

original wording, for it might well be that someone relaying Phaenias' remark added *Μεγαρικοῦ* to make it clear which Diodorus Phaenias had meant.

In consequence, Athenaeus adds little to the small amount that we can learn about Diodorus from Eustathius. For even if he shows that Diodorus' analogy with *πεττεία* aroused the scorn of another Peripatetic besides Clearchus, he shows nothing about what that analogy was. And even if we accept that *τοῦ μεγάλου Διοδώρου* is a corruption of *τοῦ Μεγαρικοῦ Διοδώρου*, we still cannot infer that Diodorus was described by one of his contemporaries as a Megaric. Indeed, we cannot even infer that some later ancient, independently of Suetonius and his source, applied the label 'Megaric' to Diodorus Cronus. On the contrary, if *τοῦ Μεγαρικοῦ Διοδώρου* does belong in our passage from Athenaeus, then that only strengthens the already strong impression that both it and our passage from Eustathius are ultimately just different extracts from a single assemblage of such material.⁶

Trinity College, Cambridge

NICHOLAS DENYER

and printed *Μεγαλοπολίτου* instead. Schweighäuser (Strasbourg, 1801–7) followed Musurus for his text, but added the footnote 'μεγάλου dant libri nostri. *Μεγαρικοῦ* suspicari possis ex Eustathio.' Schweighäuser's conjecture is ignored by subsequent editions of this part of Athenaeus: Dindorf (Leipzig, 1827), anon. (Leipzig, 1834), Meineke (Leipzig, 1858), Kaibel (Leipzig, 1887–90), Gulick (London and New York, 1927–41), Desrousseaux and Astruc (Paris, 1956), Turturro (Bari, 1961).

⁶ Luca Castagnoli, Neil Hopkinson, and David Sedley have given help and encouragement of various kinds, but cannot otherwise be blamed for the conclusions of this paper.

NOTES ON CATULLUS¹

Nearly all these thoughts originated in a seminar which Don Fowler and I gave together some years ago. I include one conjecture which is specifically his. Characteristically, he delivered this off the cuff in conversation. Equally characteristically, and endearingly, he never bothered to lay claim to it, and so I shall make the attribution for him, and provide some back-up argument. The other notes, such as they are, are indebted to his presence and stimulus.

I. POEMS 10 AND 28

Both these poems dramatize financially unprofitable experience in a provincial governor's *cohors*.² In 10 a girl exposes Catullus' attempts to make the best of his

¹ My thanks to Jasper Griffin for helpful comments on this paper.

Editions and commentaries cited by name alone: H. Bardon (Stuttgart, 1973²), W. Eisenhut (Leipzig, 1983), R. Ellis (commentary, Oxford 1876; text Oxford, 1878²), G. P. Goold (London, 1983), C. J. Fordyce (Oxford, 1961), W. Kroll (with bibliography and addenda by H. Herter and J. Kroymann, 1960⁴), G. Lee (Oxford, 1990), R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1958), K. Quinn (London and Basingstoke, 1973²), H. P. Syndikus (Darmstadt, 1984, 1987, 1990), D. F. S. Thomson (Toronto, 1997).

² For the well-documented institution of young equestrians' serving in the entourage of a provincial governor, see M. Gelzer, *The Roman Nobility*, trans. R. Seager (Oxford, 1975), 101–2; Cic. *QFr.* 1.1.11–12 (a key text, though Gelzer and Shackleton Bailey's commentary differ slightly in interpretation of detail); Hor. *Epist.* 1.3; the amusing letters of Cicero to Trebatius Testa, *Ad Fam.* 7.6, 17, 18; and Cic. *Cael.* 73 on M. Caelius' service as *contubernalis* to Q. Pompeius Rufus proconsul of Africa in 61 B.C. (another key text) *cum autem paulum iam roboris accessisset aetati, in Africam profectus est Q. Pompeio pro consule contubernalis. . . . usus quidam provincialis non sine*

dismal experience under his *praetor* in Bithynia. In 28 Catullus addresses friends whom he presumes to have fared just as badly under their governor (Piso), and ruefully recalls his own provincial episode. Poem 28 identifies Catullus' 'praetor' in 10 as (C.) Memmius, praetor in 58 B.C.³

Poem 28 alludes to and builds on 10, and this is important to see. At 10.12–13 Catullus refers to Memmius as an *irrumator* (*praesertim quibus esset irrumator / praetor*): the reader will infer that he exploits the obscenity as a passing and casual term of abuse (as English might say 'a bugger of a praetor', 'a praetor who screwed us', which catches the gist though not of course the literal sense of *irrumator*).⁴ But with surprise and wit Catullus picks up, expands, and makes concrete the abusive term at 28.9–10 when he returns to the topic of Memmius: *o Memmi, bene me ac diu supinum / tota ista trabe lentus irrumasti*.⁵ So the two poems co-operate. With amusement we see that 28.9–10 realize the potential of 10.12–13. Re-reading 10.12–13, we should find the lines funnier, latently witty, and original.

