provincial administration served little purpose. Even if we assume that Scaevola departed for Asia during the sailing season of his praetorian year (98), he would have done well to return as soon as possible (i.e., early summer in 97), to stand for the consular elections in 96 and to exploit to best effect the *gloria iustitiae et abstinentiae* he had won in Asia (Cic. *Att.* 5. 17. 5). His timing was most effective, for he thus invited comparison with Marius' supporter M'. Aquillius (cos. 101), at this very time under threat of prosecution for gross maladministration in Sicily, *multis avaritiae criminibus testimoniisque convictum.*[30] Clearly, good provincial administration had recently become something of a political issue, as the law found at Delphi and Cnidus and some other evidence clustered around the turn of the century show.[31] Among the many rewards that Diodorus (37. 5. 6) says Scaevola received for his fine work in Asia might be counted the consulship.[32]

The Asian proconsulship of Scaevola, therefore, is not to be seen as an important change of Roman policy toward Asia, as Badian urged. It implies no general senatorial commitment to reorganize the province and to clean up administration in order to bolster the loyalty of the natives against Mithridates; rather, Scaevola's efforts should be attributed simply to his own ideals of good administration. But though we cannot retain the intriguing suggestion of a change in Roman policy toward Asia Minor, the earlier date gives us a better picture of Scaevola's path to the consulship; and if it is finally accepted, it will provide a useful chronological datum for the reconstruction of Roman politics in the 90s.[33]

ROBERT M. KALLET-MARX
Brandeis University

30. Cic. *Flac.* 98; cf. other sources in A. H. J. Greenidge and A. M. Clay, *Sources for Roman History, 133–70 B.C.*², rev. E. W. Gray (Oxford, 1960), p. 116. For the date of Aquillius' trial (95), see E. Badian, "The Death of Saturninus," *Chiron* 14 (1984): 123, n. 50, 142; but, as he notes, "this [date] does not exclude the possibility that his behavior in the province was known to have been such that prosecution was likely to follow" (p. 142).

31. See M. Hassall, M. Crawford, and J. Reynolds, "Rome and the Eastern Provinces at the End of the Second Century B.C.," *JRS* 64 (1974): 218.

32. So Marshall, "Scaevola's Governorship," p. 129 (adopting a suggestion of E. W. Gray).

33. I wish to thank E. S. Gruen, A. M. Ward, and the Editor and referees of *CP* for many suggestions and criticisms that have improved this paper.

FORMS OF LITERARY CRITICISM IN CATULLUS: POLYMETRIC VS. EPIGRAM

A good number of Catullus' poems, as readers have commonly recognized, deal in some way with poetry itself—with its creation, its effects upon the poet himself and his friends, its evaluation. In discussing here three poems of literary criticism, 35, 36, and 95, I am interested less in interpreting the individual poems than in demonstrating that the polymetrics present their literary criticism in a way utterly different from the epigram. I dwell on 35 in particular because it continues to be misunderstood and because the misunderstanding signals one of the qualities—a certain air of casualness—that define the polymetric poems.

Poetae tenero, meo sodali,
velim Caecilio, papyre, dicas
Veronam veniat, Novi relinquens
Comi moenia Lariumque litus:
nam quasdam volo cogitationes
amici accipiat sui meique.

quare, si sapiet, viam vorabit,
quamvis candida milies puella
euntem revocet, manusque collo
ambas iniciens roget morari,
quae nunc, si mihi vera nuntiantur,
illum deperit impotente amore.

nam quo tempore legit incohatam
Dindymi dominam, ex eo misellae
ignes interiorem edunt medullam.
ignosco tibi, Sapphica puella
musa doctior: est enim venuste
Magna Caecilio incohata Mater.

