# THE CATULLAN CORPUS, GREEK EPIGRAM, AND THE POETRY OF OBJECTS[1]

## I

The foremost aim of this article is to throw some light on a particularly difficult part of Catullus' corpus, poems 69–116, by following a line of thought about the relationship between Catullus and Greek epigram. This line of thought is also of significance for other parts of his work. It is presented in section II. For it to possess its full force, a particular view of the corpus as a whole is required. This is argued for in section I. The argument should be of interest in its own right, not least because it brings fresh material into the discussion.[2]

Greek papyri offer an abundance of material on epigrams and books that ought to be considered in pondering Catullus. On the one hand, the papyri encourage the ever-increasing interest in looking beyond the individual poem to larger units, and supply it with important background. The pair or group of poems, whether by one or several hands, is confirmed as an established entity with authors and readers, even in contexts far from professional publication. The new papyrus of Posidippus (iii B.C.) shows us much more fully than before a published book of epigrams by one author (probably). In it selected poems form blocks of 6–20, by subject; but the author (probably) takes care not to conjoin blocks in the same underlying category, especially dedicatory and sepulchral. These two principles of cohesion and variety are seen too, for example, in a papyrus usually thought to be a selection from Meleager's *Garland* (*P. Berol.* 10571, *BKT* 5.1.75–6, i A.D.). All the epigrams are love-poems; three are a homosexual group also found in this sequence as *AP* 12.76–8; two are consecutive poems by Meleager, addressed to a recurring female, and a recurring male, love of his narrator's. The context of the papyri confirms that the many connections, sustained

[2] For bibliography on the Catullan corpus, see J. Scherf, *Untersuchungen zur antiken Veröffentlichung der Catullgedichte*, Spudasmata 61 (Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York, 1996), adding esp. J.-W. Beck, *'Lesbia' und 'Juventius': Zwei libelli im Corpus Catullianum*, Hypomnemata 111 (Göttingen, 1995); S. J. Heyworth, 'Dividing poems', in O. Pecere and M. D. Reeve (edd.), *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Spoleto, 1995), 131–3, and 'Catullian iambics, Catullian *iambi*', in A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni, and A. Barchiesi (edd.), *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire* (Lanham, 2000), 117–39; D. F. S. Thomson's edition, Phoenix Suppl. 34 (Toronto, 1997), 7–10; H. D. Jocelyn, 'The arrangement and the language of Catullus' so-called *polymetra* with special reference to the sequence 10–11–12', in J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer (edd.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, PBA 93 (Oxford, 1999), 336–41; N. Holzberg, *Catull. Der Dichter und sein erotisches Werk* (Munich, 2002). In general, the very selective references in the footnotes are to recent work. Epigrams are given where possible their numbers in Gow and Page (capital roman) or Lloyd-Jones and Parsons; those of Callimachus and Philodemus also receive their numbers in Pfeiffer and Sider (D. Sider, *The Epigrams of Philodemos: Introduction, Text, and Commentary* [New York and Oxford, 1997]). The new Posidippus (G. Bastianini and C. Gallazzi, *Posidippo di Pella. Epigrammi, P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309* [Milan, 2001]) is cited by column (small roman). Many of the papyri mentioned, and O of Catullus, have been examined at first hand.

themes, and signs of arrangement in Catullus should continue to be vigorously explored.[3]

On the other hand, the papyri bring out two grounds for insecurity about the nature and structure of Catullus' corpus: much of it consists of small poems, and the whole consists of disparate bodies of material. The first aspect is less important for this article. The papyri suggest that collections of epigrams were easily modified. In principle, authors, later editors, and readers could omit from or add to an existing collection, or compile their own selection from one (a process that could leave signs of the original planning while not leaving anything like the original book). The informality of many of the papyri of epigrams need not make them the less revealing of readers' attitudes and activities. Although there is an important distinction between the very common personal versions and generally circulated texts, it seems doubtful that generally circulated editions of single epigrammatists were always of complete works; the concept of modification, and particular modifications, might matter widely. The do-it-yourself element was not remote from Catullus' Rome, as poem 14 shows: Calvus has had a mock-anthology made, not of little epigrams but of 'low-lights' from monster poems.[4]

No large-scale scepticism need be considered here: the general argument in II would not be drastically affected even if 1–60 and 65–116 or 69–116 were reductions of substantially larger original books. It may simply be noted that specific past ideas now acquire further credibility, and that design and alteration can be more readily combined. The end of the apparent unit 1–60, a suspicious point for interference, displays two consecutive poems (59 and 60) in the same non-hendecasyllabic metre, contrary to the patterns of 1–60. They seem unlikely to be complete poems, as they lack a point.

---

[3] On the nature of the collection of Posidippus, see G. O. Hutchinson, 'The new Posidippus and Latin poetry', *ZPE* 138 (2002), 1, 8, 10. The currency of pairs, etc., in papyri raises some doubts about the origins of *P.Berol.* 10571. Cf. for groupings *P.Oxy.* 662 (i A.D.), written on the verso of a text of Pindar and eventually abandoned. It includes three poems on the same dead woman, two on the same man's dedication, by three poets, one obscure. In his masterly *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford, 1993), A. Cameron, mistakenly thinking all the poems funerary, believes this an excerpt from Meleager's *Garland* (11–12, 27). Cf. also *SH* 977 (iii B.C.), two poems on the same dead dog sent as a letter to the owner, and P. Firmin-Didot (ii B.C.), two connected epigrams by Posidippus in a very mixed-up papyrus (H. Weil, *Un papyrus inédit. Nouveaux fragments d'Euripide et d'autres poètes grecs* [Paris, 1879]). *P.Oxy.* 15 (iii A.D.) and 1795 (i A.D.; Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, 199–200) offer a different sort of author's collection: the same poet and meiouric metre, and an alphabetic sequence. On books of epigrams, see K. J. Gutzwiller, *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1998); L. Argentieri, 'Epigramma e libro', *ZPE* 121 (1998), 1–20.

[4] Authorial change: see *SH* 701, where Aristarchus was able to think that Posidippus had omitted a poem from his collected epigrams. Cf. n. 10; and note the change in *P.Oxy.* 4502.18, 26. The process of producing a personal anthology or selection seems widespread and elaborate. It is seen already in *P.Vindob.* G 40611 (iii B.C.; H. Harrauer, 'Epigrammincipit auf einem Papyrus aus dem 3. Jh. v. Chr. Ein Vorbericht', *Proceedings of XVI International Congress of Papyrologists* [Chico, 1981], 49–53) and most likely *P.Mil.* 309 (marginalia: cf. Bastianini and Gallazzi [n. 2], 16). *SH* 976 (ostracon, ii B.C.) and *P.Oxy.* 3724 (i A.D.) seem to show at least two people involved in the preliminary stages of production. *P.Vindob.* G 40611 is working from one volume at present, *P.Oxy.* 3724 mostly from one poet (Philodemus). In the latter, two poems, presumably from a different volume, are written out in full; one is by Asclepiades. See Cameron (n. 3), 379–87; Sider (n. 2), 203–5, 220–1. Selections omit companion pieces: so *P.Oxy.* 3725 (i–ii A.D.: private copy?) has Nicarch. (II) *A.P.* 11.241 without 242; *P.Berol.* 10571 (very small) has Meleag. *HE* XXXIV = *AP* 5.152 without XXXIII = *AP* 5.151. XXXIII certainly did not precede XXXIV in *P.Oxy.* 3324 (i B.C.–i A.D.). This papyrus contains only Meleager, in what looks a professional hand; Cameron (n. 3), 27, thinks it 'undoubtedly' an excerpt from Meleager's *Garland*.

