The Classical Quarterly 66.1 180–204 © The Classical Association (2016)
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000070

CATALEPTON 9 AND HELLENISTIC POETRY

The dating of *Catalepton* 9 has been the central issue of scholarship on that poem.[1] The more particular questions of the poem's authorship, the identity of the addressee, and its chronological relation to other texts, both depend on and contribute to ascertaining the date of composition. The clearest exposition of the problem remains that by Richmond.[2] Evidence provided by *Catalepton* 9 falls into two categories: literary and historical. Literary evidence encompasses two kinds of data: various formal features of the text and intertextual links with other poetry. While the poem's metre, language and style suggest a relatively early date of composition (before the *Eclogues*), the close textual parallels with the *Eclogues*, interpreted as borrowings from rather than sources of Virgil's poetry, point in the opposite direction. Historical indications are likewise ambivalent. On the one hand, it seems likely that the addressee is M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus (*cos*. 31 B.C.) and, further, that the occasion of composition is his (only) triumph in 27 B.C. (*Catalepton* 9.3 *uictor adest, magni magnum decus ecce triumphi*). On the other hand, the allusions to his military achievements (4–5, 41–54) are both too vague and exaggerated, and, if taken literally, do not fit well our Messalla at any particular point of his career (nor any other known member of the family). Richmond, following Birt and followed by Schoonhoven,[3] believed that at least some of the historical references are 'intended to be prophetic'.[4] More recently, Peirano has attempted to explain this lack of precision by arguing that *Catalepton* 9 is not a real-life panegyric but a later biographical fiction, the real focus of which 'is to be found […] in the relationship that the poem constructs between Virgil and his patron'.[5]

While the problem of dating is certainly of crucial importance, it is inevitably tied up with that of the poem's literary evaluation and interpretation. For one thing, scholars are more inclined to view a text as derivative, and accordingly to date it later, if it appears poetically second-rate.[6] In this paper I propose to explore a particular literary aspect of

[1] Another major issue is, of course, the poem's text, which is uncertain at some crucial places. *Catalepton* 9 is in need of a modern textual and literary commentary. R.E.H. Westendorp Boerma, *P. Vergili Maronis libellus qui inscribitur Catalepton* (Assen, 1949–63), 2.1–27 is the best available option, but should be used along with T. Birt, *Jugendverse und Heimatpoesie Vergils: Erklärung des Catalepton* (Leipzig, 1910), 89–114 and P. Jahn, *Catalepton IX* (Mantova, 1930). I use G.P. Goold's text from his revision of H.R. Fairclough, *Virgil: Aeneid VII–XII; Appendix Vergiliana* (Cambridge, MA, 2000), 490–6; textual problems are only discussed when necessary.

[2] J. Richmond, 'Catalepton 9', *MPhL* 3 (1978), 189–201.

[3] Birt (n. 1), 95; H. Schoonhoven, 'The "Panegyricus Messallae": date and relation with Catalepton 9', *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983), 1681–707, at 1703.

[4] Richmond (n. 2), 198.

[5] I. Peirano, *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake: Latin Pseudepigrapha in Context* (Cambridge, 2012), 126.

[6] Cf. I. Peirano, 'Authenticity as an aesthetic value: ancient and modern reflections', in I. Sluiter and R.M. Rosen (edd.), *Aesthetic Value in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden, 2012), 215–42, esp. 218: 'the refutation of the authenticity of texts or parts thereof has often gone hand in hand with aesthetic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Catalepton 9, largely neglected in previous research: the poem's engagement with Hellenistic poetry. Apart from demonstrating the poet's familiarity with a number of Hellenistic authors, I shall argue that the use of Greek models in *Catalepton* 9 implements a specific poetological programme. Then, building up from the new reading of *Catalepton* 9, I shall offer some thoughts on the poem's date of composition.

Two preliminary notes of methodological nature should be made. Firstly, my approach will be inclusive rather than rigorously selective. Some parallels will be less convincing than others. In discussing potential intertexts of *Catalepton* 9, my aim will be not so much to prove direct connection in every individual case as to show that different cases of possible allusion to Hellenistic texts share certain formal features and poetological implications. Secondly, in several cases Hellenistic intertexts will have 'rival' intertexts in Latin poetry. Rather than asking whether the actual model of a particular passage of *Catalepton* 9 is to be found in the Hellenistic or the Latin parallel, my discussion will principally focus on points of contact with the Greek context.

Before turning to individual contexts, a few words on *Catalepton* 9 as a whole. Perhaps its most characteristic feature is that it praises Messalla both as a victorious general and, somewhat unexpectedly, as a poet.[7] The poem's entire structure is organized around this opposition. The text can be divided into five thematic blocks:[8] (1) The first (1–12) invokes the Muses, then introduces Messalla as both a man of arms and a man of arts, and finally states the problem: which side of Messalla's personality should he, the poet, write about? (2) The next passage (13–22) describes Messalla's poetry in greater detail: it turns out that he wrote bucolics in Greek. (3) The third (23–38) focusses on a central theme of Messalla's poetry: Messalla's girlfriend, who is favourably compared with a long list of mythological beauties. (4) The fourth block (39–54) switches to Messalla's military career. (5) The conclusion (55–64) answers the problem stated at the

condemnation: spurious texts are often labelled as artistically and technically inferior, and conversely texts or parts thereof that are considered aesthetically inferior are more easily believed to be spurious.' 'Authentic' is to an extent interchangeable with 'original' and 'early', while 'spurious' with 'derivative' and 'late'.

[7] The encomiastic / epinician rhetoric of *Catalepton* 9 is itself a Hellenistic trait. As is argued by R. Papke, '*Panegyricus Messallae* und *Catalepton* 9: Form und gegenseitiger Bezug', in P. Kraft and H.J. Tschiedel (edd.), *Concentus hexachordus: Beiträge zum 10. Symposion der bayerischen Hochschullehrer für Klassische Philologie in Eichstätt (24.–25. Februar 1984)* (Regensburg, 1986), 123–68, at 134–45, the opposition between Messalla's activities as a poet and his activities as a warrior follows the structure of the βασιλικὸς λόγος with its division between πράξεις κατ' εἰρήνην and πράξεις κατὰ πόλεμον. An interesting parallel for the double role of Messalla is found in a third-century B.C. epigram that praises Ptolemy Philopator as τὸν ἄριστον | ἐν δορὶ καὶ Μούσαις κοίρανον (*SH* 979.6–7: cf. *Cat.* 9.8 *maximus*); on the epigram, see D.L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1981), 465. The topos of deliberation (*Cat.* 9.9–10 *hoc itaque insuetis iactor magis, optime, curis, | quid de te possim scribere, quidue tibi*) is paralleled in Theocritus' encomium for Ptolemy Philadelphus (17.11–12 τί πρῶτον καταλέξω; ἐπεὶ πάρα μυρία εἰπεῖν | οἷσι θεοὶ τὸν ἄριστον [cf. *optime*] ἐτίμησαν βασιλήων). The opening exhortation to the Muses (*Cat.* 9.1–3 *pauca mihi, niueo sed non incognita Phoebo, | pauca mihi, doctae, dicite, Pegasides. | uictor adest* …) evokes Berenice's request to celebrate her (and her ancestors') equestrian victories at the beginning of an epigram by Posidippus (78.1–3 Austin-Bastianini εἴπατε, πάντες ἀοιδοί, ἐμὸν κλέος, […] | γνωστὰ λέγειν, ὅτι μοι δόξ[α …] | ἅρματι μὲν γάρ μοι προπάτωρ Πτολεμαῖος ἐνίκα). Finally, the idea of a victory *terra marique* (*Cat.* 9.4 *uictor, qua terrae quaque patent maria*) finds a parallel in an epigram, probably from the fifth century B.C., on a victory over the Persians by land and sea (*Anth. Pal.* 7.296.4 ἔργον ἐν ἠπείρῳ καὶ κατὰ πόντον ἅμα, though the wording is perhaps more reminiscent of *Anth. Pal.* 6.182.4 ἴδρι τὰ καὶ γαίης, ἴδρι τὰ καὶ πελάγευς).

[8] Cf. Birt (n. 1), 97–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

beginning: the poet of *Catalepton* 9 will translate (or imitate) Messalla's poems rather than praise his military achievements. I suggest that the most natural way to read *Catalepton* 9 is as an introductory piece to translations from Messalla's Greek poetry, analogous to Catullus 65 that prefaces the Latin version of Callimachus' *Coma Berenices*.

I. HOMER

Before we proceed to Hellenistic authors, a Homeric intertext can be briefly discussed. At *Catalepton* 9.25–38 the poet produces a catalogue of famous women from Greek mythology and Roman history, who are said to be surpassed in fame by Messalla's beloved. Atalanta (25–6), Helen (27) and Hippodamia (29–32) are famous for having attracted many suitors. Cassiopea (28) is apparently relevant because she boasted to be more beautiful than the Nereids (cf. 24 *altera non fama dixerit esse prior*). Lucretia (35–8), with whom the list concludes, is the only Roman figure: through her the topic of Messalla's military exploits is subtly introduced. In the penultimate position Semele and Danae are mentioned as Zeus's lovers (33–4): *regia non Semele, non Inachis Acrisione, | immiti expertae fulmine et imbre Iouem*. As is noted by Jahn, the hexameter ultimately goes back to two Homeric lines, *Il*. 14.319 οὐδ' ὅτε περ Δανάης καλλισφύρου Ἀκρισιώνης and 323 οὐδ' ὅτε περ Σεμέλης, οὐδ' Ἀλκμήνης ἐνὶ Θήβῃ.[9] What Jahn does not note is that the entire Homeric context (*Il*. 14.315–28) is highly relevant: like *Catalepton* 9.25–38, it is a list—a list of Zeus's lovers, mortal women as well as goddesses, whom he claims to have never desired as much as he now desires Hera. The allusion works on two levels. First, the joint mention of Semele and Danae produces a kind of *pars pro toto*: the reader will remember that Homer's list also included Dia, Europa and Alcmena, as well as Demeter, Leto and Hera herself.[10] Secondly, the poet of *Catalepton* 9 creates a reference to the archetypal model of all such catalogues. We may also point out a formal detail: both Semele's name and Danae's patronymic occupy in *Catalepton* 9 the same metrical position as in Homer. As we shall see, this kind of attention to the metrical structure of a model verse is highly characteristic of *Catalepton* 9.

II. THEOCRITUS, *ID*. 8

Messalla's Greek bucolics would have been the most relevant intertext, had they survived.[11] As it stands, we may attempt to trace in *Catalepton* 9 the presence of

[9] Jahn (n. 1), 26. The patronymic Ἀκρισιώνη is attested in Homer only once, and it does not reappear in poetry till Nonnus (*Dion*. 30.270), except in a fragment of Euphorion (*SH* 418.42 ὃν Διὶ χρυσ[είῳ …]αιη τέκεν Ἀκρισιώνη)—which may conceivably be among the models of *Catalepton* 9 (cf. Διὶ χρυσείῳ and *imbre Iouem*: a detail absent in Homer).

[10] Moreover, the patronymic *Inachis* more naturally evokes Inachus' daughter Io than Danae, who is several generations distant (note also that the only Greek context, till Nonnus [*Dion*. 31.40, 48.4], is Moschus, *Europa* 44 Ἰναχὶς Ἰώ): the reader is thus tempted to think of yet one more of Zeus's lovers.

[11] J.D. Reed, 'Continuity and change in Greek bucolic between Theocritus and Virgil', in M. Fantuzzi and T. Papanghelis (edd.), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral* (Leiden, 2006), 209–34, at 209 n. 1 mentions but rejects the possibility that some of Messalla's bucolics survive in the Theocritean corpus.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Theocritus,[12] who arguably appears in person as *Trinacriae doctus … iuuenis* (20).[13] Our task, however, will be complicated by the existence of intertextual links with Virgil and Messalla: quite real in the former case and hypothetical in the latter.