E. Baehrens' commentary, published a century ago, for a long while set the line of interpretation for Catullus' thirty-fifth poem.[1] Baehrens believed that the poem has as its subject the thoughts of a third party, the unnamed friend of verse 6; in the form of an invitation it tacitly rebukes Caecilius for failing to finish his *Magna Mater* and urges him to complete it. Among all that has been written since,[2] two essays stand out as landmarks in the literary exegesis of the poem. F. O. Copley in 1953 declared that in order to understand the poem it was necessary not to hunt between the lines for autobiography or other background information, but rather to avoid unwarranted assumptions and read the text itself.[3] Breathing the fresh air of the New Criticism, the warning was salutary. It detracts little from Copley's contribution that he did not put his own policy into practice;[4] instead, he too reconstructed a rather complicated personal setting, to grasp which was a condition for reading the poem. Then in 1976, in an acute and thorough study, V. Buchheit argued that 35 was neither an invitation nor an admonition nor autobiography but rather an act of literary appreciation.[5] My own view, which agrees on this cardinal point, both builds upon his and yet differs from it. If I spotlight his chief conclusion, it is in part because it appears

1. *Catulli Veronensis Liber,* vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1885), pp. 203–6.

2. To the works listed in H. Harrauer, *A Bibliography to Catullus* (Hildesheim, 1979), and in J. P. Holoka, *Gaius Valerius Catullus: A Systematic Bibliography* (New York and London, 1985), two later discussions may be added: H. P. Syndikus, *Catull: Eine Interpretation,* Erster Teil: *Einleitung, Die kleinen Gedichte (1–60),* Impulse der Forschung, 46 (Darmstadt, 1984), pp. 199–205; → E. A. Fredricksmeyer, "Catullus to Caecilius on Good Poetry (*C.* 35)," *AJP* 106 (1985): 213–21.

→ "Catullus 35," *AJP* 74 (1953): 149–60; repr. in K. Quinn, ed., *Approaches to Catullus* (Cambridge and New York, 1972), pp. 173–84.

4. As was pointed out → J. M. Fisher, "Catullus 35," *CP* 66 (1971): 1–5, who stressed the obliqueness with which, in his view, the poem advises Caecilius to give up erotic verse and return to his epyllion. I agree about the obliqueness, if not the message.

5. "Dichtertum und Lebensform in Catull c. 35/36," in A. Barrera-Vidal et al., eds., *Lebendige Romana: Festschrift für Hans-Wilhelm Klein,* Göppinger Akademische Beiträge, 88 (Göppingen, 1976), pp. 47–64.

to have escaped notice: the four most recent essays on the poem do not give evidence of knowing Buchheit.[6]

I believe I can improve upon earlier interpretations by advancing one that is simpler and more economical and that pays attention not only to what the poet says but, most especially, in what order he says it. When Catullus tells us that he wants to share "certain thoughts" with Caecilius, we know all we need to know: the poem itself, when completed, will have expressed those thoughts. Poem 35 amounts to praise for Caecilius' poetry, praise conveyed in a way that is indirect and looks casual but is, on the contrary, deliberate and effective.

I agree with several of the controversial positions taken by previous scholars: that the anonymous friend is Catullus himself; that the poem works obliquely; and that its purpose is praise. I fortify these positions with fresh arguments and go on to offer my own contribution to understanding the poem. I first analyze the poem as it unfolds before the reader; other interpreters have tended to look at it from on high and synoptically, like a map, rather than follow it in its winding course from verse to verse. The apparent casualness that this analysis discloses I then show to be essential to the impression the poem makes. My reading receives confirmation from the next poem in the collection. Poem 36, whose relationship to 35 has been overlooked, also proves to be literary criticism working in an indirect fashion.

The sequence in which subjects come up in 35 represents what seems to be a rambling, though at every turn plausible, train of thought. This contains, however, a kind of indirect proof, climactically arranged and artfully concealed. Since I lay stress on the sequence, I begin by going through the poem, following it as it unfolds.

Catullus starts with an address to his paper, that is to say, his poem itself—the metonymy is obvious and common (cf. poems 1, 22, 36, and 95). He asks it to summon Caecilius to Verona because he wants Caecilius to receive certain thoughts from "a friend of his and mine." This friend must be Catullus himself, not, as has often been claimed, some third party. The coyness of the phrase fits the urbane tone of the poem and its indirect strategy. What decides the question is that in the first line Catullus has already identified himself as Caecilius' friend.[7]

The message begins by emphasizing urgency (*si sapiet, viam vorabit*), which implies the importance of the message: it invites the reader to sit up and take notice of what is to follow. Catullus then imagines a potential obstacle to Caecilius' journey: his girlfriend may struggle to detain him by throwing her arms about his neck. At first this seems to prove her love for him, as Catullus states directly in verses 11 and 12. But the poem does not end here, and it is not about love.

