

## AN ANTHOLOGY OF EARLY LATIN EPIGRAMS? A GHOST RECONSIDERED\*

In Book 19, chapter 9 of the *Noctes Atticae* Gellius describes the birthday party of a young Greek of equestrian rank at which a group of professional singers entertained the guests by performing poems by Anacreon, Sappho, 'et poetarum quoque recentium ἑλεγεία quaedam erotica' (4). After the singing, Gellius goes on, some of the Greek *συμπόται* present challenged Roman achievements in erotic poetry, excepting only Catullus and Calvus, and criticized in particular Laevius, Hortensius, Cinna, and Memmius. Rising to meet this charge, Gellius' teacher of rhetoric, Antonius Julianus, admits the superiority of the Greeks in what he calls 'cantilenarum mollitiae' in general (8), but to show that the Romans too have some good erotic poets, he recites four early Latin love epigrams, by Valerius Aedituus (frs. 1 and 2), Porcius Licinus (fr. 6), and Lutatius Catulus (fr. 1).<sup>1</sup> The same three poets are listed in the same order in Apuleius' *Apology* in a list of amatory poets which he provides in order to establish precedents and thus invalidate his prosecutors' referral to his erotic poems in their accusation (Apul. *Apol.* 9). Catulus is also enumerated in Pliny's list of Roman dignitaries who composed 'uersiculos seueros parum' like his own (*Ep.* 5.3.5), and an amatory epigram of his is cited by Cicero in *De Natura Deorum* 1.79 (fr. 2). We possess no further evidence connecting the other two with the composition of either erotic or, more generally, 'light' verse, but a poem by Porcius Licinus on Roman literary history is attested by several sources including Varro, Suetonius, and Gellius himself.<sup>2</sup>

The relationship between Gellius' list and that of Apuleius has been at the centre of a rather heated debate. Since Apuleius does not cite the epigrams and mentions the poets only by *cognomina*, he could not have been Gellius' source. The opposite possibility, namely that Apuleius was using Gellius, is vigorously defended by scholars supporting an early date for the *Noctes Atticae*, who wish to have the date of Apuleius' trial (C.E. 158/9) as a *terminus ante quem* for its publication.<sup>3</sup> This is supported by numerous other instances of Apuleius' seeming dependence on Gellius, each of which may be explained otherwise, but their accumulation none the less suggests derivation. Scholars maintaining a later date for Gellius' publication, on the other hand, have advanced the proposition that both authors were using a common source, possibly an anthology.<sup>4</sup> The chronological issue has lost much of its point since Holford-Strevens

\* An earlier version of this paper was presented at a guest lecture at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and I am grateful to the audience for their comments. As always, I owe special thanks to L. A. Holford-Strevens for his helpful suggestions. The research involved in preparing this paper was supported by The Israel Science Foundation founded by The Israel Academy of Science and Humanities.

<sup>1</sup> Fragments are numbered according to Morel-Bländorf, *FPL* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1995). In E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993) Licinus' epigram is numbered fr. 7.

<sup>2</sup> *FPL* frs. 1–5 (Courtney 1–6).

<sup>3</sup> M. J. Hertz in his 1883–5 edition of Gellius, vol. 2, p. vi, and especially R. Marache, *La critique littéraire de langue latine et le développement du goût archaïsant au I<sup>er</sup> siècle de notre ère* (Rennes, 1952), 331; id., 'Fronton et A. Gellius (1938–1964)', *Lustrum* 10 (1965), 229–31 (a survey of bibliography); and his edition of Gellius, vol. 1 (Paris, 1967), x–xii.

<sup>4</sup> H. Usener, 'Nochmals Valerius Aedituus', *RhM* 20 (1865), 150–1 = *Kleine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1912–13; repr. Osnabrück, 1965), 2.65; L. Alfonsi, *Poetae Novi* (Como, 1945), 11–12; B. Luiselli,

proposed that Apuleius may have had access to parts of Gellius' work prior to its publication.<sup>5</sup> An acquaintance between the two is very likely, in view of the fact that they shared similar interests and had the opportunity to meet at Athens or at Rome. Holford-Strevens's suggestion thus absolves the assumption that the *Noctes Atticae* was published towards 180 from dependence on the supposition of a common source for Gellius 19.9 and Apuleius, *Apology* 9. It should, however, be noted that this suggestion does not rule out the possibility that both authors were relying at times on a common source. At all events, the assumed anthology once suggested, its ghost seems to haunt scholars to this day. As we no longer have chronological axes to grind, we may now be in a better position to give the likelihood of such an anthology the unprejudiced attention it deserves.

The question may be approached from two angles: (i) a *Quellenforschung* for Gellius and others who may be drawing on such an anthology; and (ii) the plausibility of an anthology of epigrams published in the Sullan age. But before touching on either of these, it seems appropriate to examine the likelihood that Latin anthologies circulated in antiquity without our having direct evidence of them.

### I. LATIN ANTHOLOGIES

Compared with the impressive evidence we possess of Hellenistic anthologies, both in papyri and in MS tradition, we know very little of Latin anthologies prior to the *Epigrammata Bobiensia* of the early fifth century and later ones such as that of the *codex Salamasianus* from eighth-century Africa and the Carolingian miscellanies.<sup>6</sup> The collection of *Priapea*, from some time between the Augustan age and C.E. 100, was for long considered an anthology. But the fact that, unlike the Greek anthologies and the late Latin ones, this collection does not ascribe pieces to authors permits the now generally accepted view that it is the product of a single writer.<sup>7</sup> An opposite case is offered by the so called *Appendix Vergiliana*, which is an anthology of pieces by various authors transmitted under the name of a single one. We cannot speak of a specific date at which this collection was put together, since it appears to have accumulated over a very long period. It is at least clear that by the ninth century there were already MSS containing most of the poems in our *Appendix*, and it stands to reason that similar collections were already available to Donatus and Servius when compiling their lists of works attributed to Vergil, even if we accept Lyne's view that the list adduced in the Donatian *Life of Vergil* was not included in his Suetonian source, and represents the state of knowledge in the fourth century rather than the early second.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, we should also note that at least some of the pieces in the collection called *Catalepton*, later incorporated in the *Appendix*, were already

'Apul. *De Mag.* 9; Gell. XIX.9,10 e Valerio Edituo, Porcio Licinio e Lutazio Catulo', *AFLC* 28 (1960), 125–33.

