

A commentary on Catullus 64, lines 1-201

Thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the University of Oxford

Gail Trimble

Corpus Christi College

Hilary Term 2010

Contents

Abstract	v
Acknowledgements	vii
Text and apparatus criticus	1
Note on the apparatus	1
Catullus 64.1-201	3
Commentary	11
Bibliography	329
(i) Editions of and commentaries on Catullus	329
(ii) Other sources of emendations discussed	330
(iii) Short titles and abbreviations	331
(iv) General	332

A commentary on Catullus 64, lines 1-201

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Gail Trimble, Corpus Christi College, Oxford
Hilary Term 2010

Abstract

The thesis consists of detailed commentary on the first 201 lines of Catullus 64, together with an edited text and apparatus criticus. It represents about half a planned commentary on the whole poem, which will also include an introduction.

The commentary begins by discussing the poem's Argonautic opening, its use of allusion to negotiate generic relationships with epic and tragedy, and its exploration of narrative, pictorial and first-person 'lyric' modes. As the narrative jumps to Peleus' wedding, the commentary examines the complicated moral signals about Roman luxury and the golden age sent by the description of the gleaming palace surrounded by abandoned fields. The transition to the description of Ariadne prompts an examination of how this 'disobedient' ecphrasis emphasises details that a picture could not literally convey, together with an analysis of the male narrator's objectifying presentation of a woman in distress. The ecphrasis proper is then disrupted by a 'flashback' covering Ariadne's first encounter with Theseus and his fight with the Minotaur: the commentary explores the ways in which shifting focalisation complicates the reader's judgement of Theseus' heroism. Finally, the thesis looks at Ariadne's speech as an intertextual node, investigating the meanings generated by its relationships with other speeches from both earlier and later in Greek and Roman poetic traditions, and examining how each theme or *topos* is used in this particular situation both by the alluding poet and by Ariadne herself.

More discursive notes introducing the various sections are interspersed with shorter lemmata considering textual, metrical, linguistic and cultural-historical issues as well as literary interpretation. The commentary aims both to open up the possibilities of meaning offered by individual words and phrases, and to advance critical understanding of key aspects of the whole poem, such as its narratorial voice, engagement with visuality and place in literary history.

Acknowledgements

My greatest debt is to my supervisors, Philip Hardie and Stephen Heyworth, who have given thorough, challenging and patient criticism throughout. Stephen Harrison also deserves special thanks as former tutor, college advisor, faculty advisor, Director of Graduate Studies, teaching colleague, mentor and friend. He suggested the project.

I have benefited from discussion of sections of my work at three commentary workshops, and I am very grateful to their organisers: S. Douglas Olson and Alexander Sens at Georgetown, Hayden Pellicia at Cornell, and Stephen Harrison (again) and Bruce Gibson in Oxford. Llewelyn Morgan read parts of the commentary for various purposes and offered extremely helpful advice. Stephen Oakley and E.J. Kenney read an earlier draft of the whole thesis when I was shortlisted for a Junior Research Fellowship at Trinity College, Cambridge, and provided detailed feedback. Early in my time as a doctoral student I was lucky enough to spend three months at the Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa: my thanks go especially to Gian Biagio Conte and the participants in his seminars on Catullus.

Corpus Christi College has been the best imaginable place to work over many years, and I am grateful to everyone not yet mentioned who has constituted Corpus Classics during that time: Ewen Bowie, Tim Whitmarsh, Tobias Reinhardt, Jaś Elsner (who gave advice on visual material), Peter Haarer, and all my other colleagues and students. Among fellow graduate students at Oxford and beyond I would particularly like to thank James Burbidge, Fiachra Mac Góráin, Melanie Marshall, Ailsa McDermid and Matt Hosty.

I am grateful to the Arts and Humanities Research Council for financial assistance, to Corpus Christi College for lectureships and for the Eduard Fraenkel exchange scholarship which enabled me to go to Pisa, and to Trinity College, Cambridge for recent liberation from immediate employment anxiety.

My parents have always been unfailingly supportive, and my brother, Hugh, was a sympathetic housemate. My own wedding is approaching this summer: Tom West has been a pillar of strength.

Between 1994 and 2000 I was taught Latin and Greek by four extraordinary teachers at The Lady Eleanor Holles School, Hampton, Middlesex. The thesis is dedicated to Clare Eltis, Ruth Iredale, Stephanie Ferro and Sally Welsh.

G.C.T.

Note on the apparatus

The apparatus contains readings discussed in the commentary. Sigla for manuscripts and manuscript annotations are taken from Thomson, except that I use ‘OGR’ where those manuscripts agree rather than invoking the lost V. Manuscript readings not included in Thomson are indicated by ζ (*stigma*).

Catullus 64.1-201

Peliaco quondam prognatae uertice pinus dicuntur liquidas Neptuni nasse per undas Phasidos ad fluctus et fines Aeeteos, cum lecti iuuenes, Argiuae robora pubis, auratam optantes Colchis auertere pellem	5
ausi sunt uada salsa cita decurrere puppi, caerulea uerrentes abiegnis aequora palmis. diua quibus retinens in summis urbibus arces ipsa leui fecit uolitantem flamine currum, pineae coniungens inflexae texta carinae;	10
illa rudem cursu prima imbuit Amphitriten. quae simul ac rostro uentosum proscidit aequor tortaque remigio spumis incanuit unda, emersere freti candenti e gurgite uultus	15
aequoreae monstrum Nereides admirantes. illa, atque haud alia, uiderunt luce marinas mortales oculi nudato corpore nymphas nutricum tenus exstantes e gurgite cano.	
tum Thetidis Peleus incensus fertur amore, tum Thetis humanos non despexit hymenaeos,	20
tum Thetidi pater ipse iugandum Pelea sensit. o nimis optato saeculorum tempore nati heroes, saluete, deum genus! o bona matrum progenies, saluete iter<um, saluete, bonarum!>	23b

- 6 decurrere] percurrere *Harrison*
11 illa] ipsa *Heyworth*
cursu] cursus *Heyworth*
prima β : post eam *O* (proram *O*¹): primam *GR*: prora *Postgate*
Amphitriten] aphitritem *O* (–te *O*¹): amphitricem *R*: amphitritem *GR*²:
al. amphitrionem *R*² bis
13 tortaque *Trinc.*: totaque *OGR*: motaque *Baehrens*
incanuit *Ald.*: incanduit *OGR*
14 freti *Schrader*: feri *OGR*: fero *Schrader*, *Baehrens*
candenti e] candentis *Baehrens*
16 illa atque haud alia *Bergk*: illa atque alia *GR*: illa alia *O*: illa haudque alia
Sabellicus: illaqua haud alia *Puccius*: illa, si qua alia *Lachmann*: illa alia atque
alia *Vahlen* (illa, alia atque alia *Schulze*): illa, ante haud alia *Friedrich*: illa, haud
ante alia *Goold*
17 oculi *Pal. 1652*: oculis *OGR*
22 saeculorum *R*²: saeculorum *OGR*
23 matrum *scholia Veronensia ad Virg. Aen. 5.80*: mater *OGR*, al. matre *R*²
genus] gens *Madvig (ex scholiis)*
23b *om. OGR, ex scholiis add. Orioli*
iter<um saluete bonarum> *Peerlkamp*

uos ego saepe meo uos carmine compellabo.
 teque adeo eximie taedis felicibus aucte, 25
 Thessaliae columen Peleu, cui Iuppiter ipse,
 ipse suos diuum genitor concessit amores:
 tene Thetis tenuit pulcherrima Nereine?
 tene suam Tethys concessit ducere neptem,
 Oceanusque, mari totum qui amplectitur orbem? 30
 quae simul optatae finito tempore luces
 aduenere, domum conuentu tota frequentat
 Thessalia, oppletur laetanti regia coetu:
 dona ferunt prae se, declarant gaudia uultu.
 deseritur Scyros; linquunt Pthiotica Tempe 35
 Crannonisque domos ac moenia Larisaea;
 Pharsalum coeunt, Pharsalia tecta frequentant.
 rura colit nemo, mollescunt colla iuuencis,
 non humilis curuis purgatur uinea rastris,
 non glebam pronò conuellit uomere taurus, 40
 non falx attenuat frondatorum arboris umbram,
 squalida desertis rubigo infertur aratris.
 ipsius at sedes, quacumque opulenta recessit
 regia, fulgenti splendent auro atque argento.
 candet ebur solis, collucent pocula mensae, 45
 tota domus gaudet regali splendida gaza.
 puluinar uero diuae geniale locatur
 sedibus in mediis, Indo quod dente politum
 tincta tegit roseo conchyli purpura fuco.
 haec uestis priscis hominum uariata figuris 50
 heroum mira uirtutes indicat arte.
 namque fluentisono prospectans litore Diae
 Thesea cedentem celeri cum classe tuetur
 indomitos in corde gerens Ariadna furores;

24 meo] mero *Palmer*: memor *Traill*

28 Nereine *Haupt*: nectine *OGR*: al. neptine *R*²: al. neutūne *R*² bis, *m*²: neptunine
recc.: Nerinaon *Trappes-Lomax* (Nerinarum *Allen*, *ut vid.*)

29 Tethys γδ: thetis *OGR*

35 Scyros αη: siros *O*: syros *GR*: Cieros *Meineke*

37 Pharsalum *Pontanus*: farsaliam *OGR*

42 infertur] increscit *Nisbet*

45 mensae] mensa *Heyworth*

54 Ariadna β¹: Adriana *OGR*

necdum etiam sese quae uisit uisere credit, utpote fallaci quae tum primum excita somno desertam in sola miseram se cernat harena. immemor at iuuenis fugiens pellit uada remis, irrita uentosae linquens promissa procellae.	55
quem procul ex alga maestis Minois ocellis, saxea ut effigies bacchantis, prospicit, eheu, prospicit et magnis curarum fluctuat undis, non flauo retinens subtilem uertice mitram, non contexta leui uelatum pectus amictu, non tereti strophio lactentis uincta papillas,	60
omnia quae toto delapsa e corpore passim ipsius ante pedes fluctus salis alludebant. sed neque tum mitrae neque tum fluitantis amictus illa uicem curans toto ex te pectore, Theseu, toto animo, tota pendebat perdita mente.	65
a misera, assiduis quam luctibus externauit spinosas Erycina serens in pectore curas, illa tempestate, ferox quo tempore Theseus egressus curuis e litoribus Piraei attigit iniusti regis Gortynia tecta.	70
nam perhibent olim crudeli peste coactam Androgeoneae poenas exsoluere caedis electos iuuenes simul et decus innuptarum Cecropiam solitam esse dapem dare Minotauro. quis angusta malis cum moenia uexarentur, ipse suum Theseus pro caris corpus Athenis proicere optauit potius quam talia Cretam funera Cecropia nec funera portarentur. atque ita naue leui nitens ac lenibus auris magnanimum ad Minoa uenit sedesque superbas.	75
	80
	85

55 quae uisit uisere *Voss*: –que sui tui se *OGR*: al. terni *R*²

60 alga] acta *Heinsius*

61 eheu *Bergk*: heue *OGR*: euhoe *Ald*.

64 uelatum] praeclarum *McKie*: nudatum *Schwabe*: uariatum *Nisbet*: laniatum *Owen*:
uiolatum *Haverfield*: uestanum *Riese*: decoratum *Kakridis*: bullatum *Fea*: niuem
per *Maehly*: niueum tum *Baehrens*

65 uincta] cincta *Isidorus*

68 sed neque ξη: sineque *OGR*: sic neque *Roszbach*

73 tempestate] ex tempestate *Baehrens*

quo tempore ξη, *Baehrens*: –que et tempore *OGR*: quo ex tempore ‘*Italus in
exemplari Veneto ed. Ald. 1502*’ teste *Lachmann*: qua robore *Froehlich* (cum
robore *Ritschl*, qua corpore *Thomson in comm.*)

75 tecta *Parth.*, ut vid.: tempta *OGR*: templa β¹

83 Cecropia *Baehrens*: Cecropiae *OGR*: Cecropidum *Heyworth*

hunc simul ac cupido conspexit lumine uirgo
 regia, quam suavis exspirans castus odores
 lectulus in molli complexu matris alebat,
 quales Eurotae progignunt flumina myrtus
 90 auraue distinctos educit uerna colores,
 non prius ex illo flagrantia declinauit
 lumina, quam cuncto concepit corpore flammam
 funditus atque imis exarsit tota medullis.
 heu miseros agitans in miti corde furores
 95 sancte puer, curis hominum qui gaudia misces,
 quaeque regis Golgos quaeque Idalium frondosum,
 qualibus incensam iactastis mente puellam
 fluctibus, in flauo saepe hospite suspirantem!
 quantos illa tulit languenti corde timores!
 100 quam tum saepe magis fulgore expalluit auri,
 cum saeuum cupiens contra contendere monstrum
 aut mortem appeteret Theseus aut praemia laudis!
 non ingrata tamen frustra munuscula diuis
 promittens tacito suscepit uota labello.
 nam uelut in summo quatientem brachia Tauro
 105 quercum aut coniferam sudanti cortice pinum
 indomitus turbo, contorquens flamine robur,
 eruit (illa procul radicitus exstirpata
 prona cadit, late quaeuis cumque obuia frangens),
 110 sic domito saeuum prostrauit corpore Theseus
 nequiquam uanis iactantem cornua uentis.

- 89 Eurotae *1472*: Europae *OGR*
 progignunt *ϑ*: pergignunt *OGR*: praecingunt *Baehrens*
 myrtus *GR*: myrtos *O*
 92 corpore] pectore *ζ*
 94 miseros agitans *Markland*: misere exagitans *OGR*
 in miti] immiti *OGR*
 100 quam tum *Faernus*: quanto *OGR*
 102 appeteret *O*: oppeteret *GR*
 103 frustra] superis *Fea*
 104 suscepit *Laetus* (succepit *Statius*): succendit *OGR*
 106 coniferam *Fea*: cornigeram *OGR*: conigeram *ϑ*
 108 radicitus] radicibus *ζ*
 exstirpata *Ald.*²: exturbata *OGR*
 109 quaeuis cumque *Ellis* (quaecumuis *Voss*): –que cum eius *OGR*: –que et cominus
 uel similia *ζη*: quaecumque habet *Baehrens*: quae sunt cumque *Trappes-Lomax*:
 quaecumque sibi *Statius*: –que ruinis *Schwabe*: –que furit uis *Madvig*: qua est
 impetus *Lachmann*: qua funditur *Hermann*: –que comis obit *Munro*: –que
 cacumen it *Fink*: quae corrui *Nuzzo*: quae cingunt *McKie*
 110 saeuum] taurum *ζ*

inde pedem sospes multa cum laude reflexit
errabunda regens tenui uestigia filo,
ne labyrinthis e flexibus egredientem
tecti frustraretur inobseruabilis error. 115

sed quid ego a primo digressus carmine plura
commemorem, ut linquens genitoris filia uultum,
ut consanguineae complexum, ut denique matris,
quae misera in gnata deperdita lamentata est,
omnibus his Thesei dulcem praeoptarit amorem: 120
aut ut uecta rati spumosa ad litora Diae

<.....>
aut ut eam placido deuinctam lumina somno
liquerit immemori discedens pectore coniunx?
saepe illam perhibent ardenti corde furem
clarisonas imo fudisse e pectore uoces, 125

ac tum praeruptos tristem conscendere montes,
unde aciem in pelagi uastos protenderet aestus,
tum tremuli salis aduersas procurrare in undas,
mollia nudatae tollentem tegmina surae,
atque haec extremis maestam dixisse querelis, 130
frigidulos udo singultus ore cientem:

‘sicine me patriis auctam, perfide, ab aris
perfide, deserto liquisti in litore, Theseu?
sicine discedens neglecto numine diuum,
immemor (a!) deuota domum periuria portas? 135
nullane res potuit crudelis flectere mentis
consilium? tibi nulla fuit clementia praesto,
immitte ut nostri uellet miserescere pectus?

119 lamentata est *Conington* (lamentatur *Bücheler*): leta *OGR* : laetabatur
Lachmann: luctabatur *Roszbach*: lentabatur *Ellis*

120 praeoptarit *Statius* (–ret *Laetus*, –uit *ϑ*): portaret *OGR*

121 rati] ratis *Laetus*

lacuna post 121 posuit Laetus

122 aut ut eam placido *Laetus* (dulci ζ , molli *Baehrens*): aut ut eam *OGR*: aut ut
seculo *Trappes-Lomax*: uenerit, aut ut eam *Lachmann*

126 tristem ξ : tristes *OGR*

127 in *add.* $\xi\eta$

protenderet *R*: pretenderet *OG*

132 aris] oris ζ

135 a] heu *Trappes-Lomax*

136 crudelis ... mentis R^2 : crudeles ... mentes *OGR*: crudele ... mentis *Trappes-Lomax*

at non haec quondam blanda promissa dedisti
 uoce mihi, non haec miseram sperare iubebas, 140
 sed conubia laeta, sed optatos hymenaeos,
 quae cuncta aerii discerpunt irrita uenti.
 nunc iam nulla uiro iuranti femina credat,
 nulla uiri speret sermones esse fideles;
 quis dum aliquid cupiens animus praegestit apisci, 145
 nil metuunt iurare, nihil promittere parcunt:
 sed simul ac cupidae mentis satiata libido est,
 dicta nihil meminere, nihil periuria curant.
 certe ego te medio uersantem in turbine leti
 eripui, et potius germanum amittere creui, 150
 quam tibi fallaci supremo in tempore deessem.
 pro quo dilaceranda feris dabor alitibusque
 praeda, neque iniecta tumulabor mortua terra.
 quatenam te genuit sola sub rupe leaena,
 quod mare conceptum spumantibus exspuit undis, 155
 quae Syrtis, quae Scylla rapax, quae uasta Charybdis,
 talia qui reddis pro dulci praemia uita?
 si tibi non cordi fuerant conubia nostra,
 saeua quod horrebas prisci praecepta parentis,
 at tamen in uestras potuisti ducere sedes, 160
 quae tibi iucundo famularer serua labore,
 candida permulcens liquidis uestigia lymphis,
 purpureae tuum consternens ueste cubile.
 sed quid ego ignaris nequiquam conqueror auris,
 externata malo, quae nullis sensibus auctae 165
 nec missas audire queunt nec reddere uoces?
 ille autem prope iam mediis uersatur in undis,
 nec quisquam apparet uacua mortalis in acta.
 sic nimis insultans extremo tempore saeua
 fors etiam nostris inuidit questibus auris. 170

139 blanda *O*: nobis *GR*

140 non β : nec *OGR*

miseram *1472*: misere *OGR*

143 nunc *B. Guarinus*: hinc *Froehlich*: tum *OGR*

148 meminere *Czwalina*: metuere *OGR*

149 medio uersantem in turbine *Trappes-Lomax*: i. m. u. t. *OGR*

153 iniecta *Calph.* (iniacta *Ellis*): intacta *OGR*

164 conqueror γ : conquerar *OGR*

167 prope iam] properans *Pleitner*

168 acta *Heinsius*: alga *OGR*

Iuppiter omnipotens, utinam ne tempore primo
 Cnosia Cecropiae tetigissent litora puppes,
 indomito nec dira ferens stipendia tauro
 perfidus in Creta religasset nauita funem,
 nec malus hic celans dulci crudelia forma 175
 consilia in nostris requiesset sedibus hospes!
 nam quo me referam? quali spe perdita nitor?
 Idaeosne petam montes? at gurgite lato
 discernens ponti truculentum diuidit aequor.
 an patris auxilium sperem? quemne ipsa reliqui 180
 respersum iuuenem fraterna caede secuta?
 coniugis an fido consoler memet amore?
 quine fugit lentos curuans in gurgite remos?
 praeterea nullo colitur sola insula tecto,
 nec patet egressus pelagi cingentibus undis. 185
 nulla fugae ratio, nulla spes: omnia muta,
 omnia sunt deserta, ostentant omnia letum.
 non tamen ante mihi languescent lumina morte,
 nec prius a fesso secedent corpore sensus,
 quam iustam a diuis exposcam prodita multam 190
 caelestumque fidem postrema comprecser hora.
 quare facta uirum multantes uindice poena
 Eumenides, quibus anguino redimita capillo
 frons expirantis praeportat pectoris iras,
 huc huc aduentate, meas audite querelas, 195
 quas ego uae misera extremis proferre medullis
 cogor inops, amens, ardenti caeca furore.
 quae quoniam uerae nascuntur pectore ab imo,
 uos nolite pati nostrum uanescere luctum,
 sed quali solam Theseus me mente reliquit, 200
 tali mente, deae, funestet seque suosque.'

174 in Creta *O*: in Cretam *GR*: intortum *Gratwick*

175 hic *GR*: haec *O*

177 nam *OGR*: nunc *Spengel*: iam *Baehrens*
 nitor] nitar ζη

178 Idaeosne *Parth.*, ut *vid.*: idoneos ne *OGR*: Idmoneos ne *R*²: Idomeneos ne ζ
 (Idomeneosne *Corradinus de Allio*, Idomeneusne *Lachmann*, Idomeneine
Bücheler)

at *Puccius*: a *OGR*: an *Ellis in app.*

179 diuidit *Puccius*: ubi diuidit *OGR*

181 respersum iuuenem fraterna] f. i. r. *Trappes-Lomax*

183 curuans in *Trappes-Lomax* (qui fugit incuruans lentos in g. r. *Trinc.*): incuruans
OGR

184 colitur *Palmer*: litus *OGR*

187 ostentant] intentant *Orelli*

196 misera] miserae *Ric. 606*, ∅

extremis] alr. imis *R*^a: ex imis *Lond. add. 12005*, *Par. 8232*

197 amens, ardenti *Nisbet*: ardens, amenti *OGR*

1-11: the Argo

The content of the first few lines would be expected to announce the subject-matter of the whole poem. Here, the initial focus on the Argo suggests two possibilities, neither of them the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. The first is that this *epos* will be an *Argonautica*, as the originator of the title ‘Argonautia’ found in G and many later manuscripts apparently thought. An epic often identifies its main subject or protagonist in the first word (West on Hes. *Theog.* 1); here the geographical adjective *Peliaco* describes the ship’s origin, as Callimachus’ *Hecale* began by calling its heroine Ἀκταΐη (fr. 1 Hollis). Other details personify the Argo as if it were itself the epic hero (1 *prognatae*, 2 *nasse*, 11 *illa ... prima n.*). The lines allude to the opening and several other passages of Apollonius’ *Argonautica* (see esp. 1-3n. and cf. continued allusion in 12-18, 19-30). However, this Argonautic opening also reworks the first lines of the *Medea* tragedies of Ennius and Euripides, making the alternative suggestion that this will be a *Medea*.

The conventions of both epic and tragic beginnings are more widely exploited. The narrative movement is both wayward and repetitive: the Argo journeys from Pelion to Colchis (1-3), is *en route* (4-7), is built (8-10), sets off again (11). This could potentially be either a tragic prologue, which tends to set the scene by narrating past events, or an epic proem, which often summarises what will happen in the subsequent narrative (both sorts of summary being often highly compressed, with many anachronies: 1n., cf. e.g. *Il.* 1.1-7 with Genette (1980) 36-7). The allusions to particular *Medeas* in 1-7 initially suggest the tragic type, but 8-11 then return to the beginning of the Argonautic story, inviting a reinterpretation of 1-7 as a foreshadowing epic summary (Zetzel (1983) 261, Clare (1996) 62-5). Moreover, epic and tragic openings presuppose very different roles for the speaker: in tragedy

emotionally involved with a current situation, in epic narrating a past story from a more objective viewpoint (Race (1992) 13ff.). Here, the first line evokes the wish of Euripides' and Ennius' Nurse that the story she narrates had not taken place, but *dicuntur* then signals a different speech-act, the distanced indirect statement of a Hellenistic epic narrator (see n.); yet later there are hints of emotional colouring more appropriate to the tragic Nurse (5 *auertere* n.).

This conflation of epic and tragedy reflects the interrelationships in the evolution of the two genres. Scene-setting tragic prologues are where 'tragedy comes closest to having a "narrator"' (Segal (1992) 85), and Ennius' *Medea*-prologue is itself both a 'dramatic' and a 'narrative' opening: as in Euripides, Ennius' first words indicate a wish (Eur. *Med.* 1 εἴθ' ὥφελ' / Enn. *trag.* 208 Jocelyn *utinam*), but his etymologising *quia* (212) and temporally problematic *nunc* (211 *nunc nominantur nomine*) imply epic narratorial distance. So Catullus might have written this opening to demonstrate his understanding of the debts owed by Hellenistic poetry to Euripides, and the influence of Hellenistic poetry, in turn, on Ennius (Zetzel (1983) 262-3); or to acknowledge Ennius as both a tragedian and an epicist, especially by simultaneously alluding to the *Annals* (7 *uerrentes* n.); perhaps even to 'reconstruct' the Argonautic myth that Ennius had 'demythologised' (Biondi (1980) 133-9). However, there is more to allusion than the deliberate 'references' to other works, intended to display learned understanding of literary history and the text's place in a tradition, that are emphasised in the well-known article of Thomas (1982) on these lines: see further Hinds (1998) 17-51 on the problems with this 'philological fundamentalism'. The interactions with other texts and generic ambiguity seen here invite interpretations in which they convey meaning about the poem's content. The lines can be read as a new kind of *Medea*-prologue in which tragic aspects, including

Medea herself, are excluded to produce an optimistic introduction to a happier Argonautic love story (Klingner (1956) 6-12, Harmon (1973) 312). Alternatively, the presence through allusion of Medea and Jason may cast doubt on that happiness and complicate the contrast between the two couples, Peleus-Thetis and Theseus-Ariadne (e.g. Bramble (1970) 37-8, Zetzel (1983) 260-2, Clare (1996) 60-5); the appearance of the Medea-like figure of Ariadne (cf. esp. 132-201n.) is the strongest invitation to reread this opening as equivalent to a *Medea*-prologue after all.

1-3 A journey-summarising epic opening (cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.1-7) which signposts an *Argonautica* by involving itself in an intertextual debate about how much of the Argo's journey an *Argonautica* proem should cover (see Clare (2002) 28 and refs.). In Ap. *Arg.* 1-4 the ship travels through the Pontus towards Colchis with no explicit comment on whether it got there or succeeded in its quest: V.Fl. 1.1-4, by contrast, takes the Argo all the way to the heavens. Here, although *ad* might mean only 'towards', the allusions suggest a similar extension of the Apollonian proem, moving from the Argo's origin as in the *Medea* plays (1) to a reworking of lines from the completion of the outward journey at the very end of Ap. *Arg.* 2 (3n.). The concentration of proper names establishes the mythical Greek setting, helping to characterise a learned narrator. Geymonat (1982) analyses their 'decorative' effect, but also shows how names are identically distributed in 1-7 here and Ap. *Arg.* 1.1-7 (1, 1, 1+1, 1, 1, -, -); the pattern constitutes another invitation to compare Apollonius' proem.

The lines also evoke another narrative opening with a swift voyage and proper names, poem 63; cf. 6 *cita ... puppi* n. and the resemblances between Ariadne and Attis (esp. 50-75, 132-201nn.).

