



University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

Publicly Accessible Penn Dissertations

1-1-2014

The Way That Our Catullus Walked: Grammar and Poetry in the Late Republic

Samuel David Beckelhymer

University of Pennsylvania, samuel.beckelhymer@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations>

 Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Beckelhymer, Samuel David, "The Way That Our Catullus Walked: Grammar and Poetry in the Late Republic" (2014). *Publicly Accessible Penn Dissertations*. 1205.

<http://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations/1205>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <http://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations/1205>

For more information, please contact libraryrepository@pobox.upenn.edu.

The Way That Our Catullus Walked: Grammar and Poetry in the Late Republic

Abstract

This dissertation considers the poetry of Catullus and its often express concerns with matters of language through the lens of the Roman grammatical tradition. I argue that in Latin poetry, and in Latin literature more broadly, there existed a persistent interest in discussing linguistic matters--owing in large part to an early imitation of Greek authors who engaged openly with their language--and that this interest was articulated in ways that recall the figure of the professional *grammaticus* and the *ars grammatica*, the scientific study of the Latin language. I maintain that this interest becomes particularly widespread during the final decades of the Roman Republic, and so I present Catullus as a particularly representative example of this phenomenon. In each chapter I examine Catullus' poetry with reference to a different aspect of the *grammaticus*' trade. The first chapter considers the concept of *latinitas*, an idealized form of Latin that was discussed by professional *grammatici*, and coordinates Catullus' interaction with foreign words, morphology and phonology with similar approaches to the discussion of language as they are expressed by other poets and prose authors. In the second chapter I examine one of Catullus' most ambitious poems, his translation of Callimachus' "Lock of Berenices", and argue that the philological aspects of his translation are typical of the activity and concerns of professional *grammatici* and of Latin translators of Greek more generally. In the final chapter I consider the possibility that traces of contact with certain known figures from the professional sphere of *grammatica*, Parthenius of Nicaea and Valerius Cato, can be detected in Catullus' verses, and I use these possible traces to explore an array of features of Catullan poetic craft. In each instance I demonstrate first that grammatical interests can be identified in Catullus' verses and that these interests align with the ways in which other Latin authors engage with language, and second that, by reading the poet in this way, we situate him and his poetry within a far more expansive literary and cultural phenomenon that gestures towards the lasting influence of the *ars grammatica*.

Degree Type

Dissertation

Degree Name

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Graduate Group

Classical Studies

First Advisor

Joseph Farrell

Keywords

Catullus, grammar, Latin poetry

Subject Categories

Classics

THE WAY THAT OUR CATULLUS WALKED:
GRAMMAR AND POETRY IN THE LATE REPUBLIC

Samuel D. Beckelhymer

A DISSERTATION

in

Classical Studies

Presented to the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania

in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2014

Supervisor of Dissertation

Joseph Farrell

Professor of Classical Studies

Graduate Group Chairperson

Emily Wilson, Associate Professor of Classical Studies

Dissertation Committee

Cynthia Damon, Professor of Classical Studies

James Ker, Associate Professor of Classical Studies

THE WAY THAT OUR CATULLUS WALKED:
GRAMMAR AND POETRY IN THE LATE REPUBLIC

© 2014

Samuel David Beckelhymer

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It will be difficult if not impossible to express completely and sincerely in the span of just a few paragraphs the depth of my gratitude for the many people who have supported and assisted me in bringing this project to completion, but I will try nevertheless. The first and greatest share of thanks is owed to the members of the dissertation committee, Cynthia Damon, James Ker, and especially the chair of the committee Joe Farrell. Simply put, this dissertation would not exist were it not for their unwavering support and unfailing generosity. Their shrewd and illuminative criticism sustained and directed the thesis from beginning to end, and they have all left a profound imprint not just on this dissertation but on the ways in which I will engage with literature and scholarship in the future as well. I thank James for reminding me constantly to step back from the details and to consider the project and its place in scholarship from without. I thank Cynthia for her acutely perceptive readings of my work, and for inspiring me with her profoundly intimate understanding of the Latin language.

Joe's contribution to this thesis cannot be overstated. It was in his seminar on Republican epic during my first year at Penn that the earliest germ of interest in *grammatica* took hold, and then under his direction in an independent study of the Roman grammatical tradition that the scope of the dissertation took shape. He has generously offered his attention and his learning to all that I have written, and all that I have written has benefited and improved through his reading and his commentary. I thank him especially for his particular ability to help me realize and articulate my own ideas during our numerous discussions of Latin poetry.

Two people from outside the committee are due similar recognition: Sarah Culpepper Stroup, who first taught me to love to read Catullus and his poetry at the University of Washington; and Emily Wilson, who was an early and guiding voice as the thesis first took root in our prospectus workshop. The dissertation gladly bears a title based on her suggestion.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the rest of department and the greater Penn community as well, for I consider myself privileged to have been a part of so rich and open an academic environment. In particular Bridget Murnaghan, Ralph Rosen, Peter Struck, and Don Ringe have been massively influential on my development as a teacher and a scholar and are due my express thanks. I will also extend this gratitude to my fellow graduate students in ancient studies, especially to the members of my cohort, Matt Farmer, Ginna Closs and Paul Jungwirth, who have been a constant source of intellectual and personal support. Theirs are not the only friendships that have sustained me during my time at Penn, and I will add Kyle Mahoney, Heather Elomaa, Sarah Scullin, Jason Nethercut, Benjamin L. Truesdale, and Caroline Bishop to a list that could be considerably longer.

Thanks of a slightly different kind are in order for my family. First to my parents, Michael and Norri Beckelhymer; I am utterly incapable of expressing the degree to which any success or accomplishment in my life must be credited to their chronic and unfaltering love and support. To my two younger siblings, Abram and Emily; I count myself impossibly lucky to be able to say that I watched two of my closest friends grow up right before my eyes. And to my older brother Jacob; ever since he abandoned trying

to prevent my learning to walk some 30 years ago, he has remained my first and best friend, my surest ally, and the most receptive ear for all of my *nugae*. Finally, I would like to thank my partner Sarah Beckmann. She has been the inimitable and inexhaustible source of joy, encouragement and silliness that has kept me sane and happy during this long process. Without her love and her patience I could not hope to have reached this point.

ABSTRACTTHE WAY THAT OUR CATULLUS WALKED:
GRAMMAR AND POETRY IN THE LATE REPUBLIC

Samuel D. Beckelhymer

Joseph Farrell

This dissertation considers the poetry of Catullus and its often express concerns with matters of language through the lens of the Roman grammatical tradition. I argue that in Latin poetry, and in Latin literature more broadly, there existed a persistent interest in discussing linguistic matters—owing in large part to an early imitation of Greek authors who engaged openly with their language—and that this interest was articulated in ways that recall the figure of the professional *grammaticus* and the *ars grammatica*, the scientific study of the Latin language. I maintain that this interest becomes particularly widespread during the final decades of the Roman Republic, and so I present Catullus as a particularly representative example of this phenomenon. In each chapter I examine Catullus’ poetry with reference to a different aspect of the *grammaticus*’ trade. The first chapter considers the concept of *latinitas*, an idealized form of Latin that was discussed by professional *grammatici*, and coordinates Catullus’ interaction with foreign words, morphology and phonology with similar approaches to the discussion of language as they are expressed by other poets and prose authors. In the second chapter I examine one of Catullus’ most ambitious poems, his translation of Callimachus’ *Βερενίκης πλόκαμος*, and argue that the philological aspects of his translation are typical of the activity and concerns of professional *grammatici* and of Latin translators of Greek more generally. In

the final chapter I consider the possibility that traces of contact with certain known figures from the professional sphere of *grammatica*, Parthenius of Nicaea and Valerius Cato, can be detected in Catullus' verses, and I use these possible traces to explore an array of features of Catullan poetic craft. In each instance I demonstrate first that grammatical interests can be identified in Catullus' verses and that these interests align with the ways in which other Latin authors engage with language, and second that, by reading the poet in this way, we situate him and his poetry within a far more expansive literary and cultural phenomenon that gestures towards the lasting influence of the *ars grammatica*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------------|
| Acknowledgments..... | iii |
| Abstract..... | vi |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| I. Why grammar and poetry? | 3 |
| II. Grammar in the Late Republic | 17 |
| III. Catullus and grammar | 24 |
| CHAPTER 1: CATULLUS AND <i>LATINITAS</i> | 38 |
| Section I: Citizens of Latin | 42 |
| Section II: Foreign diction and geography in Catullus | 54 |
| Section III: Conventions of prescription..... | 75 |
| Conclusions..... | 103 |
| CHAPTER 2: GRAMMATICAL TRANSLATION | 107 |
| Section I: Livius Andronicus and the tradition of grammatical translation..... | 111 |
| Section II: Catullus and Callimachus..... | 126 |
| Section III: Glossing astronomy | 134 |
| Section IV: The compensation principle..... | 152 |
| Section V: Correction and commentary..... | 171 |
| Conclusions..... | 182 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| CHAPTER 3: CATULLUS AMONG THE GRAMMARIANS | 185 |
| Section I: Catullus and Parthenius | 194 |
| Section II: Cato Grammaticus..... | 211 |
| Section III: <i>Quoniam grammaticus es</i> | 236 |
| Conclusions..... | 249 |
| CONCLUSION | 252 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 266 |

BALD heads forgetful of their sins,
Old, learned, respectable bald heads
Edit and annotate the lines
That young men, tossing on their beds,
Rhymed out in love's despair
To flatter beauty's ignorant ear.

They'll cough in the ink to the world's end;
Wear out the carpet with their shoes
Earning respect; have no strange friend;
If they have sinned nobody knows.
Lord, what would they say
Should their Catullus walk that way?

“The Scholars” ~ W.B. Yeats

INTRODUCTION

In this dissertation, I examine various aspects of Catullus' poetry that evince his attitudes towards and relationship with language, both his own and that of others, and consider these attitudes and relationships in light of the Roman grammatical tradition. In doing so, I aim to demonstrate that the poetry of Catullus is a witness to a persistent and dynamic rapport that existed between the poetic and grammatical traditions of Latin literature, and, more specifically, that it affords a suggestive glimpse at the nature of that relationship in the Late Republican period. This is perhaps an unexpected direction for Catullan scholarship—Catullus is, after all, a poet whose many aspects and interests the cumulative efforts of centuries of scholars have identified and catalogued—but the contribution of my study is twofold when he is reexamined through the grammatical lens: not only do we supplement with a relatively substantial body of testimony the record of a nascent science, the systematic study of language, that is woefully fragmentary during this period, but with this reading I also invite scholarship to reconsider the narrow but well-established definitions we have inherited for this canonical author—and implicitly for other authors as well—and the ways in which he walked.

Though its underlying aims are perhaps different in many respects from earlier interpretations of Catullus, my project actually coordinates the contributions of many earlier readers of Catullus; in fact there is a long tradition of scholarship on Catullus' interest in and special attention to the form and character of the Latin language; his implicit commentary on the intricate and dynamic relationship between Latin and Greek; and the ways in which Catullus' and his friends' sodality and the broader social circle in

which his poetry was circulated were delimited by poetic and linguistic determiners.¹ Moreover, many of these phenomena are consonant with and form the foundation of our received understanding of the so-called New Poetry and its aims and goals (though, admittedly, the term New Poetry and its synonyms are convenient more than they are truly comprehensive). Therefore, I hope to supplement our understanding of both Catullus and the New Poetry by drawing attention to these features with specific reference to the development of the *ars grammatica* in 1st century Rome. And yet, I do not imagine Catullus as the sole representative of a style of poetry that has grammatical interests. Though I do believe there are reasons why his style of poetry is especially suited to a study of grammar, he is hardly the only Latin poet who interacts with, borrows from and contributes to the field of *grammatica*, a reality that I endeavor to demonstrate in the course of this study. Indeed, a different sketch of this particular poet emerges when we consider his manifest interests in language in concert, and such a sketch serves as a testament to a far broader phenomenon that permeated and perhaps even shaped Latin literature.

This, then, is my aim, a new sketch of Catullus that is consonant with other versions of the poet—Catullus the urbane socialite; Catullus the literary critic; Catullus the *poeta doctus*—but that accounts as well for his demonstrable interest in the medium most fundamental to our understanding of all of these avatars: the language of his poetry.

¹ The degree to which these different facets of Catullus' life and poetry interact is significant, and this interaction has figured into much of the Catullan academic dialogue in the last century. Catullus is frequently taken as an exemplar of a number of literary and social phenomena, and it is my goal to contribute to this trend. On issues of Catullus' language and his investment in a poetic idiom, cf. especially Ross (1969) and Wiseman (1985). For recent treatments of the socio-literary and -linguistic contexts of Catullus' poetry cf. Fitzgerald (1995), Krostenko (2001) and Stroup (2010).

This interest is perhaps especially apparent in the New Poetry, but certain factors that underlay the development of the Roman *ars grammatica* suggest that a study of Catullus' poetry, indeed of poetry in general, is well served by parallel consideration of the grammatical tradition. The relationship between the two, poetry and *grammatica*, is closer than might be assumed, and so I will begin my introduction of the thesis by considering the conditions that make a parallel study of grammar and poetry attractive. After these conditions are established, we will turn our attention to the grammatical phenomena that occur in Catullus.

I. Why grammar and poetry?

The nature of this close relationship, and thus the circumstances that account for the broad phenomenon to which I have already alluded, requires some preliminary comments and definitions. Superficially, the substance of a relationship between poetry and grammar is obvious; the *grammatici*, “grammarians”, occupied an intermediary position between their language and its literary, especially its poetic, traditions; they were, to use the words of a contemporary of Catullus, *interpretes poetarum*, “interpreters of the poets,” or “mediators of the poets.”² But such a definition suggests a unidirectional relationship: poets write poetry and *grammatici* mediate—i.e. explicate and comment on;

² These words are quoted and attributed to Cornelius Nepos by Suetonius at *De grammaticis et rhetoribus* 4 (Nepos, of course, is the dedicatee of Catullus' *lepidus novus libellus* in the introductory poem of the corpus). I have aimed at a broad interpretation of the word *interpres* here, informed in part by the composite definition of the *grammaticus* that develops in the course of Suetonius' treatment of the subject. Specifically I wish to avoid limiting the word merely to the act of translation, a valence that is clearly operative when it appears early in *DGR* at 1.2, and the meaning that informed Isidore of Seville's proposed etymology: *interpres* [vocatur] quod inter partes medius sit duarum linguarum dum transfert, “he is called *interpres* because he is in the middle, *inter partes* [between the two sides] of two languages when he translates,” (X 123).

emend and edit; criticize and canonize—that poetry for general consumption. This is perhaps the most basic understanding of the figure of the *grammaticus*, but it is neither comprehensive of his activity nor satisfactorily descriptive of his role in the literature. A closer examination of figures called *grammatici* and of the profession of *grammatica* reveals a more complex relationship between grammar and poetry.

a. The beginnings of the *ars grammatica*

An examination of the *ars* and its practitioners should not start with the institution or the men implicated therein as they are found in the Roman sphere. Rather, much like the poetry of Catullus and his peers, and in fact much like Latin literature in most of its forms, Latin grammar originates from and closely imitates a Greek archetype, and it is with this Greek archetype in mind that any understanding of the *grammaticus* and his special interest in poetry should begin. Even the most persistently attested name for the professional man of letters is taken from Greek γραμματικός, a term which came to represent more than a teacher of γράμματα, “letters” (and so reading and writing), during the Hellenistic period.³ The Alexandrian grammarians of the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE were not always teachers, but philologists as well, who catalogued and developed a canon of existing Greek poetry, which was to them already ancient. These Greek γραμματικοί, however, were far more dynamic than mere critics and editors. They were also professional scholars and librarians, and many of them were influential poets as well, as

³ See Forbes (1933) for the development of definitions for the terms γραμματικός and γραμματική [τέχνη] from a broad and general association with γράμμα “letters” to the more specialized meaning of educator, to scholar and philologist, and then finally to the figure of the grammarian, who supplemented certain aspects of all the earlier definitions with the authority to describe and discuss the more mechanical aspects of language.

was certainly the case for Callimachus, Apollonius of Rhodes and Euphorion of Chalcis.⁴ Greek grammar—that is ἡ γραμματική τέχνη—in the sense that anticipated the Latin *ars grammatica* and the men who practiced it, was already in its earliest instantiation concerned with poetry not just as a subject of study, but as a field for the grammarian’s own creative activity as well. The relationship, then, does not simply travel in one direction. Rather it is fluid and reciprocal; the same men who studied Greek literature also created it.

No doubt it has become evident that the multifarious nature of γραμματική (and thus of *grammatica*), in the course of its development and in its various appearances in literature, resists any single definition. The *grammaticus*, therefore, is at times a scholar and a philologist and a kind of linguist, at other times a teacher and a literary coach, and at still other times a librarian or a cataloguer. Nevertheless, even if perfectly stable definitions of these two words, *grammatica* and *grammaticus*, are elusive, I propose working definitions, which will be operative as they are treated in my study, that will be capable of encompassing all of the various roles and activities described above and treated presently. Let us look still more closely at these words.

⁴ As Forbes shows, the valence of γραμματικός was unstable when these men were alive, even if the linguistic and philological activity in which they engaged would later fall within the range of the *grammaticus*’ professional interests. This being the case, we ought not to rely on specific testimony that names these men γραμματικοί when we categorize them as such, but on that philological activity. Nevertheless, Apollonius and Callimachus are called both called γραμματικός by later sources, both in the context of an alleged feud between the two. An epigram from the *AP* (11.275), which mocks Callimachus and his *Aitia*, is attributed to Ἀπολλώνιος γραμματικός; a pithy *sententia*, τὸ μέγα βιβλίον ἴσον εἶναι τῷ μεγάλῳ κακῷ, “A big book is equal to a big evil,” (Pf. fr. 465), which some have thought refers especially to *Argonautica*, is quoted as said by Καλλίμαχος ὁ γραμματικός by Athenaeus of Naucratis (see Lefkowitz 1980). No extant *testimonium* calls Euphorion a γραμματικός, though his philological activity would warrant such a title.

The etymology of the Greek term, and of an early Latin synonym *litteratus*, points unmistakably to a primary interest in letters and so in literature, but, as we have seen already, there is more to grammar than mere interest in *litterae*. In a fragment of *incerta sedes* Varro defines the functions of *grammatica*: writing, reading, comprehending and evaluating language.⁵ Rawson imagines that these activities refer especially to Varronian *elementa*—letters, syllables, words, parts of speech—and that Varro’s definition is an approximation of the Greek γραμματική, which Dionysius Thrax describes in his *Τέχνη Γραμματική*, “art of grammar”, as having six components: reading verse (with attention especially to metrical rhythms); explication of poetic figures; glossing rare words and obscure references; deriving etymologies; explaining morphological inflections; and performing textual and literary criticism.⁶ By extension, the *grammaticus*, who performs the functions of *grammatica*, ought to be capable of doing any of these things when so required, and so our working definitions should also comprise these basic meanings, which provide a general scope of his the duties and abilities.

Again, then, it is a Greek source to which Latin *grammatica* can ultimately be traced. Such a reality seems to be in Suetonius’ mind as he begins his treatment of the profession at Rome in his work called *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*. With this he provides our most important document of the Latin grammarian’s trade, a collection of

⁵ *GRF* (Funaioli) 234. The unknown author attributes to Varro the establishment of these *quattuor officia* of grammar: *scribere, legere, intellegere* and *probare*.

⁶ Rawson 1985 p.118. Dionysius was a pupil of Aristarchus who was active especially in the last half of the 2nd century BCE. The work we possess called *Τέχνη Γραμματική* is attributed to him, but there are inconsistencies with the approach and the style that suggest it is an amalgam of more than one treatise. See di Benedetto (1990) and Lallot (1998) for the text, the tradition and the issues of chronology and authorship.

vitae of famous grammarians from the end of the 2nd century BCE into the reign of Nero.⁷ From the introductory chapters of *DGR* emerges a more dynamic sketch of the relationship between *grammaticus* and *poeta* than the simple and unidirectional definition implied by *interpretes poetarum*. After quickly dismissing the earliest rumblings of a grammatical interest in Rome as a mere *mediocre initium*, Suetonius proceeds to what he imagines as the true beginning of the science in chapter 2. There we are told of the almost comical circumstances that marked the genesis of the Latin grammatical tradition: Crates of Mallus, the famous Stoic and *grammaticus* of the Greek language, fell into an open sewer while visiting Rome in 168 BCE, and, forced to stay there while he recuperated, gave a series of lectures on unspecified linguistic topics that awakened grammatical interest in the Roman people. This grammatical interest took its first steps in the form of poetic commentaries and critical editions, nothing nearly so ambitious as those that the scholars of Hellenistic Greece produced, but evidence of a modest interest in scientific study of the language of poetry and in the circulation of that poetry in wider circles, both of which Suetonius sees as having been caused by Crates' intervention.⁸

It was at this point, Suetonius maintains, that Latin grammar truly began, and so already, it would appear, the first interests of Latin grammar were in poetry. Of course,

⁷ This book of *vitae* is the only nearly intact component of the larger *De viris illustribus*, which also contained *vitae* of famous poets and historians. The section that contains the twenty *vitae* of the grammarians appears to be complete, but most of the chapters on famous rhetoricians are missing. For an overview of the text and its tradition, as well as commentary, see Kaster (1992 and 1995).

⁸ *DGR* 2. It is worth noting, as Kaster does (pp. 44ff.), that Suetonius' view on the grammatical tradition comes from a strongly Rome-centric position; he imagines, it seems, that Rome developed its grammatical art largely on its own terms, after the assistance and inspiration from a single named Greek contributor. That is to say, Suetonius does not discuss at all the character or development of Greek γραμματική. It is unclear if he imagined the two as entirely separate entities, or as distinct enough for the one to be discussed without reference to the earlier (and influential) other, or that he simply wished to focus on the specific aspects of the Latin institution without attempting a comparative history of the two.

the fortuitous injury of Crates and the narrative that follows is somewhat suspicious. Could that possibly be how Latin speakers first learned to take an interest in their own language? Certainly Suetonius' anecdote invites skepticism. In fact, even before reaching Crates' forced convalescence at Rome, Suetonius suggests rather unceremoniously and perhaps unintentionally something about the "prehistory" of Latin grammar that invites further consideration in light of our interest in its relationship to poetry. He describes those earlier rumblings in grammar's development in this way: *initium quoque [grammaticae] mediocre extitit, siquidem antiquissimi doctorum, qui iidem et poetae et semigraeci erant, (Livium et Ennium dico, quos utraque lingua domi forisque docuisse adnotatum est) nihil amplius quam Graecos interpretabantur, aut si quid ipsi Latine composuissent praelegebant.*⁹ Suetonius uses these opening remarks to depict the early species of Latin grammar as humble and rudimentary, but in doing so he also tells us that the first practitioners of this proto-grammar were in fact poets and teachers, and that they were not just poets and teachers, but that they were Livius Andronicus and Quintus Ennius, men whom later Roman authors will locate at the very beginnings of a distinctly Latin literary tradition. This is significant and invites closer inquiry, inasmuch as it suggests that, to Suetonius (and presumably to his sources, whoever they may have been), the birth of Latin *grammatica*, though in a primitive and underdeveloped state, was coeval to the birth of Latin literature qua literature.

⁹ "[grammar's] beginnings were not remarkable, inasmuch as the earliest men of learning, who were poets and half-Greek at that—I mean Livius and Ennius, who are acknowledged to have taught in both [Latin and Greek] in private and public—did nothing more than interpret Greek authors, or, if they had themselves written anything in Latin, recite it," (*DGR* 1.1).

There is perhaps more to be said about these contemporaneous events. How could it be that Latin *grammatica* began at the same time as Latin literature? Greek γραμματική developed naturally as a reaction to the genuine and problematic chronological distance between Hellenistic Greek and Homeric Greek, a gap of several centuries and the attendant linguistic change that made Homer difficult to read without assistance and clarification. In Latin this is decidedly not the case. The century that intervened between the “earliest” (according to Cicero) Latin literary figure, Livius Andronicus, and the “earliest” (according to Suetonius) Latin grammatical activity is too short a span for *grammatica* to have become essential for rendering those texts legible by a purely organic development, as had happened in Greece, and, furthermore, as would have been the case for Latin-speaking authors who wished to read Greek texts.¹⁰ The process in Latin was artificially accelerated, and the reasons for that are easy to appreciate when we look at the birth of Latin literature.

The advent of the Latin literary tradition, as identified by Latin authors, was an author writing very much in the Greek style; Cicero tags a tragedy written and produced by Livius Andronicus—almost certainly a translation of a Greek original, to which Suetonius also alludes—as the first instance of genuine, distinctly Latin literature at

¹⁰ That is to say, the works of Ennius or Plautus were not so far removed from this early version of *ars grammatica* that exegesis would have been requisite to understanding them, in the way that Homer’s language had become difficult to understand in Hellenistic Greece. There are, however, documents of archaic Latin, to read which would have necessitated assistance, and we will revisit these below. In the case of these texts, then, a “natural” impulse to explain obsolete diction and morphology might have been expected, and from that practical use of *grammatica* the spread to the earliest “literary” texts of Latin might also be unsurprising. However, the Romans did not come upon this impulse on their own. The interest in subjecting early Latin “literature” to grammatical treatment, therefore, should not be called natural or organic, but a calque of an analogous practice in Greek literature at the time.

Rome.¹¹ The birth of Latin literature, then, at least as it was understood by its own authors, cannot be said to have occurred organically at all. Rather it was synthesized from an existing Greek tradition that had matured slowly over the course of centuries. This artificial genesis is important. As Latin authors began to imitate the more fully developed Greek literature, they unconsciously came into contact with the preexisting idiom for discussing and evaluating that literature, with γραμματική. Indeed the literature from Hellenistic Greece that was contemporary with the earliest literary creations in Latin was as interested in recovering and interpreting its own literary past as it was in adding to it, and its practitioners at this time were not only poets, but librarians, scholars and technical writers of language.¹² Thus γραμματική accompanied literature as it made its way to Rome, and so Latin acquired the patina of a more practiced literary culture long before it could have developed it naturally. Certainly writing that was approximately “literary” existed in Latin before Livius, but for Cicero nothing that came before a Latin version of a Greek tragedy could be considered literary. In other words, writing in Latin only became “literature” when it effectively replicated Greek literature, and a significant component of the Greek literature at the time of this replication was the careful and conscious evaluation of language.

Of course, to place Livius Andronicus and his tragedies at the beginning of Latin literature is no less suspect than is Suetonius’ locating the birth of *grammatica* with Crates, but neither datum is without value, even if their absolute reliability is

¹¹ *Brut.* 71-2. Livius’ tragedies were most likely translations, and his most ambitious work, *Odusia*, was his attempt to render Homeric verse in a Latin idiom.

¹² That is to say, the model “literature” to which Latin authors first looked —Greek texts that had undergone a natural and necessary process of exegesis—came with much of this secondary commentary inherent. We will explore the ramifications of this in the poetry of Livius Andronicus in chapter 2.

questionable. There is indeed a genuine significance in Cicero's fixing the birth of Latin literature to Livius; in doing so he admits that Latin literature's creation involved the wholesale adoption of existing Greek models, including, we might infer, γραμματική. Moreover, even if Suetonius undersells the influence of Greek γραμματική, he nevertheless identifies in Crates a Greek figure as the catalyst for Latin *grammatica*, and even hints at an earlier stage in the development of the *ars* that relied on Greek-speaking poets. In the testimonies of both men Greek is not just prominent, but even vital. It would be incorrect to equate these *semigraeci* and this primitive form of *grammatica* with the Alexandrian scholars and their highly articulated interest in and engagement with letters, and Suetonius markedly does not make this equation, but in the earliest documented intrusion of linguistic interest into the broader literary picture, two inescapable points stand out: poets are present;¹³ Greek is present. Moreover, the Greek that assisted those earliest Latin authors as they searched for models and exempla brought with it certain aspects of its own literary culture and its own interest in language study.

Thus Latin *grammatica* and Latin poetry are already related to some extent, and so it is unsurprising that significant and persistent contact with Greek guided the development of both. Moreover, that contact is more dynamic than at first it seems. The aim of this dissertation, however, is obviously not simply to show that grammarians, Greek or Latin, were engaged with the reading, writing and studying of poetry. That is an

¹³ In fact, even beyond the modest origins of Latin grammar, when men remembered especially for their poetic contributions to Latin literature dabbled also in simpler grammatical exercises, there is a persistent tendency of poetry not just to be the object of study, but also the product of those who studied it. Of Suetonius' 20 *vitae* at least 5 of them depict their subject as a generating poetry alongside technical, grammatical work and teaching. The reverse is true as well, and Suetonius cites certain unnamed sources who maintained that Ennius edited two books on letters and syllables, though he adds to that testimony the suspicion of L. Cotta, who believed a different Ennius than the poet was meant by those anonymous sources.

important aspect of my study, and certainly it is these circumstances that recommend, at the most basic level, my examination of Catullus through the grammatical lens, but my focus instead looks at the reverse of this proposition: poetry and poets were also engaged, in ways both direct and less so, with the study of language, the province of the *grammaticus*.

b. Poetic grammar and grammatical poetry

However, there are earlier examples of Latin poetry that reinforce the suitability and appropriateness of exploring linguistic topics in verse. Suetonius' *semigraeci* survive only in fragments, but even those fragments hint subtly at a grammatical undercurrent and an interest in language, and so they invite further comment on that *initium mediocre* to which the biographer alludes. Livius Andronicus' most ambitious translation was his version of the *Odyssey* in Latin, which, it seems, he produced with the help of certain Homeric scholia, and in fact there are fragments of that poem which would suggest that his translation acted, at times, as a kind of exegetical commentary itself.¹⁴ The epic poet and dramatist Gnaeus Naevius, whom Suetonius does not count among the proto-*grammatici*, is memorialized in an epitaph that celebrates his contribution to Latin: *itaque, postquam est Orchi traditus thesauro / obliti sunt Romani loquier lingua Latina*, “and so, after [Naevius] was handed over to Orchus' vault, Romans forgot how to speak Latin.”¹⁵ The implication is that a part of Latin died along with Naevius, but also that he was a kind of guardian of Latin and how it was properly spoken. Even Ennius, whom

¹⁴ We will discuss his and others' manifestations of the phenomenon of exegetical translation in chapter 2.

¹⁵ It is noteworthy that Naevius was not *semigraecus* like Livius and Ennius, and so this epitaph draws our attention to a persistent tension between the Latin and Greek languages, a tension which is often probed and examined through the *ars grammatica*. See Krostenko (2013).

Suetonius fairly doubts was the author of certain grammatical treatises ascribed to him, depicts himself as *dicti studiosus*, “passionate about spoken language,” i.e., φιλόλογος.¹⁶ These pre-classical Latin poets took an interest in their literature and its stewardship that resembled the activity of earlier Greek γραμματική and later Latin *grammatica*.

There are other fragmentary poets from the Republican period whose grammatical interests are better attested. In particular two figures from the last half of the 2nd century BCE stand out as early precedents for the treatment of linguistic matters in poetry: the satirist Gaius Lucilius and the tragedian and literary scholar Lucius Accius.

Lucilius’ engagement in *grammatica* takes the shape of discussion and prescription of certain spelling conventions in Latin at the end of the 2nd century.¹⁷ Lucilius’ grammatical interest is on the orthography and pronunciation of Latin in general, but his most frequently quoted prescription concerns the orthography of the sound represented in Classical Latin by long ī. During his life two previously distinct phonemes in spoken Latin converged on the sound [i:], and so too, then, did the written characters that corresponded to them. Comparative linguistic evidence confirms that in the first half of the 2nd century a vowel sound that had existed in archaic Latin, a true diphthong which had been written *ei*, first became monophthongized as a sound intermediate to [e:] and [i:] before merging entirely with the long high vowel [i:].¹⁸ This

¹⁶ On the observation that this must be a calque of the Greek word see Puelma (1949) and Skutsch (1985). The phrase itself comes from the so-called second proem of *Annales* 7 (Sk. 209). Ennius actually uses the phrase in negation to describe earlier poets, ostensibly Gnaeus Naevius, and so to promote himself and his poetry as an entirely different breed of Latin poet, and a foundational figure in Latin poetry. Thus he makes an early attempt at defining a canon of Latin literature. See especially Rossi and Breed (2006) on this.

¹⁷ Some 1400 lines of Lucilius survive. Some of the earlier are in various meters, but Lucilius himself declares later that the hexameter is the meter of satire and so fragments identified as chronologically later are all in that meter. For the fragments see Marx (1904) and Krenkel (1963).

¹⁸ Sihler 1995 §57.2.

posed an obvious notational problem: when should *ei* be used and when should *i* be used, if phonological distinction was no longer reliable? Without precise knowledge of the etymology of the word (or morphological ending) in question, a writer would be left to guess which form to use, and inscriptions from well into the Classical period frequently show *ei* where etymological *i* is expected.

The clear solution, to eliminate the now superfluous spelling *ei* (which is ultimately what occurred), was not immediately adopted, and the two orthographies competed for a time. During that time, a discussion took place about which form it was appropriate to use in different circumstances.¹⁹ Lucilius joins the discussion in his satires, where he explains, in verse, where each of the two orthographies is correct.²⁰ While it is somewhat difficult to reconcile all of his prescriptions with the linguistic record—though this has not discouraged attempts²¹—more important than the accuracy of Lucilius’ solution to the spelling controversy is that poetry was apparently an appropriate platform for such a discussion to take place. Furthermore, it is surely significant that this discussion occurs in satire, which Quintilian names as the only poetic genre that is unique to Latin.²² And this cannot be simply an idiosyncrasy of Lucilius’ satires, because it is Lucilius to whom Quintilian and Horace nod when discussing the origins of the genre. The form of satire that was known to Horace, then, encompassed in its earliest purview

¹⁹ The instability of pronunciation and spelling was exactly the sort of topic that attracted *grammatici*. This instability and flux perhaps reached a peak during the 1st century BCE and attracted the attention of the professional and the amateur. We will discuss these conditions more fully below and in chapter 1.

²⁰ Orthographical issues appear in fr. 358-70 (Marx, *GRF*).

²¹ A lively academic dialogue on the matter took place a century ago, on which see Kent (1911 and 1913) and Fay (1913). See also Pepe (1946) and Perini (1983) for general treatment of the orthographical reforms. More recently Somerville (2007) defends at least some of Lucilius’ suggestions with linguistic evidence.

²² *Satura quidem tota nostra est*, “Satire is actually ours entirely,” *Institutio Oratoria* 10.1.93.

grammatica, and so serves as yet another testament to the relationship between Latin poetry and Latin grammar.²³

Satire, however, would be just the genre in which one could reasonably expect discussions of practically any contemporary issue—literary, social, political—to take place, so Lucilius’ interest in an orthographic conundrum that was topical in his day is not so surprising. On the other hand, we might not expect Lucius Accius, who was primarily a dramatist, to have addressed grammatical issues. Accius lived to extreme old age into the early 1st century BCE—Cicero claims at *Brutus* 28 that, as a youth, he himself discussed literary matters with Accius—and is remembered especially for his tragedies.²⁴ These do not survive except in fragments, but it seems that free translations of the plays of Aeschylus were his specialty. While it is possible that Accius made use of the *tools* of earlier *grammatici* as he translated—namely scholarly exegesis and commentaries²⁵—his most telling interaction with *grammatica* seems to have been of a more technical variety. He promoted numerous spelling reforms and is particularly

²³ There are authors who wrote something called *saturae* before Lucilius, namely Ennius, but it is with Lucilius that Horace imagines the tradition began, and probably on the authority of his statement that Quintilian imagines Lucilius as the founding figure of the genre as well. It is therefore likely that Quintilian had Lucilian *saturae* in mind when he named the genre *tota nostra*, and that his understanding of the genre included Lucilius’ various nods to *grammatica*.

²⁴ More than 40 titles of apparently tragedies and *praetextae* are known to us, on which cf. Ribbeck, (1897). Accius also wrote various works in non-dramatic genres, on which see Courtney (1993). None of his writings immediately suggests a specific grammatical treatise. His *Didascalica*, which sounds possibly grammatical, seems to have been a history of drama (both Greek and Roman), perhaps written in a mixture of prose and verse (though Courtney rejects this hypothesis). In a fragment from a work called *Pragmatica*, written in septenarii and cited by Nonius, Courtney reads a heated response to criticisms from Lucilius about his diction, but the majority of those other fragments again suggest a historiographic treatment of the theater. He also wrote a poem called *Annales* that seems to have treated various divine and religious matters, and Gellius names another minor works, called *Parerga*, of which the scope can only be guessed. The same is true for a work titled *Sotadica* named both by Gellius and Priscian.

²⁵ We will explore this possibility in chapter 2.

remembered for adopting his own system of distinguishing short vowels from long vowels of the same quality (e.g. [ĕ] from [ē]) by writing a long vowel twice.²⁶

Accius also represents an early example of the attempt to adapt the Latin language to accommodate features of Greek.²⁷ He advocated the transliteration of Greek inflections and declensions into Latin, when a Greek name or word was used, which we deduce from the forms of the Greek titles of his tragedies. Furthermore, it was his habit, we learn from the 4th century grammarian Marius Victorinus, to follow the Greek convention for representing the velar nasal [ŋ] with a gemination of the voiced velar plosive—i.e., γγ in Greek; gg in Latin—instead of Latin’s conventional *ng* orthography. Victorinus seems to suggest that Accius simply used these spellings when he wrote, rather than that he actually treated the topic in any formal or focused way, and so perhaps we can assume the same for his system of representing long vowels.²⁸ In that case, Accius gave subtle voice to what he recognized as a serious concern for the Latin language in his poetry, just as did Lucilius. Accius, however, may well have expressed these concerns in less predictable genres than Lucilius did. Even a high genre like tragedy, it seems, could engage with linguistic matters.

²⁶ E.g., *ee* replaced any long *ē* (*GRF* 24). The detail is quoted by the 2nd century CE grammarian Quintus Terentius Scaurus in his book *De orthographia*, but Scaurus does not tell us whether Accius actually wrote on the subject or simply attempted to reflect his preference in his own writing.

²⁷ That Latin grammar derived its system for discussing language scientifically from a system tailored for Greek created unsurprisingly a good deal of friction, and the issues and complications that ensued from mapping this system onto Latin are chronic in Latin grammatical treatments, arguably up to this day—comparative studies that assume Greek and Latin grammar can be treated parallel endure despite the distance between the Italic and Hellenic branches of Indo-European—but the problem is especially prominent when, for instance, Roman authors wished to transpose Greek discussions of inflectional cases or parts of speech or verb tenses into Latin.

²⁸ *GRF* 25: *Accius cum scriberet anguis angulus, agguis aggululus ponebat*, “When Accius would write [the words] *anguis* or *angulus*, he used [the spelling] *agguis* and *aggululus*.”

For another reason as well the examples of Accius and Lucilius will be useful models when we search elsewhere for grammatical impulses in Latin poetry, insofar as the two represent two distinct species of grammatical commentary, the one overt, the other less so. Lucilius makes his grammatical discussion the topic of his poetry, and discusses explicitly his view on orthography. On the other hand Accius, as Victorinus implies, does not appear to have expressed his views directly. Rather he seems to have proposed his innovative spellings in his poetry without further comment, as though the example of a correct form alone would be an effective demonstration of how these forms ought to be spelled. Thus both forms of commentary, one explicit and the other only implied, have precedent, and we will keep these examples in mind when we look for grammatical comment in poetry elsewhere.

II. Grammar in the Late Republic

Accius brings us into the first decade of the 1st century BCE, but the underlying issues at stake in both his and Lucilius' interaction with *grammatica* remain relevant for many years, well beyond the confines of technical and professional study. In fact, it seems as though this period in particular marked a rapid and capacious spread of grammatical concerns in Rome. Rawson notes three specific reasons for a focused study of the Late Republic with regard to *grammatica*, all of which we have obliquely suggested already. First, she notes the development of the science and the great advances therein in the Greek world. This development began perhaps centuries earlier, but figures like Crates of Mallus, Tyrannio, and perhaps Philoxenus of Alexandria, represent a series

of ambassadors from Greece who promoted grammatical interests through their professional activity at Rome. Related to this, Rawson suggests, was the Romans' need for assistance in reading and understanding the body of ancient, pre-literary documents, some many centuries older than Latin "literature", which had slowly accumulated; the Romans found etymological derivation and glosses, practices that the Greeks had pioneered, helpful to this aim. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, Rawson points to the exponential growth that Rome experienced during this time, as immigrants poured into the city and brought with them both dialects of Latin that differed significantly from metropolitan, Roman Latin, as well as entirely foreign tongues, especially Greek. A standard Latin to be spoken at Rome was required, with regularized spelling, pronunciation and usage, in order to protect it from foreign influences.²⁹ Both Lucilius and Accius, then, are early witnesses to what was clearly a mounting anxiety about the state of the Latin language.

These conditions set the stage for linguistic examination and allowed for the various topics under the umbrella of *grammatica* to permeate the intellectual and literary climate of Rome in the Late Republic. Indeed they did diffuse and pervade well beyond the boundaries of technical writing and professional activity, though the professional sphere remained active and productive as well.³⁰ The historian and orator L. Cornelius Sisenna, praetor in 78, attempted a number of spelling and morphological reforms, and was an early advocate for the delimitation of *latinitas*, purity of Latin style.³¹ P. Nigidius

²⁹ Rawson 1985 p. 119.

³⁰ The first twelve subjects of Suetonius' biographies in DGR either predate or are contemporary with Catullus during their *floruits*.

³¹ The concept of *latinitas* will be the focus of chapter 1, where we will also revisit Sisenna.

Figulus, praetor in 58 BCE, was foremost a statesman, but also produced a large-scale work called *Commentarii grammatici*, which treated a number of grammatical and linguistic topics. A significant number of amateurs contributed to the field of grammar, and they did so alongside a growing number of professionals.³²

Rawson and Suetonius both identify L. Aelius Stilo as a seminal figure in the development of the Latin grammatical tradition in this period. He was a Roman *eques* of considerable prominence in both *grammatica* and public life, but he was not, strictly speaking, a pay-for-hire teacher.³³ He commented on some of the most ancient of Latin texts, the *Carmen Saliare* and the *Twelve Tables*.³⁴ He also canonized as genuine 25 plays of Plautus.³⁵ Though he was himself a professional man of letters, his influence is reflected especially in those non-professionals who claimed to have learned from him. He taught Lucilius earlier as a younger man and influenced both Cicero and Varro nearer to the end of his life.³⁶ These prolific men of letters were Stilo's two best-known pupils, and

³² For a general treatment of these figures during the early 1st century BCE see Rawson pp. 117-31.

³³ It is perhaps significant that Suetonius highlights Stilo's contributions to the field, but does not place his discussion of him among the biographies. One wonders if his status as *eques* is responsible, on which see below.

³⁴ Both documents are ancient, even by Latin standards. The *Twelve Tables* is traditionally dated to the middle of the 5th c. BCE, and the *Carmen Saliare* to the beginning of the 7th c. The Latin used in these texts, already several centuries removed from the Classical version spoken at Rome during Stilo's lifetime, would naturally have benefitted from explication, and it is most probably to these sorts of documents that Rawson gestures when she describes the Romans' need for grammatical clarification. The *Carmen Saliare* was almost certainly illegible without assistance—Horace references its proverbial inscrutability at Ep. 2.1.86-7, and by Quintilian's time not even the priests understood it (*IO* 1.6.40)—and so a deferral to *grammatici* for its explication is unsurprising. The Latin of Naevius, Ennius and Plautus was almost certainly *not* illegible to readers of the 1st century BCE, but the application of the *ars grammatica* to what were relatively ancient texts, on the model of the Greek practice, had an obvious attraction for the Latin *grammatici*.

³⁵ Less than a century after his death Plautus' name was already being attached to plays that were later regarded as spurious, and sorting the genuine from the suspect became the task of the grammatically inclined, a practice already well developed in Greek literature. Gellius at *Noctes Atticae* 3.3 relates the specifics of the debate and names Aelius and Varro as figures who catalogued the comedies that ought properly to be attributed to Plautus.

³⁶ *Brutus* 205-7.

both were active in the grammatical scene during Catullus' lifetime. While Cicero never wrote a grammatical treatise, he is a frequent and active testament to the broad interest that grammar enjoyed during this period. Varro did write on grammatical subjects—his most extensive treatment is the monumental and partially surviving *De lingua Latina*—and he exhibits a persistent interest in grammatical topics even when he is not treating them expressly. The testimonies of both authors will feature prominently in later sections of this work.

Indeed, professional men of letters like Stilo seem to have had a lasting influence on their students and disciples. In Suetonius' third *vita*, that of Julius Caesar's teacher M. Antonius Gniphio, we learn that Gniphio's most significant contribution to Latin grammar was a two volume work *De Latino sermone*, in which he argued along the lines of *analogia*, "analogy," or the analogous development and formation of words in accordance with predictable patterns. Thus, according to Gniphio, the parallel forms in *robur* and *ebur* recommend that *marmor*, also a neuter consonant-stem noun, would be better represented as *marmur*.³⁷

This methodical approach to language—with the belief that it was regular and predictable—represented one side of a widespread philosophical debate that originated in Greek intellectual circles. The debate concerned the origins of language and was often in the foreground and frequently in the background of any grammatical treatment. One side was represented by those who subscribed to *analogia*, a proposition first supported by the Alexandrian scholars who looked for identifiable rules in the language of Homer. The other side, first argued by the Stoics, reasoned that the origins and development of

³⁷ This example is preserved by Quintilian at *IO* 1.6.23.

language were sporadic and random, and so subscribed to *anomalía* “anomaly,” or the absence of firm and predictable laws that could be applied to language and its behavior.³⁸

In Rome too both sides had support. Gniphó’s preference for *analogía* no doubt influenced the grammatical writing of his most famous student, Julius Caesar, whose treatise *De analogía* is known to us in fragments.³⁹ *Analogía* lay behind the majority of Sisenna’s reforms as well, such as his suggestion that the plural of *pater familiae* be *patres familiarum*.⁴⁰ On the side, Nigidius Figulus imagined that languages developed naturally and without regard to any pattern or rule. This he demonstrated by the physiological shape of the mouth in speaking the personal pronouns: in *ego*, *mihi* and *nos* the breath and mechanisms of articulation move towards the speaker (i.e., further back in the mouth); in *tu*, *tibi* and *vos* they move forward in the mouth and towards a second person.⁴¹ A lack of professional interest or investment in grammatical issues hardly deterred orators, statesmen and other public figures from outside of the *grammaticus*’ trade from offering and articulating their opinions and convictions on the matter.⁴²

³⁸ For the general shape of the debate, see Colson (1919) and Fehling (1956 and 1957).

³⁹ Aristarchus seems to have been a major influence on this work as well. Rawson does not believe that a particularly philosophical tone was to be felt in this lost work, but that it was more authoritarian, and simply reasoned that analogy made language more logical and thus better (1985 p. 122). We will look more closely at some of *De analogía* in chapter 1.

⁴⁰ Varro quotes this logical solution to what Sisenna viewed as illogical usage at *DLL* 8.74.

⁴¹ Gellius, who is the largest source of our fragments of Nigidius, discusses this observation at *NA* 10.4.4.

⁴² Express treatments of the debate are confined to prose authors—that is, no work of poetry openly engages it—but Bürger (1911) imagined that the wide reach of the discussion could be found in poetry as well, detected by a poet’s adherence to one or the other rather than by any clear statement of allegiance. He looked to Tibullus and posited that his usage of certain words and forms, and his preference for one set of words to a set of its synonyms or analogues betrayed an “analogisches Programm.” This hypothesis was addressed by Axelson in his influential 1945 *Unpoetische Wörter*, a survey of the poetic registers of many Latin authors and the appropriateness or inappropriateness of certain diction to those registers. Axelson was not convinced by Bürger’s argument, and used distribution statistic for some of Bürger’s forms to demonstrate that Tibullus, as well as other poets, does not seem to follow the principles of *analogía* in any meaningful way (Axelson 1945 pp. 114-133).

Our most comprehensive picture of the debate, however, comes from an apparently disinterested party. In three of the six surviving books of *De lingua Latina* (8-10) Varro grants the two sides of the debate equal voice, presenting both the strongest points of the argument for and against each disputant. His is an approach that resembles better the descriptive methodology of modern linguistics, for stepping back from the argument one can see that both principles are operative in languages. More important than this, however, is that this highly linguistic issue and the debate that it invited were important components of the intellectual discourse during this period, and, moreover, that the manifestation of this issue in works that were written by non-professionals shows how pervasive *grammatica* had become even outside of the scientific and professional community in the years since its humble origins.

And we are fortunate to possess the record of *grammatica* that comes from outside of the professional sphere. In fact, were it not for the grammatical interest of these non-professionals, our understanding of the Roman *ars grammatica* during the late Republic would be greatly reduced. Perhaps this is in part because the status of the *grammaticus* seems to have been rather low, at least during the Empire, when the state of the field and the role of its professionals undergo significant and marked changes. Unfortunately for us, however, too few of the works and authors that Suetonius cites are extant or attested outside of his *vitae*, and so a perfect sketch eludes us. By the time we have a critical mass of genuine, professional grammatical writings, at least two centuries after Suetonius, Latin as a written mode no longer reflects the language people spoke. Regional dialects are drifting and Romance is beginning to take shape. Indeed both the

field and the social standing of the men who dealt in letters have changed by this time as well. The custody of proper language, which used to attract even the wealthiest and best educated classes, has been resigned by the aristocracy and assumed by a lower stratum of trained professionals.⁴³ Even before these latter years, in Suetonius' time, the standing of *grammatica* and who studied it seems to have changed; almost without exception, every subject of his study is of servile, freedman or foreign status.⁴⁴ Thus the special interest in the *ars grammatica* from outside the professional sphere allows us to supplement our record to a significant degree. My expectation, then, is that Catullus' poetry can be used to this end as well.

The suite of factors that Rawson notes suggest that the period in which Catullus lived and wrote was especially conducive to interest in *grammatica*; this is corroborated by the broad interest that non-specialists took in certain grammatical issues. Moreover, a predilection for some of the topics and concerns of *grammatica* was built into the poetry of Catullus and into the New Poetry in general—Catullus and the neoterics did, after all, aim to replicate the poetry of some of Greece's earliest *grammatici*—and so it should also be fruitful to examine Catullus' poetry in this light.⁴⁵ That is to say, we may reasonably

⁴³ These later iterations of the *grammaticus* and his craft have drawn a good deal of scholarly attention, most importantly Kaster's 1988 *The Guardians of Language*, in which he treats the record of the grammarian and his trade, which is much fuller in the latter years of the Empire, in numerous ways: the nature of the *grammaticus* professional work; his social status and role in society; and the effects that regionalization and language change have had on the way that Latin is studied and taught.

⁴⁴ To no man identified as a *grammaticus* and given a biographical entry is noble status assigned, and only for some subjects does Suetonius fail to mention status. Often a subject is marked as *ingenuus sed expositus* (of course impossible to prove), or Suetonius cites conflicting reports about his status as freeborn, but the standard seems very much to imply that the profession of the *grammaticus* comprised especially men of lower status.

⁴⁵ In other words, much of what we call *neoteric* poetry is an approximation of the literary ideologies of the Alexandrian poets and scholars, who served as models for the *poetae novi*, and it is frequently with these earlier models in mind that we should view Catullus and his peers. See, however, Newman (1991) for a reading that resists, or at least qualifies, this approximation. Newman argues that Catullus is at first a

expect to see some of these grammatical concerns appear in poetry that is already by its nature a kind of philological exercise. Let us now turn our attention to Catullus and consider some of the issues that I plan to explore in examining his poetry through this grammatical lens.

III. Catullus and grammar

How exactly does Catullus fit into a study of grammar and poetry? To what extent can we read his poetry as behaving “grammatically”? We have already demonstrated that a broad and general interest in grammatical matters was pervasive in the intellectual climate of Catullus’ day, and that poetry and poets had long had a voice in the development of a grammatical tradition in Latin literature. Certainly these two factors contribute significantly to the creation of a literary environment that would enable Catullus as well to approach the field of *grammatica* in his poetry. Furthermore, the “school” of the *poetae novi* to which Catullus ostensibly belongs is especially receptive to many of the concerns that underlie the *ars grammatica* and the trade of the *grammaticus*.

First of all, neoteric poetry, insofar as we can define it, imitated a Greek style that was inescapably if tangentially concerned with *grammatica*. We have pointed already to the Alexandrian scholar-poets who prefigure many of the poetic ideals on which the New Poets seem to have placed such high value; theirs is, like that of their Greek progenitors,

Roman poet, and that is to that entity, Rome, that Catullus’ allegiances are most articulated. I do not find this reading incongruous with my own—in fact I will argue that Rome’s most recognizable and enduring legacy, its language, holds for Catullus a position of both personal and artistic prominence—but I do believe that the imprint of Alexandrianism and the Hellenistic aesthetic against which Newman’s reading proceeds should not be undervalued.

a precious and affected poetry, dense in its learning and polish. If the writers of the modern poetry sought to imitate Euphorion, as Cicero claims at *Tusc.* 3.45, or Callimachus, as is obvious from Catullus' oeuvre, that imitation might not only aim to embody the poetic style of its models, but also engage, just as those models did, in literary and textual criticism and the scholastic commentary process, two of the most enduring and grammatical legacies of the Alexandrian scholar-poets. In fact, in practice much of Latin poetry, which depended overwhelmingly on previous Greek models, seems to recall these philological traditions as its poets adapted, translated and reimagined Greek originals.

Secondly, the social network of friends and acquaintances in which Catullus and his poetry operated can actually be tied to some of the known grammarians of the day, grammarians who were themselves poets in addition to their professional roles as teachers, critics and early linguists. Suetonius cites in his biography for Publius Valerius Cato the testimonies of Cinna and Furius Bibaculus, both of whom appear in the poetry of Catullus, and of the poet Tigidas, who is less directly connected, but nevertheless still sometimes numbered among the neoterics. A Greek grammarian who was brought to Rome as the spoils of military conquest, Parthenius of Nicaea, is likewise to be included in the literary circle in which Catullus moved, inasmuch as Cinna almost certainly made use of Parthenius as he crafted his most accomplished and celebrated work. For both grammarian figures, Cato and Parthenius, Catullus stands only one step removed from unconcealed and direct contact.

These two factors, the traces of a philological program inherited from the Alexandrian poets and the presence of certain grammatical figures in the background of the social and literary scene to which Catullus belongs, will be explored in the second and third chapters respectively. In the first chapter I will look especially at perhaps the most persistent issue that Latin *grammatica* aimed to deal with, an issue that is most apparent in the earlier examples of grammar in Latin poetry. That issue is the definition, defense and stewardship of a stable and standard form of Latin.

In a sense, then, this first chapter will serve as a kind of organizing principle for the rest of the study. The division of my study into the chapters that follow is such that each explores a different aspect of the grammatical impulse in Catullus, and a different aspect of the figure of the *grammaticus*. First we will treat and establish Catullus' investment in language and show that his articulation of that investment recalls similar modes of linguistic engagement, both from within the professional field of *grammatica* and from amateurs. With this framework established, the project will move to other components of the *grammaticus*' trade. Chapter 2 will consider literary translation and its philological implications, and show that Latin authors who translate do with the assistance of scholarly materials that are both the tools and the products of *grammatici*, and that the translator very frequently becomes an actor in a philological tradition that is rooted in *grammatica*. In the final chapter I will look for direct traces of the professional field of *grammatica* in Catullus' poetry, and consider the repercussions of reading these figures in that poetry, by which I mean not just the repercussions of linking known figures in the field to Catullus, but rather the effect that identifying and unifying certain

grammatical phenomena has on our understanding of Catullus' poetic craft. For these final two chapters to expand our appreciation of the grammatical impulse in Catullus, however, we must first demonstrate that Catullus' interest in his language can be aligned with similar engagements in the professional field, and particularly with the early attempts to establish a standard form of the Latin language.

This standard form of Latin—that is, correct Latin—is conveyed by the idealized concept of *latinitas*, “Latinity,” which aimed not only to give definition to the purest and best form of Latin, but also to name and censure any form that was deficient, or any speaker (or writer) who failed to meet its standard. Its various definitions and valences will be treated in the first chapter, but it can be understood in the first instance as a kind of linguistic authority, and inherent in that authority lies one of the earliest forms of systematic, if not consistent, linguistic prescriptivism. Catullus himself would have had good reason to take an interest in such a topic. He very frequently appears overly concerned with his own social and financial standing and overly aware that, for all his posturing and pretension to urban culture, his origins are in the provinces; linguistic authority and demonstrable competence in the language of Rome would be a valuable tool for a man who was uncomfortable with his status, whether real or perceived, as a social climber.

Moreover, neoteric poetry, at least the kind Catullus wrote, is itself a kind of exercise in prescription, and one need not look far into the Catullan corpus to find examples in which the poet draws lines and defines boundaries, within which he and his best and most respected friends and allies lived, spoke and wrote, and beyond which were

relegated his social, sexual and literary rivals. Chapter one will look especially at two different statements of linguistic authority, of *latinitas*, in Catullus' poetry, which serve to illustrate the thin line between social and grammatical prescription. However, in order to frame this approach, and perhaps in the interest of not letting any possible statements of authority go uncatalogued, let us first consider some of the ways in which Catullus assert his own linguistic authority through practice.⁴⁶

At the most basic level, one might begin a study of Catullus and his interaction with and attitude towards grammar by scouring his poetry for instances where he enforces, contradicts or challenges the prescriptivism of later grammarians. Such an exercise, then, would expect Catullus to have behaved as Accius did, and to have reflected his position on any particular controversy or linguistic issue implicitly, through his own example. To the best of our knowledge, Accius was not interested in stating in express terms how words ought to be spelled, or in defending his orthographical reforms in his poetry. Lucilius did just this, but in the relatively more accommodating genre of satire his prescriptions are not out of place; it would be completely inappropriate for Accius to put the details and parameters of his spelling reforms in the mouth of, say,

⁴⁶ Traces of this approach to Catullus' practice are already found in Ross (1969), who describes and catalogues in detail certain features of Catullus' language and style, and observes the poetic boundaries in the corpus that allow or prohibit these features, namely the generic constraints in the three traditional groupings of the poems: the polymetric poems (1-60); the longer poems, or the *carmina docta* (62-68); and the epigrams (69-116). Ultimately he shows that the distribution of these features differs greatly between the epigrams and the first 68 poems, i.e., that the longer poems behave more like the polymetric poems in their use of these features. His thorough treatment invites with good reason an approach to linguistic and grammatical features that follows this pattern. Is *grammatica* more appropriate to one of these groups than to the others? Certainly there are grammatical aspects more readily apparent in one—a replication of those philological aspects of the Alexandrians, for instance, is naturally to be felt more strongly in the *carmina docta* than in the epigrams—and I have kept his boundaries in mind as I have probed Catullus' corpus for grammatical behavior. I have, however, traced the grammatical impulse, in various incarnations, in each of the three groups. Nevertheless, Ross' methodology is of significant value and relevance to my study as well.

Atreus, in his tragedy of the same name. Instead, as Victorinus suggests, these reforms could be utilized in the written versions of Accius' works. This too, though a subtler statement than Lucilius' unambiguous interpretation of the rules of spelling, evinces the author's authority, and Rawson notes with good reason that, during this period, the practice and example of prominent authors, authors who were amateur rather than professional *grammatici*, was often more influential than any theorizing in which the grammarians themselves engaged.⁴⁷

It is true that Catullus in one notable poem unambiguously makes prescriptive statements about proper Latin, and we will naturally look to this poem in the first chapter, but more frequently his comments about language are less overt. Often they are even obscured to some extent by the poetic medium and by the imprecise mechanism of textual transmission. But perhaps, as is the case with Accius, we can detect less obvious statements in this medium nevertheless. In other words, a study of Catullus and his linguistic authority with regard to γραμματική might well take the shape of the sort of exegetical commentary a *grammaticus* himself might prepare. Poetry is, in some sense, exempted from the critical prescription of the grammarian by the principle of *metaplasma*, a kind of poetic license that the grammarians granted to poets when they intentionally violated the "rules" of Latin for poetic effect. Nevertheless, this exemption did not discourage commentators from examining, explicating and cataloguing these violations. On the contrary, it actually attracted the microscope of the professional man of

⁴⁷ 1985 p. 121.

letters, whose treatises on correct and incorrect forms were regularly supplemented and supported by quotations taken from poetry.⁴⁸

If our aim is to note instances where Catullus violates the prescribed rules of proper Latin—and thus asserts his own definitions of those rules—we need look no further than the opening lines of the poem that introduces the collection: *cui dono lepidum novum libellum / arida modo pumice expolitum*.⁴⁹ In all other occurrences of *pumex* where the gender is marked the word is masculine, though Catullus contradicts this and makes his pumice-stone feminine.⁵⁰ What purpose does the alteration serve here? *Grammatici* took an interest in such instances of gender-reversal, and note that those that occurred in Ennius exemplified his careful replication of the gender of the corresponding word in Greek.⁵¹ Friedrich’s suggestion, that Catullus wished to avoid the sequence *arido*

⁴⁸ An example frequently repeated among the grammarians is Vergil’s use of a long \bar{i} instead of short \bar{i} in the second line of the *Aeneid*: *Italiam fato profugus* (*IO* 1.5.18). Quintilian’s testimony is our earliest attestation of the etymological length of the *i*—this would be otherwise obscured by its regular lengthening *metri gratia* in hexameters—but his citing Vergil here, or more probably the use of an earlier writer that he copied, becomes the exemplar of the phenomenon in later *artes*. Cf. those treatises of Charisius, Diomedes, Priscian, Donatus, et al., all of whom use the identical passage to illustrate a specific kind of “error” in speech, which is allowed in poetry, called *adiectio temporis*, “addition of [vowel] length.”

⁴⁹ “To whom do I dedicate my little book, neat and new / freshly polished with dry pumice?” 1.1-2.

⁵⁰ Such a trivial distinction was naturally obliterated in the transmission of the text, and a few ancient *testimonia* actually agree with the manuscripts and print *arido* when discussing this line for its metrical phenomena—c. 1.2-4 feature all three possible combinations of short and long syllables with which a hendecasyllabic line can begin ($\bar{\sim}$; $\bar{\bar{\sim}}$; and $\sim\bar{\sim}$, respectively). However, we can restore *arida* on the testimony of Servius, who gestures to c. 1 in his comment to *Aen.* 12.587: ‘*in pumice*’ *autem* [Vergilius] *masculino genere posuit, et hunc sequimur: nam et Plautus ita dixit. licet Catullus dixerit feminino*. “Vergil wrote “*in pumice*” with the masculine gender, and we follow his lead, since Plautus as well put it thus [at *Aul.* 295], although Catullus put it in the feminine.” Despite the contradiction, Servius’ testimony containing the irregular form ought to outweigh the others, though see Goold 1981, who defends the manuscript tradition and its reading of *arido*, and suggests a motivation for Servius to have noted it otherwise. For a general discussion of textual tradition with regard to this passage see Thomson (1999 p. 197).

⁵¹ Probus and Nonius both quote feminine forms of *aer* and *lapis* from Ennius, and so Klotz attempts the same explanation for c. 1, where feminine *pumex* imitates Greek κίσηρις (1931). With regard to these *testimonia* about Ennius’ usages Corbeill (2008) reads a persistent interest in Latin literature and specifically in the *grammatici* to conceptualize grammatical gender in relation to physiological gender, and that their appearance in grammatical works was not merely for clarification for young readers and students. This is demonstrably the case, he argues, since fragments of Ennius that documented non-standard gender

modo, is possible as well, especially given *dono* in the line above. The euphonic motivation, then, would be for aesthetic reasons, while the replication of the Greek gender, Batstone notes, comports well with the programmatic statements of this introductory poem.⁵² However, this is not the only place that Catullus plays with grammatical gender, and other instances appear less concerned with euphony or imitation of a Greek noun. In fact in other places, and even within the same poem, Catullus uses both standard, masculine forms alongside non-standard feminine usages.⁵³ It seems hazardous to attribute too quickly all of these violations to a single motivation. Batstone's explanation of *arida pumex* as part of a programmatic statement of Catullus and his poetry's translingual interests is attractive, and moreover suggests a kind of linguistic authority—Catullus lays claims not only to Latin but to Greek as well, and shows that he can override the Latin system when he wishes—even if it cannot account for the other apparent gender reversals. In this introductory poem, however, a programmatic declaration, such as Batstone suggests, may warrant a violation of conventions. I would expand Batstone's translingual program to encompass Catullus' persistent interest in gender as well, and attribute to this interest in gender and the degree to which a poet can manipulate it his various other alterations of grammatical gender as well.⁵⁴ Thus in the

circulated and survived in grammatical treatises long after the poems themselves ceased to be read. Nonius could not have consulted Ennius directly when Gellius two centuries before him implies that Ennius was no longer easily accessible or widely read (p. 90).

⁵² Batstone (1998 p. 121 n. 1). His preference for a Greek-inspired form of the word, along with his use of aurally and semantically equivalent *lepidus* as a stand-in for Callimachean *λεπτός*, establishes the translingual nature of his poetry.

⁵³ Cf. feminine *extrema fine* at 64.217, but masculine *fines Aeeteos* at 64.3; and feminine *cinis* at 68.90 (*acerba*) and 101.4 (*mutam*), but *cognatos cineres* at 68.98, all instances in reference to Catullus' brother's remains. Calvus also, according to Nonius, used *cinis* in the feminine.

⁵⁴ Catullus' special attention to gender, both of the lexical and the physiological kind, is not limited only to these scattered instances. Cf. as well the oxymoron implicit in *patrona* (feminine, but from *pater*) at 1.6;

first poem of the corpus, Catullus seems to profess his interest in two languages, Latin and Greek, as well as his command over those languages. It will be in part my goal to demonstrate, as Batstone does, that this and similar mediations of the Latin language are at least in part informed by Catullus' own conception of a poetic authority that is also a linguistic authority.

The reader qua *grammaticus* might also point to other instances in Catullus' poetry where morphology behaves unexpectedly. Any Latin poet who wished to incorporate the Greek poetic and mythological worlds into his work faced a decision when it came to transcribing or declining Greek names and other nouns, and in fact this very topic was also disputed in Catullus' day. When Quintilian discusses the representation of Greek declensions in Latin, which he thinks must be approached judiciously and on a case by case basis, he cites Julius Caesar as an authority who regularized Greek terminations to resemble familiar Latin ones.⁵⁵ For Quintilian, popular usage, *consuetudo*, is the ultimate authority, but on the contrary, Caesar's uncle Julius Caesar Strabo made it a point to use transliterated, rather than Latinized, Greek names in his tragedies, and so his *Tecmessa* eschewed an earlier and unconsciously Latinized form *Tecumessa* that had once been standard. Elsewhere Cicero, in a letter to Atticus that we will explore again in chapter 3, wonders whether *Piraeum* or *Piraeae* is a more correct

the physical and lexical transformation of Attis in c. 63 from masculine to feminine; his treatment of the lock in c. 66 as feminine, and his preference for feminine synonyms for *πλόκαμος*. For recent treatments of gender in Catullus see Janan (1994), Harrison (2004) and Greene (2006).

⁵⁵ Quintilian claims that Latin should be used insofar as it does not conflict with elegance, *quousque patitur decor* (*IO* 1.5.63), and implies that *Calypsonem* on analogy with *Iunonem* oversteps that elegance—i.e., that to decline *Καλυψώ*, of which the accusative is properly *Καλυψώ* (contracted from **Καλυψόα*), as a 3rd declension noun with the same shape of *Πλάτων* (which ending is cognate with *-ō*, *-ōnis* in Latin) is incorrect. Caesar, on the other hand, preferred such forms as these, and moreover *secutus antiquos*, “followed the ancients”, in this preference.

accusative form of the Piraeus, and enlists the testimony of earlier Latin authors and his friends to arrive at a consensus.⁵⁶ Opinions on this point, then, were subjective, and in many cases it was on his own authority that an author promoted or used one form or the other.

Quintilian seems to imply that Caesar's view on this topic was inflexible, that all Greek names ought to be rendered in Latin in accordance with the Latin conventions, but others are conspicuously less regular in their practice. Rawson notes that Accius too proposed that Greek names be brought into Latin with as little alteration as possible, and this proposal obtains in certain of his tragic fragments, where he does decline names in accordance with Greek morphology instead of with the nominal inflection of Latin's declensions superimposed onto them; the accusative of *Hector* is *Hectora*, not *Hectorem*.⁵⁷ Elsewhere, though, Accius uses forms that look more akin to a Latinized adaptation than a direct transliteration. *Atreum* as the accusative of *Atreus* does not properly reflect the accusative form of such words for either language.⁵⁸ In fact, it approximates more closely a Latin ending from the second declension than it does anything Greek.⁵⁹ Accius' usage too, it would seem, is somewhat arbitrary. It may be that popular usage recommended one form or another, but we have no way of recovering a

⁵⁶ *Ad Att.* 6.9.1.

⁵⁷ *TRF* 36. When he discusses a fault of *analogia* at *DLL* 8.72, Varro uses a similar example, namely that *Hectōrem* and *Nestōrem*, the results of an analogical derivation that used forms like *quaestōrem* as its model, are at odds with conventional *Hectōra* and *Nestōra* (direct transliterations of Ἑκτοῖρα and Νέστορα). In a later discussion in *DLL* 10 Varro revisits these examples, and notes that Accius preferred the direct transliteration, but that Ennius had Latinized the forms, and so used *Hectōris* (*DLL* 10.70).

⁵⁸ Latin had no ending exactly equivalent to Greek -εὖς, and so had no convention for rendering such nouns. Earlier imports that are ultimately Greek have -ēs, as in *Achilles*, *Ulixes*, but it is highly likely that these loans were either adopted from variant Greek spellings or mediated by another language before reaching Latin. Even in Greek the ending -εὖς is problematic. Nouns of this type, as far as can be told, derive from the *o*-stem declension (2nd), but were at some point in Greek prehistory remodeled on the consonant stem declension (3rd). See Sihler §319.

⁵⁹ *Atreum* appears at *TRF* 198. *Atrea* (from Ἀτρέα) would have been a direct transliteration.

record of that usage if such is the case. Whatever the case may have been, Accius, who more obviously and openly exerted grammatical authority in his spelling reforms, likely saw in himself and in his usage an authoritative voice on this question as well.

Catullus is also less rigorous, and allows inflections of both languages to interact and overlap, often for the sake of meter or to create or avoid an elision. In some cases it seems obvious that a fully Latinized form is already conventional, and no further comment or adjustment is required. Nevertheless, at certain points he does privilege a Greek form, and often his motivation is less obviously pragmatic. There are some cases, in fact, where his preference for a Greek ending actually obscures, to some extent, the meaning of a line. For instance, in c. 66.66 of the *Coma Berenices*, when he translates Callimachus' form Καλλιστοῖ (at *Aitia* fr. 110.66) Catullus produces the only attested usage of a peculiar Greek dative: *Callisto* [dative] *iuncta Lycaoniae*.⁶⁰ In isolation the word is completely ambiguous in Latin and could be interpreted as any of the singular cases.⁶¹ Perhaps for that reason no other Latin author preserves a use of this formation of the dative case for this class of nouns. In fact, nowhere else in Latin do nouns of this type appear in the dative case, in whatever form, although Greek names of this shape are not uncommon and many are represented in Latin poetry. Vergil, for instance, diplomatically

⁶⁰ Callimachus' form is the standard dative for such nouns, but, as is the case with Καλυψώ, a perfect Latin analogue for the declension of Καλλιστώ does not immediately present itself to the Roman writer. Later authors use a Greek transliteration for the accusative that produces an identical form—thus *Allecto* in *Aen.* 7.324; Pliny Maior in his *Dubius sermo* (in which he revisits the debate between analogia and anomalia) notes accusatives in *Callisto*, *Calypso*, *Io* and *Allecto*—but no other surviving text replicates Catullus' dative.

⁶¹ All cases of the singular can be represented by the *-ō* ending, although genitives of this type are extremely rare. In fact Hyginus' genitive *Callisto* at *Fabulae* 224.2 appears unparalleled. When the genitive is used it more commonly appears as a transliteration of the Greek *-οῦς*, *-ūs*. Other times it undergoes a Latinization to *-ōnis*, akin to the paradigm suggested by Quintilian's *Calypsonem*. Servius uses both of these forms, the former in his comment to *Georg.* 1.67, the latter at *Ecl.* 10.57.

avoids placing *Dido* in any case but the nominative/vocative and the accusative, rather than commit to a formation that will necessarily be either ambiguous or inaccurate.⁶²

Of course, a better choice is not obvious, and one is left to wonder what other form Catullus *could* have used for the dative.⁶³ He had other options. He might have rewritten the phrase to put the name in a different case, or have avoided it altogether by referring to Callisto by epithet.⁶⁴ Catullus however, chose to translate closely and to retain the case used by Callimachus. But he does not always replicate the forms used by his Greek source, so we cannot attribute this phenomenon entirely to his translation goals. *Memnonis Aethiopsis* at 66.52, e.g., occurs at the precise location in the line where Callimachus had Μέμνονος Αἰθίοπος, but Catullus does not transliterate here, and moreover no complications of meter or ambiguity would have arisen if he had. And yet, only a few lines later (66.54) Catullus uses obviously Greek-derived declensions with *Arsinoes Locridos*, so rigorous consistency is obviously not his goal.⁶⁵

⁶² Of the 34 uses of *Dido* in the *Aeneid*, only once is it accusative, at 4.383.