6. J. [correctly, R.] Basto, "Caecilius, Attis and Catullus 35," *LCM* 7 (1982): 30–34, and M. Swoboda, "De litterarum censura apud Catullum," *Eos* 70 (1982): 83–101, in addition to Syndikus and Fredricksmeyer cited above, n. 2.

7. Let no one object that *sodalis* and *amicus* are not synonyms: the same Veranius is now called an *amicus* of Catullus (9. 1), now a *sodalis* (47. 6); so too Caecilius. The proposal to read *tuique* for *meique*, made by R. G. M. Nisbet, "Notes on the Text of Catullus," *PCPS* 204 (1978): 97–98, and accepted by G. P. Goold, ed., *Catullus* (London, 1983), p. 76, is intended to make the identification plain but is not needed.

In the final third of the poem Catullus reveals that the girl's love is really love for Caecilius' poetry: the poor girl was inflamed from the very moment she began to read his *Magna Mater.* If this reaction seems odd, we should recall poem 50, where Catullus records that he himself, affected by Calvus' talent, suffered the symptoms of one who had fallen in love. Here the girl's ardor measures Caecilius' poetic distinction: the more passionate she, the greater poet he—and she is very passionate. The unusual syntactic link between the girl's love for Caecilius and her love for his verse binds the two together closely. *Quo tempore . . . ex eo* is a unique combination, and even, perhaps, slightly awkward.[8] The effort made toward fullness and precision stresses the simultaneity and therefore suggests the near identity of the two events. This suggestion is reinforced in the next sentence, where Catullus, punning, unites two meanings in the word *venuste,* one reflecting the girl's feelings toward the poem, the other her feelings toward Caecilius: Caecilius' poem is "charming," and it also inspires erotic passion (*Venus*).

Now, after he has shown the true significance of the girl's love, Catullus sets in place the final piece of the argument. Whence comes the authority of this girl in literary matters? To forestall any objection on grounds of her taste, Catullus pronounces her exceptionally discerning (*Sapphica musa doctior*). *Doctior* here signifies the ability to appreciate good poetry rather than to write it. It is true that for Catullus, as for Callimachus, the two faculties are close, yet they are distinct, and nothing in the poem suggests the girl is herself a poet. Then the closing, summary statement, beginning with *est enim* and placing *venuste* at the verse-end, proclaims its truth with emphasis, and it carries conviction because of what has come before.

The argument is now complete. Catullus has conveyed his thoughts to Caecilius, and his poem has actually performed what it enjoined, like others in the collection. The sixth poem, for instance, is the *versus lepidus* in which the poet says he would like to proclaim Flavius' love.[9] Similarly, his threat in 37 to scribble obscenities against Lesbia's lovers and his command in 42 that hendecasyllables gather to demand back his writing tablets are both executed in the very act of statement.[10] Poem 101 is itself the final gift Catullus offers to his dead brother.[11] The conceit of the poem's referring to something else that the poem itself becomes was to be a favorite of Horace and of many another after him.[12]

8. I have found only a very few places where *ex,* used in a temporal sense, is similarly answered by a phrase in the other clause: Cato *Agr.* 33. 5 *cum . . . , ex eo . . . ;* Verg. *Aen.* 2. 163–69 *ex quo . . . , ex illo . . .* (where *ex illo* is motivated by the distance separating the main clause from the start of the subordinate clause); and several passages of the *Digest,* where the reference needs to be unmistakable, e.g.: Cels. *Dig.* 22. 3. 13 *ex eo . . . , ex quo . . . ;* Ulp. *Dig.* 24. 3. 24 pr. *exinde . . . , ex quo. . . .*

Another passage from Catullus looks similar (64. 86–92): "hunc simul ac cupido conspexit lumine virgo / . . . , / non prius ex illo flagrantia declinavit / lumina." The redundancy of *ex illo,* if it is understood (like *non prius*) to pick up *simul ac,* might be justified as in Vergil. Nevertheless, W. Kroll, ed., *C. Valerius Catullus* (Stuttgart, 1922), pp. 156–57, is right in taking *ex illo* (= "from Theseus") with *declinavit* (the more usual *ab* would not scan).