1 Beginning with the pines from which the Argo was built, rather than with its leaving Colchis and passing the Symplegades, Catullus follows Ennius' 'correction' of Euripides' *hysteron-proteron* time sequence (Eur. *Med.* 1-6, Enn. *trag.* 208-11 Jocelyn). This fits an epic narrator better than the Nurse, who first mentions Medea leaving home because that is what she primarily regrets (cf. [Cic.] *Ad Her.* 2.34). Five-word lines are particularly favoured in the poem (nearly one line in four), while the plosive alliteration of the first, third and fifth words contributes to the establishment of a refined style (cf. Wilkinson (1963) 26-8) but also suggests Ennian archaism (cf. 159n.) and marks allusion to Eur. *Med.* 3-4 μηδ' ἐν νάπαισι Πηλίου πρῶτον ποτε | τμηθεῖσα πρύκῃ: the same alliteration in the same context at Theoc. 13.17-18, Ov. *Her.* 12.10, Phaedr. 4.7.10-11, Luc. 2.715-19, Stat. *Theb.* 5.335-7, *Ach.* 1.64-5. The line is closely reworked at Ov. *Am.* 2.11.2 *Peliaco pinus uertice caesa uias*, in the context of another Argonautic opening (to a propempticon).

Peliaco Adjective based on a Greek name, as at 35, 36, 37, 75, 172, 178 (places), 3, 77, 267, 367, 368 (persons). Many replace an expected genitive: this common feature of Latin poetic style develops a native Latin idiom (for prose occurrences see K—S I.209-12) in imitation of Greek epic and tragic usage. See Fordyce on 44.10, Austin on Virg. *Aen.* 2.543, Löfstedt (1956²) I.107-24, Wackernagel (1920-4) II.68-75, (1953) II.1346-73.

Peliacus is first found here: next at Prop. 3.22.12 *Peliacaeque trabis*, Ov. *Am.* 2.11.2 (see above), then in subsequent poetry. Mount Pelion is associated with the Argo's origin almost unanimously (see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 2.11.1-2). Since Pelion is an important location for Peleus and Achilles, as the home of Chiron (cf. 278-9), the source of the wood for Achilles' spear (*Il.* 16.143-4 = 19.390-1, recurring Πηλιάς μελίη), and even the location for Peleus' and Thetis' wedding (31-49n.), the

word also hints at the real theme of the poem's outer story, possibly even punning on *Peleus* (see Stoevesandt (1994-5) 193-4): the hero is – almost – named in the first word of the poem after all (1-11n.).

quondam indicates the narrator's distance from his subject, set in an age too long past to be specified. Baehrens, Godwin, Traill (1981) 237, Jenkyns (1982) 98, e.g., compare fairy-tales and/or translate 'once upon a time': either *quondam* or *olim* may appear with this sense at the beginning of any kind of story, anecdote or *exemplum* (e.g. 67.4, 68.73, 111, Cic. *Ver.* 2.4.72 *hoc quondam oppidum*, Plaut. *Stich.* 539 *fuit olim, quasi ego sum, senex*), while the indeterminacy of time could be compared to indeterminacy of place and/or characters' names at other narrative openings, e.g. Apul. *Met.* 4.28 (Cupid and Psyche) *erant in quadam ciuitate rex et regina* (see Kenney *ad loc.*), Petron. 111.1 *matrona quaedam Ephesi tam notae erat pudicitiae*. However, *quondam* here clearly draws on the use of ποτέ (κοτέ, ποκά) at the beginning of Hellenistic poetic narratives, whether free-standing, especially 'epyllia' (Call. *Hec.* fr. 1 Hollis, Theoc. 18.1, 24.1, Mosch. *Eur.* 1, cf. Call. fr. 198 Pfeiffer, Theoc. 6.2, [Theoc.] 19.1) or inset within larger structures (Call. *Hymn* 5.57, frr. 75.4, 194.6 Pfeiffer, [Bion] 2.10, Sotades fr. inc. 16 Powell); see Bühler and Campbell on *Eur.* 1, Hollis on *Hec.* fr. 1. Race (1992) 14 traces the technique back through Euripidean prologues (*And.*, *El.*, *Her.*, *Bacch.*, *Med.* 3 Πηλίου ... ποτέ, cf. Soph. *Phil.* 5) to Bacchyl. fr. 20 Snell; cf. also *Od.* 8.76, at the beginning of Demodocus' first song. *Peliaco quondam* adopts two particular characteristics, the temporal adverb as second word and the conjunction with a name: all the Hellenistic examples above show one or the other, while the closest parallels are Mosch. *Eur.* 1 Εὐρώπη ποτέ and, significantly (1-11n.), Call. fr. 198 Pfeiffer Ἀργώ κοτ'. Kubiak (1981) argues that Catullus also has the Latin precedent of Cic. *Arat.* 420 *uir*

quondam Orion, opening the story of Orion. *quondam* is there elided, however, as are many of the *ποτέ* examples, whereas here it is emphasised by the caesurae preceding and following it; Catullus never elides *quondam* (eight occurrences), and it often receives similar emphasis for wistful or sarcastic weight when used by a speaker remembering a time in his/her own past (e.g. 8.3; cf. Clausen (1982) 192-3). As it has this force elsewhere in the poem (139), and when Catullus again uses it in this position in an opening hexameter (72.1), some emotional charge may be felt even in this more ‘antiquarian’ context, preparing for the narrator’s nostalgia for the heroic age (22-30) and implying the contrast with the present that is explicit when *quondam* returns in ring-composition at the beginning of the epilogue (382). Cf. also *olim* below (76, 212).

prognatae ‘sprung from’. A formal, archaic word first attested in the early third-century epitaphs of the Scipios (*CIL* I² 7, 10), *prognatus* occurs comparatively often in early epic and tragedy (e.g. Enn. *Ann.* 36 Skutsch, *trag.* 291 Jocelyn); its 14 occurrences in Plautus and three in Hor. *Serm.* are in contexts of either real or parodied solemnity. It is especially connected with socially lofty or divine/heroic ancestry: cf. e.g. Liv. 1.40.3 *deo prognatus* (Romulus), Cael. *ap.* Cic. *Fam.* 8.15.2 *Venere prognatus* (Caesar, facetiously). So despite a few prose examples of its use of plants, animals and objects (*OLD* s.v. 1), its effect here is to personify the pines as heroes of noble origin. Cf. the similar metamorphosis from trees to ship at 4.10-17, and the pine ship proud of its ancestry at Hor. *Carm.* 1.14.11-12.

The rhythm with a molossus (or molossic combination) after a strong third-foot caesura is extremely characteristic of the poem (Wilkinson (1963) 129, who counts 146 instances; Gaisser (2009) 85). For effects of clusters of such lines see 38-42, 63-5, 91nn.

uertice ‘summit’, but among the other anthropomorphic details here perhaps also ‘head’; this might align the pines’ origin with the miraculous birth of Athena, anticipating her appearance in 8-10.

pinus Singular *pinus* for ‘ship’ is later common in poetry (e.g. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.38, Prop. 3.22.14, Ov. *Met.* 1.95), but here the plural is a pivot, still referring to the trees when only line 1 has been read, but then to the ship in line 2; the metonym is made as the ship is made. Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 10.230-1 *nos sumus, Idaeae sacro de uertice pinus, | nunc pelagi nymphae, classis tua* with Hardie (1987) 163-4; the line-ending *uertice pinus* (–um) is also reprised at Ov. *Met.* 1.103, Luc. 1.573, Petron. 131.8.3. The avoidance of ordinary nautical words in this opening perhaps focalises the description through the watching Nereids, but this is not obvious before their appearance: by mimicking their ignorance the narrator paradoxically puts himself on the same level as his characters, although he is usually more concerned to stress his distance from the story (2 *dicuntur* n.). See also 7 *abiegnis* n.

2 dicuntur Emphatically placed ‘Alexandrian footnote’ (label first at Ross (1975) 78), the verb of speech working together with *quondam* (as at 76, 212, 68.109-11, Call. fr. 75.4 Pfeiffer, Sotades fr. inc. 16 Powell, Cic. *Arat.* 420-1, Prop. 1.20.17) to highlight the narrator’s position in time and level of authority. The Hellenistic announcement that the subject has precedent, specifically in the literary predecessors known to the well-read poet (e.g. Call. *Hymn* 5.56, fr. 612 Pfeiffer, Ap. *Arg.* 1.18), is here made in a single word that superficially suggests the older appeal to oral tradition (φασί even in Homer, e.g. *Il.* 2.783, 5.638, 6.100, *Od.* 3.245, 6.42): cf. 19 *fertur*, 76, 124 *perhibent*, 212, 2b.1, 68.109 *ferunt* and see Norden on Virg. *Aen.* 6.14 for one way of classifying various uses of the technique. Here, as often, it marks

allusiveness: the narrator portrays himself as a scholar citing other texts (Hinds (1998) 1-2) and invites the reader to find and admire nearby allusions. Also perhaps producing a distancing or fictionalising effect, as the narrator avoids taking responsibility for the truth of his story (Jenkyns (1982) 99, Gaisser (1995) 582-3).

liquidas ... undas ‘flowing waters’: in epic style a natural object is given an obvious epithet describing an appealing physical feature. It is less Homeric, more Apollonian to divide epithet from noun rather than making the combination fill a half-line before or after the caesura (Parry (1971) 25-9). The arrangement here makes the two halves of the line rhyme, a mannered pattern recurring almost fifty times in the poem, proportionally more than twice as frequently as in Enn. *Ann.* or Virg. *Aen.* (see Thomas (1982) 155 n.43). After Catullus *liquidas* becomes a stock poetic epithet for the sea, and recurs with *undas* at Virg. *Aen.* 5.859, Ov. *Met.* 1.94-5, the latter evoking these lines to describe the end of the golden age: *nondum caesa suis ... | montibus in liquidas pinus descenderet undas*.

Neptuni Standard metonym for sea-water (cf. e.g. Enn. *Ann.* 516 Skutsch *imber Neptuni*), but also the first indication of the closeness of the gods to the physical world in the heroic age and particularly of the sea as divine element before it suffered human invasion (Syndikus 121, cf. Curran (1969) 175-6). Cf. 11 *Amphitriten*.

nasse Cf. 4.3 *natantis ... trabis*, 66.46 *nauit* of sailors. Although later quite commonly used of travel by sea (*OLD* s.v. 2b; an etymological connection with *nauis* was probably felt, see Maltby s.v. *no*), the word is particularly unexpected and personifying here because of the contrast with the verb used of the trees in the *Medea*-prologues, ‘fall’ (πεσεῖν / *accidisset*).

3 The line ostentatiously combines elements of three consecutive lines from the completion of the Argo's journey in Apollonius: the chiasmus of exotic names echoes *Arg.* 2.1277-8 Κολχίδα μὲν δὴ γαῖαν ἱκάνομεν ἥδε ῥέεθρα | Φάσιδος, while *Aeeteos* translates 1279 Αἰήταο (also at spondaic line-end). *Phasidos ad fluctus*, however, re-introduces Euripidean word-order (*Eur. Med.* 2 Κόλχων ἐς αἶαν).

The line is the first *spondeiazon* of 30 in the poem, the highest concentration in any extant Latin work; the rhythm was not rare in Homer and Hesiod, but cultivated by Hellenistic poets (statistics at Crowther (1970) 322 n.2) and famously characteristic of νεώτεροι for Cicero (*Att.* 7.2.1, cf. 84n.). See further Salvatore (1965) 257-67. Both in Greek and in Latin many *spondeiazontes* end with names, often tetrasyllabic and usually Greek even in Latin poetry; in others, the rhythm can underline the sense, especially of a verb (e.g. 15 *admirantes*). The form with spondaic fourth foot is particularly rare (elsewhere in Catullus only 44, 68.87, 116.3; never in Callimachus; see further West (1982) 154). This suggests expressive force even with the name: as a *spondeiazon* can form a 'closing cadence to a kind of "paragraph"' (Thomson), the rhythm here may depict the end of the Argo's journey.

Phasidos The main river of Colchis, flowing from the Caucasus to the Black Sea, known in poetry since Hes. *Theog.* 340 and associated with the Argonauts at Pind. *Pyth.* 4.211-12, repeatedly in Ap. *Arg.*

The Greek genitive, directly from Ap. *Arg.* 2.1278, contrasts with Latin *Thetidis* in 19, 302 (if the transmitted readings are correct: see 21 *Thetidi* n.). Fordyce here lists all Catullus' uses of Greek inflections (as transmitted or usually restored); scribes regularly corrupt such endings to Latin forms (see Housman (1972) 817-39). According to Var. *L.L.* 10.70 the trend to use Greek rather than Latin endings for Greek names began with Accius.

fluctus The periphrastic form '[name of river]' + 'streams' is Homeric (*Il.* 2.461, 2.533, 7.135 etc.), followed by e.g. Ap. *Arg.* (including 2.1277-8, see above), and in Latin epic since Ennius (*Ann.* 222 Skutsch *Naris ad undas*).

fines The 'boundaries' of Aeetes' kingdom, but perhaps also the 'end' of the Argo's journey; a teasing word at the beginning of a poem, and in a reference to such an archetypal 'beginning' as the sailing of the Argo.

Aeeteos Adjectival form of the Colchian king's name, as at Ap. *Arg.* 2.1279; not elsewhere extant in Latin. The orthography *-eos* (not *-aeos*) follows Housman's principle (Housman (1972) 887-91) that while Greek adjectives formed from first-declension feminine names end in *-αῖος* (Latin *-aeus*), those formed from other names have *-εῖος* (*-eus*).

4 lecti iuuenes Groups of 'chosen' warriors are frequent in epic and in military narrative generally (e.g. Livy); cf. esp. the echo of this line at *Aen.* 8.179 *tum lecti iuuenes*. For the Argonauts as 'chosen' cf. e.g. Pind. *Pyth.* 4.189, Ap. *Arg.* 3.347, 4.831, Theoc. 3.17-18 (below), Virg. *Ecl.* 4.34: lines 4-5 draw closely on Enn. *trag.* 212-14 Jocelyn *quia Argiui in ea delecti uiri | uecti petebant pellem inauratam arietis | Colchis* (contrast Eur. *Med.* 5 ἀνδρῶν ἀρίστων). The change from Ennius' *delecti* allows for the possibility of a metapoetic pun on 'read' young men, another marker of allusiveness (2 *dicuntur* n.). *lecti iuuenes ... robora pubis* may also combine two descriptions of the Argonauts in Theoc. 13 (17-18 ἀριστῆες ... προλελεγμένοι, 26-7 θεῖος ἄωτος | ἡρώων); for similar combinations of concrete and abstract cf. Lucr. 1.86 *ductores Danaum delecti, prima uirorum*, Virg. *Aen.* 5.729 *lectos iuuenes, fortissima corda* and see 78n.

Argiuae Perhaps a Homerising way of referring to the Greeks in general, but also suggesting Ennius' derivation of *Argo* from *Argiui uiri* (*trag.* 211-12 Jocelyn); cf. Manil. 1.694 *Argiuumque ratem*. Catullus excludes Apollonius' etymology (9n.) but (*pace* Thomas (1982) 150) does not choose between Ennius' version and derivation from the Homeric use ἄργός = 'swift', evoked by 6 *cita* (Traina (1972) 99-105; Gaisser (1995) 584 n.17).

robora pubis Poetic plural version of *robur* = 'strongest element' of a population; its literal meaning 'oaks' assimilates the men to their wooden ship (cf. 7 *palmis*). For *pubis* cf. 267, 68.101, in both cases used with a national adjective, as here and often (e.g. *trag. inc.* 33 Ribbeck³ *Attica pubes*); it especially denotes the young adult population of military age (*OLD* s.v. 1).

The diction of the whole line is evoked at Virg. *Aen.* 8.518-19 *robora pubis* | *lecta*, Stat. *Theb.* 1.606 *lectis iuuenum, qui robore primi*.

5 auratam ... pellem The first example of 23 in the poem of a noun and its adjective beginning and ending the line (e.g. 54, 72, 99) always with the adjective first; the pattern suits Catullus' frequent single-line sense-units, and is similarly frequent in Cicero's poetry and in the *Ciris* and *Culex*. See Pearce (1966), Conrad (1965) 224-9, May (1910) 2-7. The golden fleece is mentioned prominently in both *Argonautica* and *Medea* proems (Ap. *Arg.* 1.4, Eur. *Med.* 5, Enn. *trag.* 213 Jocelyn): this earliest extant use of *auratus* = 'golden' rather than artificially 'gilded' draws on Ennius' *pellem inauratam*. As *inauro* was a more specific technical term for 'gild' (*TLL* VII.1.841.29-842.15), Catullus may be 'improving' Ennius' epithet to a more 'poetic' level of diction: later poets describing the fleece use *auratus* (Ov. *Her.* 6.2, Manil. 1.263, 2.212, 5.377, Sen. *Med.* 983, V.Fl. 5.490) or *aureus* (Prop. 2.26.6, Ov. *Fast.*

3.876, Sen. *Tro.* 1036-7, *Med.* 361, V.Fl. 5.200-1 etc.), while *inauratus* recurs of it only at Hyg. *Fab.* 3.1-2.

optantes Recurring *optare* associates desire for love and marriage (31, 120, 141, 328, 372, cf. 62.30, 66.79) with desire for heroic actions (also 82) and with the narrator's desire for the heroic age (22). The addition of a new detail in a participial phrase is common in the poem (e.g. 7, 8, 10, 15; Kroll and Fordyce contrast Virgil's preference for finite verbs in parenthesis): like 4 *cum* it extends the sentence without suggesting that the action in any one clause was more important than the others.

Colchis Ablative plural of *Colchus*, 'a Colchian'.

auertere The usual word for taking something away as plunder in war, even 'stealing'; possibly glossing Ennius' *per dolum* (*trag.* 214 Jocelyn; Traill (1981) 238 n.13). Literally meaning 'to turn aside' and sometimes used of such *praeda* as cattle or horses (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.472, 8.208, Liv. 1.7.5), so wittily here of an object that was once an animal.

6 ausi sunt The heroes are daring not in confronting Aeetes but in confronting the sea, always seen as perilous in the ancient world (e.g. Hes. *Op.* 618-21, 674ff., Prop. 3.7.29-42 etc.). Helping to imply that this was the first voyage in history (11n.), the words may activate the association of the invention of seafaring with the end of the golden age (e.g. Hes. *Op.* 236-7, Arat. *Phaen.* 110-11; originally separate from the tradition of the Argo as first ship) rather than a heroic age achievement: cf. 22, 31-49nn. *audacia* is often stressed in such contexts, as Bramble (1970) 35-7 emphasises. However, Bramble's main examples are a propempticon (Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.25) and a specific tragic situation (Sen. *Med.* 301, 318, 347) and the tone of the verb is less easy to categorise than that of the noun, especially within epic narrative here and at V.Fl.

1.3. On attitudes to the invention of sailing see further Murgatroyd and Maltby on Tib. 1.3.37-8, McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 2.11.

uada salsa Again, dignified diction from old Latin poetry: *uada* (cf. 58, 63.47) = ‘waters’ in general rather than ‘shallows’ first in Accius (*inc. fab.* 687 Ribbeck³), while Ennius has *mare salsum* (*Ann.* 453 Skutsch), possibly *aequora salsa* (*trag.* 367 Vahlen², not in Jocelyn); see also 67 *fluctus salis* n. The collocation *uada salsa* recurs only (according to the PHI 5.3 database) in the precise repetition of this phrase at Virg. *Aen.* 5.158 and its echo at Sil. 17.155. The second of eight references to the sea in 1-18, none using the everyday word *mare* largely avoided in the poem (though cf. 30, 155, 269 and 16 *marinas*).

cita ... puppi The first ‘swift ship’ (Homeric νῆα θοήν, *Il.* 1.308 etc.; cf. Ap. *Arg.* 1.111) in extant Latin epic, though cf. Enn. *trag.* 43 Jocelyn *classis cita* and 63.1 *celeri rate* (1-3n.). The synecdoche *puppis* = ‘ship’ is also first attested here. At Cic. *Arat.* 389, cited by Kroll and Klingner (1956) 8 as an earlier example, it has the standard meaning ‘stern’, since Cic. *Arat.* 126-36 (cf. *Arat. Phaen.* 342-52) explains that the constellation Argo travels through the sky stern-foremost. For the etymological force of *cita* see 4 *Argiuae* n.

decurrere A problematic transitive use with accusative *uada salsa*. *decurrere* is generally intransitive meaning ‘run down’ (e.g. Virg. *Ecl.* 5.84), and while there are parallels for *currere* used transitively with an accusative word for ‘sea’ (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 3.191 *currimus aequor*, 5.235 *aequora curro*), in maritime contexts *decurrere* is usually constructed with ‘sea’ in the ablative and means ‘come in to land’, equivalent to κατατρέχειν (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 5.212), whereas this seems to describe an unspecified point during the course of the voyage. Baehrens and Quinn link the transitive use and the sense of ‘race across’ to chariot-racing language,

preparing for 9 *currum*, but even these uses are not precise parallels (Thomas (1982) 153-4): each example at *TLL* V.229.21-26 ‘refers to a course which has been carried completely through to its conclusion’, as does the metaphorical use at Lucr. 4.1196 cited by Nuzzo. It seems then that Catullus’ use here is unparalleled, possibly intended to convey the idea of ‘running down a slope of water’ (Ellis) although not to shore. Thomas suggests the influence of an orthodox use of κατέδραμεν at Call. fr. 108 Pfeiffer, describing the Argo coming into harbour. Alternatively one could consider *percurrere* (Harrison), of which this would be a more standard use (cf. e.g. Lucr. 1.287-8 *altum | murmura percurrunt caelum*, Ov. *Met.* 10.655 *segetis canae stantes percurrere aristas*); but corruption to *decurrere* among so many surrounding *ps* might seem unlikely.

7 The mingling of wood and water is highlighted by the structure of the line, one of several possible arrangements of two adjectives and two nouns separated by one verb (see Kroll, Wilkinson (1963) 215ff., Hoffer (2007)). The most famous is the ‘golden line’: adjective *a*, adjective *b*, verb, noun *A*, noun *B*. This variation, *a verb bAB*, also occurs at 10, 113, 162, 245, 295, 332, 345: in each case the verb is a present participle.

caerula *caerul(e)us*, already frequent in Ennius, is commonly applied to both sea and (dark, Mediterranean) sky (André (1949) 162-71).

uerrentes First attested of rowing at Enn. *Ann.* 377 Skutsch; Thomas (1982) 157, 160-1 traces six reminiscences of *Ann.* 376, 377-8 in 6-13 here (also *salsa*, *caerula*, *uolitantem*, *carinae*, *spumis*: cf. Perrotta (1931) 183). The metaphorical word works with *aequora* to indicate sweeping the sea’s surface (12 *aequor* n.);

similarly in Lucretius (5.388, 1227, 6.624) and Virgil (*Georg.* 3.201, *Aen.* 3.290, 5.778, 8.764).

abiegnis Yet another kind of wood after 1 *pinus* (cf. 10 *pineae*) 4 *robora*. This specificity would suggest a display of learning even to a reader unaware of Catullus' 'correction' of Ennius in reassigning fir-wood to the Argo's oars (made of ἑλάτη, usual equivalent of *abies*, at Ap. *Arg.* 1.914 etc.) rather than the ship itself. The Argo is made of fir (*abiegna*) at Enn. *trag.* 209 Jocelyn but consistently of pine elsewhere (see Jocelyn and Thomas (1982) 146-8), including Eur. *Med.* 4 πεύκη.

palmis Cf. *palmulae* at 4.4, 17; both *palma* and its diminutive are attested a few more times of oars (*TLL* X.1.148.76-9, 155.58-71), including once more in classical poetry (Virg. *Aen.* 5.163 *palmula*). Anthropomorphic play continues (cf. 1 *prognatae*, *uertice*, 2 *nasse*, 7 *robora*), but the image is ambiguous: either rows of oars spread out like the fingers of a hand, or oar-blades as hands on the ends of arms.

8 The line is a periphrasis for a cult title meaning 'city-guardian', e.g. Πολιοῦχος, Ἐρυσίπολις, Πολιάς, Ἀκροαία; cf. Liv. 31.30.9 *praesidemque arcis Mineruam*. For other antonomastic designations of Athena/Minerva cf. 228, 395.

retinens The construction avoiding another relative clause by defining the noun with a participial phrase is 'somewhat strained' in Latin (Quinn), so that *retinens* seems to refer to a specific time, with the goddess's city-guardianship being specifically of the Argonauts' cities while they are away (helped by the juxtaposition with postponed *quibus*). Its sense here of 'occupying' is mainly a prosaic, military use (*OLD* s.v. 8) but applied at Lucr. 4.412-13 to an area's usual inhabitants; Catullus perhaps mistakes or reinterprets the sense of ἔχω in Πολιοῦχος, where the element

means ‘protect’ (LSJ s.v. A.II.12, not an attested sense of *retineo*) as much as ‘dwell in’ (LSJ s.v. A.I.3).

in summis urbibus arces True plurals, as at Virg. *Ecl.* 2.61-2 *Pallas quas condidit arces | ipse colat*: Athena was ‘city-guardian’ in many places besides Athens (e.g. *Il.* 6.305 Ἐρυσίπτολις, Troy; Hdt. 1.160.3 Πολιοῦχος, Chios). But cf. 241 *summa ... ex arce*, of the Athenian Acropolis: this line may be a veiled programmatic indication that the poem will include Athenian myth.

9 ipsa ... fecit In an awed tone (cf. 21, 25-26 *ipse*) the narrator evokes Apollonius’ description (*Arg.* 1.111-12 ἀὐτὴ γὰρ καὶ νῆα θοὴν κάμει, σὸν δέ οἱ Ἄργος | τεῦξεν) but suppresses the name of the shipbuilder Argus, ascribing the building to Athena alone. This rules out Apollonius’ implicit etymology (also *Arg.* 1.18-19), strengthens the emphasis on the gods’ presence among men during the heroic age, and suggests that the voyage was divinely approved, not hubristic (6 *ausi sunt* n.). The ship is now seen as an artefact, made not born: contrast 1 *prognatae*.

leui ... flamine The ease and speed of the miraculous ship: cf. 84n. and e.g. Lucr. 4.901-2, a heavy ship moved by *uentus ... tenuis*.

uolitantem A new image, the Argo as a bird, its sails (rather than oars, given *flamine*) standing for wings; cf. 12 *rostro*, literally ‘beak’. A ship ‘flies’ (*uolat*) at Enn. *Ann.* 376 Skutsch (7 *uerrentes* n.) and Lucretius has 4.390 *quos agimus praeter nauem uelisque uolamus*, while *uolitare* is attested of ships in fr. 4 of Furius Antias, a late second/early first-century poet criticised by the grammarian Caesellius Vindex specifically for his neologistic verb forms (Courtney (1993) 97-8).

currum Of a ship only here in extant Latin; ὄχος, ὄχημα and ἀπήνη sometimes have this meaning in Greek tragedy (e.g. Aesch. *Suppl.* 32, [Aesch.] *Prom.*

468, Soph. *Trach.* 656, Eur. *Med.* 1123, *I.T.* 410), but usually with a clarifying epithet, e.g. *νάϊον*. The culmination of the metaphors avoiding nautical terms (1 *pinus* n.): more standard references follow (10-13 *carinae*, *rostro*, *remigio*). Disconcertingly, the narrator is simultaneously a learned poet imitating a Greek mannerism and a naïve observer lacking the word for ‘ship’.