<sup>5</sup> L. A. Holford-Strevens, 'Towards a chronology of Aulus Gellius', *Latomus* 36 (1977), 93–109, at 102–4; id., *Aulus Gellius* (London, 1988), 16–19; Courtney (n. 1), 71. The connection between Gellius and Apuleius is, of course, confirmed if the 'amicus meus, οὐκ ἄμουσος adulescens' to whom Gellius ascribes a Latin adaptation of a Platonic distich (19.11.3) is Apuleius, as many now believe; for which see Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius*, 17, n. 57.

<sup>6</sup> On Latin anthologies in general, see A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina* (Leipzig, 1906<sup>2</sup>), 1.1, viii–ix; S. J. Heyworth, 'Propertius: division, transmission, and the editor's task', *PLLS* 8 (1995), 165–85, at 170–1, 178.

<sup>7</sup> See C. Goldberg (ed.), *Carmina Priapea: Einleitung, Übersetzung, Interpretation und Kommentar* (Heidelberg, 1992), 30–4.

<sup>8</sup> R. O. A. M. Lyne, 'The dating of the *Ciris*', *CQ* 21 (1971), 233–8.

circulating under Vergil's name by the time of Quintilian.<sup>9</sup> Whether that early collection comprised only authentic Vergilian poems we cannot tell, but the *Catalepton* that has eventually come down to us is the result of a process of accumulation of pieces by various authors of different ages.

A miscellaneous anthology exhibiting a completely different principle of collection is that of poems by members of Messalla's household which constitutes the third book of our *Corpus Tibullianum*. This collection, generally assumed to have been compiled shortly after the death of Messalla in C.E. 8, might well be the earliest Latin anthology extant.<sup>10</sup> But an even earlier anthology of satires is ascribed by Porphyrio (*ad Hor. Ep.* 1.3.1) to Julius Florus, a member of the entourage of the young Tiberius on his campaign to the East in 20 B.C.E., and the addressee of Horace's *Epistles* 1.3 and 2.2:

Hic Florus scriba fuit <et> saturarum scriptor, cuius sunt electae ex Ennio Lucilio Varrone saturae.

Florus thus seems to have compiled a selection of satires from the whole tradition of the genre up to his day, including Varro's *Menippeans* and, if we take *saturarum scriptor* seriously, perhaps added to them some pieces of his own composition.<sup>11</sup> It also seems reasonable to infer from Porphyrio's remark that Florus' collection attached the names of the authors to the satires it contained, though the possibility that these were supplemented by the scholiast from his personal knowledge should not be ruled out.

Other collections we hear of might not have been intended for publication. In *ad Atticum* 1.16.18, for example, Cicero asks his friend for whatever poems and stories relating to Ἀμαλθεία he has, assuming, I imagine, that Atticus must have collected them to adorn his newly built shrine dedicated to the nymph. Less clear is the case of a selection of poems Catullus says he got from Calvus for the Saturnalia in poem 14:

Ni te plus oculis meis amarem,  
iucundissime Calve, munere isto  
odissem te odio Vatiniano:  
nam quid feci ego quidue sum locutus,  
cur me tot male perdes perdes poetis? 5  
isti di mala multa dent clienti,  
qui tantum tibi misit impiorum.  
quod si, ut suspicor, hoc nouum ac repertum  
munus dat tibi Sulla litterator,  
non est mi male, sed bene ac beate, 10  
quod non dispareunt tui labores.

<sup>9</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.27–8. See R. E. H. Westendorp Boerma, *P. Vergili Maronis Catalepton* (Assen, 1949), xlviii–xlix; and on the *Appendix* in general, id., 'Où en est aujourd'hui l'énigme de l'appendix Vergiliana?', in H. Bardon et P. Vardiére (edd.), *Vergiliana, Recherches sur Virgile* (Leiden, 1971), 386–421; J. A. Richmond, 'De forma libelli qui *Catalepton* inscribitur', *Mnemosyne* 28 (1975), 420–2.

<sup>10</sup> But see H. Tränkle, *Appendix Tibulliana* (Berlin and New York, 1990), 1–6, who argues for a later date.

<sup>11</sup> I admit that Porphyrio's 'saturarum scriptor, cuius sunt electae . . . saturae' is not altogether clear. Dr S. J. Heyworth has suggested to me that this might mean a composition in imitation of selected passages from the earlier authors of *Saturae*, but though a possessive with verbs of composition may carry this meaning (e.g. Gell. 9.9.3 'Vergilius cum aut Homeri . . . locos effingeret'), I am not sure the combination with *electae* could have been understood in this sense. The possibility that Florus made a pastiche of passages from the authors is not to be ruled out, but in that case he would have produced a sort of miscellaneous anthology just the same.

|                                          |    |
|------------------------------------------|----|
| di magni, horribilem et sacrum libellum! |    |
| quem tu scilicet ad tuum Catullum        |    |
| misti, continuo ut die periret,          |    |
| Saturnalibus, optimo dierum!             | 15 |
| non non hoc tibi, salse, sic abibit:     |    |
| nam, si luxerit, ad librariorum          |    |
| curram scrinia; Caesios, Aquinos,        |    |
| Suffenum, omnia colligam uenena,         |    |
| ac te his suppliciis remunerabor.        | 20 |