Catalepton 9 presents two shepherds, apparently characters from Messalla's poetry, engaged in an 'amoebean' contest[14] (17–22):

> molliter hic uiridi patulae sub tegmine quercus
> Moeris pastores et Meliboeus erant,
> dulcia iactantes alterno carmina uersu,
> qualia Trinacriae doctus amat iuuenis.
> certatim ornabant omnes heroida diui,
> certatim diuae munere quoque suo.

It is remarkable that the shepherds' names, Moeris and Meliboeus, do not occur in the Theocritean corpus (nor, in fact, in any surviving Greek poetry from B.C.), but they appear in Virgil's *Eclogues*.[15] Unless Messalla's Greek poetry is discarded as either fiction or a misreading of *Catalepton* 9,[16] it seems an attractive possibility that both our poem and Virgil have derived these names from Messalla.[17] I suggest the same may be true of perhaps the most conspicuous textual correspondence between *Catalepton* 9 and Virgil: *Catalepton* 9.17 *patulae sub tegmine quercus* and *Ecl*. 1.1 *patulae … sub tegmine fagi* (cf. *G*. 4.566). It has long been recognized that Virgil's choice of *fagus* is likely to allude to its Greek paronym φηγός (and Theoc. *Id*. 12.8 σκιερὴν δ'

[12] It seems largely irrelevant whether *Idyll* 8 is genuinely Theocritean. Virgil knew it, possibly assuming it to be a work by Theocritus, though cf. H. Bernsdorff, 'The idea of bucolic in the imitators of Theocritus, 3rd–1st century BC', in Fantuzzi and Papanghelis (n. 11), 167–207, at 168–9 n. 9. For all our present purposes, therefore, it can be taken as Theocritean.

[13] Westendorp Boerma (n. 1), 17 takes the *iuuenis* to be Theocritus. But Birt (n. 1), 102 may be right: 'Der trinakrische Jüngling ist schwerlich Theokrit, sondern der Sgl. steht kollektiv: „Lieder, wie sie die sizilischen jungen Leute lieben".' Westendorp Boerma objects that *doctus* is not a suitable epithet for a shepherd. As Jahn (n. 1), 23 pointed out, however, *doctus* can be paralleled with Theoc. 8.3–4 ἄμφω ἀνάβω, | ἄμφω συρίσδεν δεδαημένω, ἄμφω ἀείδεν. In fact, the two interpretations do not have to be mutually exclusive, especially in view of the tendency to read Theocritean poetry biographically; cf. M. Fantuzzi, 'Theocritus' constructive interpreters, and the creation of a bucolic reader', in Fantuzzi and Papanghelis (n. 11), 235–62, at 253–5. *Trinacriae doctus … iuuenis* could thus mean 'Theocritus in the disguise of a Sicilian shepherd'.

[14] Though not stated explicitly, the competitive character of their song exchange is hinted at by *certatim* at 21 and 22.

[15] Cf. Jahn (n. 1), 10–11 and 23; M. Lipka, *Language in Vergil's Eclogues* (Berlin, 2001), 187–8.

[16] K. Büchner, *P. Vergilius Maro: der Dichter der Römer* (Stuttgart, 1956), 58 takes 9.14 *lingua … Cecropia* to describe the style of Messalla's Latin poetry. Westendorp Boerma (n. 1), 15 is right to reject this reading. It has also been argued that Messalla can hardly have written bucolics in the Attic dialect, instead of the Doric used by Theocritus: G.O. Hutchinson, *Greek to Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality* (Oxford, 2013), 144–5; cf. Peirano (n. 5), 128–9. But we have fragments of a narrative bucolic poem written in the epic dialect: see H. Bernsdorff, *Das Fragmentum Bucolicum Vindobonense (P. Vindob. Rainer 29801): Einleitung, Text und Kommentar* (Göttingen, 1999), 24–5. And 'Cecropian' ('old Athenian') may include, or even specifically imply, the language of Homer, who was thought an Athenian by a number of ancient scholars: see F. Pontani, '*Ex Homero grammatica*', in S. Matthaios, F. Montanari and A. Rengakos (edd.), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar: Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts* (Berlin, 2011), 87–103, at 91–2.

[17] It is obviously impossible to determine the relative chronology of Messalla's and Virgil's bucolic poems in a direct way. It cannot be excluded that the chronological order is Virgil — Messalla — *Catalepton* 9. But, as will be argued later, *Catalepton* 9 may be roughly contemporary with the *Eclogues*; and it also seems reasonable to place the composition of 'Cecropian poems' during or shortly after Messalla's study at Athens in 45–44 B.C.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ὑπὸ φηγόν is often suggested as the actual model).[18] But it is not generally noted that *quercus* at *Catalepton* 9.17 may likewise be a translation of φηγός (rather than just a random substitute for Virgil's *fagus*). Whatever their relative chronology, both the poet of *Catalepton* 9 and Virgil seem to have had in mind—in addition to the Latin predecessor—a specific Greek context featuring φηγός, either Theoc. *Id*. 12.8 or perhaps its imitation by Messalla.[19] In other words, the later of the two Latin contexts could be described as a 'window' allusion, through the earlier context, to their common Greek model.

An analogous relationship can arguably be postulated between the references to 'amoebean' singing in *Catalepton* 9, Virgil's *Eclogues* and Theocritus. There is only one such reference in the Theocritean corpus that is terminologically explicit[20] (*Id*. 8.30–2, 61–2):

> πρᾶτος δ' ὧν ἄειδε λαχὼν ἰυκτὰ Μενάλκας,
> εἶτα δ' ἀμοιβαίαν ὑπελάμβανε Δάφνις ἀοιδάν
> βουκολικάν· οὕτω δὲ Μενάλκας ἄρξατο πρᾶτος.
> …
> ταῦτα μὲν ὧν δι' ἀμοιβαίων οἱ παῖδες ἄεισαν,
> τὰν πυμάταν δ' ᾠδὰν οὕτως ἐξῆρχε Μενάλκας.

This context is justly recognized as the source of *Ecl*. 7.18–19 *alternis igitur contendere uersibus ambo | coepere, alternos Musae meminisse uolebant*.[21] In turn, the Virgilian passage is often seen as an intertext of *Catalepton* 9.19 *dulcia iactantes alterno carmina uersu*. Again, whatever the actual relation between the two Latin contexts, *Catalepton* 9 is likely to have a direct connection with Theoc. *Id*. 8 too.[22] Indeed, the combination of bucolic motifs and elegiac metre that we encounter in *Catalepton* 9 finds a parallel in Theoc. *Id*. 8, which is the only poem in the Theocritean corpus that has a section written in elegiac distichs. If, as I am suggesting, *Catalepton* 9 was originally intended as an introductory piece to translations of Messalla's bucolics, Theoc. *Id*. 8 would have provided a precedent of a kind for combining, within a single collection, elegiacs (the metre of *Catalepton* 9) with pure hexameters (presumably the metre of Messalla's bucolics). Moreover, in Theoc. *Id*. 8 it is precisely this elegiac section (33–60), which consists of quatrains sung in turn by two shepherds, that is introduced as ἀμοιβαίαν … ἀοιδάν and then summed up with δι' ἀμοιβαίων … ἄεισαν. I tentatively suggest that *Catalepton* 9.19 *iactantes alterno carmina uersu* may be meant as a pun, for, out of context, the line can also be taken to refer, not to alternate songs, but to elegiac songs.[23] Although in Greek ἀμοιβαῖος does not seem to be used of elegy, the fact remains: in Theoc. *Id*. 8 ἀμοιβαία ἀοιδά refers to alternate songs in elegiac metre.[24]

[18] In the same way as Verg. *G*. 3.172 *faginus axis* is intended to evoke *Il*. 5.838 φήγινος ἄξων. See J.J. O'Hara, *Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor, 1996), 63 and 243–4; cf. more recently F. Cairns, 'Virgil's lime-wood yoke (*Georgics* 1.173–4)', *CQ* 63 (2013), 434–8, at 435.

[19] Cf. T. Frank, 'Il nono *Catalepton* dell'*Appendix Vergiliana*', *RFIC* 59 (1931), 1–11, at 6; D. Gall, *Zur Technik von Anspielung und Zitat in der römischen Dichtung: Vergil, Gallus und die Ciris* (Munich, 1999), 63 n. 54.

[20] Cf. Bernsdorff (n. 12), 180 n. 60.

[21] As well as of 3.58–9 *incipe, Damoeta; tu deinde sequere, Menalca. | alternis dicetis; amant alterna Camenae*.

[22] Though, of course, it should be borne in mind that a similar context may have existed in Messalla's bucolics.

[23] For *alternus* used of elegiac metre, see *OLD* s.v. 1c. Though Ovid seems to be the earliest author to use it in this sense.

[24] Note the use of aorist in Theoc. 8.61 ταῦτα μὲν ὧν δι' ἀμοιβαίων οἱ παῖδες ἄεισαν: it is only the elegiac part that is over, but the song exchange continues in hexameters, till 81 ὣς οἱ παῖδες ἄεισαν (the same aorist).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

My next suggestion is even more tentative. Near the end of the singing contest one of the shepherds[25] reveals his ideal (Theoc. *Id*. 8.53–6):

> μή μοι γᾶν Πέλοπος, μή μοι Κροίσεια τάλαντα
> εἴη ἔχειν, μηδὲ πρόσθε θέειν ἀνέμων·
> ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τᾷ πέτρᾳ τᾷδ' ἄσομαι ἀγκὰς ἔχων τυ,
> σύννομα μῆλ' ἐσορῶν Σικελικάν τ' ἐς ἅλα.

He wants no riches or supernatural abilities; what he wants is to be with his beloved and sing a bucolic song. In a comparable way, at the end of *Catalepton* 9 the poet formulates his programme (55–6, 59–64):

> non nostrum est tantas, non, inquam, attingere laudes;
> quin ausim hoc etiam dicere: uix hominum est.
> …
> nos ea quae tecum finxerunt carmina diui,
> Cynthius et Musae, Bacchus et Aglaie,
> si laudi aspirare humili, si adire Cyrenas,
> si patrio Graios carmine adire sales
> possumus, optatis plus iam procedimus ipsis.
> hoc satis est: pingui nil mihi cum populo.

He will not write an epic about Messalla's enormous military exploits, which is beyond the power of men; he will be content with merely translating Messalla's bucolics. Apart from the formal structural similarities, which are admittedly trivial, I would emphasize that both the Theocritean shepherd and the author of *Catalepton* 9 aspire, in effect, to be bucolic poets. Yet the real import of this allusion, if allusion it is, would seem to lie elsewhere: not so much on the level of content as on that of expression. To start with, there is a formal point of contact between two pentameters—σύννομα μῆλ' ἐσορῶν Σικελικάν τ' ἐς ἅλα (8.56) and *si patrio Graios carmine adire sales* (9.62)—as both end with the same word.[26] In both cases the object referred to by this word is a source of attraction for the speaker (ἐσορῶν, *adire*). In both cases the noun is defined by a 'geographical' epithet (Σικελικάν, *Graios*). In both cases it is used not in its etymological sense, 'salt', but figuratively: ἅλα means 'sea', *sales* apparently means 'witticisms, jokes'.[27]

In fact, however, the meaning of the Latin line requires closer attention. The poet of *Catalepton* 9 is evidently expressing his hope to be able to reproduce the wit of Messalla's Greek poetry in Latin. This reading is supported by an earlier context that speaks of Messalla's poetry as *cum lingua tum sale Cecropia* (14): 'Attic in both language and wit'. Yet there is room for ambiguity, for the immediate context rather appears to suggest a (quasi-)geographical interpretation. It would seem natural, after *adire Cyrenas* in the preceding line (61), to see in *Graios … adire sales* likewise a geographical metaphor: while 'to come close to Cyrene' means 'to reach the standard of Callimachean poetry', 'to come close to the Greek sea' would mean 'to reach the

[25] Whether the speaker is Daphnis or Menalcas, has been disputed: see e.g. H. White, 'On the structure of Theocritus' idyll VIII', *MPhL* 4 (1981), 181–90.

