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INTRODUCTION:
A TALE OF TWO GENRES AT ROME

ALISON KEITH,
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

The relationship between the genres of elegy and epigram has been much debated, and from a variety of angles; but with the recent publication of the Milan Posidippus papyrus and the explosion of scholarship on Hellenistic epigram in the last ten years, it seems timely to reopen discussion of the impact of Hellenistic epigram on Latin elegy. Most studies of the reception of Hellenistic epigram in the Roman world have addressed the work of Latin practitioners of the form such as Catullus and Martial. Scholars of Latin elegy, however, have long explored the aesthetic issues problematized by Hellenistic epigrammatists – such as metrical techniques, allusion and intertextuality, genre-blending and Kreuzung der Gattungen, arrangement of collections, narrative development, self-fashioning, and the like – though rarely in dialogue with the epigram tradition. This collection redresses critical neglect by examining the Latin elegists’ dynamic appropriations of Hellenistic Greek epigram through the lens of their shared literary concerns.

Indeed, the recent explosion of scholarly interest in Hellenistic epigram, well underway even before the excitement provoked by the discovery and publication of the papyrus containing an epigram collection attributed to Posidippus of Pella, had already sparked considerable interest amongst Latinists and renewed our scrutiny of intertextual relations not only between Greek and Latin epigram, but also between Greek epigram and Latin literature more broadly. In addition to detailed study of specific allusions by Latin authors to Hellenistic epigrams, scholars have explored the generic “mobility”, as Richard Thomas has called it, of the figures and tropes of sepulchral Hellenistic epigram in Latin literature. Martin Dinter, for example, has recently considered the relationship between Latin epic and Hellenistic epigram in connection with the deaths of minor heroes in the Aeneid, while Teresa Ramsby has analyzed the Roman elegists’ self-conscious deployment within their verse...
of instantiations of the epigraphic tradition in the form of actual “inscriptional” epigrams such as tomb mottoes and votive inscriptions, triumphal *tituli* and graffiti.\textsuperscript{9}

As many scholars have remarked, moreover, (Latin) elegy repeatedly acknowledges its derivation from (Greek) ἐλέγεια in general, and from the epigrammatic diffusion of the elegiac couplet in particular. For elegy shares with epigram not only a common metre, the elegiac couplet, but also a host of themes and stylistic motifs.\textsuperscript{10} From the start, Roman elegists seem to have accepted the Greek etymology deriving *elegia* from funerary lament, ἔ ὡ ἐ λέ γε έ ιν (to cry “woe, woe”), and/or ἔ λε ος (pity).\textsuperscript{11} These etymologies underlie the association of the elegiac couplet with the classical Greek tradition of sepulchral epigrams, which the Hellenistic poets exploited in their development of literary examples of the form (collected in the seventh book of the *Palatine Anthology*) and which they, and later the Roman love poets, adapted to amatory contexts (Greek examples collected in *AP* 5 and 12).\textsuperscript{12}

The contributors to this volume explore the interrelations between the genres from a variety of perspectives. In “Inscriptional Intermediality in Latin Elegy”, Martin Dinter begins by taking a step back from detailed textual examinations to offer theoretical reflection on the inscriptive and textual relations between the genres of epigram and elegy. Noting the common roots from funerary rites that have been proposed for both genres, he draws on the theoretical literature of “intermediality” to ask whether these two genres have really ever gone separate ways. When Latin love elegy enters the stage it processes much of the thematic material on offer from Hellenistic epigram. Simultaneously it playfully displays epigraphic pretensions, a habit it shares with the refined *Buchepigramm*. Elegy thereby draws on the inscriptive heritage it shares with the epigrammatic genre, while at the same time joining with the literary games of the Hellenistic poets. The second part of the chapter then takes a closer look at the forms the interaction of these two genres can take. Besides the presence of obvious thematic and formal allusions to epigram in elegy he proposes the existence of epitaphic markers, such as *tu/tu quoque*, which make reference to this most prominent subgenre of epigram.

Regina Höschele, in “Inscribing Epigrammatists’ Names: Meleager in Propertius and Philodemus in Horace”, takes Teresa Ramsby’s exploration of fictional epitaphs in Latin elegy as her point of departure for the investigation of traces of amatory epigram in Roman elegy. As is well known, Meleager’s *Garland* had a major impact on the erotic poetry of the first century BCE: not only can we trace many motifs found in Roman elegy back to Hellenistic amatory verse, but it is also possible to identify
numerous allusions to specific epigrams. Her chapter examines such “intertextual inscriptions”, in Propertius 1.1 and Horace C. 2.4-5, and reflects upon their poetic function both within the texts into which they were embedded and the oeuvre as a whole. While it is common knowledge that the Monobiblos opens with a reference to one of Meleager’s epigrams (1.1.1-4 ~ AP 12.101.1-4), it has so far remained unnoticed that the passage also contains verbal reminiscences of another Meleagrean epigram on Myiscus (AP 12.23). Taking into consideration the boy’s programmatic role in Meleager’s erôtika, she re-examines the poetological implications of this allusion at the very outset of Propertius’ first liber. Secondly, she turns to two odes in Horace’s second book and argues that Horace’s evocation of Philodemean epigrams in C. 2.4-5 exhibits some striking parallels with Propertius’ echoes of Meleager. Both authors highlight their intertextual play by inscribing into their poems the very names of their epigrammatic models.