Calvus' present comprised pieces by several poets, probably contemporary ones, to judge by the mention of Suffenus among the poets to be included in the counter-anthology Catullus threatens to send his friend in return.<sup>12</sup> But whereas Catullus' warning suggests a collection compiled *ad hoc*, it is not clear whether the one he received was of the same sort. Fordyce doubts the possibility that Calvus sent his friend a published anthology since, as he says 'we have no evidence for a published anthology at this time', an argument which would be circular for my line of reasoning.<sup>13</sup> If we consider the poem itself, it seems that Calvus' offence would have been minor if what he sent Catullus was a newly published anthology rather than a selection he made especially for him. Catullus' poem would thus carry no reproach of his dear friend's literary taste, but would direct his abuse to their mutual rivals. In such a case Sulla the *litterator* would be the suspected compiler of the anthology, either for his didactic needs, if we take *litterator* to mean 'schoolmaster', or for more general consumption, if the term is used in its earlier sense, meaning 'critic'.<sup>14</sup> But it is also possible, as some interpreters argue, that Calvus sent Catullus a choice of bad poems he assembled on purpose, intending it as a practical joke appropriate to the *Saturnalia*, and thus deserving his friend's iambic vituperation for mischievousness rather than lack of literary taste.<sup>15</sup> This interpretation requires that Sulla's novel way of paying for legal representation would consist of preparing the collection of awful poems for Calvus. But once such a compilation is sent by Sulla to Calvus (*misit* in line 7) and then by Calvus to Catullus, we already have a circulating anthology and all that remains of the distinction between an *ad hoc* collection and a published anthology is the number of copies made of it.

We possess more ample evidence for Roman collections of *excerpta*, from the works of a single author or from several, most of them, it seems, made for didactic purposes.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, we can see one very good reason for the creation of purified

<sup>12</sup> For Suffenus cf. Cat. 22, and for his possible identification with Alfenus Varus, T. Frank, 'Catullus and Horace on Suffenus and Alfenus', *CQ* 14 (1920), 160–2.

<sup>13</sup> C. J. Fordyce, *Catullus. A Commentary* (Oxford, 1961, repr. 1965), 135. The view that Calvus compiled the collection himself is also held by E. T. Merrill (Cambridge, MA, 1893), and J. Ferguson, *Catullus* (Lawrence, KS, 1985). Among scholars who assume a published anthology are W. Kroll, *Catullus* (Stuttgart, 1959<sup>3</sup>), 30; K. Quinn, *Catullus: The Poems* (London, 1970), and D. F. S. Thomson, *Catullus, Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary* (Toronto, 1997).

<sup>14</sup> For this meaning of *litterator*, see Suet. *Gram.* 4.

<sup>15</sup> For the 'practical joke' interpretation, see Kroll (n. 13), Merrill (n. 13), R. Ellis, *A Commentary on Catullus* (Oxford, 1889<sup>2</sup>), Ferguson (n. 13), and E. Fraenkel, 'Catullus' Trostgedicht für Calvus', *WS* 69 (1956), 278–88, at 281. That Catullus regarded Calvus' gift as a practical joke is implied by *salse* in line 16, but, as Thomson (n. 13), 244, observes, the joke could just as well consist of choosing to send his friend a published anthology of particularly bad poems.

<sup>16</sup> For example, Quint. *Inst.* 2.15.24; Plin. *Ep.* 6.20.5; Fro. *M. Caes.* 2.8.3, 3.9.3, 3.19.2; *Ant. Imp.* 3.8.2, 4.1.1. For the use of such anthologies in education, see H.-I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité* (Paris, 1965<sup>9</sup>), 233; R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. 1: *From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, 1968), 145.

selections for schools in Quintilian's views on the appropriateness of some lyric poems for young pupils. 'Alunt et lyrici, si tamen in iis non auctores modo sed etiam partes operis elegeris' (*Inst.* 1.8.6). Among the few Latin papyri we have, there is a fifth-century papyrus containing passages from three Ciceronian orations (*P. Oxy.* 8.1097).<sup>17</sup> Scholars also assume the presence of a florilegium from Sallust's works compiled sometime in antiquity,<sup>18</sup> and Martial's epigram 14.190 refers to an anthology from, or an epitome of, Livy. Heyworth has recently pointed out two more anthologies, composed of pieces selected from published poetry collections. This, he convincingly argues, is the case of the *Monobiblos Propertii* mentioned in Martial 14.189, as well as of the pieces in the Gallus papyrus, which he takes to consist of excerpts from an elegy rather than of epigrams.<sup>19</sup> The circulation of such editions of selected poems is supported by the remains of a first-century codex from Medinet Mâdi (*P. Narm.* inv. 66.362) containing lines 53–62 of Vergil's *Eclogue* 8. The beginning of this codex, according to the publisher, must have contained other pieces besides this *Eclogue*, but could not have accommodated all the first seven poems of our collection.<sup>20</sup> Yet another variety of miscellaneous collections circulating in the Roman world are the *gnomologia*, one of which, gathered from Ennius' works, was known already to Phaedrus (3. *Epil.* 33–5), and another, from Publilius' *Mimes*, was used by the Elder Seneca and probably also by Gellius.<sup>21</sup>

In the light of all this material I tend to accept Heyworth's view that anthologies of various types were much more common in the Roman world than has been assumed hitherto, and that these should be taken into account in considering the sources of many passages cited by ancient authors, or adduced in the late anthologies, even in cases where those citing them would not have had any difficulty in consulting the original books. Indeed, ancient modes of reference to sources make it impossible in most cases to decide whether quotations adduced by later authors are cited from comprehensive editions or from miscellaneous selections. One has only to think, for example, of fragments cited with references such as *Ennius* or *Lucilius in Saturis*, with no indication of *liber*, keeping in mind that in this case we know that an anthology of their satires was available to third-century grammarians.

