I concede that much of the enigmatic substance of this Callimachean metaphor (possibly a rejection of historical wars as content and of length as a stylistic criterion),<sup>1098</sup> is not wholly incorporated by Catullus. Nonetheless, I perceive a degree of continuity in Catullus’s allusion to the deplored bellicosity of Gellius’s onslaughts: on this basis, *tela infesta mittere* could match οἴστεύοιεν and *<meum> in usque caput* could correspond to ἐπ’ ἄνδρα / Μῆδον]. Through this refashioning of Callimachean verses, Catullus could (to no avail, as the remainder of the poem will reveal) caution Gellius against persevering in perilous conduct which would not only relegate him to the doomed aesthetic of the Telchines, but could develop into a grievous break-up in their friendship, for which the poet would hold him responsible.

The crucial succeeding lines 5 and 6 effectuate the shift from the past, to which the preceding four verses relate, and the future, into which the closing couplet projects itself.<sup>1099</sup> Presumably on account of vitriolic verses hurled at him by Gellius (line 7 potentially corroborates this view),<sup>1100</sup> Catullus realises that his poetic gift, the result of

---

<sup>1095</sup> Wray (2001): 188 and Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 220 notice the skilled juxtaposition of the anaphora of *mitto* with the two accusatives *carmina* and *tela* along with the double entendre underlying *tela*, which means both ‘missiles’ and ‘hostile verses’.

<sup>1096</sup> ‘And let the Massagetai shoot from afar at the Mede warrior’.

<sup>1097</sup> I am grateful to my supervisor for inviting me to explore this theme.

<sup>1098</sup> See Harder (2012) II: 44-45 on lines 13-16 in general and 47-49 on lines 15-16 in particular.

<sup>1099</sup> Della Corte (1977): 362 aptly spots the chronological progression.

<sup>1100</sup> See further Campana (2012): 111.

painstaking *labor limae* for the sake of a crony,<sup>1101</sup> has been undertaken in vain. Furthermore, not satisfied with this misdeed, Gellius has blatantly disregarded the poet's requests,<sup>1102</sup> thereby doubly transgressing the code of *amicitia* as the ubiquitous alliteration of /s/ and /t/ may underscore. I would append that the iteration of the same rhetorical device employed in line 1 gains in cogency if one accepts my elucidation of the force of the alliteration as a means to highlight Catullus's scare.

On the basis of this bitter revelation in the final couplet, the perspective switches to the future: since the nasty situation anticipated in lines 3-4 has come true (the anaphora of *tela* conceivably buttresses the link), Catullus adumbrates that whereas he will dodge Gellius's darts, the latter will be pelted by the poet's (poetic) missiles and pay the price for disrespecting his *amicus*. For the last time, in my opinion, the alliteration of /s/ and /t/ underpins the message Catullus wants to drive home: apart from stressing the righteousness of the poet's reprisal, it widens the divide between the two opponents' respectively successful and unsuccessful (artistic) warfare.<sup>1103</sup>

The presence of a last archaism in line 8, namely the suppression of the final *s*<sup>1104</sup> in *dabis*, which permits the scansion of the verb as a dibrach in order to create a dactyl after the long vowel *u* in *tu*, cues a few remarks before concluding this subsection. According to Cicero's witness in *Orat.* 161, this artifice used to be regarded as elegant, but is now dismissed as *subrusticum* by the *poetae noui*.<sup>1105</sup> This prosodic peculiarity has been decoded as a reminiscence of Romulus's threat to his brother in Ennius's *Ann.* 1.94- 95 Sk. (*nec pol homo quisquam faciet impune animatus / hoc nec tu: nam mi calido dabis*

---

<sup>1101</sup> *Hunc laborem* recalls the semantic range of *studioso* advocated above.

<sup>1102</sup> Campana (2012): 111-113 convincingly compares this passage with 50.18-19 (*nunc audax caue sis, precesque nostras, / oramus, caue despuas, ocelle*).

<sup>1103</sup> On this couplet as a 'forcible imposition of sexualized silence' see Stevens (2013): 70-71.

<sup>1104</sup> On this phenomenon and its frequency between the second and the first century see Adams (2007): 140 with literature.

<sup>1105</sup> Campana (2012): 54-55.

*sanguine poenas*)<sup>1106</sup>and, as a result, as an indication of a watershed in the Catullan oeuvre, even a renunciation ‘of frivolous neoteric aesthetics’.<sup>1107</sup>

Then again, Campana persuasively questioned the cogency of the resemblance and applied the change in tone only to the relationship between Catullus and Gellius: ‘l’abbandono di una comunicazione letteraria moderna e gradita al destinatario ([...] fondata sull’invio di traduzioni di Callimaco) per passare ad una produzione differente’.<sup>1108</sup> All the same, I cannot entirely espouse the idea of a full rejection of Callimacheanism. For if, by that term, one alludes to pleasant compositions, which, perhaps, as posed above, exhibit some panegyric touches, then I accord with the Italian Latinist: from the moment in which Gellius has shamelessly vilified his *amicus inferior*, he no longer deserves the artistic tribute which the poet willingly used to pay him. If, by contrast, one supposes that Catullus’s Callimacheanism can never coexist with invective, as Campana seems to do, then I beg to differ:<sup>1109</sup> one just needs to remember that *carmina* 10 and 28, which I have discussed above, partake of the self-same Phalaecian hendecasyllable, which programmatically introduces Callimachean poetics, not to mention that, as advocated in chapter 2,<sup>1110</sup> poem 10 also contains the programmatic embracement of *otium*. Finally, if one assents with him in envisaging that poem 116 preludes to the ‘Gellius-cycle’, one must not underestimate the learned overtones of the Magi in *carmen* 90<sup>1111</sup> and the outlandish manifestation of the god Harpocration in *carmen* 74.<sup>1112</sup>

---

<sup>1106</sup> ‘By Pollux, no single living man will perpetrate this crime with impunity, not even you: you will pay me the penalty with your warmblood’.

<sup>1107</sup> Skinner (2003): 24 – see the full unfolding of her thesis from p. 21 to p. 28; see also Tatum (2007): 350 for another interpretation of the Ennian echo.

<sup>1108</sup> Campana (2012): 56-57 with n. 30, where he intriguingly speculates that ‘appare [...] anche possibile un riecheggiamento di espressioni tipiche dei poeti comici’.

<sup>1109</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 220 detect in 116.8 a reverberation of the epilogue of the *Aitia* (Fr. 112.8-9 Harder) ‘where the Cyrenean bids farewell to his elegiac poem as he sets out for the pasture of the (iambic?) Muses’ and append that ‘by the word *tela* [...] Catullus recalls the battle metaphor from Callimachus’ first *Iambus*’ – Young (2015): 158-159 autonomously subscribes to an akin claim. This becomes even more plausible if, instead of watering it down, as Acosta-Hughes and Stephens partially do, one endorses the view I set forth.

<sup>1110</sup> See pp. 145-147 above.

<sup>1111</sup> See Campana (2012): 97-101.

<sup>1112</sup> See *ibid.*: 69-72.

I would now like to analyse *carmina* 65 and 66. In the interest of perspicuity, I shall begin with the covering letter (*carmen* 65) and concentrate in the first place on lines 1-4 and 15-18: apart from making up the self-contained heart of the Catullan epistle,<sup>1113</sup> these eight lines supply one with valuable insights into the poet's take on *amicitia* and Callimacheanism. Subsequently, attention will be directed towards the puzzling concluding simile (lines 19-24) to advance that the poet plays his regard for the dedicatee's desiderata off a maid's absent-mindedness about her beau's present; additionally, I shall posit that the *oblita uirgo* symbolises Lesbia. I shall instead dispense with canvassing the dense parenthetical clause running from line 6 to line 14, which links the poet's lack of creativity with his harrowing mourning for his brother.<sup>1114</sup> what interests me is its relevance in influencing Catullus's election of the *Coma Berenices*, in which this theme surfaces noticeably.

*Etsi me assiduo confectum cura dolore  
seuocat a doctis, Hortale, uirginibus,  
nec potis est dulcis Musarum expromere fetus  
mens animi, tantis fluctuat ipsa malis [...]  
sed tamen in tantis maeroribus, Hortale, mitto  
haec expressa tibi carmina Battiadae,  
ne tua dicta uagis nequiquam credita uentis  
effluxisse meo forte putes animo,  
ut missum sponsi furtiuo munere malum  
procurrit casto uirginis e gremio,  
quod miserae oblatae molli sub ueste locatum,  
dum aduentu matris prosilt, excutitur,  
atque illud prono praeceps agitur decursu,  
huic manat tristi conscius ore rubor.<sup>1115</sup>*

---

<sup>1113</sup> Woodman (2012): 132-133 and 143 n. 79 examines the syntactic affinities with Ciceronian prose (primarily his letters), with an eye on the recurrent syntactic module, in conformity with which the period is introduced by a concessive clause opening with *etsi* and the main clause is initiated by *tamen* or *sed tamen*; see also *ibid.*: 147 on *ex animo effluere*.

<sup>1114</sup> On these dense verses see the painstakingly meticulous study by Ferandelli (2004-2005): 107-144. On the elegiac implications see Höschele (2009): 137-139 (she discovers Archilochean reminiscences), Stevens (2013): 130-136 (he focuses on *maesta carmina*) and, most recently, Breed (2013): 42-45.

<sup>1115</sup> 'Although treatment separates me, exhausted by unremitting pain, from the learned virgins, Hortalus, and (although) the intellectual faculty of my soul is not able to give expression to the sweet fruits of the Muses, (because) it is in turmoil with so many afflictions, [...] nevertheless, amidst so many sorrows, Hortalus, I send you these poems of the Battiades translated for you, lest you might happen to think that your words, entrusted in vain to the wandering winds, have passed out of my mind, like an apple, which,

At first glance, the two inaugural couplets can be summarised with a reasonable amount of certainty as follows: through two coordinate concessive clauses, Catullus lays bare the adverse circumstances tampering with his creativity;<sup>1116</sup> yet the devil is in the detail. Do the very first two lines refer specifically to a physical illness as the almost technical force of *confectus*,<sup>1117</sup> *adsiduus* and *dolor* apparently encourage one to believe and, if so, does *cura* mean ‘treatment’ (*OLD s.u.* 4a) in lieu of ‘anxiety’, ‘distress’ (*OLD s.u.* 1), as most Latinists maintain?<sup>1118</sup> What do the archaic periphrasis *mens animi*<sup>1119</sup> and the unparalleled phrase *expromere fetus* exactly signify?<sup>1120</sup>

By the same token, in lines 15-18, the poet states (on the surface in a fairly transparent way) that, all his woe notwithstanding, he sends his friend Hortalus<sup>1121</sup> a translation of Callimachean poetry in order to prove that he has not neglected the latter’s words; but in actuality, one encounters difficulties in penetrating the significance of three more or less

---

after being sent as a secret gift by the betrothed and placed by the wretched oblivious virgin under her soft dress, is shaken out while she springs forward at her mother’s approach, rolls out of her chaste lap and, in its descent towards the ground, moves headlong, (while) a conscious blush diffuses across her gloomy countenance’.

<sup>1116</sup> On the artfulness of the protestation of inability to compose poetry cp. Hunter (2004): 474 n. 127 with bibliography.

<sup>1117</sup> Even if the philological issue does not influence my argument, *confectum* seems to fit imore naturally with the ablative *dolore* than *defectum* – see Woodman (2012): 134 with n. 15.

<sup>1118</sup> See *ibid.*: 133-135 with literature; see also *ibid.*: 136-137 on the two opening couplets as embodiment of the Catullan divided self: *me* in lines 1-2 and *mens animi* in 3-4.

<sup>1119</sup> ‘[*M*]ens animi is not just, as the commentators say, an archaism for the intellectual faculty of the mind, but rather gestures towards the active rôle of the mind in creating the images necessary both for memory [...] and for the creation of the true poetic *phantasia* which relies upon memory’ (Hunter (2004): 475).

<sup>1120</sup> The dispute centres above all on the understanding of *fetus*: according to the scholars enumerated in Woodman (2012): 135 n. 25, the noun indicates ‘fruits’, ‘produce’ (*OLD s.u.* 2 and 4a). The cogency augments because it tallies with the core sense of *expromere*, i.e. ‘to bring out from a store’ (*OLD s.u.* 1a), and insomuch as *dulcis Musarum fetus* may recall Pindar’s description of poetry as γλυκὸν καρπὸν φρενός, ‘sweet fruit of the mind’, in *Ol.* 7.8 – see Woodman (2012): 135-136. Instead others – see the record of advocates in Fitzgerald (1995): 192 and in Woodman (2012): 135 n. 22 – challenge this supposition and posit that *fetus* designates ‘offspring’ (*OLD s.u.* 3). In support of this claim, as Woodman remarks (*ibid.*: 135), one might anew quote Pindar’s description of songs as αἱ δὲ σοφαὶ / Μοισᾶν θυγατρὲς, ‘wise daughters of the Muses’ (*Nem.* 4.2-3). Lastly, aside from the preferred decipherment of *fetus*, one should not overlook the fact that *OLD s.u.* *expromere* 1b classifies the passage under scrutiny as an instance of the transferred sense ‘to give expression to’.

<sup>1121</sup> In all probability, the orator and former consul Quintus Hortensius Hortalus – see Du Quesnay (2012): 154-156 with bibliography.

baffling expressions: *expressa tibi carmina*,<sup>1122</sup> *tua dicta*<sup>1123</sup> and *nequiquam credita uentis*.<sup>1124</sup>

Be that as it may, one can garner substantial revelations about Catullus's construal of *amicitia* and Callimacheanism from these eight verses. In my opinion, the poet cleverly crafts the opening concessive clauses to serve a two-fold purpose: on the one hand, when read for the first time, they grant almost unconditional pride of place to his own psychological dimension, a fortiori insofar as they are amplified by the 8-line parenthetical explanation of the causes of his inconsolable grief. On the other hand, when contemplated against the backdrop of the main clause (line 15), they attest to Catullus's enormous devotion to Hortalus: in spite of his disconsolate misery, the poet has delivered on his promise to his highly-esteemed friend.<sup>1125</sup>

Afterwards, if one focuses on line 15, one should ponder the determining piece of information which Catullus provides in claiming that he sends *carmina Battiadae*. He vigorously confirms his Callimachean creed by substituting a creation of his precisely with a rendition of Callimachus. Furthermore, he presents Callimachus's poetry as a decidedly appropriate present for an indeed worthy *amicus superior*, who, as proposed

---

<sup>1122</sup> See the elucidation of Catullus's variation on the 'words on the wind' theme in Woodman (2012): 147-148: the Latinist propounds that, since *credere aliquid uentis* never occurs in concomitance with this idea, but is always used in regards to sea voyages, the poet 'is not deploying the proverbial motif of "words on the wind" at all, but is referring to the hazards of the long-distance postal service' (*ibid.*: 148).

<sup>1123</sup> In fact, *tua dicta* ranges from 'your words' to 'your commands' – cp. Du Quesnay (2012): 153. That being said, one usually envisages two scenarios: Hortalus receives the translation he asked for – for one, see Ramsby (2007): 45-46; Hortalus required original verses, but the poet, owing to his excruciating distress, could only manage a translation – see Hunter (2004): 474 n. 127 for a catalogue of endorsers of this possibility, which has also been backed by Woodman (2012): 146. Lastly, although these matters slip away from definitive explanations, I cannot agree with Skinner's claim that 'Hortalus's function in 65 is best explained on rhetorical, rather than simply factual grounds' (Skinner (2003):20).

<sup>1124</sup> In this passage, the meaning of *exprimere* is in all likelihood 'to translate' (*OLD s.u.* 7), which harmoniously dovetails with the remainder of the verse – cp. Du Quesnay (2012): 154: '[t]he pronoun *tibi* is enclosed within the intricately patterned pentameter and is primarily to be taken with *expressa*, secondarily with *mitto*, to which it adds little'. Contrarily, Fitzgerald (1995): 191 emphasises that the verb also signifies 'to force out, to elicit' (*OLD s.u.* 4a); nonetheless, as Woodman (2012): 144 n. 82 observes, 'this constitutes a very odd juxtaposition with *tibi*, anticipates and seems to weaken *tua dicta* below and (in so far as it implies unwillingness on Catullus's part) would be discourteous to Hortalus'. Finally, according to Hunter (2004): 475, '[i]n the context of memory, *exprimere* will most obviously suggest the impression on a wax tablet'.

<sup>1125</sup> Young (2015): 152-156 with literature has some astute thoughts on the *amicitia* between Hortalus and Catullus, but, to me, she underestimates their different social position.

above, might have facilitated Catullus's travel to Bithynia through a recommendation letter to Memmius. I shall return in due course to the rationale of the poet's selection of the *Coma Berenices*; at present, suffice it to say that it perfectly empowers him to discharge his debt with Hortalus and, in the same breath, to give voice to two topics (lament for his deceased brother and matrimonial fantasies about Lesbia), which immensely count for him and contribute to cementing the unity of *carmina* 61-68.<sup>1126</sup> Consequently, one might infer that the poet succeeds in combining freedom in relation to Hortalus with a willing tribute to him due to the latter's respectful treatment.

Given my focus on Catullan conceptions of *amicitia*, I need to tackle the enigmatic 6-line simile which terminates poem 65 and, among the various angles from which one can approach it,<sup>1127</sup> I am interested in the controversy over what exactly (*carmina Battiadae* or Hortalus's *dicta*) is to be compared with the apple.<sup>1128</sup> Before describing it, though, I think it advisable to recapitulate the rather intricate concatenation of images: after receiving a *malum* as a secret gift from her fiancé, a virgin conceals it under the folds of her dress; but, as she suddenly leaps forward at her mother's arrival, the apple rolls out of its precarious hiding place and causes her to flush. Does *malum* symbolise Catullus's poetic gift for

---

<sup>1126</sup> For literature on this see Feeney (2013): 70-97 and Ambühl (2014): 118 n. 16. Besides, Ambühl scrutinises the way in which Catullus unites poems 61-68 by inviting the reader to identify narrative details omitted in one *carmen* and made available in another.

<sup>1127</sup> See *ibid.*: 122-123 and 128-129 stimulatingly submits that the simile conjoins poem 65 with *carmina* 64 ('the missing apple from the mythical wedding feast in poem 64 unexpectedly rolls forth at the end of poem 65' (*ibid.*: 122)) and 68 ('in Catullus 65, the girl who is surprised by her mother inadvertently reveals her secret love token; therefore, it will probably be taken away from her against her will, just as Laodamia is caught by her father while hugging or even making love to the statue of Protesilaus' (*ibid.*: 129)). Stevens (2013): 164-172, instead, investigates the impact of mournful silence on poetic agency.