The actual topic of making money—and failing to do so—emerges in both poems in questions, direct and indirect. In 28 it surfaces in Catullus' paradoxical question to the *Pisonis comites* at 6–10 *ecquidnam in tabulis patet lucelli, / expensum . . .*?⁶ The indirect interrogative *ecquidnam*⁷ ('Is there anything which . . .?', *TLL* V.2.52.26ff., *OLD* s.v. *ecquis*, Kühner and Stegmann I.656, II.515) introduces the prosaic topic with an amusing sense of obliqueness and insinuation. It is the more amusing if Catullus is repeating the question insinuatingly asked of himself—there in *oratio obliqua*—in the earlier poem, 10.5–9 *incidere nobis / sermones uarii, in quibus . . . // ecquonam mihi profuisset aere*. We get the impression that it is the sort of question that has to surface: '*. . . and did you make any money?*' Given the interrelation of *irrumator* and *irrumasti*, it seems likely that the poems allude to each other here too, and that Statius' conjecture in 10.8 is right: *ecquonam* Statius : *et quoniam* OGR : *al. quonam* G¹R², whence the vulgate *et quonam*. Many recent editors print Statius' conjecture (Eisenhut, Goold, Kroll, Thomson, *fortasse recte* in Mynors's *app. crit.*) but only Kroll discusses the choice, and the argument from the co-operative relationship between the two poems may not be otiose.⁸

II. POEM 30

Poem 30 to an Alfenus is Catullus' only essay in the greater asclepiadean metre. Horace uses it twice in his first book of *Odes*: 1.11 to Leuconoe, and 1.18 to Varus, and then in 4.10. It seems a likely guess that Catullus' Alfenus and Horace's Varus are one and the same: the P. Alfenus Varus whom Vergil addresses as Varus in *Eclogue* 6

causa a maioribus huic aetati tributus. Catullus 46 dramatizes his leaving Memmius' province of Bithynia. Such service might be the first stage towards the *cursus honorum*; as we gather from Catullus and others, it was (also) hoped that enrichment would ensue: further excellent references on the financial aspect to service in a provincial governor's *cohors* in Kroll's note on 10.8.

³ On this C. Memmius, see Fordyce on 10.13, Syndikus I.117–18.

⁴ Cf. J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London, 1982), 124–30, esp. 124 and 130.

⁵ *trabs* itself is used sens. obsc. only here, but there are similar metaphors: Adams (n. 4), 23.

⁶ 'In your profit columns are there any . . . debts? vel sim. The same paradox in 7–8. Cf. Syndikus I.175–6.

⁷ This is an uncontroversial adjustment of *et quid nam* transmitted by OGR.

⁸ Kroll—as indeed Mynors in his *app. crit.*—cites 28.6 as a parallel, but suggests no functional interaction between the poems. On the corruption and for further brief argument, see G. Luck, *Latomus* 25 (1966), 281.

and 9.26–9.⁹ Catullus catches him young, as he caught the young Asinius Pollio (12.6), and Horace metrically alludes to his predecessor's poem to the same addressee.

The poem is written in a high style, as well as an elaborate metre.¹⁰ Whether or not the purported sentiments are entirely serious, there is no doubt about the poetic register: The Ennian compound *caelicolis* (4) and the Grecism *aerias* (10) are immediate stylistic indexes.¹¹

In line 11 Catullus surely wrote *si tu oblitus es, at di meminere, at meminit Fides . . .* which supports the high style. Muretus apparently read this in a manuscript. No such manuscript survives, and one wonders whether Muretus was creatively and wishfully misremembering the reading of—in Thomson's siglum—(ζ) *meminerunt at . . .*¹² How this Renaissance manuscript came to offer an unmetrical text with an important component of truth is an interesting question. Muretus' text is curiously neglected by modern editors. Only Bardon of those listed above prints it. Muretus' expressed belief 'quae lectio quanto sit elegantior, nemo non videt' was wide of the mark.