## II. THE CIRCULATION OF LATIN EPIGRAMS IN THE SULLAN AGE

We may now turn to the three poets cited by Gellius, and ask where their poems could have been preserved from the time they were written to the second century. Scholars tend to regard the three as amateur poets amusing themselves with poetic trifles in their spare time, and assume, on this ground, that the three did not produce enough epigrams to fill a scroll.<sup>22</sup> In the case of Valerius Aedituus, we simply have no other piece of evidence to tell us how seriously he took his poetic activity. Porcius Licinus' verse history of Latin literature seems to suggest he took it quite seriously.

<sup>17</sup> Cavenaile, *CPL* 24, Pack<sup>2</sup> 2918.

<sup>18</sup> See L. D. Reynolds, *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford, 1983), 343.

<sup>19</sup> On the Gallus fragments, S. J. Heyworth, 'A note on the Gallus fragment', *LCM* 9 (1984), 63–4; Courtney (n. 1), 264. On Propertius' *Monobiblos*, Heyworth (n. 6), 175–8.

<sup>20</sup> See C. Gallazzi, 'P. Narm. inv. 66.362: Vergilius, *Eclogae* VIII 53–62', *ZPE* 4 (1982), 75–8.

<sup>21</sup> See O. Friedrich, *Publilius Syri Mimi Sententiae* (Berlin, 1880), 4–8; K. Horna, *RE* Suppl. 6, 74ff.; J. Barns, 'A new gnomologium with some remarks on gnomonic anthologies', *CQ* 44 (1950), 126–37 (esp. 133–7) and *CQ* 1 (1951), 1–19.

<sup>22</sup> For example, U. Knoche, 'Erlebnis und dichterischer Ausdruck in der lateinischen Poesie', *Gymnasium* 65 (1958), 146–65 at 151–2.

Catulus, consul with Marius in 102, certainly was a busy politician, but he did find the time to write a *De Consulatu et De Rebus Gestis*. And let us not forget that even people like Cicero, Caesar, and Brutus produced, and apparently published, *libelli* of minor poetry which were still extant at the time of Quintilian and Tacitus.<sup>23</sup> Therefore, we cannot rule out the possibility that each of our three poets published a collection of epigrams which survived to Gellius' day.<sup>24</sup>

If, on the other hand, the three poets really produced only a few epigrams for their amusement, these could have been circulating on single sheets within a limited circle of their friends. Such circulation was not uncommon, and it has, for example, been suggested that before its incorporation in Vergil's collection of *Eclogues*, *Ecl.* 6 was for a time circulating on a single *pagina* carrying a title of its own.<sup>25</sup> It has also been assumed that this was the way Theocritus' works were originally published.<sup>26</sup> But as even these two examples reveal, such circulation appears always to have been a temporary stage, and we may discern a clear tendency of works circulating in such a dispersed manner to end up in a collection. The reason for this is probably that single sheets are much less convenient to keep in libraries and have less chance of survival than books. We may also note that when only a few pieces by the same author circulate in such a way, or when these belong to a variety of genres, their eventual gathering results either in miscellaneous compilations such as Artemidorus' collection of bucolic poetry, or in anthologies such as that of the *Corpus Tibullianum*.

There is, however, one other way in which single poems circulating in such a manner may survive oblivion, and that is to have the good luck of being cited by someone in their own generation or shortly after it. Did Gellius, therefore, find the four epigrams he cites in such a secondary source? If he did, this would probably not have been a grammatical treatise, since these appear never to include such extensive quotations. It could have been a scholarly work, such as those of Gellius' beloved Varro, or of Cicero who, as we have seen, does cite one amatory epigram by Catulus. Gellius' source for the passages he cites from Licinus' poem on Roman literary history is generally held to be Varro's *De Poetis*. But this treatise, as Dahlmann argues, appears to have covered Roman literature, and especially drama, only up to Accius' day, which is just a little early for our poets.<sup>27</sup> Varro's *De Poematis*, which seems to have been arranged by genre, might be more suitable, but we know too little of this work, nor does Gellius reveal any acquaintance with it.<sup>28</sup> We do not have much lost Cicero to speculate about, but the *Hortensius* offers yet another tempting context in which the poems could have been cited. At the beginning of this dialogue, according to Grilli's reconstruction, Lutatius Catulus junior is made to recommend poetic composition as a propitious manner

<sup>23</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 8.6.73 'Et quod Cicero [est] in quodam ioculari libello.' Tac. *Dial.* 21.6 'nisi qui et carmina eorum (= Caesaris et Bruti) miratur. fecerunt enim et carmina et in bibliothecas rettulerunt, non melius quam Cicero, sed felicius, quia illos fecisse pauciores sciunt.'

<sup>24</sup> This assumption is made by G. D'Anna, 'Alcune osservazioni sulle fonti di Gellio', *N.A.* XVII.21 e sulla cronologia geronimiana dei poeti latini arcaici', *ArchClass* 25/6 (1973/4), 166–237 at 196–8.

<sup>25</sup> See R. Coleman, *Vergil: Eclogues* (Cambridge, 1977) ad *Ecl.* 6.12; M. Geymonat, 'Ancora sul titolo delle *Bucoliche*', *BICS* 29 (1982), 17–18.

<sup>26</sup> See U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker* (Berlin, 1906), 127–9; A. S. F. Gow's edition of Theocritus (Cambridge, 1952<sup>3</sup>), lix–lxii; K. Gutzwiller, 'The evidence for Theocritean poetry books', in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker (edd.), *Theocritus—Hellenistica Groningana* II (Groningen, 1996), 119–48, esp 138.