Poem 59 in its short span contains a resolution, unusually for the iambics of 1–60 (only 37.5), and does not well suit the manner of the collection. Since 59–60 make sense and are of the same length, we might suspect not scribal accident, but deliberate activity by someone other than the author (and jottings among the poet's papers are not the only possibility).[5] Poem 52, in a type of iambic elsewhere excluded from 1–60, works much better if it belongs, as looks obvious, in 47 B.C. In the light of our discussion, it is natural to suppose 52 a later addition to the main collection 1–60, which emphatically and purposefully proclaims itself as belonging in around 55 or 54 B.C.; less natural to force the poem into that period, and to assume from the careful self-dating of this collection and of 69–116 that Catullus wrote poems only c. 56–4 B.C.[6] The possibility of omissions from the collection does not depend on the existence of references to lost poems; but it does not, for example, seem likely that Porphyrio, a commentator not an essayist, would casually misremember 40.2 *agit praecipitem in meos iambos* as *at non effugies meos iambos* (fr. 3 Mynors). Nor does the line fit poem 54. It would well suit the generic self-presentation of the collection 1–60.[7]

The second ground for insecurity is more important. *Œuvres* made up of different types of works might be diversely arranged. Theocritus' poems after the bucolic are diversely placed in the papyri (and MSS).[8] Callimachus' may seem the model of an *œuvre* arranged by the author (fr. 112.9 is popularly held to pass from *Aetia* to *Iambi*). Yet in a papyrus codex which apparently contained all Callimachus' poems (*P.Oxy.* 2258, vii A.D.) the *Lock* is immediately followed, not by the Epilogue and the *Iambi*, as in *P.Oxy.* 1011 (iv A.D.), but by the *Victoria Sosibii*. Less probably 2258 included, from the *Aetia*, only highlights: the *Lock* and the *Victoria Sosibii* are both poems on public figures, and might go together. Either view of 2258—complete works differently arranged or newly arranged selection from complete works—should make us wonder

[5] On length, cf. Holzberg (n. 2), 99. Even if 51 were two poems, the postulated lacuna would make it a poor counter-example for two consecutive poems in the same metre. See also Heyworth (n. 2, 2000), 119. For wider suspicion of the last part of 1–60, see M. B. Skinner, *Catullus' Passer: The Arrangement of the Book of Polymetric Poems* (Salem, NH, 1981), 72–6.

[6] Cf. A. A. Barrett, 'Catullus 52 and the consulship of Vatinius', *TAPA* 103 (1972), 23–38. (F. X. Ryan, 'The date of Catullus 52', *Eranos* 93 [1995], 113–21, prefers 56.) *per* 'throughout' is another joke on Vatinius' short consulship, in late 47, cf. Macrob. *Sat.* 2.3.5. The unepigrammatic 'he swears a false oath by his consulship' (he is sure of it, so it is inevitable) gives a less effective parallel to line 2 or reason for demise. The poem would have been put in this position to go with 53; without it, 51 (one poem) separates two on Calvus. On an argument suggested by Professor Feeney, 52 could actually be dated later than 1: *unus* (1.5) would be falsified by Atticus' *Liber Annalis* (published by early 46).

[7] If the text is sound at Charisius *GLK* 1.97 (the context suggests it is), *pugillaria* is said to appear *saepius . . . in hendecasyllabis*, not just in 42.5. Some brief points on the chronology of the poems: 61 may well be c. 59 B.C. (n. 15). Veranius and Fabullus' return from Spain is presumably not in 57–5 B.C. (Piso returns summer 55); 54 B.C. is conceivable (9.6–8 make tourism a possibility). M. Rambaud, 'César et Catulle', in A. Thill (ed.), *L'Élégie romaine. Enracinement—Thèmes—Diffusion* (Paris, 1980), 37–50, dates 29 to 53 or 52 B.C. 79 is probably before 52 B.C. (death of Clodius). Death at the age of 29–30 would perhaps remain possible if Catullus is writing c. 59–47 B.C. (Asinius Pollio in 12 would not be the orator); Jerome's dates are wrong anyway (R. Helm, *Eusebius Werke* 7. *Die Chronik des Hieronymus* [Berlin, 1984³], 150, 154).

[8] It is particularly interesting that the Antinoe papyrus (v–vi A.D.) places 22 after the aeolic poems. Cf. A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus* (2 vols, Cambridge, 1950), 1.lxvi–lxix, 257; P. J. Parsons, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* L (London, 1983), 100, 127–8; K. Gutzwiller, 'The evidence for Theocritean poetry books', in M. A. Harder et al. (edd.), *Theocritus* (Groningen, 1996), 119–48. There seem to have been two different arrangements of the books of Lucilius (cf. e.g. F. Charpin's edn [3 vols, Paris, 1978–91], 1.34–5).

about Catullus' corpus. To unsettle us further, a different 'public' poem precedes the *Victoria Sosibii* in *P.Oxy.* 1793 (i A.D.).[9]

Even if the corpus was published (generally circulated) by Catullus, it is still likely to have united earlier and separate publications. Poem 1 refers only to one *libellus*. It is probably a reasonable assumption that the corpus is much too long for one book, even at this period of Latin literature (cf. Lucretius' books). When Pliny writes, in his quasi-preface to his hendecasyllabic poems, *cogitare me has meas nugas ita inscribere, 'Hendecasyllabi'* (*Ep.* 4.14.8), he seems to envisage Catullus 1 as referring to a comparable volume, not all his works.[10] Poem 1 certainly need not imply there will be three books in all, to contrast with Nepos' three. Such an idea would actually spoil the contrast between the one *libellus* and Nepos' three, and the suggested contrast in their temporal range: *omne aeuum* against a forceful concentration on a very few years. The poem thus announces the publication of some part of the corpus as a distinct entity.[11]

The corpus consists of three different parts; traces of these divisions seem to appear in the MSS and other Renaissance material. 52 is quoted as *prope finem primi operis*; less decisively, in O 61 starts a new page, after a five-line gap at the bottom of the page before, and with 65 the first words of poems are treated differently.[12] The fixed *ordering* of these parts is unlikely to precede codices: without book-numbers, internal pointers, or visible chronological succession, one does not see how an order of rolls would be imposed on the reader.[13] The parts themselves have very differing claims to represent, in some form, an earlier book produced by the author. The part with the weakest claim is 61–4 (or 61–8*b*, if they are taken together); this can be seen if they are compared

---

[9] *Iambi* follow *Aetia* in the *Diegeses* too. 2258 also contains: *H.* 2, 4, 6; hypothesis to *Hecale*; *Victoria Berenices* (B fr. 2 front from *SH* 259, not mentioned in *SH*; I suggest the back may come from scholia to the poem: note ἐπ[ 4; for 10–11 cf. Posid. xii.6–7); *Acontius*. A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, 1995), 105, n. 5, gives a misleading impression of the contents. 2258 treats the beginning of the *Hecale* differently; but the scribe clearly realizes the *Sosibius* is a new poem. A different, but no more comforting, theory on fr. 112 (moved from the end of *Aet.* 2 by an editor): P. E. Knox, 'The epilogue to the Aetia: an epilogue', *ZPE* 96 (1993), 175–8; Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics*, 143–73 (109–13 on Callimachus more widely).

[10] Cf. also Auson. I.4, XV *praef.* 1–16 Green. If *passerem* at Mart. 4.14.14 denotes a book (cf. e.g. A. S. Gratwick, 'Catullus 1.10 and the title of his *libellus*', *G&R* 38 [1991], 199–202), then the book is more likely to be a small one. Cf., however, Mart. 1.7 (again playing on size), with 7.14.3–6, Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.102. Catullus' corpus contains 2,287 lines (1–60, 848; 61–4, 795; 65–8, 325; 69–116, 319). Authors and publications: Ovid says he has reduced the *Amores* from five books to three; in my opinion, Horace originally published *Odes* 1 and 2 separately ('The publication and individuality of Horace's *Odes* Books 1–3', *CQ* 52 [2002], 517–37).

[11] Poem 64, unlike 1–60, embraces a vast span of time: the heroic and the post-heroic age. The role of Nepos' work in 1 has been much discussed: cf. recently e.g. B. K. Gibson, 'Catullus 1.5–7', *CQ* 45 (1995), 569–73; J. Rauk, 'Time and history in Catullus 1', *CW* 90 (1996–7), 319–32.