<sup>1128</sup> See Woodman (2012): 149 n. 105 for a list of supporters of each view, to which one ought to add Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 227-228, along with the scholars enumerated by Breed (2013): 40 n. 1 and by Ambühl (2014): 122 n. 27. Fitzgerald (1995): 192-196, Gaisser (2009): 146-147 and Young (2015): 155 aim rather at reconciling the two camps.



Hortalus (*carmina Battiadae*)<sup>1129</sup> or the poet's heeding of Hortalus's request as opposed to the young woman's forgetfulness of her intended (*tua dicta*)<sup>1130</sup> or both?<sup>1131</sup>

I would hazard a submission on the side of the second thesis: the girl, against whom Catullus sets himself in opposition, may stand for Lesbia. In order to sustain this idea, I call upon some textual evidence: first and foremost the adjective *furtivus*, secondly, the attribute *oblita*. Catullus applies *furtivus* twice to his liaison with Lesbia, in both cases with respect to night-time events: in 7.8, it colours trysts (*furtivos hominum amores*) occurring during the silent night (*cum tacet nox*), which resemble the extra-marital exchanges of kisses between the poet and his beloved. In 68.145, even more pertinently, it defines the little presents (*furtiva munuscula*), which she, in a manner of speaking, brought in dowry during an extraordinary night (*mira nocte*). But, as the surrounding verses 143-144 and 146 make ruthlessly clear, this amounts to nothing more than an inane reverie: the small gifts are 'stealthy' not only because Lesbia's father failed to escort her to Catullus's home in

---

<sup>1129</sup> According to the first elucidation, which is effectively condensed in Woodman (2012): 149, the engineered correlation between the fruit and the Battiades' poems devolves on the mirror-like quality of the correspondence between *mitto* in line 15 and *missum* in line 19: just like the *sponsus* sends his beloved an apple as a present, Catullus dispatches Hortalus a poetic gift, which he brands as a *malum*. In addition, if that is the case, the poet would resume the commencement of the poem: if in lines 3-4 he did not produce 'the sweet fruits of the Muses', here he creates a translation, which he likens to an apple. Moreover, Catullus might evoke a scene in the *Aitia* episode of Acontius and Cydippe (Fr. 67-75e Harder) – for a dependable overview of the numerous fragments constituting this poem, see Harder (2012) II: 541-546 –, in which the young man sends his beloved an apple with an inscribed oath compelling her to marry him. See also Breed (2013): 41 n. 4 on the seminal influence of this elegy in Rome.

<sup>1130</sup> Those in favour of the alternative exegesis, by contrast, contend that via the simile Catullus differentiates himself from the girl in regards to mindfulness of received presents. Whereas the *oblita uirgo*, obliterates the apple and lets it drop, Catullus, who has *not* let Hortalus's words slip his mind, sends him the Callimachean translation. This perspective gains in strength if one upholds the idea (cursorily maintained by Fitzgerald (1995): 193 and taken up again by Woodman (2012): 149-150) that the poet touches upon a proverb attested by Festus (175 L.), which warns against entrusting anything to a woman or her lap precisely on account of her obliviousness: '*nec mulieri nec gremio credi oportere*' *proverbum est, quod et illa incerti et leuis animi est et plerumque in gremio posita, cum in obliuione uenerunt exsurgentium, prociidunt*, "one ought not to entrust things either to a woman or to her lap" is a proverb, in that she is of undependable and shallow spirit and things placed on her lap generally fall when they are forgotten by her, as she stands up'. Besides, concerning the alleged similarities with Acontius and Cydippe, one misses several points of contact, most importantly, the fact that, contrary to the Callimachean apple, the Catullan *malum* carries *no* inscription – for more differences between the sequence in Callimachus and Catullus even considering the incomplete preservation of the Greek poem, cp. Ambühl (2014): 128-129 with n. 46 for bibliography.

<sup>1131</sup> 'Does the apple refer to Hortalus' words, which have nearly slipped Catullus' mind, or to the poem that tumbles out as a gift to his friend? [...] It is both: the apple tucked up and forgotten is Hortalus' request, but the one that rolls out – the same apple, transformed by poetic alchemy in the middle of the simile – is the gift of poetry' (Gaisser (2009):146-147).

compliance with the ceremony of *deductio*,<sup>1132</sup> but also in that she was taken away from the bosom of her lawful husband.<sup>1133</sup> Hence, if this lexical survey hits the mark, one could account for the portrayal of the *sponsus*, who, all the same, sends a ‘clandestine gift’. In case Catullus himself hides behind him and Lesbia behind the *uirgo*, with this image the poet effectively encapsulates his wish to be Lesbia’s wedded husband, which, unfortunately, irremediably clashes with reality: Lesbia is already the bride of another man.<sup>1134</sup>

Then, let us inspect *oblita*. Although in the only occasion in which Catullus applies the adjective to Lesbia (83.3), it has a superficially positive ring to it (Lesbia has *not* forgotten Catullus, otherwise she would not have ranted at him), as the epigram unfolds, the optimistic halo vacillates dramatically;<sup>1135</sup> furthermore, elsewhere the adjective reproaches individuals who have disregarded either familial (Theseus, who did not change the colours of his sail, thereby causing his father’s suicide in 64.208)<sup>1136</sup> or friendly obligations (his associate Varus in 30.11).<sup>1137</sup> So, since Catullus often castigates Lesbia due to her infidelity,<sup>1138</sup> I put forward that in poem 65 as well the poet accuses her (in the guise of the *oblita uirgo*) of paying no heed to his present, thus exposing her fickleness. Contrariwise, Catullus, always observant of the demands of *amicitia* on the part of worthy friends, albeit overwhelmed with anguish, keeps his promise to Hortalus and sends him the best kind of poem he can possibly compose.

---

<sup>1132</sup> On this ritual see Hersch (2010): 140-144.

<sup>1133</sup> ‘It is made fully explicit that, however much she may *resemble* a bride, she is in fact married to another man, from whom she must steal the nights she spends with Catullus’ (Gale (2012): 204); cp. also Leigh (2016): 211. For her own part, Ambühl (2014): 125 rightly stresses ‘the ambiguities and dark hints evoked by the precarious relationship between the mythical paradigm (scil. predominantly Protesilaus and Laodamia) and the surrounding love story’ – see also *ibid.*: n. 35 for bibliography on this aspect, to which one should add Leigh (2016): 209-213.

<sup>1134</sup> See Stevens (2013): 168 for a related line of reasoning.

<sup>1135</sup> See Nesholm (2012): 686-695.

<sup>1136</sup> See Libby (2016): 65-74 with literature on forgetful Theseus.

<sup>1137</sup> On this composition see Thom (1993): 51-60 and append Williams (2012): 183-184.

<sup>1138</sup> For an overview of Lesbia poems see Hejduk (2007): 254-275.

One might object that by cramming even Lesbia into a *carmen* already saturated with Catullan themes, most notably his harrowing mourning for his dead brother (lines 6-14), the poet would end up intolerably slighting Hortalus. Yet, as I purport to show presently, apart from bearing witness to his freedom in honouring socially superior friends, Catullus's insistence on these themes in the covering letter tallies with, and anticipates, their materialisation in the *Coma Berenices*, to which I now turn.

A couple of preliminary remarks: since it has already been well elucidated, I shall not pore over the amply sifted closeness of Catullus's Latin to the extant chunks of Callimachus's Greek and occasional discrepancies;<sup>1139</sup> having said that, I remain mindful of the fact that a full comparison between the two poems is barred by the lacunae of Fr. 110 Harder and because *carmen* 66 does not literally render the Greek original. I shall also pass over the value of the poem in the eyes of Hortalus, which has already been satisfactorily elucidated Du Quesnay;<sup>1140</sup> lastly I shall leave aside the tormented final lines 89-94 because they do not affect my point.<sup>1141</sup> Rather, I shall deal with the motivations behind Catullus's selection of this Callimachean elegy<sup>1142</sup> and maintain that it enables him to tactfully bemoan his bereavement and express his amorous passion without slighting the dedicatee.<sup>1143</sup> To bolster this conjecture, which expands on the work of Gaisser,<sup>1144</sup> Acosta-

---

<sup>1139</sup> See Ferrandelli (2006): 141-157 (also with an eye on the metrical characteristics of *carmen* 6) and add Du Quesnay (2012): 164 n. 58 and Young (2015): 137-138 and 143-144; see also *ibid.*: 1-19 and 144 on translation practices in ancient Rome.

<sup>1140</sup> Du Quesnay (2012): 157-161 reconstructs the statesman's involvement in the restoration of Ptolemy XII to his throne.

<sup>1141</sup> See *ibid.*: 175-183 with literature.

<sup>1142</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 232-233 with literature emphasise the appeal of Sapphic touches in Fr. 110 Harder, which, according to them, heighten the appeal of the *Coma* lean towards the appeal of and identify. On the other hand, Young (2015): 145-150 and 156-165 with literature stresses the attractiveness of a challenging translation, the incorporation into the Catullan collection and the elevation of Callimachus to the status of *princeps elegiae* – on Callimachus's influence on Catullus and Roman Elegy see also Hunter (2013): 31-37 with bibliography.

<sup>1143</sup> In setting forth my elucidation, I heed the cautionary note struck by Skinner (2003): 40, who lacks confidence in attempts to explain away the tension between *carmina* 65 and 66 on the strength of shared themes.

<sup>1144</sup> Gaisser (2009): 148-150.

Hughes and Stephens,<sup>1145</sup> Ambühl<sup>1146</sup> and Young<sup>1147</sup> I rely on lexical proofs: to begin with *facinus* in line 26 and then the wording of lines 51-52.

*Anne bonum oblita es facinus, quo regium adeptas  
coniugium [...]?*<sup>1148</sup>

When read against the backcloth of Berenice's story, the arresting *bonum facinus* is usually deciphered as the murder of her first husband, which, as confirmed at least by Justin (*Epit.* 26.4-8),<sup>1149</sup> enabled her to be crowned queen of Egypt.<sup>1150</sup> So, although the Callimachean paternity of the couplet (along with the whole passage of lines 66.15-32) has been called into question,<sup>1151</sup> the authority of the ancient historian may partially vouch for the presence of this distich in Callimachus' poem.

Nevertheless, I set forth that there is more to this polysemous expression if one integrates it into the Catullan corpus, to wit a hint at Lesbia's betrayal of her groom to start an affair with the poet. The two other occurrences of the noun *facinus* in the Catullan oeuvre will be my guiding light: *qui tibi nunc cordi est, quem tu praeponere nobis / audes et necis quid facinus facias?*<sup>1152</sup> (81.5-6);<sup>1153</sup> *tu quod promisti, mihi quod mentita inimica es, / quod nec das et fers saepe, facis facinus*<sup>1154</sup> (110.3-4).<sup>1155</sup> In both cases, whose likeness is reinforced by the concomitant verb *facio*, which lends a certain solemnity,<sup>1156</sup> Iuventius and Aufillena renege on their faithfulness to the poet: the former has the effrontery to prefer the company of a worthless provincial and the latter refuses to give herself to Catullus despite their pact.

---

<sup>1145</sup> Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012): 228-229.

<sup>1146</sup> Ambühl (2014): 124.

<sup>1147</sup> Young (2015): 152-153.

<sup>1148</sup> 'Can it really be that you forgot the good crime, by dint of which you acquired the royal wedlock [...]?'

<sup>1149</sup> On this passage see pp. 175-176 above.

<sup>1150</sup> Clayman (2014): 98.

<sup>1151</sup> Harder (2012) II: 809.

<sup>1152</sup> 'This individual (scil. the guest from Pesaro), whom you dare to prefer to me, is now your delight and you ignore the crime you are committing?'

<sup>1153</sup> See Marisilio and Podlesney (2006): 177-180 with literature.

<sup>1154</sup> 'You are my enemy in that what you guaranteed me was falsely promised, and you commit a crime in that you do not concede (yourself) and often get (payments).'

<sup>1155</sup> See Maselli (1994): 79-83, Dettmer (1997): 213-215 and Skinner (2003): 134-135.

<sup>1156</sup> Krostenko (2001): 275.

With knowledge of these passages, let us return to the verses under scrutiny: since Catullus normally applies *facinus* to amorous deceitfulness, what could he mean by gracing the noun with the attribute *bonum*? My answer is that he salutes Lesbia's offence against her husband insofar as, even though she did not gain possession of a throne thanks to her liaison with the poet, she entered a relationship, which, in Catullus's mind, by far exceeds the ordinary marriage: an *aeternum sanctae foedus amicitiae* (109.6).<sup>1157</sup> To borrow from a recent and concise account: '[t]he words *fides* and *foedus* do not come from the vocabulary of love, but from the realm of friendships between male aristocrats. [...] To Catullus, Lesbia was much more than a lover. She was an equal who occupied the position of a friend bound to him by a sacred bond of trust'.<sup>1158</sup> Besides, the strength of this suggestion intensifies because the poet construes even Aufillena's felony in terms of a violation of *amicitia*: contrary to the trustworthy *bonae amicae* of line 1, she is *inimica* as a result of her inconstancy.<sup>1159</sup>

Let me now moot Catullus's despondency for his departed brother, which as concisely illustrated above, mightily manifests itself in poem 65, by building on Ambühl's brilliant remark that 'Berenice's grief for her absent brother-husband implicitly re-enacts [...] Catullus's personal tragedy'.<sup>1160</sup> I shall look at the extremely meaningful lines 51-52, which for once, can be compared with the original (Fr. 110.51 Harder), and briefly comment on the coil's plea for *munera* (in line 82), which, to me, equals the poet's tribute to his frater's tomb as *munus* in 101.3 and 8.

Ἄρτι [ν]εότημητόν με κόμαι ποθέεσκον ἀδε[λφραί].<sup>1161</sup>

*Abiunctae paulo ante comae mea fata sorores*

<sup>1157</sup> 'This eternal bond of sacred *amicitia*'.

<sup>1158</sup> O'Bryhim (2009): 6; see also more broadly Williams (2012): 175-179 with bibliography.

<sup>1159</sup> See Williams (2012): 179-180.

<sup>1160</sup> Ambühl (2014): 125.

<sup>1161</sup> 'My sister-locks were yearning after me, after I had just been freshly cut off'.

*lugebant*.<sup>1162</sup>

Three elements of Catullus's translation strike me immediately: above all, Catullus transfers the viewpoint from which separation is experienced from the curl to the 'sister-locks'; secondly, he renders the weaker ποθέω, which was previously used in the iterative form only by Homer to describe Achilles's longing for the abandoned battlefield,<sup>1163</sup> with *lugeo*, much stronger and more fitting for mourning,<sup>1164</sup> thirdly, the Greek accusative με becomes the much more poignant *mea fata*, which can also mean 'death'.<sup>1165</sup> In my opinion, one way to account for these peculiarities consists in envisaging that Catullus imbues them with his own fraternal disconsolateness: he turns himself into the *comae sorores*<sup>1166</sup> suffering the trauma of separation; he unambiguously vents his desperation as in a funerary lamentation; he ominously adumbrates his brother's calamitous quietus.

If my argument thus far hits the mark, I would like to conclude by propounding that the two Catullan threads (love and death) powerfully come together in the thorny lines 79-88, whose Callimachean authorship divides the scholarly community.<sup>1167</sup> Personally, I tend to uphold it: the rituals described are attested in Egypt, both with respect to legitimate marriage<sup>1168</sup> and in regards to the mourning conducive to the immortalisation of the Ptolemies.<sup>1169</sup>

Be that as it may, with an eye to Catullus, on the one hand, these verses may represent the peak of his conjugal wishful thinking: since, in his view, his union with Lesbia, which

---

<sup>1162</sup> 'Detached (from me) slightly before, my sister-locks were mourning my doom'.

<sup>1163</sup> Harder (2012) II: 823.

<sup>1164</sup> Cp. *OLD s.u.* 1.

<sup>1165</sup> Cp. *OLD s.u.* 6a.

<sup>1166</sup> Harder (2012) II: 805 stresses that whereas Catullus always chooses feminine words such as *coma* and *caesaries*, Callimachus opts for gender ambiguity: sometimes he uses the masculine βόστρυχος and πλόκαμος, sometimes the feminine κόμαι and once the indecisive νεότμητος.

<sup>1167</sup> See Du Quesnay (2012): 163 with full bibliography for the *status quaestionis*.

<sup>1168</sup> See *ibid.*: 163-175 with literature.

<sup>1169</sup> See van Oppen de Ruiter (2016): 105.

he maps onto the especially passionate union of Ptolemy III and Berenice II,<sup>1170</sup> by far exceeds ordinary matrimony, it should be blessed by the curl in her capacity of guardian of the marital chamber.<sup>1171</sup> At the same time, since the lock only sanctions faithful couples, it cannot approve of an *adulterium*, whose excruciating reality has already been broached above while briefly commenting on 68.143-46.<sup>1172</sup> On the other hand, when the poet accurately depicts the *coma*'s bid for *munera* after a cycle of death and immortalisation,<sup>1173</sup> he poignantly creates a parallel with the *munera* with which, by the rules of the venerable ceremony of the *inferiae*, he presents his brother on the latter's sepulchre in 101.3 and 8.<sup>1174</sup>

In the last subsection of the Latin half of the present chapter, I shall moot carmen 68; as a result, I cannot ignore its most perplexing conundrum: does it consist of a single sequence of 160 verses or two distinct unities ranging from line 1 to line 40 (68 A) and from line 41 to line 168 (68 B), severally?<sup>1175</sup> The mystery thickens even further when the identity of the addressee comes into play: does Allius,<sup>1176</sup> who is almost unanimously recognised as the dedicatee of lines 41-168,<sup>1177</sup> coincide with the individual apostrophised with the corrupt form *mali* in lines 11 and 30?<sup>1178</sup> For my own part, on the one hand, I would like to contribute a few remarks to the cause of unity hinging upon the language of *amicitia*, which, as I see it, binds the entire poem; on the strength of this, I think that *mi Alli* remains

---

<sup>1170</sup> Gutzwiller (1992): passim perceptively discusses this propagandistic motif in Callimachus's elegy.

<sup>1171</sup> Du Quesnay (2012): 166-168.

<sup>1172</sup> The ominous shadow of the disastrous vicissitudes of Protesilaus and Laodamia may cast itself again upon Catullus and Lesbia with respect to the inappropriate performance of the sacraments concomitant accompanying the *nuptiae* between the poet and his beloved: in 68.75-76, Laodamia, too, neglects the prescribed sacrifices prior to consummating her marriage, thus ultimately causing her husband's heartrending death – see Gale (2012): 189 with literature.

<sup>1173</sup> See van Oppen de Ruiter (2016): 105-109 with literature.

<sup>1174</sup> On this epigram and all its cultic facets, see the solid treatment in Bellandi (2007): 271-312 with bibliography and Gaisser (2009): 118-121 and 136-138.