⁶³ Some of the manuscripts preserved *Callistoe*, but this line seems to have been mangled in transmission, likely because of the confusing form, and that reading is therefore not to be trusted. For a history of the text here see Marinone 1984 p. 228-9.

⁶⁴ Vergil simply refers to her constellation, which is also at stake in Catullus, as *arcton* (accusative) at *Georg.* 1.138.

⁶⁵ A further complication to this picture comes in the poem's final line, where Catullus writes *proximus Hydrochoi fulgeret Oarion*, "may Orion flash nearest to Aquarius!" (66.94). Neither proper noun is Latin, and so for the representation of both Catullus was forced into making a decision. The corresponding fragment of *Aitia* cannot be read completely, but it is reasonable to expect that Ὠαρίων, at least, was the form Callimachus used, inasmuch as he uses the identical form in a hymn. *Hydrochoi* is more difficult to account for. It is almost certainly dative (Quinn's suggestion that it is genitive is difficult in sense and unnecessary), but the formation, presumably as though from Ὑδροχοεύς (dat. Ὑδροχοῦϊ), is not standard—*Hydrochoos* is conventional in Latin, a direct transliteration of Ὑδροχόος. Nor is the case used by Callimachus entirely certain, since only Ὑδροχ[is legible, and Pfeiffer instead of the dative suggests the nominative here. The issues of his and other restorations of Callimachus and its utility for our appreciating Catullus' engagement with the text will be the focus of chapter 2. Suffice to say, however, that Catullus' choices in morphology are not always immediately clear.

Nevertheless, here at line 66, where Latin morphology is perhaps least equipped to tackle a Greek form, Catullus boldly selects a form that has no attested antecedent, and furthermore no attested successor. This is a statement of linguistic authority of the same kind that *grammatici* will later make when they discuss morphology. However, he is careful in his usage of the ambiguous form of *Callisto*; he attaches it to a verb that regularly construes with the dative in *iuncta*, and provides it with an (almost) unambiguous complement in *Lycaoniae*. He mediates the intrusion of a foreign word into Latin in such a way as to make obvious its exact meaning. In such a way he exerts an authority over Latin much in the way that Caesar does in prescribing against these transliterated forms, or Accius does when he proposes a distinct orthography for long vowels.

These few examples of Catullus' engagement with his language that I have provided, then, are sufficient for a preliminary demonstration of some of Catullus' interests in language and in the linguistic authority to which he laid claim. In this dissertation I will show how these interests are articulated with regard to *grammatica*. In such a way, I argue, Catullus engages with a tradition that is, in some sense, innate in Latin poetry—in fact, it is my suggestion that the environment that facilitated the development of a distinct Latin literary tradition was not only open to but also shaped by *grammatica*—but the conditions for this engagement were never so accommodating for a *poeta novus* as they were in his lifetime. During the late Republican period, Latin literature and its authors were forced to react to a growing presence in the city, foreign languages and non-standard dialects, and so became highly receptive to and actively

interested in such inquiries into the particulars of the language, into the *grammaticus*' world.

My argument, then, is that *grammatica* can be detected in not only Catullus' poetry, but ought to be recognized as a persistent aspect of Latin literature and Latin poetry far more broadly, and so I leave open the possibility that a similar treatment of other Latin poets will produce results of a similar kind. My study brings Catullus into that contemporary discussion, and, in doing so, proposes a underappreciated aspect of his poetic craft, an aspect that is not in conflict with or revisionist of earlier studies of the poet, but that imagines him as a particular exemplar of a clear and important phenomenon of Latin literature.

CHAPTER 1: CATULLUS AND *LATINITAS*

Latinitas, “Latinity”, refers to a hyper-idealized and “pure” form of Latin in all of the language’s components. To reach such an absolute, or, it would seem, to define the absolute once its practitioner believes he has achieved it, was often a goal of the self-styled intellectual and literary elite of Latin literature. The unknown author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* gives an adequate if reductive definition: *latinitas est quae sermonem purum conservat, ab omni vitio remotum*.⁶⁶ His definition is unfulfilling and nearly circular, but this is perhaps appropriate. The term is not easily defined, largely because its purview extends beyond mere linguistic prescription, though that is certainly one of its aims, and includes aspects of social relations and national identity as well. What can be stated about the idea of *latinitas*, however, is that it was from its earliest a term of exclusion, seeking to draw boundaries around what could be considered correct speech and writing. In this it differs greatly from modern and more scientific approaches to the study of languages, which serve merely as witnesses to observable and objective realities, without any interest in assigning value to better regarded speech, or reproach to language that is deemed inferior. Modern linguistics aims to be descriptive. On the other hand, *latinitas* is prescriptive, and in being such is just as, perhaps even more concerned with defining what lies outside of its parameters, i.e. what is not Latin, than it is with labeling those aspects of speech that fall within its range.

Such boundaries necessarily prohibited some spoken Latin, both dialects and registers regarded as deviant from the ideal, but the criteria of exclusion and inclusion

⁶⁶ “*Latinitas* is what keeps speech pure and free from all vice,” (4.12.17). This definition makes it sound more like an abstract quality that the speaker possesses than a measurable or at least appreciable feature of the speech.

were often subject to the interpretations and modes of the commenting author. For example, Cicero and Caesar, and Quintilian after them, couch their ideologically charged approaches to language and its usage in terms largely oratorical. *Latinitas* becomes not merely a set of rules for speakers and writers to memorize and emulate, but the equipment of an effective orator. Varro, on the other hand, seems to demonstrate through his concern with etymology and the behavior of individual words that *latinitas* is a kind of authority of origins, one that looks ever backward to a receding point on the linguistic horizon. For the later grammarians, *latinitas* requires first an understanding of the morphological shape of Latin words and the phonological profile of the language—its declensions and conjugations are rehearsed; its parts of speech are listed; its full range of sounds and articulations is discussed; and the common faults that betray deficiencies in any of these categories are prescribed.

Unsurprisingly, for each of these aspects of *latinitas* there exists a Greek precedent on which the Latin is modelled. In fact the word *latinitas* is a kind of a calque of the Greek term ἑλληνισμός, and it would not be inaccurate to designate the entire concept and execution of *latinitas* as an approximation of the Greek model. The differences, however, are significant. Foremost among the incompatibilities between Greek ἑλληνισμός and its Latin derivative is a geographical discrepancy. Greek ἑλληνισμός became a powerful concept because of its ability to encompass the vast and varied sea of Greek dialects that existed from the archaic period up until the Koine became the *lingua franca* of the eastern Mediterranean.⁶⁷ No parallel for this diversity

⁶⁷ I do not mean to suggest that the Greek-speaking world did not recognize at various points a “prestige” dialect, in the way that Roman Latin was so conceptualized (or, to use a modern example, the Received

ever existed for Latin, so if *latinitas* is a calque, it is hardly a perfect calque. Perhaps it is cognate with ἑλληνισμός to some extent, but it is better considered distinctly. Indeed, by the time *latinitas* becomes a topic of discussion in the Roman world, there is only one focal point for the Latin language: the Latin of Rome, specifically the Latin of Rome a generation before the Classical period. This model and its idealized development from the *prisci Latini* to the Romans of the late Republic forms the basis of all discussions of what it means to *latine loqui* “speak Latin”. The act of tying the ideal form of Latin to specific geographical point is not without its repercussions. Rather, geographical concerns, which are no doubt amplified by the rapid expansion of the Roman world, the appropriation of other peoples and places and their languages, and the influx of foreign tongues that could be heard in Rome during the 1st c. BCE, seem to figure prominently into the Roman conception of correct use of language. *Latinitas* is not merely the act of speaking Latin, but of speaking Roman Latin, in a sense, being fully Romanized.⁶⁸

Nevertheless, even without the various literary and spoken dialects that fall under the heading of Greek Language, Latin tried to find a parallel to the best regarded Greek

Pronunciation accent of British English). Attic Greek, for instance, enjoyed status not just in Athens, where other dialects could be lampooned on the comic stage (cf. the Spartan women of *Lysistra*) or regarded as unwelcome in the court room, but its reputation spread beyond Attica as well. By the time of Alexander the Great, Attic had become the preferred dialect in Macedonia, and it is no doubt that its adoption there allowed it to spread across the Greek world in the form of its direct descendent Koine. On the status of Roman Latin as a prestige dialect see section II below.

⁶⁸ There is a term for this particular aspect of *latinitas* as well, *urbanitas*. Linguistic concerns underlie it as well, as is the case in Cicero’s *Brutus* (170ish ff), and it is this underlying interest in proper use of language that allows Asinius Pollio to accuse Livy of *Patavinitas*, a kind of bastardized form of *latinitas* that consisted in a speaking Latin in the dialect of the Po Valley. Pollio’s insult seems to acknowledge that *latinitas* is calqued from ἑλληνισμός, and to imagine *Patavinitas* as parallel to some kind of inferior Greek dialect. For more on the relationship between these three concepts see Latte (1940).

speakers, those from Attica, in defining Roman Latin as the purest, and even best-sounding variety of the language.⁶⁹

More than merely a trait with the power to confer linguistic authority—though in essence *latinitas* is a kind of linguistic authority—it was a matter of socio-linguistic authority, an unstated requirement for a competent author of any genre in Latin. For this reason, its performance, and to a lesser extent its definition, held a certain attraction for the neoterics and for Catullus, whose works frequently pass judgment on the merits or faults of acquaintances and other authors, viewed through both a social and a literary lens. The aim of this chapter will be to situate Catullus within the ancient discussion of *latinitas* by treating the topic both synchronically and diachronically. I will focus in particular on two aspects of *latinitas*: the element of prescriptive phonology, which seeks to define what Latin properly spoken sounds like; and the importation, use and effect of foreign diction. For both aspects, I will first provide some context in the form of a general treatment of the topics, diction and phonology, as they are discussed elsewhere in Latin literature. After outlining the shape of the contemporary, as well as later, dialogue, I will demonstrate that Catullus, too, was an active participant in and contributor to the ongoing process of conceptualizing *latinitas*.

⁶⁹ Such is Cicero's estimation at *De Oratore* 3.42. Cicero makes a point of noting the pleasant sound of Roman Latin, though he also admits that there are some who prefer and affect the *rustica vox* from outside the city for its *gravitas linguae* and its *sonus agrestis*. Nevertheless, he calls the special quality of the Latin of the *urbs* a *suavitatem quae exit ex ore*, "a pleasantness that comes out of the mouth," and compares it to a parallel quality in Attic Greek. For more on this see Ramage (1961). For discussion of the "pleasantness" of Latin phonology, particularly Roman Latin, see section II below.

Section I: Citizens of Latin

A central tenet of any definition of *latinitas* should be obvious from the shape of the word itself; *latinitas* seeks to establish what is and what is not Latin. In writing, where strictly aural features such as pronunciation and cadence are suppressed, perhaps the most conspicuous foreign intrusions into a language come in the form of unfamiliar diction. An axiom often quoted, both in antiquity and modern scholarship, from Caesar's lost *De Analogia* states this concern unambiguously: *tamquam scopulum sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum*.⁷⁰ Under that umbrella one could place new and unfamiliar analogical formations, restored archaisms, loanwords and foreign language. The following section will consider in particular the latter two categories implied by Caesar's dictum, words that are not natively Latin, as they are treated in broader discussions of *latinitas*.

At *De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* 22 Suetonius provides the grammarian M. Pomponius Porcellus with a terse biographical entry, introducing the man as *sermonis Latini exactor molestissimus*, an extraordinarily obnoxious overseer of the Latin language.⁷¹ The unflattering epithet seems to have been earned by his reputation not as a professional teacher, but as an advocate, where he routinely reprimanded opponents for their solecisms. The chapter itself is nearly forgettable. Suetonius provides no

⁷⁰ "Just as you steer clear of a reef, so should you flee the unusual and irregular word." Gellius preserves the quotation at *NA* 1.10.4. Garcea's recent commentary on the fragments of *De Analogia* collates the refigurings of the quotation in contemporary and later authors, as well as Caesar's attitude here and in other fragments towards strange words and foreign diction (Garcea 2012 pp. 87ff.).

⁷¹ Such is the Kaster's rendering of the epithet (1995. p. 25). The tone of this translation Godfrey (1997) found disagreeable, he suggests instead Rolfe's "a most pedantic critic of the Latin language". However, given that the short entry focuses exclusively on the somewhat annoying habit of Porcellus to interpolate his advocacy with ectopic criticisms of his opponents' usage, Kaster's interpretation seems to me completely appropriate.

information about specific contributions Porcellus made to the field of grammar or to any of his grammatical activity outside of this courtroom behavior. He does, however, record in the second of the two anecdotes that demonstrate his unpopular habits an interesting interaction with the emperor Tiberius. Tiberius, we are told, used a particular word in a speech, the legitimacy of which Porcellus questioned. In defense of the emperor the jurist Ateius Capito claimed its usage was legitimate, that *esse illud Latinum et si non esset futurum certe iam inde*.⁷² Porcellus, however, refuted this, famously telling Tiberius that *tu enim...civitatem dare potes hominibus, verbis non potes*, “You can grant citizenship to people, but not to words.”⁷³

Suetonius does not disclose the word under scrutiny here, so we can only speculate, but from similar anecdotes it seems likely that it was a Greek word. In his *Life of the emperor*, Suetonius mentions again that Tiberius’ language did not always meet with approval. At *Tib.* 71 the emperor felt it necessary to beg the pardon of the senate for using a *verbum peregrinum* when he intended to use a Latinized Greek word, *monopolium*.⁷⁴ Similarly, the senate demanded that he replace the word ἔμβλημα, “insertion”, in a certain decree either with a native Latin word, or, if a semantic equivalent was determined to be lacking in Latin, with a periphrasis of whatever length

⁷² “It *is* Latin, and if wasn’t before, it surely will be from here on out” (22.2).

⁷³ Ibid. Cassius Dio relates a fuller version of the same anecdote, with Tiberius himself suspecting his usage was unacceptable and calling upon grammarians to consult their authority. Dio’s version has the error in an edict (similar to the other examples in Suetonius’ *Life of Tiberius*), not a speech, though the pithy reply is preserved by both authors. Dio, however, makes a point to note that Porcellus was not punished for his cheek (57.17.1-3). On the idiom of words as citizens of a language and other instances of the same formula, see below.

⁷⁴ Suet. *Tib.* 71.1ff. Tiberius’ interactions with the grammarians are recorded throughout Suetonius’ biographies, as at *Tib.* 32.2 and 56.

was necessary.⁷⁵ Here again Tiberius is barred from Latinizing a word through the force of his usage alone, the grounds for which in all three cases appear to be a violation of the purity of Latin, i.e. of *latinitas*.⁷⁶

This treatment of the importation of new words, including not only Greek but words from other foreign languages or dialects of Latin, and to a certain extent Latin derivations and neologisms, is fertile ground for examining Latinity. For Kaimio (1979) the very term *latinitas* implies a certain negative attitude towards foreign elements, especially those that are Greek, though it is notable that authors who herald themselves as stylistic purists do not avoid such elements entirely.⁷⁷ Cicero, for example, made frequent

⁷⁵ Ibid. Such intolerance for Grecism in political and legal language is unsurprising, and Billerbeck (1990) suggests that both of these words were in the general currency of the day's spoken Latin, but had not won acceptance in more formal spheres. This lag is no doubt a symptom of the long and slow-to-die tradition of unease regarding the intrusion of Greek culture and language into Latin, to which these criticisms of Tiberius certainly belong. Even well after Greek literary forms had insinuated themselves into Latin tradition, a process which began even before the time of Cato the Elder, the staunchest and most vocal opponent to Greek culture's pervasive influence, hostility towards the Hellenizing of Latin endured. Cicero tells us at *Verr.* 2.4.47 that he was even castigated for speaking Greek before a Greek assembly in Syracuse.

⁷⁶ There is another curious and related case of Imperial intervention, or attempt at intervention, into the *latinitas* conversation. During his reign Claudius introduced three new characters into the written alphabet to represent already existing sounds in the Latin phonological system. He designed a character to parallel Greek ψ by replacing the consonant clusters *bs* and *ps* (just as *cs* and *gs* were written with *x*). Its exact shape is unclear, but it seems to have looked something like two opposite facing *c*'s, ƆC. Another, written with an inverted digamma, Ƀ, represented the consonantal value of Latin *u* (i.e., [w] as opposed to vocalic [u]). The final letter, Ɇ, he designed to represent the ambiguous close, central and perhaps slightly rounded sound, presumably [i] or [u], which occurred especially in unstressed syllables and was written both as *i* and as *u* (as in *optime* and *optume*). These letters appear in a limited extent on some public inscriptions datable to Claudius' reign, but dropped out of use soon after his death. Both Suetonius (*Claud.* 41.3) and Tacitus (*Ann.* 11.13-14) mention the three letters, but neither describes their written shape, or suggests an underlying interest in *latinitas* on the part of the inventor; they are alluded to as features of Claudius' special interest in language, but without the humor and ridicule that characterized Tiberius' interventions. Perhaps this is because, whereas Tiberius' suggestions would be reflected in the spoken language—inherent in the concept of *latinitas* was a concern with the oratorical art—Claudius' were strictly orthographic. See Oliver (1949) for a discussion of the inscriptional evidence, the testimony of Velius Longus and the earlier reconstruction of Bücheler from 1856 that have informed our understanding of the letters today.

⁷⁷ Kaimio 1979 pp. 297ff. His study examines the station and reputation among Latin speakers and authors of the Greek language in all of its facets. The irony of *latinitas*' apparent stance on foreignisms and its obvious dependence on ἐλληνισμός is not lost on Kaimio, who deals especially with the contradictory nature of a social and literary institution that is both indebted to and mistrusting of the foreign model.

use of the Greek words as a display of learning, especially in his private correspondence.⁷⁸ Terence's relatively meager use of Greek in comparison to Plautus seems to have employed foreign diction as part of his comedic program.⁷⁹ Let us consider first attitudes towards this kind of language elsewhere, before turning our attention to Catullus.

As has been discussed above, a firm and deliberate explanation of what constituted *latinitas* for a Roman is wanting from our various *testimonia*, and so it would be reckless to assume that for any writer in any period there was not room for interpretation as to how word choice fit into his schematic of *latinitas*, but Cicero seems at least to approach a definition that includes diction in *De Oratore* 3. Here he outlines those aspects of speech *latine loqui* requires: *ut latine loquamur, non solum videndum est, ut et verba efferamus ea, quae nemo iure reprehendat, et ea sic et casibus et temporibus et genere et numero conservemus, sed etiam lingua et spiritus et vocis sonus est ipse moderandus.*⁸⁰ With these prerequisites for speaking Latin, Cicero prescribes against errors involving two of the canonical categories of reproof among the later grammarians:

Kaimio concludes his section on *latinitas* and its relationship to Greek by admitting that Greek words do not automatically violate the purity of *latinitas*, but "only in so far as they corrupted the elegance of the Latin language (p.299)." Whether he intended the phrase "elegance of the Latin language" to recall *elegantia*, the definition of which is at least as subjective and mutable as that of *latinitas*, is unclear.

⁷⁸ For a general account on the topic of loan words in Cicero see Oksala (1953 and 1954). A more recent study by Dubuisson (1995) addresses the same topic with a degree of skepticism to any methodology that overreaches in its assumptions on the relationship between two languages that have had no native speakers for centuries.

⁷⁹ These words are generally placed in the mouths of slaves and other societal dregs. See Hough (1947) for a discussion of the frequency of Greek in Terence and Maltby (1985) for comments on the distribution and effect of his use of Greek words. Cf. as well Maltby's 1995 treatment of Plautus' use of Greek.

⁸⁰ "In order for us to speak Latin, caution must be taken not only to choose words in which no one can rightly find fault, and to observe in those words [proper] case, tense, gender and number, but the sound itself, that of the breathing and the vocalization, must be moderated by the tongue," (*De Orat.* 3.40.1ff).

the mechanics of pronunciation, and accuracy and concord in morphology.⁸¹ These two spheres of language, proper pronunciation and what colloquial English today would probably term proper *grammar*, are to some extent less subjectively qualified—presumably one either pronounces his words correctly and obeys conventions of morphology and syntax or he does not—than the third of Cicero’s fundamentals of Latin speech, a selection of words *quae nemo iure reprehendat*. The sorts of words that one might rightly reproach are not detailed, but it seems safe to assume to that it is the Porcelli of the world who are concealed behind *nemo*.

As I have suggested above, it is highly plausible that Porcellus found fault in Tiberius’ use of a Greek word. Regardless of what this word may have been, such an attitude towards diction and language is remarkable for at least two reasons. First, the parallel between a state and citizenship and a language and accepted vocabulary is a telling insight into the genuine sense of propriety the *exactores* of the Latin language must have felt. In fact, the rights of the citizen are made to appear even more easily attainable than entry into the lexical catalogue of proper Latin usage. This is certainly significant, especially with regards to the shift in control of Latin’s stewardship from the political and social elite, figures such as Cicero and Caesar, to the teachers and writers of Latin grammar, *exactores* like Porcellus. Nevertheless, for the current study, more compelling is the underlying message of Porcellus’ rebuke: certain words for certain reasons are to be excluded from correct Latin, from *latinitas*, and certain figures have the authority to enact this exclusion, and, by inference, to enact inclusion as well.

⁸¹ Mistakes of both of these categories would fall comfortably under the headings of barbarisms, when only a single word contains an error, and solecisms, where agreement or syntactical friction between two or more words accounts for the error. For a fuller description of these categories in action, see below.

The idea that a capable arbiter can grant a word status as an official Latin utterance is not confined to this anecdote. Indeed, even Porcellus' metaphor of the Latin language as a state and the words as its citizens is deployed rather frequently by authors discussing loanwords into Latin. This is no accident. The image of the imperialist Latin language ever stretching its reach and adopting foreign utterances—words, place names, even syntax—into its fold cannot fail to recall the actual expansion of the Roman geopolitical world across and beyond the Mediterranean basin. As has been discussed above, space and geography necessarily underlie treatments of *latinitas*, which, since its earliest entry into conversations of the Latin language as a definable entity, has had a fixed geographical center in Rome as its focal point. If we are to discuss *latinitas*, it must be with geography and imperialism in mind.

Seneca Minor twice uses Porcellus' idiom, *civitatem d(on)are*, when discussing the naturalization of a word into Latin. At *Ep.* 120.4 he explains that the Greek word *analogia* has been ratified by the *Latini grammatici*;⁸² in his discussion of the names of winds at *Naturales Quaestiones* 5.16 the Greek name for the east wind, *Eurus*, is said to have been endowed with citizenship and no longer to be considered a foreign word.⁸³

⁸² *Hoc verbum [analogia] cum Latini grammatici civitate donaverint, ego damnandum non puto, immo in civitatem suam redigendum. Utar ergo illo non tantum tamquam recepto sed tamquam usitato.* “This word, since the Latin grammarians endowed it with citizenship, I do not think ought to be condemned, rather it ought to be returned to its citizenship! Therefore I will use it not only as though an established term, but as a usage with some currency,” (120.5.1ff.). It seems likely that *analogia* was first permitted into Latin because of its technical use by the Greek grammarians—technical terms for philosophy, astronomy and a number of other natural sciences were more easily imported than calqued or rendered through periphrasis—though in the 1st c. BCE it still competed with the Latin equivalent *proportio* and its broader synonym *ratio*. The grammarian Staberius Eros wrote a treatise *De Proportione*, of which only fragments now exist. Caesar's *De Analogia* has also only reached us in fragments, but its title reflects the technical term that won out.

⁸³ *sed et eurus iam civitate donatus est, et nostri sermoni non tamquam alienus intervenit.* “but Eurus too [alongside native *Vulturnus*] enjoys citizenship, and it is not as though it, a foreigner, has infiltrated our native language” (*NQ* 5.16.4). There is much more to be said regarding Seneca's treatment of the winds

Seneca does not cite a specific authority who authorized certain Greek names for the winds to supplant the native Latin terms, though his anemology at 5.16-17 of *NQ* follows closely the twelve point wind compass that Varro describes.⁸⁴ At any rate, these words are recognized to have attained Latin citizenship by regular use and by the authority of those who use them.

Perhaps it is to be expected that both of Seneca's examples are Greek words from technical or scientific vocabulary that have been adopted into proper Latin. Words that entered Latin from Greek through this channel are by far the most abundant, especially in the fields of medicine, philosophy and botany. But technical vocabulary does not represent the only lexical class from which foreign words have been accepted into Latin idiom. At *Noctes Atticae* 19.13 Gellius records an instance of the citizenship idiom in an academic discussion he overheard on the correctness of a word prevalent in the plebeian speech community. Fronto, Festus and Apollinaris, men whose reputations held them as capable judges of the minutiae of correct Latin, debate whether people of small stature are more appropriately called *vāvoi*, from the Greek for "dwarf", or *pumiliones*, the native Latin term. Fronto claims that he has eliminated the former from his own speech in favor of the Latin, and asks Apollinaris' opinion on this preference. Apollinaris grants that *consuetudo* in the masses does argue for *vāvoç*, but that this alone does not redeem the word from barbarism. *vāvoç*, he continues, has a literary pedigree, appearing, if memory serves him correctly, in a comedy of Aristophanes. Thus, he concludes, literary

and their names, as well as his stance in relation to other Latin authors (most notably Varro and Pliny Maior), for which see Williams (2005).

⁸⁴ See Williams (2005) for a thorough treatment of the relevant section in *NQ*, as well as observations on the development of the Roman windrose among Latin writers from Varro on.

precedent coupled with Fronto's use of the word, if he had chosen to use it, would have been enough to grant it citizenship, or—he extends the metaphor—at least to have settled it in a Latin colony.⁸⁵ Apollinaris' justification is significant, because it indicates that usage alone was not sufficient for a word's Latinization—the *vulgus*, according to Fronto, had long used *vũvoç* in place of native *pumilio* without hesitation—but that for a foreign word to be naturalized into Latin it needed the sponsorship of a capable authority, one who, ideally, could also demonstrate its appropriateness with a literary reference. Fronto is, in Apollinaris' estimation, such a sponsor.⁸⁶ As Gunderson puts it, “Fronto has the authority to lend authority to words.”⁸⁷

On the other hand, there are records of other attempts to introduce foreign diction into Latin where the sponsor is unable to secure Latin citizenship for his word. L. Cornelius Sisenna was by all accounts a man of high erudition and refined learning.⁸⁸ Nevertheless, he was famously chastised for his attempt to import a word deemed too ridiculous for the Latin of the courtroom, *sputatilicus*, in an anecdote that appears in *Brutus*.⁸⁹ The formation at least seems to be Latin, and is presumably to be understood as a derivative of *spuere*, indicating that the accusations were worthy of being spit out or

⁸⁵ *fuisset autem verbum hoc a te civitate donatum aut in Latinam coloniam deductum, si tu eo uti dignatus fores* “but you would have been bestowing citizenship on this word or establishing it in a Latin colony, if you had thought it worthy to use” (NA 19.13.3).

⁸⁶ This is the conclusion that Holford-Stevens draws from the passage, and in fact he contrasts the honor conferred on Fronto with the same that was denied Tiberius (2003 p. 137).

⁸⁷ 2009 p. 104.

⁸⁸ Sisenna was foremost a historian, and his history of the Social Wars and the Sullan period that followed is praised lavishly by Sallust, Varro and Cicero as a masterpiece of Latin historiography. He was, however, also known for the peculiar language reforms he attempted to implement in his writing and for his adherence to the analogist understanding of a logical and regular system to how words are formed and used in a given language. For an account of his life, fragments and *testimonia*, see Rawson (1979).

⁸⁹ The account is related by Cicero at *Brutus* 260: Sisenna in a legal defense said that the accusations were *sputatilica*. His opponent C. Rutilus deferred to the judges, claiming that *sputa quid sit scio, tilica nescio*, “I know what the *sputa* is, I'm not sure about *tilica*.” Rutilus' rebuttal was accompanied with jeering laughter.

upon (i.e., false and tawdry). Rawson (1985) reasons that the word is based on a Greek form, *κατάπτυστα*, “to be spat upon, abominable,” though it is not immediately clear from Cicero’s account if the word is rejected because of its Greek model or merely because it sounds too awkward for the serious tone of the court. At any rate, the negative reaction to *sputatilica* is evidence that even the intellectual clout of a learned man such as Sisenna cannot modify the Latin language with impunity.

A further example of prescription against foreign diction, and a hardline approach to the debate as to whether a reputable authority can simply will a word into the idiom of respectable Latin, appears in Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria*. In the first chapter of the eighth book he makes Cicero’s vague *verba iure reprehendenda* a more obvious condemnation of foreign diction in his discussion of *elocutio*, a key component of the oratorical art that corresponds to Greek φράσις and is often translated into English as the style of a writer. *elocutio* consists in both *verba singula* and *verba coniuncta*, and foremost among Quintilian’s criteria for determining the appropriateness of the former is that they be *latina*, that is, they must evince *latinitas*.⁹⁰ Words that succeed in being *latina* must be *minime peregrina et externa*, “in no way exotic or foreign”, but orators must also moderate their speech, so as not to be said *curiose potius loqui... quam latine*, “to speak more in a precious manner than in a Latin manner.” On the dangers of affectation, even careful and informed affectation, Quintilian adduces the example of the

⁹⁰ Latte (1940) reasons that the abstract noun must be concealed in the adjective, and that this can be inferred by the correspondence of Quintilian’s Latin calques to similar Greek terms: *latina* ≈ ἑλληνισμός, *perspicua* ≈ σαφήνεια, *ornata* ≈ κόσμος, etc.

Greek orator Theophrastus, who was once identified by an old Athenian woman as a foreigner to the Attic dialect by his affected use of a single word.⁹¹

Quintilian's next example provides another counterpoint to the principle that a capable authority could admit new words to Latin idiom. Quintilian does not hesitate to agree with Asinius Pollio's accusation of Livy, the latter of whom Quintilian nonetheless describes as a *mirae facundiae vir*, for exhibiting *Patavinitas*. The charge took aim at certain oddities of Livy's usage and sought to correlate his origins in Padua with a deficiency in replicating the Roman style, using a coinage of a shape that was surely meant to recall the *urbanitas* on which Roman writers prided themselves.⁹² Rather than apologize for Livy, whose style Quintilian appreciated with an explicit compliment, he uses the occasion to admonish that the orator will aim to use words that have a genuine Roman origin. He draws a contrast between those words that have a kind of citizenship in Latin by birth and those that have merely been adopted and naturalized, *civitate donata*, into the language.⁹³ Indeed this interpretation of the precise meaning of a word's citizenship status seems to agree with the principal dichotomy that Quintilian uses in

⁹¹ Quintilian probably came across the anecdote in *Brutus* 172. It is curious and somewhat of a contradiction to Quintilian's *dictum* that words must not be *peregrina et externa* that this error was detected because the speaker *nimum Attice loqueretur*, "spoke too Attic," i.e. affected his speech in a way that was intended to sound genuinely Attic, but instead was heard as unnatural-sounding to native speakers, but this very contradiction illustrates well how discussions that treat *latinitas* are subject to the interpretation of the concept by the author.

⁹² The questions of the precise meaning of Asinius' charge, and what features of Livy led him to make it, have been by and large the focus of scholarship dealing this passage, rather than any serious analysis of Quintilian's attitude towards foreign diction. Latte's 1940 treatment is perhaps the most helpful in appreciating the context of the remark (i.e., Quintilian's discussion of word choice and *elocutio*).

⁹³ *quare, si fieri potest, et verba omnia et vox huius alumnum urbis oleant, ut oratio Romana plane videatur, non civitate donata*, "for which reason, if it can be done, let every word and utterance declare itself a child of the city, so that speech appears obviously Roman, not merely endowed with citizenship (8.1.3)."

describing the origins of words elsewhere in the *IO*: they are either *nostra* or *peregrina*.⁹⁴

From the attitude of approval that he expresses with regard to Pollio's criticism, it seems clear that he felt that certain features of Livy's language could be classified under his system as *peregrina*. For some authors, mere adoption by usage was not sufficient for a word to be recognized as complying with *latinitas*.⁹⁵

While this dialogue appears to be confined largely to the prose authors, the incursion of foreign diction into Latin is not ignored by the poets, and in poetry as well there seemed to have been a requirement that the sponsor of a new word possess both the authority to alter the lexicon and solid reasoning for doing so. In fact the very word *poeta*, from Greek ποιητής, had a conspicuous path to citizenship. The first Latin word that designated a crafter of verses was *vates*, perhaps more specifically "soothsayer" or "seer" than "poet". Ennius famously discarded, even denigrated, the Latin term in favor of the Greek ποιητής, both in his tragedies and *Annales*, where he distances himself from *versibus quos olim Fauni vatesque canebant*, suggesting that the Latin term may have been fine for the early, uncouth Italians and the songs they sang to their rustic gods, but that it was an unsuitable title for a composer of verse in the Greek style.⁹⁶ The lexical

⁹⁴ This binary appears alongside several others at 1.5.3. In the sections that follow (1.5.5-64) Quintilian details much of his stance on the suitability of foreign diction, including non-Latin Italic, Gallic, Punic and Hispanic words as well. These classes of non-Greek foreign words are discussed in part below.

⁹⁵ Perhaps it is also significant that Quintilian does not question the term *Patavinitas*. Though the word may have had a life before Pollio famously employed it, Quintilian's citation is our first example, which leaves open the possibility that it is an analogical coinage that Pollio created for the occasion of his criticism. That the neologism did not arouse the suspicion of Quintilian of being *civitate donatum* may indicate that he saw in Pollio an authority qualified to expand the Latin language as needed.

⁹⁶ The line is delivered as repudiation of Naevius and the Saturnian meter in which he, not long before *Annales* was written, crafted *Bellum Poenicum*, and as justification for why Ennius does not treat the event in detail. Varro preserves this first half at *DLL* 7.36, but Cicero provides a fuller quotation at *Brutus* 71: *...scripsere alii rem / versibus quos olim Fauni vatesque canebant / cum neque Musarum scopulos... / ... nec dicti studiosus quisquam erat ante hunc...* "Others have written on the matter with the verses that Fauns and *vates* used to sing [i.e. Saturnians], when no one [had climbed to] the heights of the Muses, or

choice is part of that same Ennian program by which the Greek *Musae* and the dactylic hexameter supplanted in the *Annales* their native Latin equivalents (*Camenae* and the Saturnian meter, respectively).⁹⁷ While the gesture may have been largely symbolic, it had a lasting effect on *vates*. The word was assigned to a slightly different semantic field than the Greek term that replaced it, one of primitive religiosity and superstition.⁹⁸ In prose, Varro makes an earlier attempt to redeem *vates* by suggesting in his *De Poematis* two possible etymological sources for the word: *a vi mentis*, “by the power of [his] mind”; and *a carminibus viendis*, “by weaving songs together”. The etymologies are, of course, indefensible as linguistic documents, but Newman notes that their accuracy is far less important than their plausibility to Varro, and the very fact that he attempted to distil meaning from the word.⁹⁹ In poetry it was never a perfect analogue to *poeta*; already Plautus seems to have avoided it, with few exceptions, precisely because its overly religious connotation made it unfit for the comedic stage.¹⁰⁰ After Ennius, however, his explicit and denigrating judgment of the *vates* as a kind of superstitious shaman figure endured. This attitude persisted in Latin poetry—no Republican poet names himself a *vates* instead of a *poeta*—until Vergil began a process of rehabilitation of the word, first

was interested in style before [Ennius].” Cicero notes that the polemic is somewhat weakened by the very fact that Ennius left the Punic War out of his work, suggesting that he in fact did regard Naevius’ contributions as having some value, even if he did not approve of it on strictly formal grounds.

⁹⁷ See Skutsch (1944) for a discussion of this change, its context and its import.

⁹⁸ In a fragment from the lost Ennian tragedy *Telamon* the poet speaks of *superstitiosi vates impudentesque harioli... qui sibi semitam non sapiunt, alteri monstrant viam*, “superstitious *vates* and overconfident fortunetellers who don’t see their own path but point out the way to others.” (lines 332-5).

⁹⁹ Newman 1967 p. 15.

¹⁰⁰ This is the suggestion of Latte (1960). Plautus uses the noun *vates* a single time at *Mil.* 911 (where only the sense of fortuneteller is present); the verb *vaticinor* he also uses just once, at *Ps.* 363, and there again he does so dismissively and with hokey religiosity in mind.

in *Eclogues* and then in *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*.¹⁰¹ In other words, it took a poetic authority of some weight and stature first to introduce the term *poeta*, Ennius, and another, Vergil, to restore the Latin *vates* to a position of some esteem.

Section II: Foreign diction and geography in Catullus

Though authors often contradict one another as to the role that diction played in formulating and demonstrating *latinitas*, as well as in their assessment of who is authorized to pass judgment on an utterance, we ought not to let this superficial incompatibility distract us from the more salient point: individual words, especially strange and foreign words, were, depending on the manner and source of their deployment, capable of strengthening or weakening an author's claims to *latinitas*. With this understanding in mind, let us turn our attention to instances in the Catullan corpus where the poet introduces apparent *inaudita atque insolentia verba*.

Foreign words are not overly common in Catullus, but they are not especially rare either. Many no doubt imitate the effortless and colloquial tone that he sought in much of the shorter poetry.¹⁰² Others, however, seem to serve a different purpose. In c. 10, for instance, Catullus rather unceremoniously uses the word *grabatus*, a kind of low-quality

¹⁰¹ See Newman for a thorough analysis of this process of rehabilitation, whereby the Augustan *poetae* subsumed the function of the *vates*.

¹⁰² Cooper notes the glaring disparity between the frequency of Greek terms in Latin literature (relatively fewer, and hindered no doubt by the very attitudes that are the subject of my current study) and those that were used in the *sermo plebeius* and passed into Romance, which are far commoner (1895 pp. 315ff.). At least some of Catullus' Grecisms seem to have been selected with imitation of that quotidian idiom in mind.

couch, in a quick aside after he senses himself caught in a lie.¹⁰³ The term appears in Greek with various spellings of κράβατος, κράβαττος and κράββατος, though Catullus' spelling (which is unvaried in the manuscripts) reflects the usual Latin orthography.¹⁰⁴ The word seems to be genuinely Greek, though it is a regional dialect word, possibly of the north and northwest varieties of Greek spoken in Macedonia.¹⁰⁵ Ostensibly there is little remarkable about Catullus' use of the term, but a comparison with its usage elsewhere—just a handful of recorded uses are to be found before or contemporary to Catullus, but it is extremely frequent in Petronius and Martial, as well as in the form of a diminutive, *grabattulus*, in Apuleius—suggests that it very often served, as it does here, as a foil to the better regarded *lectus*.¹⁰⁶ Quinn surmises that its use in a fragment of Lucilius lends a degree of “sophisticated poverty” by its Greekness, a phrase that recalls

¹⁰³ Varus' girlfriend has unintentionally called Catullus' bluff after he brags about able litter-bearers he brought back from Bithynia. Of course, he had returned with no such men, not even one *qui veteris pedem grabati / in collo sibi collocare possit*, “who could put the leg of a tired *grabatus* on his shoulders.”

¹⁰⁴ For an account of the variant spellings, particularly as they occur in the Greek New Testament, see Kramer (1995).

¹⁰⁵ This is the language of origin to which the 17th c. French scholar Claudius Salmasius assigned the word. He reasoned that it was a kind of medical stretcher that the bellicose Macedonians carried with them during military campaigns. Kramer doubts this on somewhat unstable grounds, that the suffix *-ατος* was not especially productive in Macedonian, and that direct contact between Macedonians and Latin-speaking peoples was “nie ausreichend, um Wortübernahmen wahrscheinlich zu machen,” (ibid. p. 207). Both points may be true, but that does not preclude entirely the possibility that the word ultimately stems from a Macedonian source. It is entirely possible, for example, that the loan word did not come to Latin directly from Macedonian, but through an intermediate stage of adoption into a more familiar Greek dialect and thence to Latin. This is demonstrably the case for a good many words, especially proper nouns, which entered Latin from Greek by way of Etruscan (e.g. Hercules, Pollux, Catamitus, et al.). Kramer ultimately decides, and demonstrates on plausible formal grounds, that the word comes from Illyrian, but this conclusion as well leaves open the possibility that it entered Latin, or Illyrian, through murkier channels. In either event, the word's origin seems to be somewhere in the north or northwest of mainland Greece.

¹⁰⁶ In Catullus it represents a piece of shoddy or pedestrian furniture in contrast to the *lectica* (line 16) that his fabricated Bithynian litter-bearers would carry. Its sole appearance in Cicero is at *de Divinatione* 2.129, where he contrasts the foreign word with *lectus*. Cicero wonders to what degree the gods' sexual liaisons with mortals should be thought to occur only with those of a more respectable pedigree, who sleep on *lecti*, or also with those whose beds were mere *grabati*.

Catullus' posturing here and in other poems.¹⁰⁷ Lucilius, however, is criticized by Horace for normalizing the bad habit of making frequent use of Greek terms, which, coupled with the rarity of this term in Republican literature, calls into question its status as a Latin word under the auspices of good *latinitas*.¹⁰⁸

It is not made clear from the immediate context in c. 10 that Catullus used *grabatus* in such a way as to make a statement about the word or its claims to *latinitas*. In fact, in the poetic rehearsal of the tableau in c. 10, crafted in imitation of an organic and *ex tempore* conversation that may or may not have actually happened—though it should be noted that the poem is presented so as to suggest that the events really did occur as described—would suggest that *grabatus* was simply the colloquial term that first came to the poet's mouth, and that perhaps under more controlled circumstances, he would not have let slip such a barbarism. However, it is not in the recorded dialogue that the character of Catullus lets *grabatus* slip. Rather it appears as a parenthetical comment from the narrator, suggesting that we should examine the word and its place in the poem apart from the colloquial language of a familiar conversation.

If this is the case, the conditions for the introduction of *grabatus* here ought to be more closely considered. A central concern of c. 10 is no doubt the material poverty of Catullus, and *grabatus* serving as a cheap, ersatz *lectica* certainly reinforces this, but also significant are the circumstances that make Catullus "poverty" topical: his recent return from an official position in Bithynia. The themes of a return from abroad and the

¹⁰⁷ Quinn (1970 p. 124) on Lucilius (6.251). Certainly the impoverished but refined poet is a persistent aspect to Catullus' poetic persona (cf. alongside c. 10 cc. 13 and 23). The word shows up in a fragment of Furius Bibaculus as well (5.1), where Quinn's "sophisticated poverty", or at least the term's ability to convey a sense of sophistication even in discussing a rather unremarkable object, seems also to be it play.

¹⁰⁸ For Horace's polemic against Lucilius see especially Scodel (1987).

concomitant importation of foreign goods—feigned or genuine, material or otherwise—beg the question: *did* Catullus return from Bithynia empty-handed? While he failed to procure *quod illic natum dicitur esse*, “what they call the local specialty” (lines 14-15), his return trip did yield at least one apparent souvenir: the word *grabatus*. The piece of furniture, however, only made it back to Rome as a phantom. In contrast to the physical object, and more importantly to the *ad lecticam homines*, the word becomes the keepsake that Catullus carries back with him from his trip, though he is careful only to share the term with the readership, and not with the other interlocutors, a precaution very much in line with the poverty that *grabatus* conveys elsewhere and with Catullus’ designs in c. 10 to represent himself as *beatior*, “more fortunate”, in front of Varus’ girlfriend.

a. Catullus’ *Verba Peregrina*

The interaction between material wealth, geography and the appropriation of foreign diction is again at play in c. 12, where a Greek term, *mnemosynum*, makes its first appearance in Latin literature in a very prominent position in the poem. The poem is short enough to warrant our presenting it here in its entirety:

*Marrucine Asini, manu sinistra
 Non belle uteris in ioco atque vino:
 Tollis lintea negligentiorum.
 Hoc salsum esse putas? Fugit te, inepte!
 Quamvis sordida res et invenusta est.
 Non credis mihi? Crede Pollioni
 Fratri, qui tua furta uel talento
 Mutari velit; est enim leporum
 Differtus puer ac facetiarum.
 Quare aut hendecasyllabos trecentos
 Exspecta, aut mihi lintheum remitte,
 Quod me non movet aestimatione,
 Verum est mnemosynum mei sodalis.
 Nam sudaria Saetaba ex Hiberis*

*Miserunt mihi muneri Fabullus
Et Veranius: haec amem necesse est
Ut Veraniolum meum et Fabullum.*

“Marrucinus Asinius, a gauche hand
You use inelegantly at a party
Stealing napkins from unsuspecting people.
You think this is a joke? You just don’t get it
Just how tasteless and vile it is, you moron.
Don’t believe me? Then, Pollio, your brother,
Take his word; for your theft he’d like to offer
Quite substantial a sum; this kid is chock-full
To the brim with charisma and with humor
Therefore either expect enormous numbers
Of my verses, or send me back my napkin,
No, the cost isn’t why the napkin moves me
Rather it’s a memento from a buddy:
These are Saetaban handkerchiefs from Spain, and
Fabullus and Veranius, they sent them,
As a gift to me: so I’m bound to love them
As Veranius and my dear Fabullus.”

At the surface, c. 12 is a fairly typical piece of Catullan invective leveled at a fairly typical target, an acquaintance who has violated the tastes and conventions of Catullus’ social circle, in this instance by making off with a napkin at a dinner party. The majority of the poem is spent inveighing against Asinius Marrucinus, brother of the Augustan historian Pollio.¹⁰⁹ Marrucinus has an inexcusable knack for practical jokes, such as napkin-theft, and an even less forgivable inability to recognize when his behavior is in poor taste, social foibles that make him a worthy target for castigation. Catullus runs

¹⁰⁹ Pollio could not be much more than 16 years old, if this is indeed the Asinius Pollio we know. The question of kinship is relevant as well. Catullus calls Pollio Marrucinus’ *frater*, and the *nomen gentile* argues for their being siblings, but the difference between their cognomina should not be ignored. Ellis offers two possible solutions: that *Marrucinus* was to be taken as a geographical epithet, meant to recall the noble Marrucini (and perhaps to shame Asinius for his failure to live up to their legacy); or that Marrucinus was a cognomen in its own right. The second of his suggestions would complicate an immediate kinship with Pollio and perhaps recommend “cousins” as a better understanding of their relation, but Monro imagines a scenario where the father of the two Asinii, upon leaving Teate, bestowed on his older son the name Marrucinus (replacing Pollio) as a token of their heritage.

through the usual litany of insults: Marrucinus' behavior fails to approach the standards of Catullus' sodality (he is *ineptus*, his actions are *sordida* and *invenusta*);¹¹⁰ by comparison other members of the club, in this case Pollio, are more charming and better behaved (*puer differtus leporum et facetiarum*, "a guy brimming with charisma and wit"); this poem is only the tip of the invective iceberg if Marrucinus does not return the napkins (*expecta trecentos hendecasyllabos*). Much of the language of social value and esteem is taken from the very highly developed idiom of Catullus and his *sodales*, and so much of the emphasis of the poem's variegated modes of attack works to distance Marrucinus from that sodality, and in effect from the cultured and refined urban life that Catullus imagines for himself, his closest friends and their best respected peers.

The matter of distance, specifically whether it is better understood as literal, geographical distance, or merely that Marrucinus is a metaphorical outsider to the special Rome that Catullus and his friends inhabit, is fraught, and so should be addressed before turning to the Greek *hapax*. Quinn and Fordyce are both quick to point out that the poem begins with a vocative of the addressee, *Marrucine*. The cognomen, if it is a cognomen, appears to be of the geographical variety, associated with the region around Teate (modern Chieti) to the northeast of Rome on the Adriatic Sea. To both commentators this prominent position suggests that Catullus wished to draw attention to the extra-Roman origins of Marrucinus, as though to stack the deck for an argument that the man is

¹¹⁰ The entire complement of typical Catullan words that describe the positive aspects of himself and his friends (as well as worthy acquaintances) need not be rehearsed here, but cf. Seager (1974) for a treatment of some of the specific words that are given prominence in c. 12, *venustus*, *salsus*, *lepidus* and *bellus*, and how these words articulate, along with their recurrences at, e.g., cc. 3, 13, 35, 50, et al., the creative and convivial atmosphere that Catullus and his friends seemed to value so highly, and that Marrucinus violated with his practical joke.

boorish and ill-suited to the refined urbanity of the other members of the dinner party.¹¹¹ It is true that Catullus himself hailed from outside Latium, and that Verona lay a great deal farther from Rome than Teate did, but we ought not in this instance rely on the relative placement of these three cities on a map to determine whose origins were more remote; the Roman road network made Verona plenty accessible, whereas Teate just on the other side of the Apennines was less so. Nevertheless, for a geographical remoteness to be at stake in c. 12, more evidence against Marrucinus than a rustic-sounding *cognomen* is wanted. To some extent Catullus accomplishes this with the language of his reproach, employing the negative forms of his usual value-words—*ineptus* and *invenustus*, as well as *illepidus* and *infacetus* by inference¹¹²—to paint Marrucinus as out of place. The use of *facetiae* in connection with Asinius Pollio at line 9, the counter-example of a man from Teate with discerning tastes, may call to mind the several instances in the *Carmina* where its opposite occurs. In each of the three poems in which Catullus uses forms of *infacetus*, it is paired, either directly or by unmistakable insinuation, with the *rus*.¹¹³ There is nothing inherent in the radical form that would suggest automatically urban refinement as opposed to rustic boorishness, but this is the *facto* meaning of the word in Catullus' idiolect. It seems likely, therefore, that Catullus'

¹¹¹ Quinn posits that “gauche behavior was perhaps to be expected of a man connected with such a remote part of Italy,” (p. 130).

¹¹² The latter two are used in their positive forms to extol Marrucinus' brother Asinius, who, contrary to Catullus' target, exhibits behavior appropriate to an urbane dinner party.

¹¹³ At c. 22.14 Suffenus becomes *infacetior infaceto rure*, “more charmless than the charmless countryside”, when he tries his hand at poetry; at 36.19 the *Annales* of Volusius are *pleni ruris et infacetiarum*, “filled with the country and charmlessness”; at 43.8 the backwards tastes of a province that would prefer Formianus' plain and unattractive girlfriend to Lesbia cause Catullus to exclaim *o saeculum insapiens et infacetum*, “what a tasteless and charmless age!”

character assassination is at least somewhat interested in establishing a spatial disconnect between Marrucinus and Rome.

That brings us to *mnemosynum*. If such an agenda is at stake in c. 12, the use of a Greek term, a foreigner from more distant shores than either Catullus or Marrucinus, at the poem's climax becomes noteworthy, even if the meaning of the word is neither difficult to understand nor incongruous with the poem's theme.¹¹⁴ However, the concern with geographical distance that underlies the attack on Marrucinus makes the sudden appearance of a Greek term at least somewhat surprising in a poem that is so utterly and thoroughly concerned with violations of decent *Roman* behavior, especially in light of the fact that a semantically equivalent term already existed in Latin in the form of *monimentum*. Catullus actually does use *monimentum*, in c. 11.10, to describe the legacy of Caesar's campaigns in Gaul and Britannia, so a personal aversion to the word cannot have precluded its use here.¹¹⁵ Perhaps he found the cold and official, even sepulchral tone of *monimentum* unsuitable here, but whatever motivated his decision, he chooses to use *mnemosynum* as a way to explain the significance of the stolen napkin to the oblivious Marrucinus, and in doing so provides something of a gloss on which valence of

¹¹⁴ On the first point, scholarly consensus seems to have decided that *mnemosynum* would prove no more cumbersome for a Roman reader's comprehension than "souvenir", a native French word, would for an English speaker (which is the prevailing translation in many modern editions). Certainly the term should have been transparent to any educated and literate Roman, but as a rejoinder to the popular English-French parallel I would argue that "souvenir" is perhaps a fully naturalized English term, its foreign origins opaque to the layperson, and suggest instead as a comparison the term "aide-memoire", which retains recognizable foreignness without hindering the understanding of the non-Francophone English reader. On the second point, it seems not at all out of place for Catullus to make use of a word that unfailingly recalls Mnemosyne, mother of the Muses (and thus mother of poetic inspiration) in a poem that is at least obliquely concerned with the poetic process (*in ioco atque vino* is as close to a metric formula as can be found in Catullus, and occurs again at c. 50.2 where the writing of poetry is the central theme). For the literary underpinnings of c. 12 and of social gatherings among Catullus' peers more generally see Nappa (1998).

¹¹⁵ *sive trans altis gradietur Alpes / Caesaris visens monimenta magni*, "or will [Catullus] cross the high Alps and visit the monuments of great Caesar."

the word he wished express. He begins his explanation just before the word occurs in line 12: *me non movet aestimatione* “I don’t care about the cost of it...” The monetary value of the napkins is not at stake, a point that is apparently lost on Pollio as well, who offers Catullus a talent to make it right. He continues: *verum est mnemosynum mei sodali*, “actually it’s a souvenir from a close friend.” This *sodalis* turns out to be two people, Veranius and Fabullus, who sent the napkins to Catullus from Saetabis in Spain, famous for its linen. Catullus tells Marrucinus *sudaria Saetaba... miserunt mihi muneri*, “[Fabullus and Veranius] sent me these Spanish napkins as a gift.” The final lines of the poem stress again the sentimental value of the napkins: *haec amem necesse est / ut Veraniolum meum et Fabullum*, “These I have to love as I do my dear Veranius and Fabullus”. By walking Marrucinus and the reader through the exact semantic value of *mnemosynum*, Catullus has, in a sense, provided a working definition of the word: a gift from an exotic place, of inconsequential monetary but high sentimental value, that serves as a kind of surrogate for the sender. Moreover, he has connected an actual, physical souvenir, the napkin, with the same sort of incorporeal souvenir that he himself brought back in the form of *grabatus*. In both the language and the content of the poem it is clear that c. 12 is concerned with modalities of appropriation, with the transfer of material and intellectual goods from one owner to another. Indeed it is presented as a contrast between good channels of appropriation, like gift giving and receiving and the careful adoption of words, and bad channels, like theft, even insincere theft meant as a joke. Two modes of good appropriation are at stake in *mnemosynum*: the exchange of physical gifts, and the

borrowing of a foreign term into a new language with due consideration of its meaning and connotation.

The case with *mnemosynum* goes still further. The definition provided facilitates for a Latin reader translation of the Greek term (which, as has been noted, would not have been a great issue), but there is more to this than a mere display of erudition. In a sense Catullus has taken the time to provide a semantic backbone for the Greek term, and in doing so has eased its transition into Latin poetic idiom. Furthermore, at line 15 Catullus equates the *mnemosynum* to a *munus*. With its range of meanings closely tied to various social and legal institutions, there are few words that can claim to be more *latinum* than *munus*, so the juxtaposition here with a foreign term is striking.¹¹⁶ By establishing a definition for *mnemosynum* and providing it with a genuine Latin sponsor, Catullus both demonstrated his authority to mint new Latinisms and exercised that authority on what he deemed a worthy subject. Indeed, we can be certain that Catullus has in mind sponsorship—a process whereby one more familiar thing vouches for another that is less familiar—because he depicts Pollio as attempting to do the same for his brother. But Pollio is unsuccessful, perhaps because he tries to put a price tag on the priceless *mnemosynum*. Catullus, on the other hand, is able to bring *mnemosynum* into Latin through the assistance of *munus*. In doing so he takes the attempted actions of Tiberius

¹¹⁶ For the significance of the use of *munus* in this context, and how this word changes our understanding of how Catullus felt about the napkins, see Stroup (2010). Her conclusions that the napkin must be more than a napkin (in fact, that it is anything but a napkin) is perhaps a more absolute stance than I am willing to adopt, but the suggestion that the napkin can represent poetic texts as well as a simple piece of cloth is compelling, especially given the circumstances of the poem, *in ioco atque vino*, and Catullus' similar attack and threat of hendecasyllables levelled at the unnamed girl who stole his writing tablets in c. 42.

one step further by granting citizenship to a Greek word and at the same time denying it to a Latin-speaking peer.

Mnemosynum is the perhaps the most striking word in this poem—as much for its prominent position at the poem’s climax as for its nod to the etiology of the Muses—but it is not the only foreign word that makes its first appearance in Latin literature in c. 12. Catullus also records the earliest mention of the Saetabi in Latin, who hail from a corner of the world far more spatially remote from the origins of Catullus and Marrucinus on the Italian peninsula, and far more culturally distant from the Greek word *mnemosynum*. And yet the toponym is given special prominence, even celebrated, for its association with the fine cloth napkins that it produced. It is true that proper names for people and places are treated somewhat differently than common nouns like *mnemosynum*, but Catullus is careful in line 14 not only to designate the region from which the napkins came, Hispania (a proper name that comports in shape and form to Latin conventions), but to specify the specific city as well with an exotic sounding name. It seems that, when Veranius and Fabullus sent back the napkin—the language of the poem and the importance of the napkins as stand-ins for the men suggest that they have not yet returned themselves—they also sent back a foreign place name.

The exact source of the name *Saetabis* is unsettled, but whatever its origins we should not imagine the cultural value of Greek words and words like *Saetaba* to be equal. The region of Spain where Saetabis, modern Xàtiva, lies was occupied first by the Iberians, whose language is poorly attested and has no known relatives.¹¹⁷ The

¹¹⁷ Attempts to connect it with Basque, another language isolate, have been unsatisfactory to modern linguistics

circumstances under which a word of Iberian origin can enter Latin are never demonstrated in pithy anecdotes by Cicero or Quintilian or the grammarians. Indeed an unspoken tension must underlie any treatment by a Latin author of a so-called Greek *barbarism*; the term, of course, referred originally to words from languages that are not Greek, *including*, at least nominally, Latin.¹¹⁸ This contradiction, however, can be overlooked when words of Iberian origin are the topic; Latin or Greek opinion can agree without hesitation that *Saetaba* is a barbarism. How, then, does *Saetaba* make its way into Latin idiom? Its appearance here ought not to be ignored, if indeed foreignness and an incompatibility with Latin are at stake. Perhaps Catullus anticipated such a controversy. After all, he does not send the Iberian word into Latin alone. He ties it closely to *mnemosynum* in the preceding line. In effect he uses the culturally vetted medium of Greek to act as a sort of guarantor for the appropriateness of *Saetaba* to this poetic context. Thus, just as *munus* seems to vouch for *mnemosynum*, so does the Greek term act as sponsor for the even more foreign Iberian term.

b. Greek words that speak Latin

Catullus seems deliberately to introduce a word into the distinct idiomatic vernacular of his peer group through the endorsement of a respectable and authoritative sponsor elsewhere as well. Carmen 4 is quite different in form and content from c. 12, but it too makes marked use of a Greek word, *phaselus*, a kind of yacht so named because its

¹¹⁸ The word βάρβαρος is in origin imitative of any speech that would be unintelligible to *Greek* ears, which ought to include Latin. Paulinus the Deacon says *barbari dicebantur antiquitus omnes gentes exceptis Graecis*, “in the past all peoples except the Greeks were called ‘barbarian.’” At *Mil.* 211 Plautus has Periplectomenus, who is of course Greek, apply the epithet *barbarus* to the poet Naevius at line 211, and in doing so admits that Greek-speakers still placed Latin-speakers under the βάρβαροι umbrella.

shape resembles a particular variety of bean pod.¹¹⁹ The use of a foreign term for a specifically foreign class of something, such as a boat (or a piece of furniture, an article of clothing, etc.), does not need to be marked, but Catullus does not just mention the *phaselus* casually. Rather the poem in its entirety serves as a kind of biography of the boat, detailing its life story—its ancestral forest and the treacherous waters it has crossed are presented as highlights of its career—up to the point of its retirement and quiet repose at a *lacus limpidus*, the current resting place of the boat. In fact, for the majority of the poem we are reading an *autobiography*, presented in Catullus’ narrative voice as though he is simply repeating to friends the high points of a conversation he has just finished with the boat: *phaselus ille, quem videtis, hospites, ait...*¹²⁰ In the course of the poem, the personality of the loquacious *phaselus*, only barely hidden by indirect speech and third person pronouns, develops in such a way that the boat appears, as Coleman (1981) notes, more like an old man with tales to tell in his retirement than an inanimate conveyance grown obsolete.¹²¹

Coleman’s gesturing to the boat’s garrulity is not insignificant, as the prominence of the boat’s speech—speech in the sense both of a prepared monologue and of the manner of speaking—hints at the fact that both the poem and the poet are concerned here

¹¹⁹ φάσηλος and *faba* are probably cognate. The Greek term provided Latin both with the name for the boat, as here, and with the name for the specific variety of bean after which the boat was named. Its use by Catullus is not the earliest in extant Latin, a distinction that belongs to Varro’s *Saturae Menippeae* (frag. 85). Kroll prefers in his text the reading that *V* transmits, *phasēllus* in place of a direct Greek transliteration, but it seems likelier that this variant was a later scribal error, especially given the propensity for Vulgar Latin to substitute long, open vowels with their short equivalent and a geminate consonant as compensation. For a discussion of this phenomenon and an argument that Catullus was aware that it happened in substandard Latin see below.

¹²⁰ “That phaselus that you, honored guests, see there says...” (4.1-2).

¹²¹ Her reading follows the boat’s biography with this characterization, the old talkative yacht, as her central focus, noting especially the frequent use of speaking words—not only do we see the boat matched *ait*, *negat*, and *dicit* (lines 2, 6, and 16), but even the trees that supplied the wood for the boat whispers, *edidit sibilum*, through *loquente coma*, “speaking foliage” (line 12).

with language. Catullus even appears to quote the *phaselus* with an unwritten “[sic]” to be understood when he preserves in the second line a distinct syntactic Grecism at line 2: *ait fuisse navium celerrimus*.¹²² The use of the nominative case with an infinitive in an indirect statement in which the subject of the main verb and the infinitive verb are the same, as is the case here, is grammatically sound for Greek syntax, but is not conventional for Latin.¹²³ By doing this Catullus asserts from the poem’s outset that we are witnessing the recitation of a conversation with the boat, rather than merely hearing Catullus tell the boat’s story in his own words. The slight departure from expected Latin syntax and has even been described as the boat’s speaking with a Greek accent.¹²⁴ Minor “errors” in the boat’s Latin occur again at lines 7, 9, and 13, where Greek nouns are declined according to Greek convention instead of Latin.¹²⁵ This not only makes apparent

¹²² “He says he used to be the swiftest ship of all.” Strictly speaking, Catullus is the source of the Grecism, and not just because it is unlikely that he ever had a conversation with his boat. Rather, the boat, or any other more realistic speaker, would probably not have said “*ait fuisse navium celerrimus*”, but “*eram navium celerrimus*”, which would not feature the characteristically Greek syntax. Catullus certainly chose to represent the boat’s speech as noticeably Greek, but it is inaccurate to call line 2 a direct quotation.

¹²³ Latin convention always requires the accusative case for the subjects of infinitives in indirect statements. That being the case, *celerrimum* is almost without exception the reading to which manuscripts emended, but the original nominative ending is assured by a parody of this poem from the *Appendix Vergiliana* (*Cat.* 10) in which a muleteer is celebrated in nearly identical terms: *Sabinus ille, quem videtis, hospites / ait fuisse mulio celerrimus*, “That Sabinus that you, honored guests, see there says he used to be the swiftest muleteer...” The nominative ending here is secure, because an accusative form of the third declension noun on which the adjective depends would yield a metrically impossibly *mulionem*.

¹²⁴ The specific phrasing of this observation belongs to Sheets (2007), though the stylistic effect of this characteristically Greek syntagma has been appreciated for as long as the nominative ending has been restored against the manuscripts in critical editions of the text.

¹²⁵ In the order of their appearance Catullus quotes the boat’s use of *Cycladas* instead of accusative plural *Cyclades*; *Propontida* instead of accusative singular *Propontidem*; and *Amastri* as the vocative singular of *Amastris*. The question of whether to use Greek or Latin declensions for words of this kind garnered a good deal of attention in antiquity, and suggested reformations of spelling convention were proposed in both directions, towards Greek and Latin. See the introduction and Rawson (1985, ch. 8 *passim*) for important figures in those discussions.

Catullus is actually fairly opportunistic when it comes to Greek declensions, with metrical concerns often lying behind his decisions, but here, where the boat has already demonstrated that it is still working out some of its Greek proclivities, the use of patently Greek declensions is noteworthy. Quinn notes as well the use of *post* as an adjective at line 10, *iste post phaselus*, “your boat to be”, which he describes as common in Greek but largely limited to colloquial speech in Latin (p. 104).

the poem's underlying concern with language, but it also adds a memorable and idiosyncratic touch to the character of *phaselus*, and presents the entire poem as a sort of formal introduction of a foreigner with a noticeable accent, here the word itself, into the society, and more specifically the lexicon, of Catullus and his *sodales*.

From the outset of the poem we accompany the boat through its biography, tracing the course in reverse from its final destination in Italy—the *litus minacis Hadriatici* of line 6 is our first of many *voces propriae* that move eastward towards and into the Black Sea—back to its ultimate origin as a stand of boxwood trees in the mountains around Cytorus on the north coast of Asia Minor, and then back through the unnamed *impotentia freta* at line 18 to an unnamed *lacus limpidum* at line 24 where it will spend the rest of its days.¹²⁶ After the preponderance of place names, all Greek, the abrupt end to specification is somewhat surprising. Indeed, one can trace a gradual trend of Latinizing in the lines that follow the final appearance of a named location at line 13. The boat calls his master an *erus*, the head of the (Roman) household, at line 19; favorable weather for sailing is metonymized as *Iuppiter secundus* at lines 20 and 21; and at lines 25 and 26 the boat now *recondita / senet quiete*, “spends his old age in withdrawn peace”, employing a rare relic from archaic Latin in the verb *senet*. It is almost as though the boat, and thus the word, grew acclimated to its new Latin surroundings in the course of the poem. At the poem's end, *phaselus* dedicates itself to the Dioscuri, but, as though still somewhat unsure of its Latin, makes the dedication to *gemellus Castor et gemellus*

¹²⁶ The specifics of the geographical catalogue's itinerary are unsurprising, given not only the fact that Cytorus was noted for its boxwood, which was valued for boat construction, but also that Catullus served his tour of duty in Bithynia, also on the Black Sea's northern coast, and so was likely familiar with the places that he names.

Castoris, “twin Castor and Castor’s twin,” and judiciously avoids mentioning the brother whose name assumes different shapes in Greek and Latin, though it does seem at least to have mastered the Latin declension of a natively Greek proper name with *Castoris*.¹²⁷ The effect of this process of acclimation is such that, by the end of the poem, *phaselus*, both as boat and as word, is comfortably Latinized, though still identifiably Greek.¹²⁸ Catullus in effect actuates this process of acclimation by vouching for the *phaselus* in front of his friends and by allowing *phaselus* to work through and correct its most conspicuous Grecisms.

In a sense this attitude is embedded from the very beginning of the poem, when Catullus initiates the introduction of a stranger to a group of friends: *phaselus ille, quem videtis, hospites*. Ostensibly these *hospites* are “guests” here, as though Catullus is hosting a party at which both the boat and the *hospites* are counted among the attendees, but the word can also mean “hosts”.¹²⁹ If we allow the dual valence of *hospes* to operate in line 1, then perhaps we are meant to understand a dynamic of hospitality between the boat and the other party-goers. In this case Catullus’ addressees are invited to extend hospitality not just to the boat and its story, but to the word as well.¹³⁰

¹²⁷ Castor and Κάστωρ, excepting the conventions of vowel length that typify words of this shape and their declensions in the two languages, are effectively equivalent. Πολυδεύκης and Pollux are noticeably not.

¹²⁸ It will be centuries before the Latinization of *phaselus* is brought to completion with the vulgar form *fasellus*.

¹²⁹ *TLL*, s.v. *hospes*. In its primary sense the noun refers to those who receive or treat foreign guests at home, and even though it is also used of the guest rather than the host, the idea of unfamiliarity is persistent in all of its valences. Also at play with *hospites* is perhaps the contrast it invites with the notoriously inhospitable Pontus at which the *phaselus*’ life began. Here at the *lacus limpidus* the boat has finally found its due welcome.

¹³⁰ While this dynamic can be operative in strictly Roman terms, the guest-host duality also resembles the Greek institution of ξενία. Indeed an introduction of the boat under the umbrella of a Greek construct would prompt the reader to reconsider the effect of those Grecisms. Syndikus (1984) sees Greek informing the poem on formal levels as well, and he points to two types of Greek epigram that seem to have provided Catullus with models for the structuring of c. 4; the consecration epigram (Weiheepigramm), in which the a

The selection of foreign words that we have treated above covers a broad semantic field, and there is no unity of category to these words. There is, however, perhaps another point of contact between the three poems, cc. 10, 12 and 4, which we have just discussed, and that is the circumstances of their geographical movement from their origin to Rome. The context of each of these poems depends at least in part on the assignments to provincial command staffs of Catullus and his close friends. In cc. 4 and 10 Catullus has recently returned from Bithynia, not with great wealth or valuable slaves, but with a boat and a handful of Greek words. In c. 12 the napkins in question are gifts from Veranius and Fabullus, who are dispatched in a similar official capacity in Hispania.¹³¹ In each case, the words are either imported over time and space, real or metaphorical, by Catullus himself, or, as is the case with *mnemosynum*, are granted entry into Catullus' language under the sponsorship of a worthy, physical surrogate (the napkin). In all cases, it seems that a step in the process of Latinized foreign diction for Catullus involves an actual, spatial importation. One further example of Catullus' use of foreign language will corroborate this.

c. *Verba Inventa*

With the exception of *Saetaba*, the examples we have treated so far are Greek words that have been carried into Latin (assuming that *grabatus*, whatever its ultimate origin, is in some way Greek as well). However, this is not the only language from which

craftsman dedicates his tools to a deity after their appreciated service; and epideictic epigram, in which the origins and escapades of a sailor and his ship are narrated. These two considerations taken together, an apparent *ξενία*-type relationship and the use of conventional tropes of Greek epigram, serve to strengthen the overall "Greekness" of the poem and its subject.

¹³¹ The official assignment is not mentioned in c. 12, but it and the despicable praetor under which Veranius and Fabullus worked are the subject matter of cc. 28 and 47.

foreign words were granted or denied citizenship. A notable Gallicism is employed by Catullus in c. 97.¹³² The poem falls under the heading of epigrammatic invective. In this instance, Catullus upbraids in unminced words an otherwise unknown Aemilius, who, despite his gross inattention to oral hygiene, imagines himself to be quite the Casanova. Its particularly coarse language has discouraged most from attempting a detailed analysis.¹³³ Nevertheless, it features a lexical oddity; in the course of detailing the specifics of Aemilius' lack of oral care, Catullus says *gingivas vero ploxeni habet veteris*, “[his mouth] has the gums of an old *ploxenum*.¹³⁴ A *ploxenum* seems to be a kind of wooden box, possibly part of the chassis of a wagon or cart. For this definition we are in debt to two men. First, there is Augustan grammarian and lexicographer Verrius Flaccus, who listed the term in his *De Verborum Significatu*.¹³⁵ That work, though lost to us, survives in the form of an epitome written by the 4th or 5th c. grammarian Sextus Pompeius Festus, and there he tells us that a *ploxenum* is said to be a kind of a *capsa*, “box”.¹³⁶ It has been the work of subsequent readers of Catullus to further narrow this

¹³² Gallicisms have attracted less attention than have Grecisms, no doubt in part because they are fewer, but for a general treatment of the use of such terms in Latin see Schmidt (1967).

¹³³ Unsurprisingly, Fordyce omits it from his commentary. Quinn calls it a “savage, but genially exuberant, attack on an unknown Don Juan.” (p. 434). Thomson notes that it is particularly nasty even by Catullan standards. Only very recently has a truly comprehensive reading of the poem been published, that of O’Byrhim, treated below.

¹³⁴ The precise shape of the word cannot be determined. There is alternation in the manuscripts between *ploxenum* and *ploxinum*, and between the masculine and neuter gender. Stable readings of the word occur only in c. 97 and in later references to its use in this passage. An alternate reading of *Catalepton* 10.22 in the *Appendix Vergiliana* has *ploxinumque* for *proximumque*, but this reading is highly unlikely for syntactical reasons.