<sup>27</sup> H. Dahlmann, 'Studien zu Varro "de poetis"', *AAWM* (1962), no. 10, 602.

<sup>28</sup> This possibility is suggested by H. Dahlmann, 'Varros Schrift "de Poematis" und die hellenistisch-römische Poetik', *AAWM* (1953), no. 3, 147, n. 2.

of relaxation, thus, perhaps, provoking Lucullus to utter the famous Ciceronian condemnation of lyric poetry cited by Seneca in *Ep.* 49.5.<sup>29</sup> Could the young Catulus, therefore, have adduced the example of the leisurely trifling of his father and his friends, quoting some of their pieces to boot? But the range of such speculations is too immense to be really fruitful. What these examples can, nevertheless, show is the sort of context in which we might suspect the poems to have been incorporated, namely either a discussion of the history of Latin poetry or one dealing with erotic or more generally nugatory poetry.

We may now turn to the possibility that the epigrams of Valerius Aedituus, Porcius Licinus, and Lutatius Catulus were indeed collected in an anthology as a joint enterprise, by one of them only, or by someone else close to their time. The idea, proposed by Usener in 1865,<sup>30</sup> was taken up by Büttner and developed into a theory of a literary circle centred around Catulus and including, in addition to the other two epigrammatists, also Furius Antias and Archias of Antioch, as well as many leading aristocrats of the turn of the second century B.C.E.<sup>31</sup> Catulus' interest in Antias, Archias, and Antipater of Sidon is attested by Cicero,<sup>32</sup> and indeed Catulus might even have taken the idea of dedicating an epigram to Roscius from Archias, who, according to Cicero, *De Divinatione* 1.79, also wrote a piece on the actor. But literary circles have since gone out of fashion, and it has been pointed out that neither in Gellius' chapter nor in any other source is there evidence for any personal connection between the three poets he adduces.<sup>33</sup> Ross has even argued that Aedituus, whom Gellius calls a *vetus poeta* (10) should be dated earlier than Catulus and Licinus, somewhere around 150 B.C.E.<sup>34</sup> This view, however, has recently been rejected by Cameron who claims, rightly I believe, that Gellius' intention in these words was to set all three poets at an earlier date than the neoteric ones named by the Greek *συμπόται*.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>29</sup> 'Negat Cicero si duplicitur sibi aetas, habiturum se tempus quo legat lyricos.' The term *lyricus* was used by Romans to designate all types of light verse: Porphyry, *ad Hor. C.* 3.1.2-3 (on Laevius' *Erotopaegnia*); Diom. Keil, *GL* 1.483.5-6 (on Archilochus' poetry). See Cicero, *Hortensius*, ed. A. Grilli (Milano-Varese, 1962), frs. 4, 6, 8-12.

<sup>30</sup> See n. 4 above.

<sup>31</sup> R. Büttner, *Porcius Licinus und der litterarische Kreis des Q. Lutatius Catulus* (Leipzig, 1893).

<sup>32</sup> Catulus' connection with Antias: Cic. *Brut.* 132; with Archias: Cic. *Arch.* 5; with Antipater of Sidon: Cic. *de Orat.* 3.194.

<sup>33</sup> For discussions of Büttner's theory, see H. Bardon, 'Q. Lutatius Catulus et son "cercle littéraire"', *LEC* 18 (1950), 145-64; id., *La littérature latine inconnue* (Paris, 1952), 1.115-32; M. Pinto, 'Il "circolo letterario" di Q. Lutazio Catulo', *GIF* 9 (1956), 210-33; L. Alfonsi, 'Sul "circolo" di Lutazio Catulo', in *Hommages à Léon Herrmann* (Brussels, 1960), 61-7; J. Granarolo, *D'Ennius à Catulle* (Paris, 1971), 32-6. Against the identification of Licinus with Licinius, a client of Catulus and a *litteratus homo*, who is mentioned by Cicero in *de Orat.* 3.225, see E. Rawson, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (London, 1985), 4-5, n. 7.

<sup>34</sup> D. O. Ross, Jr, *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, MA, 1969), 139-43.

<sup>35</sup> A. Cameron, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford, 1993), 51-6; also A. A. Day, *The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy* (Oxford, 1938), 102-4. Note that Gellius' Julianus calls all three poets 'antiquiores ante eos' in 9. The naming of Laevius among the disapproved poets of Catullus' generation in 7 does not hamper this dating, since Gellius might have overlooked strict chronology in drawing a distinction between the studied and intricate poetry of the *Novi* and the directness and simplicity he often associates with ancient literature. See e.g. 9.13.4 '[Quadrigarius] simplici et incompta orationis antiquae suavitatem descripsit'; 13.27.3 'Homeri simplicior et sincerior, Vergilii autem νεωτερικώτερος et quodam quasi ferumine inmisso fucior'; and, with some reservations, 10.3.15 'si quis . . . amat . . . priora idcirco, quod incompta et brevia et non operosa'. See also F. Leo, 'Die römische Poesie in der sullanischen Zeit', *Hermes* 44 (1914), 161-95 at 180, n. 1; and for similar modern views of Laevius' position in the history of Roman poetry, Ross (n. 34), 155-60.

If we therefore assume the three poets to have been working more or less at the same time, the 90s B.C.E. seem a reasonable date for their poetic endeavour, which at any rate would have preceded Catulus' suicide in 87. At this time Catulus could also have written his version of events during his consulate and the Cimbrian war, enjoyed his newly built *porticus* and sumptuous house on the Palatine, purchased the well-educated Daphnis for the highest price ever paid for a slave (Suet. *Gram.* 3), and composed the love epigram on Roscius, whom the *De Oratore* represents as already an established actor in Rome at the time. It is also the period in which the *Garland* of Meleager seems to have reached Rome, possibly with Archias' arrival in 102.