<sup>1175</sup> An accurate list of 'separatists' and 'unitarians' is provided by Gale (2012): 184 n.1. The first group of should be supplemented with Thomson (1997): 472, Theodorakopoulos (2007): 315-316, Gaisser (2009): 121 and the scholars enumerated by Leigh (2016): 208 n. 44; the second cohort has most recently been joined by Ambühl (2014): 124 n. 31 and Leigh (2016): 194-224.

<sup>1176</sup> Behind the dedicatee Della Corte (1977): 330 hesitantly makes out Quintus Allius Maximus, *consul suffectus* in 49, whose rank jibes with Allius's station as *amicus superior* throughout the composition.

<sup>1177</sup> Leigh (2016): 217 with n. 84.

<sup>1178</sup> *Ibid.*: 217-223 with full bibliography, Leigh sifts the pros and cons of all the possible emendations (*mi Alli*, *Manli*, *Malli*, *Mani*); in the end, albeit a unitarian, he endorses *Malli*, but awards second place to *mi Alli*.

the best amendment, even though the objection (pertaining only to line 11) that Catullus avoids the elision in the sixth foot of the hexameter bars any certainty.<sup>1179</sup> Secondly, I aim to suggest that lines 41-160 develop into an arrestingly creative hymn in honour of Allius imbued with Callimacheanism,<sup>1180</sup> which also amply accommodates Lesbia and his brother. First things first: here are the relevant portions of the poem:

*[q]uod mihi fortuna casuque oppressus acerbo  
 conscriptum hoc lacrimis mittis epistolium, [...] id gratum est mihi, me quoniam tibi dicis amicum,  
 muneraque et Musarum hinc petis et Veneris.  
 sed tibi ne mea sint ignota incommoda, mi Alli,  
 neu me odisse putes hospitis officium,  
 accipe, quis merser fortunae fluctibus ipse,  
 ne amplius a misero dona beata petas. [...] quod cum ita sit, nolim statuas nos mente maligna  
 id facere aut animo non satis ingenuo,  
 quod tibi non utriusque petenti copia posta est:  
 ultro ego deferrem, copia siqua foret.  
 non possum reticere, deae, qua me Allius in re  
 iuuerit aut quantis iuuerit officiis,  
 ne fugiens saeculis obliuiscens aetas  
 illius hoc caeca nocte tegat studium,  
 sed dicam uobis, uos porro dicite multis  
 milibus et facite haec carta loquatur anus [...] notescatque magis mortuus atque magis,  
 nec tenuem texens sublimis aranea telam  
 in deserto Alii nomine opus faciat. [...] hoc tibi, quod potui, confectum carmine munus  
 pro multis, Alli, redditur officiis,  
 ne uestrum scabra tangat rubigine nomen  
 haec atque illa dies atque alia atque alia.<sup>1181</sup>*

<sup>1179</sup> Cp. *ibid.*: 220 with n. 96.

<sup>1180</sup> On the grounds set forth below, my hypothesis runs counter to Skinner's understanding of the poem on trial as Catullus's abandonment of Callimacheanism (Skinner (2003): 153 and 157).

<sup>1181</sup> 'Concerning the fact that you, overwhelmed by misfortune and a grievous event, send me this short letter written with tears [...], that is welcome to me because you call me your friend and request from me gifts of both Venus and the Muses. But, in order that my troubles may not be unknown to you, my Allius, and you may not think that I have an aversion to the guest's duty, be aware that I am, myself, submerged by the waves of misfortune so as not to require any longer happy gifts from a wretched man. [...] Forgive me, then, if I fail to bestow upon you the gifts of which mourning deprived me, because I cannot. [...] That being the case, since a supply of both sorts of gifts is not put at your disposal, I would not wish you to deem that I do this out of spiteful disposition or out of an attitude not generous enough: I would spontaneously offer them, if there were any possibility. I cannot leave unsaid, goddesses, neither the circumstance, in which Allius assisted me, nor the beneficial acts with which he assisted me, lest the fleeting lapse of time, as generations lose remembrance of things, may obscure this man's goodwill with a blind night. But I shall tell you, you, in turn, tell it to several thousands of men and see to it that these pages will mention it (even when) aged [...] and (see to it that) he will become more and more famous once dead and (see to it that) the spider, which weaves its thin web high up, will not work on Allius's abandoned name. [...] This gift



The *carmen* opens with Catullus receiving a missive<sup>1182</sup> from his distressed addressee, in which the latter urges him to assuage his emotional turmoil; this request pleases him insofar as Allius salutes him forthrightly as *amicus*. The appearance of this adjective ought to give one pause: apart from the sarcastically resentful occurrence in 28.13 (*pete nobiles amicos*) discussed above, the word presents itself only here in the group of texts under examination. Here, quite contrary to the unsatisfactory *praetores*, an *amicus superior* proves himself utterly true to his role: as line 12 anticipates and lines 67-69 more fully relate, he has let the poet take advantage of his own place for the sake of a special encounter with Lesbia. Hence, Catullus, who finds himself incapable of granting his correspondent's desire for love poems (*munera et Musarum et Veneris*),<sup>1183</sup> hastens to clarify that his impasse does not reflect disdain for his *hospitis officium*: what prevents him is his heartbroken keening of which the collocutor is probably unaware.<sup>1184</sup> The remorse for his (ultimately transcended) inability to discharge his debt, in my opinion, plagues Catullus so much that he feels compelled to iterate his apologies twice over in lines 21-32 and 36-40 and terminate them in a tremendously eloquent fashion: *ultra ego deferrem copia siqua foret* (line 40).

From line 41, according to the separatists, an independent poem begins; however, in light of Catullus's deep gratitude and affection, which, as proposed, permeate the entire first section of the composition in question, I doubt that the poet does not succeed in producing anything at all. By contrast, in my opinion, apart from enabling Catullus to extol

---

manufactured for you as I could in the shape of a poem is rendered to you in repayment for all of your beneficial acts, in order that this day and that one and another one and another one may not touch your family's name with rough rust.'

<sup>1182</sup> The use of *quod* in lines 1-10, 27-30, 33-34 can designate Catullus's reference to specific segments of Allius's letter – on the epistolary acceptance of the pronoun see Skinner (2003): 151 and append Deroux (2010): 104-105 with bibliography.

<sup>1183</sup> For this hendyadic understanding of the disputed expression see Deroux (2010): 101-102 and add Leigh (2016): 196-202, both with bibliography.

<sup>1184</sup> Deroux (2010): 100 with literature.

his *amicus* as he deserves, the successive 120 lines, which contain the tragic tale of Protesilaus and Laodamia along with a recollection of Catullus's unorthodox wedding night with Lesbia,<sup>1185</sup> satisfy his friend's hankering for amorous verses in a manner compatible with the poet's own mood. Besides, against this backdrop, the incipit of verse 41 (*non possum reticere*) sounds to me more natural than if it inaugurated a wholly new *carmen*: although one misses a linking word such as *tamen*, which, like in 65.14, would admittedly facilitate the progression, the turn of phrase implies that the poet has had to surmount some kind of obstacle. This contention is cemented by line 149: had Catullus not been hampered by the pangs of dejection which recur throughout lines 1-40, why should he have deployed the unprecedented<sup>1186</sup> phrase *quod potui?*<sup>1187</sup> Lastly, one can invoke<sup>1188</sup> the verbal symmetries between Allius's *officia* (in the sense of 'beneficial acts' of hospitality) in line 42 and 150<sup>1189</sup> and Catullus's *hospitis officium* (in the sense of guest's obligation) in line 12, along with the one between Catullus's *hoc confectum carmine munus* in line 149 and the recipient's thirst for *munera et Musarum et Veneris* in line 10.

On that note, let me turn attention to what I would define as Catullus's Callimachean hymn (lines 41-160). As Catullus sets his encomium of Allius in motion in lines 41-50, he, to me, programmatically borrows from Callimachus: line 45 takes its cue from *H.* 3.186 (εἰπέ, θεή, σὺ μὲν ἄμμιν, ἐγὼ δ' ἑτέροισιν ἀείσω).<sup>1190</sup> On the face of it, one may be tempted to contend that here Catullus 'reverses the usual claim of a poet to be the mouthpiece of the Muses'.<sup>1191</sup> Yet another possibility arises: by transforming Callimachus's learned

---

<sup>1185</sup> See above.

<sup>1186</sup> Cp., for example, *hoc, iucunde, tibi poema feci* in 50.16, in which the professed exhaustion might have led Catullus to include a formula of the same ilk.

<sup>1187</sup> Other scholars, who are enumerated by Leigh (2016): 221 n. 101, have detected a respension between the phrase at hand and the poet's protestation of incapacity in line 32 (*cum nequeo*).

<sup>1188</sup> See *ibid.*: 221 with n. 100.

<sup>1189</sup> See also Gaisser (2009): 122 on the conspicuous reflections between lines 42 and 150.

<sup>1190</sup> 'Speak, you, goddess, to me and I shall song to others'.

<sup>1191</sup> Thomson (1997): 479. It should not, still, be underestimated that Callimachus himself modifies the motif: he 'has substituted the goddess for his Muse' (Stephens (2015):145-146).

curiosity about Artemis's favourite haunts and Nymphs<sup>1192</sup> into the copious aspects of his dedicatee's goodwill towards him, Catullus turns the dedicatee into the honorand of his own unique hymn and beseeches the goddesses for assistance in imparting to his *amicus* everlasting fame.<sup>1193</sup> Subsequently, though, after comparing Allius's help with a thirst-quenching river<sup>1194</sup> and briefly recounting how he provided the poet and his beloved with bountiful shelter, somewhat surprisingly, Catullus makes Allius subside in the distance, from which the latter will not reappear until line 149, where the poet promises anew undying renown and wishes him prosperity.<sup>1195</sup>

Then, as the puzzlingly interlocking thematic blocks (Lesbia's arrival at the retreat, Protesilaus and Laodamia and grief for the brother) take centre stage by turns,<sup>1196</sup> Callimachus makes afresh his presence known through the elliptical narration of Protesilaus and Laodamia's tragedy.<sup>1197</sup> Furthermore, in my opinion, a similar procedure may be spotted in the learned simile ranging from line 109 to line 116, in which the poet decides on an obscure *parergon* at the time of Hercules's sixth labour.<sup>1198</sup> The Callimachean scent intensifies even more inasmuch as the epithet *falsiparens* denoting the

---

<sup>1192</sup> This stratagem reminds me of the dialogue with the Muses in *Aitia* 1-2; see Harder (2012) I: 52.

<sup>1193</sup> On these lines see Hunter (2006): 102-103.

<sup>1194</sup> On the enigmatic reference of this simile see Hunter (2006): 103-106 and, more recently, Gale (2012): 193-194, both with literature.

<sup>1195</sup> On these verses see Ambühl (2014): 130-131 with literature. Incidentally, I must demur at Skinner's contention that *tenuis* is equivalent to Callimachean λεπτός, there is a level (Skinner (2003): 157): as shown in chapter 1, when Catullus grapples with Callimachus's λεπτότης, he employs either *lepos* or *lepidus*; he only puts *tenuis* to use when he translates Sappho's λέπτων / [...] πῦρ (Fr. 31.9-10 Voigt) into *tenuis* [...] / *flamma* in 51.9-10.

<sup>1196</sup> On Protesilaus and Laodamia in the poem, see Hunter (2006): 106-108. On the intricate 'Chinese-box' structure see Gaisser (2009): 221-228 and append Gale (2012): 185-190, both with bibliography.

<sup>1197</sup> Ambühl (2014): 123-127 convincingly illustrates this narrative technique. In fact, she does not *apertis uerbis* indicate Callimachus as Catullus's predecessor, but *ibid.*: 115-116 she adduces the episode from Fr. 54 Harder as a broadly seminal model. In addition, *ibid.*: 127-132 she tantalisingly sets forth that the missing elements of the Protesilaus and Laodamia story may be more or less overtly spread on the adjoining poem 65. Moreover, she cautiously propounds that Catullus may have been inspired by an analogous Callimachean technique in his *H.* 2, *H.* 3 and *H.* 4 in regards to the childhood stories of Apollo and Artemis (cp. also *ibid.*: 117).

<sup>1198</sup> See Leigh (2016): 214-216 with bibliography.

erudite patronymic *Amphitryoniades* is modelled on the unmistakably Callimachean compound ψευδοπάτωρ<sup>1199</sup> in *H.* 6.98.<sup>1200</sup>

In sum, what impresses me above all in this extraordinary hymn *sui generis* is that precisely when Catullus exalts enthusiastically the *amicus superior* who conforms most scrupulously to the dictates of *amicitia*, he feels free to consecrate the vast majority of the verses to the topics dearest to his heart. In this respect, it seems to me, Catullus arguably appropriated Callimachus's shrewd exploitation of his hymns to promote his poetics, which I champion in the first half of this chapter. Both poets trusted their social superiors' (in the case of Catullus, Hortalus and Allius in the highest degree) magnanimity, which, all things considered, redounds to their credit: thanks to Callimachus and Catullus, neither cobwebs nor rust will ever damage their memory.

To wrap up my argument, I hope to have demonstrated that Catullus, plunged into the tumultuous final decades of the Republic and aware of his own prerogatives, makes a further leap towards independence by attacking social superiors (more savagely his praetor and, to a slightly less merciless degree, Gellius), who, poles apart from Allius, dare to ill-treat him. Even when assaulting these *amici superiores*, nevertheless, Catullus does not turn his back on Callimachean poetics altogether: he either borrows images from the cantankerous *Reply* or turns upside down the Cyrenean's erotic vocabulary consecrated to Berenice II to depict the abuses perpetrated upon him by Memmius.

---

<sup>1199</sup> Stephens (2015): 291 notes that this adjective is used only here in extant Greek literature.

<sup>1200</sup> On the original context, i.e. Erysichthon's father supplicating his own father Poseidon for aid, see *ibid.*: 290.

## Conclusions

The time has come to recapitulate the main findings of my dissertation. Each of the three chapters was centred on one aspect of Callimachus's quest for liberty, which ranged from the aesthetic realm to interactions with higher-ranking individuals, and on Catullus's Romanisation of Callimachus's pursuit. In accord with the structure of my thesis, I now split the summary of the outcomes of each chapter into a Greek and a Latin half: the former will be dedicated to Callimachus; the second to Catullus, who, in continuity with the design of this paper, will share the stage with Lucretius (only in chapter 1) and Cicero (in chapters 1 and 2). My decision to include these major contemporaries of Catullus aims to steer clear of muddying the waters, but to give a valuable insight into Catullus apropos of *lepos* in chapter 1 and of *honestum otium* and *utilitas* in chapter 2.

In chapter 1, I submitted that through the combination of the two metaphors in the *Reply to the Telchines*, namely Μοῦσα λεπταλέη in line 24 and σχοῖνος Περσίς in verse 18, Callimachus staked his claim to poetic freedom. Touching on Μοῦσα λεπταλέη, in the first place, I propounded that Callimachus raised her to the status of epitome of his refined poetics. I buttressed my hypothesis by intimating that the Muse symbolised poetry. Besides, I reviewed the other Callimachean occurrences of λεπτός-λεπταλέος and vindicated their consistent poetological import: αὐταὶ δ', Οὐπι ἄνασσα, περὶ πρύλιν ὠρχήσαντο / πρῶτα μὲν ἐν σακέεσιν ἐνόπλιον, αὔθι δὲ κύκλω / στησάμεναι χορὸν εὐρύν· ὑπήεισαν δὲ λίγεια / λεπταλέον σύριγγες in *H.* 3.240-243; Κολχίδες ἢ Νείλω[ι / λεπταλέους ἔξυσαν in *Fr.* 54.14-15 Harder; and λεπταί / ῥήσιες in epigram 27.3-4 Pfeiffer. Additionally, unlike previous Hellenists, I also traversed λεπτὸν ὕδωρ in *Fr.* 228.14 Pfeiffer. I championed not only its metapoetic force, but also its momentous consonance with the programmatic *Wassermetaphorik* in *H.* 2.108-112 on account of the similar ritual context, which the two passages share. Finally, I set forth that *Wassermetaphorik*

represented one bone of dissension between Callimachus and Posidippus in evaluating inflated oriental rivers. Whereas Callimachus dismisses the Assyrian river since its imposing stream carries debris in *H.* 2.108-112 (Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλά / λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἔλκει. / Διοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι, / ἀλλ' ἦτις καθαρὴ τε καὶ ἀχράαντος ἀνέρπει / πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβάς ἄκρον ἄωτον), Posidippus detects a gem amidst the waste in lines 1-4 of his *Ep.* 7 (ἐξ Ἀράβων τὰ ξάνθ{α} ὀ[ρέων κατέρ]υτα κυλίων, / εἰς ἄλλα χειμάρρους ὄκ' [ἐφόρει ποταμ]ὸς / τὸν μέλιτι χροίην λίθ[ον εἴκελον, ὄ]ν Κρονίο[υ] χεῖρ / ἔγλυψε.

Secondly, with an eye on σχοῖνος Περσίς, I advocated a further layer to the traditional understanding of the phrase in terms of Callimachus's rejection of a disproportionately long unit of measurement with the purpose of repudiating his adversaries' obsession with length per se as a valid means to gauge poetry. To wit, I argued that Callimachus combined the Greek image of the Persians as an enslaving people with the chain, one of the most graphic symbols of thralldom. Thereby, Callimachus rejected more sweepingly his critics' old-fashioned aesthetic criteria, which, by Callimachus's lights, would inevitably clip his wings. In support of my thesis, I used a normally overlooked line 19 of the programmatic *Iamb.* 13: Τ[ε]ῦ μέχρι τολμᾶς; Οἱ φίλοι σε δῆσουσ[ι]. After voicing his outrage at Callimachus's brazen mixture of Ionic and Doric dialect in his *Iambi*, the niggler, not unlike the Telchines, oppugns Callimachus's daring and unorthodox approach and exclaims that his friends should bind him. I granted that the verb δέω was entirely unrelated to σχοῖνος from an etymological viewpoint; in spite of that, the thrust of the verse, in my opinion, chimed with the explication of my decipherment of expression σχοῖνος Περσίς in Fr. 1.18 Harder. In fine, I maintained that Callimachus targeted most especially Plato's and Aristotle's determination to subjugate poetry to their own agendas and, first and foremost in the case of Aristotle, put form under the yoke of content – I expanded on this theme in chapter 2.