[26] Priscian, for example, explicitly states that *sal* is derived from ἅλς (*GL* 2.32.19–2.33.1 Keil): [the letter S] *saepe pro aspiratione ponitur in his dictionibus, quas a Graecis sumpsimus, ut semis, sex, septem, se, sal: nam* ἥμισυ, ἕξ, ἑπτά, ἑ, ἅλς *apud illos aspirationem habent in principio*.

[27] I shall later discuss the implications of this context for *Catalepton* 9 in greater detail.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

standard of Greek poetry'.[28] The literal reading of *adire* at 62 as 'to come close to' is further supported by the use of the same verb, in the same form and at the same metrical position, in an unequivocally geographical context only ten lines earlier (52): *aurea nunc rapidi flumina adire Tagi* (note that it too speaks of a body of water). The Theocritean intertext would also favour understanding *Graios sales* as 'Greek sea'.[29] This ambiguity may be intended, I suggest, as an example of the wit the line, on one interpretation, is speaking about. And finally, there is arguably a third way of reading the line, as a pointer to the intertextual bilingual pun: *patrio Graios carmine adire sales* could be taken to mean 'to come close to the word *salt* in Greek (ἅλς)', and this is—assuming the Theocritean intertext is there—precisely what we see happen. In other words, the poet of *Catalepton* 9 thus demonstrates, quite literally, his ability to come close to *Graios sales* (found at Theoc. *Id*. 8.56), which is all he hopes for (9.63): *optatis plus iam procedimus ipsis*.

A detailed discussion of the last parallel organized around the connection of *sales* with ἅλα, however uncertain it may be, was important for two reasons. First, as we shall see, the practice of placing a Latin word at the same metrical position as its etymologically related counterpart in the Greek model is typical of *Catalepton* 9[30] and has certain poetological implications. Secondly, the ideal of transplanting Greek wit to the Roman soil, both proclaimed and, on my reading, exemplified by *Catalepton* 9.62, is of crucial significance for the entire poem; later we shall return to it too.

III. CALLIMACHUS

The other Hellenistic poet most obviously present in the background of *Catalepton* 9 is Callimachus.[31] As already noted, he is likely to be implied by the mention of Cyrene at 61. Likewise, the concluding statement (64 *pingui nil mihi cum populo*) has often been seen as a declaration of Callimachean elitism. Callimachus, *Epigr*. 28.4 (*Anth. Pal.* 12.43.4) σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια and Catullus 95.9–10 *parua mei mihi sint cordi monumenta ... | at populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho* are generally adduced as the most relevant intertexts (the latter in turn going back to Callim. fr. 398 Pfeiffer Λύδη καὶ παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν).[32] The Catullan context also voices another Callimachean idea important for *Catalepton* 9: the preference of quality over quantity. The poet of *Catalepton* 9 only asks the Muses for a few lines (1–2 *pauca mihi … dicite, Pegasides*); he is happy to have only a few of Messalla's poems translated in his collection (13 *pauca tua in nostras uenerunt carmina chartas*) and does not want to write

[28] This would no doubt be anticlimactic; moreover, Cyrene stands for Callimachus by metonymy, whereas 'the Greek sea' for 'Greek poetry' would be a metaphor.

[29] Note for comparison that Val. Fl. 3.422 *sale purpureo* alludes to *Il*. 16.391 ἅλα πορφυρέην: cf. R.J. Edgeworth, '"Off-color" allusions in Roman poetry', *Glotta* 65 (1987), 134–7.

[30] This technique is, of course, by no means unique to *Catalepton* 9; a good example is Tib. 1.8.10 *saepeque mutatas disposuisse comas* alluding to Callim. *Lav. Pall*. 22 πολλάκι τὰν αὐτὰν δὶς μετέθηκε κόμαν: see S.J. Heyworth, 'Looking into the river: literary history and interpretation in Callimachus, *Hymns* 5 and 6', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (edd.), *Callimachus II* (Groningen, 2002), 139–60, at 145–6.

[31] Note A. Cameron, *Callimachus and His Critics* (Princeton, 1995), 479–80.

[32] O.L. Richmond, *Sexti Properti quae supersunt opera* (Cambridge, 1928), 82; Westendorp Boerma (n. 1), 27.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

about the many merits of the Messallae family (39 *multa … praemia*). This poetic ideal of brevity will repeatedly resurface in our discussion.

As suggested earlier, *Catalepton* 9 may have been originally an introductory piece to translations from Messalla's bucolics, just as Catullus 65 prefaces the translation of Callimachus' *Coma Berenices*.[33] There is, in fact, at least one close textual parallel between the two 'introductions': *Catalepton* 9.7 *uestros* [*sc*. the Muses'] *expromere cantus* is in all probability modelled on Catull. 65.3 *Musarum expromere fetus*. More to the point, the hexameter of the preceding couplet (9.5 *horrida barbaricae portans insignia pugnae*) is a variation on a line from the *Coma Berenices* itself (66.13 *dulcia nocturnae portans uestigia rixae*).[34] Unfortunately the Greek original of the Catullan line is lost, but it seems intrinsically likely that the poet of *Catalepton* 9 would have been familiar with it.[35] First of all, it should be pointed out that *Catalepton* 9.5 is not merely an inert *imitatio cum variatione* of the Catullan line, but takes into account its wider context. The transfer of the notion of the 'marks of fight' (*uestigia rixae, insignia pugnae*) from an erotic to a military context reflects the parallelism implied in Catullus (and presumably Callimachus): fresh from his victory in bed, Ptolemy III is headed for military victories in the east (66.12 *uastatum fines iuerat Assyrios*). But there may be a more specific point of contact with Callimachus. It has been speculated that the word translated by Catullus as *rixa* was ἀεθλοσύνη (on the ground of Agathias, *Anth. Pal.* 5.294.17–18 τὸ φίλημα | σύμβολον ἐννυχίης εἶχον ἀεθλοσύνης).[36] Yet ἀεθλοσύνη is arguably too mild a term, and in Agathias it refers to a contest for a girl, not with a girl. In Callimachus, if Catullus' translation is to be trusted, it is a violent fight which left visible marks on the king's body (the idea is more closely paralleled by Hedylus, *Anth. Pal.* 5.199.6 σκυλμῶν τῶν τότε μαρτύρια).[37] I tentatively propose a different word, πυγμή: σύμβολα πυγμῆς, 'a (victory?) token of the fight',[38] would closely parallel both Catullus' *uestigia rixae* and, especially, *insignia pugnae* of *Catalepton* 9. The term *pugna* is usually understood at *Catalepton* 9.5 as 'fight, combat' in general, but it seems likely that its more specific etymological sense of 'boxing',[39] which is also the standard meaning of πυγμή, is alluded to as well. The reason behind the comparison of Messalla with Oeneus' offspring and Eryx (6 *magnus ut Oenides, utque superbus Eryx*), as well as the identity of the former, have been a matter of dispute.[40] But

[33] Cf. G.O. Hutchinson, 'The Catullan corpus, Greek epigram and the poetry of objects', *CQ* 53 (2003), 206–21, at 212, suggesting that Catullus 65 introduces the entire elegiac sequence; cf. further M.B. Skinner, *Catullus in Verona: A Reading of the Elegiac Libellus, Poems 65–116* (Columbus, 2003), xxvi; B.W. Breed, 'Maximum orality: Catullus 65 and Propertius 2.13', *MD* 70 (2013), 37–62, at 38.

[34] In turn, Silius draws on *Catalepton* 9 when he speaks (5.78–9) of a *Coruinus, Phoebea sedet cui cassside fulua | ostentans ales proauitae insignia pugnae*.

[35] In a comparable way, it has been argued, the wider context of Verg. *Aen*. 4.460 *inuitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi*, a line modelled on Catull. 66.39 *inuita, o regina, tuo de uertice cessi*, takes account of Catullus' Greek original: cf. e.g. J.D. Reed, 'Another Greek pun in the *Aeneid*', *Mnemosyne* 61 (2008), 300–2.

[36] See A. Harder, *Callimachus,* Aetia*: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford, 2012), 2.807–9.

[37] Harder (n. 36), 2.808.

[38] Cf. Callim. fr. 54i.7 (Harder) νίκης σύμβολον Ἰσθμιάδος (of the celery wreath), with Harder's comment ([n. 36], 2.478): 'Expressions with σύμβολον apparently were popular with Callimachus.' Note that the fragment comes from the *Victoria Berenices*.

[39] That is, *pugna a pugno*: cf. R. Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds, 1991), 507, s.v. *pugna*.

[40] On the former point, see Westendorp Boerma (n. 1), 13. Oenides is usually assumed to be Diomedes; but Richmond (n. 2), 195 and Peirano (n. 5), 131 argue for Meleager.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Eryx is best known as an outstanding boxer, and Schoonhoven seems right in suggesting that the other is Tydeus (rather than Diomedes or Meleager), who is said by Apollodorus to have won the boxing at the first Nemean games (3.66 ἐνίκησεν … πυγμῇ Τυδεύς).[41] The point of comparison between Messalla on the one hand and Tydeus and Eryx on the other would thus be quite precise: he is not just generally as great as the two heroes, but he resembles them at their moment of victory in a boxing match (5 *portans insignia pugnae*).

While the direct engagement of *Catalepton* 9.5 with the Greek original of Catull. 66.13 remains a conjecture, another textual parallel with the *Aetia* is more palpable. *Catalepton* 9.15–16 praises Messalla's poems as

> carmina, quae Phrygium, saeclis accepta futuris,
> carmina, quae Pylium uincere digna senem.

It is usually assumed that the point of comparison between Messalla's poetry and Nestor is longevity.[42] Yet a Callimachean intertext suggests the implication may be different; love, says Callimachus, makes people more eloquent, not longer-lived, than Nestor (fr. 80.20–1):[43]

> ἔνδειξας καὶ Κύπριν ὅτι ῥητῆρας ἐκείνου
> τεύχει τοῦ Πυλίου κρέσσονας οὐκ ὀλίγον.

Messalla's poetry too was inspired by love (*Catalepton* 9.23 *felicem ante alias o te scriptore puellam*). A formal point of contact should be stressed: both passages refer to Nestor with the same antonomasia (note also that *Pylium* and Πυλίου are placed in the same metrical position). Callimachus' fragment is the earliest extant text to use this antonomasia for Nestor.[44] Although it is not uncommon in Latin poetry, its origin in Callimachus is likely to be remembered.[45] The wider context of the passage, the story of Phrygius and Pieria, is also relevant. As Harder points out, 'Pieria's name may be related to the birthplace of the Muses in Hes. […] Thus Pieria, whose achievement surpasses that of Nestor […], may remind the reader of the qualities of Hesiod's poetry.'[46] The superiority of Pieria's brief request over Nestor's many long speeches[47] is clearly consonant with Callimachus' preference of quality over quantity—an ideal also important for *Catalepton* 9. Like Pieria's few words, Messalla's few poems (13 *pauca tua in nostras uenerunt carmina chartas*) are worth more than all the speeches of Nestor.

Why, then, does *Catalepton* 9 emphasize Nestor's age (*senem*: a motif absent in Callimachus) and the durability of Messalla's poetry (*saeclis accepta futuris*)? The 'Pylian old man', I suggest, is to be contrasted with the 'Sicilian young man',

[41] Schoonhoven (n. 3), 1705. This tradition may conceivably originate from Antimachus' *Thebaid* (note fr. 6 Τύδης τ' Οἰνείδης); in Statius, Tydeus wins the wrestling (*Theb*. 6.826–910).