The overwhelming influence of this anthology, noticeable even in the graffito on the walls of the Sullan theatre at Pompeii,<sup>36</sup> is well marked in the surviving epigrams of Aedituus, Licinus, and Catulus. As has often been noted, Catulus' *Epigram* 1 is an adaptation of Callimachus' *Epigram* 41. More important for our case are the echoes of Meleager's poems in Aedituus' second piece and in Catulus' Roscius epigram, since these suggest that our poets came to know Hellenistic epigram through the *Garland*.<sup>37</sup> If they were imitating Hellenistic epigrams which they read in the *Garland*, and if they did compose only a small number of epigrams, but wanted nevertheless to show them round, it seems to me miraculous that our poets should not have thought of publishing their pieces in an anthology. And if they did not think of it themselves, the idea might easily have been suggested to them by Archias or somewhat earlier by Antipater of Sidon, both of whom, as has been established by Cameron, had their contributions published in the first *Garland*.<sup>38</sup> To be meticulous, let us note that the Romans do not seem to have had an aversion to any other type of Hellenistic poetry collections, and even generically miscellaneous gatherings such as Hellenistic *Paegnia* were imitated by Laevius in his *Erotopaegnia*, which, according to Charisius (p. 376.1–2 B) contained at least one *technopaegnia*.

But we cannot tell whether our three poets actually adopted the idea of publishing their epigrams in an anthology or not, and if they did, whether this was a joint enterprise, or a compilation made by one of them, playing the Hedylys for a Roman *Soros*. We should also take into consideration the possibility of an anthology which comprised poems by other poets beside those quoted by Gellius, either of their own generation, or even later ones, as in accumulative collections like the Greek anthologies, Florus' collection of satires, the *Appendix Vergiliana*, and the late Latin florilegia.

### III. GELLIUS' SOURCE FOR THE EPIGRAMS IN 19.9

Returning to consider possible sources for Gellius' quotations, we are thus left with three possibilities: a separate collection of epigrams by each of the three poets, a scholarly treatise closer to their time in which the four epigrams were quoted, or an anthology of one of the types we have considered.

Bardon assumes Gellius' source to be either a separate collection by each of the poets or an anthology in which their poems were reproduced together with pieces by

<sup>36</sup> J. Hutton, *The Greek Anthology in Italy to the Year 1800* (Ithaca, NY, 1935), 10–19; D. O. Ross, Jr, 'Nine epigrams from Pompeii (CIL 4.4966–73)', *YCS* 21 (1969), 127–42.

<sup>37</sup> See e.g. J. Hubaux, *Les thèmes bucoliques dans la poésie latine* (Brussels, 1930), 26–32; Day (n. 35), 102–4; A. Perutelli, 'Lutazio Catulo Poeta', *RFIC* 118 (1990), 257–81; Cameron (n. 35), 52.

<sup>38</sup> Cameron (n. 35), 50.



other poets. His only argument against the possibility that Gellius was using an anthology composed of pieces by our three poets alone is that the exploitation of such an anthology, which anyone may run into in a library, would impair the nonchalance with which Antonius Julianus is made to recite them in Gellius' chapter.<sup>39</sup> This argument, I believe, would apply just as well to any other possible type of source for the epigrams. What is more, it seems not to take into account Gellius' quotation habits and the way he builds up his little scenes. Gellius, like Cicero, does not hesitate to put in the mouths of his *dramatis personae* things he had found written in scholarly books. He is even capable of some embarrassing confusions, such as getting a name wrong in listing the authors of books of *miracula* which he feigns to have bought second hand in Brundisium, but had actually taken over from Book 7 of Pliny's *Natural History*.<sup>40</sup> In fact, in the preface to his work Gellius openly declares he does not eschew material which one may come across in books, as long as it is not a trite commonplace reiterated in schools and commentaries (*Praef.* 14–15).

But more important, I am not sure that Julianus' nonchalance matters all that much as regards the points Gellius tries to make in this chapter. The main aim of the chapter, as far as I can see, is to establish Roman competence in producing erotic poetry comparable to that of the Greeks, and perhaps to counter cultural ethnocentrism in general and make a claim for the universality of cultural achievement, similar to that put forward by Favorinus in his speech to the Corinthians, where aptitude for culture is asserted for Greeks, Romans, and Celts alike.<sup>41</sup> This may explain Gellius' decision to represent the Greek youth at whose house the symposion takes place as coming from *Asia* (19.9.1) and his emphasis on Julianus' Spanish origin and funny accent, which appears *barbarus et agrestis* to the Greeks (7), but *suavis* to Gellius' ears (10).<sup>42</sup> In addition, the chapter appears to challenge old Roman prejudices against erotic and generally minor poetic forms by suggesting circumstances in which even serious Romans may engage in such reading with no blemish. And finally, as a true second-century intellectual, Gellius cannot resist scoring one more point for the archaistic cause by pointing out the superiority of poets of the Sullan age over their neoteric successors. For this he might indeed have preferred to rely on a fairly recondite source dug up in some library, as he often does with both pride and pleasure. Apuleius' recourse to our three poets, whether reached through Gellius or independently, reveals the same interest in archaic literature characteristic of their age, as may also be the case with an apparent echo of Catulus' *Epigram* 1 in one of Marcus Aurelius' letters to Fronto (*M.Caes.* 1.2.1, pp. 2.6ff. v.d. Hout), though this passage is now generally assumed to depend directly on Callimachus rather than on its Latin adaptation.<sup>43</sup>

We are thus still left with no strong reason to reject any of the three possible sources for the epigrams. Pliny's inclusion of Catulus alone of the three in his list of Roman dignitaries who deigned to toy with the composition of erotic poetry (*Ep.* 5.3.5) lends no support to the separate collections assumption, since this list comprises only persons of distinguished political career. Catulus certainly was such a one, but Porcius Licinus and Valerius Aedituus, in spite of their impressive names, left no mark of political prominence. Furthermore, Pliny could have got his information about

<sup>39</sup> See n. 33 above.