[12] *Primi operis*: copy of Terence, London, BL Harl. 2525 11ʳ (G. Billanovich, 'Il Catullo della cattedrale di Verona', in S. Krämer and M. Bernhard [edd.], *Scire litteras. Forschungen zum mittelalterlichen Geistesleben*, ABAW 99 [Munich, 1988], 38–9). On O see B. L. Ullman, *Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (Rome, 1973²), 96–102. The gap before 61 could be related to the distinct status of 61 (see below). Illuminated initials are added from 65 on (that of 65 itself blue, like those of 80 [and 2] and the unique paragraphus of 31, the rest red; the whole first word is placed differently from before). The treatment may be connected with the irregular ink decoration of first and last initials of pages beginning two pages *before* 65. The initials themselves seem not to have been based on a good source: there are revealing errors and omissions with proper names in 89, 92, 100. One should be cautious, then, in making inferences about the tradition from these features in O. None the less, their location is striking.

[13] Catullus is never quoted by book-number in antiquity; this is hardly surprising with so disparate a corpus (cf. Vell. 2.36.2). Galen has to write a separate work on the order to read his books in (*Ord. Libr. Propr., Script. Min.* 2.80–90 Müller).

with 1–60. 1–60 (or some part of them) appear to have a preface which groups them together. The citations of Catullus *in hendecasyllabis* suggest a body of poems, as early as Sen. Rh. *Contr.* 7.4.7; the specification, which ought to be useful, could reasonably be applied to a group of poems where hendecasyllables predominated. The tradition of Greek epigram allows for metrical excursions within a collection (cf. *P.Köln* 204 [ii B.C.]). By contrast, the metrical differences of 61–4 would make for a generically heterogeneous collection. 61–4 also have a much stronger claim to have been published as individual items. The virtual confinement of the aeolic base of the hendecasyllable to one form in 2–26, but not 27–60, suggests consecutive composition.[14] By contrast, Torquatus cannot have had to wait for the publication of the corpus to receive 61. And if he is L. Manlius Torquatus, the poem is probably substantially earlier even than the original publication of the collection 1–60.[15] 62 is quoted *in epithalamio*; it later led an independent life, anthologized as *Epithalamium Catulli*. At the end of 61 in O is written *explicit Epithalamium* (no other poems receive an *explicit* in OGR).[16] The epithalamia of Calvus and Ticida are referred to by grammarians and scholiasts as distinct poems. So are the small epics of Calvus, Cinna, Cornificius; Catull. 95 describes Cinna's *Smyrna* as a distinct book. It would be natural so to regard the dense and monumental 64. The eagerly awaited *Magna Mater* of Caecilius (35) sounds rather like the virtuoso 63.[17]

The theme of marriage connects 61, 62, and 64; but since the Neoterics were in any case keen on writing and toying with epithalamia, this is not a particularly strong argument for combining the poems into an authorial book. Nor is resemblance between parts of, say, 63 and 64: different plays of Sophocles or episodes in different works of Ovid may also have much in common. One can see why a collected or selected works might place the poems together, and, when the parts were given their present order, place them at this point. If, as will be argued, the long elegiac poems already belonged before 69–116, it would have been natural to place the other long poems next to them. As for the ordering of the other two parts of the corpus, 1 would have seemed an apt beginning, and the epigrams a natural coda. The present sequence of 61–4 could in fact be understood as simultaneous with the larger ordering: 61 next to the

---

[14] Cf. O. Skutsch, 'Metrical variations and some textual problems in Catullus', *BICS* 16 (1969), 38–40. The poems after 26 with only spondaic base show that the arrangement is not due to an editor's principle.

[15] Torquatus was probably praetor in 50 or 49 (cf. T. R. S. Broughton, *MRR* 3 [1986], 136; D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Onomasticon to Cicero's Treatises* [Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1996], 43); *c.* 55 would be too late for his first marriage (cf. lines 119–41). On him, see D. H. Berry, *Cicero: Pro P. Sulla Oratio* (Cambridge, 1996), 17–20.

[16] It is written as if it were another line of verse, but with two lines to show the place for a paragraphus.

[17] Often seen as an exceptional poem in the corpus, cf. e.g. S. M. Braund, *Latin Literature* (London and New York, 2002), 253. At Terent. Maur. 2899–900 *ipse* implies 63 is a *liber* (identified by first line); this may mean only *libellus*, as used by Statius of poems in the *Silvae*, but it shows 63 still thought of as a distinct work, not just one in a run of poems. As to small epics, the *Smyrna* received its own commentary (Suet. *G.R.* 18.2); Cato's *Lydia*, a single poem (Suet. *G.R.* 11.2), is described as a book by Ticid. fr. 2 Courtney. The *absence* of references to 64 as a separate poem would show only that it was not circulating alone in Nonius' or Macrobius' time; but possibly it was unclear how to refer to the poem. Cf. Scherf (n. 2), 39. On the date of 64: line 37 would suit but does not demand a date after Pharsalus. It was a novel locale for the wedding (P. J. Heskin, 'The scansion of *Pharsalia* [Catullus 64.37; Statius, *Achilleis* 1.152; Calpurnius Siculus 4.101]', *CQ* 47 [1997], 591), but a standard place for Peleus (Pherecyd. fr. 1 Fowler, etc.).

'polymetrics', 62 after it to make a pair, 63 to complete the non-dactylic metres, 64 to make a pair of narratives, and precede the dactylic elegiacs.[18]

The two parts 1–60 and 65 or 69–116 look much more like original books, as we have seen in regard to 1–60. The notion that they are simply or largely posthumous collections of privately circulated individual items or groups of items is excluded: by poem 1; by references to readers who sound like the general public (14b), and to the permanence of the writing (78b);[19] and by defences of the poems (104, 116, cf. 102). The groups of poems are often not straightforward groups which might be privately circulated, but arrangements in which connected poems are separated by another (cf. 2b?, 6, 17, 22, 38, 70, 71, 108): this combination of connection and variety implies a book. The reason for the attacks on Rufus and Gellius (love) is kept for the last or penultimate poem on each in a way that implies consecutive reading.[20] Of course, previous limited circulation of particular items is compatible with later incorporation in a book by Catullus himself; but even this notion of two stages should not be too casually assumed. The metrical practice of 2–26 (above) makes against it; so too do the pseudonyms *Lesbia* and *Mentula*. They must mask or affect to mask the identity of individuals; the device should imply, at least in the case of Lesbia, readers unfamiliar with Catullus' life. Since Mentula is probably unmasked by the contemporary 1–60, the purpose will hardly be literal concealment within a social group, but rather play with concealment from the public.[21]

Any idea that 1–60 and 65 or 69–116 were mingled in one original book seems excluded by their careful separations: no mention of Bithynian service in the former or the brother's death or Lesbia's adultery in the latter.[22] Each has its own recurring figures; the connecting ones are confined to: Catullus; Lesbia, Iuventius; Cinna, Calvus; Caelius; Pompey, Caesar (Mamurra/Mentula apart). The same points look like further grounds for seeing the collections as representing original books. If Catullus did not by accident use only the metres of 1–60 to write about Veranius and

---

[18] On the placing of the long poems in the middle, cf. Beck (n. 2), 289–90. Epigrams put last in lists of works: Sud. μ 24 (Marianus' *Metaphrasis* of Callimachus); θ 166, and K of Theocritus (but his *Epigrams* have been a complicated case). It is noteworthy that arguments on the theme of marriage have also been used to unite 61–68b (see esp. T. P. Wiseman, *Catullan Questions* [Leicester, 1969], 20–5; G. Most, 'On the arrangement of Catullus' carmina', *Philologus* 125 [1981], 118–20, 124). For the Neoterics and epithalamia, cf. R. O. A. M. Lyne, 'The Neoteric poets', *CQ* 28 (1978), 175, and the play in Cat. 6 (cf. 61.107–12, Ticid. fr. 1; Prop. 2.15.1–2, Juv. 9.77–8). Relevant to the tradition behind 64 is Agamestor *SH* 14, an elegiac Θέτιδος Ἐπιθαλάμιος, with narrative. The inset epithalamium of 64 is marked out in G; cf. also 64.86–93. 1–61 would make a strange book by Catullus, esp. with 1 as prologue (Jocelyn [n. 2], 341, rather prefers an editor). And it would be too fortunate a coincidence that 61 should happen to be at the end of the book, where 62 could follow it.