In “Philodemus AP 5.123, the Epigrammatic Tradition, and Propertius 1.3”, Francis Cairns returns to the question of Philodemus’ reception in Latin elegy to investigate the impact of Philodemus’ famous epigram on the Latin elegists. Philodemus AP 5.123 (= 14 Sider [1997]; 9 Gow/Page [1968]) has justifiably been described as “in tone one of the most lyrical of Philodemus’ epigrams” (Sider [1997], 113), and several of its dimensions have been well explored. But part of its central couplet (ἐς ὀτὰ ὀφίλευντων ὄ/ὄ ἐργα ὀκατοπτεύειν ὄ/ὄ φθόνος ὀ/ἄθανάτῃ, 3-4) has been rendered in very different ways, all of which turn on the significance of ὄφθόνος (4). Cairns argues that Philodemus’ collocation of ὄφθόνος with ὀλβίζεις in the following line (5) recalls those pairings of φθόνος and ὀλβος and their cognates which in Homer, Pindar, Sophocles and elsewhere express the commonplace that human happiness and prosperity attract envy. The text of AP 5.123 also evokes two other ancient topoi not yet brought to bear on it: that gods may feel envy and malice towards men, and that envious observers can harm the object of their envy merely by looking – the so-called “Evil Eye”. The burden of AP 5.123 is then: Selene is told to look upon or illuminate (αὔγαζε is ambivalent) the sleeping Kallistion. The request is made because, although Kallistion and her poet-lover are happy and although Selene as a deity is predisposed to φθόνος towards mortals, she does not in fact feel grudging envy for Kallistion or for her lover; rather she ratifies/approves their happiness – because she too was a lover. The pointe thus lies in the paradoxical benevolence of the goddess Selene qua observer of happy mutual love. This interpretation immediately calls to mind (and enlists as confirmation) Catullus 5 and 7, where the reactions
of unsympathetic observers of happy love, i.e. envy/malice = the Evil Eye/mala lingua, are present. The analogies between \textit{AP} 5.123 and Catullus 5 and 7 thus add to the known traffic between Philodemus and Catullus.

Joan Booth contributes a third paper on the impact of Philodemean epigram on Latin elegy to the volume, in “Negotiating with the Epigram in Latin Love Elegy”. In this chapter, she offers a detailed re-examination of the relations between another epigram of Philodemus (\textit{AP} 5.132 = 12 Sider [1997]; 12 Gow/Page [1968]) and an elegy in Ovid’s collection of \textit{Amores} (1.5) in the context of contemporary Greek epigram (Marcus Argentarius) and Augustan Latin elegy (Prop. 2.15, Ov. \textit{Am}. 3.7). Despite the recent surge of interest in the “gaze”, an obvious common element between \textit{Amores} 1.5 and the Greek epigram of Philodemus (\textit{AP} 5.132), long recognized as lying behind lines 19-22 of the elegy, the two poems and their relationship have not been probed by the intertextual approach, and one of the aims of her paper is to fill the interpretational gap. In this reading, she seeks to recalibrate our understanding of the relationship of Latin elegy with Hellenistic epigram, still viewed through a reductionist lens as one of both indebtedness and aesthetic superiority.

In “Propertius and Propertian Elegy’s Epigram Riffs: Radical Poet/Radical Critics”, Richard Thomas pursues scholarly debate concerning the impact of the epigrams of the Milan papyrus (\textit{P. Mil. Vogl.} VIII 309) on Latin elegy in the context of the editorial theories and decisions in S. J. Heyworth’s 2007 OCT of Propertius, and its companion volume of the same year, \textit{Cynthia} (Oxford). Thomas begins by addressing the problem that “radical” textual intervention in a poet who is otherwise difficult in his thought may in fact produce a more readable but less authentic text than is legitimate. In his earlier work on the relationship between epigram and elegy, he focused on Propertius 3.7, the Paetus elegy, and suggested that multiple editorial interventions aimed at creating unity of thought obscured the possibility of reading the poem, in the order given by the manuscripts, as a series of thematically related but deliberately disjointed epigrams – never meant to have the unity that is so violently imposed on them by the reordering of couplets. In this chapter, he extends that investigation of the abuses of transposition to other poems (1.17, and 2.6) and focuses on Propertius as a dynamic poet who, in gesturing towards rather than away from the epigrammatic origins of Roman elegy, creates a poetry that is truly Callimachean, freed as it is from the Aristotelian unity that misguided textual positivism with its preconceptions about normative forms of “elegy” (a genre of which Propertius is the first extant practitioner) can sometimes impose on it.
Robert Maltby, in “The Influence of Hellenistic Epigram on Tibullus”, observes that the influence of Greek epigram permeates many of Tibullus’ elegies and their presence is particularly striking in the opening of certain poems in the first book (1.2, 1.5, 1.6 and 1.8), although Tibullus never spells out openly his literary debt to the Greeks. Occasionally, as in the case of the opening of 1.2, we can identify with some certainty the actual Greek epigram on which the lines are based, but more often although we can identify common epigrammatic themes in Tibullan openings it is difficult to say which particular Greek epigram the Roman poet had in mind. Professor Maltby argues that Tibullus is closer in many ways than the other Roman elegists, Propertius and Ovid, to the Greek epigrammatic tradition, and considers how his use of epigram changes over his brief poetic career. He underlines Tibullus’ closeness in his approach to cycles of love and rejection to the world of the Greek epigrammatists, particularly Meleager, and he notes his possible debt to Gallus in the use of epigram as a starting point for poems in the first book. Other tactics for opening poems, influenced especially by Propertius, seem to take over in the second book. In both books epigrams are used to mark the beginnings and ends, of cycles in book 1, and of the book itself in book 2.