[42] Westendorp Boerma (n. 1), 15. The 'Pylian old man' is no doubt Nestor. The reading *Phrygium* at 15 is textually uncertain; even if it is correct, the identity of this 'Phrygian' is far from obvious. It can perhaps be argued that *Phrygium* is not an antonomasia, but alludes to King Phrygius of the *aition*. But since the reading is uncertain, I only discuss the significance of Nestor.

[43] Text from Harder (n. 36), 1.257.

[44] Harder (n. 36), 2.690 and G. Massimilla, *Callimaco, Aitia: libro terzo e quarto* (Pisa, 2010), 408 mention no earlier examples.

[45] Especially if we assume for *Catalepton* 9 a relatively early date of composition.

[46] Harder (n. 36), 2.690.

[47] Cf. Harder (n. 36), 2.689.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Theocritus (20 *qualia Trinacriae doctus amat iuuenis*). It is Theocritus' poems, rather than Nestor's speeches, that establish a model for Messalla's poetic production. This opposition of youth and old age finds a telling parallel in the *Aetia* prologue, where Callimachus reports the Telchines' reproach (fr. 1.5–6): ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἐλίσσω | παῖς ἄτε, τῶν δ' ἐτέων ἡ δεκὰς οὐκ ὀλίγη. As Harder comments: 'The childlike or youthful poet is a positive contrast to the Telchines' demand of adulthood and Callimachus shows how, in spite of old age, he is able to preserve and renew his youthful qualities.'[48] Paradoxically, the poet's youthfulness goes hand in hand with the longevity of his poetry (fr. 7.14 ἵνα μοι πουλὺ μένωσιν ἔτος: the similarity of diction with fr. 1.6 τῶν δ' ἐτέων ἡ δεκὰς οὐκ ὀλίγη seems deliberate). *Catalepton* 9 employs the same paradox: Messalla's youthful poetry surpasses Nestor's senile eloquence and thus secures lasting fame.

IV. ANTIPATER OF SIDON, *ANTH. PAL.* 7.713

The Callimachean preference of quality over quantity finds a notable expression in an epigram by Antipater of Sidon on the poetess Erinna (*Anth. Pal.* 7.713):

παυροεπὴς Ἤριννα καὶ οὐ πολύμυθος ἀοιδαῖς,
ἀλλ' ἔλαχεν Μούσας τοῦτο τὸ βαιὸν ἔπος.
τοιγάρτοι μνήμης οὐκ ἤμβροτεν οὐδὲ μελαίνης
Νυκτὸς ὑπὸ σκιερῇ κωλύεται πτέρυγι,
αἱ δ' ἀναρίθμητοι νεαρῶν σωρηδὸν ἀοιδῶν
μυριάδες λήθῃ, ξεῖνε, μαραινόμεθα.
λωίτερος κύκνου μικρὸς θρόος ἠὲ κολοιῶν
κρωγμὸς ἐν εἰαριναῖς κιδνάμενος νεφέλαις.

This epigram is perhaps best known as the model of a programmatic statement in Lucretius (4.180–2 = 909–11):[49]

suauidicis potius quam multis uersibus edam;
paruus ut est cycni melior canor, ille gruum quam
clamor in aetheriis dispersus nubibus austri.

Commentators usually draw attention to the closeness of Lucretius' imitation of the epigram's final couplet in the second and third lines of the quoted passage.[50] But its first line too has points of contact with the first line of the epigram. The compound adjective *suauidicus*, unattested elsewhere, parallels in a way παυροεπής, which likewise does not occur again till Nonnus (*Dion*. 19.103); *multis uersibus* corresponds to πολύμυθος ἀοιδαῖς (which looks forward to ἀναρίθμητοι ἀοιδῶν μυριάδες). Lucretius' allusion to the epigram indicates that it was known in Rome in the first century B.C.

Antipater's epigram seems also to be present in the intertextual background of *Catalepton* 9, even if less conspicuously than in Lucretius'. The epigram's opening couplet finds a neat parallel in 1–2 *pauca mihi, niueo sed non incognita Phoebo,* | *pauca mihi, doctae, dicite, Pegasides*. As we can see, the epigram and *Catalepton* 9

[48] Harder (n. 36), 2.28.
[49] See esp. H. Donohue, *The Song of Swan: Lucretius and the Influence of Callimachus* (Lanham, 1993), 1–34.
[50] See e.g. Donohue (n. 49), 30.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

share the same combination of two concepts: that a poem's shortness can be outweighed by its poetic excellence (παυροεπής … ἀλλ<ά>, *pauca … sed*) and that the latter depends on divine inspiration (ἀλλ' ἔλαχεν Μούσας τοῦτο τὸ βαιὸν ἔπος,[51] *sed non incognita Phoebo* and *dicite, Pegasides*).[52] Of course, both concepts can be traced back to the prologue of Callimachus' *Aetia*, but their combination within a singe elegiac couplet as well as the formal similarity of expression (note the adversative ἀλλά and *sed*) place Antipater's epigram and *Catalepton* 9 together in opposition to Callimachus. As is often the case with epigrams, our epigram is not entirely original. It borrows the former concept from a similar epigram by Asclepiades (*Anth. Pal.* 7.11.1–3): ὁ γλυκὺς Ἠρίννης οὗτος πόνος, οὐχὶ πολὺς μέν … ἀλλ' ἑτέρων πολλῶν δυνατώτερος. Both concepts are employed in an anonymous epigram on the same subject, which also, however, prominently features the metaphor of honeycomb, alien to Antipater as well as *Catalepton* 9 (*Anth. Pal.* 9.190.1–2): Λέσβιον Ἠρίννης τόδε κηρίον· εἰ δέ τι μικρόν, | ἀλλ' ὅλον ἐκ Μουσέων κιρνάμενον μέλιτι.[53] On the Latin side, the closest parallel is provided by the opening of Virgil's tenth eclogue, which is no doubt directly related to *Catalepton* 9.1–2 (*Eclogues* 10.2–3): *pauca meo Gallo, sed quae legat ipsa Lycoris, | carmina sunt dicenda; neget quis carmina Gallo?* Yet again, although Virgil does voice the idea that quality is more essential than quantity (*pauca … sed*), Lycoris' approval takes the place of divine inspiration as the criterion of poetic excellence.[54]

Rather than arguing that *Catalepton* 9 alludes solely to Antipater to the exclusion of other related epigrams, I would admit the possibility that, of the five epigrams on Erinna preserved in the *Greek Anthology* (*Anth. Pal.* 7.11 [Asclepiades], 7.12 [anonymous], 7.13 [Leonidas], 7.713 [Antipater], 9.190 [anonymous]), more than just one may have influenced *Catalepton* 9. It seems reasonable to view these five epigrams, if only hypothetically, as in a sense a single unit.[55] With this admission, I would speculate that *Catalepton* 9.7–8 *nec minus idcirco uestros expromere cantus | maximus, et sanctos dignus inire choros* may have been inspired by *Anth. Pal.* 7.12.5–6 σὸς δ' ἐπέων, Ἤριννα, καλὸς πόνος οὔ σε γεγωνεῖ | φθίσθαι, ἔχειν δὲ χοροὺς ἄμμιγα Πιερίσιν.[56]

[51] On the line's grammar, cf. A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1965), 2.80: 'The translators take ἔπος to be the subject of the verb and Μούσας (acc. plur.) to be its object. We suppose Erinna to be the subject, ἔπος to be object, and Μούσας to be gen. sing., possibly possessive (*the Muse's brief epic*) but more probably ablative on the analogy of τυγχάνειν and δέχομαί τί τινος (*received it from the Muse*).' Just as Erinna was given her βαιὸν ἔπος (which glosses παυροεπής) by one of the Muses, so the poet of *Catalepton* 9 asks them for *pauca*.

[52] Moreover, by placing *pauca* in the same initial position as **παυρο**επής (not just at the beginning of a line, but of the whole poem), the poet of *Catalepton* 9 may have intended to stress their etymological connection. Note for comparison that Verg. *Ecl.* 4.31 ***pauca*** *tamen suberunt priscae uestigia fraudis* is translated in the *Oratio Constantini* as **παῦρα** δ' ὅμως ἴχνη προτέρας περιλείπεται ἄτης.

[53] The pentameter is clearly related to that of Antipater's epigram (*Anth. Pal.* 7.713.2 ἀλλ' ἔλαχεν Μούσας τοῦτο τὸ βαιὸν ἔπος), but their relative chronology is uncertain. Though suggesting no specific date for *Anth. Pal.* 9.190, Page (n. 7), 343 considers it 'competently phrased in Alexandrian style'.

[54] Even though, as Virgil's model in Gallus demonstrates, the two are related (fr. 145.6–7 Hollis): *tandem fecerunt carmina Musae | quae possem domina deicere digna mea*.

[55] Note that three of the five are transmitted together; it is not unlikely that, at some point of their textual history at least, the remaining two may have been part of the same sequence.

[56] Page (n. 7), 346: 'The epigram is beautifully phrased, and may confidently be assigned to an Hellenistic author of the period 250–150 B.C.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

To start with a formal observation, the grammatically equivalent phrases *inire choros* and ἔχειν δὲ χορούς are placed in metrically similar positions: at the end of either the second or the first half of a pentameter. More essentially, both elegiac couplets speak of a poet's admittance to the choir of the Muses.[57] Considering their wider contexts, we may further point out that in both cases this statement is made in opposition to some other fact: Messalla is a great warrior but also a great poet, worthy of the company of the Muses; Erinna may have died, but she continues to live in the company of the Muses.

V. ASCLEPIADES, *ANTH. PAL.* 9.63

Antipater's epigram we dealt with in the preceding section is thought to have been intended, or at least imagined, as a preface to Erinna's *Distaff*.[58] Let us now consider another piece of the same kind, an epigram by Asclepiades on Antimachus' *Lyde* (*Anth. Pal.* 9.63 [= XXXII Sens]):[59]

> Λυδὴ καὶ γένος εἰμὶ καὶ οὔνομα· τῶν δ' ἀπὸ Κόδρου
> σεμνοτέρη πασῶν εἰμι δι' Ἀντίμαχον.
> τίς γὰρ ἔμ' οὐκ ἤεισε; τίς οὐκ ἀνελέξατο Λύδην,
> τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου;

To begin with, we may note two possible allusions to this epigram in Latin poetry that attest to its circulation in Rome in the first century B.C. First, there is a fragment of an epigram by Ticida on Valerius Cato's *Lydia* (fr. 103 Hollis): *Lydia doctorum maxima cura liber*. The line seems to be punning on two meanings of *Lydia*: a girl's name and a book's title (especially if *cura* already means here 'beloved' as in later poetry).[60] In Asclepiades' epigram ΛΥΔΗ (Λυδή / Λύδη) is similarly first an ethnonym, then a proper name, and finally a book's title. The appositive *liber* neatly parallels the appositive γράμμα. Both the *Lydia* and the *Lyde* have their readership (*doctorum maxima cura*, τίς οὐκ ἀνελέξατο Λύδην;). Cairns even speculates that '*Lydia* could […] have been the title of a translation by Valerius Cato of Antimachus' *Lyde*'[61] (rather than of an entirely original work).[62] Second, an ode by Horace has a girl boast (3.9.7–8): *multi Lydia nominis | Romana uigui clarior Ilia*. This (Lydian) Lydia, more illustrious than the Roman Ilia, has been argued likewise to be modelled on Antimachus' Lyde, who

[57] It has caused some disagreement whether the Latin context refers to the Muses' or the poets' choir, but Westendorp Boerma (n. 1), 13 is probably right that the two can hardly be strictly distinguished. Yet the adjective (*sanctos*) rather suggests the former possibility; cf. Hes. *Sc.* 201 ἐν δ' ἦν ἀθανάτων ἱερὸς χορός.