Muretus' text gives us the rhetorical figure of anaphora, and on top of that the stately structure of anaphoric *at* in an apodosis to a *si* clause. For *at* in anaphora, see *TLL* I.992.79ff., for *at* in apodosis, 1011.8ff. (and Mynors' note on Verg. *G.* 2.467), and for the complete structure of anaphoric *at* in an apodosis, cf. Verg. *G.* 2.461–71 *si non ingentem foribus domus alta superbis / . . . uomit . . . / nec uarios inhiant . . . // nec casia liquidi corrumpitur usus oliui; / at secura quies et nescia fallere uita, / . . . at latiss otia fundis, / speluncae uiuique lacus, at¹³ frigida tempe . . . // non absunt*. Horace has a comparable structure, but without the formality of the regular *si* protasis at *Serm.* 1.3.341–2. Cf. too Philodemus, *Anth. Pal.* 11.44.1–6 = Gow and Page XXIII.1–6 *Αὔριον εἰς λιτὴν σε καλιάδα, φίλτατε Πείσων, / ἔξ ἐνάτης ἔλκει μουσοφιλῆς ἔταρος / εἰκάδα δειπνίζων ἐνιαύσιον· εἰ δ' ἀπολείψης / οὔθατα καὶ Βρομίου Χιογενῆ πρόποσιν, / ἀλλ' ἐτάρους ὄψει παναληθέας, ἀλλ' ἐπακούσῃ / Φανήκων γαίης πουλὸν μελιχρότερα . . .*

The perfect form *meminere* may seem attractive in itself. *meminere* was plausibly conjectured by Czwalina at 64.148¹⁴ in a similar sort of context, and the *-ere* termination may seem to marry better with the surrounding poetic style¹⁵—though Catullus' practice with *-ere* and *-erunt* suggests no great stylistic distinction in his mind.

In lines 4–5 there is something seriously wrong:

⁹ For P. Alfenus Varus, see the introductory note in Nisbet and Hubbard on *Ode* 1.18.

¹⁰ There is a useful summary history of the metre in Fordyce's introductory note to poem 30.

¹¹ *caelicolae* at Ennius *Ann.* 445; in Catullus also at 64.386 and 68.138; in between Ennius and Catullus the only instance of *caelicola* to survive is Lucilius 28 Marx = 21 Warmington, clearly parodic. *aerius* transliterates ἀέριος: *TLL* s.v. 'voc. poeticum (primiti utuntur VARRO AT CATULL. LUCR.), ex scriptoribus acceperunt CIC. phil. (semel), APVL. . . .'. Cf. Lucr. 1.12, etc., Varro Atacinus fr. 14.6 Courtney, Catull. also at 64.142, 240, 291, 66.6, 68.57. We note that Catullus' other uses of both *aerius* and *caelicola* are in his longer, high-style poems. (Perversely Mynors adopts the spelling *aereas* in 30.10: Catullus is likely to have transliterated the Greek word accurately. Mynors prints *aere-* again at 64.240, 291, 66.6, but *aeri-* at 64.142 and 68.57.)

¹² Muretus' note (Venice, 1554) suggests that he was relying on memory: 'In meo illo libro, cujus bonitatem nunquam tantopere perspexi, quam cum haec scriberem (eo autem magis meminere, quod eo urens, totum Catullum etiam tum puerulus, saepe relegendo edidiceram) in eo igitur versus hic ita scriptus erat. . . .'

¹³ *et* has good manuscript authority, but Mynors prints *at*, clearly rightly.

¹⁴ Cf. G. P. Goold, *Phoenix* 12 (1958), 105.

¹⁵ On the third-person plural perfect in *-ere*, see R. G. G. Coleman, 'Poetic diction and the poetic registers', in J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer (edd.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 1999), 44.

nec facta impia fallacum hominum caelicolis placent.
 quae tu neglegis ac me miserum deseris in malis.

A single *nec* makes little sense as a connective here: hence *nunc* (Baehrens), *num* . . . ? (Schwabe); and the relative *quae* has no natural antecedent: hence *quos* (B. Guarinus) and other suggestions. Economically Ellis proposed to solve the problems together, positing a lacuna after line 3: ‘That something is lost after 3 is probable partly from the unintelligible *Nec*, partly from *Quae*, which seems to refer to several considerations, perhaps the sense of shame, as well as the vengeance of the celestials.’