10 Expands on Athena’s carpentry (no details in Ap. *Arg.*) in a miniature version of Homeric practice (e.g. Odysseus building his raft, *Od.* 5.244ff.).

pineae ... texta Cf. 292 *contexta* of similarly miraculous craftsmanship with trees. Here, a more realistic understanding is possible: the ribs of the *carina* (warp) are crossed perpendicularly by the curved slats (weft) fitted on to form the ship’s sides. V.Fl. 1.125 clarifies and humanises the picture, showing planks being softened by steaming and bent into shape. *texta* completes a set of references to Athena as patron of shipbuilding, chariot-making, and weaving (9 *currum*; cf. e.g. *Il.* 15.410-12, *Hymn. Hom.* 5.12-15). The Indo-European root of *texere* meant ‘build, construct (of wood)’ as well as ‘weave’ (see Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 504): Ennius has *textrinum* there of a dockyard, and *texere* continued to be used of shipbuilding, especially in poetry (see Fordyce and cf. esp. Enn. *trag.* 43 Jocelyn *classis cita* | *textitur* with 6n.). However *pineae ... texta* still sounds oxymoronic here, implying that the pines are for Athena as flexible as woven threads, and foreshadowing the woven *uestis*, which is wondered at (267-8) as the Argo is a *monstrum* (15); with 15 *admirantes* cf. 51 *mira ... arte* n. Both artefacts have metapoetic significance as analogues for the poem itself, a resonance cued here by *texta*: see further 12-18n.

coniungens The verb recurs in the poem only with reference to marriage (331, 335, 372; *coniunx*, 123, 182, 298, 329, 373): perhaps another programmatic hint (8n.).

inflexae ... carinae Given the details of its construction here, ‘curved hull’ (rather than ‘keel’).

11 A statement that the Argo was the first ever ship. This is in any case implied by the wonder of the Nereids in 12-18, so alternative readings that make the line refer to this particular ship’s having never sailed before do not remove the temporal paradox caused by the appearance of Theseus’ ship on the *uestis* (52 *cum classe* n.) and are anticlimactic given the line’s position as a hinge between the initial description of the Argo, which it summarises, and the nymphs’ reaction, which it motivates. This rules out *illa rudem cursu proram imbuit Amphitrite*, whether understood with *Amphitrite* ablative and *illa* = Athena (Baehrens), or with *Amphitrite* nominative with *illa*, ‘the Amphitrite of that time’ (Ellis); for discussion of other less plausible possibilities see Zicàri (1961) and Nuzzo.

I print the modern vulgate, in which *illa* refers to 10 *carinae*, now understood synecdochically as ‘ship’, and the role of the Argo as triumphant hero and *protos heurètes* is emphasised with β’s *prima*; the slight pleonasm with *imbuit* is entirely appropriate, and paralleled at e.g. Prop. 4.10.5, Sen. *H.F.* 455, Stat. *Theb.* 3.219, Sil. 3.64-5. Specifically, *prima* may be supported by Prop. 3.15.5-6 *illa rudes animos per noctes conscia primas* | *imbuit* (so Zicàri (1961), although the syntactic role played by *primas* is of course different), but also by Ov. *Am.* 2.11.1-2 *prima malas docuit mirantibus aequoris undis* | *Peliaco pinus uertice caesa uias* (cf. 1n.), an allusive summary of lines 1-18 here, with comparable personification of the Argo. Moreover

prima could easily lie behind O's original reading *post eam* via a misreading of the abbreviation for *pri*–; see Thomson.

However, this text has one serious stylistic problem, the combination with 12 *quae*, since as Heyworth notes 'it is not normal Latin style to pick up the subject of the preceding sentence with a nominative relative'. (This objection would also apply to nominative *illa ... prora* (Postgate, recently printed by Lee and Nuzzo); moreover *carinae* picked up by *prora* would be an odd identification of one part of a ship with another.) Heyworth therefore proposes reintroducing *prora*, but as an instrumental ablative, and reading *ipsa rudem cursus prora imbuit Amphitriten*, where *ipsa* = Athena. *prora* would be a good anticipation of 12 not simply syntactically but because the beak is attached to the prow, and *proscidit* might suggest an etymology for *prora* (though see 12 *proscidit* n.); Heyworth also compares the allusion to this line (and to the metaphor of 12) at V.Fl. 1.69-70 *ignaras Cereris qui uomere terras | imbuit*.

Yet Valerius' passage is focused on the actions of the hero Triptolemus, whereas it might seem preferable here for the emphasis to have shifted away from Athena to the Argo itself, so that the point made is not that it was Athena herself who caused the first seafaring (*ipsa*), but that the Argo was indeed the first ship (*illa ... prima*, where *illa* has identifying force, picking out this ship from among other ships in history). Contrast line 9, where *ipsa* is highly motivated (see n.); although Heyworth points to αὐτή beginning Ap. Arg. 1.109 and 111, it is the second of these lines that is reprised in 9 here, while Apollonius too goes on to describe the Argo (113-14). But until Heyworth's objection to *illa ... quae* is answered his text remains a real alternative. One interesting aspect of the choice between Athena and the Argo here is that both are female: the emphatic position of either *illa* or *ipsa* creates a

strange effect as the female ship or goddess takes the virginity (see below and 12n.) of the equally female (*Amphitriten*) sea.

rudem cursu ‘inexperienced in travel’; *rudis* has sexual overtones, as frequently in elegy (see Pichon s.v.). It also appears of the sea before the first voyage at Stat. *Silu.* 3.2.62 *quis rude et abscisum miseris animantibus aequor | fecit iter?* Heyworth’s *cursus* is needed in his text next to ablative *prora*, and may in any case be right, since genitive after *rudis* is common (also *in* + ablative, *ad* + accusative): it would then be clearer that the word should be taken with *rudem* rather than with *imbuit*. However, bare ablative is attested in the expression *arte* or *artibus rudis* (Ov. *Tr.* 1.424, *Pont.* 3.3.38, Stat. *Theb.* 6.437) and at Vell. 2.73.1 *hic adulescens erat studiis rudis*, Mart. 6.42.4 *fontes Aponi rudes puellis*.

imbuit The sense ‘introduce (to a new activity)’ is activated by the personal object *Amphitriten*, but *imbuere* reached this meaning through ‘dip or wet for the first time’ (cf. 4.17) from its basic sense ‘drench’: paradoxically, the ship ‘wets’ the sea.

Amphitriten Wife of Poseidon/Neptune, e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 930-33; see further Roscher I.1.318-21. *Amphitrite* = ‘sea’ first here in Latin, possibly taken directly from a Hellenistic source, or created on the model of similar metonymies in Hellenistic poetry: not found in extant Greek until Oppian, Dionysius Periegetes, Quintus Smyrnaeus. The Greek ending is a safe restoration (see 3 *Phasidos* n. and Housman (1972) 817-39); cf. the transmission of *Acmen* in poem 45, where the fact that it looked less like a name and more like other Latin words perhaps preserved –*n* (45.1 *ac men* OGR, 45.21 *agmen* OGR).

12-18: the Nereids

The Nereids initially seem to be presented as a decorative accompaniment to the apparent protagonist, the Argo, rather than as a group that could include one of the poem's central characters. Although a few have their own stories (Thetis, Amphitrite, Galatea), the daughters of Nereus usually appear in literature in large groups (*LIMC* VI.1.786) and are not highly individualised, even when named, since this is usually in catalogues (*Il.* 18.37-49, Hes. *Theog.* 240-64). In art, and in some Hellenistic and later literary representations (e.g. Mosch. *Eur.* 118-19, Lucian *Dial. Mar.* 15.3) they are even more obviously pieces of decoration, appearing alongside other typical sea creatures such as dolphins and Tritons.

As the first obvious visual tableau in the poem, yet occurring in the 'narrative' outer story rather than the 'descriptive' ecphrasis, this passage often plays a key role in critical approaches emphasising the poem's 'pictorialism' and artistic imagery (e.g. Granarolo (1972), O'Connell (1977)). The gaze is an important unifying factor in the poem (see e.g. Fitzgerald (1995) 140-68): recurring aspects introduced here are the voyeuristic viewing of the female body (cf. the Fates (305-22), Polyxena (362-70) and especially Ariadne), love at first sight (cf. Ariadne at 86-93), and the gaze towards a ship (Ariadne at 53ff., 126-7, 249-50; Aegeus at 241-5). The mutual divine-human gaze leading to marriage contrasts with men no longer being able to *see* the gods in the epilogue (esp. 407-8). But the passage also indicates how the process of reading can bridge this gap: like the *uestis* (10n.) the Argo offers itself as a potential metaphor for the text, a work of art to be gazed and wondered at, while, as narrative time slows down to linger on one moment in the story, the Nereids are presented pictorially. Seeking to appeal to the reader by its erotic visual details, and

reminiscent of a common artistic subject (*LIMC* s.v. ‘Nereides’, Griffin (1985) 93 n.24), the description programmatically invites the reader to read this and the poem’s other visual scenes simply by gazing at them. The implication is that the poem can give the reader access to the heroic age via the pictures it creates, even though more narrative, less descriptive passages distance narrator and reader from the past (1 *quondam*, 2 *dicuntur* nn.). Cf. 50-75n.

However, the scene’s engagement with earlier epic treatments of nymphs rising from the water gives it a narrative aspect of its own, which suggests a less happy tone than the pictorial reading. The two main passages evoked are *Ap. Arg.* 1.540-58 (gods wonder at the newly-launched *Argo*) and 4.930-63 (Thetis and Nereids help it through the *Planctae*). On one level these allusions to basically joyous occasions of divine support for the Argonauts underline the optimistic mood; but they also alert the reader to Apollonius’ specific treatment of Peleus and Thetis (Hunter (1991)), especially since both emphasise the unhappy end of the marriage and the separation of Achilles from his parents (at *Ap. Arg.* 1.553-8, the baby Achilles appears with Chiron; the Nereids’ appearance in book 4 is part of an episode (757-960) in which the whole story of the marriage and estrangement is told). Moreover, in Homer Thetis and the Nereids mainly rise from the sea in contexts involving Achilles’ grief or death (*Il.* 1.357ff., 18.65ff.; *Od.* 24.47-8); and Clare (1996) 63-4 plausibly identifies another Apollonian model for this scene, the rape of Hylas (*Ap. Arg.* 1.1228-39; cf. also Theocritus’ version, 13.39-54, closer to Catullus in having plural nymphs). Allusion to this story is not ‘propitious’ for a meeting of lovers, since love at first sight ends tragically for Hylas, or in an Argonautic context, since it causes the loss of Heracles.

12 quae simul ac Monosyllable + *simul ac* at line-beginning also at 86, 147, 233, 366; once in Cic. *Arat.* (350), eight times in Lucretius, only twice in Virgil (*Aen.* 4.90, 12.222). Cf. 31 *quae simul*, again a line-beginning opening a new section of narrative, where *simul* alone is used in the same way as a conjunction, ‘as soon as’, as at 22.15, 51.6, 91.7.

rostro Technical term for the beak on a ship’s prow; also meaning ‘ploughshare’ (Plin. *N.H.* 18.171, 34.144), contributing to the metaphor in *proscidit aequor* (Konstan (1977) 19 n.25). Cf. Cic. *Arat.* 129 *rostris Neptunia prata secantes*; as this describes how other ships, unlike the celestial Argo, travel forwards, not stern-foremost (6 *cita ... puppi* n.), Catullus may be alluding to Cicero’s word and imagery (the phrase has no original in Aratus) to make the point that while still an earthly ship the Argo did not travel backwards.

uentosum ... aequor loosely translates Ap. *Arg.* 1.541 λάβρον ὕδωρ, the ‘boisterous’ water hit by the Argonauts’ oars (the beak is not mentioned). *aequor* in either singular or plural is used by Catullus with more (7, 206, 4.17, 11.11, 68.3) or less (179, 11.8, 101.1) sense of the sea’s ‘flat surface’ (see Ernout-Meillet, Walde-Hofmann, de Vaan s.v. for derivation from *aequus*). For plural cf. Enn. *trag.* 367 Vahlen² (not in Jocelyn), *Ann.* 505 Skutsch; singular, Cic. *Arat.* 67, frequently in Lucretius. As *aequor* can also mean the level surface of a field, it suggests the new fluidity of the land/sea boundary; cf. Virg. *Georg.* 1.50, where ploughing untilled soil seems comparable to the first ploughing or seafaring in history (*ignotum ... scindimus aequor*).

On poetic *-osus* adjectives see Ross (1969) 53-60, Knox (1986). Virg. *Georg.* 1.206 conflates *uentosum ... aequor* with Cat. 101.1 to produce *uentosa per aequora uectis*, echoed at *Aen.* 6.335, Ov. *Her.* 17.5.

proscidit ‘Ploughing’ or ‘cutting through’ the sea is a regular poetic image (e.g. Ap. *Arg.* 4.225, Ov. *Met.* 4.706-7, Homeric τέμνειν, e.g. *Od.* 3.174-5); *proscindere* is especially appropriate for the first seafaring as it strictly means the first ploughing of the year (e.g. Lucr. 5.209, Virg. *Georg.* 1.97 and Servius *ad loc.*, Var. *R.R.* 1.29.2), while *rostro* ... *proscidit* might make an etymological point (but see 11n.). The image also develops the sexual metaphor of 11 (see n.), here highlighted by the phallic shape of the *rostrum*.

13 Whitening of sea-water by a ship is described at e.g. *Od.* 12.171-2, Eur. *Cycl.* 16-17 (caused by oars); Eur. fr. 757.844-5 (caused by the Argo’s prow). The implied colour contrast with the blue sea (7) is more explicit at Enn. *Ann.* 377-8 Skutsch and at Ap. *Arg.* 1.542, mentioning both foam and dark sea (ἀφρῶ ... κελαινὴ ... ἄλμη) and 545-6, comparing the white wake to a path on a green plain (χλοεροῖο ... πεδίοιο, cf. 12 *aequor*). Catullus emphasises this visual aspect of Apollonius’ launching scene (Ap. *Arg.* 1.519-58), excluding references to the roaring sea and Orpheus’ lyre-playing (Syndikus 119-21).

tortaque OGR *totaque* would leave *remigio* unsupported. For *tortaque* (*editio Trincavelliana*) against Baehrens’ *motaque* cf. Virg. *Aen.* 3.207-8 *nautae | adnixi torquent spumas et caerula uerrunt*, V.Fl. 1.362 *tortas ... undas*: it demonstrates acute ‘visual precision’ (Jenkyns (1982) 104) as each dipped oar creates a small vortex. The shape of this line, with *-que* introducing an end-stopped, tacked-on detail after another end-stopped line that could have completed a sentence or clause, recurs frequently in the poem (191, 235, 264, 300, 310, 316, 331, 345, 351, 398); cf. 5 *optantes* n.

incanuit OGR *incanduit* is retained by Baehrens, Munro, Friedrich, Kroll and Eisenhut, but is unlikely given the closeness of 14 *candenti*. This could be explained as ‘participial resumption’ (Wills 311-25), but this figure (otherwise absent from Catullus, except possibly for 67.12-13; cf. Wills 315) would not be particularly pointed here; more importantly, *incandescere* meaning ‘shine white’ (clearly the sense of 14 *candenti*, cf. 45 *candet ebur* n.) would be unparalleled, although *candescere* = ‘shine white’ is attested (TLL III.236.20-6). *incanduit* could mean ‘became shining’ only in the sense ‘became glowing red-hot’, which would be nonsensical (the conceit of the river growing hot with sexual excitement at Ov. *Am.* 3.6.25-6, cited by Konstan (1977) 13, is much more explicit). *canus*, *canere* etc., referring to grey or matt white, are common of sea-foam (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 8.672, Ov. *Her.* 3.65, 5.54, Sen. *Ag.* 441, V.Fl. 3.32), following Homeric ἄλός πολίῃς (e.g. *Il.* 1.350). While *canus* and other words for ‘white’ can be used together of the same object with little distinction of sense (André (1949) 67-8), here a contrast of textures is implied between *incanuit* and *candenti* (Jenkyns (1982) 104): as at Lucr. 2.766-7 *mare ... | uertitur in canos candenti marmore fluctus*, the image is probably matt foam with a surface gleam from the sunlight. This also explains why 14 *candenti e gurgite* can be followed by 18 *e gurgite cano*.

14 emersere If Schrader’s *freti* is accepted, *emersere* is best taken as transitive, subject *Nereides*, object *uultus*; difficult, but less problematic than keeping *feri*. For full discussions of possible parallels see Puelma (1977) 158-60 and Thomson: in all except *Dirae* 56-7 (below) the text has been challenged. However, reflexive *se emergere* is established by e.g. Nep. *Att.* 11.1 *quibus ex malis ut se emersit*, Sall. *Hist.* 4.28 *ubi se laniata naufragia fundo emergunt*, Manil. 5.198 *ex undis ... sese emergit*

in astra, and the past participle usually occurs in a middle sense, ‘having raised oneself out’ (cf. *OLD* s.v. 1b), e.g. Cic. *Diu.* 2.140 *subito sum uisus emersus e flumine*, [Ov.] *Hal.* 36 *demum emersus in auras*. Although this does not prove that *emergere* could be used fully transitively, the use here with a body part as object could be considered similar (quasi-reflexive). This would also cover *Dirae* 56-7 *monstra ... | subito emersere furenti corpora ponto* (where however it is ‘just possible’ that *emersere* might be intransitive, *corpora* a rather flat nominative: Richmond (1962) 44).

freti For genitive with *gurgite* cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 3.421 *imo barathri ... gurgite*, Ov. *Fast.* 4.48 *Tuscae gurgite ... aquae* and the common *gurgite ponti* (e.g. Cic. *Progn.* 3.7, Lucr. 5.387, Luc. 7.813), and cf. similar periphrases for ‘sea’ at 127, 178-9. *fretum*, like e.g. *unda*, *uada*, *aequor*, *gurgis*, is a generalised usage (since Acc. *trag.* 401 Ribbeck³, cf. 4.18) of a word literally meaning a certain part of the sea. It is particularly appropriate for the foaming water here (an image to which *gurgite* may also contribute: 178-9n.) because of the connection with *ferueo* (Var. *L.L.* 7.22, see further Maltby s.v. *fretum*; often punned, e.g. Lucr. 6.427-8, Virg. *Georg.* 1.327), while [Sen.] *Oct.* 706-7 *talis emersam freto | spumante Peleus coniugem accipit Thetin* suggests that the author read *freti* here (Ferri *ad loc.*).

OGR *feri* is printed by Ellis, Lenchantin, Quinn and Thomson and defended by Puelma (1977) 156-72. Despite the lack of close parallels *feri ... uultus* seems potentially acceptable as nominative plural in apposition with 15 *aequoreae ... Nereides* (more likely than genitive singular qualifying it), but the sense of *ferus* creates a more serious problem. Its primary meaning is ‘undomesticated’; the only possible parallel for an extension of this to ‘timid’ (Quinn) is Virg. *Aen.* 4.152 *ferae ... caprae*, probably simply technical ‘wild goats’. Of the face, where emotions are

shown, *ferus* would much more naturally have its second main meaning, ‘savage’. But the Nereids are friendly, reacting with wonder, not anger or fear; the sea they personify is stirred up by oars (see above) but otherwise calm, whereas *feri* understood as transferred to the sea would mean ‘stormy’, ‘hostile’ (63.40 *mare ferum*). This also counts against Schrader’s alternative reading *fero* (with *gurgite*), adopted by Baehrens, who also reads *candentis*, nominative plural with *uultus*.

gurgite always occurs in this place in the line in Catullus (18, 178, 183, 65.5) and Lucretius (three times); Luck (1976) 333 suggests that this may show the influence of Cicero’s poetry (*Arat.* 422, *Progn.* 3.7, 6). Cf. also 179, 183 *gurgite* nn.

15 The first of four four-word hexameters in the poem (also 77, 115, 319, not elsewhere in Catullus): see Bassett (1919). The rareness of such lines encourages the inference that this one ‘translates’ Ap. *Arg.* 1.550 Πηλιάδες κορυφῆσιν ἐδάμβειον εἰσορόωσαι (Thomas (1982) 158 n.54).

aequoreae The adjective appears first here, possibly coined (*TLL* s.v. ‘adi. a neotericis formatum’); see further Ross (1969) 60-3 on Catullus’ use of ‘poetic’ adjectives in *-eus*. *aequoreus* became fairly common in poetry, describing sea-gods at e.g. Prop. 3.7.67, Ov. *Met.* 12.197, *Fast.* 1.372, Manil. 5.434, Sil. 7.414.

monstrum Originally a religious ‘portent’ (cf. *moneo*), but often more widely ‘strange phenomenon’, ‘wonder’, though here as for the Trojan Horse (Virg. *Aen.* 2.245) the sense ‘object presaging things to come’ is still appropriate – the apparition of the Argo marks the beginning of seafaring, Peleus’ and Thetis’ relationship and the poem. A *monstrum* would normally be a sign from the divine world seen by humans: here this is reversed, as although the Argo was divinely made it is now in human hands, appearing to the hitherto solely divine society of the sea. Quite possibly the

sense of ‘monster’ or strange animal is also active (cf. 2 *nasse*, 7 *palmis*, 9 *uolitantem* n., 12 *rostro*). According to Cic. *N.D.* 2.89 the shepherd in Accius’ *Medea* thought the Argo was a *diuinum et nouum uehiculum* (see below), while his predecessors at Ap. *Arg.* 4.315-22 see the Argonauts’ ships as θῆρας. At Virg. *Aen.* 9.120 the ship-nymphs are *mirabile monstrum*, a phrase common in Virgil but also echoing this line (Hardie (1987) 163 n.4); cf. also Dracont. *Med.* 38 *nam monstra putat*.

Nereides Late in the sentence as the Argonauts and the reader finally discover the creatures’ identity. The Greek form of the Greek name (cf. 3 *Phasidos* n.) is usual in Latin for third declension nominative plural (Housman (1972) 836-9); cf. 23 *heroes*, 193 *Eumenides*. *Nereides* appears first in Latin at Cic. *Arat.* 446 (also with Greek short *-es*). Catullus, like Cicero, transliterates Νηρηΐδες rather than the alternative Νηρηΐδες: the former occurs at Ap. *Arg.* 4.930 but is also the consistent Homeric form (*Il.* 18.38, 49, 52) whereas Νηρηΐδες does not appear in epic until Mosch. *Eur.* 118 (Campbell *ad loc.*).

admirantes translates ἐθαύμβεον (Ap. *Arg.* 1.550), perhaps also drawing on the description in Accius’ *Medea* (391ff. Ribbeck³) of amazement at the Argo felt by a shepherd, *admirans et perterritus* in Cicero’s summary (*N.D.* 2.89). Further examples of wonder at the Argo include V.Fl. 1.149, 4.711-12, Stat. *Silu.* 3.2.61ff., Claud. 26.8-9, *Orph. Arg.* 237; reminiscences of this line, *Ciris* 391 and perhaps an Isis hymn from Andros, Kaibel 1028.64ff. (see Kroll, Kaibel *ad loc.*, Wilamowitz (1924) II.300). At Virg. *Aen.* 8.91-2 *mirantur et undae*, | *miratur nemus* and Ov. *Am.* 2.11.1 *mirantibus aequoris undis*, the pathetic fallacy ascribes the emotion to inanimate nature.

16-18 The narrative shifts from reactions to the Argo to the Argonauts' own point of view; the importance of this turn away from the model of Ap. *Arg.* 1.540-58, where the divine gaze simply emphasises the miraculous nature of the Argo, becomes clear at 19ff. The auspicious vision of the nymphs in these lines accords with references in Pindar to Peleus as particularly blessed for having *seen* the gods (*Pyth.* 3.97, *Nem.* 4.66-8), but contrasts with the tradition that seeing naked nymphs is a danger to be avoided, causing blindness or madness (Balland (1976) 3-6); Tiresias (e.g. *Call. Hymn* 5) and Actaeon (e.g. *Ov. Met.* 3.177ff.) are both punished for seeing naked goddesses with their attendant nymphs. This tradition may undermine, or simply be a foil for, the description here of a happy outcome from mutual gaze between heroic man and naked goddess.

16 illa, atque haud alia The *paradosis* is incomplete: supplements giving the meaning 'on that day [*luce*], and on no other' began in the Renaissance (Sabellicus *illa haudque alia*, Puccius *illaque haud alia*), and Bergk's is the clearest in expression and closest to the transmitted text, since the readings in GR and O would simply show different extents of omission. Other conjectures avoid saying that the event was unique, since there are numerous instances of Nereids accompanying ships on 'later' occasions (e.g. *Soph. O.C.* 716-9, *Eur. El.* 432ff., *Culex* 345-6 and indeed Ap. *Arg.* 4.930-63). But e.g. 'on that day, if on any' (Lachmann *illa si qua alia*), 'on that day and on other succeeding days' (Vahlen *illa alia atque alia*, cf. 68.152 *haec atque illa dies atque alia atque alia*) seem too vague for a context in which the importance of a single moment is emphasised (12 *simul ac*, 19-21 *tum*), while 'on that day and never before' (Friedrich *illa, ante haud alia*, Goold (1973) *illa, haud ante alia*) might, as Godwin points out, suggest the odd inference that while this was the first time that

sailors saw nymphs, such an occurrence is now commonplace. Schulze tried bringing in a spatial element, introducing a comma into Vahlen's conjecture to read it as 'on that day [*illa ... luce*] from one side and another [*alia atque alia*]', comparing Ap. Arg. 4.930-1 ἔνθα σφιν κοῦραι Νηρηίδες ἄλλοθεν ἄλλαι | ἦντεον, but as Friedrich notes it would be very difficult to read *alia* as agreeing with an understood feminine noun (*uia*?) when it comes between *illa* and *luce*; for further textual discussion see also Thomson, Nuzzo, Balland (1976) 7 n.25, Biondi (1980) 143 n.51. A statement of complete uniqueness fits this emphatic position better, and contradicts only the external examples of Nereid sightings mentioned above, not the epilogue's implication that gods and men generally intermingled in the heroic age (384-408). This is because the reference here is specifically to naked nymphs: this was the only time when the innocent Nereids did not know that a ship would contain mortals who might see them.

luce Primarily 'day' (cf. 31, 325, 376; *illa ... uiderunt luce* translates Ap. Arg. 1.547 λεῦσσον ... ἥματι κείνῳ), but with connotations of sunlight (cf. 14 *candenti*) and clear vision (cf. 17 *oculi* and 408 *nec se contingi patiuntur lumine claro*). Perhaps a piece of 'Hellenistic' philological cleverness to put *mortales* and *oculi* so close to *luce* when the use of *luce* = 'day' is modelled on that of Greek φως, also primarily 'light': φως also = 'eye' and φώς (from a different root) = 'mortal man'.

marinas First here of sea deities; frequently so in later Latin poetry (*TLL* VIII.397.82-398.10), sometimes, as here, with specifying force (e.g. Prop. 4.6.61-2; Ov. *Met.* 11.228, 13.964, 14.566). *RE* XVII.1 s.v. 'Nereiden' 3-4 collects Greek and Latin examples of similar phrases, e.g. Soph. *Phil.* 1470 νῦμφαις ἀλίσαισιν. *marinas* varies 15 *aequoreae*, the repetition of sense helping to convey the reciprocity of the

gaze. The first strongly enjambed line in the poem, though the wide separation from *nymphas* is mitigated by the position of both at line-end; cf. *qualibus ... | fluctibus* opening lines 97-8.