¹³⁵ Flaccus’ *De Verborum Significatu* is likely datable to the late 2nd c. CE. The character of the original is difficult to judge, since it is preserved only as a rather late epitome, and that only in pieces as well, but it seems to have been a kind of encyclopedia of rare words, including archaisms and words of foreign languages. Festus’ epitome serves as a kind of etymological dictionary of the more encyclopedic original. For an admirable attempt at a commentary of this very fragmented work, with due attention to the epitome of Festus’ and the abridgment of that epitome by Paul the Deacon, see Pieroni (2004).

¹³⁶ The epitome is organized alphabetically, and the word in question appears on p. 230 of K.O. Müller’s text of Festus.

definition to some manner of wooden vehicle. This definition does not make an interpretation of the poem any simpler—ways in which gums can be fairly equated to a box are not especially clear¹³⁷—but the lack of a precise definition of for the word does not prevent our exploration of the significance of its use. We will return to the implications of Verrius’ definition in a moment, but first let us consider an early witness to the meaning and import of the word.

Ploxenum is not obviously Latin (nor obviously non-Latin), but our supposition that it is Gallic is owed to Quintilian. In his discussion of barbarisms, errors in speech that are confined to single words, Quintilian lists their various kinds, among which are those that occur *gente*, because of [the speaker’s] national origin.¹³⁸ In this category he places Persius’ *cantus*, a kind of iron tire wheel,¹³⁹ and c. 97’s *ploxenum*, which he says Catullus *circa Padum invenit*, “found in the Po valley”. In both cases he implies that the user *tamquam recepto utitur*, “uses it as though it has been established [in Latin].”

¹³⁷ For an imaginative answer to this question see Garrod (1910), who sees *ploxenum* as referring to a specific part of a wagon frame, and reasons that it could, in fact, be associated with gums if the wagon in question was a for-hire taxi, which kept track of the distance travelled by a complex system of “teeth” connected to the wheels. Garrod directs us to a description of the teeth of a wheel on a taxi wagon, in fact a description of the entire mechanism, which appears in Vitruvius’ *De Architectura* 10.14. He might also have mentioned that wagon’s with draft animals also have tongues (though there is no evidence that such a usage of *lingua* occurred in Latin), but his reading merits consideration nonetheless.

¹³⁸ The discussion begins at *IO* 1.5.8ff. *unum gente quale est, si quis Afrum vel Hispanum Latinae orationi nomen inserat, ut ferrum quo rotae vinciuntur dici solet cantus, quamquam eo tamquam receptor utitur Persius; sicut Catullus ploxenum circa Padum invenit*, “one [type of barbarism] happens because of [the speaker’s] race, as when someone who is from Africa or Hispania inserts a word [from these dialects] into Latin speech; for instance, the iron that wraps around a wagon wheel is often called *cantus*, though Persius uses it as though it has been established in Latin, just like how Catullus found *ploxenum* over in the Po Valley.” Later grammatical authors do not classify usages such as these, foreign or dialectical words that are otherwise free of errors, as barbarisms, but as *barbarolexeis*. This term does not appear in Quintilian.

¹³⁹ Quintilian’s text preserves this spelling, but in Persius’ 5th satire, line 71, it has been transmitted as *canthum*. It is unclear whether Quintilian meant to imply the word was African or Spanish (he does not assign to it a place of origin as he does for Catullus’ *ploxenum*), but Russell (2002) believes it to be Gallic as well. According to the *vita* that prefaces his poetry in the manuscripts Persius hailed from Volterra, a city in Etruria that predated Roman expansion into the area. In the context of Quintilian’s discussion one might be tempted then to assume that *canthum* was an Etruscan word, but the evidence does not seem overly supportive of such a hypothesis.

There may be another phrase in Quintilian's account that warrants our interest. Catullus does not simply use a foreign word *ploxenum*. Quintilian explicitly indicates that he himself *found* it in the Po Valley, *invenit circum Padum*. Words are heard or read; objects are found. Here it would appear that Quintilian, regardless of his opinion of *ploxenum*, admits that a word, even a foreign word, is not simply repeated once it is heard, but it is first discovered in and then imported from its original, geographical context. It would be very simple indeed to imagine the scenario that Quintilian describes: Catullus became acquainted with a word, which was foreign to the ears of Roman Latin speakers but quite at home in Cisalpine Gaul, in his earliest youth or upon visits home, and so employed it in c. 97 as a natural piece of his idiolect.¹⁴⁰ Indeed the process of discovery abroad and careful introduction is an adequate description of how Catullus treated foreign diction in the poems we have already discussed, and one could insert any of those earlier words and their native contexts into the scenario described above to produce a similarly plausible sequence of events.

The currency of *ploxenum* in the dialect of Latin spoken in Gaul is the topic of O'Bryhim's recent treatment of the poem. He seeks to align the Aemilius of c. 97 with Aemilius Macer, a fellow poet and Veronese perhaps only a few years younger than

¹⁴⁰ The phenomenon of regional diction that did not exist at Rome attracted attention. At *Brutus* 171, Brutus asks Cicero to explain what he means by *urbanitatis color* "shadings of urbanity" (referring to an intangible quality of the proper Latin spoken at Rome), which Cicero cannot put into precise words, but explains that *cum in Galliam veneris, audies tu quidem etiam verba quaedam non trita Romae, sed haec mutari dediscique possunt*,

"When you come to Gaul you will hear for yourself certain words that are not common in Rome, but these words can be altered and unlearned."

Cicero makes foreign diction seem like a kind of contagion that is first encountered abroad and can be introduced, though it ought not to be, into a speaker's idiolect. Perhaps this is implied by Quintilian as well, that Catullus was contaminated by Gallic diction during his youth or in visiting home, and that the symptoms of this condition were occasional Gallicisms in his poetry.

Catullus, and in doing so suggests that *ploxenum* was an appropriate word in c. 97 precisely because of its Gallic roots and the common dialect of attacker and target.¹⁴¹ In this case, Quintilian's remark that Catullus used it *tamquam recepto* is particularly appropriate; no doubt in the regional dialect of Latin that was spoken in the Po Valley the word *ploxenum* required no special elucidation and was unremarkable in everyday speech. Quintilian must not agree with either term's legitimate claims to Latin citizenship or he would not have included them in a discussion on barbarisms. However, Quintilian tells at least as much to us about how Catullus felt about *ploxenum* as he does about his own opinion on words of that kind, and his subjective interpretation of the boundaries of *latinitas* and the limited circumstances under which neologisms and dialectical words may be included within it should not overshadow the implication of his remarks: both Catullus and Persius regarded their dialect words as genuine Latin utterances. They used them *tamquam recepto*, "as though they were conventional". This would imply that for both poets their dialect words were not in conflict with personal understandings of what is and is not Latin. Rather, for either to use a word as if it is a conventional or idiomatic expression suggests that the users deemed them not at odds with *latinitas*.

Perhaps even more important for our specific treatment of Catullus, however, is that he himself brought the word to the city and to the city's dialect of Latin by closing a genuine, spatial gap between Cisalpine Gaul and Rome. Once again, *latinitas* seems to involve a negotiation of the geographical space between Rome and fixed points outside

¹⁴¹ O'Bryhim's 2012 reading is advertised by the author as the only complete treatment of the poem, in which he is right, to some extent. He treats the short poem with particular attention to the identity of the target and to the likelihood that he suffered from periodontal disease. His reading, however, is only tangentially concerned with the Gallicism.

of the city. This appears to be a key component of Catullus' personal program of lexical importation, and in each of the examples I have considered Catullus either finds the word for himself, that is, he engages in an act of *invenire*, or acknowledges the authority of a worthy sponsor and allows that authority to supply new diction for his idiolect.

Section III: Conventions of prescription

In the previous section we considered the various attitudes and approaches to foreign diction that characterize a diachronic understanding of *latinitas* as it is discussed by Roman authors. Our treatment of Catullus in that section focused out of necessity on the opinions he likely held on foreign diction as evidenced by *his own* usage. In other words, we have so far considered Catullus' concept of *latinitas* almost entirely internally. To define Catullus' *latinitas* as "the language that Catullus uses" is, of course, circular and unhelpful. As has been stated above, discussions of language that aim to prescribe against certain usages and formulations, especially when the idiom of that prescription lacks scientific precision, find it most efficient to do so by providing negative examples of incorrect usage for comparison. While explicit, linguistic prescription is the express concern of the *grammaticus*, we may not expect the phenomenon to occur in poetry so transparently, or at least not in a form that recalls the highly codified treatises of the professional grammarian. While there are other examples within the Catullan corpus where the poet's treatment of issues of language and literature recalls the *grammaticus*' trade, there is no more explicit example of Catullus' engaging with an overtly linguistic question, with the actual prescription against certain features of language, than that which

occurs in c. 84, where he delivers commentary and mild invective on the substandard speech of a certain Arrius.¹⁴² The text and translation below reflect the standard interpretation of the poem:

*Chommoda dicebat, si quando commoda vellet
dicere, et insidias Arrius hinsidias,
et tum mirifice sperabat se esse locutum,
cum quantum poterat dixerat hinsidias.
credo, sic mater, sic liber avunculus eius, (5)
sic maternus avus dixerat atque avia.*

*hoc misso in Syriam requierant omnibus aures:
audibant eadem haec leniter et leuiter,
nec sibi postilla metuebant talia verba,
cum subito affertur nuntius horribilis: (10)
Ionios fluctus, postquam illuc Arrius isset,
iam non Ionios esse sed Hionios.*

“Hopportune,” he said whenever “opportune” was what he meant
And Arrius said “hambush” instead of saying ambush.
And then he trusted that his elocution had been marvelous,
When he had spoken “hambush” as much as he was able.
I guess that’s how his mother spoke, and how his freeborn uncle, (5)
And likewise his maternal grandfather and grandmother.
When he’d been sent to Syria the ears of all enjoyed relief
They’d hear those same expressions, now mildly and smoothly,
And none had cause thereafter to have fear of words of such a kind,
But then, all of a sudden, some dreadful news is given: (10)
The waves of the Ionian, since Arrius had passed their way,
Are not Ionian, but now Hionian.”

The charge is simple: Arrius does not make consistent or correct use of the aspirate, and by doing so betrays both his ignorance and his origins.¹⁴³ In modern linguistic terms, we

¹⁴² Much of the attention given to this poem has focused on the identification of this Arrius. A Quintus Arrius, a satellite of Crassus cited by Cicero in *Brutus* 242 as an example of a person of low birth who rose to wealth and status *sine doctrina, sine ingenio*, is an attractive possibility. For a fuller examination of the identities of Cicero’s and Catullus’ Arrii (specifically the likelihood that they are the same person) see Marshall and Baker (1975), with whom commentators have generally agreed. Ramage (1959), however, identifies the Arrius of c. 84 with a Gaius Arrius mentioned by Cicero in two letters to Atticus, 2.14 and 2.15. This Arrius was, according to Cicero, insufferably tedious for his obviously artificial refinement and his eager willingness to put it on display. Neither of Cicero’s depictions contradicts Catullus’, and in fact either can be shown to complement the sketch in c. 84, but a precise identification is not necessary for us to parse the poem’s grammatical implications.

would say that Arrius is guilty of hypercorrection. He has, we may assume, learned natively a dialect of Latin that does not feature the aspirate, but, upon finding that it has been retained in the educated Latin of Rome, and that there is a degree of prestige conferred on the speakers of this dialect, he sets about correcting the perceived deficiency in his native speech.¹⁴⁴ We might further characterize Arrius as an active participant in a regular linguistic process called dialect leveling, whereby native speakers of Roman Latin, attempting to preserve the purity of their language, and newcomers to the city, attempting to assimilate to some linguistic ideal, imagined or genuine, end up meeting somewhere in the middle.¹⁴⁵ Arrius is, presumably, one of these newcomers. But he overcompensates, inserting aspirates even where they do not belong. In committing such a fault he is not alone. The state of the aspirate was already in flux among the various

¹⁴³ The mention of Arrius' family here is curious. They are implicated as the source of his peculiar manner of speech, but it is not made clear whether they were simply speakers of an unaspirated variety of Latin, like Arrius, or attempted unsuccessfully to introduce aspiration into their speech. A more literal reading of the lines (5-6) in question would see *liber avunculus* as implying that Arrius' uncle was freeborn, but only first-generation freeborn (i.e. his parents, and thus his maternal grandparents, also mentioned in the poem, were of servile or freedman status), and Fordyce (1961) suggests that "his uncle made pretensions to free birth," which would make him guilty of the same misguided attempts at status as Arrius. Nicholson (1998) would have the *liber* of line 5 allude to the nickname for Bacchus, and thus turn the entire poem into a series of slanders at Arrius and his family for their licentious and indulgent banqueting. The mispronunciations, then, become drunken slurs, and a series of sound effects in the poem (e.g. the triplicate *sics* of 5-6, heavy use of alliteration and *h* and *s* sounds), along with a few choice puns (*poterat* for *potaverat* at 3, *Hionios* and Chian [wine] in the final line), contributes to a general sense of bibulousness. This reading is certainly imaginative, but perhaps more so than it need be.

¹⁴⁴ Attempts to assign to Arrius a dialect of Latin flavored by Etruscan or Venetic influence are, "unconvincing and unnecessary," (Fordyce 1961 p. 374). Psilosis, generally called h-dropping in languages other than ancient Greek, can occur in a given speaking population without foreign influence. The common modern parallel of the state of the aitch—i.e. its absence—in most dialects of spoken British English is made the more fitting by Received Pronunciation's deliberate preservation of the aspirate and its patent status as a feature of educated speech. Arrius is thus often imagined as some sort of Roman Cockney. Fordyce notes, "The status of the aspirate in Rome itself, from such evidence as we have appears to have been not very different from its status in modern England, where most dialects (including that of the metropolis) have lost initial h- but educated speech has preserved it (ibid. p.374-5)." Cf. Quinn as well (1970 p. 472). Whether the retention of *h* was natural or artificial is not clear, nor is it especially important. Aspiration was a feature of the prestige dialect of Latin spoken at Rome by the educated.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Adams: "Provincials who attached prestige to Latin were displaying an attitude that would lead to a language shift, and implicit in any such shift was a feeling that use of the Latin language was a requirement of being Roman," (2003 p.27).

dialects of Latin, and the focus of one of the frequently attested contemporary prescriptions on Latin phonology. We will turn to the poem itself, especially its impact on our understanding of Catullus' motivation for grammatical comment, momentarily, but let us first consider the intellectual and historical context of Catullus' prescription, as well as its place in contemporary grammatical discussion.

a. *Latine loqui* and Aspiration

A heightened sensitivity to “correctness” in Latin—i.e. to *latinitas*—was evident even well outside the late Republican classroom. As the city grew more and more cosmopolitan, and an influx of foreigners and their foreign languages (or foreign dialects of Latin) began to color the dialect of Rome, a drive to define clearly a “standard” Latin ceased to be a concern exclusive to professional teachers. The canon by which this standard ought to be measured was, unsurprisingly, the idealized version of the Roman dialect. Such motivations are stated explicitly by Cicero in the *Brutus*. He observes that immigrants brought with them an *inquinatio* in their speech, a pollution that marred the pristine and effortless Latin of old. Everyone who lived in the city used to speak this pure form of Latin naturally and without deliberate training:

solum quidem...quasi fundamentum oratoris vides locutionem emendatam et Latinam, cuius penes quos laus adhuc fuit, non fuit rationis aut scientiae sed quasi bonae consuetudinis. mitto C. Laelium P. Scipionem: aetatis illius ista fuit laus tamquam innocentiae sic Latine loquendi—nec omnium tamen; nam illorum aequales Caecilium et Pacuvium male locutos videmus —: sed omnes tum fere, qui nec extra urbem hanc vixerant neque eos aliqua barbaries domestica infuscaverat, recte loquebantur. sed hanc certe rem deteriolem vetustas fecit et Romae et in Graecia. confluxerunt enim et Athenas et in hanc urbem multi inquinate loquentes ex diversis locis. quo magis expurgandus est sermo et

adhibenda tamquam obrussa ratio, quae mutari non potest, nec utendum pravissima consuetudinis regula.

“Indeed you see that speaking [a form of] Latin free of errors is the basis, practically the foundation, of an orator, though men at that time enjoyed praise for such not so much for their systematic knowledge [of speaking Latin correctly] as for their good habits. I’ll pass over Laelius and Scipio; speaking Latin [well] was, just as integrity was, the very glory of that age—not of everyone, of course, for we see that Caecilius and Pacuvius, their contemporaries, spoke poorly. And yet, at that time, quite nearly everyone who had never lived outside of the city, or whom no domestic barbarism had corrupted, spoke correctly. However, the passage of time, in Rome as it had in Greece, caused [the way people speak] to deteriorate. For just as in Athens, many who speak a contaminated language have gathered in our city from various places. Thus all the more must our speech be cleansed, and a proven standard must be provided, one which cannot be altered, and we must not make use of the extremely unreliable model of common use.”¹⁴⁶

This passage gives voice to the body of concerns and reservations that underlie efforts to establish standards for the “correct” dialect, of which consistent and regular aspiration was a part, and what is important here is that Latin—proper Latin as it was spoken a few generations earlier—cannot be recreated by the men of Cicero’s day without some form of instruction and concomitant practice. The emphasis on habits, captured in the distinction between the *bona consuetudo* of old and the *pravissima consuetudinis regula* of the present, highlights a related contrast between the lack of effort required of speakers in the past and the complete inability of contemporary speakers to match them without study.

Why the aspirate became a target for linguistic prescription may have its answer in the history of Latin’s development and regional divergence. Latin inherited its aspirate from Proto-Indo-European **g^h*, but the sound began its evanescence very early in the

¹⁴⁶ *Brutus* 258.

attested history of the language.¹⁴⁷ Though our earliest inscriptional evidence of a dialect that had lost the aitch appears only in graffiti from Pompeii, which gives us a *terminus ante quem* in 79 CE for the loss of aspiration in that particular dialect, comparative studies of Indo-European and *testimonia* from Latin authors (Catullus included) suggest that its decline and artificial restoration began far earlier than that, especially in rural speech communities.¹⁴⁸ While no explicit charge of rusticity is worked into the invective of c. 84, the fault of misaspiration is elsewhere expressly tied by Catullus' immediate contemporaries to the countryside.¹⁴⁹ A comment on the aspirate from the late republican scholar Nigidius Figulus in his *Commentarii Grammatici* is terse and unambiguous: *rusticus fit sermo si aspiras perperam*.¹⁵⁰ Julius Caesar too apparently addressed the aspirate in his lost grammatical work *De Analogia*.¹⁵¹ Thus both its topicality and its association with rustic speakers have unambiguous historical support.

¹⁴⁷ This was a breathy voiced velar plosive, IPA [g^h], which has no equivalent in English. The Latin letter *h* comes from Greek η, which, at its earliest, represented a consonantal sound not unlike Greek χ (Sturtevant 1940 p. 69). It is likely that an intermediate stage of [x] (voiceless velar fricative, as in “loch” and “Bach”) came before the simple aspiration, and that it was during this stage that the character was adopted (Birt 1901). Whatever its precise trajectory from PIE to Latin, *h* was already unstable by the time it represented the aspiration proper.

¹⁴⁸ Aspirations is not universally omitted in Pompeii, but its sporadic appearance in graffiti of Pompeii corroborates its instability, its evanescence and its role as an indicator of education and prestige (Sturtevant p. 156). This would presumably account for words semantically tied to the countryside appearing to have lost an aspirate very early, such as *anser* from earlier **hanser* (cf. English ‘goose’ from Proto-Germanic **gans*, where the original PIE [g^h] has followed its regular progression to [g]). Quintilian’s discussion of the aspirate in *IO* 1.5.20 adds *ircus* and *aedus* (for *hircus* and *haedus*, “goat” and “kid” respectively) to the list of rural words that are regularly spoken without the aitch.

¹⁴⁹ The charge of rusticity in speech or behavior is a frequent component of Catullus’ insults, one involving either the drawing of the target into a direct association with the provinces or the *rus*, or the distancing of him or her from the city. Cf. c. 12, discussed in detail above, as well as cc. 22, 25, 36, 39, 44, et al.

¹⁵⁰ “Speech becomes rustic if one aspirates incorrectly.” The fragment appears in Aulus Gellius’ *Noctes Atticae* 13.6.3.

¹⁵¹ Marcus Cornelius Fronto tells an anecdote of Caesar’s writing *de nominibus declinandis* and *de verborum aspirationibus*, “about the declensions of nouns and the aspirations of words”, while campaigning in Gaul (*De Bello Parthica* 9). This is an expansion, or perhaps a correction, of an anecdote that Suetonius gives of Caesar’s writing *De Analogia* while crossing the Alps (*Divus Iulius* 56.5). Fronto’s version is far more romantic: that Caesar wrote in the very midst of combat, *inter tela volantia*. The setting

Likewise an impulse to restore original aitches, whose pronunciation became a privilege of the educated, had been felt early, and, just as in Arrius' case, mistakes were often made, and just as often corrected. Forms that artificially conceal an unaspirated root, such as *humerus* and *humor*, are frequent, and debates on the correctness of the aspiration in one or another form are common.¹⁵² Indeed, even in classical Latin many regular and familiar forms show traces of an original aspirate that was lost, especially in medial position.¹⁵³ Often such forms appear even alongside an equally popular form that retained the aspirate.¹⁵⁴ The frequent and often unexpected disappearance and reappearance of the aspirate, then, is exactly the sort of linguistic issue that called for firm, prescriptive establishment by an authority on the Latin language. For this reason it attracted the attention of grammarians and writers on language from our earliest attestations until centuries later, when its inappropriate appearance or absence became one of the canonical barbarisms to be addressed in traditional *artes grammaticae*.

for Caesar's writing the treatise, however, is unimportant; Fronto's description of the content of *De Analogia* is confirmation enough that Caesar too treated this very contemporary topic.

¹⁵² The forms *umerus* and *umor* are better attested in classical texts and better supported by comparative evidence. Cf. Greek ὄμοος and Sanskrit अंस (amsas) respectively, where the [h] is patently not original (Tucker 1931 p. 261 and Sihler 1995 p. 89). Discussions like Caesar's continue to be touchstones of the grammatical tradition. Even in writings from much later, the aspirate commands the attention both of the grammarian—Velius Longus, among others, acknowledges that both the forms *harena* and *arena* have their advocates, but that *harena* is the more historical form, and is to be preferred (*De Orthographia* 7.69)—and of the non-grammarian—Augustine remarks facetiously on the aspirate and its status as a topic of linguistic quibbling: “*si contra disciplinam grammaticam sine adspiratione primae syllabae hominem dixerit, magis displiceat hominibus, quam si contra tua praecepta hominem oderit*,” “if [a man] should speak the first syllable of *hominem* without the aspiration, contrary to the teaching of the grammarian, his fellow men would more despise him than if he hated another man, contrary to your instructions. (*Conf.* 1.18).” Even in some modern Romance languages, where original aspiration has been dropped universally in pronunciation, orthographical conventions have retained the letter *h*, and, though a phonological nonentity, *h* can still exert a degree of influence on languages as they are spoken, as in the French *h aspiré*, which prevents liaison and elision, but has no value of its own.

¹⁵³ e.g. *nemo* < *nehomo, *debeo* < *dehibeo (Allen 1965).

¹⁵⁴ e.g. *nīl* alongside *nihil*, and *mī* and *mihī*. Ibid.

By the time the *ars grammatica* has a clearly defined shape, there is general agreement among *grammatici* as to what constitutes a *barbarismus*, “barbarism,” in speech, and *artes* adopt almost unilaterally some iteration of the definition “*una pars orationis uitiosa in communi sermone*,” that is, an error that is confined to a single word. Solecisms, on the other hand, are understood as errors that involve syntactical disagreement or inconsistency between words in a phrase.¹⁵⁵ These two constitute the major classes of *vitia*. They are to be distinguished from both *metaplasmus*, which is an intentional barbarism employed under the auspices of poetic license, and *barbarolexis*, which is the use of foreign words, generally for some rhetorical effect. Barbarisms themselves are identified as one of four types of error effecting one of five categories of speech, yielding twenty possible permutations. The four types of error are *adiectio*, *deductio*, *immutatio* and *transmutatio*, or addition, removal, substitution and transposition, respectively. The five categories of speech are *litterae*, *syllabae*, *tempora*, *accentus* (sometimes *toni*) and *adspirationes*, or letters, syllables, length/quantity, tone or

¹⁵⁵ Whenever the two, *barbarismus* and *soloecismus*, are treated together, this distinction accompanies their discussion. Aelius Donatus explains the difference between the two in his *Ars Maior* (mid 4th c. CE): *inter soloecismum et barbarismum hoc interest, quod soloecismus discrepantes aut inconsequentes in se dictiones habet, barbarismus autem in singulis verbis fit scriptis vel pronuntiatis*. “This is the difference between solecisms and barbarisms, the fact that a solecism contains words that disagree or do not logically follow one another, but a barbarism happens on individual words, either when written or spoken.” The same definition persists as well in the 4th c. *artes* of Diomedes Grammaticus, Charisius, Dositheus Magister—all of whom, along with Donatus, likely relied on the same, lost source—of Publius Consentius of the 5th c, et al. On the other hand, Quintilian, after defining barbarism in like manner, *barbarismum quod est unius verbi vitium* (IO 1.5.16), complicates the simplicity of this distinction by recognizing that a solecism can also be confined to a single word: *in singulis quoque verbis possit fieri soloecismus, ut si unum quis ad se vocans dicat “venite,”* “a solecism can happen in single words as well, such as when someone calling an individual to himself says “come [plural]” (IO 1.5.36). In reality, this particular error is also syntactical—one could even understand the two disagreeing words as the unexpressed singular *tu* and the plural verb form—and so does not contradict the definitions as they are codified by later grammarians.

accent and aspiration, respectively.¹⁵⁶ The later *artes* are highly codified to the extent that even the orders in which the types of errors and categories of speech are presented show only minor variation from treatise to treatise. The order in which the errors themselves are discussed is almost completely free of variation. In listing the categories of speech, *litterae* and *syllabae* are generally presented first, in that order, but there seems to be no strict convention for ordering the final three.

Catullus, then, is not alone in considering the aspirate and in giving it special status as an identifying mark of educated Latin and a prerequisite for anyone laying claim to *latinitas*, and his sensitivity to its misuse fits neatly into this tradition of debating its nature and placement. This alone, however, is not an especially forceful argument for the presence of a grammatical undercurrent in c. 84 of a technical nature. Certainly to prescribe norms in speech (and to reprove those who fail in adherence to those norms) falls within the scope of the *grammaticus*, but, as I will show, the prescription in c. 84 takes a distinct form, a form that suggests more than casual interest in the prescription of misapplied aspiration, but also hints at an awareness of the idiom of prescription that features in professional treatments of the aspirate and of certain other elements of Latin phonology.

¹⁵⁶ Because grammarians have attempted to adapt a model for discussing Greek accent into Latin, whose system of accentuation is vastly different, this category, *accentus* or *toni*, of the five is the least clearly defined, which probably accounts for the inconsistency in terminology. Latin authors have generally tried to equate their own stress accent to the rise in pitch of a Greek acute or circumflex accent. For our understanding, a satisfactory definition of a barbarism of *accentus* is any instance of uttering a word with the accent, whether stress or tonal, placed on the incorrect syllable. It should be noted that there are some Greek words, particularly proper nouns, whose correct *accentus* in spoken Latin and spoken Greek will not coincide. Quintilian uses, for instance, the name “Atreus” at 1.5.24: *id saepius in Graecis nominibus accidit, ut “Atreus”, quem nobis iuvenibus doctissimi senes acuta prima dicere solebant, ut necessario secunda gravis esset.* “This [disagreement between Latin and Greek accent] occurs frequently in Greek names, such that “Atreus”, which, when we were young, our most educated elders used to pronounce with an acute accent on the first syllable, so that it had as a matter of course a grave on the ultima [i.e. contrary to its conventional Greek pronunciation Ἀτρεός, which has an acute on the ultima].”

b. Restoring Arrius' errors

To illustrate this, it will be necessary for us to consider the poem in its attested, unedited form, as transmitted in the earliest manuscripts, where Arrius' spurious aitches are almost entirely absent. This reading, of course, would render the poem a rather pointless commentary on Arrius' perfectly conventional speech. For this reason editors have restored aspirates on the basis of a comment made by Quintilian at *IO* 1.5.20, where the nature and status of the aspirate is expressly discussed and a "well-known epigram" of Catullus is cited.¹⁵⁷ From this offhand reference it has been inferred that the epigram in question is c. 84 and that the main point of the poem is Arrius' misuse of the aspirate in word-initial position, either with a vowel or when it is joined to a consonant.¹⁵⁸ This interpretation has informed the shape of the poem as it appears in all critical editions and commentaries today.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷ *Erupit breui tempore nimius usus, ut choronae chenturiones praechones adhuc quibusdam inscriptionibus maneant, qua de re Catulli nobile epigramma est.*

"Hypercorrective use [of the aspirate] broke out quite quickly, so that [forms like] *choronae*, *chenturiones*, *praechones* still exist on certain inscriptions, about which phenomenon there is a well-known epigram by Catullus."

It is unclear whether Quintilian noted the phenomenon of the unetymological aspiration of all consonants to which there existed a Greek parallel (i.e. *c*, *p* and *t*), or just to *c*, which occurs in each of the examples he describes.

¹⁵⁸ This inference, that c. 84 was Quintilian's *nobile epigramma*, is usually credited to the 15th c. Italian scholar Angelo Poliziano, or Politian, who is also believed to have established the current ordering of the couplets. Both of these emendations occur in the marginalia of his chapters on Catullan problems in the *Miscellanea*, but this association between 84 and Politian appears to be, more or less, academic convention. The larger picture, detailed especially by Gaisser (1982), includes the corroborative efforts of a handful of contemporaries, who represent the third generation of Catullan scholars active during the Renaissance after the fortuitous emergence of a badly damaged copy of the corpus in the late 13th or early 14th c. This copy, *V*, disappeared shortly afterward, but left behind three daughter manuscripts, *O*, *G* and *R*, from which our modern textual tradition was born. For details see Thomson (1973) and Ullman (1960).

¹⁵⁹ The earliest manuscripts, all predating Politian, read *Ionios...Ionios* without exception. *G* and *O* read *insidias he* or *insidias hee*, respectively, for the final word of line 2, with an extrametrical particle after the unaspirated form, which at least hints at a form that was irregular in its application of the aitch (and thus subject to scribal correction), i.e. *hinsidias*. Most have *commoda...commoda*, but *D* and its parent, likely descended from *R* or *O*, have *comoda* in the first position followed by *commoda*. Nothing that would suggest underlying *chommoda* or *Hionios* appears in a manuscript of Catullus before Politian's time.

Thus c. 84 is generally presented as a poem that deals with two different aspects of the aspirate, its bare use with vowels, as in *hinsidias* and *Hionios*, and its combination with consonants, as in *chommoda*. We can reasonably expect Classical Latin to have dealt with these two uses at least somewhat differently.¹⁶⁰ The language was heir to the same system of consonants that made a tripartite distinction between voiced, voiceless, and breathy-voiced (i.e. aspirated) plosives as was Greek, but, unlike Greek, which retained that distinction (replacing the original breathy-voiced plosives with their voiceless, aspirated counterparts), Latin did not persist in this distinction, so that, while a bare aspirate was part of the phonological system of Classical Latin, aspirated consonants were not.¹⁶¹ The educated Roman, however, would have been familiar with aspirated consonants from his knowledge of Greek, and presumably would have been careful to pronounce them where appropriate—i.e. in words of Greek origin—but this did not

¹⁶⁰ Greek, for instance, treated the two uses differently, with a fully-realized orthography for representing the aspirated consonants alongside their unaspirated counterparts (as in φ and π), but only diacritical marks for distinguishing an aspirated or unaspirated vowel, and these only (in most dialects) in the word initial position. Modern English as well treats the aspirate differently in these two roles. Certain dialects retain the aspirate, as does American English, when it appears at syllable onset (as in *hat*, or *behind*), but no dialect of English distinguishes between aspirated and unaspirated plosives (as in *tab*, where the initial *t* is aspirated, and *stab*, where it is not; native English speakers can appreciate this distinction even if they cannot hear it by placing their hand close to their mouth and speaking each word aloud; a noticeable puff of air will accompany the enunciation of the *t* in *tab*).

¹⁶¹ The original Indo-European breathy-voiced plosives underwent a series of conditioned changes in Latin, converging in some instances with each other to form new consonants (such as word-initial *f* in Latin from both PIE *d^h and *b^h), or with other, existing consonants (such as PIE *d^h in medial position yielding *b* alongside original *b*), or simply evolving directly into new phonemes, such as our aspirate *h* from PIE *g^h. See Sihler (1995) for a complete mapping of the PIE system as it developed into the Latin consonants as we know them. Allen (1965), however, interprets the appearance of unexpected aspiration after consonants, which begin to appear in the middle of the second century BCE in Latin inscriptions, differently. He notes that most (but not all) of the consonants “incorrectly” aspirated occur in the environment of a liquid (*r* or *l*), such as *pulcher* and *Carthago*, and supposes from this that the aspiration under these phonological conditions was and had been a natural and regular pronunciation in some dialects of Latin for some time. Reflecting this in writing had been unnecessary, just as English does not need to write the aspiration in *tab*, but “once the digraphs had been introduced in order more accurately to represent the pronunciation of loan-words from Greek, it would be natural enough to employ them also for writing similar sounds in Latin,” (pp. 26-7). This seems plausible in theory, but would require of the literate, speaking population phonological sensitivity to a fairly nuanced distinction, which is, in my opinion, unrealistic.

prevent their use in words where they are not original.¹⁶² Indeed many words, particularly family names, are overwhelmingly represented with aspirations that could not have been original to Latin, either because they came from Etruscan, or because the prestige of Greek engendered folk etymologies that lent prestige and credibility to such hypercorrect pronunciations.¹⁶³ Cicero brings the question of the aspirated consonant, its fashionable use where it does not belong, and its appropriateness into the contemporary discussion of “correct” speech in *Orator* 160:

cum scirem ita maiores locutos esse, ut nusquam nisi in vocali aspiratione uterentur, loquebar sic, ut pulcros, Cetegos, triumphos, Cartaginem dicerem; aliquando, idque sero, convicio aurium cum extorta mihi veritas esset, usum loquendi populo concessi, scientiam mihi reservavi.

“Since I knew that our ancestors spoke such that they never used the aspiration except with vowels, I used to speak so that I said “*pulcros*”, “*Cetego*”, “*triumpos*”, “*Cartaginem*” [in place of *pulchros*, *Cethegos*, *triumphos*, *Carthaginem*], but after a while, and it was a while, once etymological precision had been wrenched out of me by the reproach of the ear, I conceded convention of speech to the people, and I’ve kept my knowledge to myself.”¹⁶⁴

¹⁶² There seems to have been a trend of inserting aspirations where they did not belong among educated speakers of Latin as a way of affecting a Greek accent. It is not uncommon in languages which have a relationship with another language, one that is largely the property of the educated (as Latin to Greek, or English to French), to attribute a degree of prestige to foreign accents. Adams (2003) cites sociolinguists Josine Hamers and Michael Blanc, who report a study of the prestige and perception of foreign accents: “English spoken with a French foreign accent was rated in a very favourable way, as superior to any regional accent and much superior to an Italian or German foreign accent.” (Hamers and Blanc 1989).

¹⁶³ *Cethegos* and *Otho*, for instance, are likely to be Etruscan. Leumann (1928 pp. 162-3):

“Altüberkommene aspirierte Tenuen besaß das Latein nur in einigen Personennamen etruskischen Ursprungs.” Leumann posits that folk etymologies are responsible for *Pulcher*, which he supposes was thought falsely to be cognate with πολύχρως, “many-colored”. The adjective is more probably from the same root as *polire*, but the association of *pulcer* with color is present in *Tusculan Disputations: corporis est quaedam apta figura membrorum cum coloris quadam suavitate eaque dicitur “pulchritudo”* (“there is of the body a certain fitting arrangement of the limbs, with a kind of sweetness of complexion, and this is called ‘beauty,’” *Tusc. Disp. 4.31*). *Gracchus*, Leumann suggests, took its aspiration at the suggestion of *Bacchus*.

¹⁶⁴ He continues: *Orcivios tamen et Matones, Otones, Caepiones, sepulcra, coronas, lacrimas dicimus, quia per aurium iudicium licet*. “Nevertheless, we continue to say ‘*Orcivios*’ ‘*Matones*,’ ‘*Otones*’, ‘*Caepiones*’, ‘*sepulcra*’, ‘*coronas*’, ‘*lacrimas*’, which is what the discretion of my ears allows.”

Cicero, then, corroborates what we have surmised about Latin's phonological history from comparative analysis: that the aspirate after a consonant was not native to Latin, but had insinuated itself by artificial means into affected speech, and thence into popular usage.¹⁶⁵

Cicero's comments on the fashionable pronunciation of the aspirated consonant (and his reluctance to accept them on aesthetic grounds) show that, unlike the relationship between aspirated and unaspirated consonants in English, where no distinction is made—indeed most native speakers are unable even to discern a difference between the *t* in *tab* and that in *stab*, even if they maintain consistently and unconsciously the distinction in their own speech—a Roman ear, at least the ear of a highly educated Roman such as Cicero was, would have detected such a difference.¹⁶⁶ To what degree they would have detected this difference we can only guess, but the relationship between, for instance,

¹⁶⁵ Its non-native status in early Latin accounts as well for early transliterations of Greek words that are imported without aspirations, such as *Aciles*, *teatrum*, *punicus*, (Fordyce 1961 p. 374). The routes through which Greek words entered Latin in Roman prehistory are never certain, however, and it is possible that forms such as these were mediated by Etruscan or some other local language rather than imported directly from Greek. Writers on language in Catullus' time were at least aware of this phenomenon, even if their explanations were inaccurate. Varro in *Res Rusticae* 3 describes the etymology from *Thebae* of a regional word for "hill":

Nec minus oppidi quoque nomen Thebae indicat antiquiorem esse agrum, quod ab agri genere, non a conditore nomen ei est impositum. Nam lingua prisca et in Graecia Aeolis Boeoti sine afflatu vocant collis tebas, et in Sabinis, quo e Graecia venerunt Pelasgi, etiam nunc ita dicunt, cuius vestigium in agro Sabino via Salaria non longe a Reate miliarius clivus cum appellatur tebae.

"And the name of Thebes as well indicates no less that rural settlements are older [than cities], a name which was given to the city from the lay of the land, not from its founder. For, in the ancient tongue, the Boeotians of Aeolia in Greece call hills 'tebae', without the aspiration. Among the Sabines as well, the land where the Pelasgi settled from Greece, even today they say it like this, the traces of which [can be seen] in Sabine country along the Via Salaria, not far from Reate, where a mile-long slope is called 'tebae', (*RR* 3.1.6)"

¹⁶⁶ Ancient Greek, of course, expressed such a distinction far more concretely. The minimal pair of Κρόνος and χρόνος, where only the presence of aspiration on the initial consonant distinguishes the latter from the former, illustrates this clearly, but many modern languages as well make a contrast between aspirated and unaspirated consonants. Languages from the Indo-Aryan family (including Hindi, Gujarati, Bengali, et al.) persist in their contrast between aspirated and unaspirated consonants, a distinction they too inherited from the PIE system.

Latin *c* and transliterated *ch* is worth considering.¹⁶⁷ Sturtevant notices that the unaspirated/aspirated pairs (*c/ch*, *t/th* and *p/ph*) are not excluded from alliterating in poetry, so their dissimilarity as perceived by Roman ears could not have been vast.¹⁶⁸

With this in mind, the error in the opening word to c. 84, *chommoda*, could conceivably have gone unnoticed until the distinction was made explicit in line 2. This does not make for an especially biting opening to a piece of invective.

If we reexamine the state of the earliest manuscripts we find that none preserves Arrius' spurious aspirates as they appear in modern additions. However, as Rosén points out, at least one early manuscript, *D*, transmits the first coupling of incorrect and correct forms as *comoda...commoda*.¹⁶⁹ With this in mind he proposes an attractive solution to the appearance of the irregular form *comoda*: that *cōmoda* (which must be read with a long *ō* in the first syllable to scan correctly) represents an instance of a different type of hypercorrection, the tendency of some speakers to shorten long vowels and compensate with a geminate consonant, as in *tōttus* for *tōtus*.¹⁷⁰ The rule here is to avoid geminating consonants when the vowel itself ought to be long instead. The hypercorrective speaker,

¹⁶⁷ Perhaps the perceived difference was rather slight. Sturtevant (1940) notes that the aspirate was always a somewhat weak sound in Latin, proving no obstacle for elision, failing to combine with another consonant to make position, and inviting names, *aspiratio* or *spiritus*, which speak to its slightness. Quintilian wonders whether it even warrants a letter (*IO* 1.4.9 and 1.5.19).

¹⁶⁸ Ibid. He cites Vergil: **Phoenissa et partier puero donisque movetur** (*Aen.* 1.714); and Horace: **Moenia vel Baccho Thebas vel Apolline Delphos / insignis aut Thessala Tempe** (*Carm.* 1.7.3-4).

¹⁶⁹ The *comoda...commoda* reading, Rosén points out, is better attested than any of the other pairs as they have been read since Politian, i.e. *chommoda...commoda*; *hinsidias...insidias*; and *Ionios...Hionios* (Rosén p. 224).

¹⁷⁰ The Latin example is from Consentius' *Ars*, via Sommer (1902, p 291.). Equally relevant here is the variant reading of *phasēllus* for *phasēlus* in c. 4 (see p. 66, n. 119). Consonant length distinguishes minimal pairs in many languages (as in Italian *fatto* "fact", and *fato* "fate", for instance), but is difficult for a native English speaker to appreciate; English consonants, even when printed as geminates, are almost invariably short. Long consonants in English occur most frequently across word boundaries, but a handful of individual words feature phonologically graphically: e.g. "wholly" v. "holy". For other Latin examples and a sketch of the development in Vulgar Latin that accounts for such forms in modern Romance cf. Carnoy 1917.

then, would seek out other geminate consonants and substitute a spurious long vowel for an etymological double consonant, as in *cōmoda* for *cōmmoda*. Rosén’s suggestion is interesting because the appearance in certain manuscripts of *comoda* is curious, and Rosén adds to this that there did exist in the grammatical tradition instances of prescription against this particular error in speech, whereas, according to Rosén, no such record of correcting unaspirated consonants exists.¹⁷¹

It is true, moreover, that, alongside various treatments of failures to aspirate in word-initial position—one of the stock errors in pronunciation that both Catullus’ contemporaries and the later heirs to Latin grammar recognized—errors in vowel quantities, or *tempora*, are also identified by grammarians as common barbarisms in speech. They too are realized in one of four ways, as an *adiectio*, a *detractio*, an *immutatio*, or a *transmutatio*. Both Cicero in *Orator* and Quintilian in *IO* discuss briefly the importance of accurate vowel quantity in affecting proper speech, and, as Rosén notes, in both cases this discussion is followed immediately by treatments of the aspirate, just as it is in c. 84. Cicero, to be fair, addresses the subject under circumstances that are not quite the same as those under which he discusses the aspirate. He makes vowel

¹⁷¹ I.e. Arrius’ hypercorrection in *hinsidias* actually fits with prescriptive rules of the day (the rule being something like, “Latin aspirates the initial vowel of many words and to fail to do so is to speak incorrectly”), but *chommoda* is less obviously a hypercorrection, because the rule is less clearly stated. Rosén adds that, “there was a normative grammatical rule which required the speaker not to follow the vulgar habit of dropping *h*’es, but there never was one requiring him to use aspirated consonants for unaspirated ones,” because Latin did not feature natively any aspirated consonants (p. 224). Arrius’ substitution of *ch* for *c*, in other words, could not be hypercorrective in the same way because there was no prescriptive rule for him to overuse zealously.

I cannot agree entirely with Rosén on this final point, especially since he seems willing to overlook the apparent incongruity with the examples that Quintilian uses alongside c. 84 to highlight hypercorrect aspiration—*choronae*, *chenturiones*, *praeachones*, all of which contain a *ch* for original *c*—and, to use an example closer to Catullus’ own time, the examples of spontaneous aberrant aitches which Cicero adduces in *Orator*. Quintilian’s own words for the phenomenon, *nimius usus*, seem very clearly to suggest hypercorrection, as I have translated them above (p. 80, n. 157).

quantities a demonstration of distinctions in pronunciation that are easily detected when spoken, but cannot be arrived at through etymology or analogy. At *Orator* 159 vowel quantity comes up as a way to illustrate the process of nasalization and compensatory lengthening that occurs when *n* is followed by certain letters, and to establish that an orator ought to trust his ear, rather than to chastise any group of ungrammatical speakers.¹⁷² Quintilian's treatment of vowel length, however, shares more with Catullus, as well as with the attested tradition of classifying barbarisms of speech. It is clear that his discussion of vowel length is concerned with identifying faults, and exonerating apparent faults when they occur in poetry.¹⁷³ Certainly these discussions of syllable length do differ in some regards, both from their subsequent, companion approaches to aspiration and from Catullus' reproach of Arrius' mispronunciation, and that difference is enough at least to give us pause; but Rosén's observation, that there is a conventional sequence for discussing errors in pronunciation and that Catullus apparently conforms to it, is persuasive.¹⁷⁴ A reading of *comoda* at line 1, then, not only gives the opening of the poem a more forceful entry into the invective that follows—the exaggerated *ō* in the first

¹⁷² *Inclutus dicimus brevi prima littera, insatius producta, inhumanus brevi, infelix longa. Et, ne multis, quibus in verbis eae primae litterae sunt quae in sapiente atque felice, producte dicitur, in ceteris omnibus breviter; itemque composuit, consuevit, concrepuit, confecit. Consule veritatem: reprehendet; refer ad auris, probabunt.*

“We say *inclutus* with a short initial letter, *insatius* with a drawn out letter, *inhumanus* short, *infelix* long. To avoid mentioning others, [the initial vowel] in words in which the first letters are the same as in *sapiente* and *felice* [i.e. *s* and *f*] are drawn out in their utterance. In others the vowel is short. Compare *composuit* with *consuevit*, or *concrepuit* and *confecit*. If you consider the etymology [*veritas* here must be a calque for ἔτυμον], it will find fault [in my examples], but refer the matter to your ears. They will approve (159).”

¹⁷³ *quae fiunt spatio, sive cum syllaba correpta producitur, ut "Italiam fato profugus", seu longa corripitur, ut "unius ob noxam et furias", extra carmen non deprehendas, sed nec in carmine vitia dicenda sunt.*

“Those [faults] that happen with quantity, as when a contracted syllable is drawn out, like in “*Italiam fato profugus*”, or a long syllable is contracted, as in “*unius ob noxam et furias*”, you might not catch outside of poetry [where metrical concerns and syllable length must cooperate], but even in poetry they ought not be called faults,” (*IO* 1.5.19).

¹⁷⁴ Let us assume, for the moment, that Rosén is correct in supplying *comoda* as the original opening word of the poem.

position highlights a distinction Latin does make, that of vowel length, rather than one that is not native to the language, as consonantal aspiration—but also places it securely within the conventions that grammarians observed in discussing faults of pronunciation.

Such a reading accounts for the first two barbarisms in Arrius' speech, *cōmoda* and *hinsidias*, and coordinates them neatly with the professional conventions of addressing faults in speech, but Rosén's reading rather curiously leaves untreated the significance of the third barbarism in the poem's final word. This points to a long-standing general problem in the interpretation of the poem. A.J. Bell famously declared of c. 84, "What is an epigram without a point? And surely the point of an epigram should come at the end of it? So the point of this epigram must be in the word *Hionios*.¹⁷⁵" The principle that Bell cites, as well as the inference he draws from it, is sound. One can certainly find evidence that Catullus had a predilection for suspending the upshot of a poem until the final line, or even the final word, but a wholly satisfactory explanation of the pun in *Hionios* has yet to be offered.¹⁷⁶ Harrison's proposal remains the most convincing, but it is not without complications. He, as most scholars have done, prefers a reading of c. 84 that deals exclusively with aspiration, and conjectures that *Hionios* is meant to recall *χιονέους*, "snowy", and that the *horribilis nuntius*, i.e. news that makes the hair on the back of one's neck stand on end, was that the Ionian sea had been churned snowy white by the blizzard of aspirates issuing from Arrius as he passed through.¹⁷⁷ This pun was naturally obliterated from the manuscripts, which without exception emended Catullus' original word to an unremarkable *Ionios*, but Harrison's suggestion,

¹⁷⁵ Bell 1915.

¹⁷⁶ A single, final word provides the denouement for, e.g., cc. 13, 21, 49, 102, et al.

¹⁷⁷ Harrison 1915.

as well as his assumption that *Hionios* is the best reading, raises a related question: would a word written in Latin characters as *Hionios* signal so readily the χιονέους his pun requires? Would the pun be strengthened if the final word were written with the Greek alphabet?¹⁷⁸ We will return to the graphic representation of this final word, and what complications or solutions it may provide, in time, but it is an uncertainty that should be kept in mind as we consider the implications of Harrison's reading.

This sensitivity to Greek diction is characteristically Catullan, and perhaps there are further reasons to read a meteorological pun in c. 84.¹⁷⁹ However, there are some basic problems with the mechanics of a pun on *Hionios* and χιονέους. The most obvious is that *h* and *χ* do not represent the same sound, and that such a substitution would lengthen the preceding syllable and result in a pentameter that does not scan. Harrison at least addresses this problem, though his proposed explanation, that the Greek chi as it was used in Latin had deteriorated in force to something more approximate to mere aspiration, is unsupported and unsound. To blur the distinction between [k^h] and a simple aspirate [h], and by doing so effectively conflating the two sounds into a single phoneme, undermines the most fundamental premise of the poem: that an educated speaker of Latin can hear a distinction between the two sounds, and thus aspirates his speech

¹⁷⁸ The use of Greek words and Greek letters at the end of an epigram has the later support of Martial. Coleman (2006) traces the textual criticism that recovered παρ' ἰστορίαν from transmitted (and nonsensical) *ita pictoria* at the end of *Liber Spectaculorum* 24, and notes that others (Weinreich 1928) have found that certain categories of Greek words seem to appear often at the end of Martial's epigrams, particularly "puns on names, quotations from literature, inscriptions, titles of literary works, colloquialisms, obscenities, gastronomical terms, proverbs, and scholarly terminology," (Coleman p.181).

¹⁷⁹ Jones (1956) is particularly concerned with the semantic range of such words as *leniter* and *leviter*, which occur in the poem, and *asper* and *spiritus*, which are hinted at by the poem's attention to aspiration, all of which can refer both to phenomena of weather and speech. The punning between weather and language is too neat to be ignored, and Rosén's point that *lenis* and *levis* can be applied to unaspirated words and short vowels respectively (i.e. the words *insidias* and *commoda* when they are pronounced as they should be) is well taken.

appropriately. Furthermore, as Fordyce observes, Porphyron records in his commentary to Horace that a play on the similarity of $\chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ and *excalceare* occurs in *Serm.* 1.8.39, which suggests that χ shared more with *c* than it did with *h*.¹⁸⁰

Einarson builds upon Harrison and makes an admirable attempt to coordinate the aspiration in *Hionios* with those in *chommoda* and *hinsidias* by claiming that “*Ch* for *c* in *c(h)ommoda* and *hī* for *ī* in *(h)insidias* prepare us for *Ch* for *I* in the finishing thrust *Hionios* (= $\chi\iota\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$),” but his reading requires the same oversight as Harrison’s.¹⁸¹ He continues: “as the preceding syllable remains short we must suppose that the *H* represents a guttural spirant, which could be understood as χ and written as *h*.”¹⁸² Again, if we are to understand the poem in the same way as Einarson and Harrison, by correcting the attested manuscript readings so as to restore only aspirations instead of other faults of speech as well, then Catullus, whose joke relies on real, significant phonological differences—which are pronounced to any educated speaker—between simple aspiration, unaspirated consonants, and aspirated consonants, would necessarily compromise his own credibility as an authority on Latin phonology by suggesting a pun on *Hionios* and $\chi\iota\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ that demands the conflation of these two sounds. Appreciation of this instantiation of the pun, and thus the central joke of the poem, requires the reader or audience member to commit the same aural mistake for which the poet brings Arrius to task.

¹⁸⁰ Fordyce 1961. If a conflation of χ and *c* was possible, he reasons, “it follows that a play on χ - and *h*- was not,” (p. 374).

¹⁸¹ Einarson 1966, p. 3

¹⁸² Ibid. It is not clear, but probably unlikely that Einarson used the phrase “guttural spirant” to suggest a guttural consonant as they are usually described by modern phonologists (that is, the class of uvular sounds that are articulated further back in the mouth than the velar consonants, especially [ʀ] and [ʁ], which “r” represents in certain modern European languages like French and German). If this was his meaning, then he errs in his understanding of Latin phonology. No such sound ever existed in attested dialects of Latin or ancient Greek.

The true nature of the pun, then, appears yet to be discovered. Though Rosén does not look closely at the barbarized form of *Ionios*, the results of his dealings with the counterparts to *commoda* and *insidias* are compelling enough to apply similar treatment to the poem's final word. As noted above, *Hionios*, just like the barbarized forms of *commoda* and *insidias*, does not appear in any manuscripts written before Politian's shrewd interpretation of Quintilian's remark. Earlier editions give the apparently pointless reading *Ionios...Ionios*. Because the early manuscripts are in such poor condition, and in view of the propensity of scribes to simplify a reading that violates what they knew or thought they knew about Latin, we cannot be certain that Catullus did not write *Hionios*, but nevertheless, if we assume that *Ionios...Ionios* is the correct reading for the final line, the barbarism at stake becomes one that cannot be represented by Latin orthography, but one that can only be detected when the poem is read aloud. In other words, it is at least worth entertaining the notion that the barbarism in line 12 was concerned with an error in intonation, rather than with the insertion or deletion of any particular sound or written character. Indeed the word in question, *Ionios*, would be especially likely to feature this sort of error because it was not a native Latin word. The Latin pronunciation of *Ionios*, with the stress accent placed on the antepenult, actually violates the proper Greek pronunciation of the Greek equivalent Ἴονίους, whose accent, which would furthermore be indicated by a raise in pitch rather than an emphatic stress, is pulled from the antepenult to the penult on account of the long ultima. The value of the final vowel in each form of the word is different as well. The pronunciation of the Greek accusative plural should be [i:oniú:s], where the Latin is [i:'onio:s].¹⁸³ Arrius, then, was

¹⁸³ Conventional IPA transcription indicates primary **stress accents** in a word with a simple high vertical

faced with a logical paradox in choosing how to articulate this word. We do not have to strain ourselves to imagine that Arrius' enthusiasm for polishing his pronunciation would have been exposed to new challenges if he did indeed travel from Italy to Syria and learned that many of the words whose pronunciation he had rehearsed according to Latin convention, particularly places names, in fact sounded completely different when delivered by native Greek speakers. It would be unsurprising that he returned to Italy eager to put the contents of his recent discovery on display. Unfortunately for Arrius, both pronunciations can be found to be in violation of one or the other set of rules of either Greek or Latin accentuation. Of course, a speaker who had demonstrated that his eloquence was pure and effortless and otherwise free of barbarisms would be seen as making the correct decision, however he chose to accentuate the word, on the basis of his established authority alone. Arrius, however, has already proved to Catullus that his pronunciation is defective and unreliable, so he is not afforded the benefit of the doubt. To have its victim trapped in such an inescapable dilemma provides the poem with a more satisfactory punch line than previous interpretations, and Catullus does not have to rely on the same joke on misaspiration, tired, no doubt, after its earlier use.

Rosén's reading of the poem is so compelling in part because of the evidence from Cicero and Quintilian that he uses to corroborate Catullus' grammatical program. In fact, the sequence of barbarism, according to his interpretation and my supplement, that

line, ' , before the accented syllable, as with [i:'onio:s] for Latin *Ionios*. **Tonal accents** are marked with a variety of symbols commensurate to the complexity of the system. In the case of Greek, where there are only two tones—that is, “high”, as in vowels with an acute accent, and the first half of long vowels and diphthongs with a circumflex; and “low”, as shown by the grave, and in implicit in the second half of a circumflexed vowel or diphthong and in vowels with no accent mark—only one notation is used, to indicate a “high” accent, which is written with an acute accent, as with [i:óníu:s] or [sɔ:kráte:s] for Ἴωνίους and Σωκράτης respectively.

Catullus mocks in c. 84—vowel quantity, aspiration and accent—are discussed in the very same order in Quintilian. Furthermore, just as seems to be the case in Catullus’ poem, Quintilian makes it clear that the species of barbarism that affects intonation is especially common in Greek words, whose proper accentuation is often at odds with the Latinized pronunciation.¹⁸⁴ The section of *Orator* that follows Cicero’s discussion of

¹⁸⁴ *Adhuc difficilior observatio est per tenores (quos quidem ab antiquis dictos tonores comperi, videlicet declinato a Graecis verbo, qui τόνος dicunt) vel adcentus, quas Graeci προσῳδίας vocant, cum acuta et gravis alia pro alia ponuntur, ut in hoc "Camillus", si acuitur prima, aut gravis pro flexa, ut "Cethegus" et hic prima acuta; nam sic media mutatur), aut flexa pro gravi, ut "Appi" circumducta sequenti, quam ex duabus syllabis in unam cogentes et deinde flectentes dupliciter peccant. Sed id saepius in Graecis nominibus accidit, ut "Atreus", quem nobis iuvenibus doctissimi senes acuta prima dicere solebant, ut necessario secunda gravis esset...*

“Still more difficult is detecting errors in “tenor,” (which, I have actually found called tonor by the ancients, no doubt deriving the word from the Greeks, who called it “τόνος”), or “accent,” what the Greeks call “prosody.” These occur when an acute or grave accent [i.e., the absence of accent] is used in place of the other, as in Cāmillus, with an acute on the first syllable [when the “acute” accent should fall on the penult], or when a grave is used instead of a circumflex, like in Céthegus [that is, a grave falls on the second *e*, inasmuch as it is not stressed; the correct form with is Cethégus]. Here the first syllable has an acute accent, because the middle syllable has been altered. Or when a circumflex is used instead of a grave on the second syllable, as in “Appi”, where anyone contracting the two syllables into one and then bending the pitch [as in the rising and falling of a circumflex, which is really the combination on one syllable of an acute and a grave (a raising and a levelling of the tone)] errs twice. This occurs frequently in Greek names, such that “Atreus”, which, when we were young, our most educated elders used to pronounce with an acute accent on the first syllable, so that it had as a matter of course a grave on the second syllable [contrary to its conventional Greek pronunciation Ἀτρέυς],” (*IO* 1.5.22-24).

Quintilian tries, without complete success, to force the Latin system of accentuation to align with the Greek. This is, in a word, impossible, not only because the accents of the two languages are fundamentally different—one stress-based, the other pitch-based— but because the rules that determine where these accents fall are also incompatible. Greek accents are predictably altered or relocated based on the changing length of inflectional endings and the position of the word in a phrase, but their initial assignment to a syllable in a word is, to a speaker or reader, arbitrary (though surely speakers and readers notice patterns, even if they are not aware of the underlying system that determined accent placement in PIE). Latin’s system is more predictable, and is determined entirely by the number of syllables in the word and the presence or absence of a long syllable in the penult (a system called the Penultimate Rule). These differences caused obvious problems, of which Quintilian seems at least to have been vaguely aware.

His basic approach is to equate the Latin stress accent, wherever it occurred, to either of the two Greek accents that could raise the tone, namely the acute and the circumflex, depending on the length of the vowel and its position in the word. He designated the type of accent in the stressed syllable of a Latin word as acute or circumflex accent according to Greek convention. According to his understanding we can presume that a Latin “circumflex” only occurs on the penult, and only when the penult contains a long vowel or diphthong and the ultima is short (so *laudatur* but not *laudantur*). A Latin disyllabic word with a short penult, such as *fides*, or a word with a long penult and a long ultima, such as *sumo*, features an acute accent word, as does a word with its stress on the antepenult, such in *agricola*. Quintilian offers us nothing on which we could conjecture what accent would occur in a word with the shape of *agricolis*, which by Latin pronunciation conventions keeps its stress on the antepenult, but under the Greek system should shift

aspirations is not focused specifically on accentuation, but it does center on the Latinized forms of nouns that are, like *Ionios*, Greek names.¹⁸⁵ Moreover, his treatment of Greek proper nouns is concerned also with the incongruities of Latin and Greek case endings, a point that is equally applicable to *Ionios*, which would be written Ἴονίους in Greek, or even *Ionious* as a direct transliteration.¹⁸⁶ Concerns such as these, both of the correct accentuation and the proper case endings for transliterated Greek words, make Arrius' task even more difficult, and his inevitable failure even more spectacular.

It seems, then, that already during the late Republic a systematic formula of discussing barbarisms in speech was already emerging. Certainly it is more fully realized by the time Quintilian wrote *Institutio Oratoria*—which features the terms *adiectio*, *detractio*, *immutatio* and *transmutatio* in this same, established sequence¹⁸⁷—but traces can already be found in Cicero, and, arguably, in Catullus as well, whose commentary on the overactive self-correction of Arrius recalls the burgeoning grammatical tradition. Of course, Catullus' intended audience, whose sensitivity to *latinitas* was shaped by the

its accent to the penult. The grave accent he correctly interprets as the absence of accent, and so he says of vowels in Latin words that are not stressed when they should be that the “correct” accent (acute or circumflex) has been replaced by a grave accent.

¹⁸⁵ “*Burrum*” *semper Ennius, numquam “Pyrrhum”*; “*vi patefecerunt Bruges,*” *non “Phryges,” ipsius antiqui declarant libri. Nec enim Graecam litteram adhibebant, nunc autem etiam duas, et cum “Phrygum” et “Phrygibus” dicendum esset, absurdum erat aut etiam in barbaris casibus Graecam litteram adhibere aut recto casu solum Graece loqui; tamen et “Phryges,” et “Pyrrhum” aurium causa dicimus.* “Ennius always used ‘Burrus’, never ‘Pyrrhus’: ‘The Bruges violently opened the way,’ Not ‘the Phrygians’, as the ancient copies of the author himself attest. For they did not yet employ the Greek letter. Now, however, we use two, and even though ‘Phrygum’ and ‘Phrygibus’ ought to have been said, it would have been absurd to use the Greek letter in the foreign cases [i.e. in cases, like the ablative, which were not native to Greek], or to use the Greek form only the nominative. Nevertheless, we say ‘Phryges’ and ‘Pyrrhum’ for the sake of our ears,” (*Orator* 160).

¹⁸⁶ It is, of course, impossible to know how or even whether Catullus' original captured this difference in pronunciation. He must have written one of the two instances of *Ionios* in line 12 (likely the first) as it appears in modern editions (i.e. transliterated and fully Latinized with respect to declension), but the other could have been written as Ἴονίους or as a Latin transliteration of the correct Greek form *Ionious*, or he could have left both identical in form, obscuring the joke to all but the audience at a recitation of the poem and particularly shrewd readers.

¹⁸⁷ *IO* 1.5.6.

same prescriptions of speech as the poet, would have recognized the failure in each of Arrius' barbarisms when read aloud, but does their arrangement, add another layer to the invective? It is unlikely that Catullus made use of the traditional arrangement as a serious attempt to assume the role of the *grammaticus*, but by arranging them in an order that mimicked conventional, technical discussions of proper speech, even if he did so unconsciously, Catullus makes c. 84 an early document to a tradition that would produce more fully realized *artes grammaticae* in later generations.¹⁸⁸

c. "The point of the epigram"

At this stage, one might reasonably wonder whether there was careful consideration in selecting the words to represent Arrius' errors, and what the significance of those words might be. To imagine a single semantic field that can encompass all three words would not be possible, but supposing some sort of correspondence between them, especially in light of Catullus' meticulous sequencing of these barbarisms, yields interesting results. Einarson's reasoning, that *commoda* and *insidias* are words appropriate to a courtroom and thus suggest that Arrius was an orator of some kind, is enticing, but perhaps imperfect.¹⁸⁹ His interpretation leaves *Ionios* untreated for its

¹⁸⁸ If Catullus did have in mind a conventional arrangement of barbarisms, one is forced to wonder why, or at least what he might stand to accomplish by ordering his faults in this way. Nobody likes a pedantic know-it-all who fastidiously makes corrections every time a person misspeaks (cf. Porcellus Pomponius discussed *passim*), so for Catullus to don the cap of the professional *exactor sermonis* here is at least somewhat at odds with his normally cool and self-assured poetic persona. It is at least possible, therefore, that Catullus is mocking not just Arrius in c. 84, but also the trade of the grammarian. Thus, the biting humor of the epigram could operate on two levels, one made to be appreciated by any speaker of prescribed, "correct" Latin, and a second directed at a subset of this group, those who were also sensitive to the conventional arrangement of discussions of grammar and could see the humor in adducing that discussion here. Indeed, the *grammaticus*, as well as his familiar and tedious classroom exercises, becomes the subject of frequent ridicule in later authors, a topic that will be treated in my third chapter.

¹⁸⁹ Einarson 1966: "The two words *commoda* and *insidias* and the loudness with which *hinsidias* was pronounced, not to mention his satisfaction in so pronouncing it, suggest that Arrius was an orator. *Insidiae* would refer to the maneuvers of the other party, *commoda* to what those maneuvers imperiled, perhaps the

significance beyond the incidental circumstances of the narrative, although Einarson subscribed to Harrison's meteorological pun, so further meaning, at least for that word, is unnecessary for his reading to work.¹⁹⁰ Nevertheless, if the original did contain incorrect spellings to recreate the first two mistakes in the ways Rosén suggested, *comoda...commoda* and *insidias...hinsidias*, but kept *Ionios...Ionios* in the final line, as I have suggested, the sequence in its entirety can operate beyond its immediate and superficial parody of Arrius' speech, particularly when the poem is recited by someone other than its author. *comoda...commoda* at the poem's opening suggests convenience and suitability, i.e. what is ordinary and familiar, but this sense of comfort is threatened very shortly afterwards by *insidias*. The significance of (*h*)*insidias* to the poem as a whole is made prominent by its repetition at the ends of lines two and four; thus the reader is made aware that he is in danger of being ambushed by a joke, but, true to the meaning of *insidiae*, the joke itself is not meant to be detected. This careful arrangement of barbarisms, with the first two explained cursorily in the initial couplet and the last delayed until the final couplet, directs the reader and encourages him to proceed with caution and the uneasy expectation that a final snare awaits him. Lines 3-6 are traveled easily, as Catullus stops to repeat Arrius' second fault and then extrapolate aloud on the likely origins of his speech. False alarms, however, begin to sound in lines 7, 8 and 9: the contracted form *requierant*; an archaic imperfect in *audibant* for more classical

interests of his client, more probably the interests of the state. They were key words in his speeches and pronounced with becoming emphasis." Einarson must have had the orator Q. Arrius of *Brutus* 242 in mind, which makes connecting Catullus' Arrius to the courts attractive.

¹⁹⁰ That is, Einarson's and Harrison's readings present a poem where the two initial errors in speech do little more than establish that Arrius is prone to improper aspiration and set the stage for the final, lackluster pun between *Hionios* and *χιονέους*.

audiebant; another archaism in *postilla*. The reader is forced to stay on guard to avert a surprise attack. The tension seems to have been mitigated somewhat at the end of line 10, where Catullus promises a *nuntius horribilis*. This “announcement to make you shudder”, however, is not a cheap pun as one might expect.¹⁹¹ Indeed the reader only sees that Arrius’ final barbarism relied on *Ionios* after he had read through the poem, by which point he too has been caught reading the second *Ionios*, however he may have read it, incorrectly, merely because of his failure to recognize the trap.

This reading lends significance to the correspondence of all three words, and the effect of that correspondence on the reader, but there is more to be considered regarding *Ionios*, which alone of the three is not a native Latin word. The use of a Greek term or phrase at the final words of the poem to provide flavor and erudition to the denouement seems to have become conventional to Latin epigram already by Martial’s time.¹⁹² In c. 84, where the holes in a man’s learning are brought to light, a Greek word would be especially fitting; Arrius’ inability to pronounce this specific Greek term correctly (or at least with confidence enough to affect correctness) puts into relief his own feeble *latinitas* against the literary acumen of the poet. The Ionian Sea, whose name Arrius garbles, takes its name from the most famous figure from mythology to have crossed it, Io. She and Arrius, Catullus suggests, both have a knack for altering the names of places as they pass through them.¹⁹³ One might be tempted to adduce as well the difficulty in

¹⁹¹ It is not difficult to imagine a Roman squirming uncomfortably at a particularly insipid pun, much in the way English speakers wince or groan at obvious, or even unobvious puns. Plautus was quite fond punning, as Fontaine (2010) demonstrates. In fact, were it not difficult to accept *Hionios* as a stand in for *χιονέους* for the reasons discussed above, such a pun is quite in line with Roman practice. Catullus, however, eschews the obvious joke in favor for a subtler and more erudite one.

¹⁹² See p. 92, n. 178 above.

¹⁹³ Io, of course, did Arrius two better by naming the Bosphorus and Euboea as well.

speech that the two share—Arrius because of his mistakes in pronunciation, Io because she has been rendered mute by her transformation into a cow—but the motif of Io’s silence seems to be entirely Ovidian.¹⁹⁴ However, the phrase *Ionios fluctus* that begins line 11, has the makings of an epic collocation, and in fact only appears outside of c. 84 in high Latin epic. Vergil uses it with Polyphemus’ vain attempts to reach Aeneas as they flee Sicily;¹⁹⁵ Lucan at the beginning of *Bellum Civile* 3.¹⁹⁶ It is highly unlikely that either Vergil or Lucan is quoting Catullus, and an exactly equivalent expression in Greek occurs only in fragment of Hesiod.¹⁹⁷ If Catullus is quoting another poem, then his source is not available to us. However, a lost epyllion by the name *Io* was written by Catullus’ friend and literary peer Calvus, which must have dealt at least in cursory fashion with the appellative impact Io had on the geography of the Mediterranean.¹⁹⁸ Unfortunately, because our best guess at how Calvus might have discussed the Ionian Sea can only be hypothetical, so too must any connection between Calvus’ *Io* and the *Ionios fluctus* of Vergil and Lucan.¹⁹⁹ Some support is given to such a hypothesis by Catullus’ naming of

¹⁹⁴ *Met.* 1.583ff.

¹⁹⁵ *nec potis Ionios fluctus aequare sequendo*. “Nor was he a match for the Ionian waves with his pursuit.” *Aen* 3.671.

¹⁹⁶ *omnis in Ionios spectabat nauita fluctus* “Every sailor looked towards the Ionian waves” (3.3).

¹⁹⁷ Ἴόνιον δ’ ἀνὰ κύμα φέρων Γαδειρόθεν ἄξει “...shall lead from Gadir up along the Ionian wave...” From West & Merkelbach’s *Fragmenta Hesiodica*, fr. 372 line 10.

¹⁹⁸ It would be unsurprising, in fact, if Calvus paid a good deal of attention to this motif of the Io myth. Place names, especially variants of place names and the sources of those variants, appear to have been a popular topic among the neoterics. This

¹⁹⁹ What we can discuss, however, at least to some extent, is how later poets accessed and repurposed material from the epyllia of the neoterics for their own projects. Lyne’s commentary to *Ciris* finds much there that he suspects to have been modeled on or derived from known but lost epyllia, namely Cinna’s *Zmyrna* (about which Catullus speaks very flatteringly in c. 95) and Calvus’ *Io*. In both instances Lyne can use the parallel scenes in *Metamorphoses* as something of a control, but neither *Metamorphoses* nor *Ciris* can provide absolute evidence for a Calvan allusion in c. 84. Our best evidence for an attested point of contact between Catullus and Calvus from the text of *Ciris* is at 184, *fertur et horribili praeceps impellitur oestro*, “carried and pressed headlong by the dreadful goad.” Lyne follows Sudhaus (1907) in his reasoning that this line must be, at least in part, derived from *Io* (p. 177). Certainly *horribili oestro* would be at home in an epyllion about Io, but *fertur* and *horribili* also recall 84.10, *affertur nuntius horribilis*. If we could be

the *sacrae undae Setrachi* at c. 95.5, which, it would seem, establishes at least a parallel for recalling the hydrological references of a friends' poems.²⁰⁰ At any rate, it appears at least possible that the capstone to Catullus' satire involved an implied comparison, accomplished through poetic intertext, of Arrius' weak attempts at *latinitas* to Calvus' polished achievement of it. This would be made all the more apparent if, as I have suggested, as Arrius recounted his travels to Catullus and his friends, he intoned the chimerical "Ἰονίους *fluctus*," with the comically jingly pronunciation [i:oníu:s 'flu:ktu:s].