The economy of a lacuna as a solution is attractive, but I wonder whether it should not be placed after line 4 rather than line 3. Line 4 seems to allude to Homer, *Od.* 14.83:

οὐ μὲν σχέτλια ἔργα θεοὶ μάκαρες φιλέουσιν

but Eumaeus (the speaker) also puts the point positively in the next line:

ἀλλὰ δίκην τίουσιν καὶ αἴσιμα ἔργ’ ἀνθρώπων.

Did Catullus do the same? For, while a single *nec* is an unacceptable connective in the context, a *nec* followed by a *sed*—translating Eumaeus’ ἀλλά—produces an idiomatic pattern: cf. Cic. *Phil.* 6.7 *nec uero de illo sicut de homine aliquo debemus, sed ut de importunissima belua cogitare*, 7.19 *nec ego pacem nolo, sed pacis nomine bellum inuolutum reformido*; Verg. *G.* 3.404–6 *nec tibi cura canum fuerit postrema, sed una l uelocis Spartaec catulos acremque Molossum l pasce sero pingui*, *G.* 3.471–2; *Aen.* 2.314–15 *nec sat rationis in armis, l sed glomerare manum bello . . . ardent animi*. And in such a *sed* clause we can easily imagine a suitable antecedent for *quae*. Exempli gratia:

nec facta impia fallacum hominum caelicolis placent
 sed grata officia et foedera seruata fideliter,
 quae tu neglegis ac me miserum deseris in malis.

A serious problem remains, however. Catullus’ polymetrics do not follow any systematic pattern of even numbers of lines, let alone Meineke’s law for Horace’s *Odes* (Horace composed in multiples of four lines: the exception, 4.8, suffers from interpolation).¹⁶ But a glance at the transmitted text of poem 30 suggests that Catullus is thinking in terms of couplets, and the acute Ellis posited a lacuna of *two* lines. I can see nothing else that needs to be said between the transmitted lines 4 and 5. The best way I can see of restoring a couplet structure is to posit another, single line lacuna after line 3: another line beginning with *iam*.

In line 6 OGR transmit the unidiomatic *o heu*. Palladius corrected this to *eheu*. *heu heu* is just as available. Investigation suggests that *eheu* is more colloquial than *heu*, and an iterated *heu* may be more suitable in the high style of this poem. On *heu* and *eheu*, see my note on *Ciris* 264—a single telling fact is that the good manuscript tradition of Vergil preserves forty-five examples of *heu*, none at all of *eheu*. For iterated *heu* see, for example, *Ecl.* 2.58, 3.100. Horace presents an editor with some nice judgements in this respect.¹⁷ Catullus 64.61, 77.5 and 6 likewise.

¹⁶ Lachmann irresistibly proposed the excision of 4.8.15b–19a: see the excellent summary of H. P. Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz* (Darmstadt, 2001³), II.346–8. Lachmann also proposed the excision of 28 and 33 to achieve a line-number divisible by four, but about this Syndikus (II.348) is sceptical.

¹⁷ Horace, *Odes* 1.15.9, 1.35.33, and 2.14.1. Shackleton Bailey’s Teubner (Stuttgart, 1985) gets

III. POEM 34

These are the last two stanzas of Catullus' Hymn to Diana, 34.17–24:

tu *cursu*, dea, *menstruo*
 metiens iter annuum,
rustica agricolae bonis
tecta frugibus explēs.
 sis quocumque tibi placet
 sancta nomine, Romulamque,
 antique ut solita es, *bona*
 sospites *ope gentem*.

Romulam *Fowler*: Romuli *OGR*

The adjective form *Romulam* is a convincing improvement on the transmitted *Romuli* (which itself is an easy normalization). On this text, we have an ablative noun-epithet and an accusative noun-epithet in the participial (*metiens*) clause; we then have an accusative epithet-noun and an ablative epithet-noun in the succeeding main clause and in the next sentence. What is more, in these last two, we have the pattern epithet-epithet/noun-noun (abAB in the first, abBA in the second). Catullus shows himself highly interested in word-patterning especially in poems 64 and 65–8.¹⁸ The precise phrase *Romula gens* is picked up by Horace at *Ode* 4.5.1–2 *diuis orte bonis, optime Romulae / custos gentis . . .* and most significantly in another hymn at *Carmen Saeculare* 47 *di, . . . Romulae genti date remque prolemque / et decus omne*.

