TWO CATULLIAN QUESTIONS

I. Catullus, Archilochus and the 'motto'.

Two poems of Catullus have long been compared with fragments of Archilochus. First, Catullus 40 and Archilochus 172 West (fully discussed by Hendrickson "CP" 20, 1925, 155):

quaenam te mala mens, miselle Ravide,
agit praecipitem in meos iambos?
quid deus tibi non bene advocatus
vecordem parat excitare rixam?
an ut pervenias in ora vulgi?
quid vis? qualubet esse notus optas?
eris, quandoquidem meos amores
cum longa voluisti amare poena.

πάτερ Λυκάμβα, ποῖον ἐφράσω τόδε;
τίς σὰς παρήειρε φρένας
ἧς τὸ πρὶν ἠρήρησθα; νῦν δὲ δὴ πολὺς
ἀστοῖσι φαινέαι γέλως.

This is known to be the beginning of a poem, since Hephaestion, who quotes 1-2, only adduces the beginnings of poems; 210 τίς ἆρα δαίμων (*quis deus*) καὶ τέου χολούμενος may well come from the same context. Moreover, as Hendrickson remarks, Lucian's (*Pseudol.* 1) paraphrase of the context of 223, which he says was addressed to one of τοὺς περιπετεῖς ἐσομένους (cf. *praecipitem*) τῇ χολῇ τῶν ἰάμβων αὐτοῦ who had reviled the poet, seems to indicate that it went with 172; in that case Lucian's ὦ κακόδαιμον ἄνθρωπε = *miselle*, and αἰτίας ζητοῦντα καὶ ὑποθέσεις τοῖς ἰάμβοις will help to explain Catullus' application of *iambi* to hendecasyllables (though it does not need much explanation; cf. 54.6 and fr. 3). If Catullus had Archilochus in mind, he diverged from him in the last two lines, which envisage a situation quite different from that between Archilochus and Lycambes; the poem of Archilochus seems to have continued at considerable length and included the fable of the fox and the eagle (172-181).

Second, Catullus 56 in relation to Archilochus 168 (also, for the same reason, known to have been the beginning of a poem):

o rem ridiculam, Cato, et iocosam
dignamque auribus et tuo cachinno!
ride quicquid amas, Cato, Catullum:
res est ridicula et nimis iocosa.
deprendi modo pupulum puellae
trusantem; hunc ego, si placet Dionae,
protelo rigida mea cecidi.

'Ερασμονίδη Χαρίλαε
χρῆμά τοι γελοῖον
ἐρέω, πολὺ φίλταθ' ἑταίρων,
τέρψεαι δ' ἀκούων.

Again it seems likely that the poem went off in a different direction from Catullus. This Charila(o)s was a glutton (fr. 167, not from this poem), and the χρῆμα γελοῖον recounted to him was perhaps, as has been conjectured by M. Treu (*Archilochos* 1979[2], p. 241), the story about the folly displayed by another glutton (fr. 293).

Since Catullus palpably draws on Archilochus in these poems, we should pay some attention to 215 καί μ' οὔτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει. This came from a poem lamenting the death of his brother-in-law, in which he resisted those who urged him to immerse himself in writing. That seems to be relevant to the interpretation of Catullus 68A (see "BICS" 32, 1985, 97-9), in which Mallius asks Catullus (perhaps merely as a benevolent ruse to divert Catullus; "BICS" *l.c.*) to provide *munera et Musarum et Veneris*, and Catullus replies that grief at the death of his brother prevents him from providing either. With τερπωλέων cf. in particular *fugavi... omnes delicias animi* (25-6). One may note that Archilochus wrote another poem in elegiacs on the same theme (fr. 9-11), in which however he embraced τερπωλαί.

In two of the above instances Catullus has taken what in the case of Horace has been christened a 'motto' (Fraenkel, *Horace*, 159; Richmond, "Rh.M." 113, 1970, 197) from the beginning of a poem of Archilochus which went off in a different direction. Since I have never seen it noted (except incidentally in Fordyce's note on a very dubious case at 29.1) that Horace learned this technique from Catullus, it seems worth while to assemble the other instances in which the same thing may have happened. For the dedicatory poem to Cornelius Nepos Catullus took the motto from Meleager's preface to his anthology (*A.P.* 4.1.1-4):

cui dono lepidum novum libellum...?
Corneli, tibi...

1 Μοῦσα φίλα, τίνι τάνδε φέρεις πάγκαρπον ἀοιδάν;

3 ἄνυσε μὲν Μελέαγρος, ἀριζάλῳ δὲ Διοκλεῖ
μναμόσυνον ταύταν ἐξεπόνησε χάριν.

One might like to note 46.1-3 in relation to Leonidas *A.P.* 10.1.1-4, though the resemblance is not all that striking, and to observe how 70, based on Callimachus *A.P.* 5.6, derives the concluding concept from Meleager *A.P.* 5.8, which stood almost next door to Callimachus in Meleager's *Garland* (see Laurens, "Latomus" 24, 1965, 547; de Venuto "RCCM" 8, 1966, 215). But much more interesting than these is 32.1 *amabo, mea dulcis Ipsitilla* in relation to Laevius fr. 28 Morel *mea Vatiena, amabo* (Alfonsi, "Hermes" 86, 1958, 359 also quotes a similar phrase from Titinius); unfortunately we have no idea how the poem of Laevius continued, but in any case this is a striking confirmation of Richmond's insistence that Latin mottoes as well as Greek need to be considered.