The final chapter, “Latin Elegiac Collections and Hellenistic Epigram Books”, examines precisely this question in the Roman elegists’ evocation of Greek epigram in the opening and closing poems of their elegiac collections, whether through allusion, inscriptive instantiation, the composition of their own verse epigrams, or two or more of these elements in combination. Taking Catullus, and his allusions to Meleager and Callimachus in Cat. 1, 65 and 116, as my starting point, I argue that later Latin elegists follow his lead both in including epigrams in their collections (Gallus, Prop. 1.21-22, Ov. Am. Epigr.) and in playing on commonalities and differences between the two closely related forms. The Latin elegists’ keen interest in Hellenistic epigrammatic models for both individual poems and artfully arranged poetry books is reflected in particularly concentrated form at moments of aperture and closure. There is considerable evidence that the Hellenistic Greek epigrammatists also flirt with elegy in the long opening and closing poems of their epigram books. Posidippus’ “Seal”, or the epithalamium for Arsinoe (SH 961), for example, accompanied a collection entitled “Symmeiktika Epigrammata”, which constituted either an anthology or a single-authored libellus by Posidippus himself, while the introductory poem that prefaced Meleager’s Garland contains twenty-nine elegiac distichs and thus exceeds in length most of the elegiac poems authored by Catullus, Propertius, and Ovid. Callimachus too seems to have played with the permeability of the genres
in his famous *Coma Berenices*, the elegy that closed the *Aetia*, by representing it as a (vastly expanded) dedicatory epigram. In this regard, Catullus, Gallus, Propertius, and Ovid show themselves self-conscious inheritors of the Hellenistic epigrammatists’ exploitation of the thematic, generic and intertextual versatility of their form.
CHAPTER ONE

INSCRIPTIONAL INTERMEDIALITY IN LATIN ELEGY

MARTIN DINTER,
KING’S COLLEGE LONDON

The history of epigram is characterised by a progressive dissolution of its ties with its physical and communicative contexts. From the fifth century on, epigram started freeing itself first from its material support – to become a literary and then bookish genre – and then also from the obligation to treat real events and people; this is particularly clear in the case of funerary epigrams which soon started commemorating people who were long dead and people who never lived. (Aloni [2009], 180)

Elegy builds up a monument out of the memory of brave men and glorious acts past and present, a mnêma to be looked at as much as listened to, both by the immediate addressee and by those who will enjoy the poem in the future. Performance and inscription on physical objects converge in accomplishing this function [...] ; this is also the primary function of the inscribed epigram. (Aloni [2009], 182)

THIS STUDY PLUNGES INTO THE THICK OF LATIN POETRY and adopts an avowedly methodological approach to interrogate elegy’s engagement with epigram through embedded inscriptions. I suggest that when epigram moved on from its inscriptional roots to become a literary genre and thus an abstract concept, it opened up not only itself but also inscriptions for dissection and reception in other genres. Accordingly, I shall ask whether there are such things as epigraphic markers in Latin elegy, i.e., formulae that bear the connotation of the inscriptive and thus combine and emphasise the primal memorialising function of elegy and epigram (cf. Aloni 182, quoted above). I shall thus consider how the theoretical approach of intermediality (Intermedialität) can provide a framework for exploring the blurring of inscriptive and narrative modes in Latin elegy. This framework helps us better understand the relationship of inscription
and elegy in the context of the elegiac world. In what follows I shall argue that epigraphic markers are used to construct epitaphic gestures in Latin poetry.

As we will see, both elegy and epigram look back to a shared past in Roman literature. In her recent study of embedded inscription in Latin elegy, Teresa Ramsby begins by proposing that the Roman elegists wrested the elegiac genre from the epigraphers who had made elegy the preferred medium of memorial, and added the spice of Hellenistic poetics. She then discusses Catullus’ lament for his deceased brother in poem 65, suggesting that his personal experience added to the thematic development of Latin elegy since the poem was intended as a monument for his brother. This constitutes, then, an important precursor for Propertius’ reflections on his literary legacy and his efforts to articulate a career as a poet worth memorialising as an alternative to the existing categories of Roman manhood in politics and military. In addition, Ramsby frequently links the elegists’ drive for (self)memorialisation to the political situation of Augustan Rome, in which public honours were reserved for the princeps. On her interpretation, Propertius “utilizes … elegy to memorialise those whose voices were lost […] in the age of Empire”.

We may supplement Ramsby’s important discussion by describing and defining the Roman elegists’ use of the inscriptional from the perspective of the theory of intermediality. Embedded inscriptions, products of the (inter)textual world of Roman elegists, are points where “two semiotic systems partially overlap”. Obviously, an embedded inscription can be explained as an effort to capture an inscription in words; but at the same time it also “denotes a kind of intermedial and self-reflexive relationship between two different media [stone and text in our case], which ponder their own material characteristics”.

But what exactly is meant by the terms intermedial and intermediality? I understand the term “medium” as defined by Wolf:

I here propose to use a broad concept of medium: not in the restricted sense of a technical or institutional channel of communication [e.g., letter, book, radio or poster] but as a conventionally distinct means of communication or expression characterized not only by particular channels or one channel for sending or receiving messages but also by the use of one or more semiotic systems.

On the most basic level, intermediality is thus a hyperonym for all phenomena which cross the borders between media and are accordingly – as the prefix inter indicates – located in some way or other between media. In a recent attempt to define and systematise intermediality, three
areas of research have been highlighted: the combination of media, the transformation of media, and intermedial connections, the last of which includes phenomena such as ekphrasis or embedded inscriptions. The term intermedial connection describes a way to constitute meaning through the (actual) connection, which a medial product (in our case texts) can form with the product of another medium or a medial system itself. To create meaning the medial product (i.e. text) thus uses in addition to its usual means also intermedial ones. This contact between media products or systems lets both of them – as well as their medial differences and equivalences – be absorbed by their consumer (i.e., the reader in the case of texts). Intermedial connections thus participate in the creation of meaning differently from the standard means employed by texts. As texts remain the sole medium that is present, however, elements and structures of other media or another medium are thematised, simulated and, as far as possible, reproduced with the means specific to texts. The only way in which a medium such as the literary text can make elements and structures of other media (such as film, music, painting or inscription) its own – even though it only has its own, media-typical literary means at its disposal – is by investing these elements and structures with an “as-if mode”, which creates an illusion of the other, alien medium. To such an extent and in such a way is it actually possible to quote, reproduce or incorporate a medial system, or medial product, within literary texts. These illusions are often marked out and identified as medial connections by an explicit reference to the alien medium, which has been incorporated for the purpose of directing the readers’ reception.