17 mortales Usually taken as substantive, subject of *uiderunt*, but adjectival elsewhere in Catullus (385, perhaps 168 (see n.), no other appearances): see below.

oculi Manuscript conjecture for OGR *oculis*; the editor faces the same textual choice at Virg. *Aen.* 8.222-3 *nostri ... | oculis* (*oculi* ‘alii’ ap. Servius). An ablative strengthening the verb of seeing would follow Homeric ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδεῖν (e.g. *Il.* 1.587, *Od.* 4.269); in Latin this usage is much more common in comedy and prose than in epic (*OLD* s.v. 2b; in Virg. *Aen.* only certain at 2.68, 589, 12.151). Here it sounds awkward next to the unrelated ablative *nudato corpore*, while nominative *mortales oculi* forms a balanced contrast with *aequoreae ... Nereides* and *marinas | ... nymphas*. For *mortalis* with a part of the body and a similar contrast with the divine cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.327-8 *haud tibi uultus | mortalis*, Prop. 2.32.50 *altaque mortali deligere astra manu*; with *oculi* at Albinovanus Pedo 20-1 Courtney *di reuocant rerumque uetant cognoscere finem | mortales oculos*, Lucr. 1.66-7 (of Epicurus, another ‘hero’ viewing, near the start of the poem, what was not previously open to mortal sight), Apul. *De mund.* 31, and cf. Nonn. *Dion.* 5.402 ὀφθαλμοὺς βροτέους (also at the start of the line, as Nuzzo notes; for the possible relationship between Catullus and Nonnus see 132-201n.). Cf. also 385-6 *sese mortali ostendere coetu | caelicolae*.

nudato corpore A detail from artistic rather than literary representations of Nereids: in art after the classical period they are usually naked or semi-naked (*LIMC* s.v., cf. Cairns (1984) 96 n.3), while no particular state of dress is mentioned in Ap.

Arg. 1, *Il.* 18, *Od.* 24. See further 18 *tenus* n. *nudato* for *nudo* suggests they have been actively ‘stripped’, perhaps by the poet.

nymphas Greek, but already adopted into Latin at Liv. And. 13 Büchner. The generalising word allows a more direct allusion to the νύμφαι | Πηλιάδες of Ap. *Arg.* 1.549-50 (Syndikus 120 n.80).

18 Although 17 *nudato corpore* is literally true, the Nereids turn out to have only their upper bodies above the water: the construction in which a participle (*exstantes*) adds a further detail after the apparent end of a sentence (5 *optantes* n.) is teasingly effective. Cairns (1984), working from Artemidorus’ *Oneirokritikon* 2.37-8 where dreaming of Aphrodite emerging from the sea as far as the ζώνη is a good omen for seafarers, ingeniously suggests that both Catullus and Lucian *Dial. Mar.* 15.3 refer to a tradition of marriage-omens involving dream-apparitions of Aphrodite, the Nereids and Nereus: however, the connection between Aphrodite and the Nereids together and marriage is unconvincing, resting only on Aphrodite’s associations with marriage and with the Nereids and on the appearance of Nereids at the weddings of two of their own number (Amphitrite and Thetis). Moreover ἡμίγυμνοι of Lucian’s Nereids could mean ‘negligently dressed’ rather than specifically ‘naked to the waist’.

nutricum Literally ‘nurses’, here ‘breasts’. Apparently a display of Greek etymological learning, since, according to Hesych. s.v., τιτθή, feminine of more common τιτθός, ‘breast’, could also mean ‘nurse’; *nutricum*, moreover, would translate τιτθῶν, genitive plural of either noun. No literary examples of τιτθή = ‘nurse’ survive: whether or not Catullus imitates a lost Hellenistic use, on this explanation the point is only comprehensible to a reader aware of a rare meaning of a Greek word. This could be part of a strategy to construct, or attract, a learned reader

at the beginning of the poem. Alternatively, Adkin (2002) explains *nutricum* = ‘breasts’ as an example of *transumptio* (Quint. 8.6.37-9, cf. Lausberg §571), whereby since *mamma* can mean ‘nurse’ (e.g. Pers. 3.18) as well as ‘breast’, the meaning of *nutrix*, synonymous with *mamma* in the sense of ‘nurse’, can be extended to ‘breast’. This keeps within Latin the reader’s process of understanding *nutricum*, but still gives a clear impression of the author’s shifting of ordinary meanings. Some sense connected with ‘nursing’ would also still be felt, strengthening the links with the other appearances of breasts in the poem (65 *lactentis* ... *papillas* n., 351 *pectora* of mothers). In other ways too the detail allusively draws attention to the unhappiness of Thetis’ future motherhood: when the Homeric Thetis mourns with Achilles the Nereids beat their breasts (*Il.* 18.51), and one etymology for Achilles’ name was ἄ-χρίλος, he who did *not* put his *lips* to the breast (Apollod. 3.13.6, cf. Ap. *Arg.* 4.813; see Hunter (1991) 255, Heslin (2005) 175-81).

tenus Almost always placed after its noun (N—W *Il.* 9.48-9); genitive with *tenus* is a rare, usually poetic alternative to the ablative (see Harrison on Virg. *Aen.* 10.210). Its apparent precision titillates the reader, since it is not clear whether *tenus* = ‘as far as and including’ or ‘as far as and not including’. The detail also neatly reverses Ap. *Arg.* 4.940 and (in a simile) 949, where the Nereids have rolled up their clothing to expose their legs (Cairns (1984) 100); it may even offer a ‘humorous misinterpretation’ of the κόλπος that has been rolled away in 949, since κόλπος would normally refer to the top half of a garment (Hunter (1991) 254).

e gurgite cano closes a ring from 13-14, uniting *incanuit* with *candenti e gurgite*. This phrase is the closest to Homeric ἄλός πολὺν (13 *incanuit* n.); *gurgite cano* is reprised at *Ciris* 514, Stat. *Theb.* 11.43, Avien. *Or. Mar.* 67. Its appearance next to *nutricum* (cf. 14 *candenti* and *uultus*) suggests both a similar whiteness to the

nymphs' bodies and a textural contrast, this time between smooth skin and 'hoary' foam. The reader is reminded that the only thing covering the Nereids' lower halves is water; *cano* may suggest at least semi-opaque foam, but Friedrich thinks it would be transparent enough to allow the Argonauts 'to guess'.

19-30: betrothal of Peleus and Thetis

This introduction to the wedding scene centres on the hymnic invocation of the heroes at 22-4, and hymnic markers continue into the address to Peleus at 25-30. Such elements are appropriate for the opening of an otherwise non-hymnic text: cf. hymnic proems in didactic *epos* (e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 1-115, Arat. *Phaen.* 1-18, Lucr. 1.1-49, Virg. *Georg.* 1.1-42) and the proem to Achilles in Simonides' Plataea elegy (fr. 11 West²). The 'rhapsodic farewell' echoing the Homeric hymns (24n.) might appropriately mark the transition from introductory material to the main subject, since the Homeric hymns were apparently *proemia* to epic recitations (see e.g. Richardson (1974) 3-4, Aloni (2001) 92-3), and the ἀντάρ ἐγώ of the 'farewell' can also be used in the middle of a poem to indicate a similar transition to narrative (Obbink (2001) 67-73). However, such formulae close the Homeric hymns as transmitted, and invocations frequently characterise the endings of other hymns (a tradition represented by e.g. 63.91-3 (on 63 and hymn see Harrison (2005) 18-23), Call. *Hymn* 1.93-5, 5.140-2, 6.134-8), while address is a closural marker in other Catullan poems (Peden (1987) 97-8). Lines 22-4 allude to the *end* of the *Argonautica*, Ap. *Arg.* 4.1773-5 (see further Zetzel (1983) 261); yet this is an end whose own use of hymnic formulae suggests that it might be a beginning, 'as if the complete *Argonautica* has been a (hymnic) prelude' (Goldhill (1991) 287). These conflicting signals about

location in the text mirror the disorientation over location in mythical chronology caused by the innovation of Peleus' and Thetis' wedding coming after the Argo's voyage (19-21n.): both draw attention to how much the reader is in the power of the narrator and are part of one of the poem's many explorations of the workings of narrative time. It is initially unclear whether repeated *tum* in 19-21 is freezing the moment described in 12-18 or moving on from it (see n.), while the change at 22 to second-person address means that by 28-30 the reader is unsure whether the text connects with any identifiable moment of narrative time at all (cf. Culler (1981) 148-54): it does not seem reasonable for Friedrich to claim that 28 *tenuit* cannot mean 'embraced' (see n.) because Thetis is still in the water, Peleus on board the Argo, yet the text has not told us where else they might be.

There is also generic ambiguity, comparable to that between tragedy and epic in the opening (1-11n.), over whether the addresses in 22-30 are really hymnic at all. Though praise of ancestry is typical of hymns (23 *deum genus* n.), the heroes are otherwise 'praised' only for their enviable blessedness, arguably making 22-4 as well as the address to Peleus in 25-8 simply a *macarismos*, an exclamation at others' good fortune which occurs in various genres, not always with hymnic force, and which lacks the element of prayer. At the point where in a hymn a prayer would be expected, or where in the hymnic proem to an *epos* the deity addressed would be asked to inspire the song (e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 104-15, Arat. *Phaen.* 17-18), the heroes are not asked to do anything: the only imperative is *saluete*, and the questions to Peleus do not request any new information (28-30n.; cf. also 94-8n.). Despite his apparent piety, the narrator, who emerges in the first person for the first time here, does not relinquish his own authority over the narrative. All this complicates even further than is generally recognised the issue of how seriously we should take the

enthusiasm for the heroic age that he expresses (see e.g. Kinsey (1965), Curran (1969), Harmon (1973), Courtney (1990)).

19-21 The acoustically and visually striking *tum ... tum ... tum* and *Thetidis ... Thetis ... Thetidi* emphasise the long-delayed announcement of the real subject of the outer story and Catullus' innovative treatment of it. Though other examples of triple anaphora occur at 117-18, 280-1 (cf. Évrard-Gillis 197-205), this form, with the repeated word opening three consecutive lines, is particularly distinctive: see Wills 400-5. It occurs in early Greek hexameter (e.g. *Il.* 2.382-4, *Od.* 3.109-11; Hes. *Theog.* 833-5, *Op.* 5-8, 317-19) but proportionally more often in Callimachus (e.g. *Hymn* 6.4-6, 108-10; extended versions, *Hymn* 3.262-6, 4.70-5, 6.18-22), and in 64 more often than in any other Latin poem (39-41, 63-5, 257-9, cf. 387-94). Triple line-initial anaphora of *tum* is paralleled only at *Ciris* 387-9 (Lyne *ad loc.*), near other echoes of this poem (*Ciris* 391-2, cf. 15n.). It conveys the speed with which events followed one another (*tum* = 'next'), or might even suggest simultaneity (*tum* = 'at that moment', each referring to the same point in time); each *tum* also gains the force of 'it was then that' as Catullus' unexpected treatment of the myth, making the wedding follow the launching of the Argo (contrast e.g. *Ap. Arg.* 1.533-8, 4.757-960; *V.Fl.* 1.130-3; *Apollod.* 3.13.7), is emphasised; cf. 334-6 on the similarly innovative mutual happiness of the marriage, linked to these lines by similar repetitions. The polyptoton of a name is paralleled at Call. *Hymn* 2.44-7, 55-8 but more closely in Archil. 115 West², Anacr. 359 *PMG*; as Anacreon repeats the name of a beloved, the narrator mimics Peleus' love for Thetis. The combination of repetition patterns here may in general be closer to lyric (Syndikus 124-5; Wills 402 on 51.13-16 *otium ... otio ... otium*) or to 'incantatory' repetition in Hellenistic hexameters influenced by

lyric hymn or encomium (e.g. Call. *Hymn* 1.93-5, 2.43-5, 4.83-5; Theoc. 16.3-4, 17.26-7, 22.23-6) or by magical and other sub-literary song (especially Theocritus, e.g. 1.97-8, 100-1, 2.38-41, 5.68-75, 11.22-3; cf. Dover (1971) xlv-l); the lines therefore form a stylistic bridge to the hymn at 22ff.

19 Peleus falls in love at first sight in the space of one line: cf. 86n.

incensus ... amore Repeated of Bacchus at 253, inviting a parallel between the two divine-human couples, Peleus-Thetis and Bacchus-Ariadne; cf. also 97 *incensam* n. Since *incensus* can describe the effect of any strong emotion (e.g. Liv. 2.6.1 *incensus Tarquinius non dolore solum ... sed etiam odio iraque*), only at *amore* do the surprising chronology and relative importance in the poem of the wedding and the voyage emerge: at Ap. *Arg.* 4.866 Thetis' appearance causes Peleus regretful ὄχος αἰνόν, and here, even after the erotic presentation of the Nereids, *tum Thetidis Peleus incensus* could begin a description of a bitter detail incidentally relevant to the Argo's setting out (e.g. 'Then Peleus, noticing Thetis's face, was inflamed with grief, remembering ...').

fertur Probably *incensus fertur* = *incensus esse fertur*, 'is said to have been inflamed'; the appeal to tradition (2 *dicuntur* n.) is here ironic, emphasising Catullus' originality. Quinn thinks this construction 'out of harmony with the positive statements of 20 and 21' and suggests 'swept along on fire' (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 4.376); but the present tense would clash with *despexit, sensit* (20-1).

20 humanos Like *homo* itself, thought to be derived from *humus* (e.g. Prisc. *Gramm.* 2.79.8 *ab humo humanus*; Maltby s.v. *humanus, humus, homo*) and therefore adding

an elemental aspect to the contrast between the sea-creature Thetis and her earthly husband (Feeney (2007) 123).

hymenaeos ὑμήν and lengthened form ὑμέναι' ὦ were ritual cries at wedding ceremonies (reproduced in poems 61 and 62); a version of the latter, ὑμεναίος / *hymenaeus*, can mean either 'wedding-song' (62.4; cf. e.g. *Il.* 18.493, *Pac. trag.* 88 Schierl, *Lucr.* 1.97), or, as here, often in the plural, synecdochically 'wedding' or 'marriage' (141, 66.11; attested from the fifth century, e.g. *Soph. Ant.* 813, *Eur. Ion* 1475; cf. e.g. *Lucr.* 4.1251). Catullus always has it at line-end and is followed by Virgil (15 out of 16 occurrences); this is also its position in the majority of appearances in Nonnus and Musaeus, the only two Greek hexameter poets to use it frequently, so that Kroll suspects a shared Hellenistic source. See below and 141n.

non despexit In no other version is Thetis willing to marry Peleus: many involve Peleus wrestling with her while she struggles to escape by metamorphosis (*Pind. Nem.* 3.35-6, 4.62-5, *Ov. Met.* 11.221ff., *Paus.* 5.18.5, *Apollod.* 3.13.5). Here *non* juxtaposed with the verb evokes Homer's brief reference to her feelings, *Il.* 18.434 οὐκ ἐθέλουσα, to state the opposite meaning. Though surprising, this first indication of her consent is not strong compared to the Fates' later references (328-36, 372-80): it is difficult to judge the level of emotion implied by the litotes, which contrasts markedly with the description of Peleus' emotion in 19. Literally 'looked down on', *despexit* also continues the motif of the gaze (12-18n.), contrasting with the Nereids coming *up* from the sea to look at the Argonauts.

Catullus combines the Greek tetrasyllable at line-end with another Greek metrical 'licence', the lengthening in arsis of a short closed syllable. This is consistent before *hymenaeos* in Catullus (62.4, 66.11), and in Virgil (*Aen.* 7.398, 10.720), where it seems to be a marker of allusion to Catullus (Wills 20 n.18; there

are no extant examples before ὑμεναίος in Greek hexameters). Cf. also V.Fl. 8.259 *impediit hymenaeos* and see Norden (1903) 427-8, Fordyce on Virg. *Aen.* 7.398, Harrison on *Aen.* 10.720.

21 Thetidi Metre confirms Latin dative with *-ī*, perhaps supporting the manuscript reading of Latin genitive *Thetidis* at 19 (3 *Phasidos* n.). Cf. *Thetidī* (336) but Greek *Minoidī* (247), *Tethyī* (66.70).

pater ipse Usually interpreted as Jupiter, the line making the same point as 26-7. But it is not clear that ‘the father (himself)’ without defining genitive (contrast 27 *diuum genitor*, 298 *pater diuum*) would always be so understood; apparent examples involve Jupiter in the context (Tib. 1.4.23, Virg. *Georg.* 1.121, *Aen.* 2.617) or feature defining activities, e.g. hurling thunderbolts (Lucr. 6.398, Virg. *Georg.* 1.328, 353, Hor. *Carm.* 3.29.44). The return by Mayer (1980) to Renaissance commentators’ identification of *pater ipse* as Nereus is persuasive (accepted by Thomson, Gaisser (1995) 584): the natural meaning is the father of someone currently being mentioned, and this would be particularly expected in this context given the crucial role played by the bride’s father in arranging any marriage; cf. also Alc. 42.7 Voigt, in which Peleus takes Thetis ἐκ Νή[ρ]ος ... [μελάθρων]. Unlike Jupiter, Nereus has already been briefly referred to (15 *Nereides*), and it would be odd to mention Thetis’ grandparents (29-30) without the most obviously concerned family member; the contrast with Ariadne’s relationship with Theseus being unsanctioned by her father (esp. 117) is also effective. However, given the well-known background to Thetis’s marriage, largely suppressed here (27n.), the reader may sense Jupiter as a secondary presence hovering behind the primary reference to Nereus, especially after reading 26 *Iuppiter ipse*, whose echo of *pater ipse* evokes the etymology of *Iuppiter*.

ipse here, instead of emphasising a definite identity, paradoxically draws attention to these doubts (cf. Hardie (1993) 33, 39, 109, 113 n.47 on ironic uses of epic *ipse*).

iugandum ... sensit *iugare* meaning ‘marry’ (poetic, cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.345, Hor. *C.S.* 18) is first attested here, probably following Greek ζευγνύναι (e.g. Soph. *Trach.* 536). *sensit* = ‘realised’, with the gerundive conveying the ‘must’ of fate, shows the *pater*, aware of the prophecy about Thetis (27n.), realising that Peleus’ love reveals him as her destined husband, and of the two possible identities fits Nereus particularly well since he is a prophet in his own right (e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 233-6, Pind. *Pyth.* 3.92, Ap. *Arg.* 1.1311, Hor. *Carm.* 1.15.4-5). Alternatively, if *pater* = Jupiter, *sensit* could be ‘judged’ (e.g. Cic. *Orat.* 195, *Leg.* 3.39, Hor. *C.S.* 73).

22 o marks the turn from narration to address; repeated *o* occurs in hymnic series of invocations (Norden (1913) 144). This *o* is also reminiscent of Catullus’ use of emotional, exclamatory *o* (e.g. 26.5, 43.8, 107.6): see further Ross (1969) 49-53.

nimis Baehrens and Fordyce point to 56.4 *nimis iocosa* (cf. 43.4, 93.1) to argue that this means simply ‘very much’, but in this elevated context it is highly unlikely to be read in this colloquial sense (cf. affected English ‘just too funny’); though more widespread with a negative (e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 12.30.7, Caes. *B.G.* 7.36.6), the use is not found in positive sentences after Catullus. The choice of an explanation for the note of excess in ‘too much longed for’ is important for the reader’s perception of the narrator’s attitude to the heroic age (19-30n.): perhaps simply ‘too much to say how much’ (Ellis ‘happy beyond measure’); or, regretfully, ‘all too much’ for the peace of mind of men of today (cf. Virg. *Georg.* 2.458 *fortunatos nimium*, *Aen.* 4.657 *nimum felix*); or, bitterly, ‘too much’ because the heroic age was not really worth such desire (Janan (1994) 108).

optato Stronger than ‘gratus iucundusque’ (Baehrens), ‘felix’ (Kroll): the adjectival form in particular is associated in Catullus (and later in elegy) with erotic longing (5 *optantes* n., cf. 62.30, 66.79 and Pichon s.v. *optare*).

saeclorum tempore For praise of heroes via the time in which they were born cf. Virg. *Aen.* 6.649 *magnanimi heroes, nati melioribus annis*. The periphrasis probably alludes to the Hesiodic Myth of Races (Hes. *Op.* 106-201, cf. Arat. *Phaen.* 100-36): the *saecla* are the five successive gold, silver, bronze, heroic and iron races or ages of men, from which the *tempus* of the heroes is singled out. The implication that the narrator knows about the whole series is complicated by the ambiguous status of the sailing of the Argo (6n.), by the appearance of golden age motifs in Peleus’ and Thetis’ time (31-49n.), and especially by the focus in the epilogue (384-408) on a sharp division between the age of theoxeny and the wicked present: for the epilogue’s ‘binary opposition’ Pontani (2000) sees the influence of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*.

Disyllabic *saeclum*, more tractable in dactylic verse than *saeculum* (manuscripts add the *u* here), is the older form, used consistently by Catullus except at 95.6.

23-23b The first half of 23b is restored from the Veronese scholion on Virg. *Aen.* 5.80, which has the note ‘Catullus: *saluete deum gens, o bona matrum | progenies, saluete iter*’ followed by a lacuna.

heroes Emphasised by enjambment from the previous line with following pause; this method of isolating a single word, found throughout Greek and Latin dactylic verse, is quite common in the poem (e.g. 30, 32, 33, 44, 87, 108, where see n.). Here the repetition of the technique in consecutive lines (23b *progenies*) creates

by far the most violent use of enjambment so far, strongly conveying a heightened emotional tone.

In Latin, *heros* is not usually particularly technical (*TLL* gives many more examples s.v. I ‘uir fortis’ than s.v. II, III, deified men or Lares, ‘daemones’ etc.), but the rest of 23-23b almost defines *heroes* according to the widespread post-Homeric Greek understanding as the sons of one divine, one human parent (e.g. Hes. *Op.* 159-60, Pind. *Pyth.* 4.12-13, Plat. *Rep.* 391d). This sense of a defining, all-encompassing address encourages the identification of these *heroes* with the heroes of the heroic age in general rather than just the Argonauts, though the specific echoes of Ap. *Arg.* 4.1773-5 rather suggest a hymnic farewell to them in particular (see below and 24n.). Cf. also 51n.

saluete ... saluete iterum ... saluete *salue(te)* ~ χαῖρε (χαίρετε), very frequent in hymns either as opening ‘welcome’ or closing ‘farewell’ (Furley and Bremer (2001) I.61-3, Fraenkel (1957) 169-70), and often doubled (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 7.120-1). *iterum* draws attention to this repetition; see Norden on Virg. *Aen.* 6.46 for hymnic repetition in general. Peerlkamp’s third *saluete* is made likely by Call. *Hymn* 1.90-3 (a closing address) χαῖρε μέγα Κρονίδη πανυπέρτατε ... χαῖρε πάτερ, χαῖρ’ αὖθι (αὖθι ~ *iterum*) and by the imitations in the *Ciris* (triple *gaudete* 195-7, double *uos* 198-9) and at Virg. *Aen.* 5.80-1 *salue sancte parens iterum saluete recepti | nequiquam cineres* (only two greetings, but the second placed after *iterum*: Wills 95-6).

deum genus Praise of the addressees’ ancestry after the initial hymnic greeting (Furley and Bremer (2001) I.56-60; Norden (1913) 148). The two-word apposition after *saluete* echoes e.g. *Hymn. Hom.* 25.6 χαίρετε, τέκνα Διός, Theoc. 22.214 χαίρετε, Λήδας τέκνα. Probable models for the expression are Hes. *Op.* 159

ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῖον γένος and esp. Ap. *Arg.* 3.402 θεῶν γένος, in the same place in the line, and 4.1773 ἴλατ' ἀριστῆες μακάρων γένος, opening the final hymnic address to the Argonauts (cf. West (1965)). *deum* with the original *-um* genitive plural of the second declension (see Fordyce on Virg. *Aen.* 7.189) is a regular form in poetry, especially hexameters (*TLL* V.886.25-37; cf. 27n.), while *genus* = 'offspring' (also a possible meaning of γένος, LSJ s.v. II) is attested from Enn. *trag.* 321 Jocelyn, and is also used by Catullus at 61.2 *Uraniae genus*, another hymnic address, and by other poets in elevated contexts (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 6.792 *diui genus*, Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.27). The whole phrase *deum genus* occurs at Enn. *trag.* 270 Jocelyn, but meaning 'the race of gods' = gods, as also at Lucr. 5.1156 *dium genus humanumque*. Munro and Syndikus 125 n.105 follow Madvig in arguing for *gens*, the reading of the Veronese scholion; this is very possible given the general level of corruption in OGR and the early date of the Veronese palimpsest (fifth or sixth century), but on the other hand Virg. *Aen.* 10.228 *deum gens* may have been in the mind of a Virgilian commentator quoting Catullus from memory.

o bona matrum | progenies ... bonarum OGR *o bona mater* was obviously intended to make the line grammatical after 23b had been omitted: it would be a puzzling and inept reference either to Thetis or to the 'mother' Argo (Ellis) in the middle of an address to the heroes (clearly also 24 *uos*), and would destroy the tricolon *crescens heroes, deum genus, bona matrum progenies* <... *bonarum*> (cf. e.g. Arat. *Phaen.* 15 χαῖρε, πάτερ, μέγα θαῦμα, μέγ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὄνειαρ). Peerlkamp's supplement provides the necessary positive adjective for *matrum* and contributes to the patterns of repetition: the chiasmus *bona matrum progenies ... bonarum* is especially attractive, cf. 34.5-6 *maximi | magna progenies Iouis* (hymnic address), Hor. *Carm.* 1.16.1 with N—H. For the praise of the heroes through their

mothers cf. formulae involving both mothers and fathers at Pind. fr. 75.11-12 Schroeder γόνον ὑπάτων μὲν πατέρων μελπόμενοι γυναικῶν τε Καδμεϊᾶν, Eur. *Cycl.* 41-2 παῖ γενναίων μὲν πατέρων γενναίων τ' ἐκ τοκάδων (parody), and generally traditional interest in heroes' maternal ancestry going back to the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, possibly an important influence on the poem (22n.).

24 ego saepe ... carmine compellabo The main model is αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' ὀιδῆς (formulaic final line of *Hymn. Hom.* 2, 3, 4, 6, 19, 28, 30; plural version, 25, 27, 29, 33). As there and in Theocritus' adaptation (17.135 σέθεν δ' ἐγώ), the prominent, juxtaposed pronouns foreground the privileged relationship, set up by the vocative mode (cf. Culler (1981) 141), between the speaker and his addressees. In the *Hymn. Hom.* formula 'another song' probably means immediately following epic recitation (19-30n.), but the line could also be understood as promising to sing of the named deity/hero again on future occasions (Richardson on *Hymn. Hom.* 2.495), and Theoc. 1.144-5 ὦ χαίρετε πολλάκι Μοῖσαι | χαίρετ'· ἐγὼ δ' ὕμνῳ καὶ ἐς ὕστερον ὄδιον ὄσῳ, evoked here by the equivalence πολλάκι ~ *saepe*, clearly promises future song: Catullus too appears to promise more hymns to the heroes, and formally this promise is never fulfilled in this poem or his other extant work. The main effect of reproducing a formula that was probably already stereotyped, not taken literally, in many of its *Hymn. Hom.* uses (Richardson *loc. cit.*) is apparently the briefly created impression of a pious, archaic voice; but see also 19-30n.

uos ... meo uos The text has been suspected, as repeated *uos* might be expected to divide the line into two balanced halves: replacing *meo* with *mero* (Palmer) or *memor* (Traill), would produce clear anaphora of a second person personal pronoun, a very well-known hymnic feature (cf. 34.12-20, 61-51.60; see

Norden (1913) 149ff.). But *mero*, ‘with wine’, would create a very strained syllepsis with *compellabo*, ‘name’, ‘invoke’, while such a direct translation of μνήσομαι as *memor* would make *compellabo* itself almost redundant. Repetition of a second person pronoun within the same clause can itself be a feature of addresses to gods (Wills 82-5), while the chiasmic arrangement *uos ego ... meo uos* effectively expands the juxtaposition of pronouns noted above. Cf. the pronominal repetition in 68.68 *isque domum nobis isque dedit dominam*; also Virg. *Ecl.* 4.11 *teque adeo decus hoc aeui, te consule, inibit* (25n.), Prop. 1.16.35 *sed tu sola mei, tu maxima causa doloris*.