[19] Cf. perhaps Suet. *Jul.* 73.

[20] Cf. C. Nappa, 'The goat, the gout, and the girl: Catullus 69, 71, and 77', *Mnemos.* 52 (1999), 273–4.

[21] For a more positive approach to private circulation, see M. Citroni, *Poesia e lettori in Roma antica* (Bari, 1995), chs 3 and 4. Poem 79 seems to confirm that *Lesbia* is to be read as a pseudonym: cf. in 69–116 the brother–sister pairs Aufillenus, -a, Quintius, -a (C. M. Neudling, *A Prosopography to Catullus* [Oxford, 1955], 154), and *Rufa Rufulum* in 59. Otherwise, N. Holzberg, 'Lesbia, the poet, and the two faces of Sappho: "womanufacture" in Catullus', *PCPS* 46 (2000), 39–41. Ovid was presumably right that Ticida's Perilla was a pseudonym (*Tr.* 2.437–8; = 'cause of torments'). I have spotted no instance of the name Perillus in Latin inscriptions or of the feminine anywhere; the pseudonym will be taken over by Ovid in *Tr.* 3.7.

[22] On the first two, see Holzberg (n. 2), 152.

Fabullus or Bithynian service, then the poems about them scattered through 1–60 probably indicate that the original book is not represented only by the first few poems.

However, while the claim of 1–60 to represent an original book is particularly strong, the end of that book is much less clearly defined than for the elegiac poems. There 116, and other poems late in the series, affect to defend the poems themselves. The final poem, like the first elegiac poem (65), refers to giving a poem or poems by Callimachus (*mitto . . . carmina Battiadae* 65.16, *carmina uti possem mittere [uertere* Palmer] *Battiadae* 116.2). This forms a ring so palpable and significant as to indicate both that 116 is the end of the book and that 65 is the beginning. (69–116, unless a reduction, would be a short book of poems.) There is much point in opening and closing with allusion to the most celebrated author of elegy (Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.58, etc.). The epigrams proper virtually begin with an imitation of Callimachus (70); it would also be elegant that the book should *begin* from the *last* poem of the *Aetia*. Hellenistic books of epigram can include longer poems, especially at beginning and end; this book seems to take the idea further. Its two parts lay claim to a full range, in this metre, of Callimachean talent.[23]

It remains possible that 68*a* is a subsequent addition to the book. Lines in 68*a* pre-empt the powerful and unexpected passage of 68*b* on Catullus' brother, in a way that seems hard to parallel or, in my opinion, justify (68*a*.22–4 = 68*b*.94–6). 68*a* also has a notably different rate of elision—as an average, one in 52.5 per cent of lines—from 65 (25 per cent), 66 (37.2 per cent, or less), 67 (29.2 per cent), and 68*b* (35 per cent). Since it seems addressed to a different person from 68*b*, it does not have an obvious connection with that poem. It could be thought not to suit the air of artistic display in 65–6, 67, 68*b*, nor their function of introducing, after a Callimachean opening, major aspects of the epigrams.[24]

The argument so far has contended that the Catullan corpus offers us, in at least somewhat distorted form, two books that we can have reasonable confidence were designed by the author: 1–60 and 65–116. In what follows, these books, or the extant versions of them, will be referred to as *a* (1–60) and *c* (65–116); the two halves of *c*, 65–68*b* and 69–116, will be referred to as *c*1 and *c*2. It follows from what has been said that we should be considering two sets of contrasts, one between *c*1 and *c*2, and one between *a* and *c*. Comparisons between any of Catullus' works are of course legitimate; but here they seem to be called for by the books themselves. Contrasts between *c*1 and *c*2 are of course invited by the very nature and structure of *c*. *a* and *c* present themselves as books to be confronted. They advertise that they concern the same

---

[23] In the light of 70, the point in 116 would be that rendering Callimachus in Latin is natural to Catullus, not that the epigrams are un-Callimachean (and cf. e.g. 99 with Call. VIII = 42). The link does also mark a contrast within the book between 66 and the epigrams. Cf. C. W. Macleod, 'Catullus 116', *Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1983), 181–6. Callimachus' pre-eminence in elegy includes epigram: cf. Mart. 4.23.4, and note the implicit inclusion of epigram within elegy at 10.4.10. For all their allusions to Callimachus, Latin poets refer to him by name only in elegiacs or when elegy is referred to, save at Stat. *Silv.* 5.3.153–4 and Terent. Maur. 1886, 2941 (*GLK* 6.381, 412). On 65, cf. R. Hunter, 'Callimachean echoes in Catullus 65', *ZPE* 96 (1993), 179–82. For longer poems in books of epigrams: Posidippus' sphragis *SH* 705 (wooden tablets, i A.D.); *SH* 961 (iii B.C.), elegy on marriage of Arsinoe (II?), 24 lines at least, part of a book of 'mixed epigrams' (title), including Posidippus; poems of 40 and 52 lines in the Vienna papyrus (poems of 14 lines Posid. iii.28–41, xii.20–33); Meleag. *HE* I.

[24] Cf. G. O. Hutchinson, *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford, 1988), 314, n. 75. The repetition of 68*a*.22–4 is not akin to the repetition of a line or less between connected poems, cf. e.g. 23.1, 24.5, 10, Philod. *GP* XVII = 4.4, XVIII = 5.4.

narrow range of time (cf. 113!); key figures and themes connect them. The comparison will be particularly between $a$ and $c2$: these are the two groups of short poems; it is here that we find the most obvious links (including the name of Lesbia).[25]

One basic aspect of these contrasts needs to be mentioned at once: that of metre. $c$ appears to create a marked difference between its two halves in the rate of elision. In $c1$ there is one elision in 36.3 per cent of lines (34.8 per cent without 68$a$); in $c2$, one in 68.7 per cent. If $c1$ and $c2$ are to be contemplated together, this difference is bound to strike the reader. The rate in $a$, 46.8 per cent, comes in between (when allowance is made for the mostly shorter lines, $a$ is probably closer to $c2$). This suggests that the general difference in rate has more to do with displaying a difference in style, and stylistic level, than with emotion or uncouth epigrammatic tradition. $c2$ likewise has notably fewer of the imposing *spondeiazontes* so common in 64 (29; $c1$ has eight, in 65–6 and 68$b$): it has three, one expressive (76.15), two humorous (100.1 Veronese name, 116.3 parody of Ennius).[26]

It is important to realize, however, that $c2$, for all this paraded difference of manner, is not metrically less artistic than $c1$: it essentially follows the same norms as Catullus' other dactylic poetry. Although Hermann's Bridge is violated three times in $c2$ and only once in $c1$, the more important point is that it is generally observed even in $c2$. $c2$, like the rest of Catullus, avoids ending hexameters with more than three syllables (save in *spondeiazontes* and Greek words); 97.5 *sesquipedalis* is a humorous exception, but there are actually more exceptions in 62 (8) and 64 (114, 152, 205 [archaic?]). Slight monosyllables at the end of the hexameter occur much more often in $c1$ (66.63, 91, 67.43, 68$a$.33; 107.5). A weak caesura in the fourth foot is always accompanied in $c2$ by a strong caesura in the second and fourth (13 times); in $c1$ and 62 and 64 Catullus is less strict ($c1$: five out of 16 cases of weak caesura do not conform; 62: one out of ten; 64: eight out of thirty-seven).[27]

---

[25] On contrasts between $a$ and $c2$, cf. J. B. Solodow, 'Forms of literary criticism in Catullus: polymetric vs. epigram', *CP* 84 (1989), 312–19.