[58] Cf. e.g. Gow and Page (n. 51), 2.80: 'The first couplet […] suggests that the epigram was intended to stand at the head of her chief poem.'

[59] *Pace* Gow and Page (n. 51), 2.138, 'possibly to be inscribed at the head of the poem'.

[60] Cf. A.S. Hollis, *Fragments of Latin Poetry c.60 BC–AD 20* (Oxford, 2007), 163: 'Here […] the scholars are represented as lovers of the girl after whom the poem is called.' Cf. further F. Cairns, *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist* (Cambridge, 2006), 116.

[61] Cairns (n. 60), 116 n. 44.

[62] Cf. also R. Cowan, 'Valerius Cato, Callimachus and the very large girl (Ticida fr. 103 *FRP*)', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XVI* (Brussels, 2012), 94–100, who argues that Ticida's fragment echoes Callimachus' critique of Antimachus' *Lyde*—which, of course, has many points of contact with Asclepiades' praise of that poem.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is τῶν δ' ἀπὸ Κόδρου | σεμνοτέρη πασῶν:[63] although Lydian, more dignified than the noblest Athenian women.[64]

Again, it is a specific combination of two motifs that exclusively links Asclepiades' epigram to a passage of *Catalepton* 9 (23–4): *felicem ante alias o te scriptore puellam:* | *altera non fama dixerit esse prior*. This passage is usually compared with Propertius 3.2.15–16 *fortunata meo si qua es celebrata libello:* | *carmina erunt formae tot monumenta tuae*. Indeed, both Latin contexts express the same idea that the poet makes his beloved famous by writing about her (*te scriptore* and *meo … celebrata libello*; cf. δι' Ἀντίμαχον). But whereas Propertius speaks in absolute terms, *Catalepton* 9 introduces comparison: Messalla's beloved is more famous than many celebrated women of the past,[65] just as Lyde is τῶν δ' ἀπὸ Κόδρου | σεμνοτέρη πασῶν.[66] A further point of contact between Asclepiades' epigram and *Catalepton* 9 is the notion of the joint authorship by the poet and the Muses: τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου and 9.59–60 *quae tecum finxerunt carmina diui,* | *Cynthius et Musae* …. One more possible link between *Catalepton* 9 and Antimachus will be suggested in the following section.

VI. HERMESIANAX, FR. 3 (LIGHTFOOT)

Most passages of *Catalepton* 9 we have discussed so far come from those parts of the poem that are more or less directly concerned with poetry. It is therefore hardly surprising that most intertexts suggested so far have poetological implications. Now we turn to the section of *Catalepton* 9 that speaks of Messalla's military exploits; but as we shall see, on the intertextual level it likewise contributes to shaping Messalla's character as a poet. A kind of Odysseus figure, Messalla leaves Rome and undergoes all manner of hardships on his military campaigns[67] (43–6):

> castra foro, te castra urbi praeponere, castra
> tam procul hoc gnato, tam procul hac patria?
> immoderata pati iam frigora iamque calores?
> sternere uel dura posse super silice?

Yet, while vaguely Odyssean associations are certainly there in this passage, I suggest that also a specific intertext is alluded to which opens a rather unexpected perspective. This intertext is the section of Hermesianax's *Leontion* narrating of Homer (fr. 3.29–32):

[63] On the meaning of σεμνοτέρη, see A. Sens, *Asclepiades of Samos: Epigrams and Fragments* (Oxford, 2011), 216–17.

[64] Cf. recently F. Klein, 'Une réponse ovidienne à Asclépiade? Hypothèse d'une allusion à l'épigramme sur la *Lydé* d'Antimaque (*AP* IX, 63) dans le *certamen* de Pallas et Arachné (*Met.* VI)', *Dictynna* 7 (2010), with further references.

[65] Prop. 2.34.87–8 *haec quoque lasciui cantarunt scripta Catulli,* | *Lesbia quis ipsa notior est Helena* involves comparison, but only with one other woman (Helen).

[66] As Sens (n. 63), 214 points out, it is probable that 'Antimachus' own poem compared Lyde with other, better-born Greeks' in a more detailed fashion, which would provide a fuller parallel for the catalogue of heroines in *Catalepton* 9. It may also not be irrelevant to note that a fragment, possibly from Antimachus' *Deltoi* (*SSH* 79A), speaks of Lyde as ἀθ]ανάταισιν ἴσην: see Cameron (n. 31), 303–4.

[67] The text of line 43 is uncertain; cf. below.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

λεπτὴν ἣς Ἰθάκην ἐνετείνατο θεῖος Ὅμηρος
ᾠδῆσιν πινυτῆς εἵνεκα Πηνελόπης·
ἣν διὰ πολλὰ παθὼν ὀλίγην ἐσενάσσατο νῆσον,
πολλὸν ἀπ' εὐρείης λειπόμενος πατρίδος.

To start with a formal observation, both Homer and Messalla are said to have left their fatherland far behind: πολλὸν ἀπ' εὐρείης λειπόμενος πατρίδος and *tam procul hoc gnato, tam procul hac patria* (note that both contexts place the word 'fatherland', πατρίδος or *patria*, in the same position at the end of a pentameter). This may not be a very specific parallel, but it is further corroborated by the emphatic contrast between their previous and their current places of residence. Homer leaves his wide home-country, Asia Minor (εὐρείης … πατρίδος), for the tiny island, Ithaca (λεπτὴν … Ἰθάκην, ὀλίγην … νῆσον);[68] Messalla leaves the city and forum for military camps (*castra foro, te castra urbi praeponere*). Both contexts refer to their heroes' suffering: ἣν διὰ πολλὰ παθών and *immoderata pati* … (note, again, that both place a form of the verb 'to suffer', παθών or *pati*,[69] in the same metrical position). Behind these similarities lurks the fact that Hermesianax's Homer, too, is modelled on Odysseus.[70] Homer, it turns out, 'wrote the *Odyssey* as a fictional analogue to his own migration from Asia Minor to Ithaka and his own love for Penelope: he created the fictional Odysseus in his own likeness'; in this way Hermesianax creatively misrepresents Homer as 'a crypto-love poet'.[71] By alluding to Hermesianax, I suggest, the poet of *Catalepton* 9 accomplishes a similar goal: while on the surface presenting Messalla as an Odysseus figure, implicitly he indicates that the driving force behind his military exploits is nothing other than love. Messalla's military career proves subordinate to his love poetry.[72]

This implication is apparently further asserted by the allusion to another part of the same fragment that treats Antimachus and his love for Lyde (Hermesianax, fr. 3.41–2): Λυδῆς δ' Ἀντίμαχος Λυδηίδος ἐκ μὲν ἔρωτος | πληγεὶς Πακτωλοῦ ῥεῦμ' ἐπέβη ποταμοῦ. Just as Antimachus is said here to have 'come near the stream of the river Pactolus', so Messalla, only a few lines after the previous passage, is envisioned to 'come near the stream of the rapid Tagus' (*Catalepton* 9.51–2): *nunc celeris Afros, peri-urae milia gentis,* | *aurea nunc rapidi flumina adire Tagi* (note the syntactical similarity of the second hemistichs of the pentameters). What in the Greek passage is stated explicitly—Antimachus did it for love of Lyde—is to be inferred, I suggest, for the Latin context as well. Apparently the concept of *militia amoris* is thus hinted at. But why is the Pactolus replaced with the Tagus? While the former lies far to the east and the latter far to the west, the two rivers share a prominent feature: both of them were famous for their gold-bearing sands. Unlike the Latin (*aurea … flumina*), the Greek context does not explicitly mention this feature, but it is referred to in what apparently was Hermesianax's model, a fragment of Antimachus' *Lyde* (fr. 93 Matthews Πακτωλοῦ χρυσέοισιν ἐπ' ἀνδήροισι θάασσον).[73] As argued earlier, *Catalepton* 9.52 *aurea*

[68] Cf. C.L. Caspers, 'The loves of the poets: allusions in Hermesianax fr. 7 Powell', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit and G.C. Wakker (edd.), *Beyond the Canon* (Leuven, 2006), 21–42, at 24.
[69] Maltby (n. 39), 456, s.v. *patior*.
[70] Caspers (n. 68), 23–5.
[71] Caspers (n. 68), 24.
[72] On the importance of Hermesianax's fragment for shaping the tradition of Latin love elegy, cf. J. Farrell, 'Calling out the Greeks: dynamics of the elegiac canon', in B.K. Gold (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Love Elegy* (Chichester, 2012), 8–24, at 14–17.
[73] On the ascription of this fragment to Antimachus, see V.J. Matthews, *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary* (Leiden, 1996), 258.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nunc rapidi flumina adire Tagi may be intentionally phrased so as to parallel, and thus suggest an alternative reading for, 62 *si patrio Graios carmine adire sales*. But it also seems likely that, in return, line 62 can shed some light on line 52: the replacement of one gold-bearing river with another—the Pactolus flowing at the edge of the Greek-speaking world, the Tagus at the (opposite) edge of the Latin-speaking world—can be seen precisely as a case of the adaptation of Greek poetry to the Roman soil line 62 speaks about.

VII. POSIDIPPUS' *SPHRAGIS*

Our final and in certain ways most crucial Hellenistic intertext is Posidippus' so-called *Seal* elegy (118 Austin-Bastianini) that apparently either introduced or concluded a collection of Posidippus' epigrams.[74] This *sphragis* opens with an invocation of the Muses, who are to help Posidippus in composing poetry (1–8). Then it turns to Apollo, who is asked for an oracle to secure the poet's fame (9–18). And it concludes with a wish for a blessed journey to the underworld after a long and fruitful life (19–28). The clearest points of contact with *Catalepton* 9 are found in the first section of the *sphragis* (1–8):[75]

εἴ τι καλόν, Μοῦσαι πολιήτιδες, ἢ παρὰ Φοίβου
χρυσολύρεω καθαροῖς οὔασιν ἐκλύετε
Παρνησοῦ νιφόεντος ἀνὰ πτύχας ἢ παρ' Ὀλύμπῳ
Βάκχῳ τὰς τριετεῖς ἀρχόμεναι θυμέλας,
νῦν δὲ Ποσειδίππῳ στυγερὸν συναείρατε[76] γῆρας
γραψάμεναι δέλτων ἐν χρυσέαις σελίσιν.
λιμπάνετε σκοπιὰς Ἑλικωνίδας, εἰς δὲ τὰ Θήβης
τείχεα Πιπλείης βαίνετε, Κασταλίδες.

These first four distichs of Posidippus' poem are summed up, as it were, in the opening couplet of *Catalepton* 9 (1–2):

pauca mihi, niueo sed non incognita Phoebo,
pauca mihi, doctae, dicite, Pegasides.

As usual, we may start with formal details. Both passages have their first lines end with a form of Apollo's alias Phoebus; both have their last lines end with formally analogous addresses to the Muses: βαίνετε, Κασταλίδες[77] and *dicite, Pegasides*. Similarly, though this is more likely to be a coincidence, the etymologically cognate adjectives νιφόεντος and *niueo* are placed in the same metrical position.[78] It seems further relevant that both poems refer to Apollo for a second time by his rarer epithet 'Cynthian' (9 καὶ σὺ

[74] See recently B.M. Gauly, 'Poseidipp und das Gedichtbuch: Überlegungen zur Sphragis und zum Mailänder Papyrus', *ZPE* 151 (2005), 33–47.

[75] The text, preserved on a wax tablet, is uncertain at many crucial places. I follow the edition of C. Austin and G. Bastianini, *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia* (Milan, 2002), 148.

[76] The tablet's text is συναείσαδε. Diels's συναείσατε seems more attractive than συναείρατε printed by Austin and Bastianini.

[77] The Muses' epithet (Κασταλίδες) is restored conjecturally; but the wording is closely paralleled in βαίνετε, Κρηνιάδες (113.15 A.-B.). Cf. further ἀγναί, βαίνετε, θυγατέρες (116.8 A.-B.), which has the same syntactical pattern as *doctae, dicite, Pegasides* (epithet — imperative — vocative).