It remains to raise the question of where the difference between intermediality and intertextuality lies. Julia Kristeva has proposed a concept of intertextuality in which “any text is a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another”. Moreover, she has widened the term “text” to include any cultural system and any cultural structure. Literary scholars on the hunt for intentional allusions of specific texts to specific texts, however, must focus the term “text” if they want to employ intertextuality. For my study, therefore, I will use the term in its most narrow meaning, to refer to literary texts only. “Intertextuality” will thus only refer to the relation of one literary text to one or several other literary texts.

Intermediality on the other hand is “an intended and identifiable use or incorporation of at least two usually distinct media in one artefact”. Its “overt/direct” form (i.e., the combination of media) is characterised by the fact that “at least in one instance more than one medium is present […]”, whereby each medium appears with its typical or conventional signifiers,
remains distinct and in principle ‘quotable’.

Intermedial connections, on the other hand, feature the involvement of (at least) two conventionally distinct media in the signification of an artefact in which, however, only one (dominant) medium appears directly with its typical or conventional signifiers, the other one (the non-dominant medium) being only indirectly present “within” the first medium as a signified (in some cases as a referent). It is, as it were, “covered” by the dominant medium (though the description of a statue in a novel, for instance, involves a visual art, it still remains literature), and hence the two media cannot be separated from each other, as in the case of the overt/direct intermediality.

While the theory of intertextuality uses the term “textual reference” to describe how texts relate to each other, the theory of intermediality employs “systemic reference” to refer to the relation between a text and one or several semiotic systems (such as genres or other types of discourse).

Naturally, systemic references come in different shapes and sizes but there are two sub-categories which will be of relevance to my discussion. One is the contamination of two semiotic systems (“Systemkontamination”) such as full-blown ekphrasis entails, in which the reader witnesses the overlap of the visual medium and the textual. The “as if” mode of ekphrasis which attempts an actualisation and reproduction of the visual with the means of the literary medium creates an altermedially referenced illusion, which is usually marked out clearly by a systemic pointer to the medium referenced (“explizite Systemerwähnung”) with a statement such as “there is an object and on it we see”, which directs the readers’ reception. In the same way, inscriptions tend to be signalled by a statement such as “there is or will be a stone and on it we read”. In modern editions of classical texts, embedded inscriptions are also frequently flagged for the reader by being printed in capital letters. In cases where the medium referenced is less easily discernible or detectable (e.g., film), systemic pointers can serve as signals of intermediality. On the other hand, where the medium referenced is easily discernable and detectable, the systemic pointers may be implicit.

In my discussion, however, a further way of referencing a semiotic system will be of particular prominence. In addition to the contamination of two semiotic systems which results in a full altermedial illusion, a medium can also be only partially reproduced by another medium; this leads to a partial altermedial illusion (“[teil-]reproduzierende Systemerwähnung”). Here components (or parts thereof) which are characteristic of another medium are reproduced – in our case in literature. It is important that
these altermedial components be recognised as such by the reader – as before they might have been signposted by systemic pointers – who then associates with them those medial components that could not be reproduced by the text. As a result the altermedial components reverberate with the other absent characteristics of the medium or genre they belong to. This partial reproduction of a medium has also been dubbed “associative quotation”. In sum, a microform such as an associative quotation can evoke a macroform such as the genre of ekphrasis, the medium film or the format of inscription.

The variety of ways in which a text may interact with another medium thus ranges from full blown ekphrasis, which often has important metapoetic resonances and is monopolised by programmatic functions, to inconspicuous “medial quotations”; as we shall see, what I call “medial quotation” is a form of “associative quotation” and poses a hermeneutic challenge to the reader, since it can be discerned less easily from the surrounding text than an overt and clearly marked ekphrasis or an embedded inscription announced with the formula “here is a stone and on it we read”. Consequently, for the critic inspecting “texts, which parade their relation to images” or inscriptions under the auspices of intermediality, it is a defining feature “that the essential dimension of intermediality in these texts finds its dominant expression not necessarily on the structural or syntactical but rather on the semantic level of the narrative examined: images [or associative quotes] expand or even create the significance of these texts”. Hence, the dialogue-structure (Dialogizität) of what has been imported from another medium (i.e., the associative quote) affects the meaning and thus the semantic aspects of a text. These quotes carry associations that impart significant meaning to the texts they feature in and, as a consequence, they inform the way in which these texts are read. Paech accordingly observes:

After all a medial product […] achieves intermediality only if the multimodal juxtaposition of medial quotes and elements becomes a conceptual unity, whose (aesthetical) fractures and faults open up new dimensions of experience.

As we shall see, then, the technique of employing medial quotes in the Roman elegists showcases different aspects of intermediality.

When applied to literary inscriptions, “intermediality” encourages us to think harder about exactly how inscriptions and literature interact and to treat these texts rather more as hermeneutic “processes” than “works”. It also encourages us not to content ourselves with the analysis of literary inscriptions, where obvious embedded inscriptions fulfil the programmatic
function of summing up a literary career or securing lasting fame, but to embrace “medial quotes” which evoke the inscriptive and are less discrete or easily discernable from the surrounding text. I will focus on one formal epitaphic marker, to demonstrate how Greek epigraphic formulae such as kai su are absorbed into Latin poetry. There they then develop a life of their own: (over)emphasising the sepulchral origin of kai su, Latin authors develop a literary game in which the expression tu/te quoque serves as an epitaphic gesture to death or future death.