Such a reading adds a depth to the dialect joke of c. 84 that is absent when the Catullus' criticism consist in aspiration alone, but even without the help of a learned literary allusion (made doubly appealing to Catullus by its reference to a close friend and like-minded poet), the arrangement of Arrius' faults takes on a new significance when it is viewed in light of the conventions of describing errors of speech that will develop more concretely in later generations. Whether Catullus designed c. 84 to imitate specific grammatical texts or the remembered curriculum of his own education, a reading of the poem that can trace an interdependence between the faults described is a more powerful piece of invective. Moreover such a demonstration not only of the correct way to use Latin, but also of the correct way to prescribe against its misuse, provides Catullus' poetic voice in c. 84 with absolute authority to condemn and criticize Arrius' speech. It becomes an effective statement of *latinitas*, and provides at least the skeleton of a definition that seems very much in line with the character of other authors' attempts to describe the concept. In contrast to the implied definition of an aspect of *latinitas* that we

certain that Calvus used the phrase *Ionios fluctus*, this coincidence of vocabulary would be more convincing, but as it stands we can merely speculate.

²⁰⁰ For this reference see chapter 2 p. 124 n. 262 and chapter 3 p. 192 n. 398.

can glean from Catullus' use of foreign diction, the explicit prescription of certain features of non-standard or hyper-correct Latin dialects, alongside any additional commentary on literary tastes that is gained if Calvus' lost epyllion is at stake, articulates clearly how Catullus felt about at least one aspect of *latine loqui*.

Conclusions

Naturally, Catullus does not at any point declare openly his stance on or his definition of *latinitas*, even though it is clear from *testimonia* that the topic was in vogue during his lifetime. For this reason, we are ultimately able only to speculate to what extent he intended his mediations of language to participate actively in the contemporary dialogue. And yet, we should be more surprised if he had not vocalized, however faintly, his personal views on the subject. Catullus' poetry begins and ends with the social surroundings that he and his friends so carefully constructed. Indeed, beyond the mere social implications of defining a standard for language—both poetic language and language more broadly—the New Poetry of Catullus and his peers was, in a sense, predicated on a kind of linguistic engagement. As self-styled heirs and continuators of the highly philological poetry composed by the professional scholars of Hellenistic Greece—men who edited, standardized, and explicated texts written in obsolete dialects; who first attempted to describe their own language in vaguely scientific terms; whose poetry adopted and recreated artificially the components of their literary predecessors—the *poetae novi* would have been poor imitators indeed if they had not injected into their

poetry some demonstration of their interaction with and commentary on the language in which they wrote.

For Catullus, this interaction is usually subtle, but I have shown in this chapter that, however faint these echoes of grammatical commentary may be, they are a persistent aspect of his poetic craft. Though he does not mince his words when he attacks the non-standard pronunciations of Arrius in c. 84, the undercurrent of conventional prescription is a subtext that is only recognized with a discerning eye and a familiarity of the tradition, a tradition whose primary directive was to outline what it meant to speak or write *latine*, “in Latin”. Arrius’ hypercorrect forms show that the rules could be hard to follow, but, nevertheless, the rules existed; moreover, the rules had enforcers ranging from skilled amateurs to avowed professionals. Catullus, like Cicero and Caesar and Varro and Quintilian, places himself on this spectrum. By defining at least in part the opposite of *latinitas*—i.e. what errors marked a speaker’s failures to adhere to *latinitas*—he takes a stance on an issue that is both topical and subject to interpretation; he shows that he subscribed, on some level, to the idea that there was a standard of Latinity, and that effective writers and speakers were capable of accomplishing it.

Likewise, he betrays his personal attitudes towards language in his lexical choices and the subtle commentary that often accompanies them. Words and expressions that are frequent in the spoken idiom of everyday life must undergo careful arbitration and tempering as they are brought into Catullus’ rehearsed poetic medium, into his own *latinitas*, even when this process is not expressly noted. Foreign diction is admitted when appropriate, though the channels and procedures through which this language earns its

citizenship are often nuanced and complex, and so they are easily overlooked. I have demonstrated, I think, that these processes can be documented, and that they reflect in key ways the practice of neologism and importation that occurred more explicitly at other points in Latin literature. Though Catullus does not utilize the idiomatic expression *civitatem d(on)are* when he grants a foreign word entry into his own poetic register, he frequently embeds the process of naturalization into his poetry, and in doing so makes it clear that there was a process, and that adoption does not occur without consideration.

This species of subtle linguistic commentary is in no place more telling than when Catullus adopts a Grecism, no doubt because of the special relationship that existed between Greek and Latin. Grecisms, as we have seen, come in the form of individual words, syntactical constructions, and even cultural institutions. I have shown that these various types of Grecism are treated by Catullus similarly, and that each of them can inform in subtle ways his poetic program and its specific attention to *latinitas*. The special attention that *latinitas* gives to Greek should hardly surprise us, as Catullus' poetry, indeed all of Latin literature, owes a significant debt to Greek literary forms and models. Nevertheless, diction is not the only arena in which Catullus assumes a stake in Latin's ongoing process of acculturating itself to a Greek archetype. It is perhaps the most basic point of contact between Latin and Greek, but a more ambitious project, such as the translation of a poem of Callimachus at c. 66, will demonstrate even more completely this complex and constantly evolving relationship, and where in this

relationship Catullus and his and his peers' grammatical poetry lie. Translation will be the focus of the following chapter.

CHAPTER 2: GRAMMATICAL TRANSLATION

mitto haec expressa tibi carmina Battiadae

“I am sending you this translated poetry of Battus’ son.” c. 65.15-6

With these words, straddling a distich in a poetic epistle to a certain Hortalus, Catullus introduces c. 66, a translation of Callimachus’ *Βερενίκης Πλόκαμος*, “the Lock of Berenice,” a piece of court poetry on the catasterization of a lock of hair dedicated by the Egyptian queen on the event of her husband’s safe and successful return from a military campaign in Syria.²⁰¹ In c. 65 we learn from Catullus that the poem that follows is meant to fulfill in part a promise that he can no longer keep. The grief of his brother’s death is still too great for him “to display the sweet produce of the Muses”, *dulcis Musarum expromere fetus* (65.3), and so a translation will have to suffice. This translation is complex in its relation to the original, but relatively faithful, as far as can be told by comparison with the surviving fragments of the Greek. In it is revealed a translator who is keenly attuned to the poetic sensibilities of the source author and to the language in which that author wrote. This chapter will consider Catullus the translator, and how this avatar of the poet is also indebted to a philological tradition whose roots lie in the *ars grammatica*.

²⁰¹ The poem closes the fourth and final book of Callimachus’ *Aitia*. As will become evident immediately below, Callimachus’ version has reached us only in pieces. Scholia, the *Etymologicum Genuinum*, and a partial diegesis of the poem have provided some of these fragments, but the largest proportion of the text has been reconstructed from papyrus remains discovered in the last century at Oxyrhynchus and edited and restored over several decades by a number of scholars and especially by Rudolf Pfeiffer. His text has since become the starting point for any serious treatment of the fragments. We will discuss below the implications and complications of his restorations below.

The very act of translation, because of its concern with language, obviously verges on the territory of the professional grammarian, but it is also an event of cultural significance. Attitudes towards translation are as subjective and as culturally mediated as the authors who translate, but in all instances there must be an intimacy on the part of the translator with both the source and target language. The character of this intimacy depends very much both on the underlying dynamic relationship between the source and target languages as well as on the intentions of the author performing the translation. The translating author is in a unique position to act as a sort of linguistic ambassador to the language from which he translates, admitting and preserving as he sees fit elements from the source language, even supplementing when he chooses, but denying or modulating certain elements' entry when they are discordant or incompatible with the target language. Often this role and the decisions it requires of its actor are informed by purely linguistic concerns, but cultural considerations shape and affect the translation as well.²⁰² In a sense such authority is inherent as well in the role of the *grammaticus*, one of whose professional responsibilities is mediating the correctness of his language in similar terms. However, in the translator we can also see put to use the entire breadth of technical skills and resources—lexica, commentaries and scholia, e.g.—that were both the products and the tools of the *grammaticus*.

²⁰² Somewhat surprisingly, the field of translation studies and translation theory are relatively recent voices in the broader dialogue of ancient and classical studies. For a general treatment of the theoretical approaches to translation see especially Venuti (1995), though his study is interested especially in translations into English (i.e., modern translation, beginning from the 17th c.), and his treatment of Latin authors (such as Catullus and Cicero) focuses on their transfer into English, rather than on their own engagement with translation. For theoretical perspectives more immediately relevant to Catullus, cf. McElduff and Sciarrino, eds. (2011).

Below we will consider how translators from Greek into Latin mediate language in ways that recall the *grammaticus*, and we will attempt to place Catullus' translation of Callimachus' *Coma Berenices* within that tradition, but before we undertake a survey of the phenomenon of translation as grammar some remarks on the special case of Greek to Latin translation are necessary. The earliest literary translations in Latin were unsurprisingly derived from Greek sources. In fact both by the ancients and by modern scholarship translations are said to stand at the very birth of a distinctly Latin literature. If we trust Cicero's claims, Latin's literary tradition begins with Livius Andronicus, a bilingual freedman of Tarentine origin, who produced translations of Greek tragedies and of the *Odyssey* in the middle of the 3rd century BCE.²⁰³ Cicero's account leaves somewhat open to interpretation whether it was the tragedies or the epic that came first, though he places special emphasis on the stage production as an inaugural moment in the history of Latin. In either case, translations marked the birth of literature in the Latin language, and Livius' can be regarded not only as the earliest pieces of Latin literature, but among our earliest examples of literary translation—an aesthetic translation as opposed to a merely practical one—in Western literature.²⁰⁴ His *Odusia*, in which he not

²⁰³ His stage production of an unnamed tragedy, presumably a translation of a Greek original, is regarded by Cicero as the humble origin of Latin's native literature. Cf. *Brutus* 71-2: *nam et Odyssea Latina est sic tamquam opus aliquod Daedali et Livianae fabulae non satis dignae quae iterum legantur. atqui hic Livius qui primus fabulam C. Claudio Caeci filio et M. Tuditano consulibus docuit anno ipso ante quam natus est Ennius, post Romam conditam autem quarto decimo et quingentesimo*, "for [before Ennius] there was a Latin *Odyssey*, like some work of Daedalus [i.e. unpolished] and some of Livius's dramatic works, hardly worth a second read. But the same Livius was first to put on a dramatic performance, during the consulships of Gaius Claudius, son of Caecus, and Marcus Tuditanus in the year just before Ennius was born, 514 AUC (240 BCE)."

²⁰⁴ Possanza's blunt, "Livius had neither predecessor nor precedent," echoes nearly a century later Leo's equally forceful, "[Livius] hat den Weg gebahnt, indem er die Kunst des Übersetzens erfand, für Rom und die Welt," (Possanza, 2004 p. 46; Leo 1912, p.88). There is perhaps some truth to this sentiment, but it is at any rate a more subjective statement than the rhetoric of either scholar cares to admit. Internal evidence seems to confirm that the Torah portion of the Septuagint can be dated to the 3rd c. BCE, which would

only faithfully rendered the content of Homer's epic into idiomatic Latin, but also converted the Greek hexameters of *Odyssey* into the Italic Saturnian meter, is of particular interest here, inasmuch as an epic translation is a somewhat better analogue to c. 66 than are tragedies.²⁰⁵ We will discuss momentarily the specifics of this translation and the tradition it established, but suffice it to say, it is no accident that the works identified as the starting point of Latin's national literature were translation.

Literary translations such as *Odusia* and c. 66 are visible manifestations of an ongoing process of cultural transfer that was hardly limited to literature.²⁰⁶ Rome and the Latin language had from our earliest written attestations a relationship with Greek culture and language that could be at times reverent, emulative, or hostile.²⁰⁷ Therefore, to convey Greek literature into Latin idiom was an act with considerable social and cultural consequence, and for that reason we must always keep in mind that it meant something more for a Greek text to be rendered into Latin than it would for, say, a Portuguese poem

make this translation from Hebrew to Koine Greek at the very least contemporary with Livius' activity. It is certainly debatable whether the act of bringing a religious text into a new language, which has at least alongside any artistic goals some practical interests, ought to be regarded as a species of translation wholly different from a strictly literary translation, but we can, at any rate, count Livius' *Odusia* and his Latin versions of Attic tragedies among the earliest large-scale translations of which we know in the Mediterranean World.

²⁰⁵ It also appears that Livius' approach to the two genres, epic and drama, were somewhat different. His program of translation in the tragedies, which were naturally intended for the stage, was somewhat freer and more given to adaptation than it in the Latin *Odyssey* which the author had an ulterior intention of using as a teaching text in his classroom (cf. Horace *Ep.* 2.1.69ff).

²⁰⁶ It included as well other artistic media and various social institutions and cultural practices. Indeed, the very tradition of Latin *grammatica* is a kind of calque, a translation, of a Greek model. The effect that the dissimilarity of the two languages had on how the Latin system worked has already been discussed in part in chapter one.

²⁰⁷ This paradox is not expeditiously reconciled in a footnote. Ancient authors themselves were aware of the seemingly dichotomous status of Greek culture, being both the property of a people subjugated and brought into the Roman hegemony by force as well as a cultural touchstone for the subjugators. Horace's oft repeated comment on the relationship, *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis / intulit agresti Latio*, "Captured Greece made captive her savage conqueror and brought the arts to wild Latium (*Ep.* 2.1.156-7), is effective, and demonstrates that even centuries after the importation of Greek culture into Rome began there persisted an uneasy awareness of the irony that a subject people could exercise such influence on their captors

to be brought into English, even when an artistic recreation is the goal of the translator. In the latter example, one may reasonably expect the poetic aspects of the original to be conveyed to the fullest possible extent in the target language, but there exists no persistent dynamic of appropriation and emulation between the two cultures, source and target, involved, and so the act itself is fundamentally different. In translations of Greek to Latin, however, we must consider as well the cultural implications and that underlying dynamic of the relationship between the cultures that speak the two languages.²⁰⁸ By selecting a Greek text for translation and bringing that text in Latin, an author takes part in this broader cultural phenomenon. Thus, the act of translation of Greek to Latin, while in many cases an act that is deeply personal and individual for the translator, nevertheless becomes a culturally significant event, and both the process and the product of that translation serve as witnesses to this ongoing cultural exchange. Such considerations render the study of Catullus as translator, as well as the authors that I will treat before turning to c. 66, a valuable endeavor with implications beyond mere appreciation the poet's idiosyncratic interactions with language.

Section I: Livius Andronicus and the tradition of grammatical translation

With the cultural aspects of translation in mind it is perhaps less than surprising that later generations of Latin authors would place Livius Andronicus' translations, among them *Oduvia*, at the beginning of their national literature. Livius' translation was a monumental enterprise, as *Oduvia* would come to represent the beginnings of a literature

²⁰⁸ See especially Hutchinson 2013. His work treats the dynamic in all of its facets (so, beyond but including literary appropriation) from the Roman perspective, and focuses on what he calls "the effect of Greek literature on Latin."

that, in a sense, wished to regard itself as a continuation of the Greek tradition.²⁰⁹ The process of assimilation through which the art of Homer's poem was brought into a new mode of expression required of Livius acumen of a highly philological kind. His translation would provide for later generations of translators from Latin to Greek a template of how an exegetical, a grammatical translation is accomplished: with sensitivity not only to arriving at lexical and semantic equivalences, but also to reproducing the more recondite aspects of language— register, etymology, morphology and syntax, even exegetical commentary—and to facilitating for the reader an experience at least approximate to the interchange between reader and text in the source language.²¹⁰ We need look no further for evidence of this than the first line of Livius' *Odusia: virum mihi Camena insece versutum*. There is little that deviates from Homer's opening to the *Odyssey*, Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον... Word order is only altered in one place, when the imperative verb and the vocative noun are reversed;²¹¹ Homer's ἔννεπε is neatly captured by similarly formed and metrically equivalent compound verb *insece*,²¹²

²⁰⁹ There is some disagreement as to how much of *Odyssey* Livius actually translated. It is true that the books that *Odusia* comprises number only 17, seven fewer than the 24 of Homer's text, though it should be noted that the division of Homer's epics in books named by the 24 letters of the Greek alphabet was not the work of the author, but that of a later editor, traditionally said to be Aristarchus (*floruit* early 2nd century BCE, so earlier than Livius), and this disparity in "books" should not by itself preclude a faithful translation of the entire work.

²¹⁰ I have termed this species of translation "grammatical" here and will use this collocation below as shorthand for any such translation that incorporates alongside the transfer of semantic data from one language to another any of the components listed above under the heading "the more recondite aspects of language."

²¹¹ Professor Farrell alerts me to a minor detail that ought not to go unremarked: this small adjustment yields a Saturnian of which the first half begins with the poem's three principal actors, protagonist, poet and muse.

²¹² Cf. Goldberg (1993 p. 22). The forms are also cognate, though it is not certain that we can credit such an observation to Livius. It is also senseless to press too far the literary pedigree of either word at the time of composition. *insece*, coming from one of the earliest passages of Latin literature qua literature, cannot be shown to have had precedence as a word of marked literary importance any more than we can postulate that Homer's ἔννεπε, which, naturally, is untraceable before Homer, enjoyed similar status. It is likely, however, that Livius recognized the poetic implication of ἔννεπε in subsequent Greek literature, where

and Livius substitutes a native Latin divinity for Homer's Μοῦσα, and by doing so adds an immediate touch of Romanness to his Greek subject.²¹³ Each of these shows thoughtful and careful consideration on the part of the translator.

Livius' *versutus* lacks the intensifying prefix of the original, but is nevertheless an effective rendering. It is a calque, in a sense, since πολύτροπος is derived from τρέπειν "to turn" just as *versutus* comes from Latin *vertere*, but the semantic correspondence is more significant than this alone.²¹⁴ First of all, aside from its basic meaning, *vertere* can be used, as its English counterpart, of turning one thing into another, the most fundamental principle in the act of translation.²¹⁵ By his use of *versutus* Livius demonstrates both that he understood the important role that the first line played in defining the scope and direction of the entire work, as well as a sensitivity to the impression that this word would give; Odysseus' wiles became proverbial and πολύτροπος became bound to and indissolubly associated with his character. Quite

the verb is confined almost entirely to epic and tragedy, and that he it was in light of such an observation that he sought a Latin counterpart that could capture the lofty, solemn register of the highest literature.

Cf. as well Sheets (1981), who sees a dialect gloss in *insece*. He argues that a Latin formation ought to preserve the labiovelar *qu* in place of *c* (and so read **inseque*), and that the absence of *qu* indicates that Livius modelled his formation on an Umbrian form. In this case Livius would have recognized in ἔννεπε an Aeolicism and sought to recreate the feature of the dialect gloss in Homer by analogy. Kearns (1990), however, shows that elsewhere in Latin *c* replaces *qu*, most notably before a vocalic *u* (as in *secutus* for expected **sequutus*), and that forms analogical to Livius' exist elsewhere in native Latin words (such as Cato's *insecenda* cited by Gellius at NA (18.9.5)). Regardless of the specifics, however, it seems obvious that Livius' word choice is more significant than the mere semantic equivalence of the Greek and Latin verbs.

²¹³ The label "a touch of Romanness" is for myself and for others a frequent but pleonastic crutch on which to lean when trying to explain away difficulties with parsing the precise motivation behind some of Catullus', or Livius' for that matter, decisions in his translation—how could the act of rendering Greek into the language of Rome *not* add a "touch of Romanness"?—but this is a deflection I have tried to avoid and will address in my treatment of c. 66 below.

²¹⁴ The assonance of the line's bookends *virum* and *versutum* is noteworthy too, though this aural effect is an innovation not found in Homer's opening line.

²¹⁵ *vertere* is in fact the expected term for the act of translation in early Latin. Cf. the prologue to Plautus' *Trinummus*: *Plautus vertit barbare* (v. 19). Hinds (1995) finds this layer of *versutus*, a self-aware acknowledgement of the process of translation, especially programmatic of the poem, occurring as it does in the initial line.

immediately, then, we are confronted with the author's declaration that he is engaged in a new kind of turning, a transformation of one language into another. *versutus*, however, contains additional and significant semantic information. While it is derived from *vertere*, the adjective only preserves in general usage the meaning of turning in a metaphorical sense, and actually comes much closer to the "clever/wily" register underlying Homer's form than it does the literal and superficial "much turned about/traveled."²¹⁶ There was a lively debate even before Livius' time among Greek scholars as to which sense of the word was intended by Homer. By using a term that aligns better with the transferred than the literal sense of the original, Livius has engaged in this discussion, and made *versutum*, as Possanza puts it, "an exegetical comment on a word whose meaning was contested as early as the fourth century B.C."²¹⁷ However, the exterior resemblance of the two words is hardly made opaque; thus, Possanza continues, the word, "performs the functions of both translation and interpretive gloss."²¹⁸ In other words, Livius' translation evinces from its outset aspects of philology and exegetical commentary that go beyond its merely replacing words from one language with those from another.

This is not the only instance where Livius seems to admit an ulterior exegetical program into his work. Elsewhere in Livius' *Odyssia* as well we can detect a similar motive underlying the nuanced alterations of his translation. His treatment of Greek patronyms is especially telling. Because no exactly parallel form existed in Latin, Livius

²¹⁶ Vergil's *multum...iactatus* of *Aen.* 1.3 is a closer rendering of the surface definition of Homer's word.

²¹⁷ Possanza 2004 p. 53.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.* He goes on: "Livius treated the text of the *Odyssey* not as an artifact which required reverential preservation in Latin but as a living organism interacting with its new environment, still capable of change and adaptation, its past history creating new possibilities for the future," (p. 54).

was forced either to circumlocute or to neologize.²¹⁹ Thus ὁ πάτερ ἡμετερε Κρονίδη “our father, the son of Kronos” is brought into Latin as *pater noster*, *Saturni filie* with almost no effect on the meaning.²²⁰ However, in other instances, Livius goes somewhat further than simply paraphrasing a Greek construction with no equivalent in Latin. Fragment 5 reads *neque enim te oblitus sum Laertie noster*, where *Laertius* seems to calque Λαερτιάδης. This is a curious decision. The form he has used is of the possessive adjective, which is not itself especially strange.²²¹ However, none of the lines of Homer that have been identified as the source for Livius’ line contains the form Λαερτιάδης. It seems, then, that Livius is innovating in this instance. Whether it is, as Possanza suggests, for “stylistic effect” is not appreciable from the single line.²²² Other instances of these patronymic verses where there is dissonance between the source text and Livius’ version shed more light on his intentions. Fragment 28 relates a piece of the episode at Calypso’s house: *apud nimpham Atlantis filiam Calipsonam*.²²³ This corresponds to *Od.* 4.557 νύμφης ἐν μεγάροισι Καλυψοῦς, “in the halls of the nymph Calypso.” Here again Livius has circumvented Latin’s lack of a morphological patronymic with a simple noun phrase featuring the father in the genitive, but here it is unclear why such an explanation was needed, when Homer did not see a need for a specific mention of lineage. Mariotti

²¹⁹ It would not be until years later that Latin authors were emboldened to hybridize native Latin names with Greek

-ides. The form becomes standard for referencing especially the descendants of Aeneas. Cf. Accius’ praetexta *Aeneadae vel Decius*; Lucretius *DRN* 1.1; Vergil *Aen.* passim; also Catullus’ *Battiadae*, “descendant of Battus”, which he uses at c. 65.16 to refer to Callimachus.

²²⁰ *Od.* 1.45; *Odusia* 19. I have used the ordering of the fragments proposed by Mariotti (1952) throughout.

²²¹ Ennius will later use this form with great regularity to evoke the Homeric patronymic.

²²² Possanza p. 51. This sort of stylistic flourish as a kind of compensatory gesture towards the epic tradition will be discussed in detail below with regards to c. 66.

²²³ The form *Calipsonam*, of course, represents an early statement on the proper mode of Latin transliteration of Greek words. This name and its other possible Latin forms (and the proponents of those forms) we discussed in the introduction.

suggests that Livius conflated the source line of the narrative context, 4.777, with other instances in the *Odyssey* where Calypso is, in fact, called Ἄτλαντος θυγάτηρ.²²⁴ A similar conflation seems to occur at fragment 10, <venit> *Mercurius cumque eo filius Latonas*. This appears to translate Ἑρμείας, ἦλθεν δὲ ἄναξ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων, during the public mocking of Mars and Venus caught *in flagrante*, but, again, the patronymic is conspicuously absent in Homer's original. Instead Livius has replaced Homer's existing epithet with one of his own. Λητοῦς υἱός does occur twice in the *Iliad* (1.9 and 16.849), but it is absent from the *Odyssey*. From these examples it becomes clear that Livius felt no need to adhere to a one-to-one, line-to-line equivalence with his source text, and indeed was comfortable accessing language and formulae from elsewhere in the Homeric corpus as well.²²⁵

A third example will perhaps shed some light on what Livius' goal may have been in taking these liberties. Fragment 12 presumably refers to Demodocus: *nam divina Monetas filia docuit*. The equivalent lines in the *Odyssey*, οὐνεκ' ἄρα σφέας / οἶμας Μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε (8.480-1), are again free from genealogical qualification. What is especially significant with this instance, however, is that, in establishing his muse as the daughter of Moneta (Greek Mnemosyne), Livius has introduced a mythological datum from outside Homer. Only in Hesiod is the parentage of the Muses first assigned to Mnemosyne and Zeus. Indeed, Livius already has shown by his treatment of Apollo's

²²⁴ Mariotti (1986 p. 33). The formula appears at *Od.* 1.54 and 7.245.

²²⁵ This sort of opportunistic use of the source *author*, rather than use confined only to the source *text* hints at the *contaminatio* mode of translation and adaption that is characteristic especially of Roman New Comedy. Terence in particular was accused of cheating by importing elements, scenes and characters from one Menander play into his adaptation of another. He defends and espouses the practice expressly in the prologue to *Andria*, citing as precedents Naevius, Plautus and Ennius (none of whom we can be certain from extant material did actually engage in this sort of activity). For *contaminatio* in Terence see especially Chalmers (1957), Beare (1959), and Guastella (1988).

epithet, *filius Latonas*, that he was unafraid to allow both of Homer's surviving epics to have a voice in his translation. It is therefore possible that he extended this allowance to accounts beyond Homer as well. Possanza attributed this allowance to Livius' stylistic freedom, and surely this is true, but the recurrence of this freedom in the relatively scant fragments of *Odusia* hints at something else as well. Perhaps Apollo's relationship to Latona had currency, but it seems somewhat less likely that the genealogy of a lesser figure, such as Calypso, would have been readily apparent to a Roman audience.²²⁶ In other words, it can be said that the syncretism of the Greek and Roman pantheons and minor deities, especially as they are represented in literature, was not so complete in the latter parts of the 3rd century BCE as it would be by the age of Classical Latin.²²⁷ A good deal more can be said of Moneta and the Camenae, the latter of whom were concerned with prophecy and arcane lore, as were the Muses, but had not yet acquired the association of their Greek counterparts with literary and artistic inspiration that tied the Muses so closely to the Greek poetic tradition.²²⁸ For the translation of the source text

²²⁶ To this end, perhaps Possanza's "conflation" of the passage translated in the extant fragment of Livius, fr. 28, is in truth simply a helpful repetition, provided by Livius for an audience that would not know to associate the nymph Calypso with Atlas. Livius then, presumably, preserved the genealogical information in the original locus as well.

²²⁷ For a discussion of the process by which Latin speaking people syncretized their gods with the Greek pantheon based on interaction with the Greek speaking peoples of Magna Graecia (as well as with the other Italic peoples, especially the Etruscans), see Wissowa (1902, general pp. 44ff.; specifically nymphs pp. 182ff). The conflation is detectable very early in Rome's history, and Wissowa notes that "um die Wende von Königszeit und Republik ein besonders starker Strom griechischer Einflüsse von Unteritalien aus in Rom Eingang gefunden haben muss," beginning with the Cumean Sybill and Apollo, the earliest temple for whose worship is datable to 433 BCE (1902 p. 45-6). This is truer for the principal gods than for minor, local deities, like nymphs, whose appearance in Greek literature was undoubtedly more influential in their recognition in Rome than any remote worship or cult could have been.

²²⁸ Waszink 1956. Livius appears to have created this equivalence, both of the Greek Muses to the Roman Camenae and by extension the parallel in their parentage, just as Ennius famously rejected the Camenae in a line of *Annales* in favor of the *Musae*. This passage, Latin's first mention of Muses, has somewhat wishfully been imagined as the opening of the poem: *Musae, quae pedibus magnum pulsatis Olympum*, "Muses who strike with your feet great Olympus," though Skutsch (1968) doubts with good reason that the combination of bare vocative and relative clause are an appropriate means of introducing a fairly radical

into Latin to retain a casual fluency with a foreign mythology, Livius was obligated to provide for his readers these mythological glosses alongside his version, much in the tradition of the Homeric scholia. Livius, however, has artfully and seamlessly woven these explanatory details into his text. The complicated and often conflicting genealogies of Greek deities necessitated explanation that could trace not just the tradition as it had been crystalized in Homer at the beginnings of Greek literature, but also the ongoing progression and evolution of the tradition as altered by later authors. Furthermore, these explanations would have been especially useful and effective as teaching tools, if indeed *Odusia* was intended to serve as a school textbook.²²⁹

However, Livius' attention to the development of this literary tradition does not seem to have been limited to his primary sources. Fränkel points to a fragment of *Odusia* that seems not only to provide explanatory details that Homer's version omitted, but to have drawn these details from a scholiast's notes, supplying the translation with a complete record of existing interpretation. Fragment 11 translates the games of *Odyssey* 8: *nexabant multa inter se flexu nodorum dubio*.²³⁰ The same scene in Homer at 8.378-9 is noticeably different: ὀρχείσθην δὴ ἔπειτα ποτὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ / ταρφέ'

change to Latin poetics (i.e., the relegation of the oracular Camenae to their wooded glens in favor of the patently Greek Musae on patently Greek Olympus). He suggests instead that something more dignified preceded this early line.

²²⁹ The suggestion that such was the purpose of *Odusia* comes from Leo (1913), but it has its skeptics. The *carmina Livi* that Horace mentions at *Ep.* 2.1.69 seems to point to *Odusia*, but the belief that Livius wrote this text for the classroom can only be inferred. When Suetonius counts him as one of the *antiquissimi doctorum* at *DGR* 1.2, but he does not expressly name *Odusia*. Waszink (1972) and Kaster (1995) do not dismiss the possibility that it was used in Livius' classroom, but are judiciously skeptical because of the absence of any confirmation. Kaimio all but takes the assumption as given (1999, p. 202), but it is probably best to remain cautiously unconvinced.

²³⁰ “[Halius and Laodamas] were thoroughly intertwined with an alternating winding of knots.” Warmington marks these words as occurring in two separate lines, hence they are fragments 28 and 29 in his edition, but, given the uncertain character of the Saturnian's limits on syllable count, Mariotti and others have regarded it as a single verse.

ἀμειβομένω.²³¹ In fact, as Fränkel notes, the final two words of Homer appear to have supplied for Livius the entire line, which he supplemented with further information not found in the original text. Fränkel continues: “die beiden Worte, die er so ausführlich wiedergab, sind nicht ganz leicht zu deuten. Um sie zu verstehen, konnte Livius vielleicht einen Homer-kommentar zu Rate ziehen.”²³² Fränkel’s suggestion seems very probable; the first half of the verse *nexabant multa inter se* may very well be a translation of the scholiast’s attempt to describe more clearly the dancing indicated by ταρφέ’ ἀμειβομένω: πυκνῶς πλέκοντες εἰς ἀλλήλους.²³³ The consequence of Fränkel’s observation, then, is that Livius as he prepared his translation consulted a commentary, from which the note preserved in the surviving scholia descends, and, having recognized the utility of the note for giving a complete interpretation of the text, decided to metabolize and incorporate its helpful exegesis into his own work.

Thus we have in a very small sample size three distinct grammatical exercises: an interpretative lexical gloss; commentary on and explication of mythological particulars; and active engagement with and inclusion of an existing exegetical tradition. Such a program, focused as it is on facilitating an interpretation of the text, should hardly surprise, given that Livius was a teacher, and that, by some accounts, his translation of Homer was to serve as a school text. Furthermore this reading of his treatment of the lineages of mythological figures comports very well with the apparent philological

²³¹ “Then did they dance a great deal on the much-nourishing earth, frequently exchanging [the ball].”

²³² H. Fränkel (1932) p. 306.

²³³ “winding frequently between each other.” The note appears in scholium V. The second half of fragment 11, *flexu nodorum dubio*, is neither derived from any existing line of Homer nor from an extant scholiastic comment. Fränkel posits that these words too Livius may have adapted from a scholiast’s gloss that was subsequently lost.

implications of his nuanced rendering of πολύτροπον. *Oduisia*, then, exhibits certain scholastic tendencies that recall the craft of the grammarian as much as they do the poet, and this early precedent had a lasting impact on the translation process of later Latin authors as well. Even in the poet whom later writers regarded as the founder of a distinctly Latin literary tradition, translation of Greek texts into Latin is accomplished with the aid of secondary materials.

Nevertheless, Livius was active nearly two centuries before Catullus. What did grammatical translation look like in the intervening generations? The earliest *entire* Latin texts that we possess surely belong on this continuum, the comedies of Plautus, Greek models taken mostly from Menander and recast for a Roman audience. Yet they stray perhaps too far from the word-for-word or line-by-line approximations that would signal translation in the most restricted sense.²³⁴ Indeed, they are more properly adaptations than translations, though the line between the two was far less defined for a Roman than for us today. Terence's conflation of multiple sources in the structuring of his plays, as I have noted above, recalls in some regard Livius' conflation of Iliadic and Odyssean motifs (along with his incorporation of exegetical commentary), but they involve the combination of entire scenes and characters rather than just words and phrases. For more explicit examples of grammatical translation we are forced to rely on fragmentary evidence. In Ennius' tragedy *Medea*, for instance, Leo detected what may be the traces of

²³⁴ In almost every case the original Greek play is completely unknown to us, though Handley's 1968 publication of papyrus fragments from a play of Menander called *Dis Exapaton* has been shown to correspond to a continuous passage of 68 lines from Plautus' *Bacchides* (494-561) and confirms that Plautus' approach to adaptation was freer, with events rearranged and language rewritten entirely. See Handley (1968) for the fragments and a comparison. Additionally, Gellius at *NA* 2.23 transmits and thus allows us to compare fragments of Menander adapted by Caecilius Statius in his *Plocium*, which show clearly that adaptation, rather than translation, was Caecilius' approach as well.

a translation program that utilized exegetical commentary in the way that Livius did.²³⁵ In the decades immediately before Catullus' brief *floruit*, the evidence for translations, and specifically grammatical translations of the kind that Livius produced in *Odusia*, grows somewhat richer. In some cases only the names of authors and their works remain.²³⁶ In other cases we have at least brief samples of the translation. Leo again suggests that Accius may have allowed a commentary on Euripides *Phoenissae* to influence his translation.²³⁷ Varro Atacinus' translation of Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica* survives only in a handful of fragments comprising some three dozen lines, but there are reasons to believe his otherwise faithful translation was influenced by the remarks of scholiasts.²³⁸ Two works of Gnaeus Matius, whose life we can only date to some period before Varro who quotes him, are known only from fragments: one, titled *Mimiambi*, is modelled on Herodas' work of the same name (and perhaps in part translated from pieces of the Greek original that we no longer possess) and is rich with neologism and

²³⁵ Leo (1913) noticed that Ennius appears to correct Euripides' use of *hysteron proteron* when he reorders the events at the beginning of his translation of *Medea*, of which some 43 lines, including the first nine, are preserved in *Rhetoricum ad Herennium* 2.34. Leo thus suggested that with his emendations Ennius was reacting to a critical tradition that had long noted Euripides' relaxed approach to chronology in the nurse's opening lament (1913 pp 190ff). The philologist and glossarist Timachidas of Rhodes made clear in his hypothesis to the Greek original that Euripides had utilized the device of *hysteron proteron*, though, as a contemporary of Ennius, it is hardly a forgone conclusion that his commentary was available when Ennius produced his translation. Leo reasons, however, that Timachidas would not have been the first reader to have noticed the reversal of chronology, and that Ennius was aware of and influenced by the criticism of other such commentators. Drabkin (1937) and Courtney (1993) accept Leo's postulation as highly probable.

²³⁶ Such seems to be the case for a poem called *Empedoclea* written by a certain Sallustius. Cicero recommends the poem, possibly with tongue in cheek, to his brother at *Ad. Fam.* 2.9.3, telling him that it is a more difficult read than Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*. See Hamblenne (1981) for speculation as to its shape and relation to other poems called *Empedoclea*.

²³⁷ Leo (1913 p. 395). Only about 20 verses of Accius' *Phoenissae* have survived, among which are the prologue preserved by Priscian at *GL* 3.424, where Leo suspects Accius translated in accordance with "dem kritischen Bedenken eines alexandrischen Kommentators."

²³⁸ Courtney (1993) allows this possibility, suggesting that intervening sources or a scholiast's suggestions are responsible for some of the deviations from the original, though allows the possibility that Varro's late acquaintance with Greek—he is not supposed to have learned it until he was nearly 40—may be to blame for some of his misfirings.

etymological play;²³⁹ his translation of the *Iliad*, Courtney notes, appears at points to expand Homer's original text with exegetical material of the sort that Livius used in *Odusia*.²⁴⁰ Almost wherever we find a translation of a Greek original into Latin we can detect a degree of engagement with some kind of scholarly apparatus.

Several aspects of grammatical translation in Cicero's version of Aratus' *Phaenomena* have enjoyed a long history of scholarly attention. Already in the 17th century the Dutch humanist Hugo Grotius postulated in his edition of Aratus' original and its Latin imitations that Cicero had access to certain commentaries on the *Phaenomena*.²⁴¹ These aided him both in reading the Greek and rendering equivalents in Latin and in producing a version that would be accessible to a Latin audience.²⁴² Relatively more recent work by German scholars of the 19th and early 20th centuries has tested this hypothesis. Just as Aratus did, Cicero errs frequently with his astronomical data, and so scholars have reasoned that it is unlikely that he consulted, or perhaps simply that he did not make much use of Hipparchus' commentary to *Phaenomena*.²⁴³ But

²³⁹ Gellius held him and his learning in high regard, and cites among other usages a coinage, *recentatur*, that, according to Gellius, was meant to calque Greek ἀνανεοῦται “is renewed” (NA 15.25.1). Calques are perhaps the most basic type of translations, but their role in Latin literature, and specifically their role in Catullus' poetry, is the concern of the previous chapter.

²⁴⁰ Courtney (1993 99-100). Varro quotes a hexameter of Matius, *obsceni interpretes funestique ominis auctor* (DLL 7.96), “the interpreter and **cause** of an inauspicious and macabre omen”, which, according to Courtney, appears not only to translate *Iliad* 1.106, μάντι κακῶν, “seer of evils”, but also to incorporate a scholiast's gloss: οἱ δυστυχοῦντες τοὺς προεφηκότας ὡς αἰτίους μισοῦσιν (Erbse i.40.29), “the unfortunate despise those who foretold [evil] as though they were its **cause**.”

²⁴¹ Grotius notes at *Aratea* fr. 19 (Ewbank) an instance in which Cicero appears to follow the suggestion of πολλοὶ τῶν γραμματικῶν whom the scholiast mentions. The fragment in question was already suspect because it does not seem to correspond to any part of the *Phaenomena*.

²⁴² Cicero's interest in Aratus was in part due to the lack of astronomical texts in Latin, and to the relative deficiency of the language for discussing scientifically the movements of stars and planets, a point to which I will give fuller treatment below.

²⁴³ Hipparchus' commentary to the *Phaenomena* of Aratus (and to some extent to the prose treatise of Eudoxus on which Aratus' poem is modelled) represents our earliest complete piece of ancient scholarship, but it is not necessarily characteristic of the practice. Whereas other commentaries appear to have praised the poetics of *Phaenomena*—and no doubt its reputation in Greece contributed to its appeal at Rome well

Hipparchus himself tells us that his is not the first commentary to Aratus' poem. Some of these earlier commentaries are known to us. Attalus of Rhodes produced one shortly before Hipparchus (who cites him), which survives in fragmentary form, and Maybaum identified its influence in numerous passages of Cicero's translation.²⁴⁴ In a 2nd century BCE commentary of Boethus of Sidon, *Phaenomena* is divided into three parts, the last of which bore the name Προγνώσεις διὰ σημείων, a subsection heading that, Maass notes, seems to anticipate Cicero's own designation of the second half of his translation as *Prognostica*.²⁴⁵

There are other scholarly flourishes as well, which demonstrate not just that Cicero made use of available scholastic materials, but even aimed, in a sense, to provide comments and glosses of his own. This is especially the case in the numerous instances where Cicero has sought to render a Greek name or concept into Latin, or to provide a familiar Latin name in place of a less accessible Greek designation, and he is often unafraid of paraphrasing Aratus' Greek as he brings it into Latin.²⁴⁶ However, in instances such as this Cicero is careful to note the original Greek term alongside the

after Cicero's version—Hipparchus' edition seems to have been less interested in poetic exegesis or textual criticism than in identifying and correcting errors in its astronomy. It is certainly true that some of Aratus' errors are not addressed by Cicero. Van den Bruwaene (1973) argues that Hipparchus' commentary was not available to Cicero at the time he wrote *Aratea*. Bishop (2011) suggests that Cicero's translation was, like the other commentators, more interested in Aratus' poetics than his technical precision, and to this end did not concern himself overly with scientific errors.

²⁴⁴ Maybaum 1889 passim, but especially pp. 14ff.

²⁴⁵ Maass (1892). When this title was first applied to the section of Cicero's translation is debated, but this is unimportant to Maass' hypothesis, which states only that the name *Prognostica* was borrowed from the name given to a section of Aratus' original that only appeared in annotated editions of the poem.

²⁴⁶ This aligns with Cicero's broader approach to translation of Greek elsewhere as well, which he defines at *De Fin.* 3.15: *nec tamen exprimi verbum e verbo necesse erit, ut interpretes indiserti solent, cum sit verbum, quod idem declaret, magis usitatum. equidem soleo etiam quod uno Graeci, si aliter non possum, idem pluribus verbis exponere*, "And yet, a word-for-word translation is not required—such is the habit of an inelegant translator—just because there is familiar [Latin] word that means the same thing. I actually am in the habit of using many words, if I can't do it any other way, to express the same thing Greek authors did with only one word."

Latinization, effectively providing a gloss. For instance, when he introduces a star in the constellation Canis Minor as *Ante-Canis*, so called because it precedes Sirius (the “dog star” of Canis Major) in its movement across the sky, he does not merely calque the Greek name for the star, Προκύων, but with the addition of *Graio Procyon qui nomine fertur*, he makes his translation a learned comment on the original as well.²⁴⁷

Elsewhere Cicero supplements Aratus’ catalogue of constellations and his short mythological excursuses with information not present in the original in a way that recalls not only the manner of exegetical commentaries, but also the Alexandrian practice of explicating mythological minutiae, the so-called Alexandrian footnote; and by doing so it anticipates a mannerism employed by the New Poets’ when treating obscure aspects of mythology. Clausen suggests that his treatment of the Orion myth at fr. 33.418-35, which is at least 50% larger than the corresponding passage in *Phaenomena*, exhibits just such an interest, and in fact behaves like a miniature epyllion of only 19 or so lines.²⁴⁸ Clausen sees Cicero’s expansion of Orion’s death, said to take place on the island of Chios by Aratus but on Delos by other authors, as correcting the version of events in *Phaenomena* in favor of more traditional versions.²⁴⁹ Kubiak notes in the same passage an imitation of

²⁴⁷ Fr. 33.222 (Ewbank). The device occurs as well at fr. 5, fr. 14, and fr. 33.6 and 33.212.

²⁴⁸ Clausen 1986. The imprecision in line count is due to an obvious lacuna in the manuscript, so Cicero’s version of the events could be even longer. Clausen points to structural and lexical similarities between the Orion episode in *Aratea* and Callimachus’ *Hecale*, Theocritus *Idyll* 24.1, Moschus’ *Europa* and c. 64 of Catullus.

²⁴⁹ Clausen emends slightly the manuscript reading of *quos* [sc. *colles*] *tenet Aegaeo defixa in gurgite Chios* (fr. 33.422) by replacing *Chios* with *tellus*. He reasons that the setting on Chios will be established in the following line—fr. 33.421 reads *Bacchica quam viridi convesit tegmine vitis*—and so a specific name is unnecessary here, but with *defixa tellus* Cicero alludes subtly to the only island supposed to have needed to undergo an act of *defingere*, wandering Delos. Thus Cicero first “corrects” the version of the myth contained in *Phaenomena*, with details that were better known to him and his Roman audience before he then more accurately reflects the content of the original with an oblique reference to the wine production for which Chios was celebrated.

the Alexandrian convention of introducing oneself not as a poetic inventor but as an observer or witness reporting “the fruit of his antiquarian investigations.”²⁵⁰

Activity of this kind points very noticeably to the Hellenistic poetry that typified the attitudes and subject matter of Catullus and the New Poets, a point that is not lost on Kubiak or Clausen. There is, in fact, evidence in Catullus’ most ambitious poem, c. 64, which is not a translation, of a debt to the poetry of Cicero; curiously, little comparison has been made between Cicero’s *Aratea* and Catullus’ *Coma Berenices*, though both are translations of astronomical works by Greek poets of the same period.²⁵¹ Nevertheless, the species of translation in which Cicero engaged, which in many of its exegetical features looks backward to that same tradition of grammatical translation for which Livius “den Weg gebahnt hat,” also seems very much in line with the neoteric sensibilities of c. 66. My intention, then, is to demonstrate that Catullus’ treatment of Callimachus’ Πλόκαμος fits logically into this same continuum, which began with Livius’ grammatical translation of the *Odyssey* and continued, as best as we can judge from the surviving evidence, through the intervening years and into the Late Republic. Let us now place Catullus’ translation within that tradition.

²⁵⁰ Kubiak 1981. He adds that *quondam* and *dicitur*, which introduce these digressions, are very much in line with the Alexandrian practice as well. I would add to these Alexandrian conventions Cicero’s use of features of archaic Latin poetry—elision of final *s*; genitive singular of the 1st declension in *-āī*; *figurae etymologicae*. All of these recall the archaizing tendencies of the Alexandrian poets, such as their phonological reproduction of the artificial literary dialects, both of the epic variety—really a blend of Ionic and Aeolic features—and of the Doric of the tragic chorus, as well as their use of certain morphological archaisms, like genitive singular of the 2nd declension in *-oīo*.

²⁵¹ Luck (1976) is especially interested in demonstrating the debt of c. 64 not just to Aratus’ *Phaenomena* but to Cicero’s translation as well. Nevertheless he points to only one passage in c. 66 that evinces an obvious reflection of *Phaenomena*, where 66.69 represents *Ph.* 359.

Section II: Catullus and Callimachus

Poem 66 is one of the few poems, if not the only poem of the corpus that enjoys an introduction from the previous entry.²⁵² From his own testimony we know that Catullus sent c. 66 to Hortalus, shortly after the death of his brother, in lieu of the original composition he had promised.²⁵³ The appeal for Catullus of Callimachus' *Βερενίκης Πλόκαμος*, concerned as it is with dedication and devotion, love and marriage, loss and separation, is not difficult to appreciate.²⁵⁴ These concerns, however, are not the immediate subject of my analysis, and so will only enter into the discussion when they are relevant to our understanding of Catullus' translation techniques.

In order to appreciate how Catullus produced a translation of a Greek poet so highly practiced in his erudition and ornate in his style as Callimachus, we can operate under one of two mutually exclusive assumptions: either that Catullus and his learning

²⁵² Because of the mention of *Battiadae* and its position in immediately preceding c. 66, scholars have reached a virtual consensus that c. 65 anticipates c. 66, though the reliability of this inference is apparently not so great that all editors have felt that the statement can go unqualified, and so some have provided a modest proviso. Quinn writes of c. 66 that it is, "almost certainly the version of Callimachus referred to in c. 65." Thomson echoes these words by saying that, "from [c. 66's] position we may say that it is almost certainly the work which poem 65 was designed to accompany." This is perhaps merely diplomatic editorializing, but our treatment, at any rate, will operate with the understanding that these two poems are related to one another by more than their ordering in the corpus.

Another likely candidate for the distinction of an introduction from the previous poem is c. 50, which describes the tortured inspiration to write poetry and seems to present c. 51, the famous translation of Sappho 31, as the result of that struggle: *hoc, iucunde, tibi poema feci / ex quo perspiceres meum dolorem*. If c. 50 is indeed meant to introduce the poem that follows it, we can immediately appreciate a compelling pattern in the way Catullus treated his translations. The relationship between cc. 50 and 51 is perhaps less certainly established than is the case for cc. 65 and 66, but see Ferrero (1955), Clack (1976), Finamore (1984), Stroup (2010) and Young (2011) for arguments in favor of a connection, based not just on their positioning, but also on their content and on the emphatic use of *otium* and its derivatives in each poem. Young in particular treats the c. 50 as a kind of necessary and mitigating preface to a Greek translation, as though the corrupting influence of Greek literature required some kind of apology, which she sees also at stake in the final stanza of c. 51, in which Catullus abandons the text of Sappho and its immediate context to characterize the translation as a kind of exercise in his *otium*.

²⁵³ His brother's death is dealt with as well in poems 68 and 101.

²⁵⁴ Catullus' suppression or simplification of technical vocabulary, for instance, is often cited as a casualty of his privileging the sentimental and romantic aspects of the poem. This notion will be challenged in part below.

were equipped for such a challenge solely on the poet's own merits, that he was capable by himself not only of distilling meaning from the foreign language, but also reconstituting it into an artistic frame that paid homage to the labor of the original author; or that Catullus accomplished his translation with the assistance of some kind of scholarly apparatus.²⁵⁵ In my opinion the second scenario is more probable, especially in light of what we know of the practice of other Roman poets before and after Catullus.²⁵⁶ Even in Catullus there is evidence enough to propose that the poet did not hone his craft in a vacuum. The nearly perfect observance of Hermann's bridge in c. 64, a fairly subtle rule of hexameter verse craft in *Greek* but not Latin, suggests to Ross that the poet probably learned to recognize and replicate this detail from a more capable, possibly native Greek tutor, rather than that he possessed an uncannily acute ear.²⁵⁷

²⁵⁵ I would list commentaries, exegeses and summaries, lexical aids, technical treatises, scholia or perhaps even a more experienced reader or tutor under this heading.

²⁵⁶ The idea that Cicero translated Aratus' *Phaenomena* under such conditions, with some sort of secondary material on hand, has been discussed already, but we can add here his own claims that he "devoured literature with [Pomponius] Dionysius, a remarkable man", *nos hic voramus litteras cum homine mirifico Dionysio* (*ad Att.* 4.11.2). Dionysius was Atticus' highly educated freedman, but seems to have been on loan to Cicero during a stay at Tusculum in 55 BCE.

Though not, strictly speaking, a translation, Vergil's *Eclogues* appears to show the influence of a recently available commentary to Theocritus' *Idylls*. Wendel (1899) was the first to demonstrate in the collected scholia to Theocritus the evidence of a commentary produced by the lexicographer Theon, an Alexandrian scholar active during Vergil's lifetime, whose father Artemidorus may also have produced a commentary to Theocritus, but Wendel did not consider seriously that this recent commentary, or any other, could have influenced Vergil. The uncertainty of the dates of Theon's life and activity perhaps preclude this possibility, but Vergil's obvious debt to scholarship elsewhere (cf. Schlunk 1974), as well as certain parallels in the Theocritean scholia to Vergil's adaptations and etymologies argue more forcefully for Vergil's use of them than against. For more on the Theocritean scholia, Theon and Vergil see Gow (1952), van Sickle, (1975), Vaughn (1981), Clausen (1987) and Cairns (1999).

²⁵⁷ Ross (1969 p. 129 n. 36). Ross allows the possibility that Catullus observed Callimachus' consistency on this detail by ear, and in the same note posits that Cicero, whose extant hexameters from *Aratea* also observe almost without exception this minor feature of Greek prosody, may have picked up on Aratus' attention to Hermann's bridge, which is also nearly without exception, but he concludes as more probable that an external influence assisted both authors on this detail. If this is true we have potentially another point of contact between Catullus and *Aratea*.

Ross imagines that this trainer was the poet and teacher Parthenius of Nicaea, whom the *Suda* tells us was brought to Rome as a prisoner after Nicaea fell in the Mithridatic Wars by a certain Cinna.²⁵⁸ Little of Parthenius' poetry has reached us, though his only surviving work, an epitome of erotic tales called *Erotica Pathemata* that he dedicated to Cornelius Gallus, seems to indicate that alongside his own literary production he was also a kind of teacher, specifically the sort of secondary teacher who assisted poets.²⁵⁹ There has been much conjecture on every detail of his career in this capacity—where he taught, whom he taught, what he taught²⁶⁰—and it is perhaps

²⁵⁸ Our most complete biographical picture of Parthenius comes from this short encyclopedia entry. For a collation of the *testimonia* and fragments (and a complete commentary on Parthenius' mythographical work), see Lightfoot (1999).

The name of Cinna has, unsurprisingly, attracted the attention of scholars who want Gaius Helvius Cinna, Catullus' close friend, to stand behind the cognomen. Cinna, then, is supposed as a young man to have taken Parthenius, who would have been already a teacher of some standing in his native city, as a captive when Nicaea first fell (in 72 BCE), or after Mithridates' death finally ended the series of campaigns against Pontus (63 BCE), but once back in Italy recognized his talents and employed him as a poetic advisor. This is not impossible, and Rawson (1985) is able to make the dates work with a degree of imagination (and she and others are right to dismiss the *Suda*'s claims that he lived into the reign of Tiberius, making him well over 100 at his death). Lightfoot allows this possibility, but also speculates that the Cinna in question may have been the father of Catullus' friend. Crowther (1976) is cautious not to assume too readily that the unspecified Cinna is either of these Helvii Cinnae because of the lack of definite evidence, though an association with either Cinna, father or son, is unquestionably strengthened by the demonstrable influence that Parthenius exerted on certain aspects of the younger Cinna's poetry, which we discuss below.

²⁵⁹ Macrobius pins him as the *grammaticus* under whom Vergil studied Greek, *quo grammaticus in Graecis Vergilius usus est*, "the *grammaticus* that Vergil employed in [learning] Greek literature," (5.17.18). He does not appear to have produced grammatical treatises of the kind written by figures such as Orbilius or Remmius Palaemon, or at least later grammarians do not cite any specific contributions of that type from him, but Francese (1999) reminds us that *grammatici* were not only schoolmasters and authors of technical works on language, but also philologists and advisors to aspiring writers. Francese reasons that it was such a capacity that Parthenius produced the epitome *Erotica Pathemata*. Called *breviaria* or *commentarii* in Latin, ὑπομνήματα in Greek, these epitomes were reference materials that an author could use a convenient crutch in the absence of complete volumes, which could be expensive and difficult to come by. Gallus was intended to consult the *Erotica Pathemata* for background material to be expanded in poetic treatment. Similarly Sallust was the recipient of a *breviarium* of all of Roman history prepared by the *grammaticus* Aetius Philologus, from which he was to choose subjects for his histories (Suet. *DGR* 10.6). On Parthenius the teacher and the *Erotica Pathemata* see Lightfoot (1999).

²⁶⁰ Dyer (1996) treats especially the question of his influence on Vergil, and in particular where and at what stage of the poet's life Parthenius served as his *grammaticus in Graecis*. He operates under the assumption that the *Suda*'s Cinna is one of the aforementioned Helvii, and that Parthenius first taught aspiring Latin poets in Cisalpine Gaul. Jerome quoting Suetonius names Cremona as the city in which Vergil's education

impossible to support definitively any of those speculations, but we can say with reasonable certainty that he did have an effect on the New Poets. Direct attestations of his influence, i.e., mentions by name, are wanting, but there is strong indirect evidence for his having promoted Hellenistic poetry and his specific interests within the field of Hellenistic poetry among Catullus' and the subsequent generation of poets. Clausen's influential article from 1964 went so far as to claim that Parthenius awakened in Rome an interest in Hellenistic poetry and in Callimachus in particular.²⁶¹ Cinna's *Zmyrna* deals with subject matter, the incestuous rape of a daughter by her father, which very much recalls Parthenius' favorite poet Euphorion. Furthermore, Clausen notes that, during his discussion of *Zmyrna*'s son Adonis at the end of his poem, Cinna names the river Setrachus and locates it in Cyprus, a location that agrees with Parthenius' own treatment of the river (including its discussion in the context of the Adonis story), but differs from other accounts that place the river in Arabia or Assyria.²⁶² The nine years of composition that finally produced *Zmyrna*, then, were very likely to have enjoyed Parthenius'

began, which stood only 35 or so miles from Brixia, where the Cinnae lived, and only slightly farther from Catullus' Verona. Much of this depends on our accepting hypothetical scenarios for the other uncertainties surrounding Parthenius—namely which Cinna brought him to Italy and when he did so—but Dyer's locating Parthenius' seat of activity in Cisalpine Gaul is attractive. As for the content of his teachings, Dyer and Francese (1999) both accept that Parthenius the teacher likely introduced his students to the Greek authors that he himself most enjoyed, namely the Hellenistic authors. Francese names Callimachus, Rhianus and especially Euphorion as poets frequently mentioned alongside Parthenius' name. Francese mentions as well Parthenius' particular interest in proper nouns and place names.

²⁶¹ Clausen (1964 p. 187-8). He does not overlook the fact that Ennius, Lucilius, Lutatius Catulus and others before the New Poets were familiar with Callimachus, though he maintains that that familiarity was limited until Parthenius' arrival on the scene.

²⁶² Clausen 1964 p. 66-7. The passage of *Zmyrna* that references Setrachus does not survive, but that Cinna placed the river in Cyprus at the suggestion of Parthenius is reasonable secure. Catullus names the Setrachus in c. 95 (which praises Cinna and *Zmyrna*) as a kind of impossibly distant spatial limit to *Zmyrna*'s legacy, contrasted sharply with the *Annales* of Volusius which are already serving as wrappings for fish taken from the far more domestic Po. It seems almost impossible that Catullus would have selected this obscure river unless *Zmyrna* mentioned it, and since the subject of *Zmyrna* is the mother of Adonis, who is invariably tied to Cyprus, we can be comfortably certain that Cinna followed Parthenius in placing the river on the island instead of in Syria.

assistance. Clausen believes as well that Parthenius introduced the epyllion form to the poets of Rome, though Crowther regards the influence on Catullus' attempt at the form at c. 64 to be only indirectly indebted to Parthenius' introduction.²⁶³ One might be tempted to speculate that the refrains to Hymen in Catullus' epithalamia (cc. 61 and 62, as well as mention in c. 64) also betray a debt to Parthenius, who seems to have written at least one epithalamium, but Crowther is unwilling to assume too much here as well.²⁶⁴

In fact, with the exception of Cinna, no certain traces of Parthenius' instruction can be found in any of the New Poets.²⁶⁵ Catullus even references Nicaea in c. 46 without mentioning Parthenius. At best we can only conjecture that Parthenius or some other teacher assisted Catullus, not just in his mastery of Hermann's bridge, but in the careful translation of a section of Callimachus' *Aitia* into Latin. Nevertheless, given the precedents of Livius and Ennius, as well as of Cinna, it is not unreasonable for us to approach c. 66 with the assumption that Catullus enjoyed the assistance of secondary materials, commentaries or a private tutor, as he was writing it.²⁶⁶ Indisputable evidence, however, is wanting, as we have shown, so it will be only through a close examination of c. 66's Latin text alongside Callimachus' Greek that we will be able to appreciate the

²⁶³ Crowther (1976 p. 70). He surmises that the content of c. 64 does not possess the "Euphorionic" qualities associated with Parthenius and Cinna." Ultimately any attempt to define and classify the epyllion, and to assign to its introduction any individual champion or progenitor, will be forced to acknowledge that the term is a modern construct, and, as Trimble notes in her contribution to Brill's recent companion volume on the form (2012, eds. Baumbach and Bär), our concept of the epyllion relies too much on our defining it as "a poem that reminds us of Catullus 64."

²⁶⁴ Lightfoot offers fr. 37 and fr. 53 (less likely) as possible epithalamia, and exhausts such a hypothesis without eliminating the possibility, but she stops short of asserting definitively that Parthenius ever attempted the form, or that Catullus' epithalamia relied on Parthenius (1999 p. 41 and 196-7).

²⁶⁵ That Calvus too may have been influenced by Parthenius—an elegy for his deceased wife Quintilia seems to resemble strongly in tone Parthenius' own *Arete*, his most famous work and a lament of his own wife's death—is possible, but Crowther's characteristic hesitation here is certainly warranted by the paucity of the *comparanda*.

²⁶⁶ I will treat in greater detail the question of Parthenius' involvement with the New Poets, and specifically with Catullus, in the chapter that follows.

scope of Catullus' translation technique, and to determine instances of likely scholastic contact.

Before we can undertake a comparison, however, we must first consider a reality that complicates any comparative analysis of the two poems: Callimachus' version has not reached us intact. In fact until rather recently we possessed only a few fragments preserved in the form of quotations, and, owing to the state of the papyrus from which the great bulk of the poem has been restored, these literary fragments, though fewer in number, remain among the most secure with regard to their original shape. A considerable amount of *Aitia* 110 has only been recovered through a combination of paleographic work on the papyrus, which includes fortuitously extensive scholiastic comments on the poem, and a good deal of conjecture—shrewd and well-informed, but conjecture nonetheless—from the original redactors of the two sources, literary *testimonia* and papyrus. For this reason, we ought to begin with few words on the text of the *Aitia*, and in particular the state of the *Βερενίκης Πλόκαμος* and its relationship with Catullus' *Coma*.

Critical editions of the *Aitia* were only made possible after the discovery of the Oxyrhynchus papyri and the publication of Pfeiffer's 1949 edition of the text. His recension remains the touchstone for subsequent editions, and his efforts, along with those of Lobel, Vogliano and Vitelli, whose contemporary treatments of the newly unearthed fragments were collated into that 1949 edition, have been invaluable for generating a legible text of the *Aitia* and the *Coma*. There are, however, passages throughout that warrant further consideration. The nature of a text produced from

fragmentary papyrus is, of course, much different from that of one composed of literary *testimonia* from a manuscript tradition, and as result our extant verses of the *Aitia* often are lacunose to the point of being illegible. In many such cases, it has been necessary to admit defeat and regard the line in question as lost, despite the survival of an errant omicron or contextless particle. In the case of less fractured verses, some conjectures have yielded possible, sometimes even highly likely readings. Some readings seem all the more likely because restorers of *Aitia* 110 have had at their disposal an almost irresistible aide, namely the text of c. 66. For the most part, Pfeiffer manages to avoid restoring Callimachus on the model of Catullus' translation, and so he has been willing to leave a good number of especially particulate verses unrestored. In many passages where Pfeiffer fashioned his Greek text on the basis of cues taken from its Latin descendant, his decisions can hardly be faulted. His supplementation of]περφε[]ετ[to ὑπερφέρεται at 110.44, for instance, would have been difficult without the text of Catullus, where the Latin *supervehitur* at the end of a pentameter helps to capture perfectly the morphological shape, semantic valence and metrical requirements of the Greek.

For proper names as well Pfeiffer generally makes responsible use of Catullus' translation, as at 110.56, where he expands an orphaned ...]ιδος to Κύπριδος as recommended by *et Veneris* at the same position in 66.56. There are also more extensive restorations of such forms, such as at 110.64, where a line legible only as ...]ς ἐν ἀρχαίοις ἄστρον[...] can be extrapolated to yield Κύπρι]ς ἐν ἀρχαίοις ἄστρον [ἔθηκε νέον. No doubt correspondence between it and Catullus' 66.64, which reads *sidus in antiquis novum diva posuit*, is secure by the semantic coincidence of ἐν ἀρχαίοις ἄστρον and *sidus*

in antiquis, and so the expansion of a single sigma to Κύπρις and the supplementation of a suitable verb and adjectival attribute is perhaps to be permitted, despite the fact that Catullus' goddess does not appear with any name or epithet, and that the back half of the line is missing entirely.

Other instances invite at least some skepticism. Fr. 110.44 mentioned above would likely have had to be forsaken as lost entirely without Catullus' help, but Pfeiffer's restoration of the first half of the line is less a matter of shrewd comparison between exemplum and original—there is nothing of the original to compare—than it is a hopeful conjecture based on the shape of the Latin. The entire line as it reached us reads ...]μω[]περφε[]ετ[...], from which Pfeiffer reconstructed ἀμνά]μω[ν Θεΐης ἀργός ὕ]περφέ[ρ]ετ[αι. Pfeiffer is forced to supply 19 characters in this conjecture, more than twice the number of letters that are legible on the papyrus, and by doing so produces a near perfect Greek version of Catullus' *progenies Thiae clara supervehitur* at 66.44. While his reconstruction has merit, it assumes too much that Catullus converted Callimachus' text from Greek into Latin with an eye towards word-to-word equivalence, which can at several places be demonstrated as an oversimplification of his normal process of translation.²⁶⁷

The assistance from Catullus' text in restoring 110.67 presents a different sort of problem, but invites the same sort of cautious and careful assessment of Pfeiffer's text. In the Latin the four lines starting at 66.65 describe the astral surroundings of the newly minted constellation of the lock in the night sky. Of the Greek the only survivors are a

²⁶⁷ These departures from the original tell us unsurprisingly a good deal more about how Catullus went about his translation than do his closer word-by-word renderings, and their analysis will make up a good deal of our treatment of c. 66 below.

single omicron and, just above it, the letters ...]εανονδε at the end of (apparently) a hexameter. Nevertheless Pfeiffer, following Lobel, prints πρόσθε μὲν ἐρχομεν... μετοπωρίνον Ὠκ]εανόνδε. Here a lemma in the scholium confirms that Callimachus also spoke of the movements of other constellations around the lock, and recommends μετοπωρίνον, “autumnal”, which does not correspond in precise sense to anything in c. 66, but the restoration as a whole must be approached as suggestion more than as defensible conjecture.

Despite uncertainties like these, Pfeiffer’s text has persisted in its reputation as a close, plausible and even likely recreation of the original *Βερενίκης Πλόκαμος*. And indeed it is a useful tool; without something like it, it would be impossible to undertake a close examination of Catullus’ process of translation. But we should always proceed through any comparison of the two texts with a cautious suspicion of the restored Callimachus. Let us now turn again to the first lines of c. 66 and our extant counterparts in *Aitia* 110.

Section III: Glossing astronomy

Livius demonstrated already in the opening line of *Oduisia* certain features of his translation that we have described as “grammatical.” A gloss of Homeric πολύτροπον as *versutum* is far more fraught than a simple semantic analogue, and glosses of this type not only recur elsewhere in *Oduisia*, but seem to have been a regular component of Latin translations up to Catullus’ own time. In fact, it is my suggestion that Catullus can also be shown to have made judicious and considerate choices in his diction at points in c. 66.

Let us consider now the shape and content of the first lines of the poem and their corresponding verses in Callimachus. In Catullus' version—and in Callimachus' as well, it seems—the poem's opening seven distichs contain a single sentence, which slowly introduces first the astronomer Conon by describing his professional abilities and accomplishments (lines 1-7), then introduces the lock of hair, *πλόκαμος* or *coma*, who narrates the poem throughout (lines 8-9), and finally the preliminary circumstances of the lock's dedication (lines 9-14). Only lines 1, 7 and 8 of this section of the Greek have reached us, but we can nonetheless consider even from this small sampling the character of Catullus' initial approach to the translation.

*Omnia qui magni dispexit lumina mundi,
qui stellarum ortus comperit atque obitus,
flammeus ut rapidi solis nitor obscuretur,
ut cedant certis sidera temporibus,
ut Triviam furtim sub Latmia saxa relegans* (5)
dulcis amor gyro devocet aereo:

*idem me ille Conon caelesti in limine uidit
e Bereniceo vertice caesariem
fulgentem clare, quam multis illa dearum
levia protendens brachia pollicita est,* (10)
*qua rex tempestate nouo auctus hymenaeo
vastatum finis iverat Assyrios,
dulcia nocturnae portans vestigia rixae,
quam de virgineis gesserat exuviis.*

Πάντα τὸν ἐν γραμμαῖσι ἰδὼν ὄρον ἧ τε φέρονται (1)

...
ἧ με Κόνων ἔβλεψεν ἐν ἡέρι τὸν Βερενίκης (7)
βόστρυχον ὄν κείνη πᾶσιν ἔθηκε θεοῖς

Pfeiffer and most subsequent editors print the opening lines as I have done above (with one very small adjustment²⁶⁸). The accuracy of the opening line is largely secure. It comes directly from the introduction of a diegesis or prose paraphrase of the poem, itself recovered from another papyrus found in Tebtynis.²⁶⁹ In the diegesis the first line of the poem is quoted verbatim and then followed by a summary of the subsequent exposition of Conon, the lock, and the circumstances of Berenice's dedication.²⁷⁰ Pfeiffer's reading of lines 7-8 have enjoyed general but not universal approval in subsequent editions.²⁷¹ Marinone (1984), Asper (2004) and Massimilla (2010) have all accepted Pfeiffer's version of the text with the scholiast's note without comment. Harder, however, casts plausible doubt at least on these two lines. She suggests that the scholiast introduces his quotation as though from memory.²⁷² This, she argues, would explain key differences between Callimachus' and Catullus' versions of these lines. The curious shift in Catullus' translation of gender and the scope of the dedicatees, from *πᾶσιν θεοῖς* to *multis dearum*, is especially noticeable; the tenuous semantic rapport between *ἔθηκε* and *pollicita est* is even more so. These last two words in particular, in both poems the verb of the main

²⁶⁸ I have followed Marinone, Massimilla and Harder in reading ἦ at line 7 instead of Pfeiffer's η, which he printed and marked with a dagger in favor of the manuscript's ἦ. The suggestion was first made by Valckenaer in his 1799 edition. I will explain the reason for preferring this reading below.

²⁶⁹ The diegesis is probably too late to have influenced Catullus. However, it is likely to have been derived from earlier summaries or scholastic commentaries, the consequence of which possibility to our understanding of Catullus as a translator will be treated below.

²⁷⁰ Φησὶν ὅτι Κόνων κατηστέρισε τὸν Βερενίκης βόστρυχον, ὃν θεοῖς ἀναθήσειν ὑπέσχετο κείνη, ἐπειδὴν ἐπινήκη ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ Συρίαν μάχης, “[Callimachus] says that Conon catasterized the lock of Berenice, which she promised to dedicate to the gods, whenever [her husband] would return from his campaign against Syria.”

²⁷¹ These two lines are preserved by a scholiast's remarks in the margin of a commentary on Aratus' *Phaenomena*. The marginal note occurs at Σ Arat. 146: Κόνων δὲ ὁ μαθηματικὸς Πτολεμαίῳ χαριζόμενος Βερονίκης πλόκαμον ἐξ αὐτῶν κατηστέρισε. τοῦτο καὶ Καλλιμάχος πού φησιν, “Conon the mathematician catasterized a lock from Berenice's hair as a favor to Ptolemy [III Euergetes]. This is what Callimachus said somewhere,” after which lines 7 and 8 follow.

²⁷² 2012, line 2 pp. 802-3. She is right to be suspicious of a quotation that is introduced with the particle πού, which can convey a kind of casual imprecision and uncertainty.

clause on which all of the introductory distichs depend, call into question the reliability of the scholiast's quotation, and thus of Pfeiffer's text. Catullus' *pollicita est* would occur two lines later than Callimachus' ἔθηκε, a discrepancy that Harder believes Catullus generally avoided. In fact Harder claims that, "Catullus translates each line of Callimachus by a line of his own."²⁷³ I am not certain that Catullus' method is as definite and regular as that, and it is no doubt a significant obstacle for our comparison that we do not have in our possession the ninth and tenth lines of Callimachus, but her point is well taken. Nevertheless, even Harder prints in her own edition lines 7-8 as they were presented by the scholiast and Pfeiffer, suggesting that she regards them as sufficiently stable, at least for the purpose of her commentary. Once again, for the time being, Pfeiffer's text should remain the basis of critical discussion, and it is for this reason that I have used his version above, though it will be with Harder's cautious approach in mind that my reading proceeds.

The first line of Callimachus, the authenticity of which is not in doubt, posed for Catullus an immediate challenge. While he is able to retain the semantics and grammatical case of the original initial word (the adjective for "all"), very soon afterwards the word-for-word correspondence becomes untenable, and from the ensuing deviations we can appreciate the poet's principles of translation. Notably, τὸν ἐν γραμμαῖσι... ὄρον, "the [entire] limit in the constellations", is not even approximately rendered by *lumina magni mundi*, "[all] the lights of the vast universe".²⁷⁴ Callimachus'

²⁷³ Ibid.