[26] Name: R. Syme, 'Verona's earliest senators: some comparisons', *Roman Papers* 7 (Oxford, 1991), 484. Figures for metrical features have been worked out afresh, with a text similar to Goold's. The prodelision of finite parts of *esse* is not counted as elision. It seems unlikely that Neoteric epigram was compelled to continue an unsophisticated Latin tradition (cf. D. O. Ross, Jr, *Style and Tradition in Catullus* [Cambridge, MA, 1969], 160); nor do the exiguous remains of other Neoteric epigram accord. Emotion (cf. D. A. West, 'The metre of Catullus' elegiacs', *CQ* 7 [1957], 102) would not work as a general explanation. Further on informality in $c2$: the huge sentence that comprises the first poem in $c1$ among other things serves the role of stylistic differentiation. *atque* + consonant occurs once in $c1$, three times in $c2$; eight in $a$ (0.9 per cent of lines, as in $c2$), never in 61–4. Probably informal too are, at the caesura of the pentameter, the commoner elisions ($c1$, 4; $c2$, 8), and the placing of a prepositive (76.18, 87.4, 111.2); the former feature Callimachus confines to his *Epigrams*, beyond $\tau'$ and the very common $\delta'$ (*HE* VIII = 42.6, XII = 30.6).

[27] Again, Catullus, like Virgil, prefers an elision before *et*, *ac*, etc., at the caesura of the hexameter (64.224, 67.35, 77.1, 90.3, 107.5, cf. 63.68); it is at 62.58, 64.229 that he foregoes this nicety. Hermann's Bridge breached (e.g. *aranea telam* |): 68$b$.49; 76.1, 101.1 (both prominent positions in prominent poems), 84.5 (a textually problematic passage: cf. R. G. M. Nisbet, *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* [Oxford, 1995], 97–8, 349; S. J. Harrison and S. J. Heyworth, 'Notes on the text and interpretation of Catullus', *PCPS* 85 [1998], 106–7). 73.5 *nec acerbius urget* is not an instance. Different parts of authors behave differently here; thus Lucretius, often thought cavalier, has very few violations in Book 1. For this and other features, see Th. Birt, *Ad historiam hexametri Latini symbola* (dissertation, Bonn, 1876), 25–6; H. A. J. Munro, *Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus* (Cambridge, 1878), 152–3; W. Meyer, *Zur Geschichte des griechischen und lateinischen Hexameters*, SB Münch. 1884, Philos.-philol.-hist. Cl. 6 (Munich, 1884), 1040, 1076; West (n. 26); M. Zicàri, 'Some metrical and prosodical features of Catullus' poetry',

The fundamental division between $a$ and $c$ in metre is immediately visible. It is reinforced by the references to Callimachus, the exemplar of elegy, in $c$ (see above) and by frequent explicit references to metre in $a$ (12.10, 36.5, 40.2, 42.1, 54.6). These latter commonly imply, by a convention internal to $a$, that *iambi* or *hendecasyllabi* (the terms overlap) are the medium generally expected from the poet of this book. The overlap confirms that $a$ has its own metrical cohesion: the basic hendecasyllables probably connect both to the single-short (iambic) and to the aeolic metres. The metrical character of $a$ serves to separate it firmly both from $c2$ and from an ordinary book of Hellenistic epigrams. These metres were probably popular with other Neoteric poets; there is some sign of them in Hellenistic literature, and epigrams were sometimes composed in metres other than elegiacs. But it seems reasonable to suppose that a book with no elegiacs would not have struck a contemporary Greek reader as a normal book of epigrams, or probably as a book of epigrams at all. We thus seem to see in $a$ and $c2$ a different relationship with Greek epigrammatic tradition.[28]

A difference in stylistic tendency accompanies the metrical separation of the two series of short poems; it is much less relevant to $c1$. $c2$ cultivates compression and the densely wrought couplet. $a$ likes to accumulate exuberantly; its numerous repetitions, refrains, and rings make part of a less constricted artistry. 39 (Egnatius' teeth) comes unusually close to $c2$'s territory (cf. 80, Gellius' lips); but the long delay of the revelation, the expressively recurring *renidet ille*, the piling up of ethnicities, give the poem a very different spirit. The relatively ample 99 comes close to $a$ in subject (kisses) and especially form (beginning takes up end);[29] but the neat reversal of the opening (13–16), and the clogged mock-intensity of the narrative, result in a quite different impact.

<div style="text-align:center">II</div>

It is apparent, then, that $a$ and $c2$ both have a crucial, but different, relationship with Greek epigram. In some areas, their connection with Greek epigram is similar. Both have groups or series of poems to named lovers. These have links with Latin poetry too, but Hellenistic epigram is clearly an important model, both for the series themselves and for the combination of heterosexual and homosexual. Epigram is also one source for the abundant use of the poet's own name (seen also in $c1$, including 68$a$). It has a special force in $a$ and $c2$, where the use of *Lesbia* (= Sappho) brings the narrator and his most unusual character almost on to a level—both characters, both 'poets'. But, in a particularly interesting and important area, $a$ and $c2$ diverge in their

*Phoenix* 18 (1964), 193–205; F. Cupaiuolo, *Studi sull'esametro di Catullo* (Naples, 1965); Ross (n. 26), 115–31; J. Duhigg, 'The elegiac metre of Catullus', *Antichthon* 5 (1971), 57–67; Scherf (n. 2), 86–90.

[28] Even choliambics are found in the Neoterics (Cinna fr. 10 Courtney); for Greek epigram, cf. Aeschr. *HE* I (ἰαμβεῖα Athenaeus), Theocr. *HE* XIII (Hipponax). Relation of metres: one ancient analysis of the hendecasyllable sees the last seven syllables as iambic (Hephaest. 32, pp. 32–3 Consbruch, with scholia p. 143; Atil. Fort. *GLK* 6.293). On the metres of $a$: Gow on Theoc. *Ep.* 17; J. W. Loomis, *Studies in Catullan Verse: An Analysis of Word Types and Patterns in the Poly-metra*, Mnemos. Suppl. 24 (Leiden, 1972); J. K. Newman, *Roman Catullus and the Modification of the Alexandrian Sensibility* (Hildesheim, 1990), ch. 2; R. Kassel, 'Die Phalaceen des neuen hellenistischen Weihepigramms aus Pergamon', *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin and New York, 1991), 348–9; Th. Fuhrer, 'The question of genre and metre in Catullus' Polymetrics', *QUCC* 46 (1994), 95–108; E. E. Batinski and W. M. Clarke, 'Word-patterning in the Latin hendecasyllable', *Latomus* 55 (1996), 63–77; Jocelyn (n. 2), 336–41; Heyworth (n. 2, 2000); Holzberg (n. 2), 44–9.

[29] Cf. also Posid. iv.8, 13.

use of Greek epigram. This area is the employment of physical objects or things. As the new Posidippus brings out vividly, objects have an especially prominent role in epigram, which often notionally concerns itself with something dedicated, or a tomb, or an object described. A brief survey may illustrate the treatment of objects in *a*; some particular Greek epigrams will be referred to, where not mentioned in commentaries and the like.[30]

Poem 1 plays on dedication (to a person, not a god); the physical book is conjured up.[31] In 2 and 3 the sparrow is described, in connection with love, and lamented; the parallels are well-known, but the bird is made particularly bird-like, and the boundaries between thing and person explored.[32] 4 presents a crucial event for the book (Catullus' return from Bithynia) through an object, a yacht.[33] The poem plays with epigrammatic categories (no dedication in the past [22–4]; the yacht dedicates itself [26–7]; it speaks, but through elaborate *oratio obliqua*). The yacht dwells on its own beginnings as a thing, evoking, like Callim. *HE* XLV = 17.1, the beginning of tragedies on Medea.[34] 6, in developing epigrams where love is revealed, gives more weight than they to the evidence of things, in this case a bed and pillow, which are personified.[35] 12 concerns a gift, received rather than presented by the narrator; the thanks are conveyed obliquely by complaining of theft. Theft is a theme sometimes found in epigram (Theodorid. *HE* I, Antip. Sid. *HE* XIX, cf. Posid. v.12–15), and important in *a*. (In the commonest form of *furtum*, a *person* takes a *thing* from a *person*.) 13, an invitation, plays on the presence and absence of things, and the turning of a person into part of his body (the nose).