Instances of kai su or kai se in Greek literary epitaph abound; most prominent is the example of an epigram on Cleanorides, a youth who died at sea, by Anacreon, which actually opens with kai se (AP 7.263). In Greek epigram, the address in the second person singular becomes essential for creating the “voice” of the epitaph which speaks to the deceased or the passer by. For the Latin tradition, the influence of epigram on Virgil’s Aeneid has been well established and it is therefore from this text that I shall take my starting point. For Merkelbach has traced one notorious example of our tu quoque formula at the beginning of Aeneid 7.

Tu quoque litoribus nostris, Aeneia nutrix,
aeternam moriens famam, Caieta, dedisti;
et nunc seruat honos sedem tuus ossaque nomen
Hesperia in magna, siqua est ea gloria, signat.
(Virg. Aen. 7.1)

You, too, Caieta, nurse of Aeneas, have by your death given eternal fame to our shores; and still your honour guards your resting place, and in great Hesperia, if that be glory, your name marks your dust!

As precursors to Caieta’s epigram, Merkelbach cites two epitaphs by Caesar and Cicero on the deceased Terence, preserved in Suetonius’ life of Terence (Vit. Ter. 7), both of which feature tu quoque prominently at the beginning of the first line; Domitius Marsus 7 on Tibullus, which opens with te quoque, offers a further parallel. Merkelbach then suggests that we see tu quoque not narrowly as a feature of epigrams on poets – where one poet may address the other or where this formula may signal that the epigram is part of an enumeration, a list of poems on poets – but also more generally as an echo of the address to the deceased in Roman funerary practice. He concludes, therefore, that for the Roman reader Virgil’s verses on Caieta must have combined Roman epitaph with Roman eulogy. Horsfall, too, in his commentary on Aeneid 7, points out that the
phrase *tu quoque* carries resonances of literary epitaph, however innocent it may appear at first glance.\(^3^4\)

It is, indeed, worth considering the use of personal pronouns in Latin poetry more generally. Adams has suggested that the general conception that the use of the nominative first and second person personal pronouns *ego* and *tu* can be explained as either “emphatic” or “unemphatic” is misguided: “certain structural conditions are among the determinants which may generate the use of a nominative pronoun, regardless of whether that pronoun in the context is emphatic or not. *Ego* and *tu* have a tendency to attach themselves to certain preferential terms, that is, terms which habitually are placed at the head of a colon”.\(^3^5\) The conjunction of *tu quoque* fits the pattern Adams has identified well. Moreover, his suggestion explains the frequent and prominent position of the phrase at the beginning of a sentence while also underlining the fact that Romans must have been used to perceiving the word *tu* as part of a two-word unit. Hence, despite the fact that “you” and “too/as well” must be among the most frequently employed words in any language, the combination of *tu* and *quoque* acquires formulaic status, mimicking the formulaic language of inscriptions, a language that Hellenistic epigram already studiously and frequently imitates, and which the epigraphic habit of Roman culture also cultivated in Latin.\(^3^6\) This allows us to see *tu quoque* as a systemic marker for epitaphs bearing the defining features of this medium (inscription) and genre (epitaph): a connotation of death but also of memorialisation, because of the durability of the medium stone. As I suggested earlier, in love elegy both these characteristics look back to the original functions of the elegiac genre.\(^3^7\)

One example where many of these strands come together is provided by Ovid’s abortion poem, *Amores* 2.14, where both enumeration and epitaphic gesture occur in tandem. In a list of anti-examples (*Am.* 2.14.13-18), the poetcatalogues the mothers of famous heroes who did not employ abortion, with the result that their children performed great deeds. Although Ovid begins with Thetis, the mother of Achilles, who was instrumental in the sack of Troy, he moves immediately towards Rome, the city that Ilia’s twins founded. Now, however, Rome is ruled not by the descendents of Mars but of Venus, thanks to the fact that all these women have refrained from abortion. Indeed, Ovid reminds us that his *puella* herself would not have been a renowned beauty if her mother had done to her what she has done to her own foetus. Ovid here places his *puella* flatteringly in line next to the goddess Venus and the doomed offspring in line not only with the great heroes of the past but also with the Caesars. The epitaphic gesture of *tu quoque*, however, is directed towards a non-
event when for a brief moment the *puella* is imagined as having been aborted by her mother (*Ov. Am.* 2.14.19-22):

\[ Tu quoque, cum posses nasci formosa, perisses, \
   temptasset, quod tu, si tua mater opus; \
 ipse ego, cum fuerim melius periturus amando, \
   uidissem nullos matre necante dies. \]

You, too, though you were to be born fair, would have perished had your mother tried what you have tried; and I myself, though a death through love was to be my better fate, would never have seen the day had my mother slain me.

In addition, the poet also inserts an epitaphic address to himself (*ipse ego*) which is modelled on the *ille ego* formula common in the (self-)epitaphs of poets. He, too, although he would prefer to die as a soldier of love, could have been killed before even being born. Ovid here wittily contrasts two epitaphic addresses, one to his *puella* and one to himself, to illustrate the consequences of unrestrained abortion practices. For the learned reader who can recognise these addresses as systemic markers of the epitaphic genre, they in turn can be read as epitaphic gestures and the associations they evoke reach out beyond those of an ordinary address.