²⁷⁴ The Latin phrase is more easily brought into English idiom divorced of its context than is the Greek. Harder's translation of this first line of Callimachus, "observing the whole sky as divided by lines and

terms are from the vocabulary of astronomy, which Latin was ill-equipped to discuss in its native idiom. ὄρον is the delimitation, here designating the actual spatial boundaries of Conon's inquiry and observation, but γραμμή in its sense "astronomical line" (cf. the connect-the-dots system of illustrating constellations that is in use today) has drifted further from its etymological meaning of "line" or "mark" to assume a very technical character. Catullus cannot make use of astronomical jargon, because it does not exist to the same extent in Latin as in Greek. Instead, he rewrites the noun phrase entirely, using a less technical and more poetic term, *lumina*, to refer to the stars (which are not explicitly mentioned in the surviving Callimachus fragment—*γραμμή per se* does not mean star—but are the presumed subject of the relative clause that continues in the lost second line), perhaps because *lumina* sounds quite similar to the family of words from the stem *līm-*, which approximate the sense of ὄρον better.²⁷⁵ He further qualifies those *lumina* with the genitive phrase *magni mundi*. In truth the phrase *in limine uidit* at line 7 is closer in meaning to Callimachus τὸν...ἰδὼν ὄρον, but more on this peculiarity below.

Because the translation of one the noun phrase is so imprecise, we can assume that Catullus, if close translation is indeed his goal, aimed to make up for the nuance and semantic register he lost there with the main verb. In fact Catullus' verb choice does express more than that of Callimachus. The original poem uses a simple form of the

movements...", is effective, and demonstrates that the force of the noun ὄρον is best realized periphrastically, here as a verb.

²⁷⁵ These words all have to do with obliqueness in some way, and so often indicate a boundary or sideline. Rehm (1934), in fact, argues that *limina* is actually a better reading here, given the propensity of the two words for confusion in transmission and the use of *limen* for an astronomical boundary by other poets. A more accurate rendering of Callimachus' participial phrase actually does occur in Catullus' version, thanks to Baehrens emendation, at line 7: *idem me ille Conon caelesti in limine uidit*, "the famous Conon saw me in the heavenly limit." The original reading of line 7 was *numine*, which Marinone's text emends to *lumine*—he also keeps *lumina* in line 1—by reasoning that, of the three, manuscript *numine* and the two contrasting emendations, only *lumine* is an appropriate rendering of ἐν ἡέρι (pp. 115-6).

aorist active participle for the verb to see, ἰδών. The deficiency of a past active form in the Latin participial system required a circumlocution as a matter of course, which Catullus supplies in the form of a relative clause and a finite verb. But he also introduces a prefix, *di(s)-*, to the radical form of his verb for “seeing”. However, instead of the *dispexit* that I have printed above, V, the now lost manuscript that spawned the earliest extant exempla in the 14th c., transmitted *despexit*. This seemed to earlier editors of Catullus to pose a logistical problem—“looking down” makes star-gazing difficult if not impossible—and so, beginning with Calpurnius’ 1481 edition, edited volumes have almost universally emended the verb to *dispexit*. In its most basic meaning, according to the TLL, the force of the prefix in *dispicere* conveys a process of looking at something through an obstructing medium, such as fog, or the darkness of the night sky.²⁷⁶ In the absence of Callimachus’ original, this emendation has seemed to most editors more appropriate to the practice of an astronomer, his eyes peering through the night, than has the manuscript reading.

And yet, in light of the discovery in the 20th century of the corresponding line from the original, it is surprising that the alternate reading preserved has still so little support. Only A.A. Barret has argued forcefully for *despexit*.²⁷⁷ His reasoning as well seeks to explain how Catullus achieved equivalence to the original by placing the semantic thrust of the idea to be conveyed on the verb instead of the noun, and he does so by examining more closely the technical term that Greek supplied and Latin lacked.

γραμμαί, strictly speaking, are any marks written down (from γράφειν, naturally, the

²⁷⁶ TLL, s.v. *dispicere* A.1.

²⁷⁷ Barret 1982.

ultimate source of γράμμα “letter” as well). γραμμή came easily to signify the series of lines that an astronomer used to connect the points on a star chart so as to form the rudimentary shapes for which the constellations get their names. In turn these lines came to represent the clusters of stars themselves, viewed with the technical considerations of an astronomer, and so in Callimachus’ original we are to imagine that Conon looked into the night sky to see the ὄρον ἐν γραμμαῖσι, “limit in the constellations”. Thus would Catullus’ Conon be craning his neck in the wrong direction if he were trying to examine the stars by “looking down” (*despicere*) at the charts instead of up to and through the sky.

However, nothing in the Greek demands that γραμμαῖσι represents by metonymy the stars themselves—indeed the verb that begins the relative clause with which fr. 110.1 ends, φέρονται, anticipates in the lost second verse specific heavenly bodies as its subject—and there is no reason that Conon, a mathematician who would have been at least as comfortable with using the physical charts as with star gazing, must be assumed to have performed his professional duties and to have made his discovery of the lock with his eyes trained only to the sky. Even if Callimachus had wished to exaggerate his praise of Conon by implying that he had no real need for star charts, because he knew the night sky in its entirety by heart, we would expect such a bookish poet to imagine Conon as consulting any reference materials available to him, such as astronomical charts, to determine that a new star had appeared.²⁷⁸ In that case we may be meant to take

²⁷⁸ That Callimachus would appreciate and thus document another’s thorough engagement with reference materials and his process of research is hardly surprising. He produced in addition to his poetry an enormous bibliographical survey to serve as a catalogue of the Library of Alexandria, called *Πίνακες*, “Tablets,” of which a handful of fragments survive, as well as numerous other reference materials on subjects as varied as geography and ornithology, which are now lost, but known to us from the *Suda*. For treatments of both collections, the library catalogue and the even more voluminous reference works, see Witty (1958 and 1973, respectively).

γραμμαῖσι more literally after all. Indeed, it undoubtedly would have been while looking at one of these star charts, once Conon had noticed an anomalous cluster of stars in the night sky and established its absence from the astronomical map, that his discovery would first have been realized. Indeed at some point during his studies, and moreover during his discovery of the catasterized lock, Conon must have “looked down” (*despicere*) at a chart.

In this case it is not unreasonable to allow Barret’s reading of *despexit*, which is the reading preferred by our earliest manuscripts as well, to stand.²⁷⁹ Barret’s point rests on the recognition that Catullus could not directly translate ἐν γραμμαῖσι, since no such concept existed in Latin, and that he required two expressions to coax out the meaning of the original: “that constellations are involved he shows by the phrase *lumina mundi*; that he conceives of them as being on charts he shows with *despexit*.”²⁸⁰ Catullus then has effectively rendered the original, “having looked at the star chart” with “who looked down at the stars,” a translation that forces the reader to picture the only imaginable scenario in which a mortal man *can* look down at the stars: when they are on a chart rolled out for inspection. In fact, this manner of viewing the constellations, as representations of the night sky carefully drawn on a chart, would be the only way that

²⁷⁹ Admittedly, the distinction between *despexit* and *dispexit* is far too slight for us to invest too greatly in the authority of the manuscript readings, but perhaps *despexit* is supported by Vergil at *Eclogue* 3.40-1 as well, where the same Conon is mentioned along with another, unrecalled astronomer *descripsit radio totum qui gentibus orbem* “who marked with a compass the whole world.”

Nevertheless, there are other difficulties in accepting *despexit* as Barret does. For one, the negative valence of *despicere*, “disdain,” is somewhat more frequent than the neutral, literal meaning, and this is surely not the sense Catullus or his lock wish to convey, that Conon despised, or worse still disregarded the *lumina mundi*. There is also no guarantee that *despexit* alone could convey to Catullus’ readers that Conon had his head fixed on a star chart, though it is surely not the case that Catullus wrote his poetry with the intention of its being read and understood by *everyone*.

²⁸⁰ Barret 1982 p. 137.

one could see πάντα ὄρον, “the entire demarcation”; from any given point on earth certain constellations are only observable during fixed times of years, and at no time are all of them visible in the night sky. This subtlety more accurately captures the tools of the astronomer, whose work was not simply star-gazing, but recording the scheduled movements of the shifting skies, just as c. 66.2-5 seem to describe. The sense of Greek as well is serviced by Catullus’ supplementation, where the bare verb of seeing is complemented by a direct object and associated prepositional phrase of a technical character that conveys more than that Conon merely fixed his gaze on the night sky, though this effect is accomplished with either the *de-* or *di-* verb.²⁸¹

Regardless of which verb is to be preferred, the image of the diligent astronomer bent over the physical materials requisite to his studies suggests as well the similar engagement of the *poeta doctus* and his own research, which would have involved various texts, commentaries, and other comparanda to achieve such a high level of academic ornamentation.²⁸² With a downward direction clearly stated, the first words of the poem, *omnia qui...despexit*, become programmatic not only of Conon’s astronomical achievement, but also of the laborious process of translation that the poet undertook. In

²⁸¹ Massimilla (2010) acknowledges that the complete semantic picture in Callimachus depends on the entire verb phrase ἐν γραμμαῖσι ἰδὼν (ἐν γραμμαῖσι, he suggests, is to be taken more closely with the participle), though he does not comment on the effectiveness of Catullus’ *-spicere* compound—whichever he used—in capturing the Greek (p. 467). On the contrary, Thompson (1999) actually notes Barret’s more nuanced interpretation, but does not agree that Catullus’ readers could have appreciated so fine a detail (p. 450).

²⁸² Perhaps it need not be pressed any farther than a mere mention, but the astronomer, too, whose work is accomplished as a matter of course during night time hours, is much like the author absorbed in focused lucubration. The trope of sleepless nights reaches its apogee in the empire, for which see Ker (2004), but there are hints at its roots much earlier. In fact there is an ongoing dialogue on a fragment of Callimachus that praises Aratus, the author of the most famous of astronomical poems *Phaenomena*, for his working through sleepless nights, his ἀγρυπνίη. The reading is not certain, and there is too little context to say whether Callimachus noted the overlap in the productive hours of the astronomer and the poet (and the astronomer-poet), but for discussions of the meaning of the fragment see Cameron (1972) and Stewart (2008).

fact, this programmatic statement is available if we read *dispexit* as well. The verbal action of *dispicere* implies close and discerning inspection and the ability to pick certain elements from out of a larger context. This very much recalls the translator's interaction with his own source text. Thus, in either reading, Catullus makes c. 66 about the process of writing poetry, but the process of writing a very specific type of poetry. C. 66 begins as a self-conscious account of the process of translating a highly artificial piece of writing from one language to another, featuring all of the erudition and literary allusions of the original, as well as subtle commentary on technical and more philological aspects— morphology, inflection, idiom and syntax, but also mythological and literary historical information as well. More than that, however, it is here in this first line that Catullus has already signaled his translation as not only of a text from one language into another, but as a literary and cultural process.

Both readings, *dispicere* and *despicere*, open a broad semantic field for the Latin author to convey an act of sight appropriate for an astronomer, but in either case Catullus demonstrates a shrewd sensitivity to the meaning in the Greek as he brings it into Latin.²⁸³ Catullus' Conon does not look simply at a complex astronomy, as Callimachus' does; rather he applies a complex and discerning manner of viewing to more generally and mundanely described features of the night sky. Conon, according to Callimachus and so to Catullus, knew the night sky and its behaviors with a practiced and academic precision. When he identified and picked out the catasterism of the lock from among the other manifold constellations of the night sky, rather than simply seeing it he used a

²⁸³ Marinone notes that "Catullus rinuncia a tradurre il termine tecnico, però si dimostra sensibile alla connotazione semantica..." (1984 p. 105).

precise form of visual engagement. This is an interesting adjustment, the choice to use a richer verb with a more protean noun rather than to allow a simple verb to govern a highly technical noun phrase, thus shifting the greater share of the semantic load from one part of speech to the next, but it was necessary to convey meaning that would be lost or obfuscated by a more literal translation.²⁸⁴ In order to describe such activities, for which a functioning technical idiom existed in the source but was wanting in the target language, Catullus was obligated to paraphrase, and to shift semantic weight around when necessary. In this way, the phrase *di/despicere omnia lumina* seems to provide a dense and learned gloss of the technical language of ἰδεῖν τὸν ἐν γραμμαῖσι ὄρον.

Arguably, glosses of this type continue into the next several lines that intercede between opening clause and the official, express introduction of Conon. Line two reads: *qui stellarum ortus comperit atque obitus* “who detected the rising and setting of the stars.” This has very much the shape of the first relative clause and Marinone notes that “qui il valore è traslato, e ad ulteriore chiarimento è aggiunto al v. 2 *comperit* “riconobbe, capi” per introdurre i concetti di cui Call. inizia l’esposizione con ἧ τε,” as though the glossing of technical terms does not end in the first line.²⁸⁵ Of course, Callimachus’ opening line breaks off in the midst of a subordinate clause, probably describing the movement of the stars—ἧ τε φέρονται/ [ἀστέρες *vel sim.*] “in which path [the stars] are borne”—and we cannot know for certain how faithful Catullus’ second verse is to the original, or whether another periphrastic clarification of Greek astronomical terms occurs, but it seems somewhat doubtful that line 2 is any more precise

²⁸⁴ If Catullus had aimed at a more literal translation, Latin *lineis* might have sufficed for γραμμαῖσι, but this would have been wanting of the precise and scientific sense of the Greek.

²⁸⁵ Marinone p. 105

than the first line.²⁸⁶ We can assume that ἤ τε anticipates an indirect question, three of which appear in the Latin before we again have a Greek line for comparison.²⁸⁷ Catullus' string of subjunctives, examples of Conon's various inquiries, does not begin until line 3.²⁸⁸ Catullus' version of line 2 continues with a relative pronoun, but one that is not equivalent to the Greek ἤ. Rather he again alludes to the yet unnamed astronomer—perhaps Catullus is translating once more an aorist active participle—and thus delays further the revelation of his identity in such a way that resembles more his treatment of Callimachus' participial phrase in line one than it does that which would logically follow in Callimachus' second line. Whatever the circumstances are for 110.2, from the little Greek we have, we must assume that Catullus' somewhat free translation of Callimachus continues at least until line 7, where Conon is introduced and more obvious parallels in structure and diction resume.

In 66.2 we find astrological terminology in more certain terms for the first time. It has already been noted, in the discussion of line 1, that the first hurdle faced in his translation was that Latin's relatively meager vocabulary of astronomical terms required more cautious translation in order to be effective and accurate. Basic expressions for the objects in the night sky were not an issue, since metaphorical or transferred usages of unscientific terms, such as *lumina*, require no special knowledge to appreciate. Other

²⁸⁶ Cassio (1973) suggests that *comperit* would be an appropriate rendering if it is the case that ἤ τε “fosse retto da un ἐπιστάμενος ο da qualcosa di simile alla fine del verso successivo,” (p. 330 n. 3). This conjecture as well would have Catullus compensating the poor semantic equivalence of his *comperit* to Callimachus' ἐπιστάμενος, the Greek term again being the less nuanced of the two, with plainer nominal forms.

²⁸⁷ We can probably assume at least a pair of indirect questions in Callimachus, to judge from the anticipatory τε.

²⁸⁸ The mood of φέρονται does not preclude this possibility, as it would in Latin, because Greek allowed the indicative mood in indirect questions, even in secondary sequence—it is actually required in primary sequence—to express a sense of vividness. Cf. Smyth (1956) 2677a.

heavenly bodies and their movements could also be described sufficiently with quotidian words like *ortus*, *obitus* and *stella*, just as “sunrise” “sunset” and “stars” evoke nothing scientific in English.²⁸⁹ The technical terms for the tools and apparatus of the astronomer, however, were not at the Latin poet’s disposal, and did not translate quite so readily. The first line of Callimachus’ poem accessed this language with τὸν ἐν γραμμαῖσι... ὄρον, and, as has been suggested, Catullus needed to treat the entire phrase delicately and collectively in order to produce an effective Latin translation.

West, however, thinks differently, and she probes the assumed alteration of these astronomical phrases a bit further, suggesting that “the Romans were, confessedly, less interested in astronomy than the Greeks,” and that “since [Catullus] starts his translation by depriving Conon of his star-atlas, we should not be too surprised if he has removed or camouflaged astronomical details elsewhere.”²⁹⁰ While West’s further point that Catullus seems more concerned in the romantic themes of devotion and separation is well taken, her dismissal of a willingness and interest on the part of the translator to export astronomical nomenclature from Greek into Latin takes for granted too readily that *dispexit* is the correct reading (which would effectively obliterate any sense of technical

²⁸⁹ Nevertheless it is perhaps significant that Catullus uses these three words only in c. 66. Other, finite forms of *oriri* appear twice for the motions of heavenly bodies at 64.271 and 376, but no form of *obire* occurs elsewhere in the corpus for astronomical phenomena. *sidus* (generally in the plural) is Catullus’ usual word for “stars”, but *stella* seems here to have been employed so as to avoid repetition when *sidera* occurs in line 4. Marinone points to similar uses of these three words in Cicero’s *Aratea*, another translation of a Greek astronomical text (p. 106), and in doing so admits that perhaps at this time standard and appropriate equivalences for the richer Greek vocabulary were gaining literary traction in Latin. It does appear that Catullus wished to step beyond the confines of his own highly articulated poetic register—which possessed already a term equivalent to each of these three Catullan hapax legomena—to capture better the language of astronomy, and perhaps Marinone is unfair to dismiss so readily Traglia’s (1955) suggestion that “[C.] abbia ricalcato l’espressione ciceroniana,” as “assai debole”. Thomson in fact notes a fairly certain borrowing from Cicero’s *Aratea* at c. 64.125, where *clarisonos* is included among “a number of other unusual words in poem 64...paralleled in Cicero,” (Thomson 1999 p. 409). Luck found echoes of Ciceronian poetic language in 64 as well as in 66 (see above, p. 125 n. 251).

²⁹⁰ West (1982) pp. 62-3.

γραμμαῖσι). Furthermore, the confession that the Romans were less interested in astronomy than the Greeks, a fair assessment, should not preclude all interest in establishing a conventional idiom for the discussion of astronomical concepts in Latin. Cicero, for instance is quite regular in his use of specific words to denote the triad of celestial movements, rising, setting, and transit. Marinone points out that at least twice he translated Greek ἀνατολή “rising”, δύσις “setting” and κίνησις “movement/transit”, as *ortus obitus motusque*.²⁹¹ The absence of an organic development of such jargon concomitant to the development of the science does not mean that the concepts simply could not be expressed in Latin, nor that Latin authors had no interest in establishing conventions for the expression of the concepts.

In fact another earlier manuscript reading of c. 66, obscured by a conventional emendation, may suggest just the opposite, and in doing so reveal another possible astronomical gloss. The earliest manuscript reading of line 2 had *habitus* in place of *obitus*, and its emendation to the latter has been attractive in that it produces a succinct and alliterative couplet for describing the action of heavenly bodies, *ortus atque obitus*, rising and setting. However, the reading *habitus* has merit if we believe that Catullus actively tried to render technical language with Latin equivalents. Even our received text of 66, with *ortus* and *obitus*, should already suggest that Catullus has the Greek triad in mind, and that a Latin technical idiom for astronomy was developing, but Marinone suggests further that Catullus could well have realized ἀνατολή with *ortus* and used *habitus* “bearing”, rather than *obitus* “setting”, to capture κίνησις “transit”. Of course, this leaves δύσις “setting”, still unaccounted for, and the triad is far more effectively

²⁹¹ Marinone p. 106. Cicero’s triad occurs at *de Orat.* 1.187 and *de Div.* 1.128.

reduced to two when rising and setting are contrasted, rather than rising and transit. But there is another term that Cicero used often in *Aratea* for translations of Aratus' δύνειν, and that is *cedere*. In fact this very word occurs at 66.4, *ut cedant certis sidera temporibus*, again referencing the movements of stars specifically. If in lines 2-6 Callimachus had described the triad of celestial movements according to the standard Greek terminology, the trio of *ortus*, *habitus* and *cedant* would be effective correspondences with support from contemporary astronomical discussion in Latin. Moreover this arrangement of the three would have them in chronological order: stars first rise from below the horizon, then move across the visible plane of the sky, and finally set at the opposite horizon.

This trio, in Latin or in Greek, is perhaps more transparent to the layperson than other jargon, since even the Greek reader required assistance to understand fully the more technical terminology of astronomy. Let us look again, then, at the most scientifically specific of Callimachus' surviving diction, γραμμαῖσι. From its basic sense of "lines", then transferred to "lines on a star chart," αἱ γραμμαί in the plural came to serve as a metonym for "the science of astronomy and astrology" more broadly.²⁹² Both Pfeiffer and the LSJ cite as the earliest explicit attestation of this meaning a line of the 1st century CE epigrammatist and astronomer Leonidas of Alexandria (AG 9.344): Ἦν ὁπότε γραμμαῖσιν ἐμὴν φρένα μόνον ἔτερπον.²⁹³ A scholiast's remarks to this passage supply τῆς ἀστρολογίας καὶ ἀστρονομίας for the reader's understanding of γραμμαῖσι. If the

²⁹² Liddel and Scott, s.v. γραμμή.

²⁹³ "When I was delighting my mind in astronomy alone." Leonidas of Alexandria was active in Nero's Rome. He is known especially for his isopsephic poetry, in which the sum of the numerical values of Greek letters ($\alpha = 1$, $\iota = 10$, $\rho = 100$; the system assumes values for obsolete Greek letters as well, such as koppa and digamma) in every distich of elegiac poetry are equal.

term required a gloss for a Greek reader, surely the Latin author would be forced as well to provide his readers with some sort of revelatory language. Catullus accomplishes this by allowing his translation to rephrase Callimachus' language when necessary, shifting the semantic burden away from individual technical terms, like *γραμμαί*, and replacing these with fuller descriptions in more illustrative language, such as his verb phrase in the first line with *di-* or *despexit*. The manifest deviation in line 1 establishes a precedent for the trend; the apparent dislocation of Callimachus' indirect questions in c. 66 presumes a continuation of that trend in the following lines. It is hardly tendentious to imagine that, if highly technical language followed in Callimachus' poem, Catullus felt comfortable rendering the Greek with similarly periphrastic forms that would be less opaque to non-specialist readers.

In other words, Catullus' "gloss" of *γραμμαί*, compulsory though it may have been, appears to set the stage for a series of similar explications for his audience. In a sense Catullus, and perhaps Callimachus as well, quickly defined the profession of the astronomer by presenting in familiar language the activities and inquiries typical of astronomy and astrology: surveying the stars of the vast world (*magni lumina mundi*); observing the regular movements and behaviors of constellations (*stellarum ortus atque obitus/habitus*), and rarer events such as solar eclipses (*ut solis nitor obscuretur*); documenting the seasonal and/or periodic changes in the night sky (*ut cedant certis sidera temporibus*); and explaining all of these as the interactions of celestial bodies personified (*Triviam relegans dulcis amor*). This exposition covers lines 1-6 in Catullus' version, everything that precedes the introduction of Conon and the lock. That these six

lines correspond to six lines of Callimachus has been inferred with little attention to an alternative. As I have noted above it has been largely taken for granted that Catullus treated each line of Callimachus with one of his own.²⁹⁴ However, all but the first of these lines has no extant parallel in Callimachus, and unlike in other fragmentary passages of *Aitia* 110, where a physical copy has surfaced and the layout of the papyrus has given us some semblance of the shape of the poem between legible portions, lines 1 and 7-8 were preserved as quotations in other texts, and so have no physical context. It is not impossible that Catullus' version was supplemented with explication that did not occur in the Greek original. Such a freedom could explain as well the failure of certain constructions to fall within the same position in both texts, as with Callimachus' indirect question in ἤ τε φέρονται in line 1 and the first of Catullus' indirect questions, which do not begin until line 3. In other words, the intervening indirect questions may not have been presented as fully in the original as in c. 66. Catullus has taken poetic liberties by making the additional information in the sketch of Conon serve the double purpose of extolling his qualifications as an astronomer and of explicating the province of the astronomer/astrologer more completely, whereas Callimachus was able to do so merely by accessing the abstruse, technical idiom of the science.

²⁹⁴ Harder's blunt dictum "Catullus translates each line of Callimachus by a line of his own," is difficult to disprove from our surviving evidence, but it is hardly more securely proven by what of Callimachus' poem we *do* possess. Such absolutes also fail to consider the intervention of some 10 lines in Catullus' poem, the lock's admonition to new brides on the wearing of perfume and its implications about their fidelity, for which there is no Callimachean equivalent (lines 79-88). As Putnam observes, the concord between the lines on either side of this apparent digression form "a perfect unity" (1960 p. 223). The verses have been imagined as an invention of Catullus, out of place in a court poem addressed to a queen whose chastity ought not be called into doubt; a later addition of Callimachus reflecting a difference between our badly damaged text and the manuscript from which Catullus translated (on which point see Jackson 2001); or even a contamination of verses from elsewhere in the *Aitia* that Catullus recognized as germane to the subject matter of the *Coma* and thus allowed to intervene in c. 66. On this last point especially, cf. Hollis (1992), but the issue and its repercussions are treated more fully below.

One additional observation on the opening seven lines will likewise suggest that they were treated by Catullus as a unit. After the first line, the next correspondence between *Aitia* fr. 110 and c. 66 occurs in lines 7-8. In both works Conon is introduced by name and said to have seen “me” (referring to the lock, the poem’s speaker throughout). It is curious that here in the seventh line Catullus’ translation seems to echo a phrase he did not directly translate in line 1. Callimachus’ τὸν ἐν γραμμαῖσι ἰδὼν ὄρον, as has been discussed, is, ostensibly, ineffectually expressed by Catullus’ *magni lumina mundi*. However, Catullus appears to express more completely the idea of seeing a boundary in the heavens here in line 7, with the phrase *caelesti in limine vidit*. This lacks a clear parallel in the source text, where ἔβλεψεν ἐν ἡέρι provides the nearest correspondence. It is my suggestion that Catullus at line 7 is completing the idea that Callimachus began in line 1, adapting and altering the original in order to represent faithfully the technical character of Callimachus’ lines, and providing where necessary glosses of the Greek astronomical terminology. The use of simple *vidit* here to capture the more poetic and specific ἔβλεψεν corroborates this, inasmuch as it effectively signals the interdependence of lines 1, where unadorned ἰδὼν became *di-* or *despexit*, and line 7, the closure of the period.²⁹⁵ It seems plausible that the aurally similar *lumina* and *limine* occurring in the same metrical position in lines 1 and 7, respectively, are meant to solidify such a relationship as well. Thus Catullus uses lines 1 and 7 to bookend the intervening lines of

²⁹⁵ This reversal has not gone unnoticed by others. Marinone comments twice on the unexpected chiasmus between the source and the translation: “[C. usa] *dispicere* in opposizione a line 7 ἔβλεψεν reso con *vidit*,” (p. 105); and “L’espressione [*caelesti in limine vidit*] è opposta alla precedente ἐν γραμμαῖσι ἰδὼν,” (p. 114). Massimilla also notes a “voluto contrasto” between the two (p. 468).

description and to highlight the role of lines 2-5 as glosses to explain the meanings of a series of scientifically precise phrases.

Section IV: The compensation principle

The section above examines just one aspect of Catullus' translations, namely how the poet rendered the technical terminology of the Greek original, but more can be gathered even from these short lines. A few of Catullus' proclivities have been mentioned or implied in passing—his deliberate placement of *omnia* at the poem's outset to match *πάντα*; the use of relative clauses to circumvent deficiencies in the Latin participial system; an approach both to the lock and the group of gods to whom it is dedicated that emphasizes the feminine aspects of the poem's theme²⁹⁶—but another adjustment in the introductory lines of the poem seems especially significant. I have discussed the reciprocal relationship between the verbs used in lines 1 and 7, but I did not mention in that discussion the fate of Callimachus' *ἐν ἡέρι*. No doubt the basic semantic information of this phrase is conveyed in the expanded *caelesti in limine*, but it is surely significant that Catullus does, in fact, mention the *ἡέρι* in his version as well, just above its use by

²⁹⁶ This is at least suggested by the decision to render *πᾶσιν ἔθηκε θεοῖς* through *multis dearum*. The shift from “all gods” to “many of the [female] gods” has inspired editors to emend *multis dearum*, the reading in manuscripts O and G, to *multis*, or even *cunctis deorum*, and, as mentioned above, was part of Harder's cause for suspecting the scholiast's memory, though she admits below when considering the genders of the various words for “lock” and the pronouns and adjectives that describe it in both versions that, whereas Callimachus allows ambiguity of gender in his use of *πλόκαμος* and *βόστρυχος* alongside *κόμαι ἀδελφραί*, Catullus' translation seems to favor feminine nouns such as *coma* and *caesaries* (p. 805, though she has either ignored *quid facient crines* at line 47 or decided that, as a somewhat gnomic generality in the distant third person, it does not violate the prescribed “gender” of the specific lock in question). If it is the case that Catullus chose to emphasize the feminine aspects of the lock and of separation more generally, perhaps then we should not be surprised either that he singled out the female gods as the specific dedicatees. Whether Catullus derived his intention to promote gender from Callimachus or for more personal reasons, as has been suggested, is not clear, but Gutzwiller (1992) actually traces a heavily gendered tone in Callimachus' version as well, noting that the poem celebrates and strengthens the role of the female component in the Ptolemaic dynasty.

Callimachus in line 6 *gyro deuocet aerio*. Although it appears here among other more technical terms, it seems unlikely that either poet intended ἀήρ or its derivatives to be taken literally. At its most specific the term is reserved for the *lower air* of earth's atmosphere (i.e., not at all where stars or other cosmic bodies move about), and it is surely for this reason that earlier editions of Catullus' text emended the manuscript reading to the more accurate aetherio; the αἰθήρ, strictly speaking, is the upper atmosphere and the heavens beyond. Such an emendation is not necessary, as Thomson notes, because, according to Aristotle, the orbit of the moon, which is at stake in *gyro aerio*, is located in the space between the ἀήρ and the αἰθήρ. The specific motivation for choosing one over the other, however, can just as easily be credited to the occurrence of the related word in the source text. Certainty is impossible, but it seems unlikely that Callimachus again had ἀήρ or a related word in whatever lost line could have yielded 66.6 in the Latin version, and this would suggest that Catullus deliberately placed the word here for other reasons. Granted, he has displaced it from its original location, but, as I have noted, this alteration seems to have been part of the larger agenda undertaken in lines 1-7. *aerio* at line 6, then, seems to be some sort of concession, a compensation for the disappearance and reworking of the idea expressed by ἐν ἡέρι in the following line. Was this word somehow indispensable to the poetics of the original? This is doubtful, especially when one considers the lack of precision with which Hellenistic poets treated the two terms for the atmosphere's layers. Nevertheless, Catullus chose to retain the term for some reason, and made a kind of concession by removing it from its original location to a nearby line. Much like the glosses of lines 1-7, this sort of compensation at points

where a more literal translation is impossible, inconvenient or merely cumbersome typifies Catullus' highly philological approach to the source text, as I will now show.

After 66.8 (\approx *Aitia* fr. 110.8) we have over 30 more lines of Catullus' translation before the appearance of a secure counterpart in our patchwork text of Callimachus.²⁹⁷ Fragment 110.40 is preserved in the 9th century lexical encyclopedia *Etymologicum Genuinum* because it contains an instance of nonstandard gender for the noun κάρη (Attic κάρα). Catullus' translation at 66.40 of σήν τε κάρην ὄμοσα σόν τε βίον is the most extensive use of an almost word-for-word equivalence between the two versions that we have yet encountered: the phrase *adiuro teque tuumque caput* even replicates the disyndeton of the cognate enclitics. Nearly literal translations, however, are less demonstrative of the any philological program on the part of the poet than are deviations—the goal of a word-for-word translation is an exact, literal replica in the target language, and when such is achieved little is left for our analysis—so we will leave this line behind in favor of the next correspondence between the two poems. The best preserved and longest uninterrupted papyrus fragment of *Aitia* 110 begins in mangled pieces at line 43, and carries on for 21 lines, some of which are more lacunose than others, until a disruption at line 64, after which the text of Callimachus becomes significantly more fractured and depends heavily on editorial restoration for legibility. As

²⁹⁷ In this span, however, there are two controversial and fragmentary lines that Pfeiffer prints in his text with brackets. No editor has admitted these without a disclaimer (often just with diacritical marks, as Pfeiffer), and some editors have chosen not to include them at all. The first is three (or four) words—seemingly quoted or imitated much later by Nonnus of Panopolis (4th or 5th c. CE) and Agathias Scholasticus (6th c. CE)—that bear a strong resemblance to parts of 66.13-14 *dulcia nocturnae portans vestigia rixae / quam de virgineis gesserat exuviis*: σύμβολον ἐννοχίης [εἶχον] ἀεθλοσύνης; the second is a single word, *μεγάθυμον*, restored to correspond to *magnanimam* at 66.26, owing to the remarks of (possibly pseudo-) Hyginus, the learned freedman of Augustus and superintendent of the Palatine library, who claimed at *Astr.* 2.24.5 that *Callimachus eam* [sc. *Berenicen*] *magnanimam dixit*. The likelihood that either or both are genuine fragments of Callimachus and their import if they are is discussed below.

I signaled in the introduction of my comparison between the poems, there are certain points in Pfeiffer's text for this section where it seems more than merely possible that he has used Catullus' Latin to conjecture the Greek of the original, but because this continuous passage of *Aitia* 110 is largely intact, it does not require substantial conjectures, and so it provides one of the more fertile sections for a comparative analysis of the two poems and of the procedures and aims of the translator.

In a recent article, De Wilde has used a section of this continuous correspondence with Callimachus' original, lines 45-50, to detail some of Catullus' translation techniques.²⁹⁸ De Wilde discusses a technique very similar to the sort of compensatory use of the adjectival form of ἄνθρωπος which he calls the compensation principle, part of a larger family of translation techniques that he calls "modulated transposition."²⁹⁹ He situates this discussion in a more general treatment of the faithfulness of Catullus' translation, asserting that the poet aimed at a close reproduction of the Greek, as is evidenced by a number of metrical resonances and word placements. Where fidelity to the Greek was not easily available, De Wilde argues, Catullus chose to make compensations in his version.³⁰⁰ I will in a moment discuss several points that demonstrate Catullus' interest in a faithful translation, as well as De Wilde's specific

²⁹⁸ De Wilde 2008.

²⁹⁹ Ibid. p. 161. "Modulated transposition" is the term used by Kelly (1979).

³⁰⁰ Though he does not state so outright, his hypothesis operates under the belief that Catullus performs with these compensations a variation on Thomas' "window reference", a concept introduced in his treatment of *Georgics* (1986). The "window reference" is a two-part allusion, the one part of which is the reference back to a primary source, the other the act of referencing that primary source through the mediation of another source, which itself had made reference to the primary source. For Thomas the reference is a kind of correction of the intermediary source's allusion. Catullus' version would do the same, using as the primary source both Callimachus and whatever earlier Greek author to which *Aitia* 110 makes reference (Homer and the Homeric Hymns most probably), and as the intermediary source both Callimachus, who stands in between Catullus and earlier Greek epic, and other Latin poets (Ennius, Accius and Lucretius, according to De Wilde).

treatment of the compensation principle, but to illustrate the type of delicate sensitivity to the original Greek that such alterations suggest, let us first consider once more the seventh line from the original and from Catullus' translation: Callimachus' ἦ με Κόνων... becomes *idem me ille Conon*. This use of ἦ, called "asseverative ἦ" by Smyth, is generally prepositive to another particle (especially γάρ and δὲ), but, according to Denniston, can occur as well before the unaccented personal pronouns.³⁰¹ In either case, it places heavy emphasis not on the word that follows it directly, but rather "[draws] the reader's attention to the truth of the following words," as Harder puts it.³⁰² She suggests for a translation of the line of Callimachus something like, "Truly, it was (this) Conon..." While Latin cannot match the variability and nuance of the Greek particles, it does possess a rich and adaptable system of pronouns, and it seems that Catullus elected to combine two such pronominal forms in order to compensate for the forceful assertion of the Greek, which would otherwise be lost in translation. The placement of the two pronouns as well—the one before *me* as in the Greek; the other before the proper name, mimicking the way in which ἦ directs the reader's attention to Conon—works to complement the meaning of Callimachus' particle.

The two examples I have offered have been highly lexical and relatively straightforward, but De Wilde's most telling example is more difficult to explain. That is Catullus' addition of an address to Jupiter at 66.48.³⁰³ This does not occur in any form in the original. It is an innovation, and a somewhat curious one at that. The line in question and its context in both poems are as follows:

³⁰¹ Cf. Smyth 2864 and Denniston 1954 p. 280 ff.

³⁰² Harder p. 804. She cites examples at *Il.* 17.143 and 22.356.

³⁰³ De Wilde p. 160ff.

cum Medi peperere novum mare cumque iuventus (45)
per medium classi barbara navit Athon
quid facient crines, cum ferro talia cedant?
Iuppiter, ut Chalybon omne genus pereat
et qui principio sub terra quaerere venas
*institit ac ferri stringere duritiem!*³⁰⁴ (50)

βουπόρος Ἀρσινόη[ς μ]ητρὸς σέο, καὶ διὰ μέ[σσου] (45)
 Μηδείων ὄλοαι νῆες ἔβησαν Ἄθω.
 τί πλόκαμοι ῥέξωμεν, ὅτ' οὔρεα τοῖα σιδή[ρω]
 εἴκουσιν; Χαλύβων ὡς ἀπόλοιτο γένος,
 γειόθεν ἀντέλλοντα, κακὸν φυτόν, οἳ μιν ἔφ[ηναν] (50)
 πρῶτοι καὶ τυπιδῶν ἔφρασαν ἐργασίην.³⁰⁵

The apostrophe, or perhaps expletive, is especially odd when one considers that Catullus follows Callimachus relatively closely in the rest of the couplet at lines 47-8. De Wilde sees Catullus' use of Jupiter's name as compensating for certain elements that were present in the source text but were altered in the translation. Specifically, there is first the minor adjustment of the rhetorical question τί πλόκαμοι ῥέξωμεν, "what are we locks to do?" Catullus' *quid facient crines* is distant from Callimachus' verse, not vastly, but still appreciably, with the change in person from the 1st to the 3rd and the alteration of grammatical mood.³⁰⁶ Callimachus' verb also has an epic pedigree that *facere* lacks.

³⁰⁴ "If Medes made a new body of water, when their men / sailed with their savage fleet straight through Mt. Athon's core / then what are locks supposed to do, when things like that give way to iron? / By God, may all the race of Chalybes die out / and those who first insisted on obtaining from beneath the earth / the veins of ore, and in extracting iron's obstinance."

³⁰⁵ "...the ox-spit of Arsinoe your mother, and straight through the core / of Athon went the Medes' destructive fleet. / What ever are we locks to do, when mountains like these yield / to iron, may the race of Chalybes die out / who first revealed it rising from the earth, a wicked growth, / and made how it is wrought by hammers known."

³⁰⁶ Technically speaking the tenses are different too; Callimachus' verb is aorist subjunctive while Catullus' is future indicative. The generally preterite tense of the Greek aorist is, of course, not felt in the subjunctive, which conveys only simple aspect, and so there is no semantic conflict between the tenses of ῥέξωμεν and Catullus' future indicative; indeed in Latin the future tense expresses both simple and progressive aspect. It is true that Catullus might have more accurately reflected the mood of Callimachus' verb with *faciant*, though it is often the case that the present subjunctive and the future indicative express no significant difference, both dealing with events that have not yet (and may not) take place. Cf. as well

Extremely rare in Attic prose, ῥέζειν is at home in epic and tragedy, and its mock-epic usage in comedy indicates unmistakably that it belongs to the loftier register of more serious poetry.³⁰⁷ De Wilde notes that both of Catullus' modifications, the shift from 1st to 3rd person and the substitution of a generically weighted verb with an unremarkable one, yield a translation that seems incompletely to capture the spirit of the original. Indeed, as the line continues Catullus strays from the original again. Callimachus qualified his rhetorical utterance with an aphorism: ὄτ' οὖρα τοῖα σιδήρω / εἴκουσιν “when mountains like these yield / to iron”; Catullus followed suit, but chose to suppress οὖρα entirely, leaving just *cum ferro talia cedant* “when things like that give way to iron”. With the omission of a specific noun, Callimachus' enjambment of the verb becomes another casualty of the translation. These two alterations do not produce a Latin translation that is altogether different from the original, but they are notable. Minor as they are, they would not be missed if metrical constraints or a lack of room precluded them, but, nevertheless, in line 48, where Callimachus' εἴκουσιν completes the sense of the line above, Catullus has decided instead to add an element that is wanting in the source text.³⁰⁸ The direct address, *Iuppiter*, is entirely Catullus', and, as De Wilde,

the identical forms of the 3rd and 4th conjugations' 1st person singular future active indicative and present active subjunctive: *agam, audiam*. If such a syncretism had created confusion for native learners, no doubt they would have analogized the 1st person future forms from the rest of the paradigm to **agem* and **audiem*.

The rearranged word order, De Wilde claims, can be explained readily, even though *quid crines facient* scans equally well. It is rather more likely that Catullus wished to preserve Callimachus' opening metrical salvo of dactyl and spondee with words of identical shape: a one syllable word scanned long followed by a self-contained anapest (p. 160).

³⁰⁷ The comic poet Pherecrates preserves this mock-heroic usage at fragment 152. In its more natural environment, τί ῥέξομεν is an epic formula, occurring as a genuine deliberation rather than as a rhetorical question at *Il.* 11.838. The same combination appears as a rhetorical question, as it is used by Callimachus, at *Il.* 19.90 and again at *Od.* 4.649. Sophocles uses the formula at *OC* 1724.

³⁰⁸ Wormell (1966) actually does blame “metrical stringency” for the disappearance of οὖρα at 66.47, though he does not attempt to explain why Catullus chose to forfeit those syllables, making room for his

remarks, evokes a distinct Romanness while supplying a parallel to what he calls the “epic colouring” of Callimachus that was forfeited by the loss of ῥέξωμεν.

De Wilde argues that the alterations that preceded the apostrophe demanded some sort of compensation, though, by confessing that, “both missing features are *somehow* counterbalanced by the invocation of the supreme deity,” he admits that how exactly the address achieves this compensation is somewhat murky.³⁰⁹ However, De Wilde does not consider at all the possibility that *Iuppiter* could be an expletive rather than an apostrophic appeal, similar to Catullus’ use of the same name in c. 1.7, *doctis, Iuppiter, et laboriosis*, and earlier in c. 66 at line 30, *Iuppiter, ut tristi lumina saepe manu*. Heusch prefers to read *Iuppiter* in this way, “als Kraftausdruck, der... stark umgangssprachliche Nuance gibt”.³¹⁰ De Wilde mentions colloquial speech (alongside Ennian usage, oddly), but he does not account for how this use of a colloquialism would accomplish any sort of compensation either. In fact, a rich tradition of such use of the gods’ names existed in Roman comedy (presumably a reflection of everyday speech), which would oppose directly De Wilde’s idea of epic/tragic compensation. In my opinion the use of *Iuppiter* does more to compensate for the loss of the 1st person verb—the meter would allow for *facimus*, but not *faciemus*, and so Catullus could only preserve either the person or the tense of the Greek verb—than it does to recall a particularly “Romanizing” mode of speech. An aside such as this, whether a genuine apostrophe or an expletive, reminds us

innovative address to Jupiter, instead of coaxing a Latin equivalent for “mountains” into the line’s vacated dactyl (p. 197).

³⁰⁹ Ibid. p. 161. The emphasis is mine.

³¹⁰ 1954 p. 133.

that the speaker of the lines *quid facient crines* is not a detached 3rd person narrator, but a party invested and interested directly in the substance of the narration.³¹¹

Nevertheless, the attention to the phenomenon that De Wilde invites, not his explanation, is most compelling here. In fact, relegated to a footnote in his treatment of the *Iuppiter* phenomenon is a provocative observation that I wish to explore further. He notes that, “Catullus seems to compensate (adapt) the epic-archaic reminiscences of Kallimachos by the use of archaic Latin and allusions to mainly Ennius and Lucretius.”³¹² The notion is intriguing, especially when one considers that a rejection of earlier Latin poetics has been regarded as a basic element of neoteric poetry since antiquity.³¹³ Such a denunciation of one’s poetic heritage bears a striking resemblance to the sentiment Callimachus often expressed towards his own native literary tradition, who famously dismisses the heroic themes and lengthy scope of epic poetry in favor of a “slender Muse” at the introduction of the *Aitia*.³¹⁴ And yet, even in Callimachus’ introductory poem the voices of his literary forebears are hardly silent;³¹⁵ on the contrary, careful

³¹¹ There is perhaps another interpretation of the use of an apostrophe here as well. Courtney notes two instances in Varro Atacinus’ *Argonautica* where an address of this type appears in the translation but is absent from the original, a phenomenon he says is “in the style of the ‘new’ poets” (1993 p. 247).

³¹² Ibid. p. 161 n. 81, where the address to the king of the gods is said by De Wilde to recall not only Ennius’ use, but also a colloquial tone. This somewhat dichotomous equation is not reconciled by De Wilde, but in the same note he lists without further comment several other passages in c. 66 that recall Ennius, Accius and archaic Latin, which will be probed and considered below.

³¹³ Cf. not only Cicero’s famous remarks at *Tusc.* 3.45 on the contempt the *cantores Euphorionis* have for Ennius, but also Catullus’ own strongly worded criticism of a certain poet named Volusius, whose ambitious poem, called *Annales* and so presumably written in the annalistic format that could not but recall Ennius, is designated *cacata charta* in c. 36 and said to be suitable only for wrapping fish in c. 95. We will revisit c. 36 and c. 95 in chapter 3.

³¹⁴ *Aitia* 1.24.

³¹⁵ One need look no further than the opening lines, where Callimachus responds to criticism from the Telchines. The mythological race of metallurgists are presented as opponents to his brand of poetry, which is not an ἄεισμα διηκεῖς “continuous song” of thousands of lines about kings and heroes, but even in this act of distancing himself from the traditional subject matter and format of epic, Callimachus makes use of the practitioners of this style of poetry. Harder notes that his use of διηκεῖς to imply a labored, even painful or undesirable narrative process depends on an epic valence of the adverbial form that appears in

engagement with and skillful allusion to literary tradition are hallmarks of Hellenistic poetry.³¹⁶ The characterization of Catullus as categorically free from, even hostile to the influence of early Latin poetry is comparably unfair. In a 1983 article Zetzel treats this cliché. He argues that Ennian echoes are not only abundant in Catullus, but carefully and deliberately employed.³¹⁷ It should come as no great surprise that allusion is for Catullus a delicate and artful process, but of greater import to the current discussion is Zetzel's analogizing of the relationship between Catullus and Ennius, with its superficial polemic distracting from more fundamental indebtedness, as more or less parallel to the poetic rapport that Callimachus maintained with Homer.

De Wilde's note on the compensation principle invites this same association, though only implicitly. It is my suggestion, then, that, at certain places—often but not always where a literal translation is in some way inconvenient or undesirable—Catullus aims to imitate Callimachus' engagement with the traditions that informed his text. To demonstrate this I will utilize De Wilde's compensation principle and examine the examples he provides more thoroughly than he does in his footnote. In that note he merely catalogues passages where Catullus seems to access the language of earlier Latin poetry for a counterbalancing effect, providing only a citation of a word in c. 66 and a

Homer and Hesiod (p. 20). The epithet with which he casts the Telchines as inclement Philistines, νήϊδες Μούσης, “unknowing of the Muse”, is similarly evocative of a Homeric usage of the adjective and a concept of poetic ignorance that first appears in Pindar (Harder p. 16).

³¹⁶ No footnote, nor indeed a treatment of a considerably larger scale, would suffice to demonstrate this point exhaustively, but Bing's *The Well-read Muse* (1988) can serve as an entrée to Callimachus' relationship with his slender muse and the literary past, as well as the transition from an oral to a written literature that fostered the highly erudite writing of the Alexandrian poets.

³¹⁷ Zetzel (1983). Allusions, stylistic mannerisms and their contexts are considered especially in c. 64, but Zetzel provides examples from beyond the epyllion as well to demonstrate that Catullus used Ennius in particular, “as a point of reference, as a source of archaic diction. . . in order to anchor the myths of Greece in the Roman tradition,” (p. 264). Cf. as well Thomas (1982) and Clausen (in Kenney and Clausen 1982), both of which treat the process of allusion in Catullus (and the other neoterics) more broadly.

specific Latin poet from which the usage conceivably is derived. For the appearance of another apostrophic *Iuppiter* at line 30, for instance, he lists only the word, the line number and the name Ennius, to whom he assumes Catullus made reference. He explores neither the occurrence of the form in the earlier authors—let alone why Catullus chose specifically to reference such a passage in c. 66—nor the parallel phenomenon of reference in Callimachus for which Catullus purportedly compensates. It therefore seems worthwhile to probe some of De Wilde’s hypothetical compensations further.

Let us consider, for instance a reference he lists as occurring at 66.63. In the context of the immediate aftermath of the lock’s catasterization and placement within the sky Catullus wrote *uvidulam a fluctu cedentem ad templa deum me*, “[placed] me, wet and heading from the waves to the gods’ temples”. De Wilde suggests that Catullus’ *ad templa deum* serves to recall an Ennian use of *templa* in the sense of “abode”. Presumably he has in mind *Annales* 1.48, *ad caeli caerulea templa*, the passage to which both Quinn and Fordyce direct readers as well.³¹⁸ I would add to this lexical reference the metrical effect of a hexameter that ends with a self-contained iamb followed by a single syllable word, *deum me*, a cadence that Thomas calls “strictly Ennian.”³¹⁹ De Wilde does not, however, tell us what feature of Callimachus lost in translation this reference serves to compensate. Nevertheless, let us consider the complete line and its Greek counterpart. The papyrus fragments do not transmit the entire line of Greek that corresponds to 66.63, and perhaps we ought to suspect Pfeiffer’s restoration as seemingly divined from the

³¹⁸ The lines read *quamquam multa manus ad caeli caerulea templa / tendebam lacrumans*... “though many times I wept and raised my hands to the blue abodes of the heavens.”

³¹⁹ *Ibid.* p. 180. He notes that the pattern ends roughly 4% of lines of *Annales*. By my count the pattern is rare in Catullus as well, occurring only once in the wholly hexametrical poems (64.315), and in only three other instances in the hexametrical lines of the longer elegiac poems (66.91 and 68.19 and 33).

Latin, but that his conjecture or a semantic equivalent is required here is virtually guaranteed, even from the small sample of genuine Greek that is legible from the papyrus. Callimachus' line with Pfeiffer's supplements reads ὕδατι] λουόμενόν με παρ' ἄθα[νάτους ἀνιόντα, "[placed] me washed in water and rising to the gods," is passably if not perfectly matched by Catullus' "[placed] me, wet and heading from the waves to the gods' temples".³²⁰ As is the case in other instances where Pfeiffer has been forced to supplement the text with conjectures, some of his suggestions here require little scrutiny. The likelihood that παρ' ἄθα[νάτους, for instance, could have been expanded by Catullus to *ad templa deum*, with only a minor stretch of the semantics, is reasonably high. Even ἀνιόντα, which the Latin *cedentem* recommends, is a workable suggestion, despite some minor issues.³²¹ Though also passable, the semantic rapport between ὕδατι] λουόμενον and *uvidulam a fluctu* is less precise, particularly because the water word in the Latin almost certainly construes with *cedentem*. Perhaps it is here that loss and compensation occur. Furthermore, a noun more suitable to the meaning of *fluctus* "wave" would be preferable, and in fact two such nouns can better anticipate the Latin while maintaining the metrical needs of the line. Vitelli preferred κύματι "waves"; Manteuffel suggested νάματι "stream". Either captures the movement of water implied with *fluctus* better than more semantically sterile ὕδατι. However, Marinone rightly points out that both of the two more fluid terms contain an extra letter that the *esiguo spazio della lacuna*, i.e. the

³²⁰ In both passages the sense is not that the lock is literally washed, but rather that, as a new star, it is made damp as it rises over the sea. Homer uses λούειν of the rising and setting stars, which appear to come from and to return to Oceanus. Cf. Il 5.5 and 18.489

³²¹ Harder fairly finds Pfeiffer's ἀνιόντα problematic, since there is no effort to coordinate it with the earlier participle. Her preferred reading follows Nauta's suggestion of ἀνάγουσα in place of ἀνιόντα, referring then to Aphrodite rather than the lock, and this phrase actually enjoys the support of an epic precedent in *Homeric Hymn* 6.15: ἦγγον ἐς ἀθανάτους "they bring [Aphrodite] up to the gods" (Nauta 2006). In any event it seems likely that a single-word attribute occupied the end of this line in *Aitia* 110.

physical space on the papyrus itself, could not accommodate. A word of only five letters is needed, and so Vogliano's ὕδατι is desirable. There is no need to lament the loss of semantic information with such a bland noun; in fact the closely linked attribute, the participle λουόμενον, contains its own important semantic information, action that is wanting in Catullus' adjective. Catullus' lock is wet as it moves away from the waves—the motion of water is expressed in the noun and participle alongside a static adjectival attribute. Callimachus has the lock “washed in the water”, where the verbal action makes the water dynamic but the noun is unremarkable. This metathesis of semantic burdens is very similar to the phenomenon discussed above in regards to the verbs and nouns Catullus uses in the first several lines of c. 66.³²² In this it is a kind of compensation, but not quite a compensation of the allusory kind as De Wilde suggested.

However, there is perhaps more to this transposition of semantic information than is immediately apparent. In *Aitia* fr. 110.63 the lock is said to be λουόμενον, “washed”. The sense is not that the lock is literally washed, but rather that it is made damp as it rises over the sea, which is the sense that Catullus captures by attaching his water word *fluctu* to the participle of motion. This seems to portend the regular cycle of rising from and setting into the sea that it will experience as a star. In fact Homer uses λούειν and its derivatives of the rising and setting of stars frequently, inasmuch as they appear to come

³²² One may note as well that we are rewarded with a rather fortuitous phonological coincidence between the two phrases, ὕδατι λουόμενον and *uidulam*. The alveolar consonantal sounds [d] and [l] occur in both the Greek original and the Latin translation, as do the principle vocalic phonemes in [u:] and semi-vowel [w]. In the Latin there is also the nasalized final vowel correlating to the sequence of nasal consonants with which the Greek word terminates.

from and to return to Oceanus during their regular circuits.³²³ In the context of celestial movements it seems likely that this Homeric usage is at play.³²⁴ Thus it appears that in both versions of the poem the author alluded to his epic forebears. De Wilde's implication is that Catullus could not replicate the specifics of Callimachus' appropriation of Homeric language, but found that he could compensate for the loss of the reference through a parallel act of allusion, and adopted instead features of Ennian epic. One could imagine that Catullus would most likely have accomplished this with the assistance of certain scholarly aides; a commentary to Callimachus, or perhaps a teacher, would point to the Homeric precedent, and Catullus would recreate this lost feature with an echo of Latin epic. This would be a fairly straightforward instance of De Wilde's allusive schematic—Callimachus references Homer; and Catullus, as Latin Callimachus, references Ennius, the Latin Homer—but not all of De Wilde's hypothetical compensations are so simple when they are pursued fully.

We are faced with a more difficult task in tracing the compensation that underlies *flammeus* at 66.3, which De Wilde lists as an epic reminiscence of Ennius and Lucretius.³²⁵ It will be more helpful to consider the entire phrase in which the adjective occurs: *flammeus nitor rapidi solis*, “the blazing flash of the swift sun.”³²⁶ The

³²³ Cf. *Il.* 5.6 and 18.489, as well as *Od.* 5.275, which repeats the formula of *Il.* 18.489. In the former a rising star is λελουμένος Ὠκεανοῖο “washed by Oceanus”; in the latter the constellation of the Bear is said to be ἄμμορός ... λουτρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο “having no share in the baths of Oceanus”.

³²⁴ This is Harder's suggestion (p. 837). Cf. as well the appearance of Oceanus just a few lines later both at c. 66.67 and, so it would appear, *Aitia* fr. 110.67, though in the Greek the word can only be restored from the badly damaged fragment at the recommendation of the Latin, which I have discussed above.

³²⁵ The adjective does occur in both authors, though of the two only Lucretius applies it to celestial bodies. He does so at DRN 5.525 during his discussion of the motivation of the stars' movement: *flammea per caelum pascentis corpora passim*, “feeding their blazing bodies here and there through the sky.”

³²⁶ *rapidi* is slightly ambiguous. Quinn takes the adjective in the sense of “frenzied” or “rapid(ly moving)”. Marinone would have it taken more in line with its etymological meaning (from *rapere*) of “snatching” or

collocation of *nitor* with *flammeus* occurs only here in Latin literature, though *nitor* for heavenly bodies is not confined to c. 66. In fact it appears in Cicero's translation of Aratus (20.2), where he uses it to render αἴγλη, "gleam", from *Phaenomena* 139.³²⁷ Aratus may have taken his word from a Homeric usage at *Od.* 4.45, where he speaks of the αἴγλη of the sun and moon. It is unproven that Catullus relied on Cicero's *Aratea* to any great degree in the *Coma*, though it is possible that some of Cicero's mediation of certain astronomical terms from Greek into Latin influenced the idiom of Latin astronomy, if not Catullus' translation directly.³²⁸ It is equally impossible to prove definitively that Catullus consulted either Aratus' *Phaenomena* or Homer as he prepared his translation—although Luck reads at least Aratean resonances in Catullus' verses³²⁹—but it is certainly the case that Catullus' *nitor solis* is closer to Homeric ἡελίου αἴγλη than it is to anything in Lucretius or Ennius. However, the phrasing of 66.3 reminds Marinone of a similar expression in Accius' lost *Brutus*, where Tarquinius relates an ominous dream he had in which the *orbem flammeum / radiatum solis*, "the blazing, radiant circle of the sun" had left its expected course.³³⁰ The coincidence of *flammeus* applied to a noun on which genitive *solis* depends, as well as the aural similarity between *rapidi* and *radiati* is striking, and in both passages, c. 66 and *Brutus*, Marinone notes, *flammeus* does not refer to the idea of heat and fire contained in its etymological roots, but rather to the sun's

"voracious" (p. 107). I have privileged the transferred meaning of "swiftly moving" for reasons that will become obvious below.

³²⁷ Both Aratus and Cicero use αἴγλη of stars, rather than the sun.

³²⁸ I discussed earlier in this chapter the possibility that Catullus' description of celestial movements in lines 2-4 may echo the Latin translation of corresponding Greek terms first attested in Cicero.

³²⁹ See above, p 120 n. 251. Luck points to explicit reflections of *Phaenomena* at c. 66.69 and at 68.153 (1976 p. 233 n. 33).

³³⁰ The passage is preserved by Cicero *De Div.* 1.22.

visual display.³³¹ Although at other points in his list of compensations De Wilde lists Accius as a target of Catullus' allusions, he does not suggest that *flammeus* could recall the tragedian here, even though Tarquinius' dream is replete with astronomical phenomena and language.³³² Nevertheless, it would seem that the best we can do with *flammeus*, if we are to believe that it is allusive, is to link it to Accius' usage, rather than to Lucretius' or Ennius'.

Of course, to some extent our search for a compensation in this passage is limited by another problem, namely that *Aitia* 110.3 has not survived, and so we cannot ever be certain for which forfeited element of the Greek poem Catullus sought compensation in *flammeus*. However, as I have discussed above, the introductory section of c. 66 showcased Catullus' immediate program of translating difficult astronomical jargon for which Latin equivalents were not in all cases readily at hand. Therefore it seems plausible to suggest that Catullus used *flammeus nitor*, a complex allusion that could recall Accius or Cicero, and perhaps Lucretius or Ennius as well, in part as counterbalance for lost technical vocabulary, which Callimachus could have taken from existing astronomical writings. However, Catullus also achieved compensation by going a step further. While the account of Conon's qualifications that Callimachus presumably listed at *Aitia* 110's introduction did not survive, he did, in fact, use elsewhere in his poetry a collocation that resembles strongly Catullus *rapidi solis*: ὀξύν ἥλιον.³³³ It is possible that ὀξύν ἥλιον or

³³¹ p. 107, but cf. as well de Meo (1965) for the distinction in this particular usage.

³³² For instance, *impetu nocturno* of night's onset (cf. *caeli impetu* of Luc. *DRN* 5.200); *cursum novo* and *cursum ab laeva signum praepotens* of the sun's movement.

³³³ The collocation occurs in the epigrams at 30.1-2, but the formula also resembles ὀξέος Ἡελίοιο, found at *Homeric Hymn* 3.374, and so had a pre-existing epic precedent. It is impossible to determine that Callimachus meant for his ὀξύν ἥλιον to recall usage in the hymn to Apollo, though Nauta's restoration of

something similar recurred in the lost lines of *Aitia* 110, but it not unreasonable to suggest that Catullus found a Callimachean model for his collocation outside of the *Aitia* and then made appropriate use of it in his translation of *Aitia* 110.³³⁴ In this case, it may again be plausible that Catullus was alerted to existence of the Callimachean phrase, or to the epic precedent in *HH* 3.374, by some sort of external agent.

De Wilde lists one additional “compensation” that I believe can be pressed further. 66.85, if we allow its classification as a compensation, is in fact a skillful blending of two allusions: *mala dona levis bibat irrita pulvis*.³³⁵ The first is conveyed by the “light dust”, *levis pulvis*, a description which De Wilde suggests was captured by Homer as λεπτή κονίη at *Il.* 23.506, itself appropriated by Sophocles’ as λεπτή κόνις at *Ant.* 256. Already we are dealing with a different kind of allusion if De Wilde is right in assuming that Catullus references Greek authors rather than earlier Latin poets. The second is the image of that same dust (or sand, as Marinone reckons) “drinking [offerings]”, *dona bibat*, which recalls Aeschylus’ κόνις πῖη...αἷμα “dust drank the blood,” from *Sept.* 736-7, but perhaps looks also again to *Antigone*, where thirsty dust, θυρίαν κόνιν, is mentioned twice, at 247 and 429. In both tragedies the image of thirsty dust is used to describe last rites performed for the dead, a somewhat unexpected reversal of the circumstances discussed in c. 66, where the lock admonishes new brides. However, in this context, where the lock laments its separation and the end of its life among its sister locks, marriage and death are not irreconcilable. For the lock, Berenice’s death

ἀνάγουσα in place of Pfeiffer’s ἀνιόντα at fr. 110.63 (p. 156, n. 321 above) suggests a similar use of the Homeric Hymn tradition for deriving formulae.

³³⁴ We have already seen that Livius Andronicus was comfortable importing elements from elsewhere in the Homeric corpus as he prepared his *Oduisia*.

³³⁵ “Let the light sand drink those wicked, baseless gifts.”

ultimately does lead to “death” as an organic part of a living being. The irony, then, of drawing attention to funerary rites with a stock metaphor is not inappropriate.

Furthermore, Homer’s (and thus Sophocles’) λεπτή, literally “peeled” but more frequently “slender”, is a word of some importance to Callimachus, and though Catullus elsewhere prefers *lepidus* as his sonic and semantic equivalent to the Greek adjective, the sense of *levis* that conveys slightness or reduced importance recalls his deprecatory label for his own poetry as *nugae* at c. 1.4, and it is tempting to read this correspondence here. However, we are forced into mere speculation as to how a tragic or epic reference would explicate or compensate Callimachus’ poem, because the verses of *Aitia* 110 that would correspond to this section have eluded transmission. In fact, the passage comprised of lines 79-88 has been heavily scrutinized as a possible Catullan creation.³³⁶ Hollis proposes an interesting solution to the provenance of these 10 lines. Persuaded to reexamine the passage by the “very Callimachean nature of the motif ‘non prius.../quam’” at lines 80-2, he imagines that Catullus has incorporated lines of another Callimachus poem into his translation, lines which were appropriate to the specific marital context of the *Coma*, but appeared at another point in Callimachus’ *Aitia*. He points to a practically illegible fragment of papyrus, on which is transmitted very clearly the name Βερενίκης and a word that ends]άμεναι (ostensibly a participle to correspond to Catullus’ *nudantes* at line 81).³³⁷ If Catullus can be shown to import language from

³³⁶ On the various hypothetical scenarios in which 79-88 could have found its way into c. 66, see p. 150 n. 294 above.

³³⁷ Hollis 1992. He joins his solution to this problem with another unsolved question about c. 66, the description of Berenice’s heroic behavior that earned her the epithet *magnanima* at line 26. The hypothetical wedding poem in which this papyrus fragment would appear is joined to another badly damaged papyrus fragment that preserves the name of Berenice but of which the context is doubtful. In this second fragment the name of Berenice’s father Magas also appears, who is implicit in the demonstration of

elsewhere in Callimachus with his translation *rapidi solis* for ὄξυν ἥλιον, I am inclined to agree with Hollis that another instance of *contaminatio* may have occurred at lines 66.79-88. This still leaves unanswered what lost element Catullus' epic or tragic reference would compensate, or how this compensation would be accomplished by referencing Greek authors, rather than Latin authors, but we can perhaps speculate that an allusion to Homer or to Sophocles that Catullus carried *through* Callimachus would stand as a more genuine example of a window reference. If Catullus saw in Callimachus, and not necessarily just in *Aitia* 110, an allusion to λεπτή κονίη or κόνις πῆη, perhaps an incomplete or otherwise defective allusion, his own *levis bibat...pulvis* would serve to correct or augment the original allusion, and stand as a typical example of Thomas' original definition of the device. This, then, would perhaps be better classified as such, as a window reference, rather than as a compensation, but the correction of the source text has precedent in earlier Latin translations as well.³³⁸

In my treatment of each of DeWilde's compensations, an obvious question arises: was Catullus so thoroughly well-read in both Latin and Greek poetry that he could have recognized allusions to Homer and the Homeric Hymns, the Attic tragedians, or recalled relevant passages and language from elsewhere in Callimachus, *and* supplied from memory references to the poetry of Ennius or Accius or Cicero or Lucretius in imitation of Callimachus? Perhaps, though it seems at least as likely that the tools of a professional teacher or philologist—exegetical commentaries or even the practiced eye of a teacher

her magnanimity that is discussed by Catullus at line 26 as well. Hollis admits that his treatment is highly speculative, particularly the coordination of the two fragments, but the idea that Catullus supplemented his translation with material from elsewhere in Callimachus, rather than creating it *ex nihilo*, is compelling.

For more on line 26 see below.

³³⁸ See p. 124 n. 249 on Cicero's correction of Aratus' version of the Orion myth.

himself—would have been extremely useful to this end. There is no explicit evidence in Catullus that he employed such tools, but the circumstantial evidence of earlier practice suggests that ambitious translations such as *Coma Berenices* were not produced without assistance. In fact, in earlier translations the digestion and incorporation of scholastic tools into the final project appears to have been a deliberate feature of the translation process.

Section V: Correction and commentary

Thus far we have considered two aspects of Catullus' translation that recall the professional philologist or commentator. The first, the incorporation of lexical glosses into the translation at points where Callimachus' language invites explication, behaves, in a sense, like an exegetical commentary, providing additional information in order to facilitate a reading of the text. The second aspect appears to show Catullus making use of the tools of the professional man of letters to identify and replicate literary language or allusions. Both types of activity are demonstrable elsewhere in artistic translations of Greek texts into Latin, but there is perhaps another side to Catullus' interaction with the scholarly tradition that I wish to consider. To have written something worthy not only of readership but of academic commentary as well garnered the admiration of one's peers among the neoterics. Tigidas' praise of Valerius Cato's *Lydia*, that it was *doctorum maxima cura liber*, implies as much.³³⁹ Likewise Cinna's *Zmyrna*, the virtues of which Catullus extols in c. 95, was apparently so rich and complex in its sophistication and

³³⁹ "A book of the greatest solicitude for learned men." The quotation comes from Suetonius' chapter on Cato in DGR 11.

learning that it very quickly attracted, even required, a scholarly commentary, which was written by the grammarian Lucius Crassicius.³⁴⁰ For the new poets, such recognition of their labored and artificial erudition was high praise. No contemporary, or near-contemporary, scholarly companion to Catullus' poetry existed, at least of which we are aware. Wiseman doubts that anything Catullus wrote could have taken the fabled nine years that *Zmyrna* needed, or would have required a learned commentary in order to be understood by native readers.³⁴¹ However, he also admits that Catullus' poetry is perhaps an untypical example of neotericism in this regard, persuaded as the author was by personal considerations to undertake in his longer works poetic projects that dealt largely with themes of devotion, separation and the pains of love.³⁴² Nevertheless, it is with those more traditionally "neoteric" artistic values—density of allusion and erudition, preciousness of style—that Catullus aligned himself and his poetry, and these were no doubt the features of *Zmyrna* that wanted, even required comment. Moreover, dense poetry of the kind that *Zmyrna* is supposed to have been was not the only poetry to garner scholarly attention, and learned commentaries were not the only form such attention assumed. The grammarian Q. Caecilius Epirota was, according to Suetonius, already teaching the

³⁴⁰ Suetonius DGR 18. The relationship between *Zmyrna* and Crassicius is portrayed in an anonymous epigram as a literal monogamy; *soli Crassicio se dixit nubere velle*, "[Zmyrna] claimed to wish to marry Crassicius alone." Meanwhile the *indocti* are told to cease trying to court the poem, which bespeaks flattery not only of the grammarian and his skill, but of the *doctus poeta* who crafted such learned verses. Crassicius' activity is dated to the 30s and 20s BCE.

³⁴¹ 1974 p. 54.

³⁴² Such are the unifying themes of the so-called "longer poems", the *carmina docta* (61-68), if they are to be regarded as forming a set for anything other than their length and their position in the collection. Wiseman's implication is that personal investment is responsible for the difference in subject matter between Catullus' narrative poems and those of Cinna and his other peers, but that a Callimachean interest in abstruse mythology and other such miscellany drawn from the more remote corners of Greek history were the typical concerns of neoteric poetry (ibid. pp. 54-55).

poetry of Vergil during the latter's lifetime.³⁴³ We cannot, therefore, dismiss the possibility that praise and attention from the *docti* were at least in mind as he composed his most polished works, even if those works did not reach the level of celebrated inscrutability that characterizes *Zmyrna*'s reputation.

Let us consider, for instance, a rather minor example of a poetic compensation in action, and the import that it has on such a hypothesis. Catullus uses the epithet *magnanimam* to describe Berenice at line 26. Because *Aitia* 110.26 is lost, we can only infer what corresponding Greek epithet the Latin represents, and *μεγάθυμον* has been the preferred form in critical recensions that choose to offer a conjecture. Pfeiffer felt that *μεγάθυμος* was somehow too obvious, and so he suggested alternatives as well, namely *μεγαλήτωρ*, *μεγαλόφρων*, *μεγαθαρσής*, or *μεγάτολμος*.³⁴⁴ Whatever the correct reading of the Greek form may be, both Greek and Latin words stem from their respective epic predecessors.³⁴⁵ The basis for the restoration of the missing Greek word is found in a

³⁴³ DGR 16.3 states that he is was said to be *primusque Vergilium et alios poetas novos praelegere coepisse*, "first to have started lecturing on Vergil and other modern poets." Epirota was a freedman of Pomponius Atticus, but fell out of favor with his former master after misconduct with Atticus' daughter, whose teacher he had been. Later he devoted himself first to Cornelius Gallus, and then, on the occasion of his condemnation and death, founded a secondary school of his own where he taught young men, but not boys. There he lectured on Vergil and certain other *novi poetae*. Kaster notes that this latter designation does not point necessarily to Catullus and the neoterics, but merely distinguishes these unnamed poets from the canon of older and established authors (1995 p. 188).

³⁴⁴ Pfeiffer (1932). He adds *μεγαλόψυχος* to that list in his 1949 commentary. Harder prefers *μεγάθυμος*, in that "it would *not* be obvious when used of a mortal woman," (p. 810).