14 twists the sending of a present (Crin. *GP* III–V; books 7, 11) by repudiating a gift and threatening retaliation.[36] 17, a poem insulting a cuckold, begins unexpectedly from an old bridge, described graphically and with some personification; Antag. *HE* II celebrates a new bridge. 22 is not on a particular book, a common theme of epigram, but on the numerous books of a prolific and dreadful poet; the physicality of the books is prominent. 25 shows us a different thief, of objects including those in 12. 31 presents the narrator's return from Bithynia; it concentrates on a place, not considering its past (cf. for example Antip. Sid. *HE* LIX) but portraying the elegant (12) beauty of

---

[30] The later discussion of *c* will include material found in standard works. Several third-century epigrammatists insert their own names (Catull. 13.7–8 surely evoke Leonid. Tar. *HE* XXXVII. 1–2); the usage is then conspicuous in Meleager, Philodemus, Crinagoras (Philod. *GP* VI = 10.5, XXII = 28.3, *P.Oxy.* 3724, col. ii.12, 15; one of Philodemus' loves is given the linked name Demo). Caesar's *Commentarii* may perhaps be relevant too. *Lesbia* chiefly shows cultural attainment, cf. 35.16–17, Prop. 2.3.21–2 (ἡ Λεσβία for Sappho, e.g. Gal. *Protr.* 8.2 [*CMG* 5.1.1, p. 126 Barigazzi]); a different approach: Holzberg (n. 21) and (n. 2), 33–9.

[31] The play on dedication is more marked in Catullus than in Meleag. *HE* I.1–4. (A. S. Gratwick, '*Vale, patrona uirgo*: the text of Catullus 1.9', *CQ* 52 [2002], 305–20, like others, expels the Muse.)

[32] Note also perhaps the birds in Posid. iv.8–vi.8. If there is an anatomical level too, that adds to the complication; but it would remain interesting that such obliqueness could hardly be imagined in *c2*.

[33] E. Courtney, 'Catullus' yacht (or was it?)', *CJ* 99 (1996–7), 113–22 favours a different view.

[34] Eur. *Med.* 1–6; Enn. *Trag.* 103 Joc. (the testimonia show the fame of the passage in Catullus' time).

[35] On the tradition of such poems, see F. Cairns, 'Theocritus Idyll 10', *Hermes* (1970), 38–44.

[36] The idea of giving is at least less emphasized in Lucill. *AP* 11.135–6 (H.-P. Syndikus, *Catull. Eine Interpretation* [3 vols, Darmstadt, 1984–90], 1.135).

[37] The property of the family (*ero* 12); cf. T. P. Wiseman, 'The masters of Sirmio', *Roman Studies, Literary and Historical* (Liverpool, 1987), 307–72. For the final *salue*, cf. both Macedon. *GP* III (addressing the physical earth of places) and Virg. *G.* 2.173–6 (personifying and deifying).

this slender needle of land.[37] 36 presents a mock-dedication, addresses a collection of books, with abusive physicality, and presents a prayer to Venus (cf. Posid. *HE* VIII). 39 creates an insult from white teeth (effectively placed in the scazon); see above and below. 42, on a theft, turns poetry into things (writing-tablets) and people (the gang of hendecasyllables). Poems, like other objects, talk about themselves in epigrams (for example, Callim. *HE* LV = 6); but here the poetry of this book and of this poem is given words by the narrator to yell. 43 addresses a woman, with *salue*; but χαῖρε would not normally in epigram be addressed to a living individual. Both a god—in parody— and a thing are suggested. (See further below.)[38] 44, to a thing, the narrator's farm, parodies not just hymns but poems giving thanks for healing, as the new Posidippus makes clear (xiv.30–xv.22). The remaining poems have numerous connections with epigrams, but not so much in the areas that concern us.[39]

*a*, then, makes abundant use of epigrams on objects in poems which are not normal epigrams; the poems in *c*2 have the form of epigrams, but in general appear to make little use of this fundamental epigrammatic interest. Where *a* found fresh ways to emphasize objects, *c*2 excludes them. So 89, on signs of love like 6, omits the physical evidence. The second half of 76, using ἰαματικά metaphorically like 44, addresses the gods, not a thing. Theft is not of actual objects but of happiness, the beloved, kisses: 77, 82, and 99, which is all on punishment.[40]

The apparently slight use of Greek epigrams on objects in *c*2 is the more noteworthy because the long elegies of *c*1 use them extensively. 65 presents the gift of a poem (cf. Crin. *GP* XI [Callimachus]; Cinna fr. 11 Courtney [Aratus]). 66 translates a poem spoken by a dedicated object, now catasterized (Callimachus himself is extending epigram here). 67 consists of a dialogue with an object; one may compare for example Nicias *HE* I, Posid. *HE* XIX, Theodorid. *HE* V, Antip. Sid. *HE* XX, XXXI. The expansion of dialogue epigram is seen, for example, in the new inscription from Salmakis.[41] 68*a* declines the giving of a poem. In 68*b* sepulchral epigram is moment-ously exploited (87–100).[42] The foreign and inglorious tomb itself forms the culmination (97–100); the idea of burial has been broadened to include the destruction in the Trojan War and the ruin of Catullus' house (itself a theme of sepulchral epi-gram, cf. Callim. *HE* XXXII = 20). Much less is contributed to *c*2 by such types of epigrams on objects; yet the instances in *c*1 remain important, as will be seen later, for the development of the whole book.

---

[38] Note Crat. 359 Kassel–Austin (scolion [?] to Pan), Hephaestion's example of hendeca-syllables.

[39] So 46 presents the crucial return from Bithynia more directly than before, but in strongly epigrammatic form; add to the commentaries, etc., and O. Hezel, *Catull und das griechische Epigramm* (Stuttgart, 1932), 22–6, Philod. *GP* XIX = 34, Crin. *GP* XXXII, Alph. *GP* I, Posid. xvi.19 (cf. Hutchinson [n. 3], 6–7; H. Bernsdorff, 'Anmerkungen zum neuen Posidipp [P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309]', *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 5 [2002], 32–7 [http://www.gfa.d-r.de/ 5-02/bernsdorff.pdf]).

[40] Cf. with 76.17–26 esp. Posid. xv.19–22. On sickness in 76: J. Booth, 'All in the mind: sickness in Catullus 76', in S. M. Braund, C. Gill (edd.), *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature* (Cambridge, 1997), 150–68. Heyworth (n. 2, 1995), 133–6, argues powerfully that 76 is two poems. In my opinion, one should not lose the potent movement from the illogicality of desperation (16) to anguished prayer, or the expressive prolongation of a poem which, like the passion, refuses to close. The poem comes soon after *c*1, so the length has special point; but it separates itself from *c*1 by a particularly high number of elisions.

[41] S. Isager, 'The pride of Halicarnassus', *ZPE* 123 (1998), 1–23; H. Lloyd-Jones, 'The pride of Halicarnassus', *ZPE* 124 (1999), 1–14.

[42] The lines follow on from the epigrammatic theme, shared with poem 66, of knowledge or ignorance about return or failure to return from war (85–6); cf. Posid. v.26–39.

Poems on books—a special class—and on tombs have some place in c2 (especially 95, 101), and connect with c1. But the main debts of c2 to epigram appear to be debts to the epigram of love and the epigram of insult. The epigram of insult is significant for *a* too, but to a much more limited extent. It is less refined in register than ordinary epigrams (not therefore less artistic). In Greek it becomes clearly visible with Lucillius and Nicarchus II (i A.D.); but the earlier existence of the type is indicated by the close relation of Catull. 97 to Nicarch. *AP* 11.241 and 242 (241 also now found in *P.Oxy.* 3725, i–ii A.D., close to the poet in time). The papyri indicate that whole books of such poems were circulating and popular.[43] Erotic and sceptic epigram come together in c2. Some of the main victims have injured the narrator in love—hence a dramatized sense of hatred behind the insults; and much of the behaviour assailed is sexual. The narrator's love-life contrasts with, but also shades into, the disgraceful world of the epigrams of scandal and abuse. 66, 67, and 68*b* prepare the way, with their sequence of loving and respectable—if notionally incestuous!—marriage in Alexandria (66), shocking goings-on in Brixia (67), and something in between from the narrator (68*b*). The use of objects in c2 is linked in, it will be seen, to the peculiar world and themes of its poems.