In the Latin section, I broached Catullus's translation of λεπτότης into the etymologically related *lepos* in the inaugural verse of the programmatic *carmen* 1. By building on the exhaustive studies of how the attributes defining the *libellus* in lines 1-2 (*lepidum, nouum, / arida modo pumice expolitum*) of poem 1 did not merely pertain to its visual aspect, but also programmatically pointed to Callimachean tenets, I spelled out what *lepidus* meant exactly for Catullus and, in conformity with the introductory scheme, I started with its poetological bearing. Consequently, I advanced that the phrase *lepidum* [...] *libellum* heralded Catullus's embracement of Callimacheanism by neatly rendering Callimachus's hailing of Aratus's *Phain.* as λεπταί / ῥήσιες in *Ep.* 27.3-4 Pfeiffer and his Μοῦσα λεπταλέη in Fr. 1.24 Harder, a fortiori if one joins me in interpreting the Muse as the personification of poetry. Then, I called attention to Catullus's choice to dedicate two full lines to his poetics, and barely one word in line 4 (*nugae*) to the content of his booklet. Additionally, since *nugae* basically signifies 'frivolities', 'bagatelles' or 'trifles', I advocated an overlap with the Telchines' disparagement of Callimachus's *Aitia* as a childish product in Fr. 1.6 Harder (παῖς ᾄτε) and deduced that Catullus adopted Callimachus's aspiration to set his art free from all coercions, subject matter included. Ultimately, I conjectured that *carmen* 1 could have been overall indebted to the polemic tone of the *Reply to the Telchines*. Catullus, too, had enemies who ἐπιτρύζουσιν ... ἀοιδῆι (Fr. 1.1 Harder), who frown upon his *libellus*. That said, there existed some people, οἱ Μούσης [...] ἐγένοντο φίλοι (Fr. 1.2), and it was precisely to one of these, Cornelius Nepos, that Catullus donated his collection of poems. In addition, in case the title of the Catullan collection had been *Passer* (ἀηδών in Greek), Nepos and the Muse would have been besought to look after the small bird, so that its μελιχρός voice (Callimachus's Fr. 1.16 Harder) might escape the all-snatching hand of Hades like the immortal poems of Callimachus's friend Heraclitus, which were metaphorically designated as ἀηδονίδες in *Ep.* 2.5 Pfeiffer.

Afterwards, I mooted the Roman *côté* of *lepidus* and relied upon other telling instances thereof in the Catullan corpus, videlicet the one in lines 7-8 of *carmen* 50 (*atque illinc abii tuo lepore / incensus, Licinii, facetiisque*), the Catullan recollection of a day spent with his close associate L. Calvus leisurely (*otiosi*, line 1) absorbed into light-hearted poetry (*multum lusimus*, line 2). To Roman ears, such an activity would have appeared intolerably beyond the pale – I reverted in detail to this issue in chapter 2. Against this backdrop, I dissected the Latin sense of *lepos* in the Catullan corpus and, by expanding on previous scholarship, I proposed that Catullus usually attributed the adjective *lepidus* or the noun *lepos* to human beings to denote their verbal adroitness, amiable conviviality and a tinge of erotic charm. From all this, I inferred that by terming his *libellus lepidus* in *carmen* 1.1, through a decidedly bold gesture, Catullus transferred human qualities onto an object.

Therefrom, I concluded that at the heart of Catullus's project dwelt *lepos* in its infrangible unity of the Callimachean afflatus towards self-legislating poetry and espousal of emancipated and politically charged Latin 'charm'. For all that, the last occurrence of *lepos* in the Catullan corpus in 16.5-11 (*nam castum esse decet pium poetam / ipsum, uersiculos nihil necesse est, / qui tum denique habent salem ac leporem, / si sunt molliculi et parum pudici / et quod pruriat incitare possunt, / non dico pueris, sed his pilosis, / qui duros nequeunt mouere lumbos*) complicates the picture. Although here Catullus admittedly resorts to a traditional assertion of aggressively penetrating masculinity, which effectively frames the composition (*pedicabo ego uos et irrumabo*), I contended that Catullus uniquely rejected the aspersion of effeminacy (*parum pudicum* in line 4 and *male marem* 13). Conversely, Catullus never abjured *lepos*, but provoked the most adamant guardians of morality more arrestingly: on the one hand, to Catullus, *lepos* stemmed precisely from the *impudicitia* of his *uersiculi*; on the other hand, he insinuated that his *lepos* succeeded in titillating even the most intransigent standard-bearers of the *mos maiorum*.



To shed light on Catullus's profound commitment to λεπτότης, I surveyed the numerous deployments of Lucretian *lepos*, among which I granted pride of place to those pertaining to literary criticism. First and foremost, I examined Lucretius's paradoxical reception of Callimachus in 1.926-950 and spotted a two-sided (and until now overlooked) citation of the *Aitia* prologue: *musaeo lepore* at 1.934, which harks back to Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην in Fr. 1.24 Harder. To me, this allusion betokened that, on the one hand, at one with the imagery in 1.926-928, Lucretius embraced Callimachean λεπτότης; on the other hand, Lucretius subverted its substance. In other words, he turned the accusative Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην, scilicet Callimachus's supreme ideal of artistic autonomy, into an ablative, that is a medium to cajole the disciple into adopting the potentially unappetising Epicurean message of the poem. Lastly, I applied myself to Cicero's handling of *lepos*. I took my cue from prior treatments of Ciceronian *lepos* and worked against the theoretical background, which hinged on the assumption that each Ciceronian speech (be it senatorial, electoral or forensic) contributed to Cicero's political self-fashioning. I dealt with all the six extant occurrences of *lepos* in the orations (*Ver.* 2.3.35 and 2.5.142, *Clu.* 141, *Cat.* 2.23, *Flac.* 9, *Prov. cons.* 29) and some instances from the dialogue *de Orat.* (2.220, 221, 222, 225, 227, 228, 230) and made a case for Cicero's resolve to disapprovingly associate *lepos* with his opponents in the clear majority of the oratorical passages in question, so as to chastise them as grievously devoid of Roman values. In the same breath, in my judgement, Cicero propagated an image of himself as the champion of Latin morals. At the same time, from my standpoint, even in the two cases (*Clu.* 141 and *Prov. cons.* 29), in which he handled *lepos* slightly more tolerantly, he never styled himself as *lepidus* for fear that his detractors might take him to task for his unsteadiness. Finally, I advanced that, constantly toiling to hold attackers at bay, in *de Orat.* Cicero apologetically strove to sanction *lepos* as a type of acceptable humour ancillary to the very Roman values of *grauitas*, *auctoritas* and *dignitas*.

In the Greek section of chapter 2, I called attention to Callimachus's refusal to abide by τὸ πρέπον, which governed the suitable relationship between subject-matter and linguistic register. I conceded that one finds neither Callimachean occurrences of the notion nor ancient scholia testifying to Callimachus's engagement with this aesthetic law. Nevertheless, Aristotle's weighty theorisation of the concept (above all in *Rhet.* 2 and 7) wielded influence over the third century. To corroborate my contention, in the first place, I briefly noted Alexandrian philologists' (evidence abounds in the case of Aristarchus, but one discovers some attestations, which can be traced back to Zenodotus, whose lifespan overlaps with Callimachus's) deployment of this criterion in editing Homer; thereupon, thanks to the indispensable gradual decipherment of the charred remains of Philodemus's *Poëm.*, I pored over the fragments of four contemporaries of Callimachus's, scilicet Heraclides of Pontus, whose membership of the Academy or the Peripatos remains disputed, Theophrastus, Andromenides and Praxiphanes of Mitilene, who belonged to the Peripatetic school and adopted their master's conceptualisation of literary appropriateness. Touching on Praxiphanes, furthermore, who, according to the *Scholia Florentina*, ranked among the Telchines, and is reported to have been the addressee of a Callimachean (possibly polemical) work entitled Πρὸς Πραξιφάνην, I tentatively speculated that the axiom of aptness might have been a source of disagreement between him and Callimachus. In the second place, apart from bringing to light a first proof of Callimachus's spurning of Aristotelian precepts in his non-acceptance of the tenet of unity (*Po.* 8) in Fr. 1.3-4 Harder (οὐχ ἔν ἄεσιμα [...] / ἦνυσσᾶ), I scrutinised Callimachus's deployment of language in Frs. 54b and c Harder in the *Victoria Berenices* and identified manifold grievous breaches of literary propriety. My analysis extended to the enigmatic phrase παῖς ἄτε in Fr. 1.6 Harder, with which Callimachus's critics reprimand him, as an attack levelled at Callimachus's 'childish' collapse of any barrier between high and low registers in favour of a mixture of solemn and common vocabulary, Homeric phrases and technical jargon, common or iambic

and comic words turned into mock-epic diction. Moreover, although I took on board the upshot of recent studies which have proved Aristotle's wide-ranging impact on the Alexandrian library and Callimachus's own compositions in prose, I vindicated Callimachus's revolt against philosophical attempts to legislate poetry. In the third place, I cursorily commented on Callimachus's will, to a degree in counter-tendency to the infringement of fittingness in the *Victoria Berenices*, when faced *in propria persona* with taboo sacred themes (for instance Zeus's and Hera's sexual intercourse in Fr. 75.4-9 Harder or Demeter's plights in *H.* 6.17-22) to avoid telling these forbidden tales at the very last minute.

Subsequently, in the Latin portion of chapter 2, I proposed that Catullus adopted Callimachus's rebellion against literary propriety to reinforce his own more politically charged noncompliance with two staples of Roman seemliness: *honestum otium* and *utilitas* of the written fruits of *otium*. Videlicet, I analysed Catullus's will to create *lusus* in *carmen* 50 instead of penning time-sanctioned compositions such as an annalistic celebration of the glory of Rome, which conformed to *utilitas* for society at large. Likewise, I traversed *carmen* 10 to bring to the fore Catullus's flaunting of his slothful condition in the *forum*, never bothering to prove that his leisurely hours did not interfere with official *negotia*, which he rejected to retire into the private sphere. By the same token, in studying the *basia* poems 5 and 7, I drew a parallel between the Telchines, who discountenanced Callimachus's infringement of literary seemliness, with Catullus's *senes seueriores*, who looked sternly upon his frivolity. Here, I showed that in Rome, the absence of aesthetic appropriateness instantly merged with social and moral issues: not content with snubbing the key qualification of respectable usefulness, Catullan poetry limned unabashedly a scandalous sluggishness, which teeters on the edge of a lack of self-control and a resultant devastating insinuation of effeminacy. For all that, I did not erase the tensions fissuring Catullus's stance towards *otium*: suffice it to mention here the last stanza of poem 51

(*otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est, otio exultas nimiumque gestis, / otium et reges prius et beatas / perdidit urbes*). Still, I emphasised that Catullus never disavowed his choices in favour of a more traditional conduct, but rather reflected on the repercussions of his *otium* upon himself: he stressed his physical detriment and excessive restlessness, perhaps thereby ironically implying that he failed to enjoy the tranquillity which, by definition, *otium* should engender.

Yet, before turning attention to Catullus, just as in the previous chapter, I attempted to throw into sharper relief his markedly untraditional posture by comparing him with Cicero. By examining a passage from *Inv.* 4, relevant extracts from four orations (*Sull.* 26, *Arch.* 12, *Sest.* 98, *Planc.* 66), a fragment of the poem *Cons.* and §§ 1-3 from the preface to *de Orat.*, along with a few samples from the epistles, I demonstrated that, in sheer contrast with Catullus, Cicero took the criteria very seriously which the literary pursuits of the elite were expected to meet to gain approval. By implication, irrespective of the agenda peculiar to each work, Cicero went to great lengths to exculpate them and resorted to two chief arguments: he has always granted pride of place to his *negotium*; far from interfering with his services to the commonwealth, all his intellectual activities have benefitted the state.

In the Greek section of chapter 3, I distanced myself from modern bias inducing one to equal the exaltation of kings to undignified adulation. By contrast, in harmony with the most up-to-date scholarly developments, I considered Callimachus as an active forger of Ptolemaic ideology, who consistently preferred subtlety to overt eulogy, particularly when attending to the incorporation of his sovereigns into the Greek pantheon in his capacity as expert in cultic matters. As a result, without obliterating the undeniable propagandistic aspect, I posited that Callimachus deftly succeeded in exploiting it, even in pursuit of a more personal agenda. Specifically, to my mind, in *H.* 4.171-175 and *H.* 1.3, Callimachus neatly likened Ptolemy II's military triumphs over his enemies to his own aesthetic defeat of his detractors. Concerning Arsinoe II and Berenice II, Callimachus enlisted his queens

as guarantors of his original poetics in the *Ἐκθέωσις Ἀρσινόης*, the *Victoria Berenices* and the *Coma Berenices*. Hereafter, I elucidated the poet's laudation of his sovereigns' tolerance, which underpinned Callimachus's ironic handling of the incestuous marriage between Arsinoe II and Ptolemy II in Fr. 75.4-9 Harder, as well as the questionable aspects of the queen's past (most notably her assassination of Demetrius the Fair) in *H. 5*, *H. 6* and in the *Coma*. Lastly, I probed the *Victoria Sosibii* (Fr. 384 Pfeiffer) and *Iamb. 12* with its important poetological import to uncover a further (and disregarded) dimension of Callimachean court poetry: Callimachus did not restrict his range of patrons to kings and queens, but also included other prominent members of the lordly entourage.

The Latin part of this chapter was geared towards a group of poems (10, 28, 116, 65-66 and 68), in which Catullus apostrophised individuals belonging to upper social strata. I held that, never intimidated by their standing, irrespective of whether they sat in the senate or hail from illustrious noble families, Catullus based his attitude towards them exclusively on the treatment they gave him: whereas respect was reciprocated with Callimachean gifts, haughtiness was repaid with scathing invective. My line of inquiry incorporated Catullus's scanty biographical data, which enable one to take it for granted that Catullus belonged to a wealthy Cisalpine equestrian household, which was acquainted even with Julius Caesar. So, even if he did not need support from a wealthy patron, who expected the poet to repay his liberality with celebratory compositions, he could not neglect wholesale that complex network of ties called *amicitia*. What is more, I interpreted those Catullan poems against the backcloth of *amicitia*: despite the scholarly disagreement concerning its definition, one seems to tread on safe ground in maintaining that this quintessentially Roman bond rested chiefly upon loyalty and reciprocity, which was put into effect via a continuous and varied exchange. One of the most fiercely discussed issues relates to the extent to which in moderately uneven relationships between *amici superiores* and *inferiores*, for instance knights and senators, the former were supposed to show deference towards the latter. The

question is complicated even further because Catullus makes sparing use of *amicus* in regard to these rapports: the acrimoniously ironic phrase *pete nobiles amicos* in 28.13, in which he denounces provincial governors' imperiousness towards their staff, and the warmly affectionate *me quoniam tibi dicis amicum* in 68.9, where the addressee of the composition bestows the title upon the poet. Even so, with all due caution enjoined by the lack of comprehensive information on Catullus's life, I intimated that the *carmina* in question could be used to better grasp Catullus's position on these matters. In my estimation, Catullus paid homage to his *amici superiores* uniquely on condition that they behaved fairly towards him; on the contrary, when he believed that they had trampled over him, he hit back by dint of venomous verses.

Following that, I considered the way in which Callimacheanism intertwined with these relationships: *carmina Battiadae* were chosen to laud courteous *amici superiores*. With ungracious *amici superiores*, the rather poisonous character of Catullus's verses notwithstanding, contact with Callimachus's poetics was not entirely lost. In the case of Caius Memmius, who short-changed Catullus (a breach of the cardinal principle of mutuality), Catullus did not hesitate to do the same and even the score. To achieve this goal, Catullus selected the crude image of oral rape, which may have amounted to a reversal of Callimachus's original usage of erotic terminology in his compositions addressed to queen Berenice II. Then, the stormy *amicitia* with Gellius perfectly exemplified the transition from amity to hostility: while the aristocratic dedicatee deported himself civilly towards his proud *amicus inferior*, he received *carmina Battiadae*, perhaps in an encomiastic vein, just like the translation of Fr. 110 Harder dispatched to Hortalus and introduced with the same turn of phrase. However, when Gellius began to despise Catullus, he was repaid with bellicose lines, which, all the same, did not ensue from a wholesale rejection of Callimacheanism. I challenged the common understanding of the morphological archaisms in lines 2-3 (*uti* and *qui*) and the holospondaic rhythm of line 3

as Catullus's abandonment of Callimacheanism to pose as an Ennian Romulus to vent his wrath. Contrariwise, I upheld a resonance from the *Reply*, which would amplify the likely adaptation of πολλάκι μοι (Fr. 1.1 Harder) with *saepe tibi* in 116.1 and impart further Callimachean savour to the poem: Μασσαγέται καὶ μακρὸν ὀϊστεύοιεν ἐπ' ἄνδρα / Μῆδον] (Fr. 1.15-16 Harder). Much of the enigmatic substance of this Callimachean metaphor (possibly a rejection of historical wars as content and of length as a stylistic criterion), is admittedly not thoroughly absorbed by Catullus. Regardless, *tela infesta mittere* could match ὀϊστεύοιεν and *<meum> in usque caput* could correspond to ἐπ' ἄνδρα / Μῆδον]. Through this refashioning of Callimachean verses, Catullus could (to no avail, as the remainder of the poem will reveal) caution Gellius against persevering in perilous conduct which would relegate him to the doomed aesthetic of the Telchines, and lead to a grievous break-up in their friendship for which the poet would hold him responsible. After that, I tackled the diptych 65-66 addressed to the worthy *amicus superior* Hortalus, to whom the poet sent a Latin rendition of the *Coma Berenices* as a token of his affection. I also canvassed Catullus's pick of this specific Callimachean piece because it permitted Catullus to mingle tactfully the dedicatee's interests with his love for Lesbia and his despair at his brother's premature death. To conclude, I addressed *carmen* 68, probably the most comprehensive illustration of Catullus's stance on *amicitia* with a benevolent member of the senatorial ranks, where the poet thankfully rewarded a truly deserving friend with a complex mythical narration à la Callimachus, which, once again, interweaved with Catullus's affair with Lesbia and disconsolation at his fraternal grief. I insisted predominantly on the fact that, in poems 66 and 68, when Catullus exalted the *amicus superior* who conformed most scrupulously to the dictates of *amicitia*, he felt free to consecrate the majority of the verses to the topics dearest to his heart. In this respect, Catullus may be said to have appropriated Callimachus's shrewd exploitation of his hymns in honour of the Ptolemies to promote his poetics. Both poets trusted their social superiors'

magnanimity (in the case of Catullus, Hortalus and Allius in the highest degree), which, all things considered, redounded to their credit: thanks to Callimachus and Catullus, neither cobwebs nor rust will ever damage their memory.