³⁴⁵ This is no doubt why De Wilde listed it in his catalogue of compensations. *μεγάθυμον* and many of the other possible Greek terms suggested by Pfeiffer occur in Greek epic, especially Homer and Hesiod. The compound *magnanimus* is first attested in Roman comedy, *Amphitryo* 212, but later becomes a favorite epithet of Vergil (twice in Book 4 of the *Georgics*; a dozen scattered uses in the *Aeneid*) and subsequent Latin epic. Lucretius' use of *magnanimus* in conjunction with Phaethon at *DRN* 5.400 is generally taken as a somewhat sarcastic, almost mock-epic epithet, a usage that would only work if the word, or at least words of this type, had had genuine currency in the idiom of early Latin epic. Perhaps Ennius' *magnis animis* at *Annales* 535 (Sk.) presages its use in the epic of Classical Latin. Both appearances of *magnanimus* elsewhere in Catullus also lampoon a presumed epic usage. In c. 64.85 it is applied to Minos alongside his *sedes superbae*; in c. 58.5 Catullus applies the ironic epithet of *magnanimi Remi nepotes* to Lesbia's numerous lovers.

comment made by Hyginus, who attributes Berenice's meriting such an epithet to an anecdote from her youth, when she aided her father in battle as a mere *puella*.³⁴⁶ However, complicating our own interpretation of the grounds for naming Berenice "great-hearted" are the verses that follow, in which the lock reminds Berenice of the reasons for her appellation: *anne bonum oblita es facinus, quo regium adeptas / coniugium, quo non fortior ausit alis?*³⁴⁷ Given the immediate context, Quinn and Harder maintain that this *bonum facinus* ought to have some bearing on her marriage to Ptolemy, and both prefer to think that some different anecdote must supply her performance of a "fine deed". The historian Justin implicates Berenice in the assassination of her first husband Demetrius of Cyrene, a coup that permitted her subsequent marriage to Ptolemy III.³⁴⁸ This act of bravery certainly accords better with *quo regium adeptas coniugium*, but not everyone has doubted Hyginus' authority so readily. Thomson and Marinone admit that we cannot be certain of which event Callimachus and thus Catullus aim to recall here. In fact, Thomson notes, it is entirely plausible that both *bona facinora* are adduced as examples of her courage.³⁴⁹ Indeed just before the lines in question, where *magnanimam* occurs, the lock suggests that such has been Berenice's character *a parva*

³⁴⁶ See p. 154 n. 297 above. Hyginus' claim that she hopped on a horse and "*complures hostes interfecisse*" may be a touch of hyperbole, but it is with these heroics in mind that he believed Callimachus to have called her "great-hearted". It is not entirely clear that Hyginus is attempting to explain Callimachus, or if he is simply referencing Callimachus' testimony as corroboration of her heroics in battle. The latter seems likelier.

³⁴⁷ "Or have you forgotten that fine deed by which you won your kingly union, which no braver man has dared?" (66.27-8).

³⁴⁸ The story appears in Justin's *Historiarum Philippicarum libri XLIV* at 26.3.2. After King Magas of Cyrene died, his wife promised in marriage their only daughter Berenice to the Macedonian prince Demetrius, who was the widowed queen's niece. Demetrius accepted her offer and ascended to the throne of Cyrene. Once in a power, he became arrogant and reckless, even beginning an affair with his mother-in-law. This incensed her daughter, as well as the people of Cyrene, once they got word of it, and she conspired to have him assassinated in his bed chamber.

³⁴⁹ 1997 p. 453.

virgine, “since you were a young maiden.” Though *virgo* is not limited in practice only to the unwed, such a designation works better here for an unmarried girl. It would create noticeable friction in the context of Justin’s anecdote, where Berenice’s first marriage is the express topic.

Which act of courage did Callimachus and Catullus wish to highlight then? We can at the very least say that there is significant ambiguity here, and that Harder’s and Quinn’s solution should not be accepted too hastily. Hyginus’ testimony, though certainly not written to explicate Catullus’ text, indicates that the reasoning behind the epithet was not so transparent and needed further elucidation. And, in fact, Catullus expressly invites readers or commentators to provide that elucidation when he asks in the second person “*anne oblita es?*” and then proceeds to provide nothing of an explanation of the vague *bonum facinus*. In fact, he seems to leave open the possibility that two *facinora* are at stake with the two relative clauses introduced by *quo*. Coupled with this ostensibly intentional ambiguity, the disagreement that exists among modern critics suggests that the question at least required, and perhaps even knowingly invited, learned discussion. On the one hand Berenice’s greatness of soul was first recognized when she assisted her father in battle, but on the other hand it was later confirmed by the deed that obtained her *regium coniugium*. Perhaps Catullus, by bookending the *bonum facinus* with these dichotomous examples wished to leave its ultimate interpretation to the readers, or even to more learned professionals, such as Hyginus.

Of course, what is not apparent here is the context of the original. We have no way of knowing how or if Callimachus signaled either of these particular instances of

Berenice's demonstrating her "great heart", so we cannot say for certain that Catullus did anything other than replicate what he found in the Greek. However, there are other passages in Catullus' *Coma* about which we can say a great deal more with regards to this specific phenomenon, because we can compare them with extant pieces of original. In the first complete couplet of our longest passage of continuous and secure correspondence between *Aitia* 110 and c. 66, 44-55, Catullus' translation departs significantly from the sense of the original, though it rather deftly preserves certain metrical, aural and lexical features. De Wilde notes in particular the distribution of proper names, at the end of the two versions of the couplet where neatly *Athon* matches Ἄθω, and then the identical placement of *Chalybon* and Χαλύβων.³⁵⁰ I would add to his examples a sensitivity of a different kind as well, the aural effect achieved by *per medium*, which is doubly employed both to translate διὰ μέσσου in the preceding line and to mimic the sounds of Μηδείων, which holds the same position in the Greek but was recast from an adjective to a noun in the line above. It is possible as well that the first three consonant sounds in *peperere* provide an approximate (though displaced) aural substitute for the omitted βουπόρος. At any rate, Catullus seems to have been capable of producing a close and faithful translation when he wished to do so, and even when his rendering veers widely from the source he preserves key features of the original.

Indeed, just before this very couplet, Pfeiffer's reconstruction of the isolated pentameter in 110.44 shows a strong correlation between the Greek and Latin, suggesting that the departures in line 45 were not made to accommodate any information left

³⁵⁰ De Wilde p. 160.

lingering from the lines above.³⁵¹ Rather, lines 66.45-6 occur at a point in the text where Catullus' Latin was still comfortably pacing the text of the Greek. Nevertheless, scholarship has been forced to puzzle over these verses, *cum Medi peperere novum mare cumque iuventus / per medium classi barbara navit Athon*, and its relation to the Greek: βουπόρος Ἀρσινόη[ς μ]ητρὸς σέο, καὶ διὰ μέ[σσου / Μηδείων ὄλοαὶ νῆες ἔβησαν Ἄθω.³⁵² βουπόρος Ἀρσινόης has been especially vexing, both for its textual and its interpretative obscurity.³⁵³ The context of these lines is the proverbial strength of iron, which can cut through mountain ranges and connect arms of the sea with channels, and the futility with which a mere lock of hair might try to resist it. Presumably Mt. Athos, located at the end of the northernmost arm of the Chalcidice peninsula, which the Persian army led by Xerxes I, Callimachus' Μηδείων ὄλοαὶ νῆες, famously cut off from the mainland to form a canal, stands as the quintessential victim of the relentless power of iron. The role of βουπόρος Ἀρσινόης, however, is less obvious, which has explained for some modern scholars why Catullus did not attempt a perfectly literal translation, apparently without regard to the fact that he possessed the text of Callimachus in full, and

³⁵¹ Callimachus' text is in shambles here. This may be an instance where Pfeiffer has allowed Catullus' text undue influence on the correct reading of the original, and only with considerable conjecture has the Greek yielded something legible. The Latin reads *progenies Thiae clara supervehitur*. It is no doubt the ostensible equivalence, metrical and semantic, of *supervehitur* at the end of 66.44 to the highly fragmented (but reasonably conjectured) ὑπερφέ[ρ]ετ[αι] at the same position in 110.44 that has strengthened Pfeiffer's reconstruction of the entire line to ἀμν]άμ[ων Θεῆς ἀργὸς ὑπερφέ[ρ]ετ[αι], despite the large proportion of characters (19 of 28) that are not recuperable from the papyrus.

³⁵² Catullus' translation reads: "when the Medes created a new sea, and the savage youths sailed their fleet through the middle of Mt. Athos;" the original: "the ox-spit of Arsinoe, your mother, and the deadly ships of the Medes moved right through the middle of Mt. Athos."

³⁵³ The first half of *Aitia* 110.45 has been restored only through great difficulty. Pfeiffer's text has βουπόρος Ἀρσινόης, which was first suggested by Kuiper (1929) and seems to be the best agreement between the sense of the line and the papyrus fragments that we inherited. Marinone traces quite thoroughly the process of recovery and the myriad conjectures that predated Pfeiffer's now standard text for this passage, which he uses, and which I have printed here (pp. 171-176).

so could no doubt appreciate its context far better than we can.³⁵⁴ However, before we can address Catullus' motive for his alteration, and the consequences of making these changes, we ought to consider exactly what Callimachus' version means, at least as thoroughly as we are able.

A scholiast's remarks on the text of *Aitia* 110 at this passage have both assisted and confounded modern scholars in their attempts to tease some sense out of the complicated phrase, and a combination of the phrase's textual and semantic difficulties has prevented any consensus on the subject. Our anonymous commentator explains only that this ox-spit is to be understood as an obelisk.³⁵⁵ A notable obelisk did stand before the temple of Arsinoe in Alexandria, which Callimachus and the scholiast may have had in mind, though the unexpected geographical leap from Alexandria to northern Greece is awkward.³⁵⁶ Furthermore, there is no reason to believe that the two are in any way connected. There is, of course, also the possibility that Mt. Athos itself was known for some reason as the Obelisk of Arsinoe, though if this is the case, we have no such record, and, as Huxley notes, such a note by the scholiast would hardly be necessary or helpful, glossing one metaphorical epithet with another of equal opacity.³⁵⁷ Fraser in fact rejects readings that place the βουπόρος Ἀρσινόης in strict apposition to Mt. Athos, i.e. those

³⁵⁴ Once again, it is my suggestion as well that Catullus produced his translation with the assistance of scholarly materials, and so it seems unfair simply to assume that Catullus did not understand the passage and so translated around it. We will test this hypothesis below.

³⁵⁵ The scholium itself is incomplete: βουπόρος ὁ ὀβελίσκο[ς]...[Ἄ]θων. See Marinone (p. 171ff.) and Harder (pp. 816-7) for a discussion.

³⁵⁶ The obelisk is described by Pliny Maior at *NH* 36.67, where the difficulty of moving and erecting the cut stone expressly overshadow the difficulty in cutting it (*maiusque opus in devehendo statuendove inventum est quam in excidendo*), which would seem to contradict its use here, if this is indeed the obelisk in question, as an instance of iron's immeasurable strength. Nevertheless Harder prefers this reading, especially given that obelisks are associated in Egypt with the cult of the sun, and lines 44 could very well be referring to Helios with "scion of Theia" (Harder pp. 816-7).

³⁵⁷ Huxley (1980).

that imagine the mountain as a veritable obelisk, for failing to appreciate how little Athos, broadly pyramidal in shape, resembles an obelisk.³⁵⁸ Harder's suggestion that two mountains are meant, Athos and another named above (where the text is deficient), is attractive in that it would anticipate the οὔρεα τοῖα of the following line, although it must assume that some other unnamed mountain was known as the "ox-spit of Arsinoe".³⁵⁹ This is certainly plausible, especially if the καὶ of line 45 links Athos' clause with an earlier parallel clause (interrupted, as in Catullus' version, by the relative clause that occupies line 44, apparently in both versions). Huxley's reading is imaginative but compelling. He has found an apparent solution for describing Athos, not some other mountain or an actual obelisk, as an ox-spit. There seems to have been a large statue of a cow located on Lemnos, which, around both solstices, was "pierced" by the shadow of Athos as the sun set behind it, a phenomenon mentioned in a fragment from an unknown play of Sophocles: Ἄθως σκιάζει νῶτα Λημνίας βοός.³⁶⁰ Huxley adds that the reach of the shadow to Lemnos was known by Apollonius Rhodius and described in his *Argonautica* at 1.604, though he does not mention the statue of the cow. The tragic line, however, had already become proverbial by this point, sometimes varied with καλύπτει for σκιάζει and πλευρά for νῶτα.

Unfortunately, the state of the text ultimately means that both Harder's and Huxley's readings, which are most complete in their accounting for the various

³⁵⁸ 1972 ii, p. 1024 n. 106.

³⁵⁹ Harder notes as well that two proverbial examples would produce a priamel. She directs us to other places in the *Aitia* where Callimachus also illustrates his point with two examples: 1.13ff., 43.13ff. and 75.44ff. (Harder pp. 814-815).

³⁶⁰ "Athos shades the back of the Lemnian cow," (Soph. Frag. 776). Two Byzantine reference works, the *Suda* and the 12th c. *Etymologicum Magnum*, mention that a statue of a cow stood presumably at the south west corner of Lemnos, where Athos is only 40 miles from the island.

difficulties and obstacles to interpretation, can only be taken as very strong conjectures. They are not, however, mutually exclusive. It would be bold to use βουπόρος Ἀρσινόης to refer to a second mountain as well, looking both back to the missing lines that came before where the mountain from which the obelisk of Arsinoe was cut and forward to Mt. Athos, but not impossible. Nevertheless, this is as far as we can press the fragmentary lines of *Aitia* 110 at this point in the text. For this reason, it is perhaps best to proceed to Catullus' translation with the understanding that either or both interpretations of Callimachus could be operative in the Latin translation.

Modern explanations of Catullus' divergence here, when they have been attempted, are quick to charge Catullus with suppressing an obscure reference that he himself did not understand; he too, according to some, was unsure how best to interpret these lines, and so has replaced the "ox-spit of Arsinoe" with *peperere novum mare*.³⁶¹ Huxley in particular, however, errs in dismissing the possibility that Catullus could conceivably have understood the reference, because his reading relies on the proverbial status of the shadow of Athos. If the shadow was known in Callimachus' time, as the text of Apollonius Rhodius confirms, and its specific interaction with the statue of the cow was crystallized, as both the existence of the fragment of Sophocles and its variation with semantic equivalents suggest, it stands to reason that, unless Catullus attempted his translation in a vacuum, whatever resource that he consulted would have provided some sort of explication on this difficult passage. Indeed even the single scholium we have for this line is incomplete, and may have contained additional information that explained the

³⁶¹ That is, he has replaced the obscure ox-spit with additional information about the Persians and their monumental feat of civil engineering. Fraser, Huxley and Harder all assume that the reference to Arsinoe's ox-spit was beyond Catullus, and so he elected to expand the description of Mt. Athos.

shadow and the statue. It is possible, then, that Catullus changed this passage by choice, rather than because of his failure to appreciate its meaning.

Such a decision would have a reasonable motivation. Catullus' version more patently and more directly recalls the famous episode from the Persian's invasion of Greece, and this historical event seems to have been quite popular in Latin poetry.³⁶² Could this be another instance of Catullus' cultural mediation of the text into Latin, rendering a slightly more "Roman" version than the Greek from which he translated? Furthermore, with the adjustment here, if we can assume that the poet did understand the abstruse reference in the Greek, Catullus would aid any Latin readers by providing additional information about the severing of Athos. In a sense, Catullus' version is itself a kind of philological correction in poetic form, suppressing a difficult point in the text which may have been opaque to any reader without assistance, but maintaining poetic contact through the parallel distribution of key aural and positional features. Thus this becomes a kind of exegetical comment. Catullus has removed the difficult passage and replaced it with a fuller, explanatory (but still poetic³⁶³) description of the historical event. It is a correction of Callimachus' text, inasmuch as it yields a reading that is more easily understood and more appealing to the target audience. Moreover, his "scholium", though apparently clearer than the original, still does not explain the historical datum with any certain terms, and so might reasonably expect, were his text ever to attract the

³⁶² Rosivach (1984) in his discussion of this episode's persistent popularity among Romans lists both secure and highly likely references to Xerxes' canal in Latin literature.

³⁶³ That is to say, *peperere novum mare* "gave birth to a new sea", is hardly poetically sterile. A commentator wishing to explain the event would use far more direct language.

attention of a learned commentator, some sort of exegetical note, just as was likely the case for Callimachus' text.

Conclusions

When we consider how Latin translations before Catullus relied on, responded to and incorporated the existing scholarly tradition, it should be almost unthinkable that Catullus could have produced c. 66 in complete isolation from that tradition. Since the evidence that a commentary to the *Aitia* was in circulation in Rome, or that Parthenius or some other professional was in his employ, is wanting, we are forced into speculation as to what the character of any scholarly materials would have been, and to what extent they were utilized, but the likelier scenario is without question that Catullus had access to and made use of scholarship as he translated *Aitia* 110.

In fact, Catullus appears to claim expressly that his poetry, especially the highly refined form of poetry that appears in the *carmina docta*, suffered, or was even impossible without access to such scholarly materials. The claim, if we are interpreting it correctly, appears in the last of the longer poems, c. 68. There has been a lengthy debate as to how many poems have been transmitted to us in the 160 lines of c. 68, but the first 40 lines of the poem, which are uncontestedly a unit, take a form that recalls the poetic epistle to Hortalus of c. 65.³⁶⁴ In c. 68.1-40 Catullus responds to the requests of a certain

³⁶⁴ Textual issues have plagued attempts at reading a unity across the first 40 and final 120 lines, and some editions print the two sections as c. 68 and c. 68b. Quinn notes that, if they are two poems, their relationship is subtler than that of cc. 65 and 66, and prefers read c. 68 as "an open letter, which becomes a poem, without ever quite ceasing to be a letter," (p. 373).

Mallius, whom *sancta Venus molli requiescere somno desertum [non] perpetitur*, “Holy Venus has abandoned and does not allow to rest in gentle sleep,” (66.5-6) i.e., his heart has been broken. He adds that he has looked to distract himself with *scriptores veteres*, the “classic authors” (line 7), but that they have not lessened his heartache.³⁶⁵ Therefore he is turning to contemporary poetry; he writes to Catullus to ask for consolation in poetic form. Catullus empathizes with him, being himself no stranger to *fortuna* *fluctibus* (line 13), but admits that, alongside his grief at his brother’s death, another, more logistical complication prevents his fulfilling Mallius’ request: he is in Verona; his library is in Rome. At least, this seems to be the implications of his excuse: *quod scriptorum non magna est copia apud me*.³⁶⁶ The verse and its implications have attracted a good deal of attention. Fordyce interpreted the genitive plural dependent on *copia* as from *scriptor* (like line 7 above), and read the phrase as indicating a collection of poets from whom he could draw material appropriate to Mallius’ plight.³⁶⁷ Quinn, however, takes *scriptorum* as from *scripta* “writings”, and so imagines that Mallius believes Catullus has with him in Verona copies of his own poetry suitable for assuaging heartache.³⁶⁸ I am better convinced by Yardley, who draws from both interpretations and reads *scriptorum* as the genitive of *scripta*, but as referring not to Catullus’ own poetry, but to a small library of various writings.³⁶⁹ Whatever the precise reading of *scriptorum*, Fordyce’s observation on Catullus’ confession obtains, here in c. 68 and in the rest of the

³⁶⁵ We are told that *nec veterum dulci scriptorum carmine Musae / oblectant*, “the Muses no longer delight [him] with the sweet song of the authors of old,” (66.7-8).

³⁶⁶ “Because the supply of writings [writers?] I have with me is not great.” 66.33.

³⁶⁷ Fordyce 1961 p. 348.

³⁶⁸ Quinn 1970 380.

³⁶⁹ Yardley 1978. He suggests that *copia scriptorum* is a synonym for *copia librorum*, which more obviously means “library” and is richly attested. He cites this usage in Ovid (*Trist.* 3.14.37-8), Horace (*Ep.* 1.18.109-110), and, without an attached genitive, Cicero (*ad Att.* 2.6.1).

poems: “the excuse is revealing evidence of the methods and ideals of the *doctus poeta*; what is expected of him is Alexandrian poetry, translated from, or modelled on Greek, and for that he needs his library.”³⁷⁰ This is Catullus telling us very bluntly how his poetic process operates.

But to assume that this sort of poetic process is confined to Catullus, or to the other New Poets, is, of course, foolish. Translation of Greek to Latin, as I stated at the outset of this chapter, and hope to have demonstrated in its course, is an action with significant cultural moment, and its success depends not only on the skill of the poet to interpret the meaning of the source language, but also to understand his own language and his own audience, and, perhaps most importantly, the consequence that his alteration or removal of elements, his supplementation or suppression of information, his explication or circumlocution of unwieldy diction or concepts will have on the experience of his readers and the voice of his poem. Catullus seems to have been aware of these particulars. Or rather, Latin literature, and especially Latin literary translations, seems to have an awareness of these particulars built into it. In a sense, my reading of c. 66 is not so much an argument that Catullus’ translation shared certain features with the work of professional scholars and grammarians as it is an argument that the process of artistic, literary translation as it developed in Latin was inherently philological, inherently grammatical.

³⁷⁰ Fordyce 1961 348.

CHAPTER 3: CATULLUS AMONG THE GRAMMARIANS

Thus far we have examined the evidence of a philological undercurrent in Catullus' poetry that suggests some overlap with, and perhaps some emulation of, the activity of the professional *grammaticus*; chapter one treats Catullus' own approach to the delimitation and enforcement of the concept of *latinitas*, a topic that obviously evokes the interests of the *custodes sermonis*, but that also featured conspicuously in the prose works of other non-professionals active during Catullus' life and remained a popular touchstone for the amateur and professional alike in later treatments of the Latin language. In chapter two we considered Catullus' translation of Callimachus' *Βερενίκης πλόκαμος* and its place in the history of Latin translations of Greek literature, as well as the patently philological character of these translations. In this final chapter we will explore a related but somewhat less obvious question: if Catullus' poetry evinces particular mannerisms, concerns and practices that recall the professional grammarian, should we credit this phenomenon entirely to an unconscious impulse, inherent in Latin literature from its earliest dependence on Greek literature, or, conversely, can we trace any of these impulses to more direct sources? While I have maintained since the introduction of this study that the first explanation is always relevant to an understanding of Catullus' poetry—a concern with *γραμματική* being innate in Latin literature, simply because of its early and persistent contact with the Greek practice, not to mention the fact that the tradition as it was imagined by authors of the Classical period began with *grammatici* who were also poets—I wish in this final chapter to suggest that the second explanation is important as well. In other words, the poetry of Catullus behaves “grammatically” not

just because Latin literature behaves “grammatically,” but also because of two external factors, namely the models on which Latin neoteric poetry in specific is based (to whatever extent “neoteric poetry” can or should be defined as a fixed genre or movement), and the influence of certain acquaintances and presumed members of this nebulous group of poets.

This first external factor, the nature of the New Poetry and its close imitation of Hellenistic models and its adoption and recasting of the poetic ideals that those Greek poets defined, is difficult, or even impossible to describe exhaustively, for several reasons. First, we cannot assume that the *poetae novi* understood their Hellenistic models in the same way as we do, and indeed even our own understanding of these models continues to evolve. Finally, we have extensive evidence for the character of the New Poetry and its interaction with Hellenistic models from only a single representative of the Neoteric movement, and that is Catullus himself. Nevertheless, it is not difficult to appreciate some aspects of the relationship between Hellenistic and Neoteric poetry. These aspects have been, at least to some extent, a focus of Catullan scholarship for as long as there has been Catullan scholarship. To speak generally, it is widely assumed that Neoteric poetry aimed to replicate certain observable features of Hellenistic poetry, and my treatment of the grammatical nature of Catullus’ poetry has, I hope, contributed in some small way to our understanding of the depth, care and subtlety of that replication.

The second external factor, the existence and influence of specific individuals who were active in the broader literary and intellectual scene at Rome during the middle of the 1st century BCE and interactive with Catullus’ far narrower circle of friends and

acquaintances, is more sparsely attested. In fact, our record for specific figures in the professional sphere of *grammatica* (that is, when we exclude talented amateurs like Cicero, Caesar and Varro), depends wholly on hearsay and inference, scattered *testimonia*, and the biographical data contained in Suetonius' *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*. No work in Latin from an actual grammarian of this period has reached us. The anonymous author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* mentions casually that he intends to write an *ars grammatica*, the earliest reference to what later would become the standard format of linguistic study in the empire and well into late antiquity, but none of that work, or even confirmation that it was ever written, survives.³⁷¹ Moreover, the identity of the author, unknown but once assumed to be Cicero, prevents our ability to ascertain that he was a professional grammarian rather than a talented amateur. Indeed, even the works of non-professionals that deal specifically with grammatical concerns are either lost entirely or available to us only in fragments. Of Varro's numerous contributions to the discussion and description of the character of Latin we possess, for the most part, only names, with the exception of those six books out of *De lingua Latina*'s original 25 that have reached us, all lacunose to varying degrees.³⁷² Caesar's *De analogia* has reached us in an even

³⁷¹ The author mentions the treatise after a brief description of barbarisms and solecisms, the two principal *vitia* of speech: *haec [vitia] qua ratione vitare possumus, in arte grammatica dilucide dicemus*, "I will give a plain explanation as to how we can avoid these errors in my *ars grammatica*," (*Rhet. ad Her.* 4.17).

The Latin *ars grammatica* has been discussed to varying degrees in previous sections. The form is an imitation of Greek treatises called *περί γραμματικῆς τέχνης*, making various concessions to the differences between the language (e.g., the eighth part of speech in Greek, the article, is necessarily replaced in Latin, canonically by the interjection), but in general operating under the assumption that the two languages are similar enough that the Greek paradigm can be applied to Latin. Our earliest surviving example in Latin—and it only in part—is that of Remmius Palaemon, who was active as a teacher and professional scholar during the reigns of Tiberius and Claudius. Barwick's 1922 discussion of the tradition and the man and his annotated edition of the surviving text remains the touchstone for studies of Palaemon's life and text.

³⁷² Gellius preserves a handful of fragments and names from these other works in *Noctes Atticae*. In addition to *DLL*, we know that Varro wrote treatises on orthography and the history of the Latin alphabet,

less complete state.³⁷³ Cicero's attention to grammatical questions survives only insofar as they relate to and can be imbedded in discussions of oratory, or when they piqued his interests on a personal level, but there is no evidence that he ever produced a specific work on grammar.

That leaves only less direct evidence of grammatical figures during this period for our consideration, and for our supporting a claim that any of these shadowy figures may have influenced, directly or indirectly, Catullus' poetry. There are some cases in which a poet can be linked to specific grammarians, either by internal or external testimony, and so we have at least a very general sense of how that poet interacted with the professional *grammaticus*.³⁷⁴ These are not the circumstances for Catullus. The he only source of his *vita*, and so our best source for assessing his ties to the field of *grammatica* and for ascertaining who might have influenced him in such a capacity, is, unfortunately, Catullus' own poetry. No biography of the poet survives, and we can reliably date the events of his short life only by collating the historical events that feature (or seem to feature) in his poems with Jerome's very brief mention of him in his supplement to

the theories both of analogy and of anomaly, and Plautine diction, *inter alia*. Even in those works that are not expressly focused on linguistic matters we can detect his preoccupation with language and especially etymologies. His only work to have survived intact (or mostly intact, at any rate), *Res Rusticae*, contains much of the same etymological play that is evident and indeed fundamental to his work *De Lingua Latina* (*RR* also features similar, taxonomic organization; for a discussion of this work and the insinuation that it is typical of his style more broadly see Rayment 1945).

Despite his persistent interest in grammatical subjects, he was hardly a professional grammarian, whose role seems always to have been defined especially by his status as a for-hire teacher. Varro was an eclectic author who delighted in antiquarian and linguistic studies, but he also enjoyed equestrian rank and extensive landholdings, performed various political offices and held military appointments. He was no more a professional teacher than Cicero and Caesar were.

³⁷³ Cf. Takács (2002-3) and Garcea's recent commentary on *De analogia* (2012) for general discussions of the fragments and the shape of the work (so far as it can be judged from what remains), as well as the state of the analogy v. anomaly debate with which Caesar's work engaged, and its reception. For more general discussions of Caesar's interests in grammatical and linguistic subjects, see Oldfather and Bloom (1927), Mierow (1946) and Morgan (1997).

³⁷⁴ This is the case for Vergil, Horace and Ovid, e.g.

Eusebius' *Chronica*.³⁷⁵ For us to claim any significant contact with a figure from the field of grammar, we must rely either on speculation from the composite, poetic autobiography that emerges from his own work or on well-informed conjectures based on inference.

The poetic autobiography is not entirely silent on the matter. There is, in fact, one apparent mention of a *grammaticus* in Catullus' poetry. In c. 14, in which Catullus scolds his friend Calvus for the book of particularly atrocious poetry that the latter has sent to him as a kind of gag Saturnalia gift, Catullus speculates that Calvus is in fact recycling a genuine gift he received from a client, a certain *Sulla litterator*.³⁷⁶

Catullus provides no further information from which we might determine the identity of the Sulla in question, but the reference is nevertheless suggestive for the present discussion.³⁷⁷ Catullus' term for Sulla, *litterator*, seems to have been less straightforward than it might appear. Superficially a *litterator* is simply a teacher of reading and writing—the word itself is an agent noun denoting a man who deals in

³⁷⁵ There Jerome tells us only that he was born in Verona in 87 BCE and that he died in Rome at age 30 (or in his 30th year). Jerome's dates are already suspect because Catullus refers obliquely in his poetry to events that occurred in 55, 54 and possibly 53 BCE, which would make a 30-year lifespan impossible (on the final year see Rambaud 1980). Thomson reasons that Jerome got his information from a lost biographical chapter in Suetonius' *De Poetis*, and infers from Terence's extant biography in the same that Suetonius would have provided the age of the poet at the time of his death, but neither his birth date or his death date, and that Jerome therefore must have assigned the end of Catullus' life to a year that seemed suitable to him (but was in fact misjudged), and worked backwards from that year to arrive at 87 for his birth (Thomson 1999 p. 3-6).

³⁷⁶ *quod si, ut suspicor, hoc novum ac repertum / munus dat tibi Sulla litterator*, "but if, as I suspect, the litterator / Sulla gave you a newly gotten *munus*..." (14.8-9).

³⁷⁷ Suetonius counts among his *grammatici illustres* a certain grammarian named Cornelius Epicadus (*DGR* 12), who was the freedman of the dictator Sulla and tutor of his son Faustus, and so this otherwise unknown figure has been drawn into discussions of Catullus' *Sulla litterator*, but Quinn is correct to point out that "there is no evidence at all of freedmen taking the cognomen of their master," (1970 p. 137). It is true that Suetonius records in the few words he offers on Epicadus the apparently interesting datum that he styled himself as the *libertus* of both Sullae, father and son (which has no known precedent, and could not have been a de jure reality; cf. Kaster 1995 p. 164), and so it could be possible that Epicadus' unconventional name also involved his assuming a new cognomen, but this cannot be proven, and so it is an unstable proposition on which to argue that Suetonius' and Catullus' men are the same. This particular figure is probably beyond our recovery, but for thorough treatments (to the extent that such is possible) of the named actors who appear in Catullus' poetry, see Neudling (1955).

litterae “letters”—but Suetonius makes it clear in the introductory sections of *De Grammaticis* that in the Late Republic and into his own time the term competed with other, similar designations, and that this competition reflected a kind of hierarchy of prestige and respect. An individual designated as a *litterator* appears to have been less highly regarded than one described in other terms:

Appellatio grammaticorum Graeca consuetudine invaluit sed initio litterati vocabantur. Cornelius quoque Nepos libello quo distinguit litteratum ab erudito, litteratos vulgo quidem appellari ait eos qui aliquid diligenter et acute scienterque possint aut dicere aut scribere, ceterum proprie sic appellandos poetarum interpretes, qui a Graecis grammatici nominentur. eosdem litteratores vocitatos Messalla Corvinus in quadam epistula ostendit, non esse sibi dicens rem cum Furio Bibaculo, ne cum Ticida quidem aut litteratore Catone: significat enim haud dubie Valerium Catonem poetam simul grammaticumque notissimum. sunt qui litteratum a litteratore distinguant, ut Graeci grammaticum a grammatista, et illum quidem absolute, hunc mediocriter doctum existiment. quorum opinionem Orbilius etiam exemplis confirmat: namque apud maiores ait cum familia alicuius venalis produceretur, non temere quem litteratum in titulo sed litteratorem inscribi solitum esse, quasi non perfectum litteris sed imbutum.

“The name ‘*grammatici*’ became widespread after the Greek fashion, though these men were first called *litterati*. Cornelius Nepos as well says in a *libellus*, in which he makes a distinction between *litteratus* ‘lettered’ and *eruditus* ‘educated’, that most people call *litterati* those who can either speak or write with careful and precise understanding, but that, properly, the interpreters of the poets ought to have *that* designation, whom the Greeks call *grammatici*. Messalla Corvinus shows that those same men [i.e. *grammatici*] were called *litteratores* in a certain letter, in which he says he ‘has no truck with Furius Bibaculus, nor even with Ticidas or that *litterator* Cato.’ He almost certainly means Valerius Cato, who was very well-known both as a poet and as a *grammaticus*. Some make a distinction between *litteratus* ‘lettered’ and *litterator* ‘teacher of letters’, like the Greeks do with *grammaticus* ‘grammarian’ and *grammatista* ‘teacher of letters’, and they actually consider the former to be completely educated and the latter only moderately so. Orbilius, moreover, corroborates this opinion through exempla: he says that, whenever any of a household’s slaves were put up for sale, it was the custom not to advertise him

carelessly as being *litteratus*, but as *litterator*, as one who had not achieved mastery in his letters, but had dabbled.”³⁷⁸

Suetonius’ digression into the terminology of the grammarian has attracted a good deal of attention, largely because he seems to imply semantic overlap and synonymy that is not always borne out elsewhere in the literature (perhaps because he fails, apparently, to read any sarcasm in Corvinus’ comment), and because he is rather imprecise with regard to the time periods in which these terms held the valences and connotations that he assigns to them.³⁷⁹ The degree to which the four terms, two Greek and two Latin, can be interchanged, or reflect differing aspects of the professional man of letters, is less my concern than is the tone of Catullus’ epithet for Sulla, and to this end the three men whom Suetonius cites provide a composite definition of *litterator* during the latter half of the 1st century BCE. Nepos shows that *litteratus* ought to be reserved only for *interpretes poetarum*, that is, *grammatici*. Orbilius makes it clear that a *litterator* was a step below a *litteratus* in terms of his learning. Thus we might infer then that a *litterator* was somewhat lower in learning and prestige than a *grammaticus* (if Nepos and the unnamed

³⁷⁸ DGR 4.1-3.

³⁷⁹ These are the complaints of Bower (1961), who questions first what Suetonius meant by *initio* (169 BCE, when Crates of Mallus first came to Rome and Roman *grammatica* proper began?), and then demonstrates that the terms Suetonius provides as Greek and Latin counterparts, *grammaticus* and *litteratus*, were at no point in the history of the language interchangeable, but rather the relationship between the former and latter was more one of species and genus. In response to Nepos’ unequivocal claim that the two *were* synonymous, Bower suggests that this reflects an attempt at the time of Nepos to regularize Latin terminology used in education. He concludes that *litterator* as “teaching grammarian” seems to overlap better with *grammaticus* as professional man of letters (and occasional teacher), though in adducing c. 14 as support of this equivalence he seems to overlook the possibility that Catullus uses the term sarcastically.

Booth (1981), on the other hand, shows that *litterator* requires further scrutiny, and makes it clear that Suetonius (and perhaps Bower too) failed to appreciate the tone of Corvinus’ use of *litterator* as well, which is not to be taken simply as a synonym to *grammaticus* (an epithet elsewhere applied to Valerius Cato, to be discussed presently).

qui...distinguant are correct in their evaluations³⁸⁰). Such an arrangement appears to obtain when Corvinus, in whose tone we can only read contempt, applies the designation *litterator* to a man whom others regarded as a *summus grammaticus*.³⁸¹

This brings us to Sulla, whom, I believe, Catullus relegates by the epithet to the ranks of the *mediocriter docti*. If Sulla was merely an elementary school teacher, the designation is not reproachful at all, but apt. Bower, however, acknowledges (perhaps without suspecting any sarcasm or derision in Catullus' tone) that a *grammaticus*, a professional scholar or man of letters, would be likelier than a primary teacher to have on hand volumes of poetry that he could present to a bookish patron as thanks for services rendered.³⁸² If Sulla was a professional *grammaticus*, the negative valence of *litterator* is very appropriate in c. 14; Catullus would then be judging Sulla, whose gift showed a considerable deficiency in taste and judgment, as an inferior man of letters, properly qualified only as a teacher of young boys, rather than as a serious scholar or critic.³⁸³ This interpretation is consistent with the inference drawn from Suetonius; the epithet *litterator*, especially if applied to a man who laid professional claim to γραμματική, was not a compliment.

³⁸⁰ Bower does not accept that they are. He is convinced that both Nepos and the other unnamed group voice a minority opinion on the subject. Perhaps he is right, but more at stake is a point that is not so easily refuted: there were men who held these opinions during Nepos' (and so probably in Catullus') lifetime, and their voices endured to Suetonius' own time. Clearly there was some debate, but to dismiss Nepos and the others as vocal minorities with little influence or effect is not entirely fair.

³⁸¹ Valerius Cato was *summus grammaticus* by the estimation of Furius Bibaculus, whom Suetonius quotes in his chapter on the grammarian at *DGR* 12. We will look much more closely at Valerius Cato below.

³⁸² Bower p. 427.

³⁸³ A meaning of *litterator* that includes elementary-level teacher, the *ludi magister*, is accepted by Bower and by Bonner (1977). Booth judges that the *litterator* has not been satisfactorily defined, especially with regards to the apparent sarcasm with which Catullus uses. He concludes that a *litterator* in the 1st century BCE was a "teaching *grammaticus*," but that the title alone did not imply mastery of letters: "a *litterator* could be *litteratus*, but to constrain someone who was *litteratus* to the profession of *litterator* was, as Corvinus and Catullus show, particularly galling," (p. 378).

We can say little else about Sulla *litterator*, but his appearance in c. 14 is nevertheless significant. First, it offers a glimpse into an ongoing discussion about the development of an idiom for discussing all levels of education in Latin, and makes Catullus an active participant in that discussion. More importantly, *Sulla litterator* shows that the world of the professional grammarian was not so far removed from the isolated and isolating group of young men we call the New Poets. Sulla and Calvus seem to have had what one might call a professional relationship, and it was the substance of this relationship—that is, the probably legal assistance that Calvus the advocate provided for Sulla the *cliens*³⁸⁴—that authorized the exchange of *munera*, but the nature of Sulla’s *munus*, an anthology of poetry from multiple authors, suggests that Sulla imagined that the barrier between himself and these hip and modish poets was not so impregnable that he and Calvus could not connect on more personal levels as well. His undiscerning evaluation of “good” poetry excludes him from earning Catullus’ regard (and presumably Calvus’, if he so readily repurposed Sulla’s apparently genuine gift to serve as a joke), but what if a *grammaticus* actually shared the tastes and values of the New Poets?

Sulla is the only character from Catullus’ poetry who is tied, even obliquely, to the profession of γραμματική. However, there are two figures whose dates, interpersonal connections and documented activity make them attractive names to associate with Catullus and the New Poets, even if their presence in the corpus can only be speculative. They are the poet and professional *grammaticus* Publius Valerius Cato, and the Greek

³⁸⁴ This is suggested by lines first by lines 6-7, *isti di mala multa dent clienti / qui tantum tibi misit impiorum*, “May the gods give your client loads of trouble / who sent you such a god-awful collection;” and 10-11: *non est mi male, sed bene ac beate / quod non dispereunt tui labores*, “[assuming this gift is from your client Sulla] I’m not mad, rather pleased and thankful, knowing / that your efforts are not completely wasted.”

teacher of poets and mythographer—and poet himself—Parthenius of Nicaea. Incontrovertible evidence is wanting, but for both figures a dossier of compelling circumstantial evidence can be put forth, and in this chapter we will explore that evidence, and consider its possible implications for Catullus' poetry. The most direct route through which either man can be connected to Catullus is the poet Gaius Helvius Cinna, who was perhaps a few years older than Catullus and Calvus and whose close friendship Catullus cites in cc. 10 and 95. Valerius Cato is linked directly by Suetonius to Cinna—Suetonius ascribes to Cinna an elegiac couplet in praise of Cato's poem *Diana*—and various other associates of the New Poets, so at least some acquaintance seems probable. Moreover, an unspecified Cato is the addressee of c. 56, and thus a fuller and more direct connection may exist as well, but we will consider this possibility more thoroughly in subsequent sections of this chapter. Let us first explore the evidence for a relationship with Parthenius of Nicaea.

Section I: Catullus and Parthenius

A certain Cinna, perhaps Catullus' friend but more probably a relative, is named by the *Suda* as the man who brought Parthenius from his home in Nicaea to Italy after he was taken as a prisoner during the Mithridatic Wars in Pontus, where after being enslaved he earned his freedom through his impressive learning and erudition.³⁸⁵ Traces of Parthenius' influence on the relevant Cinna's poetic fragments suggest the latter used the

³⁸⁵ What little we can say with certainty about Parthenius' life and his capture, including a hypothetical arrangement of events that would allow for the Cinna of cc. 10, 95 and 113 to underlie the reference in *Suda*, I have treated already in chapter 2 (especially p. 128 n. 258), where I proposed cautiously that Parthenius (or another capable reader) may have assisted Catullus as he prepared his translation of Callimachus.

professional teacher as a tutor and poetic mentor, and his impact on Catullus' poetry and that of the subsequent generation of Latin poets, it has been suggested, is far more extensive.³⁸⁶ We have already discussed cursorily one possible Parthenian imprint on the metrics of Catullus.³⁸⁷ His influence on Cinna and Vergil has also been mentioned, and we can perhaps add Calvus to that list as well.³⁸⁸ Parthenius' more secure impact on Cinna and Vergil is most apparent in their approach to geographical place names (and placement) and cult epithets, both of which were not just of particular interest to him, but had also long since attracted the attention of Hellenistic scholars, who catalogued and sorted them by kind.³⁸⁹ Parthenius' interest in the subject is obvious even from his small

³⁸⁶ The apogee of this hypothesis is Clausen's 1964 article (discussed briefly already in chapter 2), who assigns to Parthenius a far-reaching level of influence on the neoterics—it was Parthenius, he argues, who made Callimachus truly fashionable in Roman poetry—and sees the continuation of that influence carried into Vergil's time. Ross follows Clausen's suggestion and posits with equal force that "it is unlikely that Cinna, Calvus, Catullus, and the other neoterics could by themselves have understood or adopted Callimachean poetry, or by themselves have devised the vocabulary and technique necessary for the creation of a new genre, a genre built of Roman elements in a new assemblage especially to satisfy the ideals of Alexandrian verse," (1969 p. 162). Clausen's treatment in particular has itself exerted a lasting influence on the scholarship of Parthenius, though Lightfoot approaches his sweeping statement with some judicious skepticism (and points to at least a few oversights, pp. 50-3). I think Parthenius' influence on Roman poetry can be shown without resorting to Clausen's absolute "Callimachus had little or no influence on Latin poetry until the generation of the New Poets" (p. 187), but I agree with Clausen and Ross that Parthenius was an integral part of Callimachus' effect on the New Poetry.

³⁸⁷ Ross (1969) argues that Catullus owes his attention Hermann's bridge in c. 64 to Parthenius, cf. chapter 2 p. 127 n. 257. As I have already stated, the evidence for reading Parthenius' influence on Catullus' epithalamia (cc. 61 and 62) is probably too thin for our use.

³⁸⁸ Cinna almost certainly learned to identify the Setrachus River with Cyprus instead its traditional placement in Assyria from Parthenius, who places it there in discussing the myth of Adonis (which is also the context of Cinna's treatment in his *Zmyrna*), though the scant number of fragments that survive of Cinna's poetry limits any speculation towards further influence. We discussed this in chapter 2, p. 129 n. 262.

Vergil's interaction with Parthenius is better attested. Parthenius is named his tutor in Greek by Macrobius (5.17.18, on which see Dyer 1996); his use of a particular form of an epithet for Apollo, *Gryneus*, at *Aen.* 4.345 recalls Parthenius' usage of the same in his lost poem *Delos* (Lightfoot fr. 36; on which point see Clausen 1964 p. 192); and he adapts an entire line of Parthenius, a mini-catalogue of nymphs, at *Geo.* 1.437 (nymphs, of course, would be doubly interesting to Parthenius, since they combine geographical nomenclature with mythology). Calvus' dependence on Parthenius stands on shakier ground, but his lost epicedium to his wife Quintilia, alluded to by Catullus in c. 96 and by Propertius at 2.34.90, might have been taken Parthenius' poem for his own wife called *Arete* as its model.

³⁸⁹ Callimachus paid particular attention to them in his references works. A work mentioned by Athenaeus seems concerned especially with names, and inspired Pfeiffer to assign to it the name *On Local*

number of poetic fragments. Indeed many of those fragments were only preserved because their use of obscure cult names, little-known toponyms or uncommon formations for geographical epithets interested later commentators.³⁹⁰ By all accounts Parthenius was an authority on such minor details, and so it is unsurprising that we should detect his influence by the residue of his idiosyncratic toponymy. But Cinna and Vergil were not alone in their willingness to defer to the judgment of a native Greek educator when geographical nomenclature in Greek was at stake; in a letter to Atticus, Cicero describes his own hesitation and doubt that he has generated the correct morphological form of a Greek place name.³⁹¹ Catullus' attitude towards such conundrums as Cicero's is never so

Nomenclature (1968 p. 135). Athenaeus' reference makes it likely that a larger work whose name he does not transmit also encompassed the book *Names of Fishes* mentioned by the *Suda*, and possibly other known books on the names of winds, nymphs and rivers. For a discussion of these see Witty (1973). Pfeiffer reasons that Callimachus used these researched lists to ornament his poetic works with exotic, learned and perhaps most importantly accurate names (comments on Pfeiffer fr. 404, 413, 457-9).

The grammarian Tyrannio of Amisus, who was also a highly educated teacher from Pontus and also brought to Rome as a slave during the course of the Mithridatic Wars, studied place names in classical Greek texts, and criticized Homer for his use of a particular river's name that did not reflect the pronunciation of the people who lived around it.

³⁹⁰ Fr. 7 (Lightfoot), 10, 12-7, 19, 20, 23-4, 26, 28-9, 34-6, 38, 40, 42-8, 50, 52 and 53, more than half of the genuine poetic fragments, survive because they record an obscure location or a non-standard form or epithet. Stephanus of Byzantium's *Ethnica* accounts for the largest share of these citations, but they are also found in *Etymologicum Genuinum*, *Etymologicum Gudianum*, various scholia and comments to the poetic travel log of Dionysius Periergetes, Aulus Gellius, and the Byzantine grammarian Choeroboscus.

³⁹¹ Cicero's concern is the correct form of "Piraeus" to use when expressing motion towards (and so is a question both of proper case usage and the declension of Greek nouns). *Ad. Att.* 7.3.10 begins, *venio ad "Piraeae," in quo magis reprehendendus sum quod homo Romanus "Piraeae" scripserim, non "Piraeum" (sic enim omnes nostri locuti sunt), quam quod addiderim "in." non enim hoc ut oppido praeposui sed ut loco. et tamen Dionysius noster et qui est nobiscum Nicias Cous non rebatur oppidum esse Piraeae. sed de re video. nostrum quidem si est peccatum, in eo est quod non ut de oppido locutus sum sed ut de loco secutusque sum non dico Caecilium, "mane ut ex portu in Piraeum" (malus enim auctor latinitatis est), sed Terentium cuius fabellae propter elegantiam sermonis putabantur a C. Laelio scribi, "heri aliquot adulescentuli coimus in Piraeum", et idem, mercator hoc addebat, captam e Sunio. quod si δῆμους oppida volumus esse, tam est oppidum Sunium quam Piraeus.*

"I came to 'Piraeus', for which I ought to be reproved more because I, being a Roman, wrote the Greek form of the accusative *Piraeae* instead of Latin *Piraeum* (since that's how our people say it), than because I added a preposition. For I used the preposition as though referring not to a town, but to a location. And yet our friend Dionysius, along with Nicias of Cos who was with us, was of the opinion that Piraeus is a town. But I'll see about that: indeed if the fault is mine it is in the fact that I spoke not about the town but about the location, and I followed—I won't say it was Caecilius, [who wrote] 'in the morning from the gate to Piraeus,' since he's a poor authority of proper Latinity—but Terence, whose plays were thought to be

plainly spelled out, but his mercurial approach to declining Greek nouns and Greek place names reflects both the volatility of any hard and fast “rules” in his poetry and the broader state of this question among his contemporaries.³⁹² A *grammaticus*, particularly a Greek *grammaticus*, would be a valuable asset in dealing with the minutiae of the Mediterranean world.

With this in mind, then, we may turn our attention to some of the rarer or more exotic of Catullus’ formations, those that are in variance with more familiar forms, or do not appear in Latin poetry before Catullus, or that simply document obscure places, because Catullus does indeed deal at times in the minutiae of the Mediterranean world. Can we read at any point in his poetry possible echoes of Parthenius’ advice or direction? Beyond Ross’ observation on Hermann’s Bridge and the implications of Clausen’s claims, scholars have been, for the most part, reluctant to speculate because of the fragmentary nature of Parthenius’ poetry and the apparent lack of any incontestable correspondence between such forms as are found in Parthenius’ poetic or mythographic work and in the most “Hellenizing” of Catullus’ poems (such as those “Parthenian” forms that occur in Vergil). In fact, the absence of any obvious proof has discouraged a serious

written by Laelius because of the elegance of their language, [who wrote] ‘yesterday a number of us youths were converging on Piraeus.’ The same play features a merchant who added that ‘she was taken from Sunium.’ As to that, if we meant that demes were towns, Sunium is as much a town as Piraeus.”

We will return to this passage in a subsequent section of this chapter.

³⁹² The question of how Greek nouns ought to be transliterated had its fair share of answerers, both professionals and talented amateurs, and the topic was an early and persistent point of contention and prescription in the field, which we have discussed already in the introduction. Catullus’ “mercurial approach” is less haphazard than it might appear. Catullus seems to have permitted variant forms and Greek endings in his poetry for effect, or when they were appropriate (as with his transliterations of Callimachus’ forms at e.g. c. 66.48, .54, .57, etc.), but to have been equally comfortable with more Latinized formations as well. Ross’ observation that Greek inflections of proper names all almost completely absent from the epigrams is certainly noteworthy (1969 p. 102 n. 241). We have examined already some of the more compelling examples, and the effects that his declension choices have on his poetic voice. See in the introduction (pp. 32-6) and in chapter 1 in the course of our discussion of c. 4 (p. 67 n. 125).

inquiry into the possibility that less obvious specimens exist. There are, however, certain geographical names that Catullus uses of which the provenance or the significance are not immediately transparent. The catalogue of place names in c. 36, for instance, which Catullus names in mock-solemnity as he fulfills an oath to Venus and offers Volusius' *Annales* to fire, has resisted any simple explanation. Ostensibly the list follows a pattern typical of religious language, but in a poem that features the phrase *cacata carta* in its first line the elevated tone of the prayer in lines 11-16 is patently and comically out-of-place:

*nunc, o caeruleo creata ponto
 quae sanctum Idalium Uriosque apertos
 quaeque Ancona Cnidumque harundinosam
 colis, quaeque Amathunta, quaeque Golgos
 quaeque Dyrrachium, Hadriae tabernam* (15)
acceptum face redditumque votum.

“Now, creation of deep-blue ocean,
 You who protect holy Idalium and exposed Urii
 Also Ancon and Cnidus with its rushes
 And Amathus and Golgi
 And Dyrrachium, inn of the Adriatic (15)
 Hold my vow entered and paid in full.”

Catullus appears to make his vow to Venus as he names a series of locales where famous shrines to the goddess existed. Idalium, Amathusa and Golgi on Cyprus, as both Wiseman and Morgan note, were indeed well-known as cult sites associated with Aphrodite, and Cnidus was the home to Praxiteles' fabled statue of the goddess (as well as a temple to Aphrodite), so their inclusion in the catalogue is unsurprising.³⁹³ Both Wiseman and Morgan, however, notice the incongruity in Catullus' inclusion of the three

³⁹³ Wiseman (1969 p. 42) and Morgan (1980 p. 60).

remaining sites, Urii, Dyrrachium and Ancon, among these more famous and, frankly, immediately relevant names. Ancon, at least, is named by Juvenal as home to a temple of Venus, but certainly it was not so celebrated a temple as to eclipse more obvious choices like Eryx and Cythera.³⁹⁴

About the connection with Venus to Dyrrachium and Urii we can only guess, but it seems reasonable to follow Wiseman and Morgan and to assume that they too must have been seats of Venus worship. But why list them here? Wiseman believes these three places on the Adriatic Sea were the ports that Catullus' *phaselus* (cf. c. 4) visited as the poet returned to Italy and Verona from Bithynia. In Wiseman's itinerary Catullus sailed along the Illyrian coast of modern Albania, stopped at Dyrrachium (modern Durrës), sailed west across the Adriatic to an imprecisely identified port in northern Apulia, and then along the Italian coast to Ancon (modern Ancona in Marche).³⁹⁵ Such a course is not impossible, as Wiseman demonstrates, and I do not reject so readily as Morgan Wiseman's suggestion that Catullus' anchored at various ports along the Adriatic.³⁹⁶ I am more persuaded, however, by Morgan's second objection, which he borrows from Ross:

³⁹⁴ Juvenal mentions Ancon at *Sat.* 4.40. It is Wiseman's suggestion that Eryx or Cythera would have been more appropriate (ibid.).

³⁹⁵ Wiseman (ibid. pp. 43-4). There is some ambiguity as to the location of Urii. The name resembles two places mentioned by Strabo, Ὑρία or Οὐρία named at 6.3.6 and Ὑριον or Οὐριον named at 6.3.9. The latter is likelier. The former, which Pliny Maior mentions at *Naturalis Historia* 3.100 as Uria (modern Oria), lay in Apulia about midway between Brundisium and Tarentum, i.e., inland. Ὑριον/Οὐριον was on the north side of the Gargano Peninsula (the "spur" of the Italian boot), and, although no port existed there, it is today the site of an estuarine lake, Lago di Varano. The sandbar that now separates it from the sea quite possibly could have been absent entirely, or at least oriented differently in antiquity, so as to provide only moderate safety for a moored vessel, hence its epithet *apertos*.

³⁹⁶ Morgan does not believe that we can rely on c. 4 as evidence that Catullus ever sailed up the Adriatic as he returned from Asian Minor and the East, a thesis necessary for Wiseman's argument to obtain. I certainly see no more reason to distrust c. 4 as evidence for a genuine sea voyage than to accept it. At any rate, we can be sure that Catullus did return from the north coast of Asia Minor (where also began the *phaselus*' journey) and that he came to Verona after his trip (as c. 31 confirms). The possibility that c. 4 narrates in part an actual itinerary, and that c. 36 supplements this itinerary, cannot simply to be dismissed.

why would Catullus list these ports of call, even if he had visited them, alongside considerably more famous temples and shrines to Venus? It is difficult to imagine a scenario in which Catullus visited all seven of the places he names. Perhaps his journey home could have included a visit to Cnidus in extreme southwest Caria.³⁹⁷ Certainly, however, Catullus did not also visit Golgi, Amathus and Idalium, all on Cyprus. If we are to reject Wiseman's attempt to reconcile the incongruous arrangement of very famous sites of Venus worship alongside decidedly less famous sites in c. 36, it is because his solution creates a new incongruity of places Catullus may have visited as he returned from Asia Minor alongside places he almost surely did not.

Morgan's explanation is no less creative, but also problematic. He reads the catalogue of place names as part of the larger program of literary criticism that is the focus of c. 36; the poem, after all, is not simply a mock religious dedication to Venus to appease Lesbia, but also a sharp critical evaluation of the poetic style and produce of a certain Volusius.³⁹⁸ Morgan goes on to guess at the content of Volusius' poem. This is no

³⁹⁷ This would not even have required much of a detour if the *phaselus* can be trusted in its claim that it encountered *Rhodus nobilis* (c. 4.8). Moreover, Catullus himself looks forward to a brief tour of the *clarae urbes Asia* at c. 46.6 as he makes his way back to Italy.

³⁹⁸ Buchheit was first to pursue this thread systematically, reading not just the blunt assessment in the poem's first and final line (*Annales Volusi, cacata carta*) as evidence for such an agenda, but subtler points too, and he does not confine his examination only to c. 36. The literary critical aspect of the poem is expanded by Clausen (1964), who sees the reappearance of Volusius' *Annales* as a point of a contrast with Cinna's *Zmyrna* in c. 95 as recreating Callimachus' discussion of rivers and poetry at Hymn 2.108-112. Volusius' poem, then, is like the muddy and swollen Po (from which fish will be taken and wrapped in the paper on which *Annales* was written, by Catullus' estimation), a point which Ross echoes, whereas the Strymon and *Zmyrna* clear. Watson revisits Clausen's argument by reading the *cacata carta* of c. 36 as a reference to the Euphrates, called muddy by Callimachus (and representative of "diffuse and careless writing to which his own exquisitely-moulded ἔπος τυτθόν stood in stark ideological contrast," Watson 2007 p. 270).

That literary criticism figures into Catullus' poetic program is practically guaranteed outside of c. 36 by his engagement with and evaluation of contemporary poetry and poets at cc. 14, 22, 35, and 95 (and perhaps c. 49; see Thomson 1967), and it would certainly be possible to read in this aspect of the New Poetry a grammatical undercurrent—the prototypical *grammaticus*, after all, was also an excellent literary critic—but this is beyond the immediate scope of my study. For more on the literary critical aspects of

easy task, inasmuch as the poem is only known to us by Catullus' *testimonia* here and in c. 95, but he is probably right to follow the lead of Baehrens and Wiseman by assuming that the Po River was in some way significant to *Annales*.³⁹⁹ With this in mind, he imagines that the *Annales* treat the career of Pompey Magnus, and in particular his campaign against the pirates in 67 BCE, some of which did occur in the Adriatic and perhaps at the mouth of the Po. As evidence of this he suggests first that Catullus quotes or paraphrases Volusius with *Hadriae tabernam* at line 16. He collates other instances of *taberna* in Latin poetry—including Catullus' use of it at c. 37.1, the *salax taberna* where his sexual rivals congregate—to show that the word was not unpoetic, but at least undignified, and he suggests that it is because Volusius used it in *Annales* that Catullus can call his poetry *pleni ruris et inficetiarum*.⁴⁰⁰ Volusius, then, celebrated several of Pompey's victories, among which were those victories that took place in the Adriatic Sea, in an Ennian-style (i.e. "long"⁴⁰¹) poem, which are recalled by those names that are most out of place in a catalogue of cult sites of Venus. The hypothesis is imaginative, even

Catullus' poetry (especially cc. 35, 36 and 95), and specifically the differing characters of his literary criticisms in the polymetric and epigrammatic poems, see Solodow (1989).

³⁹⁹ C. 95 provides perhaps our only clue as to the content of the poem: on the analogy of *Zmyrna* and its association with the Setrachus (which seems virtually confirmed, insofar as Cinna's poem treated Myrrha's son Adonis, to whom Parthenius links the Setrachus on Cyprus), *Annales* ought to have some connection with *Padua* in similar fashion.

⁴⁰⁰ That *taberna* had strong rustic associations for Catullus is unlikely, inasmuch as the *taberna* of c. 37 is patently located in the city (*a pilleatis nona fratribus pila*, "nine doors from the [temple on the Palatine of the] cap-wearing brothers [Castor and Pollux]," line 2), and the only of its patrons that Catullus appears to exonerate is the Celtiberian yokel Egnatius (lines 17-20), whose country mannerisms are not excused (cf. c. 39 as well), but are at least a point of contrast with the rest of the *taberna*'s clientele.

⁴⁰¹ Because we can only guess at what Volusius' *Annales* treated, it has been easy to assume that it was their scope and their size (which would warrant a name taken from Ennius' monumental epic) that led Catullus to cast them into the fire as the *electissima pessimi poetae scripta* (lines 6-7). This seems to be the argument of Clausen (discussed above, n. 398) and Ross after him (*ibid.* and p. 166). Indeed, turgid and lengthy poetry is clearly criticized by Catullus elsewhere (cf. 22.3-5, where Suffenus' thousands of enthusiastically crafted verses are a fault), but we can be no more certain of anything about the *Annales* of Volusius than that Catullus did not like them. Any other conclusions about them must be regarded as speculative.

attractive, but I do not think Morgan’s arguments in its defense carry conviction. While I agree that the subject matter itself would have been appropriate to the poetic tastes at the time of writers outside of Catullus’ group—and Morgan provides several known examples of epics that dealt with contemporary events⁴⁰²—I am not convinced by Morgan’s explanation for why a poem that described an anti-piracy campaign that was swiftly completed in only three months could bear the title *Annales* in earnest.⁴⁰³

I wonder, then, if another reading of this list is possible, namely if we can credit their appearance in Catullus to Parthenius’ special interest in geography and cult titles. Wiseman’s initial observation, that Urii, Ancon and Dyrrachium also recall Venus is practically assured by their inclusion in a prayer to Venus—the argument itself is circular, but the inference is sound—but we can say little else about the character of such an association. However, one fragment of Parthenius, in fact just a single word, is relevant here. Fr. 7 comes from an entry in Stephanus of Byzantium’s *Ethnica*, which deals with a peculiar adjectival toponym, Ἀκαμαντίς. According to him, this refers to Akamantion, an otherwise unknown city he locates in Phrygia, and he states that the word was used by Parthenius as an epithet for Aphrodite in a hymn called *Aphrodite*.⁴⁰⁴ There

⁴⁰² Ibid. p. 64-5.

⁴⁰³ He offers two possible explanations: that Catullus created the name to “mock the work for its Ennian pretensions,” (p. 65); or that Volusius’ poem also covered previous military action against pirates of the Mediterranean before focusing in on Pompey. In response to the first, I wonder what “Ennian pretensions” can be said to remain when we strip the poem of its Ennian name—after all, the assumption that it is a martial epic of the Ennian style derives entirely from its name; Morgan’s argument here would be circular. Morgan believes the second to be the likelier of the two, but this is wishful thinking. I do not believe that anyone would give to a poem like the serious poem Morgan imagines Volusius’ to be the name *Annales*, merely because it prefaced a detailed account of a single event that took place in a few months with a quick summary of other, similar events from earlier in history.

⁴⁰⁴ Ἀκαμάντιον, πόλις τῆς μεγάλης Φρυγίας, Ἀκάμαντος κτίσμα τοῦ Θησέως, ᾧ συμμαχήσαντι πρὸς τοὺς Σολύμους τὸν τόπον δέδωκεν Ἴσανδρος. τὸ ἔθνικόν Ἀκαμάντιος ὡς Βυζάντιος, τὸ δὲ κτητικὸν τοῦ Ἀκάμαντος διὰ τῆς εἰ διφθόγγου. λέγεται καὶ Ἀκαμαντίς ὡς Βυζαντίς. Παρθένιος δ’ ἐν Ἀφροδίτῃ Ἀκαμαντίδα αὐτὴν φησι.

may have been a city with that name in Phrygia, but Lightfoot reasons that Parthenius more probably meant the promontory in northwest Cyprus.⁴⁰⁵ This is our only surviving record that Parthenius wrote such a poem, and we have no archeological evidence that any temple or shrine to Aphrodite existed there.⁴⁰⁶ Nevertheless, it has obvious implications for our treatment of c. 36. Surely if Parthenius can be shown here to have used an exotic toponym for his treatment of Aphrodite, and to have cultivated elsewhere a learned and practiced interest in geography, his example and his authority would have been valuable to any poet wishing to compile a catalogue of cult sites, both famous and obscure, of the goddess. It is unclear what the scope of *Aphrodite* was—its single fragment guarantees only that it discussed this particular aspect of Aphrodite’s cult—and so it would be rash to assume that Parthenius anticipates any of the most of obscure names in c. 36. But even if his poetic treatment did not reach the Adriatic coast, his clear interest in geographical and mythological minutiae is reason enough to believe that he would have been familiar, or made himself familiar upon arriving in Italy, with such details.

Parthenius is likelier to have mentioned the more famous seats of Venus worship in the eastern Mediterranean, especially because Ἀκαμαντίς already locates at least some

“Akamantion is a city in Greater Phrygia, a colony of Theseus’ son Acamas, to whom Isander gave the territory for his assistance fighting against the Solymoi. The ethnonym is Ἀκαμάντιος, like Βυζάντιος, and the possessive form is derived from Acamas with the ει diphthong [that is, Ἀκαμάντειος]. There is also [a feminine form of] the adjective Ἀκαμαντίς, like Βυζαντίς. Parthenius in his *Aphrodite* calls her Ἀκαμαντίς,” (*Ethnica* 56.10-15).

The Suda also mentions a city in Phrygia called Akamantion, but these are our only records of any such settlement.

⁴⁰⁵ 1999 p. 105. This settlement still exists on the island, about midway between Paphos and Soloi (both cult centers for the worship of Aphrodite). Local legend assigns the founding of this settlement to Acamas as well.

⁴⁰⁶ Aphrodite’s association with Cyprus, however, is well established. Parthenius presumably used the specific adjective as a demonstration of his thorough knowledge of Cypriot geography.

of the poem's action in the eastern Mediterranean, and probably on Cyprus, where Amathus, Golgi and Idalium lay. Both Morgan and Wiseman (and Quinn and Thomson, for that matter) suggest that these three are "well-known cult centres of Venus" (Morgan p. 60), and this is a fair assessment. However, no commentator of c. 36 notes that all three of these terms make their first appearance in Latin literature in Catullus.⁴⁰⁷ It is impossible to prove that they did not appear before Catullus used them, given how fragmentary Latin poetry is before the Late Republic, but it is at least curious, and moreover invites speculation that it was Parthenius' comprehensive familiarity with all things geographical that sanctioned, even recommended, Catullus' introduction of these sites into his poetry.⁴⁰⁸

Excepting the possibility that Catullus' epithalamia take their cues from a Parthenian model, the list of cult sites in c. 36 (as well as the recurrence of some of those names elsewhere in the corpus) provides the most visible point of potential contact between the poetry of Catullus and Parthenius. Catullus deals in obscure cult sites of Venus in c. 36; Parthenius wrote a hymn to Aphrodite in which he made use of at least one obscure cult title for the goddess. Other instances in which Catullus might have

⁴⁰⁷ Idalium also occurs at 61.17, and again alongside Golgi at 64.96 (actually in terms quite similar to those used in c. 36: *quaeque regis Golgos quaeque Idalium frondosum*); Amathus is realized as the adjective *Amathusia* at 68.51. In all instances the names are used in conjunction with Venus. Golgi is not attested again in Latin poetry, but both Idalium and Amathus occur frequently in later authors. Perhaps it is significant that none of these names occur in Callimachus either.

To be sure, the record of cult sites or epithets of Aphrodite named before or contemporary with Catullus is quite thin. Ennius apparently locates Venus worship on Cyprus (in *Sota* and *Euhemerus*), but he is never more precise in the extant fragments. Plautus names a Venus Cyrenensis at *Rudens* 1338. Cicero mentions several times the temple to Venus at Eryx on Sicily, and its strategic role in the First and Second Punic Wars perhaps suggests that Naevius may have named the city in *Bellum Punicum*, but our extant fragments of that work do not allow any more than speculation.

⁴⁰⁸ The list, then, would be a demonstration of Catullus' familiarity with obscure names and places. Others have suggested that such an interest informs the catalogue in c. 36—both Wiseman and Morgan considered this reading to be incomplete—but nowhere else have I found it suggested that Parthenius is the ultimate source of that familiarity with obscure names and places.

called upon Parthenius' specialization in geographical details are more difficult to imagine, because there are few passages in Parthenius where we can posit significant overlap of content with Catullus' corpus. There is one place name that appears in Catullus, however, that ought to suggest immediately Parthenius of Nicaea, even if it does not stand out as an obscure or otherwise unusual location, and that is, naturally, Parthenius' own place of origin, Nicaea. In c. 46, Catullus welcomes spring and his departure from Bithynia: *linquantur Phrygii, Catulle, campi / Nicaeaeque ager uber aestuosae*.⁴⁰⁹ If Catullus was a familiar of Parthenius, surely he knew to associate the man with his place of origin. Crowther finds it noteworthy, then, that Catullus does *not* allude perceptibly to Parthenius here, and adduces that omission as a counter-argument to the Parthenian echoes that Clausen read in c. 95.⁴¹⁰ According to Crowther, the absence of Parthenius in c. 46, when a reference to him would have been most appropriate, is evidence that Parthenius' influence on Catullus could not have been so direct. But is Parthenius entirely absent from c. 46? Ross is not so sure. On the contrary, he detects perhaps a subtle nod to Parthenius in the collocation of place name and adjective, *Nicaea aestuosa*. His treatment of this possibility occurs in his discussion of the adjectival form. Catullus is quite fond of derived adjectives with the *-osus* ending, and he uses them frequently, but Ross notes that this particular formation from *aestus* "heat" occurs only at

⁴⁰⁹ "Let the Phrygian plains be left, Catullus, / And rich soil of burning-hot Nicaea,"(lines 4-5).

⁴¹⁰ Crowther (1976 p. 70); Clausen (1964). Crowther is skeptical throughout his discussion of Parthenius about the limits to which we can conjecture anything about the teacher, when our portrait of the man is so fragmentary. He admits that Clausen's reading of c. 95 is at least possible, but that the evidence is too thin in that poem, and perhaps too strong in the opposite direction in c. 46, for us to assume too much about Parthenius and Catullus' hypothetical relationship.

one other point in Catullus' poetry, in c. 7.⁴¹¹ There it is applied to the oracle of *Iuppiter aestuosus* (Jupiter Ammon) in Cyrene.⁴¹² Cyrene, of course, is the birthplace of Callimachus, and, in case the significance of the geographical setting is lost on Catullus' audience, he makes this connection even more manifest by mentioning as well Cyrene's legendary founder Battus, from whom Callimachus derived his own lineage.⁴¹³ For this reason, Ross reads the epithet for Nicaea as a "complimentary reference to Parthenius," i.e., complimentary because Catullus would be equating Parthenius' homeland to Callimachus', and thus acknowledging his debt to both.⁴¹⁴

And perhaps there is something more to be said of c. 7. Two geographical names occur in the short poem, and both assume somewhat unexpected forms. Adjectival use of *Libyssa* with *harena* at line 3, as Kroll notes, is "rein griechisch";⁴¹⁵ and the short upsilon

⁴¹¹ 1964 p. 162 n. 105. Ross devotes several pages to the discussion of this formation, in the course of which he demonstrates that they are especially concentrated in the polymetric poems (1969 pp. 53-60). They were part of Catullus' colloquializing poetic idiom, a point which we will revisit below (p. 232 n. 489).

⁴¹² The poem wonders how many of Lesbia's kisses would be sufficient for Catullus: *quam magnus numerus Libyssae harenae / laserpiceris iacet Cyrenis / oraculum Iovis inter aestuosi / et Batti veteris sacrum sepulcrum*, "as great a number as the sands of Libya / that lies in silphium-bearing Cyrene / between the oracle of seething Jupiter / and the hallowed grave of old Battus," (lines 3-6).

⁴¹³ Callimachus' father was also named Battus, and Catullus, who names him *Battiades* "descendant of Battus" at 65.16, certainly knew to associate the two names.

⁴¹⁴ Simpson and Simpson take Ross' suggestion one step further and argue that in c. 46 Catullus refers not just to Parthenius as a figure of Callimachus-like importance to Catullus, but also gestures to Asia Minor more broadly as the source of the New Poetry. They propose first that the *Phrygii Campi* recall the sites of the poetic action in c. 63, and perhaps the *Magna Mater incohata* of Caecilius, which Catullus mentions at c. 35.18, and that the *clarae urbes Asiae* of 46.6 point suggestively to Smyrna, and thus to Cinna's *Zmyrna*. These three poems, c. 63, Caecilius' *Magna Mater* and Cinna *Zmyrna*, are especially typical of the Alexandrian style, and by alluding however obliquely to them and to other poetry of the same kind (or to the originator of those poetic tastes in Rome, Parthenius), Catullus makes c. 46 a celebration of the New Poetry (Simpson and Simpson 1989).

⁴¹⁵ Kroll (1929 p. 15). Far commoner is the form *Libycus*. An anonymous epigram from the *Anthologia Palatina* (at 12.145.3-4) is obviously related to Catullus' usage, *κάπθ' Λιβύσσης / ψάμμου ἀριθμητῆν ἀρτιάσαι ψεκάδα*. Paton believes the 12th book of the anthology to have been compiled by the anthologist and poet Straton of Sardis, who probably lived during the reign of Hadrian, but we can say little else about the author of the anonymous fragment or its precise relationship to c. 7. The date of Meleager's original *Garland* anthology cannot have been much earlier than Catullus' *floruit*, but we cannot be certain that epigram 12.145 was included in that earlier anthology, or added by a later anthologist, or by Straton

of Cŷrenis at line 4, where it is metrically helpful, is not standard.⁴¹⁶ Both of these forms appear in Callimachus, so either could have been borrowed from him (which would be especially appropriate in a poem that already subtly celebrates Callimachus), but neither occurs in frequency great enough for us to call their use particularly “Callimachean”.⁴¹⁷ These forms can hardly be said to be exemplary of Callimachus’ style, but their appearance here in a poem that is so obviously interested in recalling him by his geographic origin could still serve as an appeal to his authoritative usage of them elsewhere. A motivation driven by metrical convenience is also plausible—particularly for Cŷrene, which in its conventional molossal shape could only appear at the beginning of a hendecasyllabic line—but we should not dismiss the possibility that Catullus learned these patently Greek variants from a knowledgeable teacher. Parthenius does not mention Cyrene or Libya in any of his extant poetic fragments, so we cannot determine whether he had a preference for one or the other forms of either, but we can at least register the possibility that he introduced Catullus to these non-standard forms. If Catullus encountered these forms in Callimachus (or, as could be the case with *Libyssae*, in another Greek poet), and Clausen and Ross are right to believe that Parthenius is the ultimate source of Callimachus’ and other Alexandrians’ influence on the New Poets, then the forms can be credited to Parthenius indirectly nevertheless.

himself. It seems at least likely that the form from *AP* predates and thus informs Catullus’ usage. This epigram is characteristic of the erotic, and specifically pederastic tone of the rest of book 12, and so it is quite possible that Catullus drew from it or others like it (from an anthology perhaps? We have no way of knowing) when he wrote the Iuventius poems (cc. 24, 48, 81 and 99).