<sup>40</sup> Gell. 9.4; see Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (n. 5), 50–1.

<sup>41</sup> 'D. Chr.' *Or.* 37.27: οὐδὲν τὸ παιδευσθῆναι τοῦ φῦναι πρὸς τὸ δοκεῖν διαφέρει; see A. Barigazzi, *Favorino di Arelate: Opere* (Florence, 1966), 77–8, 329.

<sup>42</sup> The attribution of harsh sound to Iberian Latin poetry is traditional; see Cic. *Arch.* 26.

<sup>43</sup> See especially Perutelli (n. 37).

Catulus' poetic activity from the Roscius epigram cited by Cicero. On the other hand, the possibility that Gellius was using a separate collection of epigrams by each of our authors presumes a tacit survival to his day of three books rather than one, and is thus less economical. I regard this possibility as the least likely also because it would assume extensive compilation work on Gellius' part. Not that Gellius is incapable of looking up several authorities, but in most of the chapters in the *Noctes Atticae* he tends to rely on a limited number of sources. This is especially noticeable in chapters where several examples or arguments are accumulated, as in our case. For such compilations of material Gellius tends to rely on grammatical treatises, collections of *mirabilia*, *gnomologia*, and all sorts of handbooks and commentaries, rather than trace the evidence himself. Thus, for example, the fourteen *sententiae* from the *Mimes* of Publilius Syrus quoted in chapter 17.14 are probably taken from a *gnomologium*, and five quotations from Furius Antias, produced in chapter 18.11, are explicitly said to have been found in a work of Caesellius Vindex, probably his *Commentarium Lectionum Antiquarum*.<sup>44</sup>

Chapter 19.9 already requires a source for the 'Anacreontic' poem quoted in full. The piece is our earliest attestation of a poem from the *Anacreontea* (4 P) and an abridged version, allowing it to pass as sympotic rather than erotic, appears in Book 11 of the Cephala collection, again with the attribution to Anacreon (*AP* 11.48). This may suggest that Gellius' source for the piece was an anthology, perhaps the collection underlying the oldest group which comprises most of the first twenty poems in our *Anacreontea* collection.<sup>45</sup> But again the possibility of a quotation in a scholarly treatise should not be overlooked. The *Noctes Atticae* contains two more pieces that also appear in the *Palatine Anthology*: an old proverb cited in 13.18.3 (*AP* 10.32), and a Platonic distich produced in chapter 19.11 (*AP* 5.78). The first of these Gellius claims he has found in a letter of his grammar teacher Sulpicius Apollinaris, and in any case the proverb is a very old one and seems to be well known in antiquity.<sup>46</sup> The Platonic distich is also cited in Diogenes Laertius' discussion of Plato (3.32), and could, therefore, have been available to Gellius in some doxographic work.<sup>47</sup> Similarly, three Platonic epigrams cited by Apuleius in *Apology* 10 and contained in Cephala's collection (*AP* 7.670, 100, 99 line 6) are also cited by Diogenes Laertius in a bunch (3.29, 31, 30), and two of these appear in the *AP* in a sequence which has been shown to be added by Cephala directly from Diogenes (*AP* 7.83–133). It therefore stands to reason that Platonic epigrams were commonly quoted in ancient doxographic works, which Apuleius, a 'Platonicus Philosophus' and perhaps the author of a *De Platone et eius Dogmate*, would certainly have consulted.<sup>48</sup> The assumption that Gellius' source for the Anacreontic piece was an anthology is therefore plausible but not certain.

<sup>44</sup> For the manner in which Gellius uses his sources, see Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (n. 5), 52–8.

<sup>45</sup> See M. L. West, *Carmina Anacreontea* (Leipzig, 1993), ix–x; id., 'The *Anacreontea*', in O. Murray (ed.), *Symptica: A Symposium on the Symposium* (Oxford, 1990), 272–3; and for epigrams ascribed to Anacreon in the Greek Anthology, D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1981), 123–4.

<sup>46</sup> *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, ed. E. L. von Leutsch and F. G. Schneidewin (Göttingen, 1839), 1.148–9; Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (n. 5), 62 and n. 6. See also *ibid.*, 53–4, 175, for a line Gellius ascribes to Parthenius in 13.27.1 which is imitated in *AP* 6.164.1.

<sup>47</sup> Or perhaps in Favorinus' *Πανροδανή 'Ιστορία*, as suggested by E. Maas, *De Biographis Graecis Quaestiones Selectae* (Berlin, 1880), 105, n. 112. See also Page (n. 45), 129.

<sup>48</sup> See J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background* (Wiesbaden, 1978), 86–7; Cameron, (n. 35), 37; V. Hunink, *Apuleius of Madagascaris, Pro se de Magia* (Amsterdam, 1997), 2.49–50.