[78] In *Catalepton* 9 *niueo* means 'snow-white', whereas in Posidippus νιφόεντος is literally 'snowy'. A few lines later, however, Posidippus repeats the adjective in the sense 'snow-white' (12 νιφόεντ<α>).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ποσείδιππόν ποτ' ἐφίλαο, Κύνθιε, 59–60 *quae tecum finxerunt carmina diui,* | *Cynthius et Musae, Bacchus et Aglaie*), and also that both mention Bacchus in connection with poetry. Even more to the point, τι καλόν (παρὰ Φοίβου) can be compared with *pauca* (*sed non incognita Phoebo*): both expressions, referring to poetic utterance, emphasize the importance of quality over quantity. And here we come to the most crucial poetological concept that is present in both Posidippus' *sphragis* and, I would argue, *Catalepton* 9: the process of composition can be visualized not just as some form of collaboration of the poet with the Muses (or other deities) but more specifically as a chain of poetic transmission in which the Muses only play the role of intermediaries. This idea is quite explicit in Posidippus: the Muses are to write in the poet's tablets what they have heard from Apollo. Indeed, in order to do so, they are to come down from Helicon to Posidippus' home town. The same scenario, I suggest, is hinted at in *Catalepton* 9 through the somewhat cryptic litotes *non incognita Phoebo*: what the Muses are to tell the poet is far from unknown to Apollo precisely because it is his *ipsissima verba*.

Is it important that in Posidippus the Muses act as mere intermediaries between Apollo and the poet? One particular intertext seems crucial for understanding the poetic programme of the *sphragis*: the so-called proem of Theognis' elegiac collection (lines 1–18). Commentators usually note that the very first words of the book, with which Theognis addresses Apollo (1 ὦ ἄνα Λητοῦς υἱέ), reappear in Posidippus (14 ὦ ἄνα, 9–10 Λητοῦς | υἵ' ἐκάεργε),[79] but do not pursue the connection further. The invocation of the Muses and the Graces concluding the proem, I suggest, may be especially relevant for Posidippus' *sphragis* (15–18):

> Μοῦσαι καὶ Χάριτες, κοῦραι Διός, αἵ ποτε Κάδμου
> ἐς γάμον ἐλθοῦσαι καλὸν ἀείσατ' ἔπος,
> "ὅττι καλόν, φίλον ἐστί· τὸ δ' οὐ καλὸν οὐ φίλον ἐστί,"
> τοῦτ' ἔπος ἀθανάτων ἦλθε διὰ στομάτων.

It has been a matter of dispute why Posidippus invites the Muses to Thebes as well as what city is actually meant (7–8): λιμπάνετε σκοπιὰς Ἑλικωνίδας, εἰς δὲ τὰ Θήβης | τείχεα Πιπλείης βαίνετε, Κασταλίδες.[80] Whatever the place alluded to as 'Piplean Thebes' (if indeed Πιπλείης is the correct reading), the reference is evidently intended to evoke the circumstances of the Theognidean context: the wedding of Cadmus and Harmonia in Thebes. Just as the Muses came to Cadmus' wedding (Κάδμου | ἐς γάμον) and sang for him, so apparently Posidippus asks them to visit him (εἰς δὲ τὰ Θήβης | τείχεα) and write poems in his tablets.

For our purposes, Theognis' invocation is remarkable for containing a line authored by the Muses (and Graces); it is against this line, as we shall see, that the opening of the *sphragis* resonates (1): εἴ τι καλόν, Μοῦσαι …. The line is a version of a proverb, also known from other texts, but its original sense is not immediately clear.[81] In the

[79] H. Lloyd-Jones, 'The Seal of Posidippus', *JHS* 83 (1963), 75–99, at 87. What he does not note is that the enjambement is paralleled in Ap. Rhod. *Argon*. 2.213–14 χάριν νύ τοι, ὦ ἄνα Λητοῦς | υἱέ, καὶ ἀργαλέοισιν ἀνάπτομαι ἐν καμάτοισιν (spoken by Phineus); note also the similarity in sound between **υἱέ, καὶ ἀργα**λέοισιν and υἵ' ἐκάεργε). It can perhaps be speculated that Apollonius' Phineus (2.188 βάκτρῳ σκηπτόμενος ῥικνοῖς ποσίν) is a parody of Posidippus' self-portrayal in the *sphragis* (24 ἀσκίπων ἐν ποσσί).

[80] See Lloyd-Jones (n. 79), 85–7; Gauly (n. 74), 39.

[81] Cf. P. Giannini, 'Il proemio, il sigillo e il libro di Teognide: alcune osservazioni', in R. Pretagostini (ed.), *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica: Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili* (Rome, 1993), 1.377–91, at 388.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Theognidean context, however, it takes on a somewhat self-referential ring: the saying about beautiful things is itself defined as beautiful (καλὸν ἀείσατ' ἔπος). It is therefore tempting to read it, whether or not this meaning was intended, as a poetological maxim: the Muses like (φίλον ἐστί) what is beautiful (ὅττι καλόν) and do not like what is not (τὸ δ' οὐ καλὸν οὐ φίλον ἐστί).[82] Theognis too quotes this line because it is beautiful itself (καλὸν … ἔπος). In a similar way, Simonides introduces a line from Homer (*Il.* 6.146) by stating that it is the most beautiful of his sayings (fr. 8.1): ἓν δὲ τὸ κάλλιστον Χῖος ἔειπεν ἀνήρ.[83] Against this background, we can see first why Posidippus asks the Muses to repeat to him, specifically, beautiful things they have heard from Apollo: only what is beautiful is worth repeating. Yet on the implicit level, the point is that in the very act of asking the Muses to write down for him their, or rather Apollo's, divine words Posidippus is actually doing what he is asking for: τι καλόν is a quotation from the Muses' *ipsissima verba* as reported by Theognis (note that Posidippus repeats the phrase in the same metrical position). And the deeper import is this: Posidippus can only know the Muses' words because of his knowledge of poetic tradition, in particular of Theognis. In other words, the Muses who are intermediaries between Apollo and the poet can be understood as a metaphor for poetic tradition, the medium by which the poet has access to the transcendent source of all poetry.[84]

It is difficult to decide if the poet of *Catalepton* 9 recognized Posidippus' allusion to Theognis,[85] but whether he did or not, he seems to have understood, and developed, its programmatic implication. We have already seen that the opening couplet of *Catalepton* 9 introduces the notion, derived from Posidippus' *sphragis*, of poetic composition as a chain of transmission from Apollo through the Muses to the poet. Messalla evidently has an analogous relationship with the gods of poetry: he gives voice to the Muses' songs (7 *uestros expromere cantus*) and, more generally, shares the authorship of his poems with Apollo, Bacchus, the Muses and one of the Graces (59–60 *quae tecum finxerunt carmina diui, | Cynthius et Musae, Bacchus et Aglaie*). It seems a natural inference, though perhaps not indisputable, that these gods assisted Messalla in different roles: some composing poems for him, others merely transmitting them. What is even more crucial is that the relationship between Messalla and the poet of *Catalepton* 9, too, follows the same pattern: our poet puts some of Messalla's poems in his own collection (13 *pauca tua in nostras uenerunt carmina chartas*; cf. 6 γραψάμεναι δέλτων ἐν χρυσέαις σελίσιν) and in general he aspires to imitate what Messalla wrote in co-authorship with the gods (59 *nos ea quae tecum finxerunt carmina diui*). While at the opening of *Catalepton* 9 the Muses are given the role of intermediaries between the poet and Apollo, at the conclusion it is already Messalla who stands between the poet and the gods. This parallelism is, I believe, programmatically important. On the surface level, Messalla is thus assimilated to the Muses; but on a deeper level, it is poetic

[82] Cf. Giannini (n. 81), 388; cf. further G. Nagy, 'Theognis and Megara: a poet's vision of his city', in T.J. Figueira and G. Nagy (edd.), *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis* (Baltimore, 1985), 22–81, at 28.

[83] Cf. A.L. Ford, 'The seal of Theognis: the politics of authorship in Archaic Greece', in Figueira and Nagy (n. 82), 82–95, at 86.

[84] Cf. Ford (n. 83), 84, who similarly interprets the use of the proverb in Theognis as a statement of the traditional nature of poetry.

[85] We may wonder if the presence of one of the Graces among Messalla's divine co-authors (60 *Cynthius et Musae, Bacchus et Aglaie*: if *Aglaie* is the correct reading) is a pointer to Theognis 15 Μοῦσαι καὶ Χάριτες.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tradition, more specifically Greek poetic tradition, that is conceptualized as the Muses' non-mythological counterpart.

VIII. THE POETIC PROGRAMME OF *CATALEPTON* 9: A SUMMARY

The introductory character of *Catalepton* 9—if indeed it was originally written as a preface to translations from Messalla's Greek bucolics—makes it a particularly suitable place for the poet to express his views on poetry. Several of its intertexts that we have discussed are likewise introductory poems (or something similar). The closest parallel is Catullus 65, which introduces a translation from Callimachus. Antipater's epigram on Erinna (*Anth. Pal.* 7.713) and Asclepiades' on Antimachus (*Anth. Pal.* 9.63) are written as prefaces, though possibly fictional, to editions of the *Distaff* and the *Lyde* respectively. Finally, Posidippus' *sphragis* is likely to have either introduced or concluded a collection of epigrams. These four intertexts make programmatic statements about the poems they accompany. *Catalepton* 9 differs in that its poetological ideas are applicable not only to the translations from Messalla but also to the poem itself. It does not only state poetic principles, but also puts them into practice.

The Callimachean insistence on the paucity of poetic output, so prominent in *Catalepton* 9, is only a negative principle. It is supplemented with a positive one: the value of a poem is guaranteed not by its length but by its divine provenance. The involvement of the Muses in the process of composition is, of course, not a new idea. It is already present in Homer (*Il.* 1.1 μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά; *Od.* 1.1 ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα). Yet the character of this involvement can be conceived of in different ways. Basically two scenarios are possible: joint authorship by the Muses and the poet, or borrowing of the Muses' words by the poet (though the two are not always strictly distinguished).[86] Among the relevant intertexts, the former concept is employed in Asclepiades' epigram on the *Lyde* (*Anth. Pal.* 9.63.4 τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου), whereas Antipater's epigram on Erinna seems to imply the latter (*Anth. Pal.* 7.713.2 ἀλλ' ἔλαχεν Μούσας τοῦτο τὸ βαιὸν ἔπος: if Erinna is the subject of ἔλαχεν). In Posidippus' *sphragis*, too, the Muses write down verses for the poet (6 γραψάμεναι δέλτων ἐν χρυσέαις σελίσιν), though the language of joint composition is also used (if at 5 συναείσατε rather than συναείρατε is read). Furthermore, it is Apollo rather than the Muses who is presented as the ultimate source of Posidippus' poetry. The idea that the poet's divine co-authors, or rather ghostwriters, are involved in the process of composition in different roles—Apollo producing poems, the Muses forwarding them to the poet—appears unique to Posidippus. I have argued that *Catalepton* 9 adopts this Posidippean concept—though, of course, the language of our elegy is far from explicit and consistent.