In this vein, we witness a multi-layered *tu quoque* in Propertius’ poem to Maecenas (Prop. 3.9.31-4):

\[ crede mihi, magnos aequabunt ista Camillos \
   iudicia, et uenies *tu quoque* in ora uirum, \
 Caesaris et famae uestigia iuncta tenebis: \
 Maecenatis erunt uera tropaea fides. \]

Believe me, your resolve will rival the great deeds of Camillus; you too will live on men’s lips, and take your stand at Caesar’s side in history. Your loyalty will be your true trophy of triumph.

With the phrase *tu quoque*, Propertius compares Maecenas with the legendary Roman general Camillus, a great exemplum from Rome’s past. Propertius may also mimic the frequent use of the address *tu quoque* in epigrams on poets when he puts Maecenas on the same level as the famous poet Ennius, who in his (self-)epitaph famously proclaimed that he would live on the lips of men (*ulitio ueuos per ora uirum*, Cic. *Tusc.* 1.34 [*var. 17-18 V*]). In addition, if we regard *tu quoque* as an epitaphic marker, Propertius makes a further point: he emphasises that Maecenas’ fame will be posthumous since he eschews a career in high office – just as the poet
does (cf. 3.9.21, at tua Maecenas, uitae praecepta recepi). What is more, having aligned Maecenas with the poet figure Ennius, Propertius can imply that what works for Maecenas will work for him: if Maecenas can win lasting fame and glory – even though only recognised as such after his death since he is not following the cursus honorum – so can the poet. Propertius thus here provides a variant on the recusatio-motif common in Roman love elegy.

Not dissimilar is Ovid’s use of tu quoque in his lament for Tibullus (Am. 3.9. 59-64):\textsuperscript{40}

\begin{quote}
\textit{si tamen e nobis aliquid nisi nomen et umbra
\textit{restat, in Elysia ualle Tibullus erit:
\textit{obuius huic uenias hedera iuuenalia cinctus
\textit{tempora cum Caluo, docte Catulle, tuo;
\textit{tu quoque, si falsumst temerati crimen amici,
\textit{sanguinis atque animae prodige Galle tuae.}
\end{quote}

If nothing survives from us beyond mere name and shade, dear Tibullus will abide in the vale of Elysium. May you come to meet him, your youthful temples encircled with ivy, and Calvus with you, learned Catullus. You too, if the charge is false that you wronged your friend, Gallus, lavish of blood and soul.

Again, there are many levels of interpretation to consider. First of all, we may note that the poem is full of second person addresses: to the personified genre of elegy (5, 7); the followers of the Isis cult (33-4), including Delia (cf. Tib. 1.3.23); and Tibullus himself (41); then Delia addresses the dead Tibullus (54-5) and Nemesis speaks to Delia (56-7). Only towards the very end of the passage, however, do we come upon the epitaphic address \textit{tu quoque}, which is not directed towards the dead, but rather features in a section in which various deceased poets are imagined to be joining Tibullus in Elysium, and it is here aimed at the poet (and politician) Gallus. Considering the poem’s setting in Elysium and its context of lament, there can be no doubt that this address carries an epitaphic flavour; as, indeed, all poets mentioned here are (of course) dead. In addition, Ovid will employ yet another epitaphic gesture when he uses a variant of the \textit{sit terra tibi leuis} formula in the poem’s final couplet (et sit humus cineri non onerosa tuo, 68). The epitaphic gesture embedded in \textit{tu quoque} in this particular instance, however, assumes a question mark. Gallus is mentioned here as a member of a group of poets in the underworld, but while his death is undisputed his presence in Elysium is not – only if innocent will he be allowed there. In this poem, in which in the manner of a dirge Ovid repeatedly addresses the deceased Tibullus, the
poet also wittily plays on the enumerative and epitaphic connotations the address *tu quoque* carries when directing it towards the notorious figure of Gallus, leaving it to the reader to detect the finer points of his poetic technique.

To conclude this section, let me cite one more passage whose epitaphic pretensions are well understood. In elegy 2.13, Propertius imagines his funeral and burial, and composes his own tombstone inscription in the process (Prop. 2.13.31-40):

```
deinde, ubi suppositus cinerem me fecerit ardor
accipiat Manis paruula testa meos,
et sit in exiguo laurus super addita busto,
quae tegat extincti funeris umbra locum,
et duo sint uersus: QVI NVNC IACET HORRIDA PVLVIS,
VNIVS HIC QVONDAM SERVVS AMORIS ERAT.
nec minus haec nostri notescet fama sepulcri,
quam fuerant Pthii busta cruenta uiri.
tu quoque si quando uenies ad fata, memento,
hoc iter ad lapides cana ueni memores.
```

Then when the fire beneath has burnt me to an ash, let the tiny earthen urn receive my ghost, and over my little tomb let a laurel be planted to overshadow the spot where the fire of death has ceased to burn; and thereon be these two verses: HE WHO NOW LIES NAUGHT BUT UNLOVELY DUST, ONCE SERVED ONE LOVE AND ONE LOVE ONLY. So shall the fame of my sepulchre be blazoned abroad no less than the bloody tomb of the Phthian hero. You too, whenever you shall come to your death, remember, come gray-haired by this path to the stones that guard my memory.

The passage features a fully referenced altermedial illusion of an inscription, along with both systemic pointers (i.e. there will be my tomb and on it these two verses) and systemic markers such as the use of *iacet*, which is extremely common in epitaphs. Propertius thus designs his own grave stone inscription, but is it convincing? Has anybody ever seen a verse inscription starting mid-verse? Without the name? One may safely assume that the inscription showcases Propertius as the ultimate slave of love and thereby provides “the codification of this elegist’s aims”. The epitaphic address customary to either the passer by or the dead person is directed to Cynthia and presages her future death and the poet’s hope of a shared tomb. Kiessling’s emendation of the final line’s *hoc iter* to *huc iter(um)* “come again here, grey haired, to the stones that remember” would only enhance the epitaphic gesture inherent in this address. The epitaphic marker *tu quoque* turns Propertius’ epitaphic gesture into an
epitaphic embrace and articulates the hope that his tombstone inscription will come true for both, lover and mistress, as slaves of one love only.