I would now like to round off my conclusion (and, by implication, my thesis) by making a confession: Callimachus and Catullus hold such a special place in my heart that I always worry about getting carried away by emotion to the detriment of the necessary scholarly lucidity. Such risk looms ever greater when the theme under examination is liberty, on which I have been setting my sights over the past six years. Having said that, I hope that my arguments have persuaded that Callimachus's powerful quest for freedom captivated Catullus to such an extent that he eagerly absorbed it and turned it into a prominent motif of his corpus. In like manner, I trust that I did justice to the Roman side of Catullus's poetry and that I did not pass over in silence those occasions on which Catullus diverged from Callimachus to a degree. Personally, I believe that these cases, a far cry from lessening the importance of a literary affiliation, bear witness to the unmistakably personal essence of the appropriation of an older poet on the part of one younger; in the same breath, they testify to the width of the cues the model is capable of offering to his successors. At any rate, I would never assert that I have exhaustively probed all ramifications of Catullan Callimacheanism: nobody can expect to exhaust this topic! I would instead count myself utterly satisfied if, even when one demurs at my line of inquiry, one does not suspect that I used violence on Callimachus and Catullus by forcing my ideas upon their verses. Should this occur, apart from apologising in advance to my readers, permit me to beg the forgiveness of my beloved poets: I assure you that it was not done on purpose.



## Bibliography

### Editions and Commentaries

- Armstrong, D., Fish, J. and Porter, J. I. (eds.) forthcoming. *Philodemus: On Poems, Book 5*, Oxford.
- Austin, C. F. L. and Bastianini, G. 2002. *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia*, Milan.
- Bailey, C. 1967<sup>2</sup>. *Lucreti De Rerum Natura*, Oxford.
- Bastianini, G and Gallazzi, C. 2001. *Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, I-II, Milan.
- Berry, D. H. 1996. *Cicero: Pro P. Sulla Oratio*, Cambridge.
- Bowra, C. M. 1963<sup>2</sup>. *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, Oxford.
- Burnet, J. 1909. *Platonis opera III: Theages; Charmides; Laches; Lysis; Euthydemus; Protagoras; Gorgias; Meno; Hippias Maior; Hippias Minor; Io; Menexenus*, Oxford.  
1978. *Platonis opera IV: Clitopho; Res publica; Timaeus; Critias*, Oxford.
- Campana, P. 2012. *Il ciclo di Gellio nel liber catulliano: per una rilettura di Catull. 74, 80, 88, 89,90, 91, 116*, Pisa.
- Clark, A. C. 1908<sup>2</sup>. *M. Tulli Ciceronis orationes I: Pro Sex. Roscio; De imperio Cn. Pompei; Pro Cluentio; In Catilinam; Pro Murena; Pro Caelio*, Oxford.  
1909. *M. Tulli Ciceronis orationes IV: Pro P. Quintio; Pro Q. Roscio comoedo; Pro A. Caecina; De lege agraria contra Rullum; Pro C. Rabirio perduellionis reo; Pro L. Flacco; In L. Pisonem; Pro C. Rabirio Postumo*, Oxford.  
1911. *M. Tulli Ciceronis orationes VI: Pro Tullio; Pro Fonteio; Pro Sulla; Pro Archia; Pro Plancio; Pro Scauro*, Oxford.
- Coşkun, A. 2010. *Cicero und das römische Bürgerrecht: Die Verteidigung des Dichters Archias*, Göttingen.
- Coppola, G. 1935. *Cirene e il nuovo Callimaco*, Bologna.
- Courtney, E. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, Oxford.
- Crawford, J. W. 1994. *M. Tullius Cicero: The Fragmentary Speeches*, Atlanta.
- D'Alessio, G. B. 2001<sup>3</sup>. *Callimaco: Inni; Epigrammi; Ecalle; Aitia; Giambi e altri frammenti*, I-II, Milan.
- Delattre, D. 2007. *Philodème de Gadara : Sur la musique, livre IV*, I-II, Paris.
- Della Corte, F. 1977. *Catullo, le poesie*, Milan.
- Des Places, E. 1982. *Porphyre : Vie de Pythagore – Lettre à Marcella*, Paris.

- Dyck, A. R. 2008. *Cicero: Catilinarians*, Cambridge.
- Einarson, B. and De Lacy, P. H. 1967. *Contra Epicuri beatitudinem (Against Epicurean Happiness)* (Plutarch *Moralia* 14), Cambridge, MA.
- Fordyce, C. J. 1961. *Catullus, a Commentary*, Oxford.
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. 2005. *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought & Influence. Commentary Volume 8: Sources on Rhetoric and Poetics*, Leiden-Boston.
- Fratantuono, L. 2015. *A Reading of Lucretius' De Rerum Natura*, Lanham-Boulder-New York-London.
- Gale, M. 2009. *Lucretius: De Rerum Natura, Book 5*, Oxford-Oakville, CT.
- Gow, A. S, F. 1950. *Theocritus, I-II*, Cambridge.
- Grillo, L. 2015a. *Cicero's De Provinciis Consularibus Oratio*, Oxford-New York.
- Gastaldi, S. 2014. *Aristotele: Retorica*, Rome.
- Guastini, D. 2010. *Aristotele: Poetica*, Rome.
- Harder, M. A. 2012. *Callimachus: Aetia, I-II*, Oxford-New York.
- Hollis, A. S. 2007. *Fragments of Roman Poetry c.60 BC-AD 20*, Oxford.  
2009<sup>2</sup>. *Callimachus: Hecale. Second Revised Edition*, Oxford-New York.
- Hopkinson, N. 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology*, Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L. 2003a. *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London.
- Kassel, R. 1965. *Aristotelis De arte poetica liber*, Oxford.
- Kaster, R. 2004. *Cicero: Speech on Behalf of Publius Sestius*, Oxford.
- Kenney, E. J. 2014<sup>2</sup>. *Lucretius: De Rerum Natura, Book 3*, Cambridge.
- Janko, R. 2000. *Philodemus: On Poems, Book 1*, Oxford.  
2011. *Philodemus: On Poems, Books 3-4, with the Fragments of Aristotle On Poets*, Oxford-New York.
- Kroll, W. 1923. *C. Valerius Catullus*, Stuttgart.
- Lelli, E. 2005a. *Callimachi Iambi XIV-XVII*, Rome.
- Lindsay, W.M. 1913. *Sexti Pompei Festi De uerborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli Epitome*, Leipzig.
- Mangoni, C. 1993. *Filodemo: il quinto libro della Poetica*, Naples.

- Mankin, D. 2011. *Cicero: De Oratore, Book 3*, Cambridge-New York.
- Martano, A., Matelli, E. and Mirhady, D. (eds.) 2012. *Praxiphanes of Mytilene and Chamaleon of Heraclea: Texts, Translation and Discussion*, Brunswick-London.
- Massimilla, G. 1996. AITIA. *Libri primo e secondo*, Pisa.  
2010. AITIA. *Libri Terzo e Quarto*, Pisa-Rome.
- Matelli, E. 2012. *Prassifane. Testimonianze e frammenti: filosofia e grammatica in età ellenistica*, Milano.
- Mynors, R. A. B. 1958. *Catulli carmina*, Oxford.
- Peterson, W. 1910. *M. Tulli Ciceronis orationes V: Cum senatui gratias egit; Cum populo gratias egit; De domo sua; De haruspicum responso; Pro Sestio; In Vatinius; De provinciis consularibus; Pro Balbo*, Oxford.  
1917<sup>2</sup>. *M. Tulli Ciceronis orationes III: Diuinatio in Q. Caecilium; In Verrem*, Oxford.
- Petrovic, A. 2007. *Kommentar zu den simonidischen Versinschriften*, Leiden-Boston.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1949-1953. *Callimachus, I-II*, Oxford.
- Powell, J. U. 1925. *Collectanea Alexandrina: Reliquiae minores poetarum Graecorum aetatis Ptolemaicae 323-146 A.C. Epicorum, Elegiacorum Lyricorum, Ethicorum*, Oxford.
- Ross, W. D. 1959. *Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica*, Oxford.
- Schwameis, C. 2014. *Die Praefatio von Ciceros De Inventione*, Munich.
- Schütrumpf, E. 2008. *Heraclides of Pontus: Texts and Translations*, Brunswick-London.
- Skutsch, O. 1985. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*, Oxford.
- Stephens, S. A. 2015. *Callimachus: The Hymns*, Oxford-New York.
- Stroebel, E. 1915. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta quae manserunt omnia. Rhetorici libri duo qui vocantur De Inventione*, Leipzig.
- Syndikus, H. P. 1984-1990. *Catull: Eine Interpretation, I-III*, Darmstadt.
- Thomson, D. S. F. 1997. *Catullus*, Toronto-Buffalo-London.
- Trappes-Lomax, J. M. 2007. *Catullus: A Textual Reappraisal*, Swansea.
- Voigt, E.-M. 1971. *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta*, Amsterdam.
- Yardley, J. C. and Heckel, W. 1997. *Justin: Epitome of the Hellenistic History of Pompeius Trogus, Volume I: Books 11-12*, Oxford.

Yatromanolakis, D. forthcoming. *Fragments of Sappho: A commentary*, Cambridge, MA.

Watt, W. S. 1982<sup>2</sup>. *M. Tulli Ciceronis epistulae I: Epistulae ad familiares*, Oxford.

Wilkins, A. S. 1902. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Rhetorica I: De oratore*, Oxford.

### Secondary Literature

Acosta-Hughes, B. 2002. *The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

2003. 'Aesthetics and Recall: Callimachus Frs. 226-229 Pf. Reconsidered' *The Classical Quarterly* 53: 478-489.

2012. 'Les Dioscures dans la poésie alexandrine : caractère et symbolique' in Cusset, Le Meur-Weissman and Levin (eds.) 155-170.

2015. 'Love and the Hunter. Callimachus and Platonic *Paideia*' *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 108: 5-24.

Acosta-Hughes, B., Lehnus, L., and Stephens, S. A. (eds.) 2011. *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, Leiden-Boston.

Acosta-Hughes, B., Kosmetatou, E and Baumbach, M. (eds.). 2004. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, Cambridge, MA.

Acosta-Hughes, B. and Stephens, S. A. 2001. 'Aetia fr. 1.5: I Told My Story Like a Child' *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 136: 214-216.

2002. 'Rereading Callimachus' *Aetia* Fragment 1' *Classical Philology* 97: 238-255.

2012. *Callimachus in Context: From Plato to the Augustan Poets*, Cambridge-New York.

Adams, J. N. 2007. *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC-AD 600*, Cambridge.

Adams, J. N. and Mayer, R. G. (eds.) 1999. *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, Oxford.

Ager, S. L. and Faber, R. A. (eds.) 2013. *Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World*, Toronto-Buffalo-London.

Agócs, P., Carey, C. and Rawles, R. and (eds.) 2012. *Receiving the Komos: Ancient and Modern Reception of the Victory Ode*, London.

Alfonsi, L. 1945. *Poetae novi: storia di un movimento poetico*, Como, 1945.

Ambühl, A. 2005. *Kinder und junge Helden: Innovative Aspekte des Umgangs mit der literarischen Tradition bei Kallimachos* (Hellenistica Groningana IX), Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA.

2014. '(Re)constructing Myth: Elliptical Narrative in Hellenistic and Latin Poetry' in Hunter, Rengakos and Sistakou (eds.) 113-132.

Andrews, N. E. 1998. 'Philosophical Satire in the *Aetia* Prologue' in Harder, Regtuit and Wakker (eds.) 1-19.

- Arena, V. 2016. 'Informal Norms, Values, and Social Control in the Roman Participatory Context' in Hammer (ed.) 217-238.
- Arrighetti, G. 2006. *Poesia, poetiche e storia nella riflessione dei Greci*, Pisa.
- Arrighetti, G., Fogazza, O., Gamberale, L. and Montanari, F. (eds.) 1989. *La filologia greca e latina nel secolo XX – Atti del convegno internazionale, Roma, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, 17-21 settembre 1984, I-III*, Pisa.
- Asmis, E. 1995. 'Epicurean Poetics' in Obbink (ed.) 15-34.  
2002. 'Review of R. Janko, *Philodemus 'On Poems' Book One*' *Classical Philology* 97: 383-394.
- Asmuth, B. 1992. 'Angemessenheit' in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, I, 579-588, Tübingen.
- Asper, M. 1997. *Onomata Allostria. Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos*, Stuttgart.  
2001. 'Gruppen und Dichter: Zu Programmatik und Adressatenbezug bei Kallimachos' *Antike und Abendland* 47: 84-116.  
2011. 'Dimensions of Power: Callimachean Geopoetics and the Ptolemaic Empire' in Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus and Stephens (eds.) 155-177.
- Atkinson, J. E. 1975. 'Catullus: the Historical Background' *Akroterion* 20: 38-53.
- Austin, C. F. L. 2006. 'L'Apothéose d'Arsinoé (P.Berol. 13417 A = Callim. fr. 228 Pf.)' in Bastianini and Casanova (eds.) 57-68.
- Auvray-Assayas, C. 2003. 'Lucrèce et Cicéron sur la poétique de la traduction : note au *De rerum natura* I, 116-145/I, 921-950' in Monet (ed.) 165-170.
- Avallone, R. 1964. *Catullo e i suoi modelli greci classici*, Naples.  
1967. *Catullo e i suoi modelli alessandrini*, Naples.
- Balbo, A., Bessone, F. and Malaspina, E. (eds.) 2011. '*Tanti affetti in tal momento*': *studi in onore di Giovanna Garbarino*, Alessandria.
- Balot, R. K. (ed.) 2009. *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought*, Malden, MA-Oxford-Chichester.
- Baratin, M., Lévy, C., Utard, R. and Videau, A. (eds.) 2010. *Stylus: la parole dans les formes – Mélanges en l'honneur du professeur Jacqueline Dangel*, Paris
- Baraz, Y. 2010. *A Written Republic: Cicero's Philosophical Politics*, Princeton-Oxford.
- Barbaud, T. 2006. *Catulle : une poétique de l'indicible*, Louvain-Paris-Dudley, MA.
- Barbantani, S. 2001. *Φάτις νικηφόρος. Frammenti di elegia encomiastica nell'età delle Guerre Galatiche*: Supplementum Hellenisticum 958 e 969, Milan.  
2002-2003. 'Callimachus and Contemporary Historical "Epic"' *Hermathena* 173-174:

- 29-47.
2005. 'Goddess of Love and Mistress of the Sea: Notes on a Hellenistic Hymn to Arsinoe-Aphrodite (P.Lit.Goodsp. 2, I-IV)' *Ancient Society* 35:133-163.
2008. 'Some Remarks on the Origin and Orthography of the "Ptolemaic Hymns" P.Lit.Goodspeed 2' in Cingano and Milano (eds.) 1-32.
2010. 'Idéologie royale et littérature de cour dans l'Égypte lagide' in Savalli-Lestrade and Cogitore (eds.) 227-251.
2011. 'Callimachus on Kings and Kingship' in Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus and Stephens (eds.) 178-200.
2012. 'Hellenistic Epinician' in Carey, Rawles and Agocs (eds.) 37-55.
2014. "'Attica in Syria". Persian War Reenactments and Reassessments of the Greek-Asian Relationship: A literary Point of View' *Erga-Logoi* 2: 21-91.
2015. 'Unitarian Poetic Program and Episodic Narratives in the Works of Callimachus' in Werner, Dourado-Lopes and Werner (eds.) 269-320.
- Barbiero, E. forthcoming *Letters in Plautus: Reading between the Lines*, Cambridge.
- Barchiesi, A. 2005. 'The Search for the Perfect Book: A PS to the New Posidippus' in Gutzwiller (ed.) 320-342
2009. 'Lyric in Rome' in Budelmann (ed.) 319-335.
2011. 'Roman Callimachus' in Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus and Stephens (eds.) 501-533.
- Bartsch, S. and Bartscherer, T. (eds.) 2005. *Erotikon: Essays on Eros, Ancient and Modern*, Chicago-London.
- Bastianini, G. 2002 'Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo: presentazione' in Bastianini and Casanova (eds.) 1-5.
- Bastianini, G. and Casanova, A. (eds.) 2002. *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo – Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze, 13-14 giugno 2002*, Florence.
- (eds.) 2006. *Callimaco, cent'anni di papiri – Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze, 9-10 giugno 2005*, Florence.
- Batstone, W. W. 1998. 'Dry Pumice and Programmatic Language of Catullus 1' *Classical Philology* 93: 125-135.
2007. 'Catullus and the Programmatic Poem: The Origins, Scope and Utility of a Concept' in Skinner (ed.) 235-253.
- Bayet, J. 1953. 'Catulle, la Grèce et Rome' in *L'influence grecque sur le poésie latine de Catulle à Ovide* (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 2) Vandoeuvres-Geneva, 3-39.
- Baumbach, M. and Bär, S. (eds.) 2012. *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and Its Reception*, Leiden-Boston.
- Bellandi, F. 2007. *Lepos e pathos: studi su Catullo*, Bologna.
- Beltrán, J. A., Encuentra, A., Fontana, G., Magallón A. I. and Marina, R. M.<sup>a</sup> (eds.) 2013. *Otium cum dignitate: Estudios en homenaje al profesor José Javier Iso Echegoyen*, Zaragoza.
- Benedetto, L., 1993. *Il sogno e l'invettiva: momenti e storia dell'esegesi callimachea*,

- Florence.
- Benitez, R. and Wang, K. (eds.) 2016. *Reflections on Plato's Poetics: Essays from Beijing*, Berrima, NSW.
- Bérenger, A. 2014. *Le métier de gouverneur dans l'empire romain : de César à Dioclétien*, Paris.
- Berry, D. H. and Erskine, A. (eds.) 2010. *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*, Cambridge.
- Bickel, E. 1940. 'Catullus Werbgedicht an Clodia und Sapphos Phaonklage im Hochzeitslied an Agallis' *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 89: 194-216.
- Bing, P. 1988. *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*, Göttingen.
- 2002-2003. 'Posidippus and the Admiral: Kallikrates of Samos in the Milan Epigrams' *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 43: 243-266.
2005. 'The Politics and Poetics of Geography in the Milan Posidippus, Section One: On Stones (AB 1-20)' in Gutzwiller (ed.) 119-140.
- Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds.) 2007. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, Leiden-Boston.
- Bouchard, E. 2012. 'Audience, Poetic Justice, and Aesthetic Value in Aristotle's *Poetics*' in Sluiter and Rosen (eds.) 183-214.
- Boyancé, P. 1947. 'Lucrece et la poesie' *Revue des Études Anciennes* 49: 88-102.
- Braga, D. 1950. *Catullo e i poeti greci*, Messina-Florence.
- Brancacci, A. 2008. *Musica e filosofia da Damone a Filodemo. Sette studi*, Florence.
- Braund, D. 1996. 'The Politics of Catullus 10: Memmius, Caesar and the Bithynians' *Hermathena* 160: 45-57.
- Braund, D. and Gill, C. (eds.) 2003. *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome: Studies in Honour of T.P. Wiseman*, Exeter.
- Breed, B. W. 2013. 'Maximum Orality: Catullus, 65 and Propertius 2.13' *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 70: 37-62.
- Brink, C. O. 1963. *Horace on Poetry: Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles*, Cambridge.
- Bron, C. 1996. 'The Sword Dance for Artemis' *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 24: 69-83.
- Brown, R. D. 1982. 'Lucretius and Callimachus' *Illinois Classical Studies* 7: 77-97.
- Buchheit, V. 1976. 'Catull c. 50 als Programm und Bekenntniss' *Rheinisches Museum* 119: 162-180.