While, as we have seen, in Posidippus the Muses' role as intermediaries between the ultimate source of poetry and the poet is attributed, on the abstract level, to poetic tradition, for the author of *Catalepton* 9 it is specifically Greek poetic tradition—of which Messalla is a representative—that performs the Muses' function. But what does this declaration mean in practice? Most generally, it means that, as has been argued throughout this paper, *Catalepton* 9 is engaged in an intricate dialogue with Greek poetry. The

[86] For a collection of examples, see G. Lieberg, 'Les Muses dans le papyrus attribué à Gallus', *Latomus* 46 (1987), 527–44, at 529 n. 10.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

author's generic consciousness can be noted: like *Catalepton* 9 itself, most of its intertexts are in elegiac metre.[87] As we have seen, *Catalepton* 9 derives from its Greek models a number of poetological ideas. Yet this intertextual dialogue takes place not only on the conceptual level but also on that of verbal texture. Throughout the discussion, I have been pointing out contexts where a Latin word is placed in the same metrical position as its etymologically cognate counterpart in the Greek model.[88] This feature is apparently meant to be recognized by the reader. In a sense, it makes Greek poetry materially present in *Catalepton* 9,[89] in the same way as the Muses' words quoted by Theognis (17 ὅττι καλόν …) are inconspicuously present in the very opening of Posidippus' *sphragis* (1 εἴ τι καλόν …).

One final aspect of our poem's engagement with Greek models requires closer attention. In an emphatic way, *Catalepton* 9 speaks of emulating the wit of Greek poetry (62 *Graios … sales*), Greek (Attic) wit also being a quality ascribed to Messalla's bucolics in particular (14 *carmina cum lingua tum sale Cecropia*). Commentators note the parallel, but do not discuss the significance of this poetological concept.[90] On the surface of it, it may seem that wit is merely singled out as a particular quality that is a manifestation of, say, elegance and sophistication in general. In fact, however, the repeated use of the metaphor of *sal* appears to have a more specific point of reference. Both passages speak explicitly of either Greek or Attic wit, which cannot but recall a number of Ciceronian contexts. Cicero is notably the most likely person to have introduced into rhetoric the concept of *sal*, as well as an exponent of the view that wit is particularly characteristic of Athenian authors.[91] The apparent lack of a proper term in Greek may have contributed to the way Cicero speaks about *sal*: in several places, he plays with the paradox of Romans mastering this art despite its Greek nature. In a letter to L. Papirius Paetus, Cicero admires his addressee's *non Attici sed salsiores quam illi Atticorum Romani ueteres atque urbani sales* (*Fam*. 9.15.2). In the *Orator* (89), Cicero sets for his Roman audience an image of the ideal orator who will exercise the art of *sal* in such a way as to surpass those self-proclaimed Atticists and become truly Attic. In *On the Orator* (2.217), Cicero makes Caesar wittily observe that Greek theorists have been unable to teach the art of wit (as well as to master it themselves); Caesar concludes: *qua re mihi quidem nullo modo uidetur doctrina ista res posse tradi*. This elusive

[87] This consciousness comes to the foreground in an especially prominent way in the allusion to Theoc. *Id.* 8, the only poem in the Theocritean corpus that inserts into a text written in hexameters an elegiac section. It seems useful to speak of elegiac 'super-genre', encompassing both elegy and epigram: cf. G. Hutchinson, 'Genre and super-genre', in T.D. Papanghelis, S.J. Harrison and S. Frangoulidis (edd.), *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations* (Berlin, 2013), 19–34. On points of contact between Latin elegy and Hellenistic epigram, see recently the edited volume by A. Keith (ed.), *Latin Elegy and Hellenistic Epigram: A Tale of Two Genres at Rome* (Newcastle, 2011), and in particular Keith's own contribution, 'Latin elegiac collections and Hellenistic epigram books', 99–115.

[88] Common words: *Cat*. 9.1 *pauca* < *Anth. Pal.* 7.713.1 παυρο(επής); 1 *niueo* < Posidipp. 118.3 A.-B. νιφόεντος (and 12 νιφόεντ<α>?); 5 *pugnae* < Callim. *Aet*. fr. 110.13 *πυγμῆς; 8 *choros* < *Anth. Pal.* 7.12.6 χορούς; 44 *patria* < Hermesian. fr. 3.32 πατρίδος; 45 *pati* < Hermesian. fr. 3.31 παθών; 62 *sales* < Theoc. *Id.* 8.56 ἅλα. Proper names: 1 *Phoebo* < Posidipp. 118.1 Φοίβου; 16 *Pylium* < Callim. *Aet*. fr. 80.21 Πυλίου; 33 *Semele* and *Acrisione* < *Il*. 14.323 Σεμέλης and 319 Ἀκρισιώνης.

[89] Greek loan-words in Latin were a popular topic in linguistic discussions: see e.g. R. Maltby, 'Varro's attitude to Latin derivations from Greek', *PLLS* 7 (1993), 47–60.

[90] On the concept of *sal* in Latin rhetoric and poetics, see recently T. Strässle, 'De arte salis: von der Modellierung einer stofflichen Poetologie in der römischen Rhetorik', *A&A* 51 (2005), 97–119.

[91] Cf. Strässle (n. 90), 102–3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

inimitable nature of *sal* is evidently the reason why the poet of *Catalepton* 9 chooses that quality as both the highest praise for Messalla's poetry and the highest ambition for his own. At the same time, although, like Cicero, he underlines the Greek character of the art of wit, the Ciceronian precedents also subtly imply that the poet of *Catalepton* 9 may in fact be able not just *patrio Graios carmine adire sales* but indeed to produce *non Attici sed salsiores quam illi Atticorum … sales*.

IX. CONCLUSION: DATING AND INTERTEXTUALITY

The main purpose of the preceding argument has been to demonstrate that Hellenistic poetry plays a prominent role in the intertextual background of *Catalepton* 9. It has also become apparent that *Catalepton* 9 develops an original poetics. The conflicting indications of date have led some scholars to suspect that *Catalepton* 9 is more of a literary game, a game which does not shun chronological inconsistencies and the dramatic date of which may be quite different from the actual date of composition.[92] Yet the character of its engagement with Hellenistic poetry, as discussed above, seems to attest to at least some seriousness of intent behind *Catalepton* 9. Even if this may not be a sufficient guarantee that *Catalepton* 9 is what it appears to be—a prefatory piece to translations from Messalla's bucolics written on the occasion of a military victory—it is a sufficient reason to attempt a reconsideration of the poem's dating under such a premise. What follows is a first uncertain step in that direction. I propose to begin by re-examining internal historical references in *Catalepton* 9. Then I shall briefly consider two possible allusions to *Catalepton* 9 that may help establish a *terminus ante*.

To start with, some relevant dates of Messalla's career.[93] Messalla's first significant military success came in 42 B.C. at Philippi, where, fighting for Cassius and Brutus, in the first battle Messalla commanded a legion on the victorious right wing.[94] In 36 B.C. Messalla participated in the Sicilian campaign against Sextus Pompey;[95] after Pompey's defeat, he was made an augur.[96] This is apparently also the year of the birth of Messalla's elder son, Messallinus.[97] In 35–34 B.C. Messalla fought against the Pannonians and, less certainly, against the Salassi, but with no significant achievements. In 31 B.C. Messalla replaced Antony as consul and held a naval command in the battle of Actium. In 29 B.C. Octavian celebrated his triple triumph (in which Messalla may have participated). Messalla's consulship of 31 B.C. was followed by governorships in Syria and in Aquitania; for successes in Aquitania, Messalla celebrated his own triumph in 27 B.C.

[92] Peirano (n. 5), 120–32; cf. Schoonhoven (n. 3), 1705; Hutchinson (n. 16), 145 n. 19.

[93] On Messalla's life, see R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford, 1986), 200–16; J. Hammer, *Prolegomena to an Edition of the Panegyricus Messallae: The Military and Political Career of M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus* (Albany, 1925).

[94] Frank (n. 19) argues that *Catalepton* 9 was composed between the indecisive first battle and the second battle won by Octavian.

[95] The mention of Eryx at 6 has been interpreted as a hint at this campaign: see H. White, 'Textual problems in Horace and Virgil', *Veleia* 23 (2006), 379–89, at 388.

[96] One could speculate that this may have prompted the possible prophetic elements in *Catalepton* 9 (cf. below); Tibullus 2.5 is a parallel to an extent, as it celebrates Messallinus' becoming an augur.

[97] See R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978), 118. This may provide a *terminus post* if the text is correct: 9.44 *tam procul hoc gnato*. Though of course it is not impossible that Messalla had earlier another son who did not survive infancy.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In *Catalepton* 9 references to Messalla's military activities are confined to two passages. One comes at the beginning of the poem, after the invocation of the Muses (3–6):

> uictor adest, magni magnum decus ecce triumphi,
> uictor, qua terrae quaque patent maria,
> horrida barbaricae portans insignia pugnae,
> magnus ut Oenides, utque superbus Eryx.

If *triumphi* is taken literally, it will naturally imply Messalla's only triumph in 27 B.C. But the complete absence of recognisable references to the Aquitanian campaign for which Messalla was awarded a triumph is awkward, to say the least.[98] It has also been proposed that *magni magnum decus ecce triumphi* may allude to Messalla's participation in Octavian's triple triumph of 29 B.C.[99] Yet the solemn acclamation (*uictor adest* …) must surely refer to the *triumphator*, not one of his generals. Moreover, *uictor, qua terrae quaque patent maria*, if taken literally, does not merely imply a victory by land and sea but a world conquest (cf. 54 *uincere et Oceani finibus ulterius*). While it can be doubted whether such an exaggerated praise would be appropriate even at Messalla's own triumph in 27 B.C., it seems all but impossible in 29 B.C. in the presence of Octavian, the real conqueror. If, however, *triumphi* does not refer to an actual triumph, it may either mean a victory in general or hint at an anticipated triumph. It has been suggested that the way in which Apollo is mentioned in the first line of the poem lends a prophetic colouring to the lines that follow.[100] A reasonable inference might be that, while some specific, perhaps not very significant, victory is meant, more is expected of Messalla in the future.

The other passage seems to describe Messalla's military activities in greater detail, but again no references to identifiable historical events are to be found (39–54):

> multa, neque immeritis, donauit praemia alumnis,
> praemia Messallis maxima Publicolis.
> nam quid ego immensi memorem studia ista laboris?
> horrida quid durae tempora militiae?
> castra foro, te castra urbi praeponere, castra
> tam procul hoc gnato, tam procul hac patria?
> immoderata pati iam frigora iamque calores?
> sternere uel dura posse super silice?
> saepe trucem aduerso perlabi sidere pontum?
> saepe mare audendo uincere, saepe hiemem?
> saepe etiam densos immittere corpus in hostes?
> communem belli non meminisse deum?
> nunc celeris Afros, periurae milia gentis,
> aurea nunc rapidi flumina adire Tagi?
> nunc aliam ex alia bellando quaerere gentem,
> uincere et Oceani finibus ulterius?

[98] Contrast Tibullus 1.7.

[99] Birt (n. 1), 94–5.

[100] Schoonhoven (n. 3), 1703: 'I think the anticipatory character of the poem comes out already in v. 1 where the curious phrase *pauca mihi, niueo sed non incognita Phoebo* (*dicite, Pegasides*) alludes to Apollo's quality as the god of prophecy.' The Posidippean intertext, which prominently features Apollo in that role (118.13–14 A.-B. τοίην ἐκχρήσαις τε καὶ ἐξ ἀδύτων καναχήσαις | φωνὴν ἀθανάτην, ὦ ἄνα, καὶ κατ' ἐμοῦ), may give support to this interpretation.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

To begin with, it has been disputed whether lines 41–54, in whole or in part, refer to Messalla himself or to his glorious ancestors, *Messallis Publicolis*. Richmond insisted that the only way to make sense of the transition from 40 to 41 is by giving *nam* its full explanatory force ('for') and taking *ista* at 41 to 'refer to the family of the Valerii, and mean *ista uestra*'.[101] This compelled him to accept *solitos* at 43 'from the inferior *Z* branch of the tradition',[102] to obelize *gnato* at 44 and, since he viewed 51–4 as referring to Messalla personally, to posit a lacuna after 50. Yet, it is by no means necessary for *nam* to imply such a strict logical connection. As an old grammar puts it, *nam* and *namque* 'are often transition particles, being used when the speaker passes on to a remark *occasioned* by the former sentence, but not containing any cause or reason'.[103] If we have to choose a specific function for *nam*, it can perhaps be described as exemplification (*OLD* s.v. 3c). First, the poet states the general rule: the merits of the Valerii have always been given due reward (39–40: *praemia*). Then he applies it to an individual case: Messalla's merits are manifest (41–54) and due reward will follow (55–8: *laudes*, *monumenta*, *decus*).