9. → M. G. Morgan, "*Nescioquid febriculosi scorti:* A Note on Catullus 6," *CQ* 71 (1977): 341; M. Skinner, "Semiotics and Poetics in Catullus 6," *LCM* 8 (1983): 141–42; and Fisher, "Catullus 35," p. 4.

10. See T. P. Wiseman, *Catullus and His World: A Reappraisal* (Cambridge, 1985), p. 141, n. 40.

11. See E. Cederstrom, "Catullus' Last Gift to His Brother (*c.* 101)," *CW* 75 (1981): 117–18.

12. Cf., e.g., *Carm.* 1. 19, where the poem is the sacrifice, and 1. 20, where the poem is the drink offered to Maecenas: see M. S. Santirocco, *Unity and Design in Horace's "Odes"* (Chapel Hill and

The poem that by design follows 35 works in the same manner:[13]

Annales Volusi, cacata charta,
votum solvite pro mea puella:
nam sanctae Veneri Cupidinique
vovit, si sibi restitutus essem
desissemque truces vibrare iambos,
electissima pessimi poetae
scripta tardipedi deo daturam
infelicibus ustulanda lignis.
et hoc pessima se puella vidit
iocose ⟨ac⟩ lepide vovere divis.

nunc, o caeruleo creata ponto,
quae sanctum Idalium Uriosque apertos,
quaeque Ancona Cnidumque harundinosam
colis, quaeque Amathunta, quaeque Golgos,
quaeque Dyrrachium, Hadriae tabernam,
acceptum face redditumque votum,
si non illepidum neque invenustum est.
at vos interea venite in ignem,
pleni ruris et inficetiarum
annales Volusi, cacata charta!

The adjoining poems have hardly been subjected to comparison, despite the elements that invite us thereto:[14] not just similar length and meter, but the recurrence of the words *ignes* and *venustus,* the apostrophe to paper, and the critical role of a girl's judgment. These are like the hinges holding together the parts of a diptych. Poem 36 pours scorn upon a literary work instead of praise. Here the background is a lovers' quarrel over Catullus' lampoons. Lesbia had mischievously vowed that if Catullus ceased the lampoons and was restored to her, she would burn the choicest writings of the worst poet. Catullus has complied and now willfully misunderstands these writings to be the *Annals* of Volusius rather than his own poetry. Only when the first verse is repeated as the last do we grasp fully what it means: no longer mere name-calling, as it might have seemed at first, it amounts to a judgment that has been proved in the course of the poem.

London, 1986), pp. 156 and 158, with n. 24. Horace's employment of the conceit is already more complex, in that a poem is less obviously a drink or a sacrifice than it is a message or a gift.

The conceit is a Roman invention. Nothing similar is found in Greek literature, not the "performative utterance" of a tragic chorus (e.g., Soph. *El.* 1066–69, where they ask φάμα to tell Atreus in the Underworld of his family's present fortunes) or the explicit similes of Pindar (e.g., *Ol.* 7. 1–10, where he likens his song to the wine offered as a toast at a wedding; cf. also *Isthm.* 6. 1–7, *Nem.* 3. 76–80). In neither case is the identification of the present poem "discovered," as it is in Catullus and Horace.

13. I am convinced that Catullus' poems, or at least the first fifty or so of them, were deliberately arranged, and I am inclined to believe that he arranged them himself. → W. Clausen, *"Catulli Veronensis Liber," CP* 71 (1976): 37–43, who argues for this, yet who views 35 not as linked to 36 but rather as dissimilar from 34 and 36, a pair of similar poems ("a hymn and a parody of the hymnic style," p. 39) that it separates. C. P. Segal, "The Order of Catullus, Poems 2–11," *Latomus* 27 (1968): 305–21, elaborates on the arrangement of a particular group.

14. Buchheit is the exception: in his essay, "Dichtertum und Lebensform," he expands what he had said in "Catulls Dichterkritik in c. 36," *Hermes* 87 (1959): 309–27, where he also compared 14 and 44 as pieces of literary criticism.