Having established the epitaphic force of the address *tu quoque*, I wish to conclude with a final instance in Propertius, where he warns fellow lovers of the fickleness of womankind (Prop. 2.25.21-2): *tu quoque, qui pleno fastus assumis amore / credule, nulla diu femina pondus habet* (“You, too, credulous lover, who waxes proud because your love is at the full, know that no woman is constant for long”).

If read as an epitaphic gesture this instance of *tu quoque* rings in the death of love and points to the swift demise of many a love affair. While this address is ostensibly directed towards the speaker’s fellow lovers, its epitaphic undertone provides us with a cynical comment on the durability of love. Propertius imparts an alienating twist to this epitaphic gesture and thereby makes us all the more aware of our expectations as readers.

Ovid trumps Propertius’ tactics when he finds an even more provocative application for this epitaphic gesture (*Ars* 3.797-803):

*Tu quoque, cui Veneris sensum natura negauit,*  
*Dulcia mendaci gaudia finge sono:*  
(Infelix, cui torpet hebes locus ille, puellast,  
Quo pariter debent femina uirque frui!)  
*Tantum, cum finges, ne sis manifesta, caueto;*  
*Effice per motum luminaque ipsa fidem!*  
*Quid iuuet, et uoces et anhelitus arguat oris!*

You too, to whom nature has denied the sensation of love, counterfeit the sweet bliss with lying sounds. Unhappy the woman for whom that place from which man and woman both ought to have joy is dull and unfeeling. Only if you pretend, see that you are not caught: win assurance by your movements and even by your eyes. Let your words and panting breath make clear your pleasure.

With his use of *tu quoque* here, Ovid seems to imply that those who cannot enjoy an orgasm are as good as dead and have little left to live for. He therefore goes on to offer detailed instructions for faking *le petit mort*, lest the death of lust infect both partners.

By citing this pun, I hope to have demonstrated that already by Ovid’s day the expression *tu/te quoque* had become so closely associated with funerary epigram that it had advanced to the status of a sepulchral marker. It thus offers the poet the opportunity to make an epitaphic gesture by using it outside its generic boundaries. My reading of this passage, as well
as others from Roman love elegy, draws attention to the allusive potential of the formulaic phrase *tu quoque* and underpins its association with inscriptional contexts by recourse to the theoretical framework of intermediality. If seen as an associative quote and systemic marker for the genre of epitaph, this brief address opens up illuminating new ways of reading and interpretation.
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INSCRIBING EPIGRAMMATISTS’ NAMES: MELEAGER IN PROPERTIUS AND PHILODEMUS IN HORACE
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Published around 100 BCE, Meleager’s *Stephanos* is not only the first anthology proper in the history of Western literature, but also the single most important collection of ancient Greek epigrams.¹ Meleager’s aesthetic ideals and editorial choices were highly influential for later conceptions of the genre; his preference for short pieces, for instance, led to a much stronger penchant for brevity among later epigrammatists.² While inevitably offering a small and idiosyncratic selection of Hellas’ epigrammatic production, the *Garland* helped preserve hundreds of texts which in all likelihood would otherwise have been lost. As a poet Meleager is most famous for his ἐρωτικά, which feature – in typically epigrammatic fashion – a multiplicity of male and female loves.³ What distinguishes his beloveds from those of his predecessors is that most of them bear personal traits, as the names appearing in his epigrams are not mere fillers, but belong to distinct characters.⁴ The creation of cycles centering around individual darlings is, in fact, one of Meleager’s most significant innovations and prepared the ground, in a way, for the birth of Propertius’, Tibullus’ and Ovid’s literary loves.⁵

As is well known, the poems of the *Garland* and other Hellenistic epigrams circulating in single-authored books had a major impact on Latin poetry of the first century BCE, not least of all on Roman elegy. Apart from embedding fictional epitaphs and dedicatory poems into their amatory verse (a phenomenon recently examined by Teresa Ramsby),⁶ the Roman elegists repeatedly mark their generic affinity and literary debt through the allusive recollection of specific epigrams.⁷ In what follows, I would like to explore the dynamics of one such “intertextual inscription”
at the beginning of Propertius’ *Monobiblos* in comparison with Horace’s allusions to Philodemus in *Odes* 2.4 and 2.5. While Propertius’ rewriting of an epigram by Meleager (*AP* 12.101 = 103 G-P) has long been noticed and numerous scholars have commented on it, there is, I believe, more to be said about his allusive technique and the poetic function of this Meleagrean motto at the very start of his oeuvre. In addition, I will propose that Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* contain a witty reader response to Propertius’ allusion, which may support a reading that connects this intertextual reference at the beginning of his first elegy with the mythological *exemplum* given later in the same text (Prop. 1.1.9-16). Even if, on a generic level, the reception of Greek epigram by a lyric poet has somewhat different implications than its reception in elegiac verse, Horace’s evocation of Philodemean epigrams, which I will discuss in the second part of this paper, exhibits some striking parallels with Propertius’ echoes of Meleager – most importantly, I will argue that both authors highlight the intertextual play by inscribing into their poems the very names of their epigrammatic models.

**Meleager in Propertius 1.1**

At the outset of the *Monobiblos* Propertius famously describes how he, so far immune to love, was struck with desire for Cynthia, started to hate “chaste girls” and lost his good sense (1.1.1-6):

\[
	ext{Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis contactum nullis ante Cupidinibus.}
\]

\[
tum mihi constantis deiecit lumina fastus et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus, donec me docuit castas odisse puellas improbus, et nullo iuure consilio.
\]

Cynthia was the first to capture pitiable me with her eyes, so far untouched by Desires. Then Amor forced down my eyes of unwavering pride and, his feet upon me, he pressed my head to the ground, until he taught me to hate chaste girls, the wicked one, and to live without sense.