25 teque adeo *adeo* emphasises the preceding word, here, as often, a pronoun (*TLL* I.614.43-616.28, Fordyce on Virg. *Aen.* 7.427). Cf. esp. Enn. *trag.* 234 Jocelyn *tuque adeo summe Sol*, Turp. *com.* 118-19 Ribbeck³ *uosque adeo uenti*, Virg. *Ecl.* 4.11-12 *teque adeo ...* | *Pollio, Georg.* 1.24 *tuque adeo ...* | ... *Caesar*, all similarly involving change of addressee within (or after) a hymnic address; on *tuque* with this role see Jocelyn *ad loc.* The combination with *adeo* suggests a climax: Peleus is the most blessed of the heroes of 22-4.

eximie ... aucte To be taken together, ‘exceptionally blessed’. The adverb is rare, extant in poetry otherwise only at Lucr. 2.644, Juv. 11.1. For *auctus* = ‘enriched’, ‘blessed’ with marriage or children (*OLD* s.v. *augeo* 6c) cf. 66.11 *nouo auctus hymenaeo*, 67.2 and e.g. Cic. *Att.* 1.2.1 *filiolo me auctum scito*. *eximium* and *augens* occur in the same respective places in the line at 323, in the Fates’ address to Peleus, which has other verbal links with this passage (26n.). The poem associates itself with a tradition of ‘bright’ versions of the myth, particularly typical of lyric (cf. Klingner (1956) 12-21), in which Peleus is praised for his good fortune in being given Thetis by the gods (e.g. Hes. fr. 211 M—W (*Catalogue of Women*), Pind. *Pyth.*

3.86-96, *Isthm.* 6.25, *Ov. Met.* 11.266), and her views (20n.) and the unhappy end of the marriage are ignored. The exceptional virtue that brought Peleus this honour (e.g. *Pind. Isthm.* 8.26-8, 42-4, *Ap. Arg.* 4.805-6; explicitly, resisting the advances of his host Acastus' wife Hippolyte, *Pind. Nem.* 4.50-65, 5.24-36) is not mentioned at this point (though cf. 323 *magnis uirtutibus*): he seems simply the recipient of divine generosity (27n.).

taedis felicibus Catullus has the first extant examples of *taedae*, 'wedding torches', in the sense of 'wedding' (also 302, 66.79). For *felix* in a marriage context cf. 373 *felici foedere*, 62.30 *felici ... hora* and cf. *TLL* VI.1.442.63-84; the application of the word to objects or events that bring or constitute good fortune is a regular Latin idiom (*OLD* s.v. 4), but since it is common of the subject of a *macarismos* (e.g. *Virg. Georg.* 2.490, *Ov. Met.* 11.266 *felix et nato, felix et coniuge Peleus*), it has the force of a transferred epithet here.

26 Thessaliae columen Peleu sounds like a formulaic epic epithet for the hero, filling half a line as in Homeric practice (2 *liquidas ... undas* n.). *columen*, literally 'ridge-pole' or 'roof', refers metaphorically to someone/something holding a key position of strength (*TLL* III.1736.64-1737.25): of heroes at e.g. *Sen. Tro.* 124 *columen patriae* (Hector), *V.Fl.* 1.117 *socium nostrae columenue carinae* (Hercules). Cf. similar uses of 'pillar' (*columna*, κίον etc.), e.g. *Pind. Ol.* 2.6, 82, *Aesch. Ag.* 898, *Enn. Ann.* 343 Skutsch. The sense and form of *Thessaliae columen* are closely echoed by 324 *Emathiae tutamen* (the Fates address Peleus).

Iuppiter ipse See 21n. The phrase is very common in poetry; cf. e.g. 70.2.

27 The part of the story in which Zeus/Jupiter desired Thetis but was warned in a prophecy, often by Prometheus, that her son would be greater than his father is referred to at e.g. Pind. *Isthm.* 8.29-52, [Aesch.] *Prom.* 755ff., 907ff., Ap. *Arg.* 4.799-804, Ov. *Met.* 11.221-8, Apollod. 3.13.5, Quint. Smyrn. 5.338ff. Catullus alludes here to a possible sexual union between Jupiter and Thetis, but to the prophecy only obliquely in Prometheus' appearance at 293-7; the implication, captured by *concessit*, is that Jupiter was not compelled to give Thetis up but acted out of generosity.

ipse ... diuum genitor Awed *ipse* of a god (9 *ipsa* n.), here emphasised by repetition with expansion: cf. Calp. Sic. 4.47-8 *non ipse daret mihi forsitan aurem, | ipse deus*, 92-3 *ipse polos etiam qui temperat igne geluque, | Iuppiter ipse parens*, *Dirae* 35-6 *Iuppiter (ipse | Iuppiter hanc aluit)* and, using the emphasis for different effects, Stat. *Theb.* 9.137-8 *hanc tibi Tydeus, | Tydeus ipse rapit*, Juv. 8.147-8 *carpento rapitur pinguis Lateranus et ipse, | ipse rotam astringit sufflamine mulio consul*. On this form of nominal expansion see Wills 124-73; in poetry it is often, as here, combined with epanalepsis from the fifth or sixth foot of one line to the first foot of the next. Such epanalepsis goes back to Homer (*Il.* 12.95-6) but is more common in Apollonius (1.87-8, 191-2, 4.764-5), possibly influencing its frequency in Catullus' longer poems. Later poets use it to allude to Catullus, especially 64, where it recurs at 61-2, 132-3 (see n.), 259-60, 285-6, 321-2, 403-4. Here cf. with the same chiastic arrangement 58.1-2 *Lesbia illa, | illa Lesbia* and especially 62.60-1 *pater cui tradidit ipse, | ipse pater*: Jupiter becomes parallel to the father who 'gives away' the bride.

This gives additional point to *diuum genitor*, an epic title in the tradition of Homeric πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (*Il.* 1.544 etc.); cf. 298, 387 *pater diuum*. Ennian variations can be seen at *Ann.* 203, 591, 592 Skutsch, while the elevated *genitor*, rare

in prose, is first found in Ennius (see Skutsch on *Ann.* 108), applied to Jupiter at *Ann.* 444 *o genitor noster, Saturnie, maxime diuom* (cf. *TLL* VI.1818.65-1819.25). The suspicion that Catullus' phrasing may have had an Ennian precedent is perhaps supported by Cic. *carm.* 6.32 Büchner *ipse deum genitor* alongside *carm.* 23.18 Büchner *genitor Saturnius*; cf. also Valerius Soranus fr. 2 Courtney *regum rerumque deumque | progenitor genetrixque* (cf. 171n.). On the distribution of the forms *deum* (cf. 23n.) and *diuum* see *TLL* V.1.886.25-37, V.1.1652.31-1653.67; after Catullus *diuum genitor* appears at Sil. 5.70, 6.618, 17.342, Mart. 12.774-5 *ipse diuum offensus genitor*, but *deum genitor* is favoured in Augustan poetry (Virg. *Aen.* 7.306 *ipse deum ... genitor*, Ov. *Am.* 1.13.45 *ipse deum genitor*, *Met.* 14.91, *Fast.* 3.285, *Tr.* 2.37) and by Statius (*Theb.* 2.115 *ipse deum genitor*, 3.556).

Such a title would normally be used instead of, rather than as well as, the name: the extended reference to the god suggests the narrator's amazement at the honour done to Peleus, perhaps even 'wondering disbelief' (Thomson), preparing for the questions in 28-30.

concessit Repeated in 29, the different construction highlighting the shift in meaning: Tethys 'allowed' the wedding to happen, Jupiter 'gave up' Thetis in a rather different sense (*TLL* IV.14.80-15.21, cf. e.g. Ov. *Her.* 4.35 *si mihi concedat Iuno fratremque uirumque*).

suos ... amores Presumably 'the love he could have had', though according to schol. *Il.* 348-50 Melanippides claimed that Thetis was pregnant by Zeus when she married Peleus. The plural perhaps hints at such a possibility, since it is a distinctive phrase for a beloved in Catullus' polymetrics (*meos* 15.1, 21.4, 40.7; *tuos* 6.16; *suos* 10.1, 45.1). It sounds ironically urbane in incongruous combination with the elevated *diuum genitor*, as when Ovid uses it of Io, *Met.* 1.617.

28-30 tene ... tene ...? Questions, particularly repeated, can be a hymnic feature (Fedeli (1972) 45), but then, however rhetorical (e.g. repeated *quis huic deo | comparier ausit?*, 61.64-75), formally they still tend to ask for unknown information: ‘who’, ‘which’. This also applies to an epic narrator’s questions to the Muse (e.g. *Il.* 1.8, 2.487) and Callimachus’ to his divine and human informants in the *Aetia*, even when a detailed ‘why’ or ‘how’ question reveals how much the narrator already knows (e.g. *frr.* 3, 7.19-21 Pfeiffer). Similarly, even at *Call. Hymn* 3.113-19, closest to this passage as narrator asks protagonist about specific details, Artemis is asked ‘where’ she went and ‘how often’ she shot. Here Catullus goes further, asking only for confirmation of the facts he states: did these things happen? The insistence of the repeated questions begins to suggest not only wonder but doubt whether Peleus was worthy (a surprising consequence of the otherwise ‘hymnic’ anaphora of *te*; Évrard-Gillis 75 notes that the closest Catullan parallels for double questions with pronoun in anaphora are 43.6-7 and 47.3-7, expressing indignation) or even whether these tales of the heroic age are really true. Cf. the complex tone of *Virg. Aen.* 1.11 *tantaene animis caelestibus irae?*

28 Thetis tenuit As at 55.17, 72.2, *Tib.* 1.5.39, *tenuit* probably = ‘held enthralled’ (e.g. *Prop.* 2.20.19-20; *Virg. Ecl.* 1.31, *Aen.* 1.670), but with strong overtones of ‘held in her arms’ (e.g. 11.18, 45.2, *Prop.* 2.22.37, *Tib.* 1.6.35). As the senses overlap and are both common in erotic contexts, the ambiguity is sometimes exploited: e.g. *Tib.* 2.6.52 *quisue meam teneat, quot teneatue modis*. Here, while Thetis actively embracing Peleus would indicate a loving wife (Syndikus 127), the weaker sense of ‘held’ need refer only to Peleus’ own love ‘holding’ him to her. But the image of an embrace would also further identify Thetis with the sea, anticipating Ocean’s

embrace of the world (30n.). The *t* alliteration throughout 28-30 is most noticeable here with the repetition of *ten-* in *tēne ... tēnuit*, surrounding (embracing?) another repetition of Thetis' name (19-21n.).

Nereine Although appearing nowhere else in extant Latin (Virg. *Ecl.* 7.37 *Nerine*, otherwise *Nereis*), this is the 'correct' form of the patronymic from a name ending in *-εύς*, and occurs in late Greek poetry (Opp. *Hal.* 1.386, seven times in Quintus Smyrnaeus), always, as here, at line-end, the usual place for *-ίνη* patronymics (Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 352). A common Hellenistic source is probably indicated: as this would fit into a pattern of Hellenistic experiments with these patronymics (see Clausen on Virg. *Ecl.* 7.37) and the manuscript variants look like further attempts to copy an unfamiliar word ending in *-ine*, Haupt's *Nereine* has the advantage over Trappes-Lomax's *Nerinaon* despite the fact that the genitive plural would give more point to *pulcherrima*.

29 suam ... neptem corresponds to 27 *suos ... amores*, in the same places in the line (see below). Tethys and Ocean were Titans (Hes. *Theog.* 132-6) and parents of Doris (*Theog.* 346-66), the mother of the Nereids (*Theog.* 240-64). The narrator appears again as *poeta doctus* by referring briefly to these relationships with the matter-of-fact *neptem*; cf. 151 *germanum* n.

Tethys The wife of Ocean appears in Latin first here and at 66.70; in mentioning her name so close to *Thetis* (to which it was corrupted) the narrator demonstrates self-consciously that he knows the difference.

ducere The standard word for 'marry' from the man's point of view (as opposed to *nubere*); here used absolutely, with an accusative of the bride but without the word *uxorem* (*TLL* V.1.2143.12-35).

30 The conception of Ocean as a river encircling the world probably goes back to Homer and Hesiod (called ὠψόρροος = ‘flowing back on itself’ at *Il.* 18.399, *Od.* 20.65, *Theog.* 776; the outermost band of Achilles’ shield, *Il.* 18.607-8); it is more explicit at e.g. [Aesch.] *Prom.* 138-40. This line may specifically rework Euphorion fr. 122 Powell Ὠκεανός, τῷ πᾶσα περίρρυτος ἐνδέδεται χθών (see Powell *ad loc.* and Wilamowitz (1924) *Il.* 300 n.2 on the attribution to Euphorion). The image of embrace (cf. Eur. *Or.* 1377-9 πόντον, Ὠκεανὸς ὅν | ταυρόκρανος ὀγκάλαις | ἐλίσσων κυκλοῖ χθόνα) shows Ocean simultaneously as an anthropomorphic god and as the river (cf. similar ‘split divinities’ in Ov. *Met.*, Fraenkel (1945) 88-9); the identification of the two aspects is only slightly softened by instrumental *mari*. Nuzzo collects similar Latin descriptions of the sea ([Tib.] 3.7.147, Luc. 10.255) and occurrences of *amplectitur* with reference to the aether, horizon etc. (Cic. *carm.* 44.2 Büchner, translating Eur. fr. 941; Stat. *Ach.* 1.621, Manil. 1.663; add Lucr. 5.319 *continet amplexu terram*, of the sky); cf. also V.Fl. 1.195, of Neptune, *terrasque salo complecteris omnes*. In the context of Thetis’ marriage, the image is a familial one, parallel to the embrace of Ariadne on her maternal bed (87-90); but simultaneously the universal image of the world suggests that not just Thetis’ extended family but the whole natural order assented to the marriage, and forms a stabilising ending to the fast-moving prologue before the narrative zooms in at 31 to the palace in which (technically) it stays until 384.

31-49: arrival of the human guests and description of the palace

Celebratory descriptions of wedding festivities, including the arrival of guests from a wide area and the beauty of the central setting, are paralleled in various ancient

contexts (e.g. *Musae.* 44ff., *Stat. Silu.* 1.2.229ff., *Charit.* 3.2.17, *Men. Rhet.* 404: possibly the ‘Hesiodic’ poem on the wedding of Ceyx, fr. 263-8 M—W). The particularly urban luxury here, and the presence of the human guests as admiring spectators, was seen by Reitzenstein (1900) 87-8 and Pasquali (1920) 22-3 as evidence for a model in a lost Hellenistic court poem involving a royal spectacle (cf. *Theoc.* 15): in most accounts Peleus and Thetis were married in Chiron’s cave on Pelion (Roscher III.2 s.v. ‘Peleus’ 1837.11-56) and this may be the only version to put the wedding in Peleus’ house at Pharsalus (Heslin (1997) 591 n.13, Pontani (2000) 270 n.12). Any such influence, however, is combined with specifically Roman details (47n., cf. Perrotta (1931) 193, Granarolo (1967) 132-3) and with a wider tradition of palace-descriptions going back to Homer (43-9n.). The wedding of Jason and Medea at Ap. *Arg.* 4.1128-69, 1182-1200 is also evoked (34 *dona ferunt*, 47 *puluinar ... geniale* nn., cf. Braga (1950) 160, Klingner (1956) 30, Syndikus 130-3): this is a potentially unhappy precedent for Peleus and Thetis (1-11n.).

The tone of lines 38-42 is controversial. Accounts of the cessation of farming for a holiday can accompany descriptions of festivals (*Tib.* 2.1.5-10, *Ov. Fast.* 1.665-8), but as apparently first noticed by Pasquali (1920) 17, this version is particularly reminiscent of treatments of the golden age, when the human race was spared agricultural labour: e.g. *Hes. Op.* 113, *Virg. Ecl.* 4.40-1, 57-62, *Tib.* 1.3.37-48, *Ov. Met.* 1.91-112. Possibly this simply heightens the festive importance of the wedding (so e.g. Syndikus 132): golden age details might then be lightly ‘ironic’ (Quinn, Fitzgerald (1995) 148), implying that the holiday was like a golden age for the enthusiastic guests, even though they went back to work afterwards (at 267-77, presumably: Dee (1982) 103). However, the tone is complicated by the hints of ‘desolation and decay’ (Konstan (1977) 32), especially in the memorable final detail

(42): Bramble (1970) 38-9 asserts that this ‘cheats the reader’ by replacing the expected climax of a list of negated farming activities, the explanation that the earth provided food spontaneously (cf. esp. Tib. 1.3.45-6, Ov. *Met.* 1.101-12). Moreover, golden ages are usually described only because they have to end (cf. Newman (1990) 219) and we might read the negatives of 38-41 in a different way, seeing farming positively as the most natural human activity (‘hard primitivism’: Arat. *Phaen.* 108-13) and its stopping as a sign of corruption. This is particularly since abandoned fields can stand for war (e.g. Virg. *Georg.* 1.505-7, Luc. 1.28-9; cf. Tib. 1.10.45-52 with 42 *squalida ... rubigo* n. and see 35-7n.), something else which the golden age lacked, and in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (Pontani (2000) 270-3, cf. 22n.) Zeus chose to end the blessed age of theoxeny by causing the Trojan War, the ultimate outcome of Peleus’ and Thetis’ marriage (see also Townend (1983)).

Furthermore, the poem began with the Argo, associated with the invention of seafaring and the end of the golden age (6, 11n.): from this point the description of the fields seems to go too far backwards in time and that of the palace too far forward. The Argonaut Peleus appears already to have possessions imported by ship (48 *Indo ... dente*, 49nn.), while the gold and silver of 44 could only be acquired by mining, another violation of the earth ending the golden age at e.g. Ov. *Met.* 1.137-40. As Jenkyns (1982) 90-1 argues, we cannot assume that ‘the normal Roman reaction’ (Bramble (1970) 39) to the sumptuousness of 43-9 would be disapproving. However, Epicurean scorn would be certainly be a contemporary possibility, cf. Godwin 7-10: in particular, Lucr. 2.20-36 mocks similar riches (44n.), while Hor. *Serm.* 2.6.102-3 *rubro ubi cocco | tincta super lectos canderet uestis eburnos* has enough coincidence of vocabulary with 45-50 to suggest that Horace saw this luxury as suitable for satiric treatment. But the chronological confusions here (cf. also 31

finito tempore n.) also mean that any ‘moralistic’ condemnation of a descent over time into wealthy decadence cannot be straightforward either: they represent ‘impediments to an easy story of the fall from grace’ (Theodorakopoulos (2000) 141). This anticipates the chronological and moral complexity of the poem’s epilogue.

Meanwhile, if the urban setting, the *domus*, and the Roman *lectus genialis* encourage a reader to wonder how Peleus is managing to domesticate the wild sea-goddess, the question is strikingly avoided. The man-made beauty replaces the focus in the previous descriptive scene (12-18) on the natural, naked bodies of the Nereids, while Peleus and Thetis themselves almost disappear under the piles of objects (cf. Konstan (1977) 6), mentioned only in oblique cases in relation to some of their possessions (43 *ipsius*, 47 *diuiae*). Their emotions (19-20) are not mentioned again: the abundant repetition of words and ideas only highlights the narrator’s lingering over the same physical details, avoiding any emotional description except for the guests’ outwardly demonstrated happiness (33-4).

31 quae Müller’s *quis*, adopted by Goold, is intended to combine with *optatae* to emphasise that the marriage was desired by both Peleus and Thetis (19-20), but would be pointlessly confusing since the last subjects mentioned were Tethys and Ocean (29-30). *quae* probably refers loosely to the idea of the approaching wedding in 19-30 (cf. 80 *quis ... malis*), although it is just possible, given *lucis*, that 25 *taedis* might be perceived as the antecedent, associating the daylight of the wedding day with the light of the wedding torches (Konstan (1977) 95): cf. 66.79 *optato ... lumine taeda*, where Fordyce notes the ambiguity between ‘with its longed-for light’ and ‘on the longed-for day’.

optatae ... luces As at 16 (see n.), 325, 376, *lux* = primarily ‘day’ but also emphasises ‘bright’ happiness. Possibly plural for singular, especially as *simul* ... | *aduenere* implies a particular moment (dawn?). However, an extended period of celebration could be inferred from 38, 42nn.: cf. e.g. Stat. *Theb.* 2.306-7 where heroic wedding celebrations last for *bissen* ... *dies* (but see also 38-42n.). For the adjective cf. 5 *optantes*, 22 *optato* nn.; it recurs with *lux* = ‘day’ at Apul. *Apol.* 9 *lux haec optata canatur*. At Virg. *Aen.* 4.619 *nec...regno aut optata luce fruatur*, *lux* is usually understood as ‘life’ but in evoking this line suggests that Dido wishes that Aeneas should get no joy of his kingdom or *marriage* in Italy.

finito tempore Probably *finito* = *definito* (cf. the idiom *diem finire* in Livy, e.g. 35.7.3, 39.17.2, 45.12.7), referring to the time fixed in advance for the wedding (see Treggiari (1991) 162-3). However, the vagueness of the expression, which could also be understood as ‘when the time [of their engagement] had passed’, draws attention to the elision of the time between Peleus’ first sight of Thetis, when the Argo was launched, and their marriage: see Perrotta (1931) 179-82. Presumably Peleus did not become a *λινόναυς* but waited until after the whole voyage, but the impression given is that he can go straight from seeing Thetis to being united with her just because the powerful narrator finds this convenient for the shape of his poem (cf. 19-30n., and especially the similarly vivid collapse of time at 19-21n.). Moreover, simply using *finire* (and in a past participial form!) in the first line of a new section, and at a point still so near the opening of the poem, continues the unsettling of the reader’s expectations about ends and beginnings observable throughout 19-30 (see n., and cf. 3 *finis* n.): is the story of Peleus and Thetis over already? See further Feeney (2007) 125-6 and cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.223 *et iam finis erat* with Feeney (1991) 137-8, Fowler (1997) 260-1.

32-3 conuentu Loosely instrumental ablative, 'in a crowd'. Kroll quotes the assertion at Paul. Fest. 41 that *conuuentus* is used *cum aliquem in locum frequentia hominum supplicationis aut gratulationis causa colligitur*.

tota ... | Thessalia The people of Peleus' kingdom form a homogeneous group sharing the same actions and emotions (34, 267-77). This is emphasised by the generalising singular *Thessalia* and the adjective, whose exaggeration is literalised in 38-42 where it seems that not a single person is left in the countryside. Cf. Prop. 2.6.2 *Graecia tota* (Lais' lovers) and famously Aug. *R.G.* 25.2 *iurauit in mea uerba tota Italia sponte sua*: possibly this use of *totus* + national name already had overtones of socio-political unity.

frequentat After the introductory perfect *aduenere* (32) the present tense continues throughout the palace-description, including the first part of the description of the *uestis* (53n.), easing the transition into the story of Ariadne (50-75n.).

oppletur laetanti regia coetu repeats the sense of the previous clause, creating a chiasmus of the verbs and nouns *domum, frequentat, oppletur, regia* and bringing in variation with passive *oppletur*, elevation of the non-specific *domus* to a royal palace, and addition of *laetanti* to the description of the crowd. With 31-3 cf. Stat. *Theb.* 2.213-15 *diffuderat Argos | expectata dies: laeto regalia coetu | atria complentur*, also a wedding, at which the guests immediately go on to marvel at works of art depicting their heroic ancestors (215-22).

34 Lines of this simple shape, divided at the caesura into two finite statements with asyndeton and often repetition of the same word or sound at the beginning of each half-line, seem appropriate for the expression of straightforward certainty. They cluster in this descriptive passage (37, 38, 45), where they contribute to the

ostentatiously direct pictorialism (31-49n.), and in Ariadne's speech (141, 146, 148, 187), where, on the other hand, they suit her static despair.

dona ferunt A few ancient sources refer to wedding presents from friends, family or dependants: e.g. Harpoc. s.v. ἀνακαλυπτήρια, Hesych. s.v. ἐπαύλια, Ter. *Phorm.* 39-40, Liv. 42.12.4. See Treggiari (1991) 165-6, *RE* VIII s.v. 'Hochzeit'. A likely model for Catullus' attribution of such a custom to the heroic age is Ap. *Arg.* 4.1185-91, where the people of the surrounding countryside bring Jason and Medea clothes and jewellery as well as animals and wine for sacrifice. Cf. also the gifts brought by the gods at 278-93. The construction switches from singular to plural: 'the members of the *coetus*' is also the unexpressed subject of *declarant*, *linquunt*, *coeunt*, *frequentant* (34-7).

prae se Literally 'in front of them', but also connoting the frank emotional expression of the second half of the line, since *prae se ferre* often means 'demonstrate' (*TLL* X.1.373.82-374.13), e.g. Cic. *Planc.* 77 *numquam dissimulaui me plurimum debere, semperque prae me feram*. Cf. 194 *praeportat*.

declarant gaudia uultu The guests' upfront expression of their happiness gives one possible model for the narrator's presentation of the mood of the wedding: perhaps we are to assume that his insistent focus on pure joy is similarly genuine (cf. 25 *felicibus*, 33 *laetanti*). So Jenkyns (1982) 108-9.

35-7 Greek place-names cluster even more densely than in 1-5, deployed in varied noun and adjective forms in a complex pattern: around the chiasmic line 36, lines 35, with verbs at the beginning and names at the end of each half-line, and 37, in each half of which this order is reversed, form one grand chiasmus. Lists of place-names in combination with verbs of leaving typically occur in troop-catalogues (e.g. Virg.

Aen. 10.167-8, *Ciris* 463-4), and the lines might evoke such a context for readers reminded in line 37 of the battle of Pharsalia (37 *coeunt* n.). In particular, this description may be behind the focus on abandonment when Lucan describes the mustering of Caesar's army (1.392ff.; 396 *deseruere*, 399 *liquerunt*) after his opening picture of deserted Italian fields (1.28-9; cf. 31-49n.).

35 Scyros OGR's *Syros* is one of the Cyclades and cannot be relevant. As confusion of *sc* and *s* is so common the manuscript conjecture *Scyros* is a plausible alternative. Initially it seems geographically inappropriate: the island is north-east of Euboea, while the list of places in 35-6 apparently expands 32-3 *tota ... Thessalia*. However, Ellis, Friedrich, Giangrande (1976) and most convincingly McKie (2009) 116 show that Scyros could be understood as having been closely enough linked to Thessaly for its inhabitants to be likely guests at Peleus' wedding, specifically that in the heroic age both Thessaly and Scyros were thought to have been inhabited by Pelasgians. The later association of Achilles with Scyros might also suggest a link with his parents, although here we may be lacking a more definite mythological detail which would have been known to Catullus. According to Thomson, the fact that Scyros is an island would raise practical problems about the journey its people made to and from Pharsalus: but although the Argo is the first ship in 1-18 (11n.), in other places too the poem makes the contradictory implication that other ships existed straight after and even before its voyage (31-49, 53nn.), while although all the guests later leave the palace on foot (277 *pede*), they would need to do so to reach the sea from Pharsalus, which is well inland.