One special class of objects predominates in the scurrilous c2: parts of a person's body. The boundaries between people and things are transgressed and confounded in a particular and demeaning way: a part of someone's body becomes a distinct thing to contemplate, or even generates a creature, or becomes the whole to which a person is reduced. This has not happened to any great degree in *a*, though one could point to 39, and could perhaps argue that in 43 it is as if the woman were an assemblage of things, of parts of the body.[44] But the first main poem in *c* far more remarkably makes its speaker what has been a part of Berenice's body, and still longs to return there. This prepares strongly for the relation of people and parts of the body in c2, though without the degradation characteristic there. The close of *c* gives the central role to a person formally identified with his own penis (114, 115, resuming 94, 105). The man and his *mentula* (29.13) have appeared in *a*, but now he has been renamed and metamorphosed. The first poem on him, 94, plays on the apparent nonsense of the linguistic transformation (*'moechatur MENTVLA?'*). The last, 115, denies that he is a person at all (*non homo sed uero mentula magna minax*, 7). The basic, colloquial, form

---

[43] *P.Oxy.* 3725 and 4501–2 (i A.D.?) are in informal hands; they may have been private copies (P. J. Parsons, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* LXVI [London, 1999], 38–9). Sceptic poems do not attack classes (Cameron [n. 3], 15), but mock fictional individuals; the papyrus headings confirm: 'on an adulterer', haranguing the cuckold (with the opening πι]ϲτεύειϲ, cf. Cat. 15.1); 'on an old man marrying a girl' (cf. Cat. 17). Cf. L. Robert, 'Les épigrammes satiriques de Lucillius sur les athlètes. Parodie et réalités', in *L'Épigramme grecque*, Entr. Hardt 14 (Geneva, 1967), 179–295; W. Burnikel, *Untersuchungen zur Struktur des Witzepigramms bei Lukillios und Martial*, Palingenesia 15 (Wiesbaden, 1980); Hezel (n. 39), 39–48. Meleager and Philip probably eschewed such material. Antecedents include prose 'joke-books' of colourful insults (cf. *P.Heid.* 190 [iii B.C.]) and anecdotal joke-books, leading to the verse of Machon (iii B.C.). Note also the obscene mock-sepulchral epigram *SH* 975 (ostracon, ii B.C.). In Latin there had been Lucilius on Granius (411–12, 1180–2 Marx, Cic. *Brut.* 172). Contemporary material includes: books of witticisms, some with narrative (cf. Kaster on Suet. *G.R.* 21.4); Calvus' epigrams against Caesar (Suet. *Jul.* 73; cf. the *spoken* mot of Curio, *Jul.* 52.3, with C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* [Cambridge, 1993], 91–2); Cic. *QFr.* 2.3.2.

[44] This parodies the division of the body in unsophisticated desire (cf. Philod. *GP* XII = 12). Note also 13.14 (above); cf. *AP* 11.203, and Gogol's '*Nos*' ('The Nose'), where part of a body becomes a person.

was a staple of the joke-book ('you have not a face *or* head, but . . . ', *P.Heid.* 190, cols ii, iv, v). Catullus' version draws in Ennius and plays elaborately on reality and size.[45]

The first poem of *c2*, far from turning an animal into a person, like the first poem of *a* after the prologue, conjures up an animal from a person: the goat in Rufus' armpits, which reappears in 71. The basic connection probably appeared in abusive epigram; Lucill. *AP* 11.240 (cf. 239) goes near to implying that a foul-smelling woman is a goat. But Catullus has much more fun with the reality and independent existence of his goat.[46] Fears of the brute cannot be overcome *perluciduli deliciis lapidis* (69.4); the phrase glances at, and puts aside, a type of object which now seems to have been conspicuous in the more normal epigram of things: so Posidippus' λιθικά indicate.

Poem 97 seems to show Catullus enlarging possibilities from Greek epigram in treating the body-part as object for description. Nicarch. *AP* 11.241 (cf. *P.Oxy.* 3725, fr. 1, col. ii.9–13), 242, 415 offer the basic confusion of ill-smelling mouth and bottom (which is which?). A similar confusion—red face and bottom—appears in a joke-book (*P.Heid.* 190.75). Rhianus *HE* I reports a conversation with a personified beautiful bottom. For Catullus the smell is merely the starting-point; he develops a grotesque and hyperbolic picture of Aemilius' mouth, deploying the huge (*dentis sesquipedalis*, 5, see above), the rustic (dialect *ploxeni*, 6, cf. 7–8), and the animal (*mulae cunnus*, 8: the confusion of body-parts thus returns on a different level). Poem 39 has nothing like this.[47]

The mouth and what it contains are much the most important area of the body in *c2*. The connections are twofold: with sexual activity and with speech. As for the first, at 88.7–8 the sexual use of the mouth forms a comic extreme in the poem on Gellius' depravity: the poem ends with an act of figurative self-devouring.[48] 97 (above) ends with another mouth and a humiliating obscenity: any woman who touched him (the verb contrasts with what follows) could *aegroti culum lingere carnificis*. 97–9 and 78*b*-80 in fact make trios of poems where mouths perform amorous or sexual actions. (78*b* may be one poem with 78.) 80 portrays Gellius' *fellatio* with violent language and graphic detail. 79 is for once less explicit, and adopts the allusiveness of scoptic epigrams on its theme (friends avoid Lesbius' kiss); but the apparent restraint has

---

[45] Enn. fr. 620 Skutsch (authorship not attested). Antip. Thess. *GP* XCIX treats the unusual size of a penis. Personification of the penis is common, notably in contexts of impotence, e.g. Straton *A.P.* 12.216; J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London, 1982), 29–30.

[46] 8 *nec quicum bella puella cubet* recalls Hom. *Od.* 4.441–3 (the husband of Helen on smelly seals). J. Nicholson, 'Goats and gout in Catullus 71', *CW* 90 (1996/7), 254, rightly stresses the goat's rusticity.

[47] Cf. for the comparison to part of an animal Hor. *Epod.* 8.6, again with country connections (V. Grassmann, *Die erotischen Epoden des Horaz. Literarischer Hintergrund und sprachliche Tradition*, Zetemata 39 [Munich, 1966], 54–5). On *os* and *culus*, cf. also A. Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor* (New York and Oxford, 1992²), 27. Arist. *Gen. Anim.* 2.745a33–5 imagines vast teeth as a preposterous counter-factual.

[48] *uor-* is commonly so used in Catullus (cf. Adams [n. 45], 139–41, add 57.8); but this moment is like the climax of Erysicthon's eating at Ov. *Met.* 8.875–8, cf. Sen. Rh. *Contr.* 3.7. See also C. A. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity* (New York and Oxford, 1999), 198; on the monstrosity of paradoxical sexual actions, H. N. Parker, 'The teratogenic grid', in J. P. Hallett and M. B. Skinner (edd.), *Roman Sexualities* (Princeton, 1997), 47–65. Syndikus (n. 36), 3.67–8, understands the poem rightly in the main (following his daughter); but the interplay of mocking and grandiose condemnation in the poem does not disable its moral force. (On the text of line 6, cf. S. J. Harrison, 'Mythological incest', *CQ* 46 [1996], 581, n. 1.)

a special point in the poem which actually reveals a crucial secret, the family of Lesbia.[49]

Connections with speech are obvious in 108. If Cominius were killed, the parts of his body would be severally devoured by birds and animals (the person is dissolved into constituent things).[50] First (*primum*), and so most important, his tongue, *inimica bonorum | lingua* (3–4), would be cut out and given to vultures. Readers would probably identify him with the orator P. Cominius.[51] The condemnation *populi arbitrio* (1) suggests that all Rome detests what his tongue has said to harm the *boni*. In 98 the addressee, who could use that tongue of his *culos et crepidas lingere carpatinas* (4), is probably himself one of the *uerbosis . . . et fatuis* (2). At any rate, the poem connects uncontrolled language, obscenity, and rusticity. The poem is itself a retaliatory, and curt, act of speaking (*dici* 1, *dicitur* 2). The close draws on a twist probably derived from scoptic epigram (cf. Lucill. *AP* 11.148): even opening his mouth, without speaking, would have a fatal effect. Through *culos . . . lingere*, the poem is clearly linked to 97; 99 on kisses is linked to 97 too (cf. especially 9–10). The trio 97–9 flaunts the range of the theme of mouths.[52]