⁴¹⁶ I can find only one parallel use in Latin poetry, at *Catalepton* 9.61.

⁴¹⁷ Λιβŷσσης at *Hymn to Apollo* 86; short-epsilon Κυρήνη (including derived forms) at *Ep.* 22.5 and 21.2 (Pfeiffer). Callimachus has long-epsilon Κυρήνη as frequently, though the short-epsilon form is regular in Pindar. Adjectives from Λιβŷα do not occur with enough frequency for us to call one or the other typical of his style.

One other possible trace of Parthenian geography can be adduced only with the collective reservations of scholars before me. At fr. 53 Stephanus of Byzantium cites Parthenius' usage of an adjectival derivation from the name of Mt. Oeta, Οἰταῖον. Catullus uses forms of *Oetaeus* twice, at 62.7 and 68.54, but a relation to Parthenius' usage cannot be confirmed. Willamowitz and Pfeiffer after him addressed the possibility that Stephanus' quotation came from a hypothetical epithalamium by Parthenius, and that this unattested poem influenced Catullus' production of two such poems (61 and 62, where *Oetaeus* occurs), but both scholars concluded that there are chronological issues with such a sequence.⁴¹⁸ Lightfoot is less concerned with the chronology. She reasons that "there would indeed have been time for Parthenius' influence to have got to work before Catullus' death in about 54 BC."⁴¹⁹ Certainly if Parthenian touches lie behind Cinna's *Zmyrna*, as seems very likely, the man's influence was operative among the neoterics before Catullus' death. In fact, if Parthenius assisted Cinna as he wrote that poem, which took him nine years, Parthenius' influence would have had ample time to find its way into Catullus' circle and thence to Catullus himself, and all the more likely if Parthenius' guidance is detectable elsewhere in Catullus' poetry.⁴²⁰ Lightfoot is still hesitant to make too much of the single-word fragment, but she is right to disregard arguments that a feasible chronology is the greatest obstacle to our speculation.

⁴¹⁸ Willamowitz (1924); Pfeiffer (1943). Their reasoning is that Catullus' death in \approx 54 BCE would require that Parthenius' poem be written unacceptably early for it to have influenced Catullus.

⁴¹⁹ Lightfoot p. 206.

⁴²⁰ This influence would include the examples we have treated in this chapter as well as Catullus' observation of Hermann's bridge and perhaps his translation of *Coma Berenices*, as was my suggestion in chapter 2.

Perhaps some of her concern is due to the fact that the adjective occurs fairly frequently in Latin prose and poetry after Catullus, and at least once before (in a tragic fragment of Accius *ex incerta fabula*, fr. 670), so one cannot regard it as a rarity in the same fashion as some of the other toponyms that we have examined. It is certainly curious, however, that in subsequent Latin poetry the association of Oeta with the evening star Vesperus became a topos, which Catullus' usage anticipates and which has no apparent Greek precedent.⁴²¹ Catullus' line reads *nimirum Oetaeos ostendit Noctifer ignes*, "surely the Night-bringer shows the flames of Oeta." Fraenkel and Lightfoot both admit that the frequency of the topos suggests a Hellenistic model, but what this model would be is left to speculation.⁴²² Perhaps it is also significant that Stephanus of Byzantium cites a neuter form of the adjective in Parthenius, Οἰταῖον, inasmuch as his habit is to cite the word exactly as it appeared in the text, rather by its conventional dictionary form (here the nominative of the masculine singular Οἰταῖος); Οἰταῖον, then, could conceivably have paired with πῦρ, from which Catullus might have taken *Oetaeos ignes*. Such an explanation of the appearance of the toponym in Catullus is perhaps the best we can offer, but it obviously falls short of proof.

These examples, then, represent all that can be said about possible forms of Parthenian toponymy in Catullus, but our extremely fragmentary account of Parthenius is an obstacle to any more verifiable or definite influence.⁴²³ There may be some connection

⁴²¹ Cf. *Ecl.* 8.30, *Ciris* 350 and *Culex* 203.

⁴²² Fraenkel (1955 p. 3); Lightfoot p. 206.

⁴²³ One additional coincidence of forms that seems unlikely to represent genuine influence is contained in Stephanus of Byzantium's citation at fr. 42, where he records Parthenius' usage of a particular epithet for Adonis, Κανοπίτης. Although the text is corrupt at Catullus 66.58, it is entirely possible that a transliterated form *Canopitis* occurs there, and this emendation has been suggested, but in that case it would probably be

between Catullus' poetic laments for his brother at cc. 68 and 101 and an elegiac fragment of Parthenius that reaches us on the top of a vellum leaf, but a suite of complicating factors limits our conjecture.⁴²⁴ In the absence of more certain information, a direct Parthenian influence on Catullus can be regarded only as plausible, not probable. Nevertheless, the circumstantial evidence for some sort of acquaintance is fairly strong. Cinna certainly knew Parthenius and his poetry, and the high praise with which Catullus lavishes Cinna's *Zmyrna* would suggest that he respected the erudite teacher and mentor behind *Zmyrna*'s dense and labored verses. If Parthenius had been available to Catullus for consultation or advice when he approached the finer and more nuanced points of Callimachean verse-craft and translation, or explored the more remote and obscure corners of the Mediterranean, it seems extremely probable that he would have utilized his expertise in the particulars of Alexandrian style to polish and ornament his poetry. Even if we are unable to prove that Parthenius lies behind these geographical details, we can nevertheless appreciate the subtlety and sophistication that any such *grammaticus* figured could add to the verses of a neoteric poet.

Callimachus' use of the same in *Aetia* fr. 110.58, which actually does survive, that prompted Catullus' use, rather than Parthenius' example, though it could be that Parthenius made Catullus aware of the word.

⁴²⁴ Lightfoot fr. 27. The vellum is badly damaged, especially on the back side. It is not even explicitly attributed to Parthenius, though it contains a marginal gloss of a word, δροίτη "bathing tub" as σορόν "cinerary urn", that resembles a more certain Parthenius fragment from the *Etymologicum Genuinum* (fr. 49). This being the case, it is almost certainly genuinely Parthenian, and Lightfoot classifies it as such, rather than as a spurious or dubious fragment. As for its possible association with Catullus, we can only guess. It is true that there is the coincidence in both Catullus' laments and fr. 27 of a premature death and cremated remains buried (perhaps) on a headland, and Parthenius' clearly legible ὀθνεῖη and οἰκεῖς τῆλε convey at least the same sentiment as *extremo terra aliena solo* at 68.100, but much of the language of both treatments is conventional of elegy, and so we cannot assume too much. Perhaps if the fragment were better preserved—there are 16 lines on the front and 14 on the back, but large pieces are missing from both sides, and only a few dozen words are legible—we could say more, but that is regrettably not the case.

Section II: Cato Grammaticus

The circumstances surrounding the grammarian Publius Valerius Cato and his hypothetical relationship with Catullus are quite different from those that exist for Parthenius. There is, first of all, an obvious difference in the nationalities of the two men. Parthenius was Greek, a native of a Greek-speaking region who wrote Greek poetry. For this reason his guidance and authority is of particular use to a Latin poet who wished to imitate the Greek, and particularly the Alexandrian, style. Our various echoes of Parthenius in Cinna and Vergil and Catullus are highly suggestive of just such a rapport. On the other hand, Valerius Cato, whose birth and origins we will discuss more fully below, was a native Latin speaker. While we can say practically nothing about what Valerius Cato taught, and thus practically nothing about how a poet may have utilized *his* authority, it will become clear as we proceed with our treatment of Cato that his relationship with Catullus took a somewhat different shape.

There is another significant difference between the two men. While we possess meager fragments of Parthenius' poetic work and a complete text of his mythographical epitome *Erotica pathemata*, no writings of Valerius Cato have reached us, either of his poetry or his grammatical works. Instead we have a complete, and fairly substantial, biographical account from chapter 11 of Suetonius' *DGR*, in which he describes Cato's life and professional activity, names major poetic works, and provides a number of *testimonia* from contemporary Roman poets (among whom are Helvius Cinna, as we mentioned earlier). From this we can safely assume acquaintance with at least some of the New Poets, and can perhaps claim to know more about Cato than we do about

Parthenius. Furthermore we can at least hypothesize on the basis of Cinna's familiarity with Cato's poetry that the grammarian knew Catullus as well. However, in the absence of any irrefutable proof, we would again be forced only to speculate on any connection with Catullus.

Nevertheless, there is one compelling piece of evidence, the crux of any argument that the two men were familiars, which may be able to demonstrate such a relationship: c. 56 is addressed to an unspecified Cato. The substance of the poem, a bawdy account of a sexual encounter, does not immediately suggest the grammarian, but maybe more is at stake than simply a salacious anecdote. In fact the short poem boasts a disproportionately long list of textual uncertainties and ambiguities, which have hindered interpretation for centuries. These ambiguities cannot be avoided in treating the poem, but if we were to arrive of a reading of c. 56 that casts Valerius Cato as the addressee, such a reading would certainly support the idea that Catullus and Cato were acquainted. However, this cannot be assumed without good reason, and so in this section we will look both at the circumstantial evidence that would suggest that Catullus and Cato were acquainted—namely Suetonius' biography—and at c. 56, in order to determine, first, how likely it is that Catullus addressed the short poem to Valerius Cato, and, if this is likely, what we can infer about the nature of Catullus' and Cato's relationship from combining the circumstantial with the more overt evidence. Because our interest in Valerius Cato will be all the more amplified if we can demonstrate that he is the addressee of c. 56 (not to

mention that we will be able to say a good deal more about him and Catullus), let us

begin by considering the poem:⁴²⁵

*O rem ridiculam, Cato, et iocosam,
dignamque auribus et tuo cachinno!
ride quidquid amas, Cato, Catullum:
res est ridicula et nimis iocosa.
deprendi modo pupulum puellae
trusantem; hunc ego, si placet Dionae,
protelo rigida mea cecidi.*

“How hilarious, Cato, how amusing,
This thing merits attention and your laughter!
Laugh as much as you love Catullus, Cato,
It’s hilarious, this thing, too comedic:
I just caught in the act my girlfriend’s houseboy
Chafing *his*, and, so help me God, I let him
Have it, right then and there, with *mine*, unyielding.”

Indeed the unknown Cato is only the first of a series of questions and complications that have plagued readers since Catullus’ earliest interpreters from the Italian Renaissance.

Three basic issues have frustrated a perfect understanding. First, the identity of the addressee, who is generally assumed to be either of the two well-known contemporary figures who bore that cognomen: the statesman Marcus Porcius Cato or the grammarian Valerius Cato.⁴²⁶ The allure of drawing either of these figures into association with

⁴²⁵ An ambiguous construction that spans the fifth and sixth line makes it unclear how many people are present in the scene Catullus recounts. I have privileged in my translation, merely for the sake of having something with which to work, those interpretations of the poem that imagine just two sexual participants instead of three (i.e. *puellae* is read as genitive rather than as an indirect object). Catullus is thus envisioned as coming upon and startling a young male slave who is preoccupied with his own self-gratification. In response, Catullus, *opportunitate data*, to use the phrasing of Housman (1931), seizes upon the boy and engages him in *pedicatio*. Opinions are divided on whether this or a scenario with a third participant, the *puella*, is syntactically and schematically better supported. There are problems inherent with both interpretations, which are addressed below.

⁴²⁶ However, two more identifications are possible. First, Catullus’ Cato could be entirely unknown. There is also another contemporary Cato, a Gaius Cato mentioned by Cicero *passim*. We can say little about Cicero’s man, other than that he was tribune of the plebs in 56 BCE, and that he was a partisan of Clodius, but we cannot simply dismiss the possibility that either additional Cato could be the addressee of c. 56, at least without due consideration, for which, see below.

Catullus has shaped many attempts at answering this question of identity.⁴²⁷ Equally vexing are two more obviously interrelated problems, which occur in the poem's final three lines: the schematic ambiguity of a *res ridicula* involving two or possibly three people (as well as why the affair is so funny), and a constellation of lexical peculiarities, including the precise meaning of the hapax *trusantem* and the consequent syntactic relationship between the participle's subject *pupulum* and oblique-case noun *puellae* in lines 5-6; the curious appeal to Dione in line 6; and the best reading and import of *protelo* in line 7. Because of these problems, previous interpretations of c. 56 have felt incomplete; no wholly satisfactory reading has been able to account for and explain each of the three issues in a way that both makes them complementary to one another and renders the poem a matter worthy of our laughter, or Cato's or, at the very least, that of Catullus. It seems plausible, therefore, that these three uncertainties are in some way interdependent, and that the most satisfactory interpretation of the poem will be able to treat them as interconnected. In other words, a reading that can account for a relationship between the identity of Cato, the ambiguity of the joke, and the significance of Catullus' choices in diction will be stronger than a reading that addresses only one or two of the

⁴²⁷ Readers have long sought to add a famous Cato to the list of historical figures Catullus names elsewhere in his poetry: Cicero, Caesar, Pompeius, et al. This possibility attracted the attention of Renaissance readers in particular. Cf. especially Gaisser's (1993) discussion. Parthenius and Politian both favored Cato the grammarian in their 15th c. editions, but perhaps their reasoning was too simplistic. Parthenius discounts M. Porcius Cato only on the grounds that he would not have found such a highly sexualized event amusing in the least, although the irony of addressing a sexually graphic poem to a man who would blush at the scene described therein has provided for modern scholars evidence enough to suggest just the opposite. Politian, on the other hand, relied merely on the known association of the grammarian with certain other members of the so-called neoteric movement (namely Gaius Helvius Cinna, Furius Bibaculus, and perhaps Ticasas, all of whom Suetonius mentions in *DGR* 11). Nothing internal to the poem allows either argument to stand without more rigorous exegesis.

problems, or that answers the three questions, especially the third composite question, in ways that are inconsistent with one another or the unity of the poem.

a. Cato Uticensis?

I will return to the second and third issues last, inasmuch as both questions are of a more philological nature, and can thus be regarded as interdependent. Let us first consider the problem of our addressee. Any complete reading of c. 56 begins invariably with this most obvious question: which Cato is Catullus addressing? This is the root of our interest in c. 56 as well, but answering this question alone is not sufficient. Any focus on the identity of Catullus' Cato ought to aim also to solve, at least in part, the poem's other difficulties. The *res* Catullus describes is, after all, *digna auribus et tuo cachinno* (as though the addressee were selected for his unique appreciation of the situation). Some treatments have done just this. Readings that advocate Cato Uticensis tend to highlight the incongruity of a man so stern of reputation—he is supposed to have walked out of a pantomime show in order to allow the scheduled striptease to continue without his objection⁴²⁸—with an act of lewd and graphic sexuality. In these scenarios Catullus has chosen his addressee for the sake of irony. A man such as Cato the Younger would no doubt consider the scene described to be uncomfortable and inappropriate, and hardly likely to elicit his laughter. This would lend support to the curious reiteration in lines 1-4

⁴²⁸ The incident is related by Valerius Maximus in the ninth book of his *Facta ac Dicta Memorabilia*, at 2.10.8, where Cato's staunch morals came into conflict with a sexually suggestive scene: [*Catone*] *Ludos Florales quos Messius aedilis faciebat spectante populus ut mimae nudarentur postulare erubuit. Quod cum ex Favonio amicissimo sibi una sedente cognosset, discessit e teatro ne praesentia sua spectaculi consuetudinem impediret.* "At the Ludi Florales that Messius the aedile had organized, the people were too embarrassed to demand that the mimes strip nude with Cato watching. When he came to this realization from his close friend Favonius who was seated with him, he left the theater so that his presence wouldn't keep the show from carrying on as usual." Cato was applauded as he exited for his unwillingness to be an obstacle to the people's entertainment.

by the poet, who spends the majority of this short poem entreating and convincing his addressee that the scene that follows is indeed funny and does, in fact, deserve laughter and attention. This is precisely the reasoning behind Buchheit's influential article, which reads Cato the Younger as the addressee: if we interpret the request for laughter as emphatic, which it clearly is, "so kommt nur eine Person in Frage, von der man wußte, daß sie von Haus aus zu Ernst und Strenge neigte."⁴²⁹ That person, he concludes, must be Cato Uticensis, whose reputation for prudish austerity made him an attractive target for an ironic appeal to enjoy a ribald story.

This irony is the strongest argument for Cato the Younger, but it is not the only argument that has been made. I am reluctant to invest too much in readings that privilege this Cato on the basis that he, like Catullus, was a practitioner of invective poetry, and so assume that Catullus addressed c. 56 to him as a man who could appreciate poetry. Cato's poetic activity is attested only once, and this activity seems to have been confined to a single incident. Plutarch relates in his *Life of Cato Minor* a brief anecdote about Cato's dabbling in iambic verse. The story is as follows: it seems that Cato, after a dispute with his future political ally Metellus Scipio—Scipio had first balked at a marriage to a certain Lepida, clearing the way for Cato's engagement to her, only then to resume his betrothal and cut Cato out of the picture—had been terribly incensed and planned to take Scipio to

⁴²⁹ Buchheit 1961. The phenomenon of ironic emphasis may have precedent outside of c. 56 as well. In c. 49, in which Catullus thanks Cicero effusively (to the point of sounding disingenuous) for unspecified reasons, the final three lines feature repetitive language that denigrates Catullus' own status as a poet—he is *pessimus omnium poeta* at the ends of both lines 5 and 6—while celebrating Cicero's as a patron: *tu optimus omnium patronus* (line 7). Scholars have not agreed as to whether it conveys genuine thanks—perhaps Cicero's comments about Clodia in *Pro Caelio*?—or veiled criticism—is Cicero charged with being a mercenary patron for hire (everyman's patron)? Or is Catullus deliberately withholding the title of *poeta* from him? See Thomson (especially 1967, but also 1999 for extensive bibliography) for the interpretative tradition.

law over the transgression, but was dissuaded from legal action by his friends. He channeled his anger into poetry, inveighing against Scipio in harsh iambs, τῷ πικρῷ προσρησάμενος τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου, τὸ δὲ ἀκόλαστον ἄφεις καὶ παιδαριῶδες, “making use of the bitter style of Archilochus, but rejecting his unbridled puerility,” (7.3).⁴³⁰

The inclusion in Plutarch of a reference to Archilochus is tempting, inasmuch as c. 56 appears very much to have been modeled on a poem of Archilochus of which we have only fragments (more on this below), and Cato’s avoidance of παιδαριῶδες contrasts with the literally puerile focus of c. 56. However, there remain problematic incongruities with such a reading. First of all, readings that adduce Plutarch’s *Life* as evidence that Cato was viewed by Catullus as a poet neglect the fact that it is only here that Plutarch suggests Cato wrote poetry.⁴³¹ A poetic *œuvre* so meager may not even have warranted the attention of fellow poets, let alone invited a poetic dialogue.⁴³² Furthermore, Cato’s poetry is depicted as an *ad hominem* attack against a named target, written under the capricious guidance of zealous impulse. C. 56 shares neither of these characteristics, whereas personal invective and poetry fueled by passion, are salient, even representative, features of Catullus’ taken as a whole. If Catullus had wanted to allude to Cato’s poetic output, then he might have chosen a less opaque means of doing so.

⁴³⁰ Thomson’s commentary agrees that this anecdote adds little to the case for Cato the Younger. Quinn’s does not acknowledge the anecdote at all. Are we to believe that Catullus recognized from this isolated poetic outburst a literary peer, or, to go a step further, as Friedrich did, that Cato, “was probably associated with Catullus’ circle”? This seems unlikely in the extreme.

⁴³¹ Scott (1969) notably does not acknowledge this when he identifies Cato the Younger in c. 56, but the reasoning behind his decision uses Plutarch’s testimony only in conjunction with several other points, which are treated below.

⁴³² Catullus says nothing, for instance, about Caesar’s poetry, though he is more than once a target of Catullus’ criticism. Cicero’s poetry as well is either unmentioned by Catullus in c. 49, or, if Thomson is correct, deliberately and dismissively ignored. At any rate, the poetic careers of both statesman are better documented in antiquity than Cato’s dabbling in invective iambs, but Catullus does not acknowledge either. It therefore seems unlikely that he would have written to Cato as though he was a poet.

Moreover, a secondary motivation for singling out Cato the Younger as the addressee of this particular poem is unnecessary, as his reputation alone already allows for a palpable and effective tension between subject and addressee. This practiced irony accords better with Catullus' brand of invective elsewhere in the corpus as well.⁴³³ If M. Porcius is the Cato of c. 56, the contrast between addressee and content suffices without the support of an additional, contrived subtext.

This reading attractively coordinates the unexpected emphasis put on laughter in the first four lines and the sex act depicted in the following three—obscure in its specifics, but unquestionably lascivious—but the rest of the poem's quandaries in those final lines, questions of syntax and diction, cannot be answered convincingly with reference to the identity of Cato Uticensis alone. Complicated syntax is rare in Catullus, and difficulties in understanding him can usually be attributed to textual corruption, ostentatious learned allusions, or topical references. However, line five in particular defies our expectations of Catullus, where the modern reader is presented with two uncertainties: the semantic valence of *trusantem* and the precise relationship between it and the two nouns that follow, the accusative *pupulum* and the genitive or dative *puellae*. While we can comfortably paraphrase the line to deliver the sexual imagery we expect (relying on both the previous four lines and the implicitly sexual punishment that ends the poem), best guesses at the schematics of the sex act have not been able to agree on anything other than that it is a sex act. It may be that the modern reader is at a disadvantage, removed as we are from the familiar and colloquial language with which,

⁴³³ Cf. c. 49 (discussed above, p. 216 n. 429), and c. 22, where Catullus does not mince words in passing his criticism on amateur poet Suffenus.

presumably, Catullus and his friends casually discussed sex, and that the poem is not obscure at all, provided the reader has a degree of fluency in this vernacular (a vernacular that we can only hope to approach by comparison within Catullus' corpus and the scant fragmentary remains of his peers, which provide little assistance here). However, the weight of emphasis that Catullus places on the humor of the scene to be described should tell us at least one of two things: either that the scene is so unmistakably comic that one cannot help but laugh (provided one is of a mind to find humor in sexual matters), using the doubled emphasis of the poem's exposition to protract anticipation and amplify the eventual reaction; or that there is another layer to the humor that operates beyond the sex act, probably in correspondence with the addressee. This is clearly the tack that advocates of Cato the Younger have followed, imagining the irony of an addressee so unflinching in his moral rectitude as to provide a great deal of delight and laughter for the *poet*, rather than for Cato, but such readings do not satisfactorily engage the issues with the poem that follow in lines 5-7.⁴³⁴ If we are to seek a reading that is complete in its ability to address all the complications of the poem, we must look to another Cato.

⁴³⁴ Scott (1969) does attempt to reconcile a reading that favors Cato Uticensis and the emphatic pleas for laughter in lines 1-4 with at least some of the puzzles in lines 5-7. We will discuss his reading more fully below. He takes the *pupulum puellae* of line 5 as accusative and genitive respectively, understanding the *puella* in question to be Lesbia (i.e. Clodia) and the *pupulus* as her younger brother Clodius. This diminutive moniker for Clodius, he argues, recalled a current but unattested nickname that he bore. Elsewhere a similar (and distantly cognate) term of derogation is used by Cicero for Clodius at *Pro Caelio* 36: *semper pusio cum maiore sorore cubitavit* "the lad always cuddled up with his older sister." This, he reasons, coupled with Cato the Younger's ill will towards Clodius, attested in Plutarch's *Life of Cato Minor*, provides cohesion between the poem's first four and final three lines. Scott enlists as well the appeal to Dione to corroborate his identification of the addressee. He is only able to do so, with the help of Ellis' commentary, by using a complicated reference to *Iliad* 5 and wounded Aphrodite's retreat to her mother's arms. We are thus to imagine Catullus as a bellicose Diomedes, vanquishing another out-of-her-element Aphrodite-figure (the *pupulus*) with his own spear ([*mentula*] *pro telo*). In order for this *Iliad* reference to work perfectly, *pro telo* must be read at line 7 instead of *protelo*, which has not been met with universal acceptance. In any event, this allusion can stand apart from Scott's reading of Marcus Porcius as Cato, and so will be treated once we have dealt in full with the question of identifying the addressee.

b. Cato Incertus?

This leaves us with a few options. There is, of course, P. Valerius Cato, who is an attractive candidate for more than one reason, but we cannot immediately ignore the possibility that a third Cato, who would be otherwise unknown to us, was a friend or associate of Catullus. Indeed there are several people who are mentioned by name by Catullus about whom we know nothing else, so to entertain at least this possibility is necessary before any conclusions about Cato's identity can be made.⁴³⁵ Obviously if the Cato is a genuine person about whom nothing else is known we can go no further; all of our information about this Cato would have to be gleaned from c. 56, a circular and unfulfilling approach to the problem. We can, however, at least speculate on a few items of significance. First, it will be helpful to consider the probable model for c. 56, the fragmentary beginning of an epode of Archilochus:

Ἐρασμονίδη Χαρίλαε,
 χρῆμά τοι γελοῖον
 ἔρέω, πολὺ φίλταθ' ἑταίρων,
 τέρψεται δ' ἀκούων⁴³⁶
 ...

Scott does little to advance our understanding of *trusantem*, though he admits that, as a *hapax*, it must be treated as a kind of mathematical unknown. He is comfortable leaving it largely unexplained, offering only the suggestion that an unexpressed direct object of appropriate vulgarity is to be understood (perhaps another suppressed *mentula*, as in line 7).

⁴³⁵ Neither Buchheit nor Scott considers very seriously the notion that a less obvious Cato could be meant here. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the numerous other names that appear in Catullus' verses, names of men who are otherwise unknown to us (Suffenus, Volusius, Arrius, et al.). The coincidence of the existence of two well-known contemporaries with the name Cato is not reason enough to dismiss the third possibility without at least cursory consideration, but it has been enough to distract scholarship from full pursuit of the third possibility.

⁴³⁶ "Charilaus, son of Erasmon, I'm going to tell a funny story, mark my words: you, dearest by far of my friends, will be delighted to hear this..." fr. 168, *Eleg. et Iamb.*

Even with only these meager scraps of Archilochus' poem we can appreciate a significant indebtedness of the imitation to its model; *res ridicula* calques χρῆμα γελοῖον almost perfectly; *dignam auribus et tuo cachinno* recalls τέρπειαι δ' ἀκούων; one could argue that Catullus' use of *dignam* with pronominal *tuo* is at least an adequate attempt to Latinize the weight of the particle τοι;⁴³⁷ even the depth of friendship between poets and addressees is highlighted with similar prominence.⁴³⁸ These emulations attest the shrewd discernment of the imitating author. Of course, there exists for us as well the parallel inconvenience of our being unable to say anything more about Archilochus' Charilaus than we could about an unknown Cato.

Archilochus' addressee, however, appears to be fabricated. His name, Charilaus the son of Erasmon, reads like a speaking name, doubly expressive of a disposition amenable to a humorous anecdote and of the bearer's dearness to the author.⁴³⁹ Archilochus appears to have created an addressee that he can be certain will appreciate the χρῆμα γελοῖον that follows. With this in mind, and taking into consideration how carefully Catullus emulated Archilochus in other aspects of framing his poem, we can at least entertain the possibility that the Cato of c. 56 is likewise an invention. Obviously the name Cato cannot be read as a speaking name in the same way that we can interpret Charilaus Erasmonides, but one is left to consider the immediate relationship between

⁴³⁷ Cf. Smyth 2985 and Denniston p. 537ff (especially usage 1.9) on τοι as a special appeal to an audience of one. Catullus' use of *dignam* and *tuo* imply that whatever follows will be of particular interest to the addressee, just as τοι, in essence a fossilized ethical dative of the 2nd person pronoun, does.

⁴³⁸ In addition, although Archilochus' fragment breaks off at the point where Catullus' imitation reiterates the humor of the matter to come, we cannot be sure that the Greek model did not also emphasize how γελοῖον was the χρῆμα through repetition.

⁴³⁹ Χαρίλαος should mean something like "delight of the people," i.e. the sort of good-natured and genial fellow who would be disposed to enjoying a humorous story. Gerber's 1999 Loeb edition of the Archilochus fragments sees in Ἐρασμονίδη "a coined patronymic, which might be rendered as 'Darlington,'" (p. 183).

Cato and Catullus.⁴⁴⁰ It seems the two names do share a common root in *catus*, “sharp”, “clear-minded and intelligent” in a transferred sense, an etymology that was recognized in antiquity.⁴⁴¹ To put the two names next to one another in the third line is to acknowledge their cognate relationship—the one meaning “dear little sharp-minded one”, the other “man of a sharp mind”—and to invite the audience to do the same. Catullus was unarguably sensitive to the effect a name could have, as the most famous epithet of his collection, *Lesbia*, attests.⁴⁴² It seems very unlikely that Catullus would have used these two names without consideration of the effect, merely aural or more deeply lexical, that their proximity would have. Furthermore, with this association Catullus can presume an automatic and kindred, or even an ironic sympathy for whatever he is about to say, if only

⁴⁴⁰ Thomson notes that Catullus is unafraid to draw the two names into close contact at line 3 to play on their jingly effect (1999 p. 339), and Quinn fairly suggests cognate etymologies (1970 p. 254). Perhaps Catullus also attempted to replicate the effect of Χαρίλαος “delight of the **people**” later in the poem with *pupulus* (\approx *populus*).

⁴⁴¹ *catus* is from the same root that yields *acuere* “sharpen”. Varro assigns to the adjective a Sabine origin (*DLL* 7.3). As far as the names are concerned, Catullus is an affectionate diminutive used especially by the *Gens Valeria*, whereas Cato is a more deliberate nominal derivation. Donatus’ note to Terence’s *Andria* 855 gives grammatical currency and a further (misinformed) Greek etymology to the latter supposition: “*Catus*” *callidus, doctus, ardens, παρὰ τὸ κάειν, unde et Cato dictus*. A similar etymological note coming from the authority of a grammarian does not exist for Catullus’ name, but the diminutive form can only go back to radical *catus*, and, given the alacrity with which the *sermo plebeius* formed diminutives (discussed below), we can assume that the relationship between *catus* and *Catullus* would have been equally transparent.

⁴⁴² The name serves both as a metrical equivalent of Clodia and an unambiguous allusion to the island home of Sappho. *Lesbius* for *Clodius* in c. 79, and perhaps *Mentula* as an assonant (and more hexametrically accommodating) stand-in for Mamurra in the epigrams), can be interpreted as similar forms of significant name play, but this is not unique to Catullus. There seems to have existed something of a tradition of puns on names in Latin poetry. Lucretius at *DRN* 1.117-8 puns memorably on the name of Latin’s first national poet Ennius and the *fronde perenni corona* “garland with eternal leaves” he brought down from Helicon. No doubt Lucretius saw the appropriateness of pairing *Ennius* and *perennis* in triangulation with the title *Annales* as well (*perennis* and *annalis*, at least, are both derived from *annus* “year”). *Perennis* appears also in the first line of the last poem of Horace’s third book of *Odes* (3.30, which marked the end of the first edition); at the end of *Metamorphoses*; and at the final line of the introductory poem in Catullus’ collection (c. 1.10). In each of these instances the word is prominent for its location (at either the very end or very beginning of a large work or collection) and for its self-conscious nod to Ennius’ enduring legacy. Feeney posits that the word’s pedigree in Latin poetry is owed to Ennius himself, who “*must* [sic] have punned on his significant name and title,” (Feeney 1992 n. 17). If he did so, however, the record is lost to us.

because he and his addressee share this onomastic connection and, ideally, the quality that their names suggest. Just as Archilochus' Charilaus is predetermined to delight in a humorous anecdote, Cato is prefigured to laugh at anything that comes with Catullus' recommendation, simply because the two share the innate characteristic of a clear and discerning mind.⁴⁴³ Line 3 taken in its entirety—"laugh as much as you love Catullus, Cato"—hints at just such a relationship. While we are no closer to determining that this Cato is an invention of the poet—just as if he were a real but unknown Cato, our evidence of such would be limited to c. 56, which would get us nowhere—we can nonetheless appreciate a motivation for selecting or creating an addressee with the name Cato. In fact, whatever the identity of this Cato, Catullus' willingness to exploit the similarity of their two names for aural effect invites us to consider whether the poet wished to presuppose some similitude, genuine or ironic, between himself as speaker and Cato as addressee. Catullus' imagines that his own reaction to the event, and even his participation in that event, as appropriate. He wants his Cato to react with laughter, even ironic laughter, to the narration of that event, and he offers their cognate like-mindedness as evidence that he will.

c. Cato Grammaticus?

We still cannot dismiss entirely the possibility that Catullus' Cato is unknown or fabricated, but we have taken such an interpretation as far as it allows. This leaves us

⁴⁴³ The diminutive in Catullus' own name adds another layer to the configuration of the terms of Cato's and his relationship. Elsewhere Catullus creates diminutives from the names of his friends to stress intimacy, as he does with *Veraniolum* from Veranius at 12.17. By making his own name appear as an affectionate derivation from the name of his addressee, he establishes it as the familiar pet form, reinforcing the intimacy of his relationship with Cato, just as Archilochus accomplishes the same with the patronym "Darlingson."

with our final option to consider.⁴⁴⁴ The figure of P. Valerius Cato is only sporadically attested, but his nebulous association with the neoterics has long captivated scholarly interest and encouraged attempts to prove an association with Catullus. Indeed, if Valerius Cato is the addressee of c. 56, we will want the support of peripheral evidence to prove that a relationship between the two men existed. Two significant mentions are made of this Cato in Roman poetry, once by Ovid, at *Tristia* 2.436 and the other in the probably spurious eight lines with which some of our manuscripts begin the tenth satire of the first book of Horace's *Sermones*.⁴⁴⁵ As has been noted, our most complete source for biographical information about Cato's life and works is the entry he is given by Suetonius at *De grammaticis et rhetoribus* 11, with two additional, cursory mentions in chapters two and four.⁴⁴⁶ From his biographical chapter we learn that he was, according to his detractors, the Gallic freedman of a certain Bursenus. Cato himself, however, claimed free birth, and maintained in a semi-autobiographical work titled *Indignatio*, "Protest," to have lost his inheritance and estate during the Sullan confiscations, at which time he was orphaned and left a *pupillus*. This would make him no older than 14 during the final years of the 80s BCE and suggest a birthdate in the mid-90s, making him perhaps a decade older than Catullus and rather more contemporary with C. Helvius

⁴⁴⁴ Too little is known about a fourth Cato, Gaius Cato, whom Cicero names as a supporter of Clodius at *ad Q.fr.* 2.3.4 and at *ad Att.* 4.16.5, for us to explore possible connections with Catullus, and any other possible reasoning that would underlie Catullus' choice to address the poem to an unknown Cato (i.e., reasoning that is beyond our recovery) could hold true for him as well.

⁴⁴⁵ Ovid's reference merely places Cato among a catalogue of celebrated elegiac poets, alongside Catullus, Cinna, Calvus, Tigidas, et al. Pseudo-Horace's reference is of greater import to Cato's characterization and will be dealt with below.

⁴⁴⁶ The mention in chapter 4, where Cato is called a *litterator*, featured in our treatment of Suetonius' discussion of the various terms for a grammarian.

Cinna.⁴⁴⁷ The title of his biographical work (whether it is prose or poetry can only be guessed) suggests that his claims to respectable status were disputed his whole life. Nevertheless, despite lingering anxiety about his contested social standing, he was regarded as the foremost teacher of students who aspired to poetry. Suetonius says *docuit multos et nobiles* “he had many notable people as his students,” though he does not give names, and we cannot assume that Cinna, Catullus or any other New Poet was among his students.⁴⁴⁸

The most persistent testimony to his reputation as an influential teacher of poetry and poets is the fragment in hendecasyllables that Suetonius uses to characterize his standing: *Cato Grammaticus, Latina Siren / qui solus legit ac facit poetas*, “Cato Grammaticus, the Latin siren / who alone can select and fashion poets.” It is from these anonymous lines that Valerius Cato has in the past been construed as some sort of leading figure, in the eyes of some even as the founder, of the neoteric movement. This view has now been largely discredited. Less than a century ago Robinson addressed the problems with this idealized reading, noting that, “Modern scholarship has assigned to [Valerius Cato] an importance in connection with this movement that is quite unwarranted by the facts under our control.”⁴⁴⁹ The misconception stemmed largely from wishful renderings

⁴⁴⁷ Robinson (1923) treats the dating of Cato’s life more fully. Although a minor hiccup in the chronology of biographies in *DGR* complicates a precise dating of his life—Suetonius’s strict chronological ordering of his subjects breaks down with the apparent exception of the two grammarians whose brief biographies immediately follow Valerius Cato but ought to have been active before him—and thus casts doubt on his exact placement in the Alexandrian movement at Rome, Robinson reads a *floruit* as a professional teacher and grammarian between 60 and 50 BCE.

⁴⁴⁸ Elsewhere in *DGR* Suetonius is very much interested in tying his subjects to the noteworthy students they taught (as he does with Antonius Gniphio and Julius Caesar at 7.2), so it is likely either that these *nobiles* were high-born rather than well-known (a reading Kaster endorses with his translation “nobles”) or that Suetonius’ sources, *ut nonnulli tradiderunt* (11.1), failed to provide any names.

⁴⁴⁹ Robinson 1923 p. 103.

of the second line *solus legit et facit poetas*; Cato, as critic par excellence, created poets, both the men and their reputations, through his overseeing of a poetic school and by the weight of his critical endorsement. A more pedestrian translation of each verb—he read (critically and with expertise) poets in the sense that he was a writer of commentaries; he made poets because he was the earliest exposure to writing and reading poetry that young students met—has better support from our limited sources. Kaster suggests that the adjective *solus* operates adverbially, meaning he taught and participated in criticism *eximie et unice*.⁴⁵⁰ Readings that choose to construe the sweeping and final hyperbole of *solus* literally are to be avoided, just as we are not to interpret the word *Siren* as much more than hyperbole.⁴⁵¹ We do not, however, doubt that he was a figure of some standing among the New Poets; but we ought not to assume he was the founder of any poetic school, merely because he is praised loftily in these two verses, which are moreover anonymous and deprived of their context.

Indeed it is these associations that make up the majority of Suetonius' biography. None of Valerius Cato's works on grammar survive, and even his specific contributions to the field are not detailed in his biographical entry at *DGR* 11. Only at *DGR* 2.2 is anything pertinent to his grammatical practice catalogued, where he is said to have read

⁴⁵⁰ Kaster's translation of these lines effectively addresses the misconception that informed earlier interpretations, and argues for a more controlled approach to depicting Cato's role among the neoterics. He directs us also to a similar boast recorded by Gellius (18.4.2), where a later grammarian proclaims himself to be *unus et unicus lector...enarratorque Sallusti*, "a singular and unparalleled reader and explicator of Sallust" (Kaster 1995 p. 153).

⁴⁵¹ For a discussion of the peculiarity of this appellation, which is applied nowhere else in Latin to a human poet, see Kaster's note to *DGR* 11.1 (1995 pp. 152-3). Is it meant as praise, or criticism? Is Cato's allure as a *grammaticus* a positive or negative attribute? Surely we are meant to understand in this designation that Cato had an artistic talent, but does the author of these verses appreciate or mistrust that talent? Because the Sirens straddle the line between art and violence, between beauty and destruction, the nature and tone of this hyperbole—ironic, playful, complimentary—is unclear and cause enough for us to regard the rest of the verses as ambiguous in their sincerity at best.

Lucilius with the satirist's friend and contemporary Vettius Philocomus.⁴⁵² This corroborates the implication made at the beginning of Horace's *Sermo* 1.10. There Cato is characterized as the defender and emendator of Lucilius' poorly crafted verses, which suggests that a commentary or exegetical work on Lucilius was among the *grammatici libelli* that Suetonius mentions; but here in *DGR* more than nearly anywhere else is the biography focused not on the subject's function as a grammarian, but on his associations with and reputations among other leading poets of his day, as though Suetonius saw in this facet of the man's life somewhat more compelling prosopographic material.

For this reason, perhaps, Suetonius gives more attention to Cato's poetic oeuvre than to the contents of his *grammatici libelli*, although he is terse with regard to these as well. He writes only *scripsit praeter grammaticos libellos etiam poemata ex quibus praecipue probantur Lydia et Diana*.⁴⁵³ He does, however, provide for each a brief encomiastic verse written by peers, the former praised by Tigidas and the latter by Cinna. We can be virtually sure that his poetry was of an Alexandrian character, since both named poems suggest neoteric interests: his aetiological narrative, called *Diana* by Suetonius but *Dictynna* by Cinna, appears to have been an epyllion of the shape and scope of Cinna's *Zmyrna* and Calvus' *Io*;⁴⁵⁴ the scope of *Lydia* is unknown, though Ovid makes reference to it at *Tristia* 2.436, where he calls it *levis*. This implies to Courtney

⁴⁵² Vettius is not securely attested elsewhere. If he was a friend of Lucilius but also still alive (and teaching) during Valerius Cato's lifetime he must have lived at least into the 80s BCE, and so would likely have been of the generation after Lucilius. His cognomen Philocomus, Kaster notes, was virtually exclusive to Cyrenaica (homeland of Callimachus) during the Hellenistic period, and so reasons that it may have been from Vettius that Cato developed some of his "neoteric" interests and tendencies (1995 p. 67).

⁴⁵³ "In addition to his grammatical treatises he wrote poems as well, among which two in particular are recommended, *Lydia* and *Diana*" (*DGR* 11.2).

⁴⁵⁴ The difference in names informs our understanding that the poem dealt in aetiology of the cult title for Diana, Dictynna, by which Cinna chose to identify the poem, probably in the same way that his own *Zmyrna* calques the less striking Myrrha.

that the poem was erotic in tone.⁴⁵⁵ Suggestions as to its focus range from a lover, possibly in pseudonym (as Catullus' Lesbia), to collected aetiologies associated with the country of Lydia, both of which comport with an Alexandrianizing program.⁴⁵⁶

Similar interests and poetic concerns are not sufficient for us to establish that Valerius Cato was a friend or associate of Catullus, though he can be linked confidently with the neoteric activity that characterized Catullus and his sodality. Of the two verses in Suetonius that mention Cato's known poetic works, Cinna's in particular employs the idiom of praise used by the neoterics in extolling their own. The expression *saecula permaneat nostri Dictynna Catonis* resembles a similar sentiment expressed by Catullus in c. 95, where he praises Cinna's poem that dealt with the myth of Myrrha.⁴⁵⁷ Catullus' panegyric begins *Zmyrna mei Cinnae*. Both poems bore a feminine Greek name, and in both the name of the author and a possessive adjective in the genitive modify the title; in both instances the poem in question appears to have been known among friends by a more exotic name. Moreover, in c. 95 Catullus promises that *Zmyrnam cana diu saecula peruoluent*.⁴⁵⁸ The combination of *saecula* and a temporal verb with the intensifying

⁴⁵⁵ Courtney 1993 p. 190.

⁴⁵⁶ Cf. Robinson (1923), who cautions against the former interpretation. Tigidas himself does not furnish us with a rich enough description to form an opinion of Lydia, saying of it Lydia *doctorum maxima cura liber*, "Lydia, a book that has the rapt attention of learned men." Cato's Lydia has been linked to the final 80 lines of a poem in the *Appendix Vergiliana* with the name *Dirae*. Lindsay argues forcefully for Catonian authorship, noting that, "the name was by literary convention the property of Valerius Cato," and that no one else would dare to write on the subject of name his own poem *Lydia* (1918 p. 62). Indeed it seems clear from the incongruity of the two halves of *Dirae*'s 180 lines that two poems have been transmitted under one heading, and repetition in the second half of the poem of the name Lydia has been reason enough to assign to this section the name *Lydia*, but the view that this work is the same as the named poem of Cato has been largely disproven. Courtney can trace sequences of allusion and innovation from Theocritus to Vergil's *Bucolics* to this *Lydia*, and again from Gallus to *Lydia Vergiliana*, and thereby places the poem later than Cato the grammarian (Courtney 1993 p. 191). It is probably safest to assume that the Pseudo-Vergilian poem is not the work of Valerius Cato.

⁴⁵⁷ "May our Cato's *Dictynna* last through the ages."

⁴⁵⁸ "The long-white ages will continue to unroll [the book roll of] *Zmyrna*."

preposition/prefix *per-* recalls also the final line of c. 1, where Catullus hopes that his own work will *plus uno maneat perenne saeclo*. Mutual praise among the neoterics thus appears to have been at least somewhat formulaic—name the work in question; name the author as a familiar; predict or hope for the work’s long life—and from these exemplars we can begin to piece together the conventions of that formula.

Suetonius’ biography continues with fifteen hendecasyllabic lines from one or two epigrams—they are not continuous if they are from the same poem—written by a Bibaculus.⁴⁵⁹ These verses were not made to flatter. Rather they lampoon the financial straits that Cato suffered in his later life, taking a mildly sardonic but comfortably familiar tone, much in the same way that Catullus insults his friends. Bibaculus’ verses recall in particular c. 26, where Catullus pokes fun at the relative poverty of none other than Furius Bibaculus. That poem centers on a pun consisting in the two meanings of *opposita*: one of exposure to the winds (*villula vestra ad Austri / flatus opposita*); the other of mortgaging a property.⁴⁶⁰ An equivalent financial pun is at play in Bibaculus’ verses about Cato, in which a failure to account for a single *nomen* “monetary figure” draws into contrast both the unpaid debt that bankrupted Cato and his ability to account for all *nomina* “nouns” in his professional life.⁴⁶¹ This correspondence as well shows that Cato, his life and his work were treated in terms similar to those under which Catullus

⁴⁵⁹ This is presumably the Furius Bibaculus of Catullus c. 11, 16, 23, et al. Cato is linked to the names of Tigidas and Furius Bibaculus earlier in *DGR* at 4.2, where the three are named contemptuously by Messalla Corvinus as men with whom he has no dealings. Whether Furius Bibaculus wrote poetry of an Alexandrian flavor like Cinna and Cato is not entirely clear, though he did engage in iambic and invective poetry that rivaled Catullus’, according to Quintilian (*IO* 10.1.96).

⁴⁶⁰ The joke is that the villa is not *opposita* “exposed” to any of the four cardinal winds (which are each named individually), but has been nonetheless *opposita* “mortgaged” by Furius for a rather modest sum of 15,200 sesterces.

⁴⁶¹ Cf. Quinn (1970), who sees friendly teasing in both poems rather than any genuine scorn.

discussed his closest peers and most familiar rivals, and justifies an appeal to the neoterics as a sort of missing link between the two men in question.⁴⁶² Though these parallels cannot confirm with absolute certainty either the acquaintance of Catullus and Cato or the conjecture that c. 56 documents, at least in part, this relationship, P. Valerius Cato seems a more likely candidate than M. Porcius Cato to have had poetic interaction with Catullus. In fact, if we were forced to rely only on evidence external to this short poem—namely the attested association with the neoteric poets and their predilections for addressing their friends and peers (including unambiguous references by other neoteric poets to the grammarian)—Valerius Cato would certainly be likelier to have had some personal acquaintance with Catullus.

However, we are not confined only to external evidence, and when we narrow our focus to Catullus' poem alone, a reading that imagines the Cato of c. 56 as the grammarian is arguably less stable than readings that can draw the straitlaced reputation of Cato Uticensis into a palpable tension with the bawdy scene described. For this tension relates the poem's addressee to its content in a meaningful way. The explicit depiction of sex would serve the purpose of embarrassing M. Porcius Cato, but it would have seemingly no relevance per se for P. Valerius Cato. Of course, Catullus *may* have had privileged knowledge that we lack about the grammarian's sordid sexual behavior or resolute austerity, but we have no way of verifying either from our evidence. We can be

⁴⁶² Cf. Crowther (1971), who is unwilling, because of wanting evidence, to assume that the relationship between Cato and Bibaculus hinged on the neoteric movement. Although his association with Catullus, his recurring presence in his poetry, and the resonance of these verses preserved by Suetonius with the poetry of Catullus ought not be dismissed so readily, Bibaculus does not need to be included among the neoterics for us to use his verses to corroborate claims that Valerius Cato was associated with the movement and thus with Catullus.

almost certain that Suetonius' often lurid and tabloid approach to biography would have included juicy specifics about the subject's private life and mores if such were broadly available. For example, Remmius Palaemon, the prolific grammarian of 1st c. CE, is depicted by Suetonius as the consummate violator of sexual decency. A significant portion of his entry at *DGR* 23 focuses on his manifold *vitia* and *libidines*, so well-known that Tiberius and then Claudius declared *nemini minus institutionem puerorum vel iuvenum committendam*.⁴⁶³ Furthermore, the hendecasyllables of Furius Bibaculus that lambast the grammarian for the penury of his later life make no mention of any reprobate behavior, which would have been a highly likely subject for abuse by a poet of invective epigram. In short, no information about Valerius Cato's sexual proclivities survives.

Nevertheless, a different irony is to be found by relating a tale of sexual abuse to a grammarian. The exploitation of youths by grammarians seems to have become an unpleasant stereotype at least by the century following Catullus' and Cato's lives. Remmius Palaemon was hardly the only grammarian whose sexual habits are discussed by Suetonius, though it is apparent that he served as a kind of archetype for the abusive, pederastic grammarian. Outside of *DGR* the sexual exploitation of youths by their grammarians is treated as proverbial by satirists.⁴⁶⁴ Valerius Cato does not appear to have been accused or suspected of such behavior, but, nevertheless, the stereotype existed, and Catullus could access this popular characterization for comedic effect. An invitation for a professional teacher to laugh at the exploitation of a young boy becomes highly ironic

⁴⁶³ "He was the last person to whom the education of boys and young men should be entrusted" (*DGR* 23.2).

⁴⁶⁴ Kaster points to Horace *Serm.* 1.6.81-4; Juvenal 10.221-226; and Martial 7.62, among others (1995 p. 235). I will add to his list Petronius' *Satyricon* 85-6, Eumolpus' "Boy of Pergamum" story.

when we consider that this most unsavory of the grammarian's characteristics had genuine currency in later treatments.⁴⁶⁵ It would appear, then, that the relationship between Valerius Cato and the sexual content of c. 56 has an ironic significance that can at least approximate the tension Catullus would achieve by asking the stoic Cato the Younger to laugh at his story.

Moreover, much of the incidental evidence adduced to support an identification of the addressee as Cato the Younger or an unknown Cato can be readily applied to Valerius Cato as well. Scott's casting of Cato the Younger and Clodius as addressee and *pupulus*, respectively, depends largely on his wanting *pupulus* to stand for *pusio*, the dismissive moniker that Cicero gives Clodius in *Pro Caelio*.⁴⁶⁶ But Valerius Cato bestows a similar term on himself in *Indignatio*, after he has been bereft of his freeborn parents and his inheritance.⁴⁶⁷ Suetonius tells us that in this autobiographical work Cato claims that he was *pupillum relictum*, "left an orphaned ward." This noun is actually much more closely cognate with *pupulus* than is *pusio*, *pupillus* being a diminutive formed directly from the term Catullus uses.⁴⁶⁸

And in fact such an allusion in c. 56 would also serve another purpose. According to Kaster, Cato's account as related by Suetonius implies that the grammarian was despoiled of his legacy by a *tutor* while still a *pupillus* (that is, his overseer took

⁴⁶⁵ Perhaps there is a further pun as well in *pupulus*, ostensibly from the same root on which *discipulus* "student" is constructed.

⁴⁶⁶ See p. 219 n. 434 above.

⁴⁶⁷ Indeed even the name *Indignatio* has a certain Archilochean ring to it, which would make the model Catullus imitates appropriate to this Cato as well.

⁴⁶⁸ *Pupulus* is also the ultimate source of *discipulus*, and so the word could be made to evoke the classroom as well.

advantage of his ward).⁴⁶⁹ To have suffered this sort of abuse of power in a dynamically unbalanced relationship could plausibly have informed the tempered and lenient character for which Valerius Cato was later known. For testimony to this aspect of Cato, we rely on those eight lines from *Serm.* 1.10.

*Lucili, quam sis mendosus, teste Catone,
defensore tuo, pervincam, qui male factos
emendare parat versus, hoc lenius ille,
quo melior vir et est longe subtilior illo,
qui multum puer et loris et funibus udis
exoratus, ut esset, opem qui ferre poetis
antiquis posset contra fastidia nostra,
grammaticorum equitum doctissimus. ut redeam illuc.*⁴⁷⁰

Regardless of their dubious authorship and textual issues, they are an important document in our portrait of Valerius Cato.⁴⁷¹ They depict in tandem the grammatical efforts of Cato, a commentary to Lucilius, alongside certain features of his character: an express

⁴⁶⁹ Kaster 1995 p. 151.

⁴⁷⁰ “Lucilius, just how full of faults you are I shall demonstrate, as witnessed by your champion Cato, who prepared an emended version of your badly crafted verses, and did so the more gently the better and keener a man he is—far more than he who in his youth was “encouraged” frequently with the cords and the lash so that he’d be able to support the poets of old against my fastidiousness—a most learned equestrian-grammarian, but to get back to the point...”

The text of lines 4-6 in is difficult. It is not particularly smooth Latin for *ille* and *illo* to refer to different people, but that must be the case if the text we have is correct. Who, then, is *illo*? Lucilius? It would be natural to take *illo*, whoever he is, as the antecedent to *qui*, and thus putting a third man (after Lucilius and Cato) into the verses, but that creates problems of its own. The *puer...exoratus* makes the most sense if *qui* refers to Cato (and so the relative describes his own education), but a third man (who was also a *grammaticus*, and learned to be an abusive *grammaticus* by the example of his teacher) is possible. Advocates of a third participant have often attempted to emend the text to overcome this difficulty. Heinze follows Reisig, who printed *puerum est...exhortatus* (where Cato becomes the object of the deponent verb). This leads to speculation as to who the unnamed teacher is—his mode of punishment recalls Orbilius (doubly appropriate here because he was Horace’s teacher)—and why he suddenly appears. Smoother is a translation that has *qui* refer to Cato, but the dangling *illo* is then unresolved.

⁴⁷¹ They have long been regarded as spurious in their attribution to Horace rather than in their antiquity and relevance. Hendrickson (1916, 1917a, 1917b) argued forcefully for genuine Horatian authorship, but his view has few supporters today. Cf. also Robinson (1923, esp. p. 109 n. 29), Rothstein (1933), Nemecek (1948) and Scodel (1987, esp. pp. 205-6).

compassion towards the subjects of his study (even to a fault); excellence of character and a keen eye (*melior vir... subtilior*); and the violent physical punishment in his own education, which taught him to be a lenient scholar. The last point is interesting in that it represents another instance in Cato's life in which he suffered as the lesser of two in a dynamically unbalanced relationship, and it contrasts his mildness in scholarship and quality of character with the complete absence of mildness that he experienced as a student. In these lines is hidden a grammarian of another type, the unnamed agent of the passive verb (or unexpressed subject of the deponent, if that reading is to be preferred), whose practice of "encouraging" the youths entrusted to him with whips and wet ropes recalls the abusive coercion of Horace's own *plagosus* Orbilius from *Epist.* 2.1.70-1.⁴⁷² By gesturing towards the abusive student-teacher relationship of a blatantly Orbilius-like figure, the author of these lines shows that this was a not an unexpected feature of the Latin classroom, and so recommends that we add physical abuse to the characterization of the stereotypical *grammaticus*. But perhaps equally significant, Pseudo-Horace invites us to read a contrast between Cato's character and that of the unnamed teacher. The despoliation of his estate as a child informed Cato's attitudes later in life (and supplied his *Indignatio* with its eponymous bitterness, presumably); was it this early schoolroom abuse that made Cato a *melior vir*? If so, we can perhaps imagine that Cato was not given to such extreme methods of indoctrination. Orbilius's name could serve as a byword for the stereotypical disciplinarian-teacher, just as Palaemon's became widely associated

⁴⁷²Cf. Wissowa (1914), who believes a third figure is obscured by the textual issues, and that this figure was Orbilius, at least more probably than a contemporary teacher of nearly identical character: "Daß dieser Zweite [Grammatiker] Orbilius ist, kann nur der in Abrede stellen, der es für möglich halt, es wären in Rom zur gleichen Zeit zwei verschiedene Grammatiker tätig gewesen, die beide von Ritterstande und beide wegen ihrer ungebührlichen Vorliebe für den Gebrauch ungebrannter Asche berüchtigt waren."

with his sexual abuses. Could Valerius Cato's stand for the virtuous grammarian, whose talents and restrained treatment of his students were testaments to his good character? Of course, financial exploitation and physical abuse in the classroom are not equal to the sexual abuse described in c. 56, but from these spurious lines of Serm. 1.10 it becomes apparent that the legacy of Cato's depiction tended rather towards leniency than towards the opposite pole.

Leniency of any sort is, of course, entirely absent in c. 56, where the *pupulus* suffers an overtly punitive sexual reprimand; the correspondence of *deprendi* and *cecidit* suggests punishment; *deprehendere* is the regular term for catching someone in furtive wrong doing.⁴⁷³ The abuses perpetrated on him by Catullus are more akin to the violent measures that typify grammarians like Cato's teacher and Orbilius, or the sexual exploitation for which grammarians such as Palaemon were known. Perhaps, then, advocates of identifying the addressee with Marcus Porcius are correct in reading some ironic tension between the specific Cato and the content of the poem, but are incorrect in their identification and explanation of that irony. Because the *res* at which Catullus begs his friend to laugh is an abuse of an unbalanced dynamic of power, he still achieves a degree of irony if his exploitation of the boy was made both to evoke common stereotypes about the *grammatici* as well as Cato's experiences as an adolescent, during which figures to whom he was entrusted abused and took advantage of him. With these

⁴⁷³ S.v. TLL definition II, where it means *capere eos qui clam scelestaque agunt eoque convicere* "to catch those who are doing something illicit in secret and to expose them." *caedere* is more broadly used, but features in the language of punishment, especially, as here, with the instrument of punishment in the ablative (*rigida mea*), TLL usage II.A.1. In fact this same formula is used by Domitius Marsus to characterize Orbilius: *si quos Orbilius ferula scuticaque cecidit* (the fragment is preserved by Suetonius in *DGR* 9.4). Furthermore either *ferula* or *scutica* could accommodate both the semantics and metrics of the unspecified instrument in *rigida mea cecidit*.

added layers of etymology from *pupulus*, personal allusion and a generalization of the field according to popular stereotype, c. 56 can accomplish a similar irony between addressee and content as those readings that privilege Cato the Younger.

Section III: *Quoniam grammaticus es...*

It is at least as likely, then, that Cato the grammarian lies behind the address of c. 56 as it is that Cato Uticensis is the poem's addressee. However, our consideration of both figures has done far more to tie the addressee to the *content* of the poem's second half, the sexually charged episode, rather than the specific *language* used to describe that sexual punishment, language that is surprisingly ambiguous for Catullus, and which therefore must be addressed in a complete interpretation of the poem. Let us consider the particulars of that language now.

In entertaining the possibility that an unknown or imaginary friend might lie beneath the unspecified Cato of c. 56 we commented above on the keen awareness with which Catullus compared his own name with his addressee's.⁴⁷⁴ Of course these same kindred interests can be emphasized regardless of which Cato we assume to be the addressee. And yet, as a fellow member of the *Gens Valeria* with origins in Cisalpine Gaul, Catullus would have no doubt felt an even closer tie to Valerius Cato, an additional piece of circumstantial evidence in our sketch of their hypothetical association. Indeed,

⁴⁷⁴ Indeed, as professor of language as well as a fellow poet by trade rather than circumstance, Valerius Cato would be an especially apt figure on whom to bestow an epithet that means "shrewd and clear-minded," i.e., *catus*, though the semantic overlap between English translations of *catus* and translations of *doctus* does not obtain so completely in the Latin (though Donatus offers the latter as a synonym in his gloss of *catus*, p. 222 n. 441 above), so it is unlikely that Catullus would apply the epithet here as specific nod to Cato's grammatical acumen. More likely, the coincidence of etymologies between their two names, and to a lesser extent the positive valences of the root from which those names derive (as opposed to the negative valences of *catus* as "sly, crafty, cunning"), was reason enough to place the name together.

we can add another layer to this complex when we consider again the relationship between these two names, Cato and Catullus. By placing his own diminutive name beside Cato's he can emphasize the dynamic of authority as well: Cato is an accomplished grammarian, whose function is to serve as an arbiter of the nuance and subtlety of Latin; Catullus is a talented amateur, but unafraid to defer to the expert judgment of a professional.⁴⁷⁵ Such a motivation behind Catullus' wordplay will not stand up to scrutiny without greater support, but with this in mind—that is, the possibility that Catullus saw in Cato an authority on language superior to himself and shaped the poem to acknowledge that dynamic—we can turn to the language of the final lines of c. 56 and their particular suitability for an addressee such as Valerius Cato.

As Bibaculus noted in his verses about the defaulted loan, Cato's reputation held that he *omnes solvere posse quaestiones* “could solve all [literary] questions”. Kaster notes that this line “refers to the tradition of treating literary problems in the form of questions (*quaestiones*) and answers (*solutiones*).”⁴⁷⁶ These *quaestiones* appear to have been of at least two types, literary and grammatical. Those of the first type often resembled more advanced iterations of the very drills with which the grammarian reinforced his students' literary comprehension. Kaster provides an example typical of the first type: “‘Who was the father of Hector?’ the teacher would ask; ‘Priam’ the student was expected to answer.”⁴⁷⁷ Students were exposed to this litanic format of

⁴⁷⁵ Thus Catullus would be recognizing and deferring to an authority in Cato in a manner quite different from his use of Parthenius' mastery of obscure geography and toponymy. Cato was a native Latin speaker, and so the finer points of Latin were his domain; Greek-speaking Parthenius, naturally, could be called upon when the details of Greek verse craft and nomenclature were at stake.

⁴⁷⁶ Kaster 1995 p. 160.

⁴⁷⁷ Kaster 1984 p. 457.

providing a *solutio* for a literary *quaestio*—the Latin terms calque the Greek λύσις and ζήτημα respectively—at the earliest stages of their schooling as a way of drilling the memory on basic facts. Such banal call and response was mocked and satirized already in antiquity, and Kaster cites anecdotes in Suetonius’ *Vita Tiberii* 70.2 and Juvenal 7.233ff, where grammarians are subjected to patronizing interrogation on various mythological minutiae (“who was Hecuba’s mother?” “How long did Akestes live?”).⁴⁷⁸ Elsewhere the *quaestiones* moved beyond simple narrative trivia and dealt more closely with linguistic and grammatical issues. Cicero relates to Atticus an anecdote in which a question of linguistic nuance required the help of a more practiced professional to answer: *sed quoniam grammaticus es, si hoc mihi ζήτημα persolveris, magna me molestia liberaris*.⁴⁷⁹ His diction, which uses the Greek term for the question and the Latin for the answer, gives a contemporary sketch of what was expected of a *grammaticus*. His expertise in addressing such problems and providing answers to them had become an attribute of the figure and was apropos of discussions of him. Cato too was regarded as a match for such probing inquiries, as Bibaculus tells us; it may have been a single *nomen* “debt” that stymied him and brought about his financial ruin, but we are meant to understand Cato’s unfailing ability to explain *nomina* “nouns” as well.

⁴⁷⁸ Ibid. Kaster corroborates these literary *testimonia* with a sarcastic graffito from Cyrene, which reads ζήτημα: τῶν Πριάμου παίδων τίς πατήρ; “Question: who is the father of Priam’s children.”

⁴⁷⁹ “But since you’re the grammarian, if you can solve this inquiry, you will free me of a great bother.” (*Ad Att.* 7.3.10). Cicero’s ζήτημα concerns the correct form of “Piraeus” to use when expressing motion towards (and so is a question both of proper case usage and the declension of Greek nouns). In a letter to Atticus such as this, Cicero can be bit a tongue-in-cheek, but the fact that he frames his investigation as he does—if one is a grammarian, he ought to be able to provide a *solutio* for a ζήτημα or *quaestio*—is still indication that such enquiries could be and were referred to more practiced authorities. See also p. 188 n. 391 above.

With this facet of Cato's reputation in mind, we can examine the lexical difficulties of c. 56 with renewed purpose. Quite apart from the identity of Cato, the poem presents a new series of challenges beginning at line 5. No one doubts that the scene Catullus describes is overtly sexual in nature, and the suddenness of *deprendi modo* in line 5 argues plainly for reading some deviant or transgressive activity (as does the punishment implied by *cecidit* in line 7). The specifics, however, are beyond our immediate recovery. The crux of this issue lies in the three words that straddle lines 5 and 6, *pupulum puellae / trusantem*. *pupulum* is readily enough the direct object of *deprendi*, but the participle *trusantem*, a *hapax legomenon* of uncertain meaning, leaves the relationship between accusative *pupulum* and dative or genitive *puellae* ambiguous. Housman's influential reading takes *puellae* as possessive genitive depending on *pupulum*, and understands *trusantem* as a vivid obscenity for masturbation. So he imagines a scenario with only two participants; Catullus came upon the *pupulus* masturbating, assessed the situation with regard to his own sexual gratification, and engaged the youth in *pedicatio*.⁴⁸⁰ His interpretation of these lines remains the starting point for subsequent readings. Let us follow suit and proceed until this reading meets resistance, or a better reading is borne out by a more thorough examination of the evidence.

⁴⁸⁰ Housman 1931. His most significant contribution, however, is his emendation of the manuscript reading of line 7, "*pro telo*" in G and R, to *protelo*, a rare adverbial form from *protelum*, a team of yoked oxen. He reasons fairly that boys are not punished for bad behavior with weapons, and an adverb meaning something to the effect of "in quick succession" or "straightaway." Housman is interested in showing that 56 accords with the poetic program of the *Priapeia*, where verses depict boys who have been caught stealing from the garden of Priapus and are made to endure sexual punishments, and he does not dwell for long on the specifics that recommend his two-person scenario, the meaning of *trusantem*, or indeed the identity of Cato.

In a sense we cannot treat the participle and the nouns independently, but we ought to consider first the semantics and formation of *trusantem*, Scott’s “mathematical unknown.”⁴⁸¹ Its closest attested relative is the adjective *trusatilis*, “able to be pushed”, paired twice with *mola* by Cato the Elder at *De Agri Cultura* 10.4 and 11.4.⁴⁸² With no other attested uses, the *hapax* is best interpreted as a frequentative of *trudere*, formed in the regular and most productive manner of such derivation, by creating a verb of the first conjugation from the perfect participle of the root verb.⁴⁸³ A word with an attested sexual usage would be most appropriate here, and *trudere* indeed has such a valence. There is nothing ambiguous about its use by Martial at 11.46.3: *truditur et digitis pannucea mentula lassis* “[your] shriveled dick is worked over by tired fingers.⁴⁸⁴” Martial’s passive construction implies that the verb in this sexual capacity retains its transitivity. Absent any other viable accusative forms we are perhaps to understand a suppressed *mentulam* to be the unwritten direct object of *trusantem*.⁴⁸⁵ This would quite plainly argue for the two-person scenario of Housman.

⁴⁸¹ One manuscript offers a variant reading in *crissantem*, amended by Baehrens to *crisantem* (Baehrens 1893 p. 281), but the verb *crisare* “to grind” is used exclusively for the motions of the female partner during sex, which conflicts with the sense of the poem. None of the best manuscripts preserves this reading, and modern editions have ignored it.

⁴⁸² If Cato’s use of *trusatilis* reflects the standard meaning of the verb *trusare*, this would not be the only instance of Catullus’ repurposing a word with specifically agricultural connotations for a sexual context. *Glubere*, properly “to strip bark [from a tree]”, appears at c. 58.5, where Lesbia *glubit magnanimos Remi nepotes*, “peels [the foreskins of?] Remus’ great-hearted descendants.”

⁴⁸³ This was not the only way that frequentatives were formed, but forms with the suffix *-itare* added to the radical (as in *agitare*, *flagitare*, et al.) are rarer and likely more archaic. *visere* is the only frequentative of a conjugation class other than the first and must therefore be a very ancient relic.

⁴⁸⁴ Regardless of the precise mechanics of the action in c. 56, Martial’s usage confirms that *trudere* and its derivatives can be utilized for sexual imagery and especially male masturbation. Cf. Adams 1982 p. 146, n. 1. Catullus’ form of the word, then, should mean something to the effect of “thrust forcefully” of “keep thrusting.”

⁴⁸⁵ Indeed this reading is strengthened by the appearance of *rigida mea* in the final line, which almost certainly stands for an unwritten *mentula*.

Nevertheless, the absence of a clearly articulated direct object for the participle to govern has led others to propose that *puellae* is dative, either of the indirect object or of reference of some kind. While such a use of the dative is unattested elsewhere with forms of *trudere*, the Greek verb ὠθεῖσθαι, “thrust,” takes just such a construction. Furthermore, it too has a frequentative form in ὠστιζεσθαι. Baehrens dismissed unnamed scholars who favored such a calque, but half of his reasoning for doing so either ignored or was unaware of Martial’s usage, since he claimed that *trudere* never had a “*sensum obscenum*.”⁴⁸⁶ His point that no such construction with the dative exists for the verb has endured better, and this remains the best argument against a dative reading of *puellae*.

But there is more at stake with *trusantem*. While its semantics, if we are correct in our interpreting it as a frequentative of *trudere*, present no conflict with Catullus’ sexual tableau, the formation itself is also significant. Though new nouns and adjectives abound, previously unattested verb forms are rare in Catullus; his use of frequentative forms is limited almost entirely to verbs that have a long history of literary attestation, such as *captare* and *iactari*, or verbs whose literal frequentative force—“to *root-verb* repeatedly”—is diminished or not felt, such as *nutare* and *versari*.⁴⁸⁷ The frequentative, however, seems to have been a productive outlet for verbal derivation in the *sermo plebeius*, as the prevalence of such forms in modern Romance can attest.⁴⁸⁸ Features of

⁴⁸⁶ Baehrens 1893 p. 280.

⁴⁸⁷ Indeed the vast majority of the frequentatives he uses are either already firmly cemented as verbal forms distinct from their roots or have supplanted the radical as the preferred form (as with *nutare*). This was, according to Cooper, the natural route that a frequentative verb took, beginning in pre-Classical Latin as a derivation that expressed frequency or repetition and gradually losing this emphasis until it had supplanted the radical form (Cooper 1895 p. 206).

⁴⁸⁸ Not only can we connect attested Latin frequentatives to many modern Romance verbs (all of which have become the regular form, without any emphasis on frequency), but we can also reconstruct many forms that do not appear in written or inscriptional Latin, whose existence in the *sermo plebeius* is

the *sermo plebeius* are numerous in Catullus, and one might argue that he has a regular program of neologism informed by this more colloquial variety of spoken Latin. Under this heading of colloquial neologism we can place two of Catullus' favorite and most productive derivative techniques, diminutive substantives and adjectives in *-osus*.⁴⁸⁹ Surely it is often this colloquial register that Catullus imitates when he employs either mode of derivation, but his usage goes far beyond their simple utility.⁴⁹⁰ On the other hand, new coinages of frequentative verbs are extremely rare in his poetry, and do not appear to serve any specific poetic program.

Cooper notes just two instances of a frequentative making its first appearance in Catullus, *reflagitare*, which appears twice in c. 42, and *trusare* in c. 56.⁴⁹¹ Of these, the former can be dismissed easily; it is a merely the first attested appearance of the

guaranteed by their Romance descendants. Cooper gives examples of both: Latin *adiutare, cantare, iactare* give It. *aiutare, cantare, gettare*; Fr. *aider, chanter, jeter*; Sp. *ayudar, cantar, echar* belong to the first group; from It. *osare, rifiutare, usare*; Fr. *oser, refuser, user*; Sp. *osar, rehusar, usar* we can assume Latin **ausare < audere, *refusare < refundere, *usare < uti*, where the change from a deponent to an active form reflects the loss of the simple passive that Latin underwent (Cooper 1895 p. 210).