The imagery is inspired by *AP* 12.101, where Meleager describes his defeat at the sight of a boy named Myiscus:

\[
	ext{Tόν με Πόθοις áτρωτον ύπο στέρνοισι Μυίσκος}
\]

\[
	ext{δύμαις τοξέυσας τούτ’ ἐβόησεν ἔπος: “τόν θρασύν εἶλον ἐγώ- τὸ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀφρύσι κεῖνο φρύγαμα} 
\]
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Shooting me, unwounded by Desires, under the breast with his eyes, Myiscus exclaimed thus: “I have captured the overconfident one! Look, how I tread with my feet the arrogance of the scepter-bearing wisdom that resides upon his brows.” But I, barely gathering my breath, answered him: “My dear boy, what’s so astonishing about this? Eros brought Zeus himself down from Olympus.”

It is, indeed, hard to miss the multiple verbal reminiscences and structural similarities between the two passages:¹¹ Cynthia at the beginning of line 1 picks up Μυίσκος from the end of Meleager’s first line, while the ablative ocellis at the end of Propertius’ first verse corresponds with the dative ὀμμάσι at the beginning of Meleager’s second line. The opening words of the Greek text (τὸν ὡς Πόθοις ἀτρωτον, 1), in turn, are shifted – with a reversal of participle and agent – to the first pentameter in Propertius: contactum nullis ante Cupidinibus (2). Furthermore, fastus (3) at the end of the second hexameter renders Meleager’s φρύαγμα (3, both terms, standing in the same position, characterise the arrogance of the speaker who thinks himself immune to Love), but Propertius has changed the word’s syntactical function from direct object to genitive of attribute. Structurally, then, fastus, which is coupled with the adjective constantis, recalls σκηπτροφόρου σοφίας (4) from the first half of Meleager’s second pentameter, while φρύαγμα is replaced by lumina (note, too, how the Latin word for eyes implicitly picks up the idea that the pride resides ἐπ’ ὄφρυσι).

Last but not least, the image of Myiscus trampling down Meleager’s arrogance is transformed into the memorable vignette of Amor pressing Propertius’ head to the ground with his feet: pressit pedibus (4) ingeniously translates ποσσὶ πατῶ (4), keeping the p-alliteration,¹² while reversing the order of verb and noun. ποσσὶ is further echoed in the perfect participle that goes with pedibus: impositis. One might say that Propertius has doubled the feet from Meleager’s epigram by combining a literal rendering of the Greek word with an acoustic evocation of its sound in the same line. (Could it be that Amor’s theft of one foot in the fourth line of Ovid’s Amores is a witty reversal and metrical elaboration of this “peduplication”?¹³).
In his discussion of the Propertian allusion, Schulz-Vanheyden emphasizes that the Roman elegist has substituted Cynthia, his one and only love, for Meleager’s Myiscus, a name among many. While it is true that Greek epigrammatists do not present themselves as exclusively enamored of one girl or boy at a time, the figure standing behind Cynthia is by no means a random character. For there can be no doubt that Myiscus is the most important ἐρώμενος in Meleager’s erotic universe, the male equivalent to Heliodora, who, as I have argued elsewhere, is Meleager’s most programmatic beloved, a symbol for his poetry and as such a poetic foremother of Rome’s scriptae puellae. Myiscus is the παῖς most frequently addressed in Meleager’s extant erotic epigrams; in AP 12.94 the poet even asserts that he only feels jealousy with regard to him. Just as Heliodora, the “gift of the Sun”, outshines the garland she is wearing on her head (ἐκλάμπει, AP 5.143.2), Myiscus is said to shine forth from the boys of Tyre like the sun, whose light extinguishes that of the stars (ἐκλάμψας ὀἀστέρας ὀἠέλιος, AP 12.59.2).

Propertius’ rewriting of Meleager’s epigram includes a number of structural reversals, with words being shifted, for instance, from the beginning of a line to the end, or vice versa. Significantly, the Roman text also inverts certain thematic elements: not only does Propertius change the gender of the beloved (boy becomes girl), but he also seems to have replaced Meleager’s “sun” with its opposite. For by her very name Cynthia is closely associated with Diana, the moon goddess, and there are several passages in which she appears to be equated with the moon, as O’Neil (1958) has convincingly shown. The first instance of this identification is to be found in a later section of our poem, where the desperate lover implores witches, who supposedly know how to draw the moon from the sky, to bring the object of Propertius’ desire into his arms (1.1.19-24). If I am correct in assuming that Propertius has consciously transformed Helios into Luna, then the intertextual relationship between Cynthia and Myiscus is considerably more intricate than previously supposed.

It should, moreover, be noted that, in Meleager’s poetry, the image of captivating, spellbinding eyes most frequently comes up in connection with Myiscus: in our epigram, the lover is shot by Myiscus’ eyes (ὄμμασι ὀτζεύσας, 2), in AP 12.110 the boy’s eyes are said to hurl forth thunderbolts (φλόγας ὀμμασι βάλλει, 1), in AP 12.144 Eros is burned by Myiscus’ gaze (ὀμμασιν ὀαἴθει, 3), and in AP 12.159 the poet observes that his eyes speak even to the deaf (τὰ καὶ κωφοῖς λαλεῦντα / ὀμματα, 3-4). Cynthia is thus not following in the footsteps of an arbitrary epigrammatic character, but in those of Meleager’s favorite ἐρώμενος, whose most