If, then, the whole of 41–54 refers to Messalla himself, what historical information can be derived from the passage? Not much. The first ten lines (41–50) describe the hardships of warfare in general. The only specific detail is possibly the mention of a son at 44, if we take it to imply Messallinus (apparently born in 36 B.C.). The final four lines (51–4), on the contrary, contain more or less precise geographical allusions, but none refers to any known campaign led by Messalla. Richmond concluded that they must allude 'in a prophetic way to the future achievements of the hero'.[104] 'To consider the passage from v. 41 to v. 54 as a whole, then: it will be noticed that 41–50 describe *labores* […] but 51–54 rather describe *uictoriae* […]. Verses 41–50 seem to refer to the past; we have come to the conclusion that 51–54 must refer to the future. The corollary seems to be inescapable that there is a lacuna in the text after v. 50.'[105] Richmond further speculated that 'the lacuna *post* 50 may have mentioned the conquest of the Aquitani'.[106] But is a lacuna necessary? The final four lines with their anaphoric *nunc* are clearly intended to mirror the preceding four lines with their anaphoric *saepe*. This triple *nunc* is usually understood as an idiom equivalent to the repeated *modo* (*OLD* s.v. *nunc* 8).[107] I suggest that here *nunc* retains more of its temporal force, and is, not paralleled, but contrasted with *saepe*:[108] 'often (in the past) you have been brave; now (in the imminent future) you will conquer the whole world.' This opposition of *saepe* and *nunc* is more effective when the one quatrain is immediately followed by the other. But if there is no lacuna, an argument *ex silentio* can be

[101] Richmond (n. 2), 200.
[102] Richmond (n. 2), 200. The unmetrical reading of the other branch of the tradition (*castra foro, castra urbi*) has been variously emended so as to refer to Messalla alone.
[103] T.K. Arnold, *A Practical Introduction to Latin Prose Composition* (London, 1850), 2.163. Cf. more recently C. Kroon, 'Latin particles and the grammar of discourse', in J. Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to Latin Language* (Chichester, 2011), 176–95, at 184: 'Latin *nam* signals that its host unit has a subsidiary function with regard to some other, communicatively more central, discourse unit. Depending on the context, the more specific relationship may be evidence, […] or justification, motivation, elaboration, explanation, exemplification, and the like.'
[104] Richmond (n. 2), 196, cf. 198–9. Cf. also Birt (n. 1), 95; Syme (n. 93), 203–4.
[105] Richmond (n. 2), 199.
[106] Richmond (n. 2), 201.
[107] Thus e.g. Westendorp Boerma (n. 1), 24: 'modo … modo … modo, eadem iteratione triplici, qua poeta versibus superioribus (*saepe*) delectatus est.'
[108] *OLD* s.v. *nunc* 5: '(w. ref. to the immediate future) In the time following the present'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

used: since *Catalepton* 9 has no recognisable references to any of Messalla's known military achievements, a date of composition closer to the beginning of his career is more likely.

To sum up: there are some indications of a date in or shortly after 36 B.C., but none is compelling. The mention of the Sicilian hero Eryx at 4 may hint at Messalla's participation in the Sicilian campaign against Pompey in that year. In that year Messalla also became an augur—which may account for the prophetic elements in *Catalepton* 9. The son alluded to at 44 may be Messallinus, apparently born in that same year. In addition, a British campaign, implied at 54, may have been contemplated at around the same time: in 34 B.C. Octavian is reported to have set out to invade Britain.[109]

Let us now briefly consider two intertexts that may bear on the dating of *Catalepton* 9. The first is Tibullus 1.7, a poem celebrating Messalla's Aquitanian triumph of 27 B.C.[110] To start with, a formal similarity can be pointed out: both elegies are 64 lines long (this may be a further argument against lacunae in *Catalepton* 9). The crucial parallel is found in the passage that arguably foretells Messalla's future victories (*Catalepton* 9.51–4):

> nunc celeris Afros, periurae milia gentis,
> aurea nunc rapidi flumina adire Tagi?
> nunc aliam ex alia bellando quaerere gentem,
> uincere et Oceani finibus ulterius?

I suggest that it is pointedly alluded to in the opening of Tib. 1.7 (1–4):

> hunc cecinere diem Parcae, fatalia nentes
> stamina non ulli dissoluenda deo,
> hunc fore Aquitanas posset qui fundere gentes,
> quem tremeret forti milite uictus Atur.

On the formal level, the anaphora *nunc* — *nunc* is paralleled by the anaphora *hunc* — *hunc*; the end rhyme *gentis* — *gentem*, by the end rhyme *nentes* — *gentes*. The first distich of the *Catalepton* 9 passage and the second distich of the Tibullan passage have a further similarity: in both cases, the hexameter names a people *(Afros … milia gentis, Aquitanas … gentes*), the pentameter a river (*Tagi, Atur*). The pentameters immediately preceding these distichs—9.50 *communem be**lli** non meminisse **deum*** and 1.7.2 *stamina non u**lli** dissoluenda **deo***—have a point of contact too. The former speaks of Messalla's ignoring the impartiality of the god of war, the latter explains, as it were, why Messalla was right to do so: not even a god can change fate (*belli … deum* is included in *ulli … deo*). But the most important is, of course, the thematic connection: the *Catalepton* 9 passage is arguably a prophecy, the Tibullan passage speaks of a prophecy come true (note 1.7.5 *euenere*). It is thus intrinsically probable that the latter alludes to the former rather than the other way round.

Tibullus' elegy for Messalla opens with the recollection of a birthday prophecy; it concludes with birthday wishes. This concluding passage likewise features suggestive points of contact with *Catalepton* 9 (1.7.55–62):

[109] See Syme (n. 97), 50.

[110] As recently argued by P.E. Knox, 'Milestones in the career of Tibullus', *CQ* 55 (2005), 204–16, Tibullus 1.7 may in fact have been written in anticipation of the triumph in as early as 29 B.C.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at tibi succrescat proles quae facta parentis
augeat et circum stet ueneranda senem.
nec taceat monumenta uiae quem Tuscula tellus
candidaque antiquo detinet Alba Lare.
namque opibus congesta tuis hic glarea dura
sternitur, hic apta iungitur arte silex.
te canat agricola a magna cum uenerit urbe
serus inoffensum rettuleritque pedem.

Tibullus' first wish, taking up one distich, sounds conventional: may Messalla's progeny increase his glory. The three following distichs develop a rather unexpected idea that Messalla will be praised by people walking along the road he constructed. I suggest this idea was prompted by the refusal in *Catalepton* 9 to celebrate Messalla's achievements, for 'they will secure fame and glory for themselves on their own' (57–8):

ipsa haec, ipsa ferent rerum monumenta per orbem,
ipsa sibi egregium facta decus parient.[111]

Tibullus interprets this prediction literally, as it were. The road built by Messalla will itself be his memorial, indeed a memorial much spoken about (*nec taceat monumenta uiae*). It will even inspire songs in praise of Messalla, not by poets but by farmers (*te canat agricola*). Furthermore, it seems no accident that this road is paved, so to speak, with those very stones (*hic glarea* ***dura*** | ***sternitur****, hic apta iungitur arte* ***silex***) on which, according to *Catalepton* 9, Messalla slept during his campaigns (46 ***sternere*** *uel* ***dura*** *posse super* ***silice***):[112] the road thus becomes a monument of Messalla's military exploits as well.

If my interpretation of the relationship between *Catalepton* 9 and Tib. 1.7 is correct, it gives us a *terminus ante* of about 27 B.C. The second intertext comes from Horace's first book of satires published in 36/35 B.C.; it will thus potentially establish an even earlier *terminus ante*. At the beginning of the sixth satire, addressed to Maecenas, Horace argues that humble origin should not prejudice against a man; that, on the contrary, noble descent is no guarantee of a man's virtues. Horace cites the example of a Laevinus who, although a descendant of the famous P. Valerius Publicola, apparently had no political career because of a lack of personal qualities (1.6.12–16):

contra Laeuinum, Valeri genus, unde Superbus
Tarquinius regno pulsus fugit, unius assis
non umquam pretio pluris licuisse, notante
iudice quo nosti, populo, qui stultus honores
saepe dat indignis et famae seruit ineptus.

I suggest Horace's argument can be read as a polemical allusion to the passage of *Catalepton* 9 that introduces the rehearsal of Messalla's merits (35–40):

non cuius ob raptum pulsi liquere penates
Tarquinii patrios filius atque pater,
illo quo primum dominatus Roma superbos
mutauit placidis tempore consulibus.

[111] The metaphor *facta decus parient* is paralleled in 1.7.9 *non sine me est tibi partus honos*.
[112] The parallel is noted in R. Maltby, 'Technical language in Tibullus', *Emerita* 67 (1999), 231–49, at 240–1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press

multa, neque immeritis, donauit praemia alumnis,
praemia Messallis maxima Publicolis.

In contrast to Horace, *Catalepton* 9 makes noble descent and personal virtue go hand in hand. Like Laevinus, the 'Messallae Publicolae' trace their origin from P. Valerius Publicola; unlike Laevinus, they have merited numerous awards. Two individual points of contact should be stressed. First, both passages refer to the expulsion of King Tarquin in similar terms (1.6.13 *Tarquinius regno pulsus fugit*; 9.35–6 *pulsi liquere penates* | *Tarquinii*); both allude, either explicitly or implicitly, to the role in it of P. Valerius Publicola, but omit that of L. Junius Brutus. Second, both passages speak of the Roman Republic awarding honours; yet whereas *Catalepton* 9 claims that honours are given to those who have merited them (9.39 *multa, neque immeritis, donauit praemia alumnis* [*sc*. Rome]), Horace emphatically asserts the reverse (1.6.15–16 *populo, qui stultus honores* | *saepe dat indignis*). It seems further relevant that a few lines later Messalla is mentioned, with a hint of mockery, as a typical aristocrat (1.6.41–2 *hoc tibi Paulus* | *et Messalla uideris?*). The point of Horace's polemic apparently would be this: with the aristocratic kind of patronage cultivated by Messalla,[113] Horace favourably contrasts the more liberal, meritocratic attitude of Maecenas.

This cursory discussion of the Tibullan and Horatian intertexts is, of course, in no way conclusive. Either intertext can admittedly be argued to be irrelevant, or to predate rather than postdate *Catalepton* 9. Yet it seems suggestive that the resulting *terminus ante* of 36/35 B.C. is consonant with the date indicated, however faintly, by internal historical references. This dating is also more consistent with the poem's language and style.[114] If *Catalepton* 9 was indeed written around that time, and later alluded to by Horace and Tibullus, its place in the history of Latin poetry may prove more significant than usually assumed. A date of composition in about 36 B.C., I suggest, can be accepted as a working hypothesis—to be either confirmed or refuted by further research. A systematic exploration of the intertextual links *Catalepton* 9 has with the poetry of Horace and Tibullus would no doubt be fruitful. Such an early date of composition also makes *Catalepton* 9 roughly contemporary with the *Eclogues*: perhaps one should be open to the possibility that this controversial elegy may have influenced at least some of Virgil's bucolic poems too.

University of Leeds BORIS KAYACHEV
boriskayachev@gmail.com

[113] Cf. C. Davies, 'Poetry in the "circle" of Messalla', *G&R* 20 (1973), 25–35.
[114] Cf. Richmond (n. 2), 189–93.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000070 Published online by Cambridge University Press