IV. POEM 61 (AND 68, AND OTHERS)

Poem 61 is the wedding poem for Manlius Torquatus. At 61.31–2 *ac domum dominam uoca / coniugis cupidam noui*, the text is guaranteed against attempts to make the bride less passionate and interesting¹⁹ by the description of the mythical bride Laodamia, 68.73–4 *coniugis ut quondam flagrans aduenit amore / Protesilaeam Laodamia domum*. Catullus conceives Junia Aurunculeia in similar terms to Laodamia. Whether poem 68 was composed before 61—that is, whether we have to do with a chronological allusion—we cannot of course tell; if 68 was composed after 61, Catullus makes explicit the implicit way he was thinking of Junia. Before noting other cross-references to Catullan poems that spice up 61, we should observe that poem 68 benefits from observing this parallel. At 68.68 *isque domum nobis isque dedit dominae* (*dominae* Froehlich : *dominam* OGR), *domina* is combined with *domus* as it is at 61.31 *domum dominam uoca*, and the obvious inference would be that in the former as in the latter *domina* refers to the ‘mistress, lady of the house’,²⁰ and not to a mistress as seen

it right on all three occasions, I think (*heu heu, heu heu, ehue*); the Wickham-Garrod Oxford text (1922) prints *ehue* at 1.35.33: this is surely out of keeping with the high style of the Ode?

¹⁸ Cf. D. O. Ross, Jr, *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, MA, 1969), 132–7; cf. too C. Conrad, ‘Traditional patterns of word order in Latin epic from Ennius to Vergil’, *HSCP* 69 (1965), 195–258; T. E. V. Pearce, ‘Enclosing word order in the Latin hexameter’, *CQ* 16 (1966), 140ff. and 168ff.; E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI* (Darmstadt, 1957⁴), 391–404.

¹⁹ Pleitner conjectured *coniugi*. Wilamowitz punctuated after *uoca* and took *cupidam* with *mentem*: see Fordyce’s note ad loc.

²⁰ Briefly noted by Quinn in his note on line 68, countering current trends. But neither in that note nor in his large book *Catullus. An Interpretation* (London, 1972), 83, 90, 182, does he develop the point. In the commentary indeed Quinn then instantly equivocates: ‘Perhaps also the first allusion to the concept . . . of the lover as his mistress’s slave’.

from a slave's perspective (this is *not* an anticipation of the Elegiac use of *domina*).²¹ Even less plausible than seeing a reference to a slave's mistress is to retain the transmitted *dominam* and find a reference to a 'châtelaine' or 'housekeeper'—a sense which its advocates are slow to parallel²²—or to the goddess Venus,²³ or to an unnamed girl provided by Allius.²⁴ In this vicinity of poem 68 Catullus is showing us a complex of fantasies that he built around Lesbia, fantasies stimulated by the exhilaration of expectation.²⁵ An index of his wishful fantasizing is provided by *candida diua* in line 70. In the Laodamia myth he will try, vainly, to maintain an image of Lesbia as a devoted bride arriving at the *domus* (74) of her husband: these fantasies begin in line 68, as Catullus gives her the terminology of wife and lady, *domina. nobis* is transiently ambiguous between true plural and plural for singular. The effect of this ambiguity is perhaps to lend weight to the final revelation of the fantasy contained in *dominae*. Problems have been seen in the interpretation of *ad quam*, if *dominae* is read (the antecedent must now be *domum*), but these are not I think real.²⁶ Nor do I find any difficulty in the juxtaposition of *domina* in line 156 with *lux mea* in 160, both referring to Lesbia.²⁷

There seems a clear intention in poem 61 to talk of Torquatus' bride and marriage in spicier terms than was conventional.²⁸ There is, as well as the parallel with 68.73–4,

²¹ But to find a sense 'mistress of a slave' in 68.68 is popular: see e.g. Syndikus, II.271–2; T. P. Wiseman, *Catullus and his World* (Cambridge, 1985), 160–1; D. H. Garrison, *The Student's Catullus* (London, 1991), n. ad loc.

²² Cf. Fordyce ad loc.; L. P. Wilkinson, *CR* 20 (1970), 290; D. C. Feeney, 'Shall I compare thee . . . ?': Catullus 68B and the limits of analogy', in T. Woodman and J. Powell (edd.), *Author and Audience in Latin Literature* (Cambridge, 1992), 34.

²³ C. W. Macleod, *Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1983), 163, n. 8.

²⁴ This seems to be the view of Muretus (Venice, 1554). His note on line 74 reads 'Laodamiae comparat puellam illam, cujus sibi usum concesserat Manlius . . .'.