1975. 'Catullus Literarkritik und Kallimachos' *Grazer Beiträge* 4: 21-50.  
 1984. 'Lukrez über den Ursprung von Musik und Dichtung' *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 127: 141-158.
- Budelmann, F. (ed.) 2009. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*, Cambridge.
- Busarelis, K., Stefanou, M. and Thompson, D. J. (eds.) 2013. *The Ptolemies, the Sea and the Niles: Studies in Waterborne Power*, Cambridge.
- Butterfield, D. 2013. *The Early Textual History of Lucretius' De rerum natura*, Cambridge-New York.  
 2016. 'Some Problems in the Text and Transmission of Lucretius' in Hunter and Oakley (eds.) 22-53.
- Cairns, F. 1969. 'Catullus 1' *Mnemosyne* 22: 135-158.  
 2003. 'Catullus in and about Bithynia: Poems 68, 10, 28 and 47' in Braund and Gill (eds.) 165-190.
- Cameron, A. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics*, Princeton.
- Caneva, S. G. 2013. 'Arsinoe divinizzata al fianco del re vivente Tolomeo II: uno studio di propaganda greco-egiziana' *Historia* 62:280-322.  
 2014. 'Courtly Love, Stars and Power: The Queen in 3<sup>rd</sup>-century Royal Couples, through Poetry and Epigraphic Texts' in Harder, Regtuit and Wakker (eds.) 25-57.  
 2015a. 'Paradoxon ! Perception de la puissance divine et du pouvoir royal dans l'Alexandrie des Ptolémées' in Caneva and Paul (eds.) 55-75  
 2015b. 'Costruire una dea. Arsinoe II attraverso le sue denominazioni divine' *Athenaeum* 103: 95-122.  
 2016. *From Alexander to the Theoi Adelphoi: Foundation and Legitimation of a Dynasty*, Leuven-Paris-Bristol, CT.
- Caneva, S. G. and Paul, S. (eds.) 2015. *Des hommes aux dieux : processus d'héroïsation et de divinisation dans la Méditerranée hellénistique*, Caltanissetta.
- Carney, E. D. 2013. *Arsinoë of Egypt and Macedon: A Royal Life*, Oxford-New York.
- Carrubba, R. W. 2002. 'The Structure of Catullus 76' *La parola del passato* 57: 297-302.
- Cazzato, V., Obbink, D. and Prodi, E. E. (eds.) 2016. *The Cup of Song: Studies on Poetry and the Symposion*, Oxford-New York.
- Chamoux, F. 1953. *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades*, Paris.
- Chahoud, A. 2010. 'Romani ueteres atque urbani sales: A Note on Cic. *De Orat.* 2.272 and Lucil. 173M' in Kraus, Marincola and Pelling (eds.) 86-97.
- Cingano, E. and Milano, L. (eds.) 2008. *Papers on Ancient Literatures: Greece, Rome and the Near East – Proceedings of the 'Advanced Seminar in the Humanities', Venice International University, 2004-2005*, Padua.
- Clay, D. 1983. *Lucretius and Epicurus*, Ithaca.



2003. 'Lucretius' Honeyed Muse: The History and Meaning of a Simile' in Monet (ed.) 183-196.
- Clausen, W. 1964. 'Callimachus and Latin Poetry' *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 5: 181-196.
- Clauss, J. J. and Cuypers, M. (eds.) 2010. *A Companion to the Hellenistic Literature*, Malden, MA-Oxford-Chichester.
- Clauss, J. J., Cuypers, M. and Kahane, A. (eds.) 2016. *The Gods of Greek Hexameter Poetry: From the Archaic Age to Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Stuttgart.
- Clayman, D. L. 2014. *Berenice II and the Golden Age of Ptolemaic Egypt*, Oxford-New York.
- Colomo, D. 2009. 'Scholien zu Kallimachos' *Iambus XII* in einem neuen Papyrusfragment (P.Lips. Inv. 290v, Fr. b)' *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 55: 1-20.
- Conrad, C. 1965. 'Traditional Patterns of Word-Order in Latin Epic from Ennius to Vergil' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 69: 195-258.
- Copley, F. O. 1951. 'Catullus, c. 1' *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 82: 200-206
- Coppola, A. 2012. 'Mythe et guerre Chrémonidéenne' in Cusset, Le Meur-Weissman and Levin (eds.) 439-451.
- Corbeill, A. 2013. 'Cicero and the Intellectual Milieu of the Late Republic' in Steel (ed.) 9-24.
- Cortés Tovar, R. 2013. 'Los límites del humor en el *De Oratore* de Cicerón' in Beltrán, Encuentra, Fontana, Magallón and Marina (eds.) 249-258.
- Cozzoli, A.-T. 2009. 'L' *Ecale* di Callimaco e la poesia di "nuovo stile"' in Mureddu, Nieddu and Novelli (eds.) 157-182.
2011. 'The Poet as a Child' in Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus and Stephens (eds.) 407-428.
- 2012a. '«Come un fanciullo...» (Call. fr. 1.6 Pf.)' in Martina, Cozzoli, Giuseppetti (eds.) 99-127.
- 2012b. 'Eracle, un "eroe culturale" e l'ideologia del potere in età ellenistica' in Cusset, Le Meur-Weissman and Levin (eds.) 171-186.
- Cowan, R. 2013. 'Boring Ipsitilla: Bilingual Wordplay in Catullus 32' *Museum Helveticum* 70: 190-198.
2015. 'On Not Being Archilochus Properly: Cato, Catullus and the Idea of Iambos' *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 74: 9-52.
- Crane, G. 1987. 'Bees without Honey, and Callimachean Taste' *The American Journal of Philology* 108: 399-403.
- Crowther, N. B. 1979. 'Water and Wine as Symbols of Inspiration' *Mnemosyne* 32: 1-11.

- Curran, A. 2016. *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Aristotle and the Poetics*, Abingdon-New York.
- Cusset, C., Le Meur-Weissman, N. and Levin, F. (eds.) 2012. *Mythe et pouvoir à l'époque hellénistique* (Hellenistica Groningana XVIII), Leuven-Paris-Walpole, MA.
- Danker, F. W. 1997. 'Catullus 34: A Prayer to Diana by C. Valerius Catullus' in Kiley (ed.) 139-143.
- Daniels, M. L. 1967. 'Personal Revelation in Catullus 64' *The Classical Journal* 62: 351-356.
- D'Angour, A. J. 2013. 'Love's Battlefield: Rethinking Sappho's Fragment 31' in Sanders, Thumiger, Carey and Lowe (eds.) 59-72.
- Delignon, B. and Roman, Y. (eds.) 2009. *Les poètes irrévérencieux : modèles hellénistiques et réalités romaines – Actes de la table ronde et du colloque organisés les 17 octobre 2006 et 19 et 20 octobre 2007 par l'Université Lyon 2 et l'ENS LSH, Paris*.
- Deroux, C. 2010. 'Quelques remarques grammaticales et autres sur le poème 68 de Catulle' in Baratin, Lévy, Utard and Videau (eds.) 95-110.
- De Stefani, C. and Magnelli, E. 2011. 'Callimachus and Later Greek Poetry' in Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus and Stephens (eds.) 534-565.
- Destrée, P. and Murray, P. (eds.) 2015. *A Companion to Ancient Aesthetics*, Malden, MA-Oxford-Chichester.
- Dettmer, H. 1997. *Love by the Numbers: Form and Meaning in the Poetry of Catullus*, New York-Washington, D.C./Baltimore-Bern-Frankfurt am Main-Berlin-Vienna-Paris.
- Depew, M. 2013. 'Connections, Origins, and the Construction of Belonging in the Poetry of Kallimachos' in Ager and Faber (eds.) 325-340.
- Dickey, E. and Chahoud, A. (eds.) 2010. *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, Cambridge.
- Diedrich, S. 2007. *Römische Agrarhandbücher zwischen Fachwissenschaft, Literatur und Ideologie*, Berlin-Boston.
- Dillon, J. 2003. *The Heirs of Plato: A Study of the Old Academy (347-274 BC)*, Oxford.
- Di Marco, M., Palumbo Stracca, B. M. and Lelli, E. (eds.) 2005. *Posidippo e gli altri: il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario – Atti del congresso di studio, Roma, 14-15 maggio 2004*, Rome.
- Di Nino, M. M. 2010. *I fiori campestri di Posidippo di Pella: ricerche sulla lingua e lo stile di Posidippo di Pella*, Göttingen.

- Donohue, H. 1993. *The Song of the Swan: Lucretius and the Influence of Callimachus*, Lanham-New York-London.
- Douglas Olson, S. (ed.) 2013. *Ancient Comedy and Reception: Essays in Honor of Jeffrey Henderson*, Berlin-Boston.
- Dugan, J. 2014. 'Non sine causa sed sine fine: Cicero's Compulsion to Repeat his Consulate' *The Classical Journal* 110: 9-22.
- Du Quesnay, I. 2012. 'Three Problems in Poem 66' in Du Quesnay and Woodman (eds.) 153-183.
- Du Quesnay, I. and Woodman, T. 2012. 'Epilogue' in id. (eds.): 255-272.
- Du Quesnay, I. and Woodman, T. (eds.) 2012. *Catullus: Poems, Books, Readers*, Cambridge.
- Dyson Hedjuk, J. T. 2007. 'The Lesbia Poems' in Skinner (ed.) 254-275.
- Edwards, M. J. 1993. 'Aeternus Lepos: Venus, Lucretius, and the Fear of Death' *Greece & Rome* 40: 68-78.
- Elder, J. P. 1954. 'Lucretius 1.1-49' *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 85: 88-120.  
1966. 'Catullus 1, His Poetic Creed, and Nepos' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 71: 143-149.
- Elit, S., Bremer, K. and Reents, F. (eds.) 2010. *Antike – Lyrik – Heute: Griechisch-römisches Altertum in Gedichten von der Moderne bis zur Gegenwart*, Remscheid.
- Erler, M. 2011. 'Autodidact and Student: On the Relationship of Authority and Autonomy in Epicurus and the Epicurean Tradition' in Fish and Sanders (eds.) 9-28.
- Erskine, A. and Llewellyn-Jones, L. (eds.) 2011. *Creating a Hellenistic World*, Swansea.
- Fantham, E. 2004. *The Roman World of Cicero's De Oratore*, Oxford.
- Fantuzzi, M. 1988. 'L'epos ellenistico tradizionale prima e dopo Ziegler' and 'Epici ellenistici', in K. Ziegler, *L'epos ellenistico* (Ital. trans. of Ziegler (1966)), Bari, XXV- LXXXIX.  
2004. = Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. L. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge.  
2011. 'Speaking with Authority: Polyphony in Callimachus' *Hymns*' in Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus and Stephens (eds.) 429-453.
- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. L. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge.

- Fantuzzi, M. and Sens, A. 2006. 'The Hexameter of Inscribed Hellenistic Epigrams' in Harder, Regtuit and Wakker (eds.) 105-122.
- Feeney, D. 2012. 'Representation and the Materiality of the Book in the Polymetrics' in Du Quesnay and Woodman (eds.) 29-47.
2013. 'Catullus 61: Epithalamium and Comparison' in *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 59: 70-97.
- Ferrandelli, M. 2004-2005. 'Catullo 65 e le immagini' *Incontri triestini di filologia classica* 4: 99-150.
- Ferrero, L. 1955. *Un'introduzione a Catullo*, Torino.
- Finamore, J. F. 1984. 'Catullus 50 and 51: Friendship, Love, and *Otium*' *Classical World* 78: 11-19.
- Fish, J. 2011. 'Not All Politicians Are Sisyphus: What Roman Epicureans Were Taught about Politics' in Fish and Sanders (eds.) 72-104.
- Fish, J. and Sanders, K. R. (eds.) 2011. *Epicurus and the Epicurean Tradition*, Cambridge-New York.
- Fischer-Bovet, C. 2014. *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*, Cambridge-New York.
- Fisher, J. 2014. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius and the Italic Tradition*, Baltimore.
- Fitzgerald, W. 1995. *Catullan Provocations: Lyric Poetry and the Drama of Position*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London.
- Florio, R. 2008. 'Dictis non armis: Lucrecio y el código épico' *L'Antiquité Classique* 77: 61-77.
- Ford, A. 2015. 'Literary Criticism and the Poet's Autonomy' in Destrée and Murray (eds.) 143-157.
- Fontaine, M. 2010. *Funny Words in Plautine Comedy*, Oxford.
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. and Pender, E. (eds.) 2009. *Heraclides of Pontus: Discussion*, New Brunswick-London.
- Fowler, D. P. 2000. *Roman Constructions. Readings in Postmodern Latin*, Oxford.
- Fraenkel, E. 1956. 'Catulls Trostgedicht für Calvus' *Wiener Studien* 69: 278-288.
- Frangoulidis, S. 2014. 'Renewal and Compromise in Plautus' *Mostellaria*' in Perysinakis and Karakasis (eds.) 127-140.
- Frank, R. I. 1968. 'Catullus 51: *Otium* versus *Virtus*' *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 99: 233-239.
- Frazel, T. D. 2004. 'The Composition and Circulation of Cicero's *In Verrem*' *The Classical*

- Quarterly* 54: 128-142.  
2009. *The Rhetoric of Cicero's In Verrem*, Göttingen.
- Fuhrer, T. 1992. *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos*, Basel-Kassel.  
1993. 'Callimachus' Epinician Poems' in Harder, Regtuit and Wakker (eds.) 79-97.  
1994. 'The Question of Genre and Metre in Catullus's Polymetrics' *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 46: 95-108.
- Fuqua, C. 2007. 'Two Aspects of the *Lithika*' *Classical Philology* 102: 281-291.
- Gaisser, J. H. (ed.) 2007. *Catullus* (Oxford Readings in Classical Studies), Oxford.  
2007. 'Introduction: Themes in Catullan Criticism (c.1950-2000)' in id. (ed.) 1-24.  
2009. *Catullus* (Blackwell Introductions to the Classical World), Malden, MA-Oxford-Chichester.
- Gale, M. 2007. 'Lucretius and Previous Poetic Traditions' in Gillespie and Hardie (eds.) 59-75.  
2012. 'Putting on the Yoke of Necessity: Myth, Intertextuality and Moral Agency in Catullus 68' in Du Quesnay and Woodman (eds.) 184-211.  
2016. '*Aliquid putare nugas*: Literary Filiation, Critical Communities and Reader-response in Catullus' in Hunter and Oakley (eds.) 88-107.
- Galinski, K. (ed.) 2016. *Memory in Ancient Rome and Early Christianity*, Oxford-New York.
- Gamberale, L. 2012. 'Aspetti dell'amicizia poetica fra Catullo e Calvo' in Morelli (ed.) 203-246.
- Gärtner, T. 2007. 'Zur Deutung des kallimacheischen Epigramms über die *Phainomena* des Arat' *L'Antiquité Classique* 76: 157-162.
- Gee, E. R. G. 2001. 'Cicero's Astronomy' *The Classical Quarterly* 51: 520-536.  
2013. *Aratus and the Astronomical Tradition*, Oxford-New York.
- Gianotti, G. F. 2013. 'Studi classici e libertà: Augusto Rostagni e Leonardo Ferrero' in *Sileno* 39: 205-232.
- Gigandet, A. 2003. 'Lucrèce : Tradition poétique et combat éthique' in Monet (ed.) 171-182.
- Gildenhard, I. 2007. *Paideia Romana: Cicero's Tusculan Disputations*, Cambridge.  
2011. *Creative Eloquence: The Construction of Reality in Cicero's Speeches*, Oxford-New York.  
2013. 'Of Cicero's Plato: Fictions, Forms, Foundations' in Schofield (ed.) 225-275.
- Gillespie, S. and Hardie, P. (eds.) 2007. *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*, Cambridge.
- Giuseppetti, M. 2006. 'Il *Giambo* 12 di Callimaco, occasione e allusività giambica, *Paideia* 61: 207-225.