Again Catullus embeds his literary criticism in events that he represents as occurring in daily life. He wants us to feel that the condemnation of Volusius, like the praise for Caecilius, is anchored in a set of circumstances, its truth guaranteed by mundane reality. His feigned misunderstanding plays the same role in 36 as the girl's love in 35. Because each is but gradually and indirectly revealed for what it is, a piece of literary criticism, because each one's message dawns upon the reader, it makes its point effectively.

The form that criticism takes in this pair contrasts with that in poem 95:

Smyrna mei Cinnae, nonam post denique messem
quam coepta est nonamque edita post hiemem,
milia cum interea quingenta Hatriensis in uno
⟨versiculorum anno putidus evomuit,⟩
Smyrna cavas Satrachi penitus mittetur ad undas,
Smyrnam cana diu saecula pervoluent:
at Volusi annales Paduam morientur ad ipsam
et laxas scombris saepe dabunt tunicas.
parva mei mihi sint cordi monumenta ⟨Philitae⟩:
at populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho.[15]

Volusius is pilloried again, and Cinna praised, though in a markedly different way. The epigram wears the mask of greater objectivity. The very fact that it compares two poems, that it is not a pair of poems but a single poem finding both merit and fault, promises a measure of objectivity. The qualities of the *Smyrna* and of the *Annals* are established for each by their absence from the other. The three linked points of comparison, which justify Cinna's success and coming renown, are: care in composition (small vs. swollen); subject and, by implication, narrative form (epyllion vs. annals); and intended audience (coterie of friends vs. the common people). And in carrying out the comparison, though his sentiments are manifest, Catullus is strictly even-handed in the allotment of space: a couplet to one, a couplet to the other, the same again, then the final couplet divided evenly.

Furthermore, Catullus praises and blames by impersonal standards. He defines Cinna's fame by referring to distant times and places. It will extend to the island of Cyprus, where the Satrachus is located (and the mythical story is set), and to ages that lie far in the future (*cana saecula*), whereas Volusius' fame will not. All this is remote from Catullus and his circle of friends. The Padua and the fish-market do not so much represent a personal closeness as they do the antithesis to far-off Cyprus; they mark the absence of the glory that awaits Cinna. Moreover, the judgments here are conveyed through straightforward statements made about the poems' origins and destinies rather than emerging as the

15. See my art → "On Catullus 95," *CP* 82 (1987): 141–45, for a defense of Housman's conjecture *Hatriensis in* and of retention of the last couplet as part of the poem. R. J. Tarrant has persuaded me in the meantime to change my mind about the penultimate verse and read *Philitae* rather than *sodalis:* since "Philitas" is transparently Cinna, as "Antimachus" is Volusius, there is no "presumptuous familiarity," as I claimed, in saying "my Philitas." I might also have added a word about verse 5, where *canas* of the archetype is impossible. Nisbet, "Notes on the Text," pp. 110–11, makes an appealing case for his own conjecture, *suas;* but that hardly sits well with the genitive *Satrachi,* and the early conjecture *cavas,* which has found nearly universal acceptance, is explained by W. V. Clausen, "Callimachus and Latin Poetry," *GRBS* 5 (1964): 189.

implications derived from a set of narrated events. Distance and directness lend authority to the literary criticism in 95.

The form in which the two groups of poems present literary criticism is reflected, intimately, in their shape. Poem 35 seems to give evidence of an overall structure. Its eighteen verses fall into three groups of six lines apiece, each group defined by both sense and syntax.[16] Moreover, the poem is denser with explanatory particles than any other of Catullus. Not only are the second and third sections introduced by *quare* and *nam,* which aid in articulating them, but another *nam* and an *enim* are found as well—all these in eighteen verses. Nonetheless, despite formal marks, the poem lacks a comprehensive structure. The logic is local; the particles do no more than join a segment to the preceding segment. The path between start and finish is not straight or otherwise predictable. The poem has the relatively shapeless feel of existence experienced moment by moment.

The structure of 36 is similar to that of 35, only simpler. A situation is set forth in the first part, and the prayer constituting the second part reveals the situation's unexpected meaning. The poem appears to be divided, like many another, into two halves that deal with the past and the present.[17] Nonetheless, the contrast between the halves is in fact feeble, with *nunc* correcting the expectation implicit in the preceding vow as much as it denotes the time (the *nunc* at 83. 4 is similar).