²⁵ Cf. R. O. A. M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets* (Oxford 1980, reprinted with updated introduction, etc., 1996), 52–60, 87. For further discussion of the Laodamia myth, cf. e.g. Feeney (n. 22), 33–44; Syndikus, II.275–80, 283–7; Macleod, (n. 23), 159–65; G. Williams, *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry* (New Haven and London, 1980), 50–61.

²⁶ Fordyce sternly remarks that 'The Latin for "the house in which" is not *domus ad quam* but *domus in qua*'. Similarly Wilkinson (n. 22), 290, points out that, on the other side of the coin, *ad* with an accusative of a person is idiomatic for 'at someone's (house)'; and on this positive point Wilkinson is of course right (*OLD ad* 16a). But there are plenty of examples of *ad* with an accusative of a place, effectively equivalent to *in* plus ablative. Note phrases like *ad forum*, *ad aedem*, and especially *ad uillam*, Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 44, Kühner and Stegmann I.520. For a relative pronoun jumping to a remoter antecedent, cf. e.g. Cic. *Arch.* 25.

²⁷ Wilkinson (n. 22), 290 thought that *lux mea*, the last of the subjects following *sitis*, referred to Lesbia (correctly) and that therefore *domina* could not. But there is no need to suppose that *domina* is another subject of the optative *sitis*, which would indeed make it difficult for *domina* to refer to Lesbia. In 155ff. Catullus wishes felicity to Allius, to Allius' lover, to the house in which he and Lesbia (*domina*) 'played', to a figure concealed by textual corruption, and, finally, to Lesbia (*lux mea*). It is the all important *domus* that is the subject in 156. I take *lusimus* to be transiently ambiguous between true plural and plural for singular (cf. *nobis* in 68) and both Catullus (*lusimus*) and Lesbia (*domina*) to be relegated to the subordinate, relative clause. On this interpretation there is no problem in *domina* and *lux mea* both referring to Lesbia.

²⁸ In judging what was 'conventional' there is of course a large amount of (informed) guesswork. But see J. Griffin, *Latin Poets and Roman Life* (London, 1985), 119–21, paying special attention to note 31. The rather heavy-footed prescriptions of Menander the Rhetorician may, for example, give us some index of conventional taste: see D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson, *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford, 1981), 134–59 for Menander's advice both for the 'epithalamium' (also called the 'wedding speech', *γαμήλιος λόγος*), and for the 'bedroom speech', *κατευναστικός λόγος*. Philodemus tells us that wedding *songs* (*ἐπιθαλάμια* with *μουσική*) were in Catullus' time virtually obsolete, but attests poems, *ποιήματα*. He gives no clue to the content of these poems,

the comparison of the bride to the Venus of the Judgement of Paris (61.17–20). And there is overlap with Catullus' own shorter love poems.²⁹ Note first 61.199–203:

ille pulueris Africi
siderumque micantium
subducat numerum prius,
qui uestri numerare uolt
multa milia ludi.

These lines clearly recall the sand and stars comparison of 7.3–8, and the *basia . . . quae nec pernumerare curiosi / possint* of 7.9–11; also the *milia* of kisses in poems 5 and 48. Interaction between these poems will cause the romance of Catullus' lighter love moments to spill over into the wedding poem.

ludus at 61.203 should also catch our attention, as should *ludite* at 61.204 *ludite ut lubet, et breui / liberos date*. *ludus* is a key word for Cicero in his urbane defence of the amorous Caelius' youthful flings: *Cael.* 28 *datur enim concessu omnium huic aliqui ludus aetati* [i.e. youth], *et ipsa natura profundit adulescentiae cupiditates. quae si ita erumpunt ut nullius uitam labefactent, nullius domum euertant, faciles et tolerabiles haberi solent*; cf. too *Cael.* 39, 42, and elsewhere. Love is seen as a game. For Cicero's defensive purposes love is *only* a game, but *ludus* involves a view of love shared, say, by Horace (cf. *Odes* 3.12.1 and 3.15.12)—and not normally by Catullus. But in this wedding poem it serves the purpose of showing that married sex is not just functional but fun. Catullus may exhort Manlius and Junia Aurunculeia to procreate, but he is also assuming that they will enjoy the process. Contrast, say, *Lucr.* 4.1274–7 and other publicly expressed views.³⁰