2013. *L'isola esile: studi sull'Inno a Delo di Callimaco*, Rome.
- Glei, R. F. (ed.) 2009. *Ironie: griechische und lateinische Fallstudien*, Trier.
- Goldberg, S. M. 2005. *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge.
- Graca, C. 1989. *Da Epicuro a Lucrezio: il maestro ed il poeta nei proemi del De Rerum Natura*, Amsterdam.
- Granarolo, J. 1982. *Catulle, ce vivant*, Paris.
- Gratwick, A. S. 1991. 'Catullus 1.10 and the Title of His *Libellus*' *Greece & Rome* 38: 199-202.  
2002. 'Vale, patrona uirgo: The Text of Catullus 1.9' *The Classical Quarterly* 52: 305-320.
- Graver, M. 1990. 'The Eye of the Beholder: Perceptual Relativity in Lucretius' *Apeiron* 23: 91-116.
- Greene, E. 'Catullus and Sappho' in Skinner (ed.) 131-150.
- Grillo, L. 2014. 'A Double *Sermocinatio* and a Resolved Dilemma in Cicero's *Pro Plancio*' *The Classical Quarterly* 64: 214-225.  
2015b. 'Reading Cicero's *Ad Familiares* 1 as a Collection' *The Classical Quarterly* 65: 655-668.
- Gunderson, E. 2015. *Laughing Awry: Plautus and Tragicomedy*, Oxford.
- Gurd, S. A. 2012. *Work in Progress: Literary Revision as Social performance in Ancient Rome*, Oxford-New York.
- Gutzwiller, K. 1992. 'Callimachus's *Lock of Berenice*: Fantasy, Romance, and Propaganda' *The American Journal of Philology* 113: 359-385.  
1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*, Berkeley.  
(ed.) 2005. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford.  
2005. 'Introduction' in id. (ed.) 1-16.  
2010. 'Literary Criticism' in Clauss and Cuypers (eds.) 335-365.  
2012. 'Catullus and the *Garland of Melager*' in Du Quesnay and Woodman (eds.) 79-111.
- Habinek, T. 2005. *The World of Roman Song: From Ritualized Speech to Social Order*, Baltimore-London.  
2015. 'Poetry, Patronage, and Roman Politics' in Destrée and Murray (eds.) 68-80.
- Hadjittofi, F. 2008. 'Callimachus' Sexy Athena: the *Hymn to Athena* and the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*' *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 60: 9-37.
- Hall, J. 2013. 'Savior of the Republic and Father of the Fatherland: Cicero and Political Crisis' in Steel (ed.) 215-229.
- Halliwell, S. 2011. *Between Ecstasy and Truth: Interpretation of Greek Poetics from*

- Homer to Longinus*, Oxford-New York.  
2012. 'Amousia: Living without the Muses' in Sluiter and Rosen (eds.) 15-45.
- Hamm, U. 2009. 'Zum Phänomen der Ironie in höfischer Dichtung oder Ironie ist, wenn der Herrscher trotzdem lacht' in Gleis (ed.) 77-105.
- Hammer, D. (ed.) 2015. *A Companion to Greek Democracy and the Roman Republic*, Malden, MA-Oxford-Chichester.
- Hansen, W. S. 2011. 'Catullus 44: The Invulnerability of Not Caring to Be Included' *The Classical World* 104: 419-426.
- Hanses, M. 2014. 'Plautinisches im Ovid: The *Amphitruo* and the *Metamorphoses*' in Perysinakis and Karakasis (eds.) 225-258.  
2014. 'The Pun and the Moon in the Sky: Aratus' ΔΕΙΠΘ Acrostic' *The Classical Quarterly* 64: 609-614.
- Harder, M. A. 2005. 'Catullus 63: A "Hellenistic Poem"?' in Harder and Nauta (eds.) 65-86.  
2011. 'Callimachus as Fragment' in Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus and Stephens (eds.) 63-80.  
2013. 'From Text to Text: The Impact of the Alexandrian Library on the Work of Hellenistic Poets' in König, Oikonomopoulou and Woolf (eds.) 96-108.  
2014. 'Spiders in the Greek Wide Web?' in Hunter, Rengakos and Sistaokou (eds.) 259-272.
- Harder, M. A. and Nauta, R. R. (eds.) 2005. *Catullus' Poem on Attis: Texts and Contexts*, Leiden-Boston-Köln.
- Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. and Wakker G. (eds.) 1993. *Callimachus* (Hellenistica Groningana I), Groningen.  
(eds.) 1998. *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry* (Hellenistica Groningana III), Leiden-Boston.  
(eds.) 2004. *Callimachus II* (Hellenistica Groningana VII), Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA.  
(eds.) 2006. *Beyond the Canon* (Hellenistica Groningana XI), Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA.  
(eds.) 2014. *Hellenistic Poetry in Context* (Hellenistica Groningana XX), Leuven-Paris-Walpole, MA.  
(eds.) 2017. *Past and Present in Hellenistic Poetry* (Hellenistica Groningana XXI), Leuven.
- Hardie, P. (ed.) 2016. *Augustan Poetry and the Irrational*, Oxford.
- Hauben, H. 2013. 'Callicrates of Samos and Patroclus of Macedon, Champions of Ptolemaic Thalassocracy' in Busarelis, Stefanou and Thompson (eds.) 39-65.
- Hawkins, S. 2012. 'On the Oscanism *salaputium* in Catullus 53' *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 142: 329-353.
- Heath, M. 2013. *Ancient Philosophical Poetics*, Cambridge.  
2015. 'Unity, Wholeness and Proportion' in Destrée and Murray (eds.) 381-392.
- Hersch, K. K. 2010. *The Roman Wedding: Ritual and Meaning in Antiquity*, Cambridge-New York.

- Herter, H. 1931. 'Kallimachos' in *RE Supplementband V*, 386-452, Stuttgart.
- Heyworth, S. J. 1994. 'Some Allusions to Callimachus in Latin Poetry' *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 33: 51-79.
- Hezel, O. 1932. *Catull und das griechische Epigramm*, Stuttgart.
- Hodgson, L. 2017. *Res Publica and the Roman Republic: 'Without Body or Form'*, Oxford.
- Holmes, B. 2005. 'Daedala Lingua: Crafted Speech in *De Rerum Natura*' *The American Journal of Philology* 126: 527-585.
- Holtsmark, E. B. 1987. 'A Note on Logotactic Iconicity (Catullus 1 and 47)' *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 12: 130-132.
- Honold, A., Bierl, A. and Luppi, V. (eds.) 2012. *Ästhetik des Opfers. Zeichen / Handlungen in Ritual und Spiel*, Munich.
- Hope, V. M. 2009. *Roman Death: The Dying and the Dead in Ancient Rome*, London-Oxford-New York-New Delhi-Sydney.
- Höschele, R. 2009. 'Catullus' Callimachean *Hair-itage* and the Erotics of Translation' *Rivista di filologia e istruzione classica* 137: 118-152.
- Hubbard, T. K. 2005. 'The Catullan *Libelli* Revisited' *Philologus* 149: 253-277.
- Hunter, R. L. 1993. *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies*, Cambridge.
- 2003b. 'Reflecting on Writing and Culture: Theocritus and the Style of Cultural Change' in Yunis (ed.) 213-234 (reprinted in Hunter 2008: 434-456).
2004. = Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. L. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge.
2006. *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome*, Cambridge.
2008. *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and its Reception*, Berlin-New York.
2012. *Plato and the Traditions of Ancient Literature: The Silent Stream*, Cambridge-New York.
2013. 'Greek Elegy' in Thorsen (ed.) 23-38.
2014. *Hesiodic Voices: Studies in the Ancient Reception of Hesiod's Works and Days*, Cambridge-New York.
2015. 'The Rhetorical Criticism of Homer' in Montanari, Matthaios and Rengakos (eds.) 673-705.
- Hunter, R. L. and Oakley, S. P. (eds.) 2016. *Latin Literature and its Transmission: Papers in Honour of Michael Reeve*, Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L., Rengakos, A. and Sistakou, E. (eds.) 2014. *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads: Exploring Texts, Contexts and Metatexts* (Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes XXV), Berlin-Boston.



- Hutchinson, G. O. 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry*, Oxford.  
 2008. *Talking Books: Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry*, Oxford-New York.  
 2012. 'Booking Lovers: Desire and Design in Catullus' in Du Quesnay and Woodman (eds.) 48-78.
- Jal, P. 'France: la philologie latine' in Arrighetti, Fogazza, Gamberale and Montanari (eds.) 491-542.
- Janan, M. 1994. *'When the Lamp is Shattered': Desire and Narrative in Catullus*, Carbondale-Edwardsville.
- Jansen, L. (ed.) 2014. *The Roman Paratext: Frame, Texts, Readers*, Cambridge-New York.
- Jocelyn, H. D. 1999. 'The Arrangement and the Language of Catullus' So-Called *Polymetra* with Special Reference to the Sequence 10-11-12' in Adams and Mayer (eds.) 355-376.
- Jones, E. M. 2012. 'Allocating Musical Pleasure: Performance, Pleasure and Value in Aristotle's *Politics*' in Sluiter and Rosen (eds.) 159-182.
- Kampakoglou, A. 2013. 'Victory, Mythology and the Poetics of Intercultural Praise in Callimachus' *Victoria Berenices' Trends in Classics* 5: 111-143
- Karakasis, E. 2014. 'Cicero Comicus-Catullus Plautinus. Irony and Praise in Cat. 49 Re-Examined' in Perysinakis and Karakasis (eds.) 197-224.
- Kennedy, D. J. 2014. 'Crossing the Threshold: Genette, Catullus and the Psychodynamics of Paratextuality' in Jansen (ed.) 19-32.
- Kenney, E. J. 1970. 'Doctus Lucretius' *Mnemosyne* 23: 366-392.
- Kenty, J. 2016. 'Congenital Virtue: *mos maiorum* in Cicero's Orations' *The Classical Journal* 111: 429-462.
- Kiley, M. (ed.) 1997. *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology*, London-New York.
- Kirby, J. T. 1990. *The Rhetoric of Cicero's Pro Cluentio*, Amsterdam.
- Kiss, D. (ed.) 2015. *What Catullus Wrote: Problems in Textual Criticism, Editing and the Manuscript Tradition*, Swansea.  
 2015. 'Introduction: A Sketch of the Textual Transmission' in id. (ed.) xiii-xxx.
- Knox, P. E. 1985. 'Wine, Water, and Callimachean Polemics' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 89: 107-119.  
 1999. 'Lucretius on the Narrow Road' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 99: 275-287.  
 2007. 'Catullus and Callimachus' in Skinner (ed.) 151-171.  
 2011. 'Cicero as a Hellenistic Poet' *The Classical Quarterly* 61: 192-204.

- Köhnken, A. 2012 'Libysche Mythologie bei Kallimachos und Apollonius Rhodios' in Cusset, Le Meur-Weissman and Levin (eds.) 37-44.
- König, J., Oikonomopoulou, K. and Woolf, G. D. (eds.) 2013. *Ancient Libraries*, Cambridge.
- Konstan, D. 2007. 'The Contemporary Political Context' in Skinner (ed.) 72-91.
- Kraus, C., Marincola, J. and Pelling, C. (eds.) 2010. *Ancient Historiography and Its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman*, Oxford.
- Kremmydas, C., Powell, J. and Rubinstein, L. (eds.) 2013. *Profession and Performance: Aspects of Oratory in the Greco-Roman World*, London.
- Kronenberg, L. 2009. *Allegories of Farming from Greece and Rome: Philosophical Satire in Xenophon, Varro and Virgil*, Cambridge-New York.
- Krostenko, B. A. 2001. *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance*, Chicago-London.  
2007. 'Catullus and Elite Republican Social Discourse' in Skinner (ed.) 212-232.
- Krevans, N. 1993. 'Fighting against Antimachus: the *Lyde* and the *Aitia* Reconsidered' in Harder, Regtuit and Wakker (eds.) 149-160.  
2007. 'The Arrangement of Epigrams in Collections' in Bing and Bruss (eds.) 131-146.
- Kyriakou, P. 1997. 'Aristotle's *Poetics* and Stoic Literary Theory' *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 140: 257-280.
- Ingleheart, J. 2014. 'Play on the Proper Names of Individuals in the Catullan Corpus: Wordplay, the Iambic Tradition, and the Late Republican Culture of Public Abuse' *The Journal of Roman Studies* 104: 51-72.
- Landolfi, L. 1986. 'I *lusus* simposiali di Catullo e Calvo o dell'improvvisazione conviviale neoterica' *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 24: 77-89.
- Langlands, R. 2006. *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge.
- Larsen, J. A. O. 1940. 'The Constitution and Original Purpose of the Delian League' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 51: 175-213.
- Lasserre, F. 1959. 'Aux origines de l'Anthologie: I. Le papyrus P. Brit. Mus. Inv. 589 (Pack 1121)' *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 102: 222-247.
- Latta, B. 1972. 'Zu Catulls Carmen 1' *Museum Helveticum* 29: 201-213.
- Lavigne, D. 2010. 'Catullus 8 and Catullan *Iambos*' *Syllecta Classica* 21: 65-92.
- Ledentu, M. 2004. *STVDIVM SCRIBENDI: Recherches sur les statuts de l'écrivain et de l'écriture à Rome à la fin de la République*, Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA.
- Lefèvre, E. 1988. 'Otium und  $\tau\omicron\lambda\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu$ . Catulls Sappho-Gedicht c. 51' *Rheinisches Museum*

- für Philologie* 131: 324-227.
2004. 'Romidee und Romkritik bei Sallust und Vergil' *Latein und Griechisch in Baden-Württemberg* 32: 11-20.
- Lehnus, L. 2000. *Nuova bibliografia callimachea, 1489-1988*, Alessandria.
2011. 'Callimachus Rediscovered in Papyri' in Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus and Stephens (eds.) 23-38.
- Leigh, M. 2016. 'Illa domus, illa mihi sedes: On the Interpretation of Catullus 68' in Hunter and Oakley (eds.) 194-224.
- Lelli, E. 2005b. 'Posidippo e Callimaco' in Di Marco Palumbo Stracca and Lelli (eds.) 77-132.
- Lelli, E. and Parlato, G. 2008. 'Le vittorie di Sosibio' *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 166: 59-65.
- Lenaghan, L. 1967. 'Lucretius 1.921-950' *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 98: 221-251.
- Libby, B. B. 2016. 'Forgetful Theseus and Mindful Aeneas in Catullus 64 and Aeneid 4' in Galinski (ed.) 65-88.
- Lintott, A. 2008. *Cicero as Evidence: A Historian Companion*, Oxford-New York.
- Lorenz, S. 2012. 'Versiculi parum pudici: the Use of Obscenity in the *liber Catulli*' in Morelli (ed.) 73-98.
- Lundon, J. 1997. 'Premessa alla traduzione di M. Pohlenz, Τὸ πρέπον' *Aevum Antiquum* 10: 5-11.
- Maltby, R. 2014. 'Etymology and Onomastics in Lucretius' in Reitz and Walter (eds.) 349-372.
- Männlein-Robert, I. 2007. *Stimme, Schrift und Bild: Zum Verhältnis der Künste in der hellenistischen Dichtung*, Heidelberg.
2009. 'Klage im Kontext oder Allegorie hellenistischer Spolienpoetik: Überlegungen zu Kallimachos' *Sepulchrum Simonidis* (frg. 64 Pf.)' *Antike und Abendland* 55: 45-61.
- Marinone, N. 2004<sup>2</sup>. *Cronologia ciceroniana. Seconda edizione aggiornata e corretta con nuova versione interattiva in cd-rom a cura di Ermanno Malaspina*, Bologna.
- Markovic, D. 2008. *The Rhetoric of Explanation in Lucretius' De reum natura*, Leiden-Boston.
- Marsilio, M. S. 2012. 'Catullus 36: Love and Literary Criticism' *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 16: 126-133

- Marsilio, M. S. and Podlesney, K. 2006. 'Poverty and Poetic Rivalry in Catullus (C. 23, 13, 16, 24, 81)' *Acta Classica* 49: 167-181.
- Martina, A., Cozzoli, A.-T. and Giuseppetti, M. (eds.) 2012. *Callimachea II – Seconda giornata di studi su Callimaco, Roma 12 maggio 2005*, Rome.
- Martindale, C. 1999. *Foreword* in Quinn's *The Catullan Revolution* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition) vii-xxvii, Bristol.
- Maselli, G. 1994. *Affari di Catullo: rapporti di proprietà nell'immaginario dei Carmi*, Bari.
- McCarthy, K. 2013. 'Secrets and Lies: Horace *carm.* 1.27 and Catullus 10' *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 71: 45-74.
- McConnell, S. 2010. 'Epicureans on Kingship' *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 56: 178-198.  
2014. *Philosophical Life in Cicero's Letters*, Cambridge-New York.
- McKie, D. S. 2009. *Essays in the Interpretation of Roman Poetry*, Cambridge.
- McMaster, A. 2010. 'The Rules of Gift-Exchange: Catullus 12, 13 & 14' *Mouseion* 13: 355-379.
- McPherran, M. L. (ed.) 2010. *Plato's Republic: A Critical Guide*, Cambridge-New York.
- Mejer, J. 2009. 'Heraclides' Intellectual Context' in Fortenbaugh and Pender (eds.) 27-40.
- Meyer, D. 2005. *Inszeniertes Leservergnügen. Das inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos*, Stuttgart.
- Michael, P. (ed.) 2011. *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*, Oxford-New York.
- Milanese, G. 1989. *Lucida carmina: comunicazione e scrittura da Epicuro a Lucrezio*, Milan.
- Miller, P. A. 1994. *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness: The Birth of a Genre from Archaic Greece to Augustan Rome*, London-New York.
- Minyard, J. D. 1985. *Lucretius and the Late Republic: An Essay in Roman Intellectual History*, Leiden.
- Mitsis, P. 1993. 'Committing Philosophy on the Reader: Didactic Coercion and Reader Autonomy in *De Rerum Natura*' *Materiali e Discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 31: 111-128.
- Mondin, L. 2011. 'Catullo 1 e Meleagro' in Balbo, Bessone and Malaspina (eds.) 659-672.
- Monet, A. (ed.) 2003. *Le Jardin romain. Épicurisme et poésie à Rome – Mélanges offerts à Mayotte Bollack*, Lille.

- Montana, F. 2015. 'Hellenistic Scholarship' in Montanari, Matthaios and Rengakos (eds.) 60-183.
- Montanari, F., Matthaios, S., and Rengakos, A. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, I-II, Leiden-Boston.
- Montarese, F. 2012. *Lucretius and His Sources: A Study of Lucretius, De rerum natura I 635-920*, Berlin-Boston.
- Morelli, A. M. 2007. 'Hellenistic Epigram in the Roman World: from the Beginnings to the End of the Republican Age' in Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (eds.) 519-541.  
2012. 'L'uno e il molteplice: su Catull. 5' in Passalacqua, De Nonno and Morelli (eds.) 105-126.  
2016. 'Calvus et l'image du poète dans l'oeuvre de Catulle (à propos des thèmes du banquet en Catulle 50)' in Santin and Foschia (eds.) 152-170.
- Morelli, A. M. (ed.) 2012. *Lepos e mores: una giornata su Catullo – Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 27 maggio 2010*, Cassino.
- Morgan, L. 2010. *Musa Pedestris: Metre and Meaning in Roman Verse*, Oxford.
- Morrison, A. D. 2007. *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Müller, S. 2009. *Das hellenistische Königspaar in der Medialen Repräsentation: Ptolemaios II. und und Arsinoe II.*, Berlin-New York.
- Mureddu, P., Nieddu, G. F. and Novelli, S. (eds.) 2009. *Tragico e comico nel drama attico e oltre: intersezioni e sviluppi parateatrali – Atti dell'incontro di studi, Cagliari, 4-5 febbraio 2009*, Amsterdam.
- Murray, P. 2015. 'Poetic Inspiration' in Destrée and Murray (eds.) 158-174.
- Nappa, C. 2001. *Aspects of Catullus' Social Fiction*, Frankfurt am Main-Berlin-Bern-Brussels-New York-Oxford-Wien.
- Narducci, E. 1997. 'Relativismo dell'avvocato, probabilismo del filosofo. Interpretazione di alcuni aspetti dell'opera di Cicerone a partire da *Pro Cluentio* 139' in Stelluti (ed.) 107-114.
- Nauta, R. R. 2005. "'Catullus 63" in a Roman Context' in Harder and Nauta (eds.) 87-119.
- Nelis, D. P. 2012. 'Callimachus in Verona: Catullus and Alexandrian Poetry' in Du Quesnay and Woodman (eds.) 1-28.
- Nesholm, E. J. 2012. 'Uritur and loquitur: (Mis)understanding Passionate Speech in Catullus 83' *Latomus* 71: 686-695.
- Newman, J. K. 1990. *Roman Catullus and the Modification of Alexandrian Sensibility*, Hildesheim.
- Novokhatko, A. 2015. 'Greek Scholarship from its Beginnings to Alexandria' in Montanari, Matthaios and Rengakos (eds.) 3-59.