The only more straightforwardly Thessalian place to have been proposed is *Cieros* (Meineke), a town mentioned in this form at Strabo 9.5.14 (more commonly

Cierium, e.g. Liv. 32.15.3, 35.14.6); it is in Thessaliotis, about the same distance from Pharsalus as Crannon is. However, it is much smaller and more obscure than Crannon and Larisa, and although again we may be missing a detail of which Catullus would have been aware, it has no known literary or mythological significance. Fordyce suggests that including such a little-known place would show ‘Hellenistic’ learning, but this seems unlikely given its prominent position in the passage as the first name mentioned, and emphasised by its own verb *deseritur* in a different construction from the rest of 35-7. *Scyros* rather provides an inward geographical sweep from the island past the valley of Tempe (below) and the primary cities of Pelasgiotis to Pharsalus, prefiguring the further inward movement in 38-49. It is therefore the better choice: see further McKie (2009) 115-20.

Pthiotica Tempe *Tempe* probably the proper name (cf. 285-6): it is unlikely that Catullus would use *tempe* = ‘valleys’ (e.g. Virg. *Georg.* 2.469) as part of a list of Thessalian places when the original Tempe, the valley of the Peneus between Olympus and Ossa, is itself in Thessaly. Although it is to the north of the other places mentioned here and not in Pthiotis, the southernmost of the four Thessalian regions listed at Strabo 9.5.3, there is a plausible model for this loose geography at Call. *Hymn* 4.112, where the Peneus is Πηνειὸν Φθιώτῃα (and Tempe also appears at 105, cf. 36n.); see Cahen *ad loc.* and cf. 178n. For the orthography *Pth*– representing Φθ– see Schulze (1958²): Latin reduced the first of such pairs of aspirates to a simple consonant (cf. 211 *Erectheum*).

36 Crannonisque ... Larisaea Crannon and Larisa were the main cities in the plain of Pelasgiotis, the Thessalian region north of Pharsalus, and standard parts of heroic

age geography of the area: both feature in Call. *Hymn* 4 alongside ‘Pthiotic Peneus’ (104, 138; see 35n.). On the form *Larisaeus* see 3n.

37 Pharsalum ... Pharsalia Transmitted *Pharsaliam* is printed by e.g. Ellis, Bardon, Eisenhut, Nuzzo. *Pharsalia* is acceptable as the name of a town, as required here by the lack of a preposition, the combination with Crannon and Larisa, and *coeunt*, which implies a place no larger than a town (Ellis): Baehrens and Fordyce (e.g.) argue that *Pharsalia* in Greek or Latin can never mean the town but always the district around it, but this is a ‘vexed question’ (see Heslin (1997) 588-9), since usage of *Pharsalus* and *Pharsalia* after 48 BC is always influenced by the disputed ways of referring to the battle (see also Postgate (1905), Bruère (1951)). Catullus is the first Latin writer to mention the place, and if the poem is earlier than 48 (though see below) then the only one to do so without becoming involved in this controversy; moreover schol. *Od.* 4.9 identifies the town of Φθία with a place that οἱ νεώτεροι call Φαρσαλία, suggesting that some Greek poetry may have given the town this form of the name. However, in Φαρσαλία the second α is long (e.g. Eur. *Andr.* 16, 22), as in adjectival *Pharsalia* in the second half of this line; if *Pharsaliam* is accepted here it would either have to be trisyllabic with consonantal *i* by synaeresis, or, more probably, the second *a* would have to be short. The variation of quantities in repeated words was acceptable to both Greek and Latin poets (examples in Hopkinson (1982)) and cultivated by some, especially Hellenistic poets and Ovid (see Wills 461-7): but although many Latin examples involve Greek names, including Virg. *Ecl.* 6.44 *Hylā Hylā*, Prop. 2.3.43-4 *Ēois ... | Ēois*, Ov. *Trist.* 4.4.55-6 *Euxīni ... | ... Axīnus*, and the refrain of Cat. 62, beginning *Hymen o Hymenaeae*, all of these directly reflect Greek usage, whether dialectal variants or the lengthening of a short

vowel in arsis before another vowel; the 62 refrain quotes the opening of the last line of Theoc. 18. Φαρσαλία with short α is not attested, and although Latin poets can also shorten quantities in Greek names when metrically convenient, e.g. Ov. *Met.* 15.708 *Leucōsiam* for Λευκωσία, such deliberately changed forms are not found with the correctly transliterated form adjacent. I therefore accept Pontanus' emendation; despite the arguments of Heslin (1997) 591-3, *Pharsāliae* should also be avoided at Stat. *Ach.* 1.152 (read *Thessaliae*) as well as Calp. Sic. 4.101 (read *Parrhasiae*), the only other possible parallel.

For the polyptoton of the name see 19-21n., and for repetition of related words at or close to the beginning of the two halves of the line, 34n.: the only other Catullan examples with place-names are 63.20 *Phrygiam ad domum Cybebes*, *Phrygia ad nemora deae* and 68.99 *sed Troia obscena*, *Troia infelice sepultum*, both similarly emphasising a destination.

coeunt Repetitive after 33 *coetu* (31-49n.). The vagueness of the verb's subject (34 *dona ferunt* n.) perhaps makes it more possible to read *Pharsalum coeunt* in a military sense (*TLL* III.1417.63-1418.6) suggesting a clash in battle at Pharsalia: Newman (1990) 221 thinks that Ovid may have read the line in this way, noting how Ov. *Met.* 15.823-4 uses *maefient caede* from 368 below to describe battlefields of the civil wars, Pharsalia included. As there is no firm evidence for the date of the poem or of Catullus' death, it is even just possible that such a meaning was intended by the poet here: cf. Hutchinson (2003) 210 n.17 'line 37 would suit but does not demand a date after Pharsalus.' This would affect our reading of the description of the deserted countryside that follows (31-49n.). Cf. also 137 *clementia* n.

38-42 The five lines are bound together by the molossi after the main caesurae in 38-40 and elided versions in 41-2 (see 1 *prognatae* n. and cf. 63-5): the monotony of the rhythm seems appropriate for the deserted stillness described. For the triple line-initial anaphora in 39-41 cf. 19-21n. and (again) 63-5. The earliest examples (see Wills 400-2) involve Greek words for ‘not’ (Hes. *Op.* 182-4, *Il.* 23.315-16 and 318); this was followed in some Hellenistic cases (e.g. Call. *Hymn* 6.4-6) and later, spectacularly, at Musae. 47-53, with alternating οὐδέ and οὐ opening six out of seven consecutive lines in a description of people assembling for a festival. On anaphora of *non* see also Guillemin (1941). Anaphora of *non* or οὐ is also frequent in descriptions of the golden age: Arat. *Phaen.* 108-9, Virg. *Ecl.* 4.40, Tib. 1.3.41-4, Ov. *Met.* 1.97-9.

The identical opening to three consecutive end-stopped lines means that jumbling in transmission would be likely, and some editors have changed the order of 39-41 or 38-42 in order to bring together the lines concerning vine-growing and those involving ploughing (see Ellis, Baehrens, Goold, Trappes-Lomax). But the alternating correspondence of 38 with 40 and 42 and 39 with 41 is equally satisfactory, and Cressey (1977) even suggests that the references to ploughing may also refer to vineyards, giving a unity of theme to the whole passage. However, there is a further oddity: ploughing is a winter job while weeding and the removal of leaves (41n.) are summer ones. While 38, 42nn. also suggest a lengthy suspension of agriculture, the references to both seasons take this to a new level, implying not just wedding celebrations of days or weeks (31n.) but an age (31-49n.).

38 colit Both ‘tills’ and ‘inhabits’ (cf. Konstan (1977) 32): not only are the farmers not working, they have left home.

nemo corresponds to 32 *tota*, with the same hyperbole (see n.). In meaning and sound it prepares for 39-41 *non ... non ... non*: see Lyne on *Ciris* 177-80 *nulla ... non ... non ... non ... nullus*.

mollescunt colla iuuencis The skin of the oxen's necks, hardened under the yoke, becomes soft again as they are left idle; even more than 42 this suggests a long break from work. In Virgil's golden age the human agent is mentioned (*Ecl.* 4.41 *iuga soluet arator*) whereas throughout 38-41 the lack of words for people, except for the generalised *frondatorum* of 41, enacts their absence from the countryside. Internal rhyme represents the softening process by assimilating *colla* to *mollescunt*.

39 After *non* the word order is that of a 'golden line' (7, 59nn.); cf. 64.

humilis ... uinea Rather than being a conventional epithet, as when applied to trees at Virg. *Ecl.* 4.2, 5.17, *Georg.* 2.213, *humilis* here probably indicates vines grown trailing on the ground, rather than with support as at e.g. 62.49-55: cf. Var. *R.R.* 1.8.1, dividing *uineae* into *humiles ac sine ridicis* and *sublimes* requiring *pedimenta* and *iuga*, Colum. 4.1.5 *humili statu uitis*, White (1970) 231-6.

curuis purgatur ... rastris The soil between the vines had to be loosened and cleared of weeds and fallen leaves (Virg. *Georg.* 2.354-7, 398-401, Colum. 4.4-5); some sort of hoe with curved teeth would probably be used for both jobs, though these accounts mention the two-pronged *bidens* rather than the *rastrum*, possibly a more general term. The absence of *rastra* in the golden age (31-49n.) is mentioned at Ov. *Met.* 1.101 and in the quasi-golden age imagery of Virg. *Georg.* 2.439 (see Thomas *ad loc.*); Virg. *Ecl.* 4.40-1 *non rastros patietur humus, non uinea falcem*; | *robustus quoque iam tauris iuga soluet arator* alludes particularly closely to 38-41, condensing details from every Catullan line. However, negated *purgatur* here (which

also suggests that it is primarily weeding that is involved rather than breaking up clods) has less happy implications, suggesting overgrown vineyards that are not ‘cleansed’ (Janan (1994) 110).

40 The spondaic rhythm is usually understood to evoke the bulls’ effort, as at Virg. *Georg.* 1.65 *fortes inuertant tauri*. However, as hard work is precisely what is *not* happening here, the spondees could alternatively express inertia; cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 4.86ff. *non coepae adsurgunt turres ...* (with Pease and Austin), which shares with this passage abandoned tools (89 *aequataque machina caelo*), anaphora of *non* and (perhaps) a context of doomed love.

prono ... uomere The bent ploughshare is turned with its point towards the ground. This accords better with 313 *prono* of the Fates’ thumbs, although in contexts of ploughing, driving etc. *pronus* more typically refers to the person or animal bent forward with exertion (e.g. Virg. *Georg.* 3.107). The line-ending *uomere taurus* is echoed at Virg. *Georg.* 3.515, Hor. *Carm.* 3.13.11 *fessis uomere tauris* and Ov. *Fast.* 2.295 *nullus anhelabat sub adunco uomere taurus*: the last is the first of three lines beginning *nullus*, *nulla*, *nullus* in a description of the pre-agricultural life of early Arcadians, and allusion to Catullus is likely (cf. 38-42n.).

conuellit ‘tears up’ (*TLL* IV.819.5-46), the most violent of the negated verbs in 38-41 and therefore conveying the positive side of the picture here, that ‘no more violence is done to the earth’ (Bramble (1970) 38).

taurus Not the usual word for a plough-ox (rather *bouis*; see Mynors on Virg. *Georg.* 1.45-6); perhaps an appropriately more sexual term for the animal whose ‘phallic ministrations’ to the earth (Fitzgerald (1995) 148) are, paradoxically

in the context of a wedding, suspended. Virgil's uses of *taurus* in this sense include *Ecl.* 4.41 (see 39n.).

41 Both trees and vines could be stripped of leaves for fodder and/or pruned so they would not waste strength on too many shoots. Baehrens, Friedrich, Kroll argue that *umbram* means generally 'foliage' here (cf. e.g. Virg. *Georg.* 1.157, Prop. 3.13.37) and therefore that this whole line need have nothing to do with vines. However, the basic meaning of *attenuat ... umbram*, 'thins out the shade', makes it likely that the reference is to leaves being cleared for a third purpose, allowing the sun to reach ripening grapes (Servius on *Ecl.* 1.57, Plin. *N.H.* 17.214). In that case *arboris* might be the vine itself, or more probably the tree up which the *sublimis* vine is trained, so that 39 and 41 refer to the two different types of vine-cultivation (39 *humilis ... uinea* n.). It is certainly not clear that a *frondator*, although usually a 'tree-pruner' in general, could not be a 'vinedresser' here: Colum. 4.7 makes it clear that the *falx* could be used on vines if necessary (and see further Cressey (1977) 153). The simple *non uinea falcem* of Virg. *Ecl.* 4.40, in a context alluding so closely to this passage (39 *curuis purgatur ... rastris* n.), may be an implicit comment on Catullus' unclarity. Meanwhile *arboris umbram* = 'shade of a tree' is picked up at Ov. *Met.* 4.116.

42 As at e.g. 7 (see n.), 75 a five-word line consisting of two nouns, two adjectives and one verb forms a stabilising conclusion to a 'paragraph'; cf. 59n. The rust and *desertis* suggest that the ploughs have been carelessly left out in the damp fields rather than being hung up as they are when work is suspended for a festival at Tib. 2.1.6, Ov. *Fast.* 1.665. The level of temporal hyperbole seen here (cf. 38-42n.) depends on how convincing we find Quinn's assertion that 'highly polished iron ...

rusts overnight in the open'. There is an important contrast with 39-41: if agricultural tools are simply said not to be doing their jobs, this might be because they have not yet been invented (as in typical golden age descriptions), but if they are actually decaying, they must already exist.

squalida ... rubigo The adjective suggests both roughness and dirtiness (*OLD* s.v. 1 and 2): there is a textural contrast, both with the skin of the bulls in 38 which became softer rather than rougher through lack of use, and with the polished brightness inside the palace (43-9). At Tib. 1.10.49-50 *pace bidens uomerque nitent, at tristia duri | militis in tenebris occupat arma situs* the same contrast attributes the attractive image of shining metal to the ploughshare in use, just as the passage gives a positive picture of agriculture in ordinary peacetime (see further Smith and Maltby *ad loc.*) rather than emphasising its absence in the peaceful golden age: see 31-49n., and cf. esp. *squalent* of fields deserted for battle at Virg. *Georg.* 1.507.

infertur Apparently 'spreads over' (Fordyce), equivalent to *infert se*, though not a very precise usage compared to the verbs of 38-41, to which the reader expects a climax (see Jenkyns (1982) 110 n.28): it might have replaced a different *in-* verb such as Nisbet's *increscit*.

43-9 Such descriptions of gleaming, luxurious palaces go back to *Od.* 4.72-5 (Menelaus' house), 7.84-92 (Alcinous'); see also Bacchyl. fr. 20B.13-16 with Snell and Maehler. Here Sappho fr. 44 Voigt is a particularly likely influence (Connely (1925) 411): the wedding of Hector and Andromache is accompanied by the arrival of guests and the appearance of gifts of gold, purple, silver cups and ivory. The description of Dido's palace at Virg. *Aen.* 1.637-42 opens with a close echo of this passage (637 *at domus interior regali splendida luxu*), with decorations of *arte*

laboratae uestes and representations of *fortia facta patrum* corresponding to 50-1 below; since Dido in book 4 recalls Ariadne (132-201n.), the allusion might invite the reader to see the contrast between the parts of Dido's story in *Aen.* 1 and 4 as comparable to that made here between the celebratory feast of Peleus and Thetis and Ariadne's suffering.

43 ipsius 'his own'; although there is no obvious antecedent (cf. 31 *quae* n.) the reference to Peleus is clear from the context; cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.114 *ipsius* = Aeneas with Austin. The colloquial sense of independent *ipse* = 'the master' (*TLL* VII.2.344.13-59; in Catullus 2.9, 3.7, 114.6, 115.7, never in the long poems) need not be felt (*pace* e.g. Fordyce, Quinn): the only indication of the wedding-guests' social status is the suggestion in 38-42 that they farm the land, and it does not follow that they are Peleus' slaves. *ipsius* rather marks the contrast between Peleus' *domus* and the abandoned homes of the visitors (36), and shifts the focus to the central figure as at 67n. On the form's variable prosody see *TLL* VII.2.293.14-33; Catullus has it only at the beginning of a dactylic line with short second syllable (also 68.146).

at signals a contrast between two strongly visual scenes as at 58, 251. The postponement of *at* to second in the clause (anastrophe) is first extant here and at 58: see Fordyce on 23.7 for other examples of Catullus' postponement of non-enclitic connective particles, which became common in later verse (see Norden (1903) 393-5 for Virgil, Platnauer 93-6 for the Augustan elegists).

sedes Cf. 48 *sedibus*: like *domus* (32, 46) and *regia* (33, 44), which it varies, the word is used twice in this initial description. The plural form (cf. 37 *tecta*) is used consistently for all the heroic royal residences in the poem (85, 160, 176, 229, 290, 303), but also of a less exalted house at 67.4.

quacumque ‘wherever’, expressing the house’s expansiveness (see below).

opulenta like English ‘opulent’ conveys both wealth and its display: cf. e.g. Liv. 31.30.8 *terram Atticam ... exornatam quondam opulentamque*, Sen. *Dial.* 7.25.1 *pone in opulentissima me domo, pone <ubi> aurum argentumque in promiscuo usu sit*, Stat. *Theb.* 6.206-8 (Archemorus’ funeral pyre) *non umquam opulentior illic | ante cinis: crepitant gemmae, atque inmane liquescit | argentum, et pictis exsudat uestibus aurum*.

recessit The house ‘stretches back’ into a large number of rooms: cf. Plin. *Epist.* 2.17.21 *contra parietem medium zotheca perquam eleganter recedit, quae specularibus et uelis obductis reductisue modo adicitur cubiculo modo aufertur*, Sen. *Thy.* 649 *in multa diues spatia discedit domus*, and e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 2.483-4 *apparet domus intus et atria longa patescunt; | apparent Priami et ueterum penetralia regum*; on the importance of such interior vistas to Roman houses see e.g. Wallace-Hadrill (1994) 44-5. Evoking a visitor’s view, the verb continues the inward movement from the surrounding countryside through the palace towards the marriage bed, but may also suggest the ‘potential endlessness’ of such a movement, as the poem moves to its ‘inner’ passage about the *uestis* which does not limit itself to describing what is actually depicted there (Theodorakopoulos (2000) 119).

44 Cf. Lucr. 2.27 *domus argento fulget auroque renidet*, part of an argument that such material luxury is useless as it cannot relieve physical pain. The Phaeacian passages of the *Odyssey* which are the distant source of Catullus’ palace-description (43-9n.) are also behind Lucretius’ words, since he is dissociating himself from the vulgar view that Epicurean pleasure involves revelling in Phaeacian luxury (Fowler on Lucr. 2.20-36); if Catullus is alluding to that passage, this looks like an early

example of ‘remythologising’ the *D.R.N.* (see e.g. Gale (2000) 116-23) as Lucretius’ picture is put back into the heroic world, though there are few clues as to whether the reader would be meant to feel unsettled by the condemnation of luxury that is evoked, or to enjoy the scene more in the awareness that Lucretius would disapprove (31-49n.). On the other hand, if Catullus’ text is earlier Lucretius’ beds of *textilibus ... picturis ostroque rubenti* (35) could be a summarising reference to Catullus’ coverlet, and Lucretius would be associating a recent ‘Phaeacian’ scene with the Homeric tradition.

fulgenti splendent The first two of four verbs of shining in 43-5 (and cf. 46 *gaudet* n.) are highlighted by juxtaposition and internal rhyme, continued in the further repetition of *-ent(-)* in *argento*, 45 *collucent*.

auro atque argento Mentioning gold and silver together to give a general indication of luxury seems as natural in Latin as in modern languages (frequent in Plautus, e.g. *As.* 155, *Rud.* 546). Here attention is drawn to the phrase by the spondees in both fifth and fourth feet (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 7.634 *aut leues ocreas lento ducunt argento*, one of only two examples in the *Aeneid* of this very rare rhythm) and by the double elision, exceptional at this point in the line and with a long vowel elided (Winbolt 169-82). Running all three words in to one another expresses the single dazzling gleam emanating from the unspecified gold and silver objects.

45 candet ebur *candere* is associated with shining white specifically: cf. 14 *candenti*, 318 *candentis ... lanae* and see 13 *incanuit* n. Also of ivory at Virg. *Aen.* 6.895, Ov. *Pont.* 3.3.98.

solis ... mensae If the two clauses in this line have the same construction, both *solis* and *mensae* must be possessive datives. But while the ivory is part of the

thrones, the cups are not part of the table: a locative ablative would describe the relation between cups and table more naturally, and Heyworth's *mensa* should be considered. However, *pocula mensae* is paralleled as a hexameter ending at Virg. *Aen.* 11.738 *plena pocula mensae*, Mart. 8.6.5 *Laomedontae fuerant haec pocula mensae*, i.e. in two poets who frequently allude to Catullus and in contexts that allow for a more clearly possessive sense of *mensae*, while *pocula mensa* is not otherwise extant (PHI 5.3).

solium is usually a royal 'throne', especially in poetry (*OLD* s.v. 2). A pun on *sol* might be felt in the midst of such insistent emphasis on shining; cf. Ov. *Met.* 2.25 *in solio Phoebus claris lucente smaragdis*, where the name Sol is avoided just when the god sits on a *solium*.

collucet The prefix suggests large numbers of cups glittering together: *collucere* is frequent in Cic. *Arat.* of stars (208, 263, 286, 322, 327) and used by Virgil of torches (*Aen.* 4.567, cf. Lucr. 6.882 where the light from a single torch perhaps undergoes multiple reflections in water).

46 tota domus The adjective expresses unity of mood (32-3n.) and highlights the way in which the line sums up the details of 43-5.

gaudet The *gaudia* of the guests (34) is transferred to the house: cf. Lake Sirmio in sympathy with Catullus at 31.12-14 *atque ero gaude | gaudente, uosque, limpidae lacus undae, | ridete*. Catullus has personified *domi* again at 246, 284, 61.149-51, 68.94, and sustained personifications of inhabited places or similar in poems 17 (Colonia), 31 (Sirmio), 44 (farm), 67 (door). Here the pathetic fallacy helps to convey delight in physical wealth and its display (cf. 43 *opulenta* n.), as at Phaedr. 4.26.10 *splendebat hilare poculis conuiuium, | magno apparatu laeta*

resonabat domus; cf. places rejoicing in natural richness of various kinds at e.g. Virg. *Ecl.* 9.48 *segetes gauderent frugibus*, Georg. 2.181 *gaudent silua uiuacis oliuae*, Aen. 12.702-3 *gaudetque niuali | uertice ... pater Apenninus*, Manil. 2.142 *mirantibus astris | et gaudente sui mundo per carmina uatis*. More specifically, the association between shining and happiness, so that one verb covering both meanings can have an inanimate subject, already appears at *Il.* 19.362-3 γέλασσε δὲ πᾶσα περὶ χυθὼν | χαλκοῦ ὑπὸ στεροπῆς; *gaudere* is used thus at Stat. *Silu.* 1.3.54-6 *nitidum referentes aera testae | monstrauere solum, uarias ubi picta per artes | gaudet humus*, and *ridere* commonly, e.g. Lucr. 2.502, 559, 3.22, 4.1125, Hor. *Carm.* 4.11.6 *ridet argento domus*.

regali ... gaza The ablative depends *apo koinou* on both *splendida* and *gaudet*; the ambiguity further connects the ideas of joy and shining (see above). *gaza* occurs in Latin (imported via Greek) first here and at Lucr. 2.37 (cf. 44n.): since according to e.g. Curt. 3.13.5, Isid. *Orig.* 20.9.1 (see further Maltby s.v. *gaza*, *Gaza*, *gazophylacium*) it was originally a Persian word meaning ‘royal treasure’, *regali* is explanatory or tautologous in this connection as well as repeating the sound and sense of 43 *regia*.

47 puluinar ... geniale A λέκτρον μέγα spread with the golden fleece is the centrepiece of the wedding of Medea and Jason (Ap. *Arg.* 4.1141, cf. 31-49n.), but the terminology here comes from two Roman sources, illustrating the wedding of mortal and goddess by paradoxically combining the *lectus genialis*, the symbolic marriage-bed displayed at a Roman wedding, with the *puluinar*, the couch on which images of the gods were placed at the ceremony of a divine banquet, the *lectisternium* (e.g. Liv. 5.13.4-8, Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 12.9); see further Pasquali (1920) 3-17. The

contaminatio goes still deeper if the original meaning of *genialis* (cf. Paul. Fest. 94 *genialis lectus, qui nuptiis sternitur in honorem genii, unde et appellatus*) is activated next to *diuae*. Later the beds of divine emperors could be called *puluinaria* in conjugal contexts (e.g. Ov. *Pont.* 2.2.69, Juv. 6.132, Suet. *Dom.* 13.1). See generally van den Berg (2008).

uero The narrator draws attention to the bed's first appearance: it is the climax of the description in 43-9, but the first-time reader does not yet know in what way it will be the central focus of the poem.

diuae ... locatur The verb gains more point if *diuae* is dative (the bed has been placed *for* the goddess), rather than genitive with *puluinar*: for this use of *loco* + dative (*TLL* VII.2.1560.72-8) cf. e.g. Liv. 5.23.7 *Iunoni reginae templum in Auentino locauit*, Pers. 6.46-7.

48 The details carry metapoetic significance: the ecphrasis, like the bed, is centrally positioned, highly 'polished' (cf. 1.2 *expolitum*) and exotic (*Indo* might even hint at Bacchus). See also 50 *uariata* n.

sedibus in mediis The inward movement of the description arrives at its central focus, as the narrator's gaze settles on the *puluinar*. The detail also confirms the reference to the *lectus genialis* (47n.), which was placed in the atrium for a wedding and remained there for the duration of the marriage (cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.1.87-9), reinforcing the impression that a Roman custom is being observed in heroic-age Thessaly.

While adjective (or genitive) followed by preposition followed by noun (3 *Phasidos ad fluctus*, 14 *candenti e gurgite* etc.) is very common in prose and verse (cf. also 149n.), the anastrophe seen here (noun-preposition-adjective) is a poeticism:

see K—S I.587-8, N—W II.943-6, Bendz (1948) and cf. 198 *pectore ab imo*, 251 *parte ex alia*, 354 *sole sub ardenti*, 387 *templo in fulgente*.

Indo ... dente Beds ornamented with ivory, though obviously luxurious, were not limited to the mythical world (*Od.* 23.200); see e.g. Plaut. *Stich.* 377, Hor. *Serm.* 2.6.103, Suet. *Diu. Iul.* 84 and probably 61.108 *candido pede lecti*, and cf. *RE* V s.v. ‘Elfenbein’ 2360, Marquardt (1879) 719-22, Hill (1963). Ivory is frequently called *dens* (*TLL* V.1. 538.44-64, cf. Var. *L.L.* 7.39), usually with some explanatory qualification (e.g. Liv. 37.59.3 *eburneos dentes*, Luc. 10.144 *dentibus ... niueis*), but here the dignified epic periphrasis, varying 45 *ebur*, highlights the paradox in the presence of the material in Peleus’ house, so soon after the sailing of the Argo, by drawing attention to its exotic origin: in the Roman period at least, Indian ivory would usually have reached Thessaly by sea.

politum might be equivalent to *ornatum* (Baehrens, Kroll etc.), as at e.g. Var. *R.R.* 3.2.9 *uilla ... polita opere tectorio eleganter*, Plin. *Epist.* 2.17.10 *cubiculum ... politissimum*. However, as its basic meaning ‘polished’ is certainly appropriate for ivory, this is more probably an extended use of the ablative of description, in which the material of which an object is made appears in the ablative, and an adjective/participle which might be felt to go more closely with the noun of material instead agrees with the noun naming the object: so the sense ‘bed made of [or “decorated with”] polished ivory’ appears as ‘bed polished with ivory’. This example may have been influential on the frequency of the construction in Virgil: see e.g. *Aen.* 5.663 *pictas abiete puppis* ‘ships of painted pine’ with Williams, *Aen.* 2.765 *crateres ... auro solidi* ‘bowls of solid gold’ with Austin, Lees (1921) 184, Mackail (1930) 513-15.