Given these strategies of spice and allusion, we can protect another reading in poem 61. With 61.109–12 (*o cubile . . .*) *quae tuo ueniunt ero, / quanta gaudia, quae uaga / nocte, quae medio die / gaudeat!*, compare 32.1–3 *Amabo, mea dulcis Ipsitilla, / meae deliciae, mei lepores, / iube ad te ueniam meridiatum*, and so on. *uaga* may be debatable, but surely *medio die* is right. Both romantics and moralists were squeamish about sex at lunchtime, but this is not a wedding poem for the severe, and Catullus, choosing the erotics of *ludus* for Torquatus, plausibly adds to 61 the atmosphere of the Ipsitilla poem 32, even though for his own Lesbia poetry he favours exclusive focus on the romantic *tacita nox* as the right time for love-making.³¹

but does not seem to rate them highly, bracketing them with cooks and other handymen that make up the celebration: see A. J. Neubecker, *Philodemus. Über die Musik IV. Buch* (Naples, 1986), ch. 3, 43–4 and 96.

²⁹ *Mutatis mutandis*, the comment above on allusion and chronology applies to what follows.

³⁰ Lyne (n. 25), 2–3.

³¹ For Catullus in romantic mood ('night time is the right time / to be with the one you love'), cf. 7.7 *cum tacet nox*, and note the whole setting of poem 68b, esp. 145 where I think *Lain's tacita* for the transmitted *mira* is probably right (*HSCP* 90 [1986], 155–80). More examples of night as the special and romantic time of love: *Prop.* 1.10.3, 2.14.9, 15.1. Contrast the calculatedly sensuous and fun effect of sex after lunch, not only in Catullus 32, but in *Ovid Am.* 1.5. Note too the persuasively expansive *seu . . . totum . . . diem* option in *Prop.* 1.14.10 (this is a man of the world he is talking to). For discussion of the sexology and text of 61.111, see R. G. M. Nisbet, *PCPhS* 24 (1978), 99; R. Mayer, *PCPhS* 25 (1979), 69; S. J. Harrison, *PCPhS* 31 (1985), 11–12. *Plut. Quaest. Conv.* 655a on Paris in *Il.* 3, quoted by Nisbet, catches well the tone of the moralist: *ὡς οὐκ ἀνδρὸς ἀλλὰ μοιχοῦ λυσσῶντος οὐδ' ἄν τὴν μεθημερινὴν ἀκρασίαν*. Nisbet challenged *medio die* on grounds of both moral propriety and style. Mayer and Harrison correctly judge the sex to be acceptable, but underestimate the degree to which there is a strategy of spiciness in the poem. Harrison agrees with Nisbet that there is a stylistic objection (which I do not feel) to the pairing of *uaga* (110) with *medio* (111), and proposes *caua*.

Finally, I add some support for a disputed punctuation. 61.5–9:

o Hymen Hymenae,
cinge tempora floribus
suaue olentis amaraci,
flammeum cape, laetus huc,
huc ueni . . .

Thus Kroll, Eisenhut, Syndikus, Goold, and Thomson.³² Other editions punctuate after *laetus*, taking the epithet with *cape* not *ueni*. The text as printed is surely to be preferred. It is a small matter that Catullus does not elsewhere in the poem start a colon at the / *huc* metrical position; and the usual division of the line is indeed after the third or fifth syllable. What is significant is that an epithet conveying the desired mood of the god in question naturally accompanies the summoning verb in a cletic hymn or a poem in that vein. Kroll cites Greek parallels (Plato, *Laws* 4.712b, *h. Orph.* 6.10, and more in Syndikus II.16, n. 85). Note the continuing pattern in Latin following Catullus: Verg. *G.* 1.17–18 *Pan, ouium custos . . . / adsis, o Tegeae, fauens*; Tibull. 1.7.63–4 *at tu, Natalis multos celebrande per annos, / candidior semper candidiorque ueni*; Hor. *Ode* 3.18.1–4 *Faune . . . / per meos finis et aprica rura / lenis incedas abeasque paruis / aequus alumnis*. Cf. too the hymnic address to Mercury/Augustus at Hor. *Ode* 1.2.45ff. *serus in caelum redeas*, that is the other side of the cletic coin; and this continues: *diuque laetus intersis populo*.

V. 68.89

Troia (nefas!) commune sepulcrum Asiae Europaeque

Horace, *Serm.* 1.8.8–10:

huc prius angustis eiecta cadauera cellis
conseruus uili portanda locabat in arca;
hoc miserae plebi stabat commune sepulcrum . . .