- Nünlist, R. 2009. *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*, Cambridge.
2015. 'Poetics and Literary Criticism in the Framework of Ancient Greek Scholarship' in Montanari, Matthaios and Rengakos (eds.) 706-755.
- Obbink, D. (ed.) 1995. *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus and Horace*, Oxford.
2007. 'Lucretius and the Herculaneum Library' in Gillespie and Hardie (eds.) 33-40.
- O'Bryhim, S. D. 2009. 'Truth from Fiction in Catullus' Gellius Poems' *Classical Bulletin* 85: 1-9.
- O'Hara, J. J. 2007. *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Virgil, Virgil, Ovid and Lucan*, Cambridge.
- Oniga, R. 2014. *Latin: A Linguistic Introduction. Edited and translated by Norma Schifano*, Oxford.
- Papanghelis, T. D., Harrison, S. J. and Frangoulidis, S. (eds.) 2013. *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations*, Berlin-Boston.
- Pappas, V. 2015. 'Greeks Are Bad after All? Cicero's Opinions in *Pro Flacco*' *Mediterranean Chronicle* 5: 67-98.
- Paratore, E. 1942. *Catullo «poeta doctus»*, Catania.
- Passalacqua, M., De Nonno, M. and Morelli, A. M. (eds.) 2012. *Venuste noster: scritti offerti a Lepoldo Gamberale*, Hildesheim.
- Patimo, V. M. 2005. 'Verrinae e *Pro Cluentio* sul problema della corruttibilità dei giudici' *Aufidus* 56: 29-63.
- Pelliccia, H. 2010-2011. 'Unlocking *Aeneid* 6.460: Plautus' *Amphitryon*, Euripides' *Protesilaus* and the Referents of Callimachus' *Coma*' *The Classical Journal* 106: 149-221.
- Peponi, A.-E. 2012. *Frontiers of Pleasure: Models of Aesthetic Response in Archaic and Classical Greek Thought*, Oxford-New York.
- (ed.) 2013. *Performance and Culture in Plato's Laws*, Cambridge-New York.
- Perysinakis, I. N. and Karakasis, E. (eds.) 2014. *Plautine Trends: Studies in Plautine Comedy and Its Reception – Festschrift in Honour of Prof. D. K. Raïos* (Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes XXIX), Berlin-Boston.
- Petrovic, I. 2006. 'Delusions of Grandeur: Homer, Zeus and the Telchines in Callimachus' *Reply* (*Aitia* Fr. 1) and *Iambus* 6' *Antike und Abendland* 52: 16-41.
2011. 'Callimachus and Contemporary Religion: The *Hymn to Apollo*' in Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus and Stephens (eds.) 264-285.
- 2012a. 'Dichtung, Reinheit, Opferritual' in Honold, Birel and Luppi (eds.) 107-130.
- 2012b. 'Rhapsodic Hymn and Epyllia' in Baumbach and Bär (eds.) 149-176.

2014. 'Posidippus and Achaemenid Royal Propaganda' in Hunter, Rengakos and Sistakou (eds.) 273-300.
2016. 'Gods in Callimachus' *Hymns*' in Clauss, Cuypers and Kahane (eds.) 164-179.
- Forthcoming. 'Royal Gods and Divine Kingship in Hellenistic Poetry'.
- Petrovic, I. and Petrovic, A. 2003. 'Stop and Smell the Statues: Callimachus' Epigram 51 Pf. Reconsidered (four times)' *Materiali e Discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 51: 179-208.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1928. 'Ein neues Altersgedicht des Kallimachos' *Hermes* 63: 302-341.
- Platter, C. L. 1995. 'Officium in Catullus and Propertius: A Foucauldian Reading' *Classical Philology* 90: 211-224.
- Pohlenz, M. 1933. 'Τὸ πρέπον. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des griechischen Geistes' *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 1: 53-92.
- Porter, J. I. 1995. 'Content and Form in Philodemus: The History of an Evasion' in Obbink (ed.) 97-147.
2005. 'Love of Life: Lucretius to Freud' in Bartsch and Bartscherer (eds.) 113-141.
2011. 'Against *AEITOTHE*: Rethinking Hellenistic Aesthetics' in Erskine, Llewellyn-Jones (eds.) 271-312.
- Forthcoming. *Literary Aesthetics after Aristotle*, Cambridge.
- Powell, J. G. F. 2010a. 'Court Procedure and Rhetorical Strategy in Cicero' in Berry and Erskine (eds.) 21-36.
- 2010b. 'Hyperbaton and Register in Cicero' in Dickey and Chahoud (eds.) 163-185.
- Pretagostini, R. 2006. 'La poetica Callimachea nella tradizione papiracea: il frammento 1 Pf. (=1 M.)' in Bastianini and Casanova (eds.) 15-27.
- Prioux, É. 2007. *Regards Alexandrins: Histoire et théorie des arts dans l'épigramme hellénistique* (Hellenistica Groningana XII), Leuven.
2009. 'Machon et Sotadès, figures de l'irrévérence alexandrine' in Delignon and Roman (eds.) 115-131.
2011. 'Callimachus' Queens' in Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus and Stephens (eds.) 201-224.
- Pucci, P. 1961. 'Il carne 50 di Catullo' *Maia* 13: 249-256.
- Quinn, K. 1959. *The Catullan Revolution*, Melbourne.
- Reitz, C. and Walter, A. (eds.) 2014. *Von Ursachen sprechen. Eine aitiologische Spurensuche / Telling Origins. On the Lookout for Aetiology*, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York.
- Riggsby, A. M. 2010. 'Form as Global Strategy in Cicero's *Second Catilinarian*' in Berry and Erskine (eds.) 92-104.
- Rocconi, E. 2012. 'The Aesthetic Value of Music in Platonic Thought' in Sluiter and Rosen (eds.) 113-132.

- Roman, L. 2014. *Poetic Autonomy in Ancient Rome*, Oxford-New York.
- Romano, A. 2011. 'Callimachus and Contemporary Criticism' in Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus and Stephens (eds.) 309-328.
- Rosivach, V. J. 1999. 'Enslaving *Barbaroi* and the Athenian Ideology of Slavery' *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 48: 129-157.
- Ross, D. O. 1969. *Style and Tradition in Catullus*, Cambridge, MA.  
1989. 'United States – Latin Philology' in Arrighetti, Fogazza, Gamberale and Montanari (eds.) 295-314.
- Rossi, L. 2000. 'La *Chioma di Berenice*: Catullo 66, 79-88, Callimaco e la propaganda di corte' *Rivista di filologia e istruzione classica* 128: 299-312.
- Rutherford, I. 1994. 'Decorum' in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, II, 423-434, Tübingen.
- Sanders, E. Thumiger, C., Carey, C. and Lowe, N. J. (eds.) 2013. *Erôs in Ancient Greece*, Oxford-New York.
- Santin, E. and Foschia, L. (eds.) 2016. *L'épigramme dans tous ses états : épigraphiques, littéraires, historiques*, Lyon.
- Savalli-Lestrade, I. and Cogitore, I. (eds.) 2010. *Des rois au Prince : pratiques du pouvoir monarchique dans l'Orient hellénistique et impérial (IV<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.-C. - II<sup>e</sup> siècle après J.-C.)*, Grenoble.
- Sbardella, L. 2012. 'La palingenesi del poeta. Un nuovo concetto della "seconda giovinezza" in Callimaco, fr. 1.31-40 +2 Maas' in Martina, Cozzoli and Giuseppetti (eds.) 53-82.
- Sberna, D. 2011. *Metaphors of Poetic Liberty in Callimachus's Aitia Prologue*, Durham (MA dissertation).  
2015. 'Ἀιγύς Swan and Intratextual Unity in Callimachus's *Aitia Prologue*' *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 74: 207-223.
- Schironi, F. 2009. 'Theory into Practice: Aristotelian Principles in Aristarchean Philology' *Classical Philology* 104: 279-316.  
2013. 'The Trickster Onstage: The Cunning Slave from Plautus to *Commedia dell'arte*' in Douglas Olson (ed.) 447-478.
- Schofield, M. 2009. 'Republican Virtues' in Balot (ed.) 199-213.  
2010. 'Music All Pow'rful' in McPherran (ed.) 229-248.  
(ed.) 2013. *Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC: New Directions for Philosophy*, Cambridge-New York..
- Schwindt, J. P. 2016. 'The Magic of Counting: On the Cantatoric Status of Poetry (Catullus 5 and 7; Horace *Odes* 1.11)' in Hardie (ed.) 117-133.



- Sciarrino, E. 2011. *Cato the Censor and the Beginnings of Latin Prose: From Poetic Translation to Elite Transcription*, Columbus.
- Segal, C. 1970. 'Catullan *otiosi*: The Lover and the Poet' *Greece & Rome* 17: 25-31.  
1989. 'Poetic Immortality and the Fear of Death: The Second Proem of *De Rerum Natura*' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 92: 193-212.
- Sens, A. 2005: 'The Art of Poetry and the Poetry of Art: The Unity and Poetics of Posidippus' Statue-Poems' in Gutzwiller (ed.) 206-225.  
2015. 'Hedylus (4 and 5 Gow-Page) and Callimachean Poetics' *Mnemosyne* 68: 40-52.  
2016. 'Party or Perish: Death, Wine and Closure in Hellenistic Symptotic Epigram' in Cazzato, Obbink and Prodi (eds.) 230-246.
- Sharrock, A. 2009. *Reading Roman Comedy: Poetics and Playfulness in Plautus and Terence*, Cambridge-New York.
- Shapiro, S. O. 2014. 'Socraton or Philodemus? Catullus 47 and Prosopographical Excess' *The Classical Journal* 109: 385-405.
- Shearin, W. H. 2015. *The Language of Atoms: Performativity and Politics in Lucretius' De rerum natura*, Oxford-New York.
- Sider, D. 1995. 'Epicurean Poetics: Response and Dialogue' in Obbink (ed.) 35-41.
- Simpson, C. 1992. 'The Identity of Catullus's Addressee' *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 70: 53-61.
- Skinner, M. B. 1987. 'Cornelius Nepos and Xenomedes of Ceos: A Callimachean Allusion in Catullus 1' *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 12:22.  
2003. *Catullus in Verona: A Reading of the Elegiac Libellus, Poems 65-116*, Columbus. (ed.) 2007. *A Companion to Catullus*, Malden, MA-Oxford-Chichester.  
2007. 'Introduction' in id. (ed.) 1-9.  
2011. *Clodia Metelli: The Tribune's Sister*, Oxford-New York.
- Sluiter, I. and Rosen, R. M. (eds.) 2012. *Aesthetic Value in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden-Boston.
- Solaro, G. 1993. 'La dedica Catulliana ed il secondo proemio di Priapea' *Sileno* 19: 533-538.
- Starr, R. J. 2012. 'Catullus 14 and Catullus 1: Gift Books, Booksellers and Poetic Statements' *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 16: 114-125.
- Steel, C. 2005. *Reading Cicero: Genre and Performance in Late Republican Rome*, London.  
(ed.) 2013. *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge.  
2013a. 'Cicero, Oratory and Public Life' in id. (ed.) 160-170.  
2013b. *The End of the Roman Republic, 146 to 44 BC: Conquest and Crisis*, Edinburgh.
- Steiner, D. 2007. 'Feathers Flying: Avian Poetics in Hesiod, Pindar, and Callimachus' *The American Journal of Philology* 128: 177-208.

- Stelluti, N. (ed.) 1997. *La Pro Cluentio di Marco Tullio Cicerone*, Larino.
- Stem, R. 2012. *The Political Biographies of Cornelius Nepos*, Ann Arbor.
- Stephens, S. A. 2002. 'Egyptian Callimachus' in *Callimaque* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 48), Vandoeuvres-Geneva, 235-262.  
 2002-2003. 'Linus song' *Hermathena* 173-174: 13-28.  
 2003. *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London.  
 2004. 'For You, Arsinoe...' in Acosta-Hughes, Kosmetatou and Baumbach (eds.) 161-176.  
 2005. 'Battle of the Books' in Gutzwiller (ed.) 229-248.  
 2011. 'Introduction' in Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus and Stephens (eds.) 1-19.  
 2012. 'Writing Alexandria as the (Common)place' in Cusset, Le Meur-Weissman and Levin (eds.) 137-152.  
 2013. 'Deregulating Poetry: Callimachus' Response to Plato's *Laws*' in Peponi (ed.) 371-391.
- Stevens, B. E. 2013. *Silence in Catullus*, Madison, WI.
- Stewart, R. 2012. *Plautus and Roman Slavery*, Malden, MA-Oxford-Chichester.
- Stewart, S. 2008. 'Emending Aratus' insomnia: Callimachus *Epigr.* 27' *Mnemosyne* 61: 586-600.
- Strootman, R. 2014. 'The Dawning of a Golden Age: Images of Peace and Abundance in Alexandrian Court Poetry in the Relation to Ptolemaic Imperial Ideology' in Harder, Regtuit and Wakker (eds.) 323-339.
- Stroup, S. C. 2010. *Catullus, Cicero and a Society of Patrons: The Generation of the Text*, Cambridge-New York.
- Tatum, W. J. 2007. 'Social Commentary and Political Invective' in Skinner (ed.) 333-353.
- Tempest, K. 2007. 'Cicero and the Art of *dispositio*: the Structure of the *Verrines*' *Leeds International Classical Studies* 6: 1-25.  
 2013. 'Staging a Prosecution: Performative Aspects in Cicero's *Verrines*' in Kremmydas, Powell and Rubinstein (eds.) 41-71.
- Tesoriero, C. 2006. 'Hidden Kisses in Catullus: Poems 5, 6, 7 and 8' *Antichthon* 40: 10-18.
- Theodorakopoulos, E. 2007. 'Poem 68: Love and Death, and the Gifts of Venus and the Muses' in Skinner (ed.) 314-332.
- Thévenaz, O. 2009. 'Procès d'intentions : le cas de Sappho traduite par Catulle (fragment 31 Voigt-poème 51)' in van Mal-Maeder, Burnier and Núñez (eds.) 57-88.
- Thom, S. 1993. 'Crime and Punishment in Catullus 30' *Akroterion* 38: 51-60.
- Thorsen, T. S. (ed.) 2013. *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*, Cambridge.

- Tsantsanoglou, K. 2009. 'The λεπτότης of Aratus' *Trends in Classics* 1: 55-89.  
 2010. 'Callimachus *Ia*. XIII, fr. 203+204a Pf. (P.Oxy. 1011 fol. VI): A New Reading' *Trends in Classics* 2: 77-114.
- Uden, J. 2006. 'Embracing the Young Man in Love: Catullus 75 and the Comic *Adulescens*' *Antichthon* 40: 19-34.
- van der Blom, H. 2010. *Cicero's Role Models: The Political Strategy of a Newcomer*, Oxford-New York.
- van Mal-Maeder, D., Burnier, A. and Núñez, L. (eds.) 2009. *Jeux de voix. Énociation, intertextualité et intentionalité dans la littérature antique*, Bern-Berlin-Brussels-Frankfurt am Main-New York-Oxford-Wien.
- van Oppen de Ruyter, B. F. 2015. *Berenice II Euergetis: Essays in Early Hellenistic Queenship*, New York.
- Vasaly, A. 2013. 'The Political Impact of Cicero's Speeches' in Steel (ed.) 141-159.
- Verboven, K. 2002. *The Economy of Friends. Economic Aspects of Roman Amicitia and Patronage in the Late Republic*, Brussels.  
 2011. 'Friendship' in Michael (ed.) 404-421.
- Viparelli, V. (ed) 2003. *Tra strategie retoriche e generi letterari. Dieci studi di letteratura latina*, Naples.  
 2003. 'Frome di vita e di poesia d'amore: tra Catullo 76 e Propertio 1,1' in id. (ed.) 179-196.
- Visscher, M. S. 2017. 'Imperial Asia: Past and Present in Callimachus's *Lock of Berenike*' in Harder, Regtuit and Wakker (eds.) 211-232.
- Volk, K. 2002. *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Virgil, Ovid, Manilius*, Oxford.  
 2010. 'Aratus' in Clauss and Cuypers (eds.) 197-210.  
 2012. 'Letters in the Sky: Reading the Signs in Aratus' *Phaenomena*' *The American Journal of Philology* 133: 209-240.  
 2013. 'The Genre of Cicero's *De consulatu suo*' in Papanghelis, Harrison and Frangoulidis (eds.) 93-112.
- Volk, K. and Zetzel, J. E. G. 2015. 'Laurel, Tongue and Glory: (Cicero, *De consulatu suo* Fr. 6 Soubiran) *The Classical Quarterly* 65: 204-223.
- Young, E. M. 2015. *Translation as Muse: Poetic Translation in Catullus's Rome*, Chicago-London.
- Yunis, H. (ed.) 2003. *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.
- Weber, G. 2011. 'Poet and Court' in Acosta-Hughes, Lehnus and Stephens (eds.) 225-244.
- Werner, C., Dourado-Lopes A. and Werner, E. (eds.) 2015. *Tecendo Narrativas: Unidade*

*e episódio na literatura grega antiga*, São Paulo.

Wheeler, A. L. 1934. *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Wiater, N. 2010. 'Der utopische Körper: Die Interpretation frühgriechischer Lyrik am Beispiel von Sappho frg. 31 LP' in Elit, Bremer and Rents (eds.) 23-49.

Williams, C. A. 2010<sup>2</sup>. *Roman Homosexuality*, Oxford-New York.  
2012. *Reading Roman Friendship*, Cambridge-New York.

Williams, G. D. and Volk, K. (eds.) 2016. *Roman Reflections: Studies in Latin Philosophy*, Oxford-New York.

Wimmel, W. 1960. *Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit*, Wiesbaden.

Wiseman, T. P. 1969. *Catullan Questions*, Leicester.  
1979. *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature*, Leicester.  
1985. *Catullus and His World: A Reappraisal*, Cambridge.  
2007. 'The Valerii Catulli of Verona' in Skinner (ed.) 57-71.

Woodard, R. D. 2014. *The Textualisation of the Greek Alphabet*, Cambridge-New York.

Woodman, A. J. 2006. 'Catullus 51: A Suitable Case for Treatment?' *The Classical Quarterly* 56: 610-611.  
2012. 'A Covering Letter: Poem 65' in Du Quesnay and Woodman (eds.) 130-152.

Wray, D. 2001. *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood*, Cambridge.

Zetzel, J. E. G. 2016. 'Philosophy in the Streets' in Williams and Volk (eds.) 50-62.

Ziegler, K. 1966<sup>2</sup>. *Das hellenistische Epos*, Leipzig.

Zoran, G. 2014. *Bodies of Speech: Text and Textuality in Aristotle*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