49 ‘all the words but the verb work toward conveying the purple of the coverlet’ as the reader’s gaze is finally made to settle on ‘the one splash of dark color amid the silvery brightness’ (O’Connell (1977) 748-9). Elder (1951) 121 may be right that each word in the line suggests a deeper colour: *roseus* and *purpureus* can sometimes indicate different shades of red (Plin. *N.H.* 14.15 *hic purpureo lucent colore, illic fulgent roseo*).

purpura can be the shell, the dye derived from it, or, as here and at e.g. Prop. 4.3.51, a cloth coloured with such dye; *fucus* was strictly applied to a vegetable pigment, but more widely to dye in general (e.g. Prop. 2.18.31, Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.5). As a universal indicator of wealth and status, purple dye from the *conchylium* is appropriate for Peleus as a king, while its association with the Phoenicians (e.g. Hor. *Epod.* 12.21 *muricibus Tyriis*, Ov. *Met.* 6.222 *Tyrio ... suco*; already *Il.* 4.141 φοίνικι) means that this detail too implies established sea trade (48 *Indo ... dente n.*), despite the existence of Greek sources of purple (Plin. *N.H.* 9.127, Laconia). Dyeing could also be associated with moral corruption and the end of the golden age because it implies deceit (e.g. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.42, *Georg.* 2.465), and this aspect may well be felt here (see Konstan (1977) 40-1, Jenkyns (1982) 111-12), especially as *fuco*, which can mean ‘deceit’ (*TLL* VI.1.1462.39-77, e.g. Cic. *Att.* 1.1.1 *sine fuco ac fallaciis*), is left to resound as the last word of this description. Konstan suggests that this also anticipates a theme of the ecphrasis, Theseus’ betrayal of Ariadne (see below and cf. 48, 50 *uariata nn.*).

The red/white colour contrast (also at 307-9 and between 364 and 368; cf. 13n. and see further André (1949) 346-7) occurs of beds decorated with ivory and purple at e.g. *Od.* 23.200-1, Theoc. 15.123-5; if the contrast between red and ivory reminds the reader of the famous simile describing Menelaus’ wound, *Il.* 4.140-4 (so

Harmon (1973) 316-17), the association of such a contrast with bloodshed would be appropriate for the loss of virginity on a marriage-bed (cf. Virgil's reworking of the simile for Lavinia's blush, *Aen.* 12.64-9) as well as preparing for the 'violence and passion' depicted on this purple cloth (see Clarke (2003) 127).

50-75: first view of Ariadne

The brevity of the summarising introduction to the ecphrasis (50-1) tricks the reader into registering the beginning of the poem's inner story as a smooth transition from one descriptive passage to another. The opening description of Ariadne is the climax of the descriptions in 31-49: Fitzgerald (1995) suggests that the heroine's beauty stands in for the natural beauty of the golden age expected after 38-42, but it could equally well replace the praise of the beautiful bride normally included alongside descriptions of the house and marriage bed in an epithalamium (e.g. 61.185-8, *Stat. Silu.* 1.2.273-7, cf. *Men. Rhet.* 403-4; 31-49n.).

Only the first and last passages of the inner section (52-75 and 251-64) are formally 'descriptive': 52-75 depend directly on 50-1 and 52 *namque*, but from 76 *perhibent* onwards the 'digressions' depend on verbs of saying, until 249 *tum prospectans* returns to the point of time captured in the picture of Ariadne, and 251 *at parte ex alia* introduces the picture of Bacchus. The reader must, therefore, conclude that only these two scenes actually appear on the *uestis*. Accordingly, although the fact that they frame such an extended series of digressions makes the reader consider the 'disobedience' of this ecphrasis throughout (terminology from Laird (1993) 19 and *passim*), it is in these directly descriptive passages that the reader is most constantly made to consider the nature of a verbal representation of visual art, and in

particular the power of the narrator. Although in a fictional ecphrasis the narrator-poet creates the invented picture as he describes it, the fiction is maintained that it exists, producing a tension between the narrator's authority and that of this second potential source of information and artistic satisfaction (see Fowler (1991)). The *uestis* is spread out before the narrator as a 'simultaneously available field' (see Theodorakopoulos (2000) 118-21) from which he can choose what he will mention. The narrator's most fundamental choice is not to reveal the Bacchus scene until 251: but the reader is already being shown Ariadne in different ways as the narrator explores and interprets the picture, offering a viewer's possible responses.

Inevitably the narrator does this in a piece of verbal discourse: the entire passage balances the tendency of such discourse to be linear, telling a story in order, with that of a picture to be flat, allow the viewer's gaze to move around it in two dimensions. The latter tendency is evident in the repetitious nature of the description: each sentence surveys various aspects of the situation and methods of describing it (e.g. 52-4 visual information and names, 54-6 psychological events, 56-7 more visual details), then reaches closure on a miniature scale with a feature such as a five-word line or a *spondeiazon* (7, 42, 59nn.) before the next sentence starts the process again. Meanwhile, together with explicit indications that one depicted moment is being described (55, 56, 68), the prevailing present tense (53n.) is appropriate for the continuing 'availability' of the static picture. However, other elements illustrate the tendency towards a narrative ordered along a temporal axis, as the interpreting narrator names Ariadne's clothes in order (63-5n.) or reveals some details before others so that Ariadne appears to move from bed to shore (60n.), while in the imperfect tenses of 67 and 70 he seems to see Ariadne as existing in the mythical past rather than in front of him in a picture. The section is also balanced in other ways

between ‘transparent’ description and obvious interpretation. Beside precise visual details are those that could not ‘really’ be represented in a picture, especially aspects of the scene which appeal to hearing and other senses (52 *fluentisono*, 57 *salis*), or introduce movement (*fluentisono*, 58 *uentosae ... procellae*). The narrator also goes beyond the physical to describe his characters’ states of mind, but this can be with physical imagery related to the visual description (62n.), as if the narrator is interpreting visual clues for their emotional significance: some ancient rhetorical treatises prescribed description of emotion for ecphrases of statues or paintings (see Landolfi (1998) 18-19). And transparently ‘pictorial’ naming of the objects in the picture alternates with verbal techniques such as simile (61), anaphora (63-5, 69-70) and verbal sound effects (e.g. 53, 71-2nn.).

All this highlights two figures: the narrator, conducting the interpretative process, and Ariadne, its object. Repeatedly the narrator circles around the still heroine, approaching her and moving away again. He sometimes seems to be a distanced observer, lingering over Ariadne’s half-naked body (63-5) or commenting with detachment on the plausibility of her state of mind (56); but at other times he exclaims sympathetically over her (61 *eheu*, 71 *a misera*) and even seems to speak for her (69 *te ... Theseu*). It is sometimes difficult to decide whether the focaliser of a word or phrase is Ariadne or the narrator agreeing with her (esp. 58-9nn.); a character who is an insistent presence in a piece of text will always be a potential focaliser, but this is particularly the case here where Ariadne’s gaze is so important (see esp. Fitzgerald (1995) 140-68, Gaisser (1995), Elsner (2007) 68-73 and cf. 52n.): there is always the encouragement to see ‘from her point of view’. More generally, the reader has to decide where to fit into the entire dynamic involving the narrator and Ariadne: he may conclude that since what he does see of Ariadne is so limited by

what the narrator offers him (e.g. revealing her body, 63-5n.) he has more in common with her, the frustrated gazer, than with the narrator, the free spectator of the picture.

Ariadne at the moment she realises her abandonment is a still figure in a state of distress, very suitable for contemplation as a picture (see e.g. Webster (1966), Eisner (1977), Deroux (1986), Gallo (1986) on the scene in ancient art and cf. 12-18n.), but not for narrative or dramatic treatment. Poets who do deal with Ariadne keep her static: Catullus through ecphrasis, Ovid in both *Her.* 10 and *Fast.* 3.469-516 through monologue, Nonnus by making Dionysus halt his epic journey to watch and listen to her (*Dion.* 47.195-418; on these other treatments see further 132-201n.). However, a distraught hero(ine) alone beside the sea also marks a narrative beginning, specifically an epic one: cf. Lynn-George (1988) 262-5 on the seashore as epic site. At *Il.* 1.348-50 Achilles sits on the seashore, weeping and looking out at the water, like Ariadne and also like Attis in 63 (63.48 *ibi maria uasta uisens lacrimantibus oculis*); like theirs his position represents his isolation from his society. But even more relevant is Odysseus' first appearance on the Ogygian beach, weeping and looking out at the water (*Od.* 5.81-4). De Jong on 5.76-91 notes that the *Odyssey*'s narrator 'indicates that this is the hero's usual location ... and usual occupation'. Odysseus has been in an unchanging state, trapped on an island, since before the point at which the epic begins; Hermes arrives and releases him so that the story can start. Here, the narrator discovers Ariadne trapped on her island and within her picture, and is able to 'release' her, so that the text can move on to different parts of her story and so that both she and the narrator can speak about her past (as Odysseus does in *Od.* 9-12). This ecphrasis turns out to be also an epic, beginning *in medias res*.

50-1 The couplet forms a hinge or pivot (cf. 11n.). Its generalised indications of what is depicted on the *uestis* could stand alone as an appropriate conclusion to the description of the interior (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.640-2, concluding the description of Dido's palace: 43-9n.), but in the light of 52ff. are instead seen by the reader as an introductory summary which the whole inner story (52-264) is engaged in expanding: cf. e.g. *Il.* 18.48-12, Virg. *Aen.* 8.626-9. The 'frame' of the ecphrasis is completed by another couplet, 265-6.

50 haec uestis indicates that the narrator's attention remains with the *puluinar*, in contrast to the frequent new subjects introduced in 31-49: but there is no indication yet that an ecphrasis is beginning (Jenkyns (1982) 113 'line 50 seems to have the plain, resumptive tone of line 31'). *uestis*, 'any *outside* cover, whether of bed, table or person' (Henry on Virg. *Aen.* 2.722), probably = 'coverlet' as at 163, Lucr. 2.36, Ov. *Met.* 8.657-9 etc. Sebesta (1994) argues that the reference is to a curtain hung around the bed in its capacity as *puluinar* ... *diuae* 'to delimit and envelop a sacred space': but Sebesta's arguments against the sense of 'coverlet' are weak, and the verbs describing the *uestis* as concealing the bed (49 *tegit*, 266 *uelabat*) can simply mean 'cover', 'clothe'.

priscis hominum ... figuris The reader soon detects hypallage for *priscorum hominum figuris*: the form of the figure where the adjective which ought to agree with the dependent genitive is attracted into the case of the other noun is common, since e.g. 'figures of people' expresses what is almost one notion. Cf. (if the text is correct) 359 *caesis ... corporum aceruis* and see Bell (1923) 318-19 with Virgilian examples. But the sense of *priscis* may still attach to *figuris* to some extent (see e.g. O'Hara (2007) 36 n.4): this would highlight the fact that no information is given about the

origin of the *uestis* (51 *mira ... arte* n.). Although hypallage sometimes occurs in prose (LHS II §93), its role as a marker of poetic ‘high style’ in Latin may owe much to its frequency in Greek tragedy (see Norden on Virg. *Aen.* 6.2); however, after *trag. inc.* 43 Ribbeck³ *gentes orarum ultimae*, Catullus and Lucretius provide the earliest extant Latin examples (Lucr. 1.474, 5.24-5).

priscis seems equivalent to παλαιγενέων in the announcement of epic subject-matter at Ap. *Arg.* 1.1 παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν, or perhaps to πρόσθεν in Nestor’s introduction to his reminiscence at *Il.* 9.524-5 οὕτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν | ἡρώων. If it is focalised through the wedding-guests who view the coverlet (267) rather than through the narrator, then like the Iliadic πρόσθεν it opens up a temporal gap within the heroic age so that Ariadne and Theseus are figures of ‘ancient’ legend in the time of Peleus and Thetis, thereby beginning the ecphrasis by flaunting the poem’s central chronological inconsistency (53 *cum classe* n.). Moreover, *hominum* suggests unnamed, ordinary people, while *priscus* is usually associated with earlier generations imagined as primitive or rustic (e.g. Var. *Men.* 186 *priscus homo ac rusticus Romanus*, Hor. *Epod.* 2.1-3, Ov. *Fast.* 3.779) and exemplifying ‘old-fashioned’ morality (e.g. Cic. *Har.* 27 *priscam illam seueritatem*, Hor. *Carm.* 3.21.11-12 *prisci Catonis | saepe mero caluisse uirtus*); cf. 159n., 101.7 *prisco quae more parentum*. So *priscis* and *hominum* together are a misleading introduction to a specific heroic age episode in which exemplary morality is not obvious (51 *heroum ... uirtutes* n.): they lead the reader to expect something more like the festivals, judgements and farming scenes on the shield of Achilles (*Il.* 18.490-508, 541-605).

uariata Derived from *uarius* (Ernout-Meillet s.v., see further Landolfi (1998) 11), so appropriate after the various shades of colour implied in 49 (see n. and cf.

61.87 *uario* with Fordyce). Ariadne's story is apparently introduced as pure decoration (cf. 265 *decorata*), though 51 immediately modifies this (see n.). As *uariare* also describes embroidery at Mart. 8.28.18, V.Fl. 3.11-12, Tac. *Germ.* 17.3 (cf. also Prop. 2.6.33, of painting), it may be a 'technical' term, equivalent to ποικίλλω 'to embroider': Faber (1998) argues that since ποικίλ- words occur in some of the earliest and most imitated Greek ecphrases (*Il.* 18.490 (Achilles' shield), *Il.* 14.125, 220 (Hera's girdle), [Hes.] *Scut.* 423, Theoc. 15.78), *uariata* glosses ποικίλος, alluding to a conventional element of other ecphrastic descriptions in order to draw attention to the unconventional, 'disobedient' nature of the ecphrasis here. Meanwhile Laird (1993) 24-9 explains *uariare* and *figura* as alluding to the technical language of rhetoric 'to accompany [the poem's] exploration of what can be done with speech in ecphrasis.'

uariata figuris also ends a hexameter at Lucr. 2.335 (atoms) and Claud. *Rapt.* 1.15 (triform Hecate), while Ov. *Met.* 11.241 *uariatis saepe figuris* alludes to this line as Ovid narrates a part of Thetis's story, her shape-shifting attempts to escape Peleus, which has no place in Catullus' version (20n.): note also Ovid's *ad solitas artes* (241) with 51 here.

51 heroum ... uirtutes indicat *heros* occurs several times in 64 (23n., 343, 385), not elsewhere in Catullus: an epic theme seems indicated at this new 'beginning' point (cf. heroes as typical subjects of high-genre poetry at Cic. *De orat.* 2.194 *heroum ueteres casus*, Virg. *Ecl.* 4.26 *heroum laudes*), and it appears that after the praise of the heroes at 22ff. for their ancestry and good fortune, the *uestis* will show their more active *uirtutes*. This word suggests a gloss on *heroum*: heroes are *uiri* characterised by *uirtutes*. Commentators explain *uirtutes* as 'brave deeds', equivalent to κλέα (*Il.*

9.189 κλέα ἀνδρῶν, 9.524-5 κλέα ἀνδρῶν | ἥρώων; Ap. *Arg.* 1.1 παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν) or to *fortia facta* at Virg. *Aen.* 1.641 (43-9n.), i.e. plural occasions on which martial, non-ethical *uirtus* is displayed. Cf. 323, 348, 357 *testis erit magnis uirtutibus unda Scamandri*, 68.90. Eisenhut (1973) 43-4 concludes that *uirtus* is used by Catullus only in this ‘traditional’ sense (the one remaining occurrence is 218 *feruida uirtus* of Theseus), while Dee (1982) 99, 102-3 argues that a *heros* need not possess moral *uirtus* at all. But even with this narrow understanding of *uirtutes* the announcement here is problematic: although Theseus’ killing of the Minotaur is featured at 76-85, 100-15, it is apparently not depicted on the *uestis* (50-75n.), and what the spectators of the coverlet see, as well as what is first described to the reader as an example of a heroic deed (52 *namque* n.), is Theseus’ treatment of Ariadne. Moreover, *uirtutes indicat* (cf. e.g. Cic. *Ver.* 2.4.80 *indicia uirtutis*, Quint. *Inst. Or.* 10.5.11 *uirtutis indicium*) implies a moral protreptic purpose for the *uestis* (contrast 50 *uariata*), in which it will concretely ‘give evidence for’ the abstract *uirtutes* (cf. 61.217-18 *pudicitiam suae | matris indicet*, Catullus’ only other use of the verb: Kinsey (1965) 916), while in the context of 50 *priscis* (see n.) *uirtutes* could be taken in the sense of ‘moral qualities’. To call this line ‘ironic’, then, is the most attractive interpretative option if we are to make any sense of how the abandoned Ariadne and her rescue by Bacchus *heroum uirtutes indicat*: Palladius Fuscus in 1496 annotated 51 with ‘ironia’ (Gaisser (1995) 592 n.42). Cf. esp. Konstan (1977) 39-53, pointing to the common meaning of *indicare* = ‘expose’, ‘unmask’ (*TLL* VII.1153.27ff.).

mira ... arte combines two typical themes used in describing the subjects of ecphrasis, the skill of the artist revealed in the work (e.g. δαίδαλα πολλά, *Il.* 14.179 etc.; see Bühler on Mosch. *Eur.* 43) and the wonder this causes in the viewer (e.g. *Il.* 18.549 τὸ δὲ περὶ θάῤῥμα τέτυκτο, [Hes.] *Scut.* 140, 224, 318, Theoc. 1.56, Mosch.

Eur. 38 θηητόν, μέγα θαῦμα). The phrase is similarly used of artefacts at Virg. *Aen.* 9.303-4 *ensem | auratum, mira quem fecerat arte Lycaon*, Ov. *Met.* 10.247-8 *interea niueum mira feliciter arte | sculpsit ebur*, *Il. Lat.* 874, Mart. 7.56.2, *Anth. Lat.* 759.1-2. This is therefore a conventional part of an ecphrastic introduction, but also paradoxically vague – ‘with wondrous skill’ is the only indication of how the work was done, replacing any details of who made the *uestis* or how the particular materials/techniques used depict the subjects (contrast e.g. *Il.* 18.481-2, 519, 549, 574, 607, Virg. *Aen.* 8.624, 655, 659 etc.; here the only possible reference to materials is an indirect one, the description of Ariadne’s clothes (63 *subtilem n.*). This encourage the reader to think of the *ars* displayed by the coverlet’s real creator, the poet: cf. 48, 50 *uariata nn.*

52 namque indicates the opening of a new narrative, like 212 *namque*, 76, 105 *nam*. It also implies a logical link with 50-1: *namque* frequently introduces illustrative examples in Lucretius (e.g. 1.404, 820, 2.453) and elsewhere often opens a narrative exemplifying or explaining a generalised assertion (e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 1.22.9 (see Fraenkel (1957) 185-6, comparing καὶ γάρ); Virg. *Aen.* 2.65ff. *accipe nunc Danaum insidias et crimine ab uno | disce omnis. | namque ut ...*; Ov. *Met.* 3.349ff. *exitus illam | resque probat letique genus nouitasque furoris. | namque ...*, 9.283ff. *Ilithyiam | quam mihi difficilem Iunonis gratia fecit. | namque ...*). The reader is invited to see what follows as an example of *priscis hominum ... figuris* and an indication of *heroum uirtutes* (see nn.).

fluentisono ... litore See Ross (1969) 17-22 on Catullus’ use of compound adjectives, a neoteric ‘Grecising’ technique, but one in an Ennian tradition. *fluentisonus* is *hapax legomenon* in extant Latin, though we cannot conclude either

that Catullus coined it or that it was never reused: compound adjectives in *-sonus* (cf. 125 *clarisonas*, 320 *clarisona*, 263 *raucisonos*) seem to have been well-established by Catullus' time (Naev. *trag.* 20 Ribbeck³ *suausionum*, Enn. *Ann.* 586 Skutsch *altisonum*, *trag.* 93, 215 Jocelyn *altisono*, Cic. *Arat.* 280 *clarisonis*, Lucr. 2.619, 5.1084 *raucisonus*) and *fluctisonus* appears at [Sen.] *H.O.* 836 *fluctisona litora*, Sil. 12.355. In *fluentisonus* the meaning of the first element, 'flowing' may derive from ἁμφιρύτῃ 'flowed-around' of Dia at *Od.* 11.325; Apollonius had called Dia ἁμφιόλω (*Arg.* 4.425, see below), but Catullus varies the other half of the Homeric compound. For the adjective to agree not with the name of the island but with *litore* neatly conveys the idea that the waves make a noise as they hit the beach: in the first line of the description of Ariadne, *fluentisono* pairs movement and sound as 'remarkable features of this unruly ecphrasis' (Heyworth (2008)). *fluentisono litore* may also allude to *Il.* 1.34 θῖνα πολυφοῖσβοιο θαλάσσης and thus help to signal an epic beginning (50-75n.).

prospectans 'Looking, gazing, watching – *seeing* – is Ariadne's most characteristic activity' (Gaisser (1995) 595): this first verb of vision is soon followed by 53 *tuetur*, 55 *uisit uisere*, 57 *se cernat*, 61-2 *prospicit*, ... | *prospicit*. Later cf. 86, 91-2, 126 and 249 *prospectans*, where 249-50 close a ring by repeating all the main ideas and many lexical elements from 52-4. *prospecto* is very typically used of looking out from a vantage point over a flat surface: e.g. Cic. *Att.* 9.10.2 *dies et noctes tamquam aus illa mare prospecto*, Virg. *Aen.* 9.168, Ov. *Met.* 3.651, Tac. *Ann.* 3.1.3. Cf. 241 *summa prospectum ex arce petebat* (Aegeus).

Diae The first of three artfully positioned proper names in 52-4 (Geymonat (1982) 174; cf. 1-3, 82nn.). We could imagine that the Thessalian guests recognise the scene and name the island to themselves as Dia, or that the narrator tells us what

we would deduce if we saw the *uestis*. Dia is named at *Od.* 11.321-5 and twice at *Ap. Arg.* 4.425-34, a passage sharing many features with this one: it describes another purple textile, Hypsipyle's robe, which had originally been made by the Graces Δίη ἐν ἀμφιάλῳ for Dionysus to lie καλὰ μεμαρπὼς στήθεα παρθενικῆς Μινωίδος (432-3, cf. 60 *Minois*, 65 *lactentis ... papillas*) after Theseus had abandoned Ariadne there when she followed him from Cnossus. (Clausen (1982) 191, Courtney (1990) 115 think that this passage was fundamental for Catullus' decision to describe a tapestry picture of Ariadne.)

Homeric Dia may have been modern Dhia, a small island near the north coast of Crete (Strab. 10.5.2); but in third-century Alexandria 'Dia' was apparently treated as an alternative name for Naxos, the island which more typically claimed the *hieros gamos* of Ariadne and Dionysus (schol. *Ap. Arg.* 4.45 = Call. fr. 601 Pfeiffer Ἐν Δίῃ· τὸ γὰρ ἔσκε παλαιότερον οὖνομα Νάξω, schol. Theoc. 2.46). This remained the usual understanding in the Roman period: Diod. 4.61.5 κατήρεν εἰς νῆσον τὴν ποτὲ μὲν Δίαν, νῦν δὲ Νάξον προσαγορευομένην, *Ov. Met.* 3.636 '*Naxon*' ait Liber '*cursus aduertite uestros*' with 689 '*excute*' *dicens* '*corde metum Diamque tene*', Servius on *Aen.* 3.125 [*Naxos*] *ipsi consecrata est; quae et Dia dicitur*; meanwhile schol. *Od.* 11.321 claims that that Dia was once known as Naxos. See further Jackson (1999). Ariadne's hopeless isolation (esp. 178-9) suggest that it is Naxos that the reader should imagine here.

53 Thesea ... tuetur Ariadne is of course thinking of Theseus obsessively (68-70), but if imagining the situation realistically the reader might doubt that she would actually be able to see him (as opposed to his ship). However, artistic representations of the scene, especially wall-painting, do often show Theseus on his ship at the

expense of scale (e.g. *LIMC* s.v. ‘Ariadne’ no. 82, Gallo (1986) pl. 12), so this detail might show the ecphrasis adopting a technique of real art. The picture of ‘a woman, bare-breasted, gazing at a ship’ (Gaiser (1995) 595) evokes the Nereids and the Argo in 12-18 (see n.): there the Argonauts returned the gaze of the nymphs, inaugurating the love of Peleus and Thetis, whereas Ariadne’s unreturned gaze at Theseus is the last event in their relationship, though the first to be described.

The present tense of *tuetur*, ‘natural in describing an artefact’ (Quinn), is maintained until 67. Possible allusions to Ariadne’s hopeless gaze here include Dido’s gaze at Aeneas, Virg. *Aen.* 4.362 *talia dicentem iamdudum auersa tuetur*; Alcyone looking for Ceyx, Ov. *Met.* 11.714-16 *dumque notata locis reminiscitur acta fretumque | prospicit, in liquida spatio distante tuetur | nescioquid quasi corpus aqua* (cf. 62 *prospicit*).

cedentem Equivalent to a compound such as *discedentem*, *decedentem*, *abscedentem* (cf. 134 *discedens*), as at 66.39 *tuo de uertice cessi*; the simple form *cedere* recurs in the poem only when *cedentem* is repeated at 249 (52 *prospectans* n.). Cf. also 145 *apisci* n. ‘The present participle is precise’ (Jenkyns (1982) 126) in both cases: the depicted Theseus remains for ever just moving away from the island but not yet out of sight. Cf. Propertius’ allusion at 1.3.1 *Thesea ... cedente carina*, with its (still alliterative) correction of Catullus’ problematic *classe* (see below).

celeri Another Latin version of the conventional Homeric ship-epithet *ῥοή* (6 *cita ... puppi* n.), but also focalised through Ariadne, expressing her distress at Theseus’ heartless speed (cf. 58, 183nn.).

cum classe The immediate appearance of Theseus at sea highlights, at the meeting-point of the inner and outer narratives, the temporal contradiction created by putting Theseus and Ariadne earlier than the Argo, which in the poem is the first ship

in history (6, 11n.): this inconsistency was apparently first noticed by Haupt (1875-6) II.73, while Wilamowitz (1924) 299 observed that Catullus follows the chronological innovation of Apollonius at *Arg.* 3.997-1004 (Jason uses Ariadne as a rhetorical *exemplum* in his persuasion of Medea, cf. 116-23n.) and 4.425-34 (Hysipyle's robe, cf. 52 *Diae* n.). In Apollonius, however, the Argo is not the first ship, while Catullus emphasises the paradox. See O'Hara (2007) 34-41 and Weber (1983) 263-9 with further bibliography; the contradiction has also been used to argue that the poem clumsily conflates two Hellenistic models (e.g. Pasquali (1920) 1-23).