By ‘common tomb’ Horace refers to mass-burial pits for the poor which had existed on the Esquiline (cf. line 14) just outside the city of Rome. Varro, *Ling.* 5.25 calls such pits, which, he says, exist *extra oppida*, ‘*puticuli*’, etymologizing the word from *puteus* ‘well’ or *putescere* ‘rot’; the latter etymology is also in Festus 216M s.v. *puticuli*; as well as generally citing such pits *extra oppida*, Varro also localizes them in the *locus publicus ultra Esquilias*, and tells us that the Afranius played on their name in a *Togata*.³³ Pseudo-Acro on Hor. *Serm.* 1.8.10 thinks of the victims of executioners: *soliti enim erant carnifices puteos in Esquilina uia facere, in quos corpora mittebant*. Nineteenth-century excavations of the Esquiline graphically confirmed references to burial pits there.³⁴

A resonance like this gives powerful ironic point to *commune sepulcrum* in Catull. 68.89, Catullus’ reference to the burial ground of the great heroes of the *Iliad*. The resonance of a pauper’s common graveyard may be at play in the only other poetical

³² Also P. Fedeli, *Il carne 61 di Catullo* (Freibourg, 1972), 22, n. 1. See further Fedeli, 25–6 for the anadiplosis *huc huc* and for the cletic *huc ueni*.

³³ *eum Afranius putilucos in Togata appellat, quod inde suspiciunt per puteos lumen* (though both key words, *putilucos* and *puteos*, are the result of emendation).

³⁴ For this evidence and for the institution of mass burial of the Roman poor, see K. Hopkins, *Death and Renewal* (Cambridge, 1983), 207–11.

example of the phrase before Ausonius: Lucretius 5.259 *et quoniam dubio procul esse uidetur / omniparens eadem rerum commune sepulcrum . . . / . . . terra*. It should be noted, however, that this resonance is not exclusive. Cicero (*Off.* 1.55) can use the phrase of upper-class family tombs; but, according to Hopkins,³⁵ long-term family burial chambers were not frequent. The phrase *commune sepulcrum* is overall rare: *TLL* III.1969.71–5.

Balliol College, Oxford

R. O. A. M. LYNE
oliver.lyne@balliol.ox.ac.uk

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 206.

CATULLUS 107.7–8

In ‘Catullus 107: a Callimachean reading’ (*CQ* 50 [2000], 615–18), A. J. D’Angour proposes a new remedy for the desperately corrupt text of Catullus 107.7–8:

quis me uno vivit felicior? aut magis †hac est
optandus vita dicere quis poterit?†

That remedy is to read *hac esse* at the end of 7 (despite introducing a hypermetric line, otherwise unattested in Catullus), with *optandam vitam* beginning 8. The approach is methodologically sound: though he is not explicit about the details of the Catullan tradition, and though he bases the conjecture upon the reading *hac*, D’Angour is clearly aware that there are two readings of equal authority here (*hac* is read by O, *me* by GR), and since he believes *hac* to be correct, he properly (though unsuccessfully) attempts in note 8 to explain how *me* arose as an alternative to it. But corruption of one reading into another is not the only possible explanation for two diverse readings of equal authority; it is also possible for both readings to have arisen from something else entirely, which I believe to have been the case here.

Obviously the context requires a second reference to Catullus’ own experience. A number of scholars (whose suggestions are recorded by D’Angour) have attempted to satisfy both palaeographical criteria (to account for *me*) and this criterion of sense with emendations that introduce forms of *res*; I propose to satisfy the same criteria in a different way, suggesting that Catullus wrote *nostra* in the final foot of 7. This requires the scansion *magi*’, which is not common in Catullus (though more common than hypermetric lines), but cf. 116.8 *tu dabi*’ *supplicium*; alternatively, Catullus perhaps wrote *mage*, later ‘normalized’ to *magis*. Whether Catullus wrote *magis* or *mage nostra*, this was, I suggest, eventually glossed in the Veronensis (or an ancestor) with something like *quam haec mea est* (‘than this life of mine is’), explaining first that *nostra* is an ablative of comparison (indicated by *quam*, to be taken with *magis*), and secondly that *nostra* is a ‘royal we’ referring to Catullus’ own life, not his life with ‘Lesbia’ or human life in general. I suggest further that, in time, *haec mea* was corrupted to *hac me* and that *nostra* was expelled in favour of *hac* or *me* and *est* either because it was itself corrupted or because it was thought not to scan after *magis*; and so the scribes whose copies lie behind the two lines of descent from the archetype then made different choices of readings to incorporate, in both cases mistaking a remnant of a gloss for a correction.