We should perhaps also ask what exactly was in Gellius' mind when he speaks of 'poetarum recentium . . . ἑλλενεῖα quaedam erotica' in 19.9.4. The words are generally taken to refer to Hellenistic erotic elegy, which has lately been rendered somewhat less elusive thanks to Butrica's study of the papyrological evidence.<sup>49</sup> This view is supported by the fact that Quintilian, in speaking of the types of poetry appropriate to the dinner table, specifically refers to the elegies of Callimachus and Philetas.<sup>50</sup> But in the passage just mentioned from Apuleius' *Apology*, it is the Platonic epigrams that are named *amoris elegia* (*Apol.* 10). If this was Gellius' meaning of the term too, he might have been thinking of the sort of poems that would most naturally appear in an anthology, and the whole chapter would thus deal only with pieces which since Meleager could be counted as epigrams, including Sapphic and Anacreontic pieces.<sup>51</sup>

If Gellius turned to a Latin anthology for the second part of this chapter, we might be able to deduce some of its characteristics. First, it must have been one which, like the Greek anthologies, attaches authors' names to the pieces it contained. It would, of course, need to include more than the four epigrams he adduced, whether by our three poets alone, or by other authors as well. And if we are dealing with a compilation of poems by several other authors, the chapter's main topic suggests either an anthology dedicated to erotic poetry, or a broader collection in which poems on this theme were grouped together. This again calls to mind the *Garland* of Meleager, which, according to Cameron's reconstruction, already showed the thematic inner arrangement familiar from later versions of the Greek anthologies.<sup>52</sup>

If we suppose for a moment that Gellius and Apuleius were indeed using the same anthology independently, we should also assume that the pieces by Aedituus, Licinus, and Catulus formed a conspicuous group within that collection, perhaps by appearing at its opening. This might suggest a chronological arrangement at some level of inner organization, a principle of arrangement which is not discernible in the Greek anthologies, but might have been present in Florus' collection of Roman satires. Gellius' archaistic point would certainly gain by producing pieces he knows to have been the earliest exemplars of Latin erotic poetry.

But let us also note that Gellius' four epigrams appear to suggest a careful choice: Valerius Aedituus' first epigram recalls, if it is not modelled on, the *φαίνεται μοι κῆνος* of Sappho, who is named as a representative of Greek erotic poetry at the beginning of the chapter (4). The second piece by Aedituus opens with the theme 'what need does a lover have of . . . ?' ('quid faculam praefers . . . quae nil opus

<sup>49</sup> J. L. Butrica, 'Hellenistic erotic elegy: the evidence of the papyri', *PLLS* 9 (1996), 297–322.

<sup>50</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.58 'quod in cenis grandibus saepe facimus, ut, cum optimis satiati sumus, uarietas tamen nobis ex uilioribus grata sit. Tunc et elegiam uacabit in manus sumere, cuius princeps habetur Callimachus, secundas confessione plurimorum Philetas occupauit.'

<sup>51</sup> If, as I believe, the text in Gell. 19.9.10 should read 'quibus mundius, uenustius, limatius, pressius Graecum Latinumue nihil quicquam reperiri puto' (*pressius* Fy: *persius* Q: *pessius* Z: *tersius* Salmasius followed by most editors; see A. D. Vardi, 'Brevity, conciseness and compression in Roman poetic criticism and the text of Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 19.9.10', *AJPh* 121 [2000], forthcoming), the mention of the quality of conciseness (*pressius*), characteristic of epigrams, lends further support to the assumption that the chapter deals with Greek and Latin erotic epigrams.

<sup>52</sup> Cameron (n. 35), 26–33. One aspect in which Meleager's thematic arrangement differed from later collections is that it did not separate heteroerotic poems from *paidika*, a distinction which Gellius' source certainly did not maintain either. Of the four epigrams Gellius cites, the first is addressed to a woman, the fourth is homoerotic, and the second and third do not disclose the gender of the beloved, Phileros the torch-bearer in Aedituus' second epigram being probably a slave accompanying the lover rather than his beloved.

nobis?<sup>53</sup>) which also appears in the Anacreontic piece Gellius cites (τί γὰρ μάχαισι καῶμοί in line 4 and τί . . . μέλει μοι in lines 9–10). The third Latin epigram, with its bucolic colour, and certainly the fourth one, modelled on Callimachus' *Epigram* 41, may thus correspond to Hellenistic epigrams, which, as I suggested, may be what Gellius meant by 'poetarum recentium . . . ἐλεγεία . . . erotica'. This correspondence appears to suggest that Gellius was using a larger collection of Latin poems from which he chose those pieces he thought most fitting to vie with his representatives of Greek erotic poetry, namely Sappho, Anacreon, and Hellenistic epigram. This seems at first glance to support a preference for an anthology over a scholarly treatise as his source. But such reasoning assumes that Gellius' point of departure in composing his chapter was the challenge set up by Greek poetry, as it is represented in his *mise-en-scène*. If, on the other hand, he possessed the four Latin epigrams grouped together somewhere, whether in an anthology or in a learned treatise, he could have noted their dependence on or similarity to Sappho, the Anacreontic piece, and Hellenistic epigram, and thereupon decide to begin his chapter by naming these as the representatives of Greek love poetry whose challenge he wanted to make his Roman poets meet.

I must conclude, therefore, that all the apparent advantages of the assumption that Gellius' source for the epigrams was an anthology would hold just as well if he had been using a learned treatise in which they were reproduced as examples of early Latin erotic poetry, which, as we have seen, is a very likely context for such pieces to be quoted in. There thus seems to be no obvious reason to prefer one of the two possibilities over the other from the point of view of Gellian *Quellenforschung*.

It seems, therefore, that the ghost of an anthology containing the epigrams of Aedituus, Licinus, and Catulus can be neither exorcized nor securely revived. What I hope this paper does manage to propose is that the existence of such an anthology is a very real possibility. There seems to be no evidence against it, some very favourable circumstances for it to have emerged, and even if we do not need it in order to explain the similarity between Gellius and Apuleius, it is just as good an assumption for the origin of Gellius' epigrams as any other possible source.

*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

AMIEL D. VARDI  
avardi@h2.hum.huji.ac.il

<sup>53</sup> For the text of this line, see L. A. Holford-Strevens, '*Adversaria minora Gelliana et Apuleiana*', *LCM* 10 (1985), 112.