If, as claimed above, Catullus had in mind a poem of Archilochus as he wrote 68A, one may like to note the declaration in this poem that he cannot write in Verona because he does not have his library with him (33-6; see "BICS" *l. c.*). This statement does represent a faithful declaration of literary creed, and has much of its justification in the above-analysed cases in which a poem starts from a Greek or Latin model; but Catullus cannot have been oblivious to the irony of the occurrence of the statement in a poem which is in fact, if I am right, based to some degree on a Greek model.

II. 64.37 *Pharsalum coeunt, Pharsalia tecta frequentant.*

Why does Catullus, who speaks of a *domus* (32, 46, 284) and a *regia* (33, 43-44, cf. 276), place the wedding of Peleus and Thetis in Pharsalus, whereas the canonical version puts it in the cave of Chiron on Mount Pelion? The answer to this question is that this version of the legend is connected with the existence at or near Pharsalus of a Θετίδειον (1). As the name indicates, this was a shrine of Thetis (the site of which is unfortunately not yet clearly established), but it also gave its name to the surrounding area and community. This is where Peleus and Thetis came to live after their wedding on Pelion (according to the orthodox version). The scene of the *Andromache* of Euripides is set by this shrine, which is beside (43) the house of Neoptolemus; Peleus, who still rules Pharsalus (22), now evidently lives at some distance (79-81, 561-2).

(1) The sources of our knowledge of this are assembled in *R.E.*, Suppl. 12.1048 and s.v. *Thetideion*; Roscher, *Myth. Lex.*, s.v. *Thetis* 792.51; Walbank, *Commentary on Polybius*, 2, pp. 578-80 (Polyb. 18.20.6, 21.2 reproduced in Livy 33.6.11, 7.4), W. K. Pritchett, *Studies in Ancient Topography*, 2 (1969) 114 and 141; Jacoby on Pherecydes of Athens fr. 1 (add Phylarchus fr. 81 Jacoby).

Now among the artistic representations of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis we have three of particular importance, the François vase painted by Kleitias about 570 B.C., and two dinoi by Sophilos, which are seen by A. Stewart in *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography* (ed. Warren Moon, 1983) 53 ff. as the models of Kleitias. On these vases Thetis, as she and Peleus receive their divine guests, is sitting within a building; the Sophilos depictions of this can be seen in Stewart pl. 4.4 a-b or G. Bakir, *Sophilos* (1981), Tafel 3 b-c or D. Williams in *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum.* "Occasional Papers on Antiquities" 1, 1983, p. 23 fig. 25 (2). What is this building? On the François vase W. Amelung, *Führer durch die Antiken in Florenz* (1897) 206 said flatly that it was the Thetideion. Most scholars have rejected this and said that it is the palace of Peleus; so e.g. Heidenreich, "Mitteil. deutsch. arch. Inst." 5, 1952, 140: "in dem Palast des Peleus in Phthia". A more constructive formulation is given by Williams 29: "A temple-like structure that may reflect the painter's idea of both the Thetideion in Thessaly and Peleus' palace". My colleague A. E. Raubitschek, to whom I am indebted for much information and advice, points out the resemblance between this edifice and the fountain-house on the same vase in the frieze showing the death of Troilus, which also has triglyphs, metopes and columns; the two can be seen together in fine photographs in M. Cristofani, *Materiali per servire alla storia del vaso François* ("Bollettino d'Arte", Serie speciale 1) pl. 83-4. In fact in black-figure vases depictions of buildings are not be pressed for accuracy of details; palace and temple are subsumed together under the heading "impressive formal edifice" with barely distinguishable architecture. The formulation of Williams well suits the close association of house and shrine which we see in Euripides. It may be as well to add that it would be futile to draw a distinction between 'wedding' in Chiron's cave and 'reception' at Pharsalus.

Was it then just painters who made the procession of guests, just as it would for any human bride, come to the home which Thetis would share with her husband? Catullus had a motive for adopting this version; wishing, in 'epyllion'-style, to insert one story (Ariadne and Theseus) inside another (Thetis and Peleus), and having decided to achieve this by representing the former as depicted on the coverlet of the *lectus genialis* of Thetis, he naturally found the most suitable setting for such a bed to be the house of the bridal pair. However, it is highly unlikely that he would have derived this version solely from works of classical Greek art, or, in view of his coincidence with them, that he invented it himself; he must have had a literary pre-

(2) I was directed to these publications by Jody Maxmin, to whom my best thanks are due.

decessor. It is therefore of great interest that Stewart (some scepticism is expressed by Williams 33) claims that Kleitias and Sophilos derived their version from a poem by Stesichorus (whose floruit may be placed around 600 B.C., though his chronology is very uncertain) of which fr. 57 = 234 Page *P.M.G.* is the surviving trace. Such a version could have passed into Hellenistic writers, and one notes with interest that (if Ptolemy Chennus has not forged all this) one Agamestor of Pharsalus wrote an *Epithalamium* for Thetis (Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Suppl. Hellenist.* 14), the surviving fragment of which deals with the naming of Achilles.

The following additional note is contributed by Jody Maxmin. It is worth noting here that among Beazley's lists of attributed black- and red-figured pottery, only two vases were found at Pharsalus: a dinos by Sophilos, featuring the funeral games for Patroclus (*A.B.V.* 39 n° 16) and a calyx-crater in the manner of Exekias, with the fight for the body of Patroclus (*A.B.V.* 148 n° 9), a vase which Beazley compares with the famous calyx-crater by Exekias found in the Agora (*A.B.V.* 145 n° 19). Such vases as Sophilos' dinos and the calyx-crater in Exekias' manner may have been specially made for export to Pharsalus, or one may imagine them to have been purchased in Athens by tourists from Pharsalus, to whom paintings devoted to Thetis and her family would have had a special appeal.

Stanford University EDWARD COURTNEY