Poem 95, however, marches according to a strict order. In the first pair of couplets Catullus expresses through numbers the pains taken by Cinna and Volusius over their work. Then in the next pair he uses rivers to mark the extent of the fame they will win as a consequence. Finally, he summarizes what has been said and affirms his own stance. An overall logic is seen to govern the movement of the poem from first to last, and this is conspicuously true as well for many of the other epigrams, such as 71, 72, 76, 91, 96, and 99.

The differences between these sets of poems can be summarized in tabular form:

POEMS 35 AND 36	POEM 95
narrative	statement
indirect	direct
from poet's experience	according to impersonal standards
line-by-line composition	clear comprehensive structure

This calls for a little qualification. The poems can be said to pass their literary judgments directly or indirectly only in a relative sense. The hendecasyllabics are not utterly indirect. Though achieving their effect principally by recounting a narrative, they also convey through the words they employ something about the

16. The boundedness of each group may be reinforced in several ways. One might feel that the first group's opening and closing lines are linked by the words *sodali* and *amici,* the last group's by the repetition of *incohata;* and that the middle pair of lines in the first group alliterate with *v-v-l-l,* in the second with *r-m-r-m,* in the third with *ign-ign.*

17. See E. Schäfer, *Das Verhältnis von Erlebnis und Kunstgestalt bei Catull,* Hermes Einzelschriften 18 (Wiesbaden, 1966), p. 17.

quality of the poets (*tener,*[18] *pessimus*) and their work (*venusta, cacata, pleni ruris et inficetiarum*). Nor is the epigram utterly direct. Catullus could have said "The *Smyrna* is a great poem, the *Annals* is not." Instead he makes statements that clearly imply that the one was composed carefully, the other hastily. Still, they are statements, not narratives.

The differences seem so marked that perhaps there is reason to revive the notion, not prominent recently, of a fundamental distinction between Catullus' lyric and epigrammatic modes.[19] D. O. Ross, Jr., has reinforced the distinction with his attempt to establish differing historical origins for the groups of poems: for the polymetric (and also the longer) poems, Hellenistic poetry; for the epigrams, native Roman tradition.[20] Whether the explanation lies in their history or somewhere else, the groups do seem opposed to one another in the nature of their representation, and this deserves renewed consideration.[21]

JOSEPH B. SOLODOW
Yale University

18. On *tener* as designating quality rather than genre, see Buchheit, "Dichtertum und Lebensform," pp. 48–50, following up a suggestion made by Kroll, ed., *Catullus,* p. 65.

19. See I. Schnelle, *Untersuchungen zu Catulls dichterischer Form,* Philologus Supplementband 25.3 (Leipzig, 1933), esp. pp. 9–10; F. Klingner, "Catull," in *Römische Geisteswelt*[3], (Munich, 1956), pp. 202–6; and more recently, Skinner, "Semiotics and Poetics," who similarly characterizes the lyric poems.

20. *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), esp. pp. 171–74.

21. I would like to express my gratitude to several colleagues and also to the journal's referees and Editor for their aid, generously given and deeply appreciated.

SUM: FURTHER THOUGHTS

Even with the publication of our paper of 1987,[1] there are still many details of the relationship and development of Latin first person singular *sum* and Oscan first person singular **súm** (etc.) that bear further examination and elucidation. In this note, we augment our earlier discussion in three such areas: we provide more evidence that the Oscan form is not a borrowing from Latin; we present additional facts relevant to the fate of *-s-* plus nasal clusters in Latin; and we attempt to clarify some aspects of the enclisis of *sum* and **súm** in Italic.

I. **iúvilú-**INSCRIPTIONS

In our other paper we argued from the general nature of Latin borrowings into Oscan (for the most part only cultural loans like **aídil**, not intimate loans of the sort that **súm** would have to be) and from the dating of the earliest Oscan forms of **súm** (late fifth century, and thus well before the period of Roman influence) that Latin could not have been a donor language for the Oscan form in question.[2] An additional argument for our position can be drawn from a small

1. B. Joseph and R. Wallace, "Latin *sum* / Oscan **súm, sim, *esum***," *AJP* 108 (1987): 675–93.

2. Joseph and Wallace, "Latin *sum*," pp. 680–81.