Speech is significant in the other oral trio. In 78*b*, *purae pura puellae | suauia comminxit spurca saliua tua* (1–2: *comminxit* metaphorically connects another part of the body). This sexual misuse of the mouth will be punished by speech. Thanks to this poem, *qui sis fama loquetur anus* (4); the half-personifying *anus* neatly inverts *puellae*, also at the end of the line. In *c*1 a similar phrase plays rather on a thing (68*b*.46 *facite haec carta loquatur anus*).[53] The idea of rumour appears again in 80, with a more colourful verb: *fama susurrat* (5) the sexual reason for Gellius' whitened lips. The play on speaking is heightened by the use of a metaphorical *clamant* (7, contrast *susurrat*); the subjects are body-parts: *ilia* and, with a further twist if sound, *labra* (*barba* Housman). The same play on *clamare* occurs with a non-human thing in 6.7, the bed (above). *c*1 has already prepared the relation of mouth and rumour, with its non-human door: the door has spoken (*diximus*), although its mistress thought it had no tongue (67.43–4).[54]

The emphasis on the mouth thus has links to the interests of the book in speech, as well as in sexual behaviour. Speech is a central concern of *c*2, not in form but in ideas. *c*1 has exploited the form of employing other speakers, derived from epigram on

[49] Epigrams: Antip. Thess. *GP* XCVIII, Nicarch. *AP* 11.220, 252; cf. also the spoken wit at Suet. *G.R.* 23.7.

[50] The division is more detailed than in Hor. *Epod.* 5.99–100, Ov. *Ib.* 169–72.

[51] *ORF*[4] nos. 143–4 (his oratorical brother is also possible). Cf. Neudling (n. 21), 48; G. V. Sumner, *The Orators in Cicero's* Brutus*: Prosopography and Chronology*, Phoenix Suppl. 11 (Toronto, 1973), 146.

[52] Interplay between different uses of mouth or tongue is familiar in Greek epigram: cf. e.g. Crates *HE* I, [Meleag.] *AP* 11.223, Adesp. *AP* 11.338. Cf. Cic. *Dom.* 25, and the very different interplay in L. Irigaray, 'Quand nos lèvres se parlent', *Ce sexe qui n'en est pas un* (Paris, 1977), 205–17, esp. 208–9. For Cat. 97–9, see P. J. Forsyth, 'Order and meaning in Catullus 97–9', *CW* 72 (1978–9), 403–8. On the meaning of 98.1–2, see Syndikus (n. 36), 3.97 (cf. 76.1–6, 96, 107.1–2; see also W. Fitzgerald, *Catullan Provocations: Lyric Poetry and the Drama of Position* [Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1995], 72–3). In line 4 presumably the rustic element at least is an importation into the proverbial phrase.

[53] The inversion in 78*b*.4 draws partly on the unattractiveness of old women, a theme prominent in scoptic epigram (it forms the first group in the scoptic part of *AP* 11; Nicarch. 11.238 [surprise] comes in *P.Oxy.* 4502). Cf. also Posid. *HE* XVII (contrast between the hetaera Doricha's death and Sappho's immortality).

[54] The Callimachean interest in impossible speakers (Hutchinson [n. 24], 71–2) is here made more physical.

objects (66 and 67); $c2$ renounces this dramatizing possibility, but pursues the consideration of speech from a more generalized perspective.[55] One aspect of this, which we have seen, is rumour and revelation. 67 has already established this as a book of secrets disclosed and scandal dispersed (even in 66, cf.13–25, 69–78). The very first poem in $c2$ invents a *mala fabula*. The second, 70, draws on the amatory Callim. *HE* XI = 25 to initiate a different aspect: the question of how words are related to thoughts. This is sustained particularly in regard to Lesbia (72.1–2; 83 [insults while husband is present]; 87 [truth of poem's own statement]; 92; 109 [her promise]). 109, the last poem on (the reader assumes) Lesbia, is ironically placed next to a poem about another woman's false promise (110), and a poem about a man who has misused his tongue in speech (108). 108 itself ironically comes in the middle of 107 and 109 (Lesbia's return).[56]

The last part of the book defends the narrator's utterance in $c2$: his own apparent betrayal of secrets, defamation of his beloved, and attacks on Gellius, probably with further ironies on speech (102, 104, 116).[57] The most comic and tragic poems in $c2$ relate to speech: 84 on Arrius, 101 on the brother's death. Both stand out from the book, though 101 had been much prepared in $c1$. In 101 sepulchral epigram, and the laments of $c1$, are powerfully reworked so that the emotional contact of address is combined with the futility of speaking to the dead. The dead person often speaks, and converses, in epitaphs (for example *P. Oxy.* 662, cols i–ii); here the person has, from an objective viewpoint, become a thing, *mutam . . . cinerem* (4, cf. 96.1 *mutis . . . sepulcris*). So speech is vain.[58]

Catullus, then, exploits the connection of Greek epigram with objects very differently in $a$, $c1$, and $c2$. $a$ is more distant in form from ordinary Greek epigram; but in using Greek epigram it pursues with avidity the importance of things. This suits the colourfulness and range of the book. $c2$, which follows the form of Greek epigram more than $a$ or $c1$, gives a far smaller place to types of Greek epigram which relate intrinsically to material objects; for the most part, its interest in objects is slight. This suits the relative sombreness and restriction of its poetic world. But it greatly develops an interest, prepared by $c1$, in a particular sort of object, parts of the body. In doing so it is partly taking up leads from Greek sceptic and related epigram; but its use of objects seems much more remote from that of Greek epigram as a whole. The structure of $c$, the highlighting of Callimachus, the role of love epigram in $c2$, and the parallelism with $a$, all keep us aware of that larger epigrammatic tradition. So Catullus' version of Greek epigram, within his book of elegiac poetry, is perceived as highly

[55] 65–6 present an elaborate *mise en abyme*: both the Lock and Callimachus are other speakers. On 66 and 67, see C. W. Macleod, 'The artistry of Catullus 67', *Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1983), 192.

[56] Other reasons for suspecting the 'happy ending' of 107 and 109: Holzberg (n. 2), 189–91.

[57] 102 looks back particularly to 100, where the narrator tells of his friend Caelius' affair, and at least indirectly defends that poem; but at the same time it looks back to 67.35–6, which revealed the secrets of Cornelius (not a real friend in the narrator's eyes). For this approach to Cornelius, see M. J. Edwards, 'The secret of Catullus 102', *Hermes* 118 (1990), 382–4. 104 particularly looks back to, and conflicts with, 92 (*male dicere, amarem* 104.1, 3; *dicit . . . male, amat, amo* 92.1, 2, 4); but now the abuse is the abuse in the poems. The irony of 104 is more complex than that in 102, and intimates the lover's confusion or caprice; the deluded 107 ensues.

[58] Cf. Th. Gelzer, 'Bermerkungen zu Catull c. 101', *MH* 49 (1992), 29; Fitzgerald (n. 52), 187–9. The pentameter 101.4 subverts the hexameter. Of interest for the poem is Posid. viii.35–8: Nicanor was in a different part of the world when Myrtis was buried by her brothers. There is a sense of story in the Catullus too, but the reader of the poem is kept without explanation: address absorbs the speaker.

distinctive. The treatment of objects is closely related to the particular thematic pre-occupations of $c2$; these include larger and more generalized concerns than is usually supposed.

If $c2$ emerges with a more definite cohesion, so too does $c$ as a whole. Effective connections and contrasts create a book that is both unified and strongly opposed in its two parts; this opposition itself displays Catullus' artistic range across a genre. Contrasts with $a$ further hold up for view the inventiveness and diversity of the writer in these two substantial creations. The epigrams are not something of an anomaly in Catullus' work: $c2$ is an integral part of bigger structures and oppositions, and itself exhibits the poet's characteristically extensive and arresting strategies.

*Exeter College, Oxford*                          G. O. HUTCHINSON
gregory.hutchinson@exeter.ox.ac.uk