⁴⁸⁹ Both usages can be shown to have been productive features of the Roman *sermo plebeius* by their widespread appearance in modern Romance. Diminutive forms of many commonplace words have supplanted the roots in vast numbers, generally because of their "immoderate use in the *sermo plebeius*," (Cooper p. 164). Often these, like frequentatives (n. 488), represent an unattested Latin source. Cf. It. *orecchio*, Fr. *oreille* "ear" < *auricula*, diminutive of *auris*; It. *anello*, Fr. *anneau*, Sp. *Anillo* "ring" < *anellus*, diminutive of *anus*; It. *uccello*, Fr. *oiseau*, Catalan *ocell* "bird" < **au(i)cellus*, diminutive of *avis* (Cooper pp. 164-195).

Adjectives in *-osus* cannot be discussed in terms quite the same as either frequentatives or diminutives because they often involve a change in part of speech—that is, whereas frequentatives and diminutives are verbs formed from verbs and substantives formed from substantives, respectively, these adjectives are only rarely formed from existing adjectives—and so in most cases cannot be observed in Romance to have replaced a radical form. They must have remained productive, however, throughout the development of pre-Classical Latin and during the fragmentation of the Romance languages. Extant forms in Romance (and in English, the source, via French, of our own *-ous* adjectives) are too numerous to list, but cf. Cooper pp. 122-125 for examples.

⁴⁹⁰ Catullus' relationship with these forms is far too complex to discuss in detail here, but it is clear that his use of such forms was at least in part informed by their colloquial feel. See Ross (1969, *passim*) for discussions of both forms in Catullus' *Carmina*.

⁴⁹¹ Cooper 1895 p. 214.

compound form with the prefix *re-*.⁴⁹² Furthermore it has undergone semantic drift to a significant enough degree that its meaning is hardly felt as iterative of the radical *flagrare*; indeed in context the sense of the root could hardly be guessed from the meaning of the derivation. In other words, without any noticeable association with its root *flagrare*, and this already by the time of Plautus, *flagitare* would not have had for Catullus any sense of frequency or repetition. At any rate, *reflagitare* is better analyzed as a compound from simple *flagitare* than as a frequentative from *reflagrare*.

This leaves a single example of an innovation of this type: *trusare*. Catullus, therefore, is doing something in c. 56 that does not occur elsewhere in the collection. Whether *trusare* is a dynamic word of his own coinage, or a stagnant word of significant antiquity, or a word of a scant literary pedigree (but one perhaps with a vibrant life in Vulgar Latin) is unclear, but in any case the word is rare in literature. Unconventional diction was, of course, worthy of grammatical commentary; what if Catullus' interest in accessing this diction was in testing the ability, or imagination, of a grammarian-figure, to see if he can explain a new or rare sexual valence to an otherwise sterile word?⁴⁹³ The combination of the novelty of this word and the ambiguous relationship of its two pendent nouns (which is rendered even more equivocal if we allow the possibility that Catullus meant to calque the parallel Greek form and its syntax) suffuses it with additional complications for any reader to consider, and at least invites consideration that Catullus is asking Cato to play a game of *quaestiones* and *solutiones*.

⁴⁹² Simple *flagitare* occurs in c. 55, but is also attested earlier than Catullus.

⁴⁹³ It was certainly within the purview of the professional *grammaticus* or scholiast to explain peculiarities of usage, semantic or otherwise, by the poets on whom they comment. Such could be the case with *glubit* in c. 58 as well.

Indeed those two nouns, whatever their precise grammatical connection, depend on some ulterior meaning to provide a *res* as *ridicula* and *iocosa* as the emphasis in lines 1-4 suggests. There is nothing particularly humorous about a straightforward narration of either of the scenarios at stake. If masturbation precedes Catullus' entry, Cato would be unlikely to see anything especially shocking in what followed. Sexual exploitation was too commonplace to be surprising, certainly too much so to warrant such an emphatic build up. Tanner notes in dismissing Housman's two-person schema that, "such events were a matter of course in ancient society."⁴⁹⁴ He goes on to posit that *puellae* is dative, an indirect object of *trusantem*, and so stood for Lesbia, who must also have been caught *in flagrante* herself. Baehrens had earlier scoffed at suggestions that *puellae* could represent Lesbia and still elicit Catullus' laughter, and it does seem unlikely that Catullus could have found the situation so enormously funny if she and a rival were the participants in the activity that he interrupted.⁴⁹⁵

A more likely scenario, if *puellae* must be read as dative (which, as has been shown, is hardly guaranteed), would be Tanner's, where instead of Lesbia engaged with a rival lover Catullus happens upon Lesbia whetting her sexual appetite with a mere adolescent. An immature youth, Tanner reasons, would not present serious competition for Catullus, and would provide for Lesbia as a sort of sexual amuse-bouche before the anticipated arrival of a mature man. Indeed there is literary evidence of just such an arrangement, which Tanner adduces as support for his hypothesis, an episode from

⁴⁹⁴ Tanner 1972 p. 506ff.

⁴⁹⁵ Lesbia's infidelities, whether real or imagined, are a point of contention, not of levity, whenever they are admitted. Cf. cc. 11, 37, 51, 79 et al. Even if Catullus managed some bitter laughter in c. 56 at the confirmation of the resentment and suspicion expressed in these poems, it seems unlikely that he would invite another to laugh at her with him, since that would likely invite laughter at Catullus as well.

Petronius' *Satyrice* (24.7), in which Giton serves just such a purpose for Quartilla. The punishment aspect, as well, is borne out in later literary accounts, and appears to have its roots in the tradition of the Milesian tale.⁴⁹⁶ Though his examples are later than Catullus, Tanner's reading is able to place the sexual attitudes of c. 56 within a literary and social tradition, and provides the humor the audience is made to expect from the forceful repetition of lines 1-4. However, Tanner does not address seriously the syntactic complications with assuming an indirect object governed by *trusantem*, for which there is no exact parallel, and he fails as well to bring the identity of Cato to bear on the significance of the poem and the *res ridicula*. Though he may well be correct in dismissing a frank narrative where Catullus comes upon a boy masturbating and then forces him into sexual submission as too ordinary to prompt substantial laughter, nevertheless, because of the ambiguity of the language, this narrative is anything but frank. Indeed it is the imprecise meaning and unexpected formation of *trusantem* coupled with the opaque and indistinct connection of participle and nouns to one another that renders the entire affair noteworthy.

But Tanner's reading nevertheless can be made to highlight the significance of this imprecision in syntax. The dative readings of *puellae* persist in part because they are a more effective explanation of what the *puella* is doing in this poem. The syntactic complication that is removed when we read *puellae* as genitive—*trusantem* is no longer asked to govern a case against the conventional usage of *trudere*—assumes a problem of a new kind along with the new case; even if the girl, whoever she may be, is not present

⁴⁹⁶ Tanner lists Petronius again, this time the story of Glyco and his wife (*Satyricon* 45.7-8), and Apuleius' baker at *Metamorphoses* 9.27, who exacts sexual vengeance on the transgressive youth much in the way that Catullus does in readings that favor a dative *puellae*.

during the punishment, which is almost certainly the case if *puellae* is genitive, she is in the speaker's mind as he recounts the story to Cato. Why? If she is Lesbia, as Tanner suggested (at which Baehrens had sneered years earlier), the *pupulus* is perhaps to be understood as a young servant of the household. But is Catullus' precise identification of the boy really necessary for the *res* to be *ridicula*? Perhaps Catullus anticipated the complication that would arise from his morphologically ambivalent noun, and included it merely for the ambiguity that his *puella*'s syntactical (if not physical) presence would create. His motivation for doing this, if *questiones* and *solutiones* are at stake in c. 56, is not hard to imagine.

The syntax and meaning of *pupulum puellae / trusantem* is certainly the most abstruse of c. 56's lexical puzzles, but there are others. Commentators have focused also on the final words of line 6, *si placet Diona*, which is not troubling in its formation—*si dis placet* is a fairly common way to petition the gods for approval before punishment is meted⁴⁹⁷—but Dione as a stand-in for Venus is unexpected. As a sexual transgression (regardless of the precise meaning), the offense that Catullus was punishing, Ellis reasons, was unquestionably against Venus.⁴⁹⁸ Ellis and Scott agree that the entreaty recalls Aphrodite's own appeal to her mother after she is wounded in *Iliad* 5.375ff.⁴⁹⁹ Thomson imagines that addressing mother for child recalls the Thyonian wine of c. 27.⁵⁰⁰ Indeed Thyone was an alternative name for Dionysus' mother Semele, but the adjectival derivation evokes better a Greek patronymic—a far commoner mode of metonymy than

⁴⁹⁷ Ellis calls such appeals “almost invariably ironic,” “as if the punishment taken...were rather beyond what the [gods] could approve,” (1889 p. 200).

⁴⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹⁹ See p. 219 n. 434.

⁵⁰⁰ *hic est merus Thyonianus* “this is undiluted Thyonian,” (27.7).

the blunt equation of parent and child—than it does the specific phenomenon of c. 56. Ellis' Iliadic reference is perhaps the most plausible, and certainly the intricacy of the allusion would have been attractive to a poet dealing in *nugae*. Furthermore such depth and involvement would naturally have required a sensitive and learned audience. A *grammaticus*, particularly a distinguished figure who *legit poetas*, would presumably have been equal to such a challenge.

Both Scott and Ellis have supported their reference to *Iliad* 5 by the ostensibly martial language of c. 56's final line, printed in the manuscripts as *pro telo* "in place of a spear." Housman's observation that *telis pueros ob delicta non caedi* "boys are not beaten with weapons for their misbehaviors," informed his emendation of *pro telo* to a single word, *protelo*.⁵⁰¹ Ellis, writing almost a half century earlier, was unaware of this alternate reading, but Scott fails to acknowledge that this equally applicable adverbial form could be in play as well. *protelo*, by Housman's estimation, is to be taken as "in a row," or, in a slightly transferred sense, "straight away." I see no reason why one of the two options must be promoted at the expense of the other. Indeed a double entendre here comports well with the general tongue-in-cheek innuendo of the poem's final line. Furthermore the two meanings of the expression could then provide for the reader two additional *quaestiones* of the two types adduced above: as a prepositional phrase it would pose an intricate literary allusion; the idiomatic use of a rare adverb would correspond with

⁵⁰¹ This form, the ablative of a rare noun *protelum* "team of joined oxen", is used as an adverb at least by Lucretius (*DRN* 2.531) and seemingly by Varro in a fragment preserved in Nonius' *De Compendiosa Doctrina*. In Varro's use the sense of oxen is entirely absent: *remotissimum a discendo formido... et omnis perturbatio animi. contra delectatio protelo ad discendum ducit* "fear is a thing furthest removed from teaching, as are all disturbances of the spirit. On the contrary, amusement leads straight to learning," (in Nonius 363.16). This use indicates that the adverb had developed a semantic register distinct from its literal nominal form, but the agricultural sense of the noun is interesting in light of our previous discussion of *trusare/trusatilis* and *glubere* (p. 229 n. 482 above).

trusantem above and corroborate the poem's interest in lexical curio. A professional *grammaticus* would be equipped to deal with either.

Now that we have surveyed the assorted issues of language in c. 56, we can step back and examine the consequences of reading the proposed Catones as the addressee. Cato Uticensis as addressee yields a clever and ironic poem in which sexually suggestive material is offered to a man known for his embarrassed aversion to such things, but in promoting this Cato we cannot easily account for the lexical problems. An unknown or little-known Cato does not allow for further speculation as to the lexical issues or the relationship between the addressee and the poem's content, but does invite our closer inspection of a more superficial element of the poem, namely the wordplay inherent in *Cato Catullum* at line 3. But, as we have shown, this wordplay and the effect it has on our understanding of Catullus' attitude towards his and Cato's name is operative regardless of which Cato we select, so an unknown Cato cannot be said to add any significant meaning or moment to the poem.

Valerius Cato offers a kind of irony different from that provided by Cato Uticensis—Valerius Cato's profession and its less seemly penchant for the physical abuse and sexual exploitation of its students is referenced, and so Cato is made to endure a stereotype that may or may not hold true for him—and perhaps that irony is subtler than the overtly ironic juxtaposition of sexual punishment beside morally upstanding Cato the Younger, but it is an irony nonetheless, and it is thus able to link the first and second halves of the poem. More importantly, however, a reading that imagines Cato the grammarian as addressee provides a compelling explanation for the lexical ambiguities

that gather in the poem's final three lines. In this reading, Catullus recognized Valerius Cato as an authority on the nuance of Latin syntax and diction—and perhaps even nodded to the semantic dynamic implied by the relationship between positive form *Cato* and diminutive *Catullus*⁵⁰²—and so constructed c. 56 both as a test of his grammatical expertise and as a jab at a popular stereotype of the *grammatici*.

The hypothesis offered at the beginning of this section, that the problem of the identity of the addressee and the problems of interpretation assorted ambiguities of language ought to be treated together, appears to hold true. A reading of c. 56 with a *grammaticus* as its addressee unifies the short poem and while providing explicit evidence, alongside the strong circumstantial evidence, for the familiarity of Catullus and Valerius Cato.

Conclusions

For both of our grammatical figures, Parthenius and Valerius Cato, we are forced to supplement the imperfect record of Catullus' own poetry with external evidence and a degree of conjecture in the absence of more stable attestation, and this is to be lamented, but this should not disqualify either figure from our sketch of Catullus and his interaction with the grammarians. This interaction, it seems, is not confined only to the direction and assistance a *grammaticus* could provide an aspiring poet, though these were certainly demonstrable aspects of both Cato and Parthenius, and, perhaps in Parthenius' case, detectable in Catullus' own poetry. Nor is this interaction merely social, in which case we

⁵⁰² Moreover, the collocation *Cato Catullum* would be particularly well suited to a grammarian, who would presumably appreciate the punning and etymological play alongside the aural effect.

would be satisfied to number Parthenius in c. 46 and Cato in c. 56 among the other characters who appear in and compose Catullus' circle of friends, rivals and acquaintances. Instead, Catullus' contact with and attitudes toward the *grammatici* points more certainly to his and the New Poetry's broader concerns; the art and artifice of poetry.

The *grammatici* in Catullus are inextricably tied to poetry, its composition, its criticism, its appreciation. Parthenius, as the figure who made Callimachus particularly accessible to the New Poets and offered his own brand of Alexandrianizing flourish—obscure figures in the mythography and toponomy of the Greco-Roman world—to the neoterics, is given high praise when Catullus seems to equate his place of origin with that of his most persistent Greek paradigm. It is his abilities, both as a poet and as a conduit to earlier poets, which recommend that praise. Valerius Cato does not leave a discernible mark on the poetic style of Catullus, and perhaps his role as a teacher of poets was not felt by the neoterics, but it is still unquestionably his shrewd ability to *read* poetry that motivated Catullus' use of him in c. 56. His critical eye is called upon to use the tools typical of his trade in order to solve a series of riddles—obscure diction, morphological ambiguity, unobvious literary allusion. Poetry is in Catullus' mind when he considers and consorts with the grammarians. Even in the only certain appearance of a grammarian in the corpus, the Sulla mentioned in c. 14, poetry is at the forefront; it is his poor taste and inability to distinguish good poetry from bad poetry that leads Catullus first to imagine that Sulla is responsible for Calvus' gift, and then to label the man a mere *litterator*.

Catullus' understanding of the grammarian's trade and his definition of the figure includes implicitly the latter's poetic credentials.

This is not surprising. So much of Catullus' social and literary world is shaped by an underlying set of poetic values. This seems, in fact, to be a hallmark of the Roman New Poetry.⁵⁰³ Those who earn his highest praise (or at least avoid his bitterest vitriol) also demonstrate their worth through their social grace and poise, yes, but very often poetry is the canon by which the good are set apart from the bad. It is fitting, then, that, in each instance in which we can detect the field of *grammatica* and the men whose profession lay in that field, poetry lies at or just below the surface. They are, after all, *interpretes poetarum*. It is only fitting that poets regard them as such.

⁵⁰³ We are of course severely limited in our estimation by our overwhelming dependence on Catullus to prove or disprove this point, but it is surely significant that this hypothesis is borne out in a large number of fragments from poets who are known or suspected to be members of this loosely defined group.

CONCLUSION

For most of the history of Latin literature, the *grammaticus* is an elusive and obscure figure. I hope that the foregoing discussion of two such men who were active in Catullus' broader literary circle has demonstrated just how difficult it is to reconstruct his life and his activity, especially during those periods when we might most wish for the elucidation such a record would provide. However, I hope also that the rewards for such an undertaking, a better and clearer understanding of how Latin authors engaged with the *grammaticus* and how early (or chronic) exposure to his instruction and his influence affected their writing, are not missed. Though my study focuses on the poetry of Catullus, my application of the *ars grammatica* and my use of that lens through which to reexamine this canonical author will be, I hope, a valuable contribution as well to our understanding of *grammatici* and *grammatica* during the Golden Age of Latin literature.

Indeed, though the *grammaticus* has all but vanished from the body of Classical Latin texts that are extant to us, he was nevertheless a pivotal, if hidden, actor in the history of Latin literature. He oversaw and mediated for our best and most revered authors their earliest contact with literature—both Latin and Greek—and so exerted a degree of influence on their own literary production, whatever shape it might take. It is unfortunate that we can only supplement our understanding of the specifics of his role during this period by the more subtle residue of his mention, his stereotyping and his presumed guidance, but any supplementations we can make will no doubt be of great interest to our field. His influence becomes most abundantly clear by the example of widespread interest in the sphere of his profession, the *ars grammatica*, which reached

new heights during the 1st century BCE, and this evidence allows us by using the testimonies of non-professionals not only to supplement to an extent the incomplete records of the *grammaticus* and the *ars grammatica*, but also to appreciate the broader impact of the scientific study of language.

In the course of this thesis I hope to have demonstrated that this interest is manifest in Catullus. The phenomena to which I have brought attention and the light that such attention casts on certain of the more recalcitrant problems in Catullan interpretation are of value in isolation, but I believe their greatest value lies in their illumination of that broader literary phenomenon. Catullus' conception of a standard of Latin and his expression of that concept by means of judicious and discerning use of morphology; the cautious importation of foreign words and other linguistic features; and more explicit prescriptions against certain phonological developments in non-standard Latin does not just expand our appreciation of his poetic craft and his claims to socio-literary authority. These features also enhance our understanding of the most fundamental aspect of the Roman *ars grammatica*, the nature of *latinitas*, and the parallel treatment of Catullus' attention to that abstract quality alongside the attention of other authors complements our outline of the concept during the Republican period. Catullus' participation in the profoundly important and pervasive process of Greek cultural appropriation, here in the form of a close literary translation, does more than simply expand our appreciation of his indebtedness to Hellenistic sources. The nuance and care of his replication of Greek was a linguistic as well as a philological exercise, and so an examination of it provides further testament to the role that ancient scholarship and the exegetical tradition played at Rome,

as Latin authors looked to Greek models for literary material and inspiration. Finally, the search for the subtle and residual influence in Catullus' poetry of key figures from the grammatical scene does not just strengthen our case for their presence in the literary circle of *poetae novi*, nor does it simply provide clarity and explanation otherwise wanting for some Catullan passages that have long resisted simple exegesis. The results of such a search exemplify, as I have already noted above, the lasting effects that these figures could have on Latin authors.

The various phenomena that I have highlighted in the course of this thesis have not always gone unnoticed by earlier readers of Catullus, and I hope that I have reflected my debt to the scholarly tradition as I have engaged them. However, the consequence of coordinating Catullus' various engagements with the *ars grammatica* and its all-too-shadowy practitioners the *grammatici* is not simply a broader understanding of this poet. They offer as well a heightened understanding of the field and its professionals, and also point tellingly to an assortment of linguistic and literary features that are detectable elsewhere, too. Indeed, the goal of this dissertation is not simply to explore and coordinate those phenomena in Catullus' poetry that approximate the technical aspects of the *ars grammatica*, but to cast his poetry as a particularly vigorous example of what I believe was a salient and persistent feature of Latin literature from its beginning.

Therefore, as I close this study, I wish to stress once again a point to which I have alluded in my introduction and above, and which I have regarded as compelling evidence for the value of my project: the poetry of Catullus may be particularly suited, for reasons that I have discussed *passim*, to a study that puts the *ars grammatica* at the forefront, but

it is patently not the case that the grammatical impulse is detectable only in this author. Indeed, it has been my policy as I examine Catullus' poetry to use the testimonies of many others and the extent to which they too evince an interest that is aligned with the *ars grammatica* as points of reference and demonstrations of how, and often why, poets and prose others alike interacted with their language. It has never been my suggestion that Catullus alone, or even just the *poetae novi*, manifested in their verses an interest in the scientific and technical aspects of their language. The *ars grammatica* is deeply ingrained in the literature of Latin authors, and through my frequent recourse to other authors, from both before and during Catullus' lifetime, I have shown that these phenomena are part of a wider intellectual culture, a culture in which Catullus, despite his own claims to detachment therefrom, is a more active participant even than he might care to admit.

My thesis makes Catullus part of this cultural and historical moment, a representative voice of the literary and intellectual zeitgeist in Late Republican Rome. In doing so, I propose a new mode of thinking about the way that our Catullus walks, but I also invite new modes of thinking more generally, about how ancient authors regarded, conceptualized and engaged with the Latin language at this critical moment, as well as at points before and after it in the course of Roman history. Indeed, the presence of the *ars grammatica* in the poetry of Catullus testifies to a far broader pattern of linguistic engagement among Roman authors. The self-conscious negotiation of the Latin language with the tools of the *grammaticus* was inherent in Latin literature from its earliest beginnings, and the phenomena that I have discussed in the course of this dissertation are

present in the poetry of other authors as well. In fact it has been the very presence of these phenomena, many of which I am hardly the first to note and document, that have anticipated my grammatical interpretations of Catullus and allowed me to align his own linguistic engagement with the engagements of other authors. It is my expectation, then, that a closer examination of these phenomena and a more expansive treatment of this aspect of the cultural history of Rome can be accomplished by considering these authors in this light.

In the introduction to this study, I outline the development and the earliest expressions of the grammatical impulse in Latin literature. A fuller treatment of these earliest voices—Livius, Ennius, Lucilius and Accius—is an obvious direction in which to point my interest in this topic in the future. Indeed, many of these fragmentary poets are poised to enjoy something of a renaissance in the field of Classical Studies, and this renewed interest may be well served by a more express acknowledgment of the early and persistent influence of the *ars grammatica*.

However, it is also my belief that the grammatical impulse is not quieted in the generations that follow Catullus. In fact, this is clearly not the case, a reality which the imperial authors—Quintilian, Suetonius, Gellius—whose testimonies so frequently contributed to my arguments confirm. With this in mind, my expectation is that the grammatical impulse endures in the poetry of the years after the collapse of the Roman Republic as well, and I would like to turn my attention briefly now to two other canonical poets, who belong to the generations immediately subsequent to that of Catullus, in order to demonstrate that the tools I have used to examine a relationship between poetry and

grammar can be applied more broadly, and to propose additional directions for the future of this study. These two poets are Horace and Ovid.

As I introduced the conditions that recommend a parallel study of grammar and poetry, I may already have implied that Horace would be an appropriate subject for a study of this type. His literary career began in the poetic genre that most openly engaged grammatical questions, satire, and he names explicitly Lucilius, who dealt with questions of orthography in his poetry, as the originator of his style of *sermones* “conversations”. It was in satire that Horace first introduced literary criticism into his poetry, a topic that he treats again in his *Epistulae*. Two poems from *Sermones* in particular, 1.4 and 1.10, have long been noted for their literary critical concerns. Indeed, even beyond satire the phenomenon of poetic literary criticism is well documented, and frequent enough that we might call it an innate feature of Latin poetics. Nevertheless, literary criticism is one of the *grammaticus*’ earliest and most persistent interests, and if one wished to identify grammatical features in Horace’s poetry, it is naturally there that she would begin. In this short epilogue to the thesis, I will look only at the first of these satires.

In *Sermones* 1.4, Horace uses criticism of Lucilius’ style as an entrée first into a discussion about one of satire’s defining characteristics, *ad hominem* reproofs of named targets, and thence into a discussion of the kinds of people and vices that are likely to attract the satirist’s censures. Thus the poem is a sort of meta-poetic reflection on the nature and character of the genre, and its prominent literary critical agenda therefore becomes programmatic, in a sense, of Horatian satire. Its interest in the criticism of good

and bad poetry (and in the literary history of Old Comedy, for that matter) gestures already to the province of the *grammaticus*.

However, within the framework of that literary criticism hides an undercurrent that takes further cues from *grammatica*. Horace seems to access the language of the professional *grammaticus* as he discusses his predecessor; Lucilius and his writing are reproved for being *vitiosus*, “full of faults”, at line 9. Focus on literary *vitia* here anticipates the broader concern of 1.4 with more familiar vices—thrift, violence, adultery—but it also recalls the formulaic prescription of various *artes grammaticae*, in which professionals treated a quantifiable group of *vitia* of speech (alongside their opposite, *virtutes*) in a highly codified idiom. *Vitium* itself is not an especially unpoetic word—it and its derivatives occur frequently in Plautine comedy, not infrequently in Lucretius, Horace and Ovid, thrice in Vergil—but its context here, in which Horace practices one of the *grammaticus*’ regular and expected functions, suggests grammatical prescription.

Horace does not couch his terms of criticism exclusively in the language of *grammatica*—the image of Lucilius’ poetry as a muddy river uses a literary-critical trope familiar from poetry⁵⁰⁴—but this initial nod to Lucilius’ *vitia* in this context is suggestive of that activity. In fact, Horace continues his use of grammatical language as he builds his case against his predecessor when he accuses Lucilius of having been *piger scribendi*

⁵⁰⁴ Horace says that Lucilius *flueret lutulentus*, “would flow along muddily,” at line 11. The image recalls not just Catullus’ literary criticism of Volusius at cc. 36 and 95, but looks back as well to Callimachus’ swollen Euphrates (for this *topos* see especially Clausen 1964 and Farmer 2013). Nevertheless, both these poetic forebears were themselves concerned with *grammatica* in various other aspects as well. Furthermore, this speech-as-body-of-water metaphor is brought more certainly into the grammatical sphere when Caesar uses it in *De analogia*, where he admonishes that unfamiliar words ought to be avoided *tamquam scopulos*, “as though a reef.”

ferre laborem / scribendi recte.⁵⁰⁵ The concept of writing correctly is of course at stake in any literary evaluation, but the phrase *scribere recte*, as others have noted, can also be a calque for Greek ὀρθογραφία, the science of proper spelling.⁵⁰⁶ Notably, discussions of orthography are a conspicuous and frequent aspect of Lucilius' satires, and the charges against him are therefore made the more provocative and appropriate if we interpret the phrase in such a way.

With that in mind I might offer a slightly variant reading of the phrase here as well. Generally English translations have read the repetition of *scribendi* in line 13 as qualifying exactly what Lucilius was *piger* to undertake. However, if we read the asyndeton and the strong punctuation of the line break as expressing contrast, our interpretation changes somewhat. Lucilius is slow to undertake the task of writing—particularly appropriate inasmuch as Horace pairs the adjective *piger* with *garrulus*, and uses the lines earlier to denigrate Lucilius' habit of rattling off hundreds of hexameters orally (*dictabat*, line 10)—but instead, if we read adversative asyndeton, was all too eager to quibble about *scribere recte*. The shift in nuance is slight, but it focuses the criticism more closely on an actual, attested reality about Lucilius' writing, and better contrasts with *dictabat* and *garrulus*. In either case, however, Horace engages in a polemic that looks to *grammatica*, and thus his criticism moves from simple points about

⁵⁰⁵ “Slow to take the trouble to write, to write correctly,” (1.4.12-13).

⁵⁰⁶ See Gowers (2012 p. 157). The phrase *scribendi recte* recurs in Horace, at *Ars Poetica* 309: *scribendi recte sapere est et principium et fons*, “knowledge is the foundation and source of writing correctly.” It is less likely that the calque is at stake here.

Lucilius' style to include as well the content of his satires, and even the content of his grammatical prescription.⁵⁰⁷

Later in the satire, Horace stipulates to what extent verses that are *sermoni propria*, like his, can be considered a *poema* by virtue of their meter alone, and again his approach to this question appears to recall the *grammaticus*. He excuses his own verses, and comedy as well, from the label, and proposes that, instead of metrical regularity, it is elevated tone and subject that signal poetry, *acer spiritus et vis [in] verbis et rebus*.⁵⁰⁸ In demonstrating this point, Horace asks his reader to *dissolvere* a verse from comedy (line 55), i.e., to rearrange its words so as to remove meter. The process of *dissolutio* reminds Gowers of Greek μετάθεσις, a phenomenon of oratory whereby the words of a phrase are reordered and rearranged in such a way that meaning is unchanged, but the force of the rhetorical period is compromised.⁵⁰⁹ In Horace's μετάθεσις as well the meaning of the words is unchanged, but its poetic force is weakened and removed. It ceases to be poetry. The reference also recalls an aspect of an education in rhetoric, which Quintilian mentions at *IO* 1.9.2, where he suggests that *versus solvere* was an early exercise that students used to demonstrate their reading comprehension.

⁵⁰⁷ By Horace's time, conventions of spelling were still not cemented, and further developments in the phonological shape of Latin had kept the evaluation of its orthography and proposed reforms topical. Suetonius tells us at DGR 19 that Verrius Flaccus, a contemporary of Horace, wrote *de orthographia*, and that to his work the grammarian Scribonius Aphrodisius composed a critical reply. For the sequence of phonological changes in Latin see Sturtevant (1940) and Allen (1965).

⁵⁰⁸ The phrase is actually presented in negation: *acer spiritus et vis / nec verbis nec rebus [comoediae] inest*, "there is nothing fierce in its spirit or forceful in the words or the subjects [of comedy]," 1.4.46-7.

⁵⁰⁹ Gowers refers this process of *dissolvere* to μετάθεσις as it is discussed in the treatise of uncertain authorship *Περὶ ἐρμηνείας* "On Style", and suggests that Horace alludes to the exercise here with tongue in cheek (p. 166-7). Quintilian also mentions *versus solvere* as an early exercise to demonstrate comprehension for students of rhetoric at *IO* 1.9.2.

For Horace, the phrase was never genuine poetry because of its tone, but when its single poetic element is removed, the error in labeling it as such becomes obvious to anyone. On the contrary, Horace remarks that real “poetry” *can* be broken apart into its constituent words and rearranged without regard to meter, and will *still* be recognizable for its poetic merits. He invites the reader to test this theory on an example, a line and a half from Ennius’ *Annales*: *si solvas ‘postquam Discordia taetra / belli ferratos postes portasque refregit,’ / invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae.*⁵¹⁰ The word *solvas* corresponds to *dissolvas* at line 55, but also recalls one of the teaching *grammaticus*’ regular classroom activities, *quaestiones* and *solutiones*, a question-and-answer exercise in which students rehearse morphology and other grammatical particulars, but also mythological and literary details. Placed just before a quotation of *Annales*, *solvas* seems to ask the reader to take part in this exercise. The reader is supposed to rearrange the words of the verses to prove that they will retain their poetic force, but implicit as well is a request for his *solutio* to a literary *quaestio*: where do these verses come from? Horace does not give the answer—it is from Servius that we know these lines to be Ennian⁵¹¹—but he gives an aural (and semantic) hint with *invenias* immediately after he closes the quotation. In doing so, he very subtly assumes the role of the teaching *grammaticus* and provides for his “reader”—i.e., the student who is learning about the nature of satire and of poetry—a test of his familiarity with Latin literature.

These are just a few minor examples of grammatical phenomena from just under half of one satire, but they are sufficient to demonstrate that a grammatical impulse is

⁵¹⁰ “If you were to apart “after loathsome Discord broke open the iron posts and gates of war’ you would still find the pieces of a disconnected poet,” (1.4.60-2). For the fragment see Skutsch 1985 p. 410ff.

⁵¹¹ He quotes this passage in his comment to *Aen.* 7.622, *Belli ferratos rumpit Saturnia postes.*

present in Horace's poetry, and to justify further examination of this poet through this lens. The presence of the *ars grammatica* in Ovid is perhaps more transparent, particularly in the self-reflective poetry that he wrote in exile. His forced removal from Rome and relocation at Tomis represents a superlative act of exclusion, a principle which, I have already suggested, motivates and underlies prescriptive approaches to grammar. However, though it is this exclusion that conditions Ovid's grammatical undercurrents, his concern is not with any form of prescription, but rather the act of *inclusion*, that will either restore him to Italy, or, failing that, guarantee that his works are not obliterated from memory. His petition for inclusion takes the shape of an aspect of the *grammaticus*' trade that he have not discussed in detail, the shaping and maintaining of a literary canon.⁵¹²

This is an early and persistent role of the *grammaticus* with a Hellenistic origin. In one sense the earliest instances of Greek γραμματική concerned canons and the shape of their canonical texts. These concerns were typical of the early Latin *ars* as well. Suetonius details these first acts of genuine *ars grammatica* in DGR 2-3. Figures such as Gaius Octavius Lampadio, who divided Gnaeus Naevius' *Bellum Punicum* into books, and Quintus Vargunteius, who did the same for the *Annales* of Ennius, represent early instances of shaping the texts that formed the Latin canon, and Aelius Stilo's work on the comedies of Plautus, under whose name a great many spurious plays had been transmitted, shows an early interest in determining the limits of that canon. Both concerns, the physical shape of his text and its status among other texts, are discussed by

⁵¹² This aspect of the Roman *grammaticus*, with specific reference to Ovid's exile poetry, is addressed especially by Goldberg (2005).

Ovid; in his exile, he became both anxious that his poetry would be excluded from the Latin canon and eager to make emendations—both to the text itself and to the physical state of the text as it reached Rome—if only doing so would secure their place in that canon.

The *Tristia* especially evince manifest this concern. *Tristia* 1.1 is programmatic of the author's anxiety about the fate of his work, in particular because he is not there to defend it. *Tristia*, then, is left to speak for itself, and to gaze and marvel at the city as a surrogate for its exiled author. It is no doubt significant that Ovid hopes the book will reach the Palatine hill, where the *domus Augusti* sat (and so where the book might entreat on its author's behalf), but it was in the complex around Augustus' palace that the Palatine Library was housed.⁵¹³ The grammarian and freedman of Augustus Julius Hyginus oversaw its collection, and it is certainly with an eye towards inclusion in that collection that Ovid wished for his book to make such a sojourn.

Tristia 3.1 reiterates Ovid's anxieties about his text and retells the narrative of the book's journey to and around Rome. This time that narrative is presented as though in the voice of the unaccompanied *liber*. After promising effusively that its content differs greatly from earlier poetry by the author—*nullus in hac charta versus amare docet*, the book assures its reader⁵¹⁴—the *liber* asks that its obvious visible faults, the same faults that were identified by the voice of the author in 1.1, be overlooked: the book is unperfumed and unpolished at line 13; its letters are stained with the tears of its author at lines 15-6; and, perhaps most significantly, the long removal from Rome, the book

⁵¹³ The library was built as though a temple to Apollo, and contained two collections, one of Greek and one of Latin texts.

⁵¹⁴ "None of the verses on this page teach love," (3.1.4).

suggests, may have left some of its language substandard with regards to *latinitas* (*non dicta Latine*, line 17).⁵¹⁵ This particular deficiency is not named in *Tristia* 1.1, where Ovid himself is the speaker. In adding this datum here Ovid casts the book as *grammaticus*, who notes not only its external flaws (tear stains and rough edges), but its linguistic faults as well.

Further in 3.1 the book fulfills many of the wishes expressed by the speaker of 1.1. The *liber* manages to find someone sympathetic enough to lead it on a tour of Rome, the sullied reputation of the author, however, has made securing lodging a difficult prospect. When it reaches the Palatine, it marvels at a particularly opulent building (*domus Iovi?*). When it that building is signaled as the *domus semper amata Leucadio deo*, “palace always beloved by the Leucadian god (Apollo)” at lines 41-2, it becomes clear that we are standing before the *domus Augusti*, and in particular the section that houses the Palatine library. The *liber* is then brought inside, and searches for its brothers, i.e., Ovid’s other books, with the exception of the *Ars Amatoria*, the presumed *carmen* of his self-described reasons for exile. These are not found, at least not before the librarian throws the book out. The Atrium Libertatis, the first public library in Rome which Asinius Pollio had constructed, also denies *Tristia* entry.⁵¹⁶

⁵¹⁵ *Dicere Latine* resembles very much the basic definition of *latinitas* that Cicero provides, *latine loqui*. Ovid provides no evidence of what would characterize his Latin as substandard, so it is difficult to assess what his own concept of *latinitas* would have entailed. Regardless, by admitting that his long removal from the metropolis may have adversely affected his language, he acknowledges that the standard by which *latinitas* is measured is always the way that it is spoken in Rome, and in doing so corroborates the *grammatici* who use that standard to formulate their prescriptions.

⁵¹⁶ Smith (2006) sees this particular rejection as a subtle and subversive commentary on the Augustan principle of *libertas*, and identifies in *Tristia* 1.1 and 3.1 a program of correspondence between line numbers and metrical loci, as well as a persistent pun in *liber* “book” and *liber* “free”.

Thus Ovid's attempts to infiltrate what he regards as the physical home of Latin's literary canon are futile, at least by his own speculation. Nevertheless, the pervasive concern of *Tristia* with its own literary pedigree—in isolation and in comparison with other works, such as the *Aeneid* in *Tristia* 2—shows Ovid's strong impulse to view his own literary legacy from the position of a *grammaticus*. Certainly, in a sense, Ovid's promise to emend his work is merely posturing, a desperate attempt to atone for at least the *carmen* of his *carmen et error*. But, he formulates this plea for mercy and exoneration, and in particular for his poetry to be treated with leniency, along grammatical lines, both in the sense of edits that he promises to make or admits need to be made, and as though the Latin canon and a place in the great public libraries of Rome are at stake.

Thus both of these authors, whose secure place in the canon of Latin literature is of course no longer in question, can be shown to have fashioned certain of their poems with the interests of the *grammaticus* and the concerns of the *ars grammatica* in mind. The traces are often subtle, but they are undoubtedly there. Further exploration of these traces will, as has been the case with Catullus, hardly rewrite the historical record for either poet or invalidate or disprove earlier readings. It need not revolutionize their study either, but it is my expectation that more attention to the underlying influence of the *ars grammatica* in Latin poetry will yield exciting results, and will shed light both on these poets' style and craft, as well as on the seemingly distant field of the scientific study of language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J.N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London. Duckworth.
- _____.2004. "A Passage of Varro, 'De Lingva Latina' and an Oscan Fragment of Atellan Farce". *Mnemosyne*, fourth series, 57. 3: 352-358.
- _____.2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- _____.2007. *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC-AD 600*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- de Angeli, E.S. 1969. "A Literary Chill: Catullus 44". *The Classical World*, 62: 354-356.
- Allen, W.S. 1965. *Vox Latina: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Latin*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Asper, M. 2004. *Kallimachos: Werke*. Darmstadt. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Atherton, C. 1996. "What Every Grammarian Knows?" *Classical Quarterly*, 46.1. 239-260.
- Axelsson, B. 1945. *Unpoetische Wörter. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache*. Lund. Gleerup.
- Baehrens, A. 1893. *Catulli Veronensis liber*. Leipzig. Teubner.
- Baker R. J.; Marshall B. A. 1978 "Commoda and insidiae. Catullus LXXXIV, 1-4." *Classical Philology*, 73: 49-50.
- Bardon, H. 1970. *Propositions sur Catulle*. Brussels. Collection Latomus.
- Barret, A.A. 1982. "Catullus 66.1: 'dispexit' or 'despexit'?" *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, neue Folge, 125.2: 135-7.

- Barwick, K. 1922. *Remmius Palaemon und die römische ars grammatica*. Leipzig. Dieterich.
- Batstone, W.W. 1988. "Dry Pumice and the Programmatic Language of Catullus 1." *Classical Philology*, 93.2: 125-35.
- Bear, W. 1959. "Contaminatio." *The Classical Review*, 9: 7-11.
- Bell, A.J. 1915. "Note on Catullus 84." *The Classical Review*, 29.5: 137-139.
- Billerbeck, A. 1990. "Philology at the Imperial Court." *Greece and Rome*, second series, 37.2: 191-203.
- Bing, P. 1988. *The Well-read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bishop, C.B. 2011. *Greek Scholarship and Interpretation in the Works of Cicero*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia.
- Bloomer, M. 1997. *Latinity and Literary Society at Rome*. Philadelphia. University of Pennsylvania Press,
- Bonner, S.F. 1977. *Education in Ancient Rome*. Berkeley. University of California Press.
- Booth, A.D. 1978. "The Appearance of the 'Schola Grammatici.'" *Hermes*, 106.1: 117-125.
- _____.1981 "Litterator." *Hermes*, 109.3: 371-8.
- Bower, E.W. 1961. "Some Technical Terms in Roman Education." *Hermes*, 89.4: 462-77.
- Buchheit, V. 1959. "Catulls Dichterkritik in c. 36." *Hermes*, 87.3: 309-27.
- _____.1961. "Catull an Cato von Utica (c. 56)." *Hermes*, 89.3: 345-56.

- van den Bruwaene, M. 1973. "Influence d'Aratus et de Rhodes sur l'oeuvre philosophique de Cicéron." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, I. Bd. Berlin. De Gruyter.
- Cairns, F. 1999. "Virgil Eclogue 1.1-2: a literary programme?" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 99: 289-93.
- Cameron, A. 1972. "Callimachus on Aratus' Sleepless Nights." *The Classical Review*, 22.2: 169-70.
- Carnoy, A.J. 1917. "The Reduplication of Consonants in Vulgar Latin." *Modern Philology*, 15.3: 159-80.
- Cassio, A.C. 1973 "L'incipit della Chioma callimachea in Virgilio." *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*, 101: 329-32.
- Chalmers, W.R. 1957. "Contaminatio." *Classical Review*, 7: 12-4.
- Claassen, J.M. 2008. *Ovid Revisited: the Poet in Exile*. London. Duckworth.
- Clack, J. 1976. "Otium tibi molestum est: Catullus 50 and 51." *Classical Bulletin*, 52: 50-3.
- Clausen, W. 1964. "Callimachus and Latin poetry." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 5: 181-96.
- _____.1970. "Catullus and Callimachus." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 74: 85-94.
- _____.1986. "Cicero and the New poetry." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 90: 159-70.

- _____.1987. *Virgil's Aeneid and the tradition of Hellenistic poetry*. Sather Classical Lecture 51. Berkeley. University of California Press.
- Clack J. 1976. "Otium tibi molestum est. Catullus 50 and 51" *Classical Bulletin*. 52: 50-53.
- Coleman, K.M. 2006. *M. Valerii Martialis Liber spectaculorum*, with introduction, translation and commentary. Oxford; New York. Oxford University Press.
- Coleman, R. 1963. "Two Linguistic Topics in Quintilian." *Classical Quarterly*, 13.1: 1-18.
- Colson, F.H. 1919. "The Analogist and Anomalist." *Classical Quarterly*, 13.1: 24-36.
- Cooper, F.T. 1895. *Word Formation in the Roman sermo plebeius*. New York; Hildesheim. Olms.
- Copeland, R. and I. Sluiter, eds. 2009. *Medieval grammar and rhetoric: language arts and literary theory, AD 300 -1475*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Copley, F.O. 1956. *Exclusus Amator: a Study in Latin Love Poetry*. Madison, WI. American Philological Association.
- Corbeill, A. 2008. "'Genus Quid Est?' Roman Scholars on Grammatical Gender and Biological Sex." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 138.1: 75-105.
- Courtney, E. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- Crowther, N.B. 1970. "OI NEΩTEPOI, Poetae Novi, and Cantores Euphorionis." *Classical Quarterly*, 22.2: 322-327.

- _____.1971. "Valerius Cato, Furius Bibaculus, and Tigidas." *Classical Philology*, 66.2: 108-9.
- _____.1976. "Parthenius and Roman Poetry." *Mnemosyne*, fourth series, 29.1: 65-71.
- _____.1978. "Horace, Catullus, and Alexandrianism." *Mnemosyne*, fourth series, 31.1: 33-44.
- De Wilde, M. 2008. "Catullus' Coma Berenices: an investigation of a true interpreter's poetic licence and its reception by Apuleius." In *Studies in Latin literature and Roman history* 14, ed. C. Deroux. Brussels. Collection Latomus.
- Dench, E. 1995. *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and modern perceptions of peoples of the central Apennines*. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- Denniston, J.D. 1954. *The Greek Particles*, 2nd edition. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- Di Benedetto, V. 1990. "At the origins of Greek grammar." *Glotta*, 68: 19-39.
- Dickey, E. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Dickey, E., and A. Chahoud, eds. 2010. *Colloquial and literary Latin*. Cambridge; New York. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Drabkin, N.L. 1937. *The Medea exul of Ennius*. New York. Columbia University Press.
- Dubuisson, M. 1995. "Cicéron et le bilinguisme gréco-latin." *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis*, 31: 43-8.
- Dyer, R.R. 1996. "Where did Parthenius teach Vergil?" *Vergilius*, 42: 14-24.
- Einarson, B. 1966. "On Catullus 84." *Classical Philology*, 61.3: 187-188.
- Ellis, R. 1889. *A Commentary on Catullus*. Oxford. Clarendon Press.

- _____. 1890. "The Dirae of Valerius Cato." *The American Journal of Philology*, 11.1: 1-15.
- Ewbank, W.W. 1933. *The poems of Cicero*. London University Press.
- Farmer, M.C. 2013. "Rivers and Rivalries in Petronius, Horace, Callimachus and Aristophanes." *The American Journal of Philology*, 134.3: 481-506.
- Farrell, J. 2001. *Latin Language and Latin Culture*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Farrell, J., and D.P. Nelis, eds. 2013. *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Fay, E.W. 1913. "Reply to Professor Kent: [Again Lucilius on EI and I]." *The American Journal of Philology*, 34.4: 497-9.
- Feeney, D.C. 1992. "Si licet et fas est: Ovid's *Fasti* and the problem of free speech under the principate." In *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, ed. A. Powell. London. Bristol Classical Press.
- Fehling, D. 1956. "Varro und die grammatische Lehre von der Analogie und der Flexion." *Glotta*, 35.3/4: 214-70.
- _____. 1957. "Varro und die grammatische Lehre von der Analogie und der Flexion. Schluss" *Glotta*, 36.1/2: 48-100.
- _____. 1974. "Gegen die Neueste Äusserung zu Cat. 56." *Hermes*, 102.2: 376.
- Feldherr, A. 2007. "The Intellectual Climate." In *A Companion to Catullus*, ed. M.B. Skinner. Malden, MA. Blackwell.
- Ferrero, L. 1955. *Interpretazione di Catullo*. Turin. Rosenberg and Sellier.

- Finamore, J.F. "Catullus 50 and 51. Friendship, love, and otium." *The Classical World*; 78: 11-9.
- Fink, J. 1952. "Analogie und Anomalie in der Sprache: Zu Varro De lingua latina 9, 1." *Hermes*, 80.3: 377-379.
- Fisch, R. 1890. *Die Lateinische Nomina pers. auf o, -onis*. Berlin. R Gaertners.
- Fitzgerald, W. 1995. *Catullan Provocations: Lyric Poetry and Drama of Position*. Berkeley. University of California Press.
- Forbes, P.B.R. 1933. "Greek Pioneers in Philology and Grammar." *The Classical Review*, 47.3: 105-12.
- Fordyce, C.J. 1961. *Catullus, a commentary*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Fraenkel, E. 1955. "Vesper adest." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 45: 1-8.
- Francese, C. 1999. "Parthenius Grammaticus". *Mnemosyne*, fourth Series, 52.1. 63-72.
 _____.2001. *Parthenius of Nicaea and Roman Poetry*. Frankfurt. Peter Lang Publishing.
- Fränkel, H. 1932 "Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen," *Hermes* 67: 303-11.
- Fraser, P.M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, vol. 2 of 3. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- Gaisser, J.H. 1982. "Catullus and his first interpreters: Antonius Parthenius and Angelo Poliziano." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 112: 83-106.
 _____.1993. *Catullus and his Renaissance readers*. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- Garcea, A. 2012. *Caesar's de Analogia: edition, translation and commentary*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Garrod, H.W. 1910. "On the Meaning of ploxinum." *Classical Quarterly*, 4.3: 201-4.

- Glinister, F., C. Woods, J.A. North, M.H. Crawford, eds. 2007. *Verrius, Festus, & Paul: lexicography, scholarship, & society*. London. Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London.
- George, D.B. 1991. Catullus 44: "The Vulnerability of Wanting to Be Included." *American Journal of Philology*. 112.2: 247-250.
- George, P. 1963. "Style and Character in the Satyricon." *Arion*, 5.3: 336-358.
- Gerber, D.E. 1999. *Greek iambic poetry: from the seventh to the fifth centuries BC*. The Loeb Classical Library 259. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.
- Godfrey, A.W. 1997. Review of Kaster (1995). *The Classical World*, 90.6: 446.
- Goldberg, S.M. 1993. "Saturnian Epic." in *Roman Epic*, ed. A.J. Boyle. London; New York. Routledge.
- _____. 2005. *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Gow, A.S.F. 1952. *Theocritus, with translation and commentary*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Gowers, E. 2003. "Fragments of Autobiography in Horace Satires 1." *Classical Antiquity*. 22.1: 55-91.
- _____. 2012. *Horace: Satires. Book 1, with introduction and commentary*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Greene, E. 2006. "Catullus, Caesar and Roman masculine identity." *Antichthon*, 40: 49-64.

- Guastella, G. 1988. *La contaminazione e il parassita: due studi su teatro e cultura romana*. Pisa. Giardini.
- Gutzwiller, L. 1992. "Callimachus' Lock of Berenice: Fantasy, Romance, and Propaganda." *The American Journal of Philology*, 113.3: 359-85.
- Habinek, T.N. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton. Princeton University Press
- Hahn, E.A. 1941. "Quintilian on Greek Letters Lacking in Latin and Latin Letters Lacking in Greek (12.10.27-29)." *Language*, 17.1: 24-32.
- Hamblenne, P. 1981. "Au Salluste inconnu." *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 59: 60-70.
- Handley, E. 1968. *Menander and Plautus: a Study in Comparison*. London. Levis.
- Harder, A. 2012. *Callimachus: Aetia: introduction, text, translation, and commentary*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Harrison, E. 1915. "Catullus, LXXXIV." *The Classical Review*, 29.7: 198-199.
- Harrison, S.J. 1990. "Cicero's 'de Temporibus Suis': The Evidence Reconsidered." *Hermes* 118.4: 455-463.
- _____.2004. "Altering Attis: ethnicity, gender and genre in Catullus 63." *Mnemosyne*, fourth series, 57.5: 520-33.
- Housman, A.E. 1931. "Praefanda" *Hermes*, 66.1: 402-12.
- Hendrickson, G.L. 1906. "The De Analogia of Julius Caesar; Its Occasion, Nature, and Date, with Additional Fragments." *Classical Philology*, 1.2: 97-120.
- _____.1916. "Horace and Valerius Cato." *Classical Philology*. 11.3. 249-269.

- _____. 1917a. "Horace and Valerius Cato II." *Classical Philology*, 12.1: 77-92.
- _____. 1917b. "Horace and Valerius Cato III." *Classical Philology*, 12.4: 329-350.
- _____. 1926. "Cicero's Correspondence with Brutus and Calvus on Oratorical Style." *The American Journal of Philology*, 47.3: 234-258.

Heusch, H. 1954. *Das Archaische in der Sprache Catulls*. Bonn. Hanstein.

Hinds, S. 1995. "Reflexive annotation in poetic allusion." *Hermathena*, 158: 41-51.

Holford-Strevens, L. 2003. *Aulus Gellius: an Antonine Scholar and His Achievement*.
New York. Oxford University Press.

Hollis, A.S. 1982. "The Nuptial Rite in Catullus 66 and Callimachus' Poetry for Berenice." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 91: 21-8.

Holzberg, N. 2002. *Catull: der Dichter und sein erotisches Werk*. Munich. Beck.

Hutchinson, G.O. 2013. *Greek to Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality*.
Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Huxley, G.L. 1980. "Βουπόρος Ἀρσινόης." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 100: 189-90.

Janan, M.W. 1994. *When the Lamp Is Shattered: Desire and Narrative in Catullus*.
Carbondale, IL. Southern Illinois University Press.

Jones, D.M. 1956. "Catulli nobile epigramma (Carm. LXXXIV)." *Proceedings of the Classical Association*, 53: 25-6.

Kaimio, J. 1979. *The Romans and the Greek Language*. Helsinki. Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Kaster, R. 1980. "The Grammarian's Authority" *Classical Philology*, 75.3: 216-241.

- _____.1983. "Notes on Primary and Secondary Schools in Late Antiquity,"
Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, 113:
323-346.
- _____.1984. "A Schoolboy's Burlesque from Cyrene?" *Mnemosyne*, fourth series, 37.
3/4: 457-8.
- _____.1988. *Guardians of language: the grammarian and society in late antiquity*.
Berkeley. University of California Press.
- _____.1992. *Studies on the text of Suetonius De grammaticis et rhetoribus*. Atlanta.
Scholars Press.
- _____.1995. *Suetonius' De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*, with introduction, translation
and commentary. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- Kenney, E.J. and Clausen W, eds. 1982. *The Cambridge history of classical literature, II:
Latin literature*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Kent, R.G. 1911. "Lucilius on EI and I." *The American Journal of Philology*, 32.3: 272-
93.
- _____.1913. "Again Lucilius on EI and I." *The American Journal of Philology*, 34.3:
315-21.
- _____.1963. "On the Text of Varro, de Lingua Latina". *Transactions and Proceedings
of the American Philological Association*, 67: 64-82.
- Ker, J. 2004. "Nocturnal writers in imperial Rome: the Culture of lucubratio." *Classical
Philology*. 99.3: 209-42.

- Kilpatrick, R.S. 1990. *The Poetry of Criticism: Horace, Epistles II and Ars Poetica*.
Edmonton. University of Alberta Press.
- Klotz, A. 1931. "Zu Catull." *Rheinisches Museum*: 342-356.
- Kramer, J. 1995. "Κράβατος, κραβάτιον und Verwandtes in den Papyri." *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete*, 42.2: 205-16.
- Krenkel, W. 1963. *Luciliana*. Rostock. Habil.-Schr. Universität Rostock.
- Kroll, W. 1923. *C. Valerius Catullus*. Leipzig. Teubner.
- Krostenko, B.A. 2001. *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance*.
Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
- _____.2007. "Catullus and Elite Republican Social Discourse." In *A Companion to Catullus*, ed. M.B. Skinner. Malden, MA. Blackwell..
- _____.2013. "The Poetics of Naevius' 'Epitaph' and the History of Latin Poetry." *Journal of Roman Studies*, 103: 46-64.
- Kubiak, D.P. 1981, "Catullus 64.1-2," *American Journal of Philology*, 102.1: 41-2.
- Kuiper, W.E.J. 1929. "De Callimachi fragmento nuperrime reperto." *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, 7: 127-9.
- Lallot, J. 1998. "Affinités entre les cas chez les grammairiens grecs." *Histoire, Épistémologie, Langage*, 20.2: 5-18.
- Langendoen, D.T. 1996. "A Note on the Linguistic Theory of M. Terentius Varro." *Foundations of Language*, 2.1: 33-36.
- Latte, K. 1940. "Livy's Patavinitas." *Classical Philology*, 35.1: 56-60.

- _____. 1960. "Römische Religionsgeschichte." In *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, V. Abt., 4. Teil, ed. K. Latte, I. Müller, et al. Munich. Beck.
- Laughton, E. 1960. "Observations on the Style of Varro". *Classical Quarterly*, 10.1: 1-28.
- Law, V. and I. Sluiter, eds. 1995. *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē*. Münster. Nodus Publikationen.
- Leo, F. 1912. *Plautinische Forschungen: zur Kritik und Geschichte der Kömedie*. Zürich. Weidmann.
- _____. 1913. *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur: die Archaische Literatur*. Berlin. Weidmann.
- Leumann, M. 1928. "Lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre." In *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, II. Abt. 2. Teil, 1. Bd. Munich. Beck.
- Lightfoot, J.L. 1999. *The poetical fragments and the Erotika pathemata of Parthenius of Nicaea, with introduction and commentary*. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- Lindsay, W.M. *Syntax of Plautus*. 1907. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1918. "Notes on the Lydia." *The Classical Review*, 32.3/4: 62-3.
- Luck, G. 1976. "Aratea," *American Journal of Philology*, 97: 213-34.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1978. *Ciris. A poem attributed to Vergil, with introduction and commentary*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- McElduff, S., and Sciarrino, E. 2011. *Complicating the History of Western Translation: the ancient Mediterranean in perspective*. Manchester; Kinderhook, NY. St. Jerome Publishing.

- McGowan, M.M. 2009. *Ovid in Exile: Power and Poetic Redress in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto*. Leiden; Boston. Brill.
- Maass, E. 1892. *Aratea*. Philologische Untersuchungen 12. Berlin. Weidmann.
- Maltby, R. 1985. "The distribution of Greek loan-words in Terence." *Classical Quarterly*, 35: 110-23.
- _____. 1995. "The distribution of Greek loan-words in Plautus." *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*, 8: 31-69.
- Marinone, N. 1984. *Berenice da Callimaco a Catullo*. Rome. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
- Mariotti, S. 1986. *Livio Andronico e la traduzione artistica: saggio critico e edizione dei frammenti dell'Odyssea*. Pubblicazioni dell'Università di Urbino, serie di lettere e filosofia, v.1. Milan.
- Marrou, H.I. 1982. *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb. Madison. University of Wisconsin Press.
- Marshall, B.A., and Baker, R.J. 1975. "The Aspirations of Q. Arrius." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 24.2: 220-231.
- Marx, F. 1904-5. *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquae* (two volumes). Leipzig. Teubner.
- Massimilla, G. 2010. *Aitia: libro terzo e quarto*, with introduction, critical text, translation and commentary. Pisa. Serra.
- Mattingly, H.B. 1957. "The Date of Livius Andronicus." *Classical Quarterly*, 7.3/4: 159-163.

- Maybaum, J. 1889. *De Cicerone et Germanico Arati Interpretibus*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Rostock. Rostock.
- de Meo, C. 1965. "De versu illo Catulli LXVI,3." *Latinitas*, 13: 182-3.
- Mierow, C.C. 1946. "Julius Caesar as a man of letters." *The Classical Journal*, 41: 353-7.
- Morgan, L. 1997. "Levi Quidem de re...': Julius Caesar as Tyrant and Pedant." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 87: 23-40.
- Morgan, M.G. 1980. "Catullus and the "Annales Volusi"." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 4: 59-67.
- Nagle, B.R. 1980. *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid*. Brussels. Collection Latomus.
- Nappa, C.J. 1998. "Place Settings: Convivium, Contrast, and Persona in Catullus 12 and 13." *American Journal of Philology*. 119.3: 385-397.
- Nauta, R.R. 2010. "Callimachus' Sacrifice to Apollo Lykios (fr. 1.21-24)." In *Myths, Martyrs and Modernity: Studies in the History of Religions in Honour of Jan N. Bremmer*, eds. J. Dijkstra, J. Kroesen and Y. Kuiper. Leiden; Boston. Brill.
- Nemec, J. 1948. "Horace et Lucilius. Contribution à l'étude de Sermones i,10." *Listy Filologické*, 72: 15-25.
- Neudling, C.L. 1955. *A Prosopography to Catullus*. Iowa Studies in Classical Philology, 12. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Newman, J.K. 1967. *The Concept of vates in Augustan Poetry*. Brussels. Collection Latomus.

- _____. 1990. *Roman Catullus and the modification of the Alexandrian sensibility*. New York; Hildesheim. Weidmann.
- Nicholson, J. 1998. "Catullus 84: 'In Vino Veritas?'" *Phoenix*, 52.3-4: 299-304.
- O'Bryhim, S. "Malodorous Aemilius (Catullus 97)." *Classical Philology*, 107.2: 150-6.
- Oksala, P. 1953. *Die griechischen Lehnwörter in den Prosaschriften Ciceros*. *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, series B*, 80.1. Helsinki.
- _____. 1954. "Über die Einstellung Ciceros zum lexikalischen Purismus." *Commentationes in honorem Edw. Linkomies*. Helsinki. Otava.
- Oldfather, W.A., and Bloom, G. 1927. "Caesar's Grammatical Theories and His Own Practice." *The Classical Journal*, 22.8: 584-602.
- Oliver, R.P. 1949. "The Claudian Letter I." *American Journal of Archaeology*, 53.3: 249-57.
- Parker, H.N.A. 1994. "Curiously Persistent Error: Satyricon 43.4". *Classical Philology*, 89.2: 162-166.
- Pepe, L. 1946. "Accio, Lucilio e la geminatio." *Studi italiani di filologia classica*, 20: 105-20.
- Perini, B.G. 1983. "Le riforme ortografiche latine di età repubblicana." *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli (sezione linguistica)*, 5: 141-69.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1932. "Βερενίκης πλόκαμος." *Philologus*, 87: 179-228.
- _____. 1943. "A Fragment of Parthenios' Arete." *Classical Quarterly*, 37.1/2: 23-32.
- _____. 1949. *Callimachus I*. Oxford. Clarendon Press.

- _____.1968. *The History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford University Press.
- Pieroni, P. 2004. *Marcus Verrius Flaccus' "De significatu verborum" in den Auszügen von Sextus Pompeius Festus und Paulus Diaconus: Einleitung und Teilkommentar*. Peter Lang Publishing. Frankfurt.
- Possanza, D.M. 2004. *Translating the Heavens: Aratus, Germanicus, and the Poetics of Latin Translation*. New York. Peter Lang Publishing.
- Puelma, P.M. 1949. *Lucilius und Kallimachos: Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistisch-römischen Poesie*. Frankfurt. Klostermann.
- Putnam, M.C.J. 1960. "Catullus LXVI, 75-88." *Classical Philology*, 55: 223-8.
- _____.2006. *Poetic Interplay: Catullus and Horace*. Princeton. Princeton University Press.
- Quinn, K, 1959. *The Catullan Revolution*. Melbourne. Carlton, Melbourne University Press.
- _____.1970. *Catullus: the Poems*. London. MacMillan. Reprint, 1971, London: Bristol Classical Press.
- Radulescu, A. 2002. *Ovid in Exile*. Palm Beach: Center for Romanian Studies. Iași.
- Ramage, E.S. 1959. "Note on Catullus' Arrius." *Classical Philology*, 54.1: 44-5.
- _____.1961. "Cicero on Extra-Roman Speech." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 92: 481-94.
- Rawson, E. 1979. "L. Cornelius Sisenna and the Early First Century B. C." *Classical Quarterly*, 29.2: 327-46.

- _____.1985. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. Duckworth. London.
- Rayment, C.S. 1945. "Varro Versutus". *The Classical Journal*, 40.6: 349-357.
- Rehm, B. 1934. "Catull 66,1 under der neue Kallimachosfund." *Philologus* 89: 385-6.
- Ribbeck, O. 1897. *Scaenicae romanorum poesis fragmenta*. Liepzig. Teubner.
- Robinson, R.P. 1923. "Valerius Cato." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 54: 98-116.
- Rosén, H.B. 1961. "Arrius' Speech again (Catullus 84)." *Mnemosyne*, fourth series, 14.3: 224-32.
- Rosivach, V.J. 1984. "The Romans' View of the Persians." *The Classical World*, 78.1: 1-8.
- Ross, D.O. 1969. *Style and Tradition in Catullus*. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.
- Rossi, A.F. and Breed, B.W. 2006. "Introduction: Ennius and the Traditions of Epic." *Arethusa*, 39.3: 397-425.
- Rothstein, V. 1933. "Die Anfangsverse der Satire I,10 des Horaz." *Hermes*, 68.1: 70-83.
- Russell, D.A. 2001. *The Orator's education* (text and translation of Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* in five volumes). Loeb Classical Library 124. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.
- Schlunk, R.R. 1974. *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid: a study of the influence of ancient Homeric literary criticism on Virgil*. Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press.
- Schmidt, K.H. 1967. "Keltisches Wortgut im Lateinischen." *Glotta*, 44.3/4: 151-74.

- Schutter, K.H.E. 1953. "De Lydia et Diris carminibus." *Mnemosyne*, fourth series, 6.2: 110-5.
- Scodel, R. 1987. "Horace, Lucilius, and Callimachean Polemic" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 91: 199-215.
- Scott, W.C. 1969. "Catullus and Cato (c. 56)." *Classical Philology*, 64.1: 24-9.
- Seager, R. 1974. "'Venustus, Lepidus, Bellus, Salsus': Notes on the Language of Catullus." *Latomus*, 33.4: 891-4.
- Shackleton-Bailey, D.R. 1976. "O Rem Ridiculam!" *Classical Philology*, 71.4: 348.
- Sheets, G.A. 1981. "The Dialect Gloss, Hellenistic Poetics and Livius Andronicus." *The American Journal of Philology*, 102.1: 58-78.
- _____. 2007. "Elements of Style in Catullus." In *A Companion to Catullus*, ed. M.B. Skinner. Malden, MA. Blackwell.
- van Sickle, J. 1975. "Epic and bucolic (Theocritus, Id. VII; Virgil, Ecl. I)." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 19: 45-72.
- Siebenborn, E. 1976. *Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien Studien zur antiken normativen Grammatik*. Amsterdam. Grübner.
- Sihler, E.G. 1905. "The Collegium Poetarum at Rome." *The American Journal of Philology*, 26: 1-21.
- Sihler, A.L. 1995. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Simpson, C.J., and Simpson, B.G. 1989. "Catullus 46." *Latomus*, 48.1: 75-85.
- Skutsch, O. 1944. "Enniana, I". *The Classical Quarterly*, 38.3/4: 79-86.

- _____.1948. "Enniana, II". *The Classical Quarterly*, 42.3/4: 94-101.
- _____.1963. "Enniana V". *The Classical Quarterly*, 13.1: 89-100.
- _____.1968. *Studia Enniana*. London. Athlone Press.
- _____.1985. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Skinner, M.B., ed. 2007. *A Companion to Catullus*. Malden, MA. Blackwell.
- Smith, R.A. 2006. "Books in search of a library: Ovid's 'response' to Augustan libertas." *Vergilius*, 52: 45-54.
- Smyth, H.W. 1956. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.
- Solodow, J.B. 1989. "Forms of Literary Criticisms in Catullus: Polymetric vs. Epigram." *Classical Philology*, 84.4: 312-9.
- Somerville, T. 2007. "The Orthography of the New Gallus and the Spelling Rules of Lucilius." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 160: 59-64.
- Spaeth, Jr., J.W. 1931. "Cicero the Poet" *The Classical Journal*, 26.7: 500-512.
- Springer, L.A. 1958. "Aulus Gellius: On Historical and Descriptive Linguistics". *The Classical Journal*, 54.3: 121-128.
- Steele, R.B. 1894. "On the Archaisms Noted by Servius in the Commentary to Vergil". *The American Journal of Philology*, 15.2: 164-193.
- Stewart, S.N.M. 2008. "Emending Aratus' insomnia." *Mnemosyne*, fourth series, 61.4: 586-600.
- Stroup, S.C. 2010. *Catullus, Cicero, and a Society of Patrons*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

- Sturtevant, E.H. 1940. *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*. Westport, CT. Greenwood Press.
- Sudhaus, S. 1907. "Die Ciris und das römische Epyllion," *Hermes* 42: 499-500.
- Syndikus, H.P. 1984. *Catull: Eine Intrepetition*, three volumes. Darmstadt. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Takács, László 2002-3. "Caesars "De analogia" und die römische Dichtung." *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis*, 38-39: 215-224.
- Tanner, R.G. 1972. "Catullus LVI." *Hermes*, 100.3: 506-08.
- Taylor, J.T. 1977. "Varro's Mathematical Models of Inflection". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 107: 313-323.
- Thomas, R.F. 1982. "Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (Poem 64.1-18)." *The American Journal of Philology*, 103.2: 144-64.
- _____.1986. "Virgil's Georgics and the art of reference." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 90: 171-98.
- Thomson, D.F.S. 1967. "Catullus and Cicero. Poetry and the criticism of poetry." *The Classical World*, 60: 225-30.
- _____.1973. "A new look at the manuscript tradition of Catullus." *Yale Classical Studies*, 33: 113-29.
- _____.1997. *Catullus*, edited with a textual and interpretative commentary. Toronto. University of Toronto Press.
- Traglia, A. 1955. "Sopra alcune consonanze fra il C. LXVI di Catullo e gli Aratea di Cicerone." In *Studi in onore di G. Funaioli*. Rome. Signorelli.

- Trappes-Lomax, J.M. 2007. *Catullus: a textual reappraisal*. Swansea. The Classical Press of Wales.
- Trimble, G. 2012. "Catullus 64: the Perfect Epyllion?" In *Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and Its Reception*, eds. M. Baumbach and S. Bär. Leiden. Brill.
- Uhlfelder, M.L. 1963. "The Romans on Linguistic Change". *The Classical Journal*, 59.1: 23-30.
- Ullman, B.L. 1917 "Horace on the Nature of Satire." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 48: 111-132.
- _____.1960. "The Transmission of the Text of Catullus." *Studi in onore di Luigi Castiglione: 1027-57*. Florence. Sansoni.
- Vandiver, E. 1990. "Sound Patterns in Catullus 84." *The Classical Journal*, 85.4: 337-40.
- Venuti, L. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: a History of Translation*. London. Routledge.
- Waszink, J.H. 1956. *De komst der Muzen in Rome*. Leiden. University of Leiden Press.
- Watson, L.C. 2007. "Catullan Recycling? "Cacata carta"." *Mnemosyne*, fourth series, 58.2: 270-7.
- Wendel, C. 1899. *De nominibus bucolicis. Pars I, De Theocriti nominibus bucolicis*. Halle. Halis Saxonum.
- Weinreich, O. 1928. *Studien zu Martial. Literarhistorische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Stuttgart. Kohlhammer.
- West, M.L. 1973. *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and 26 Latin Texts*. Stuttgart. Teubner.

- West, S. 1985. "Venus Observed? A Note on Callimachus, Fr. 110." *Classical Quarterly*, 35.1: 61-6.
- Wilamowitz, U. 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. Berlin. Weidmann.
- Williams, G. 2005. "Seneca on Winds: The Art of Anemology in "Natural Questions" 5." *The American Journal of Philology*, 126.3: 417-50.
- Wiseman, T.P. 1969. *Catullan Questions*. Leicester. Leicester University Press.
- _____.1974. *Cinna the Poet and other Roman essays*. Leicester. Leicester University Press.
- _____.1985. *Catullus and His World: a Reappraisal*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Wissowa, G. 1904. "Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur römischen Religions- und Stadtgeschichte." *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 5. Bd., 4. Abt., Suppl. Munich. Beck.
- _____.1914. "Zu Horaz Sat. I 10, 5a." *Hermes*, 49.3: 479-80.
- Witty, F.J. 1958. "The Pinakes of Callimachus." *The Library Quarterly*, 28.2: 132-6.
- _____. 1973. "The Other Pinakes and Reference Works of Callimachus." *The Library Quarterly*, 43.3: 237-44.
- Wormell, D.E.W. 1966. "Catullus as translator." *The classical tradition. Literary and historical studies in honor of H. Caplan*, ed. Wallach, L. Ithaca, NY. Cornell University Press.

- Vardi, A. 2001. "Gellius against the Professors". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 137: 41-54.
- Vaughn, J.W. 1981. "Theocritus Vergilianus and Liber bucolicon." *Aevum*, 55: 47-68.
- Varela, J.U. 2000. "Textual Criticism and Source Study in Ancient Latin Grammar: Charisius Ars Grammatica 46.5 Barwick; Excerpta Bobiensia, Grammatici Latini 1.547.35 Keil." *Classical Philology*, 95.1: 61-71.
- Yardley, J.C. 1978. "Copia scriptorum in Catullus 68.33." *Phoenix*, 32: 337-9.
- Young, E.M. 2008. "Inscribing Orpheus: Ovid and the Invention of a Greco-Roman Corpus." *Representations*, 101.1: 1-31.
- _____.2011: "Sappho Under My Skin: Catullus and the Translation of Erotic Lyric at Rome." In *Complicating the History of Western Translation*, eds. S. McEldruff and E. Sciarrino. Manchester; Kinderhook, NY. St. Jerome Publishing.
- Zetzel, J.E.G. 1975 "On the History of Latin Scholia," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 79: 335-354.
- _____.1981. *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity*. New York. Arno Press.
- _____.1983. "Catullus, Ennius, and the Poetics of Allusion." *Illinois Classical Studies*, 8.2 *HIRSUTAE CORONAE: Archaic Roman Poetry and its Meaning to Later Generations*: 251-266.