Theseus seems to have one ship at 84 *naue*, 121 *rati*, 225 *uago* ... *malo*, 249 *cedentem* ... *carinam*, several here and at 171 *Cecropiae* ... *puppes*, 212 *classi*. There is no external reason for a whole fleet: the human tribute taken to Crete was traditionally no more than 14 people (78n.) and it would be easier to change just one set of sails (cf. 233-45). Neither *LIMC* s.v. 'Ariadne', Gallo (1986) nor Dyer (1994) include any surviving pictures of Theseus leaving Naxos/Dia with more than one ship, and 171 *puppes* seems likely to be the poetic plural of 'high' epic style (on which see e.g. LHS II §26 with refs.). As at 84 *naue leui nitens*, 212 *classi cum*, the choice of word here creates alliteration: it also completes a complex sound-pattern involving repeated *l* (*celeri* and *classe*), *m* (*cedentem* and *cum*), *ce* (*cedentem* and *celeri*). *classe* for *naue* would be not plural for singular but collective for singular in a kind of reverse synecdoche, as *silua* probably refers to one tree at 4.11 (Friedrich). Alternatively, *classis* could = 'ship's company', since it can mean an assembly or contingent of people rather than of ships: ancient etymologies connected it with *καλεῖν*, *calare* (Maltby s.v. *classis*), possibly correctly (*TLL* III.1281.8-21). Cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.37.24, 3.11.48 and most clearly Virg. *Aen.* 6.334 *Lyciae ductorem classis*

Oronten (Servius: *apertum exemplum, classem dici etiam unam nauem*; see also Norden *ad loc.*).

If *classe* is instrumental ablative, the use of *cum* here is archaic (Kroll, referring to his note on 98.3 *ista cum lingua*; cf. LHS II §145); but it could just as well be ablative of accompaniment, in which case *cum* is more natural: *cum classe* is a frequent phrase in Caesar and Livy, and also continues to occur in poetry, often at the same point in a hexameter. Identical word order at Ov. *Fast.* 4.65 *plena cum classe*, Luc. 4.530 *Graia cum classe*, 5.328 *tanta cum classe*.

54 indomitos ... furores The first element of psychological description (50-75n.). *furores* suggests both anger and passionate love, seen, as so typically in the ancient world, as madness (examples at Syndikus 143 n.172): at 94 Ariadne's *furores* are sent by Cupid, and *furor* is erotic passion at 68.129. The unspecific term and the plural (cf. *curae* at 62, 72, 95 and esp. 250 *multiplies ... curas*) may indicate Ariadne's confused, conflicting feelings, which include disbelief (55-7). Cf. also 124 *furentem*, 197 *ardenti caeca furore*. For *indomitus* applied to emotions (*TLL* VII.1.1225.10-32) cf. e.g. Cic. *Dom.* 141 *inflammato atque indomito furore*, Virg. *Aen.* 2.594 *indomitas ... iras*. Literally 'untamed', it suggests an animal metaphor: contrast 62 (waves), 72 (thorny plants). Cf. also 50.11 *indomitus furore*, where the epithet seems transferred to the subject (Catullus), and contrast the other main metaphorical use seen at 63.33 *uelut iuuenca uitans onus indomita iugi* (Attis), 68.118 *indomitam ferre iugum docuit* (Laodamia): Ariadne is presumably no longer an 'unbroken' virgin. See 107, 173nn. on *indomitus* applied to both Theseus and the Minotaur.

in corde gerens *gerere* appears at all periods of harbouring emotions or attitudes: e.g. Enn. *Ann.* 44-5 Skutsch *tibi sunt ante gerendae | aerumnae*, Cic. *Diu.*

Caec. 66 *Catonem ... multis grauis inimicitias gessisse accepimus*, *Virg. Aen.* 12.48 *quam pro me curam geris*, *Plin. N.H.* 8.68 *odium aduersus equos gerunt naturale* (camels). For the use with an internal ‘place’ where the emotion is felt (*TLL* VII.1935.8-29) cf. esp. *Sen. Ag.* 127, 958 *animos uiriles corde tumefacto geris*.

Ariadna The subject of *prospectans*, *tuetur* and *gerens* is hardly a surprise after the names and other clues in 52-3, but the delayed confirmation of what the reader will have deduced is satisfying. The transmission as *Adriana* shows confusion with the Latin name-beginning seen in *(H)adria* (Adriatic) and related words, e.g. *(H)adrianus*: it became the standard medieval spelling of her name (see e.g. Heyworth (2007a) 196, *Ov. A.A.* 3.35 with Kenney’s apparatus).

55 necdum etiam A phrase extant first here, always in poetry and at the beginning of a hexameter until late prose authors (Fronto, *Apul. Apol.*, pseudo-Asconius: *TLL* V.2.931.7-14); see Fedeli on *Prop.* 1.9.17, who suspects a stereotyped archaism. Here the full meaning of both elements of each word is felt: ‘and not yet, even now’. Attention is drawn to the picture’s capturing of one transitory psychological moment, when Ariadne sees (52-3) and reacts emotionally (54) but does not yet comprehend. If ‘not yet’ refers to an undepicted later time when Ariadne does believe what she sees, this is ‘obedient’ in describing a picture (50-75n.), since it stresses what *cannot* be shown in a visual representation limited to one moment: cf. in another ecphrasis *Virg. Aen.* 8.697 *necdum etiam geminos a tergo respicit anguis* (an allusion: note the verb of seeing, and relationship of Cleopatra to Catullus’ Ariadne via Dido). However, a second-time reader who knows that the narrator will go on to describe other moments can also see *necdum* as referring to the scene later in the poem when Ariadne’s psychological state *has* changed (124-201; 124 *perhibent* n.). The phrase

may also have a metapoetic aspect, since narrator and reader are not yet very far into the ecphrasis: we are invited to reflect on whether we already ‘believe that we see’ the picture (see further below).

sese quae uisit uisere credit Ariadne’s gaze of surprise is parallel to the Nereids’ wonder at the Argo (15; cf. 12-18, 53nn.). This is the first of many explorations within the ecphrasis of vision and its reliability. Rees (1994) 77 points out the irony that Ariadne, seeing Theseus’ ship, cannot believe that he is really abandoning her, while Aegeus later commits suicide because he mistakenly interprets his sight of the same ship (241-5): for the moment, however, it is suggested to the *uestis*’ spectators (both the Thessalians and the reader) that sight may in fact be a reliable guide to the truth.

uisere has no sense of ‘go to see’ here (cf. 211, 63.48 and contrast 407, 11.10). Its use for *uidere* is metrically convenient (Kroll, comparing Lucretius’ usage) but also appropriate for an intent watching with astonishment and wonder (so Friedrich; cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.7-8 *omne cum Proteus pecus egit altos | uisere montis*, 2.15.2-4 *undique latius | extenta uisentur Lucrino | stagna lacu* with N—H, Tac. *Ann.* 14.63 *non alia exul uisentium oculos maiore misericordia adfecit*). On the consecutive use of two forms of the same verb see Wills 307-10 and especially the allusive words of Ovid’s Ariadne at *Her.* 10.31 *aut uidi aut fuerant quae me uidisse putarem* (see Barchiesi (1993) 348-9 on this text and Knox *ad loc.* on Ariadne’s state of mind in Ovid’s version). Voss’s emendation convincingly assumes that *uisit uisere* became corrupted to *sui tui se* by a combination of anagrammatisation (*uis* to *sui*), omission of one minim (*i*), a change in word division (*t uise* to *tui se*) and near-haplography (omission of *re* before *cre*—): cf. McKie (2009) 78 n.241.

56 utpote ... quae ‘naturally, since she’; cf. 67.43-4 *utpote quae mi | speraret nec linguam esse nec auriculam*. *utpote* is prosaic (Axelson 96), occurring in poetry (outside comedy) only on these two occasions in Catullus and four times in Horace’s hexameters (*Serm.* 1.4.24, 1.5.94, 2.4.9, *A.P.* 206), and the tone is also surprising for epic (cf. constructions such as *quippe qui ...* and LHS II §§300-1): the narrator conversationally intrudes to comment on the probability of his narrative, inviting the reader to agree. A metapoetic reading is again possible (55 *necdum etiam* n.): this could be a disguised version of the typical ecphrastic demand for consent, ‘you would see/say/think’ (e.g. Theoc. 1.42 φαίης κα, Virg. *Aen.* 8.650 *aspiceres*, Ov. *Met.* 6.104 *uerum taurum, freta uera putares*).

fallaci ... somno Sleep would normally be called ‘deceptive’ because of its association with misleading dreams (e.g. Lygd. 4.7 *somnia fallaci ludunt temeraria nocte*, V.Fl. 7.213 *uelut lenti fallatur imagine somni*): perhaps Ariadne wonders whether she is in a nightmare (Nuzzo). But *fallaci* here primarily refers to the way in which, by putting Ariadne into the vulnerable state in which she can be betrayed, her sleep has cooperated with Theseus, whom Ariadne calls *fallaci* at 151 (the only other occurrence of (–)fall– in the poem): Ovid develops this idea at *Her.* 10.5 *me somnusque meus male prodidit et tu*. The personification may evoke the winged figure of Hypnos, frequently shown with the abandoned Ariadne in ancient pictures in which she is still asleep (see *LIMC* s.v. ‘Ariadne’ nos. 52-4 for fourth-century vases, nos. 124, 126-7, 129 for Pompeian wall-painting).

tum primum excita Ariadne has woken up ‘then for the first time’, i.e. ‘just then’: the past participle *excita* fixes the other boundary of the depicted segment of time by stating what has already happened (55 indicated what has not happened yet). *excitus* with simple ablative *somno* and no *ex* or *a* is paralleled at e.g. Sall. *Iug.* 72,

Liv. 1.6.7, Sil. 17.100; cf. also 63.24 *ibi Somnus excitam Attin fugiens citus abiit* (50-75n.).

57 The transferred epithets (see below) and shared gender of *se* and *harena*, together with the musical effect of repeated *s*, *e* and *r* in *desertam in sola miseram se cernat harena* (Nuzzo), assimilate Ariadne to her surroundings to make the line a unified picture of abandonment concluding this initial description: see 50-75n.

desertam ... sola *solus* of places in the sense of ‘lonely’ for anyone in them rather than literally ‘alone’ is paralleled at e.g. 154 *sola sub rupe*, 184 *sola insula*, Virg. *Aen.* 11.545 *solorum nemorum* (see Horsfall *ad loc.*), 569 *solis ... montibus*; see OLD s.v. 3. However, since *desertus* is fairly common of abandoned people (TLL V.684.16-79) but even more so of places (TLL V.684.80-686.35) and is applied to the island later in the poem (133, 187), the combination of the two adjectives here gives the impression that they are both transferred: when they occur together elsewhere *solus* generally describes the person and *desertus* his environment (Prop. 1.18.30-2, the poet *solus* among *deserta ... saxa*; Virg. *Aen.* 4.467-8, Dido *sola* in a *deserta ... terra*; Ov. *Tr.* 5.7.41 *quid potius faciam desertis solus in oris*, of his own exile, perhaps alluding to this line). On such double hypallage see Bell (1923) 317ff.; a famous example which similarly assimilates subjects to their surroundings is Virg. *Aen.* 6.268 *ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram*. A similar effect can also be achieved simply by using the same epithet twice: cf. Prop. 2.19.7 *sola eris et solos spectabis, Cynthia, montes*.

The author of *Aetna*, reworking this line, keeps Ariadne’s epithet but varies that of the place: 22 *desertam uacuo Minoida litore questus*.

miseram se cernat Ariadne strikingly sees herself as part of the picture: *se cernat* refers to a different sight from all the other verbs of looking in 52-62 (*prospectans, tuetur, uisit, uisere, prospicit, prospicit*: cf. Syndikus 142 n.170). *miser* is common in Catullus, describing the situation of the unhappy lover (8.1, 10, 30.5, 50.9, 51.5, 76.12, 19, 91.2, 99.11, 15) but also, e.g., Catullus' grief at his brother's death (68a.14, 20, 30, 68b.92), Attis' situation on his own deserted shore (63.51, 61, cf. 50-75n.). Ariadne's being *misera* results from her having been abandoned in the lonely surroundings, but it is not clear how closely the word should be taken with *se cernat* or how much the latter should be understood to have the sense of 'perceived, realised'. 55 suggests that Ariadne is not yet fully enough aware of her situation for the reader to understand *miseram se cernat esse* here (instead, she sees that she is alone but does not yet realise that the sight of Theseus' departing ship means he really has abandoned her), so perhaps *miseram* is focalised through the narrator, like 71 *a misera*. By the time of her lament (cf. 124 *perhibent* n.) Ariadne is able to apply *misera* to herself (140, 196).

harena Precise and realistic (cf. 60 *ex alga* n.), and contributing to the vivid evocation of Ariadne's setting. The purple cloth that was the climax of the luxurious, urban description in 43-9 paradoxically portrays a wild, uncivilised landscape: the reader perhaps wonders how the colour and texture connoted by *harena* are depicted in the embroidered or woven picture (no clue is given: 51 *mira ... arte* n.). Cf. also Ov. *Fast.* 3.479-80 *quid me desertis morituram, Liber, harenis | seruabas* (where *desertus* again applies to the environment, see above): on Ariadne in *Fast.* 3 see 50-75, 132-201nn.

58 The line concludes with an unusual rhythm: whereas in typical Latin hexameter technique ictus and word-accent clash in the middle of the line and coincide at the end (see e.g. Bailey (1947) I.109-19), a strong caesura in the fifth foot extends the clash into that foot. This effect is less extreme either when the fifth-foot caesura is followed by a tetrasyllabic word, so that the word-accent at the beginning of the second half of the fifth foot is only a secondary accent (cf. 20 and 141 *hymenaeos*, 319 *calathisci*), or when a monosyllable occurs in the first half of the fifth foot, so that that foot at least begins with an ictus-accent coincidence (23 *o bona matrum*, 304 *sunt dape mensae*). For the further ‘restrictions’ usually observed by Virgil (and followed by later poets) on the shape of words around a fifth-foot strong caesura see Winbolt 135-40, Ewbank (1933) 63-4; as Ennius and to a large extent Lucretius and Cicero have more varied line-endings (Skutsch (1985) 49-51, Bailey (1947) I.113-19, Ewbank (1933) *loc. cit.*), Virgil probably shows the influence of a standardisation effected by Catullus and perhaps other neoterics (Norden (1903) 436-8). Here the uncompromisingly awkward series of three disyllables closing the line is unique in Catullus’ hexameters and elegiacs apart from the corrupt 68.157 (see Thomson *ad loc.*), and probably has expressive force rather than showing ‘carelessness’ (Ellis). The ictus-accent clash suggests the effort of the oars pulling at the water, possibly also the imperfect rowing rhythm of a ship hurrying to get away, in contrast to the calm sweep of the Argo’s oars in 7 (so Quinn here and (1962) 44-5). One Ennian example of the closing rhythm occurs in a similar ship-description which seems to have been influential on this line as well as 6-13 (*Ann.* 378 Skutsch, see below on *pellit uada remis*). Haste is also conveyed by the relatively high number of dactyls in the line (23 other lines in 64 have four and none have five; Ott (1973) 40), and especially by the swift dactylic opening as attention shifts to Theseus (see below on

at). For a different expressive effect achieved by the line-ending clash of ictus and accent, see also Putnam on Tib. 2.5.111.

immemor This ambiguous word dominates Catullus' presentation of Theseus, who will through Ariadne's curse be made to cause his father's death by the 'forgetfulness' with which he 'forgot' Ariadne (200-1n., 246-8). Here it initially conveys the calm blankness of Theseus' mind, to be contrasted with Ariadne's tumultuous emotions (54, 62nn.) and obsessive concentration on Theseus himself (68-70): its early position in the line emphasises this (see below on *at*) and by separating the adjective from *iuuenis* encourages the reader to read it as partly adverbial with *pellit*, linking this emotional contrast with the physical one between Ariadne's stillness and Theseus' swift movement.

Beyond this it is not yet clear whether the reader is to understand *immemor*, applied to Theseus' desertion of Ariadne, as 'accidentally forgetful' or 'deliberately heedless'. The former is possible given the existence of the mythical detail best attested in schol. Theoc. 2.45, in which Dionysus, desiring Ariadne, causes Theseus literally to forget about her. This divinely induced forgetfulness was one of various ways in which Theseus (typically because of his role as primary Athenian hero) could be absolved from blame for the well-known mythical fact that not he but Dionysus ended up married to Ariadne: he could be said to have been defeated by Dionysus with armed force (Paus. 10.29.4) or warned off by him in a dream (Diod. 4.61.6), told to leave by Hermes (Servius on Virg. *Georg.* 1.222) or swept away by a storm (Plut. *Thes.* 20.4). Some critics claim that *immemor* indicates that Catullus 'explicitly follows' the forgetfulness version (Giangrande (1977) 229, cf. e.g. Giangrande (1972) 126-30, Kroll, Lenchantin and already Muretus here). However, Theseus could be *immemor* of Ariadne because he was now more concerned with Athens (Philostr.

Imag. 1.15), with love for Aegle (Plut. *Thes.* 20.1, Athenae. 13.557b) or with possible *opprobrium* if he brought Ariadne home (Hyg. *Fab.* 43.1); perhaps the first is most likely here given what we hear of his motivation in 76-120 (so Harmon (1973) 319) but this is nowhere explicit. Ariadne also uses *immemor*, linking it to the *periuria* of which she accuses Theseus (135n.); lines 58-9 are probably focalised through her (50-75n.), but that still leaves the possibility that the narrator shares her judgement, here and when *immemor* recurs in his voice (123n., 248). Lygdamus apparently thought that Catullus judged Theseus guilty (Lygd. 3.6.41-2 *sic cecinit pro te doctus, Minoi, Catullus, | ingrati referens impia facta uiri*). But the narrator can presumably see the arrival of Bacchus, of which the reader is not told until 251: a viewer of the whole *uestis* would be justified in thinking that Theseus' leaving Ariadne behind was in some way caused by the god, and might judge him differently (Gaisser (1995) 607-8). A picture can present the known outcome of a myth without making clear the motivations among which a verbal description of the picture may have to choose: Philostratus' purported reaction to a picture of the abandoned Ariadne shows him aware of different versions of the myth and deliberately choosing one that blames Theseus (*Imag.* 1.15.1 τὴν Ἀριάδνην ὁ Θησεὺς ἄδικα δρῶν – οἱ δ' οὐκ ἄδικά φασιν, ἀλλ' ἐκ Διονύσου – κατέλιπεν, 1.15.3 Ἀριάδνην δὲ οὔτε οἶδεν ἔτι οὔτε ἔγνω ποτέ, φημὶ δ' αὐτὸν ἐκλελῆσθαι καὶ τοῦ λαβυρίνθου ...). The ambiguity of *immemor* in fact mimics the interpretative choices open to the ecphrastic narrator (50-75n.).

At Virg. *Aen.* 3.616-18 (Achaemenides) *hic me ... | immemores socii uasto Cyclopi in antro | deseruere*, Virgil activates the uncertainties of the Catullan usage to cover suggestively several possible motivations or layers of moral responsibility.

at Postponed (43n.). Cf. 251 *at*, similarly switching to another picture on the *uestis*.

iuuenis Theseus is consistently a *iuuenis* (181, 214), his companions (78) and the Argonauts (4) *iuuenes*. There is little evidence for the word in pre-Catullan Latin epic (in surviving fragments only Enn. *Ann. dub.* 15 Skutsch) and it may also have been rare in Republican tragedy (Jocelyn on Enn. *trag.* 123), so perhaps it was in neoteric *epos* that it became established as an appropriate word for an epic hero, as it is in Virg. *Georg.* 4 and *Aen.* See *TLL* VII.2.736.1-19. It is frequent of lovers in Latin elegy (Baehrens), and may be appropriate for Theseus as hero and lover (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.341, where *iuuenis* demonstrates that Coroebus plays both these roles). Apart from 100.2 Catullus' five uses of *iuuenis* outside 64 all occur in the marriage hymns 61 and 62, where there is some sense that a *iuuenis* is sexually eager but hard-hearted in a way that might suit Theseus (61.56 *fero iuueni*, 62.23 *iuueni ardenti*).

fugiens A loaded word that can be used neutrally, rather than *vice versa*; Catullus has *fugio* elsewhere of abandoning a lover (8.10, 37.11, 69.10, cf. 63.80), and it also occurs when Ariadne describes Theseus' action in a line that recapitulates this one (183n.). Here it could either be focalised through Ariadne or through the narrator in agreement with her (50-75n.). Cf. *fugio* and *fuga* in Virg. *Aen.* 4, where they form part of Dido's accusations of Aeneas (314 *mene fugis?*, 328, 430); though Aeneas denies to her the word's implications of cowardly deception (337-8), both he and the narrator elsewhere describe his departure as *fuga* (281, 400, 575).

pellit uada remis *pellere* appears first of a ship striking the sea at Enn. *Ann.* 378 Skutsch *caeruleum spumat sale conferta rate pulsum*, so this may be another allusion to the same passage of Ennius as in 6-13 (7 *uerrentes* n. and see above). The usage becomes fairly frequent, mostly in poetry (*TLL*.X.1.1018.8-20, to which Nuzzo

adds Germ. *Arat.* 154 *ne mihi tum remis pulset uada caerulea puppis*) and usually with oars specified as the instrument (a possible meaning for *rate* in Ennius: see Skutsch *ad loc.*). The suggestion that the ship treats the sea violently helps to link Theseus' sailing to that of the Argo (12). On *uada* see 6n.; here one might understand it literally, 'shallows', suggesting that Theseus is not far from the island. Cf. also Ov. *Met.* 3.657 *impellit properantibus aequora remis*, also of wicked sailors (the would-be kidnappers of Bacchus) hurrying away from Naxos (see further 139-40n.).

59 The image of worthless words being scattered to the winds is found at *Od.* 8.408-9 and was a commonplace: see N—H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.26.2, McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.4.11-12, Antolín on Lygd. 4.96, Otto 364-5, Granarolo (1967) 264 and 65.17 as well as examples below. However, the usual version in epic narration is a comment immediately after the words are spoken: e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 9.312, 10.652, 11.794-5, Ov. *R.A.* 286 (telling the story of Circe and Ulysses), Stat. *Ach.* 1.960 (closely imitating this line: *irrita uentosae rapiebant uerba procellae*). The speaker of the words (which may be oaths, entreaties, prayers, threats or advice) typically intends that they should be effective, but the omniscient narrator knows that the speaker will be frustrated and informs the reader of this in prolepsis: the general technique is Homeric (e.g. *Il.* 16.250-1). The use of the *topos* here is more like the version typical of personal love-poetry, where a disillusioned lover complains that his beloved's present unfaithfulness shows that his/her past words have gone to the winds: e.g. Prop. 2.28.8, 4.7.21-2, Ov. *Am.* 2.16.45-6, and in Catullus 70.3-4, 30.9-10 (though Alfenus is apparently friend rather than lover), and Ariadne's own judgement on Theseus, 142 (see n.). For this type to be embedded in the narration here therefore suggests either focalisation through Ariadne or the narrator's sympathy with her (50-

75n.). Given all this it is striking that Nonnus' formulation, also the narrator describing Theseus as he sails away, is so similar: *Dion.* 47.271 συνθεσίαν δ' ἀνέμοισιν ἐπέτρεπεν (it is also atypical of the *topos*, though occurring here and at 30.9-10, for the speaker to be the subject of the verb, deliberately giving his words to the winds). Cf. 132-201n.

The first of seven true 'golden' lines (7n.): the others are 129, 162, 163, 172, 235, 264. They quite often have a closural effect, as here (cf. Wilkinson (1963) 215-16); cf. also 42n.

irrita Theseus' promises are shown by his actions to have been 'unfulfilled', and perhaps when spoken were already 'ineffectual': the derivation of *irritus* (Ernout-Meillet s.v. *reor*) gives the word a range of meanings based on 'invalidated' or 'not (made) valid', allowing for its use with various different implications as to the time and agent of this invalidation. This may help explain why it became so frequent in all variations of the *topos* of words in the wind: e.g. *Virg. Aen.* 9.313, *Tib.* 1.4.22, *Lygd.* 4.96, 6.50, *Ov. Am.* 2.16.46, *A.A.* 1.634, *R.A.* 286, *Trist.* 1.8.35, *Claud. Rapt.* 3.133.

uentosae ... procellae Probably felt to be rather tautological: though *uenti* and *procellae* often occur in lists together, and *procella* can take a defining genitive of *uentus* (e.g. *Lucr.* 6.124 *uenti conlecta procella*) *uentosa* recurs with *procella* only at *Stat. Ach.* 1.960, imitating this line (see above). For adjectives characterising winds as capricious and violent see N—H on *Hor. Carm.* 1.26.2; the meaning of *uentosus* = 'fickle' (*OLD* s.v. 5) may well be relevant to its use here. Specifying the kind of wind, and using the singular (atypical for the *topos* and not determined by metre), also helps to particularise the image, practically identifying the metaphorical wind which takes Theseus' promises with the physical one blowing on the sea (cf. wave imagery for Ariadne's emotions, 62n.). Ovid several times makes this

identification explicit (*Her.* 2.25 (Phyllis) *uentis et uerba et uela dedisti*, 7.8 (Dido) *atque idem uenti uela fidemque ferent*, *Met.* 8.134 (Scylla) *an inania uenti | uerba ferunt, idemque tuas, ingrate, carinas?*), perhaps suggesting that he noticed the equivalence here: his earliest example concerns Ariadne (*Am.* 1.7.15-16 *talis periuri promissaque uelaque Thesei | fleuit praecipites Cressa tulisse Notos*) and may be a deliberate ‘improvement’ on Catullus who at this point mentions oars (58) rather than sails. The recurring references to literal and metaphorical winds throughout the ecphrasis (84, 107, 111, 142, 149, 164-6, 213, 238-40) form part of Catullus’ exploration of what verbal art can achieve that visual art cannot, as in a picture even representing the physical wind is difficult ‘since by definition it is both invisible and in motion’ (Jenkyns (1982) 126), using it symbolically still more so.

linquens (*re*)*linquo* is a key word in the ecphrasis, in which it is used for two pairs of actions. Theseus’ desertion of Ariadne, for which she blames him (123, 133, 200), balances her abandonment of her father, for which she feels guilty (117, 180); Theseus’ ‘leaving’ his *promissa* to the winds here is punished by his forgetting Aegeus’ *mandata*, which at 238-40 ‘leave’ him like clouds driven by wind from a mountain-top.

promissa Theseus’ promises are another detail from this initial scene repeated in Ariadne’s speech (139 *promissa*, 146 *promittere*, cf. 58 *immemor, fugiens* nn.) where one of her main charges against him is perjury (132-5, 174). They are not ‘marriage vows’: but since verbal consent was for Romans as much a part of the betrothal as of the actual marriage ceremony (Treggiari (1991) 146-7, 170-80), while 139-41 imply that Theseus’ *promissa* involved encouraging Ariadne to expect *conubia* and *hymenaeos*, they could be seen as a (quasi-)betrothal, certainly more far-

reaching than the promises of sex indicated by many uses of *promittere* between lovers (e.g. 110.3, 5, Prop. 2.17.1, Tib. 2.6.49).

60 quem The accusative puts Theseus firmly back into the background as the narrator's gaze returns to Ariadne.

procul On the meaning see 108n. *procul* need not be definitely taken 'with' *quem* (Baehrens) so that Theseus is 'separated from' Ariadne, or with *ex alga* (Ellis) or *prospicit* (Nuzzo) so that Ariadne is 'separated from' Theseus; it fits loosely into the sentence to emphasise in general terms the distance between them. However, its proximity to *ex alga* does suggest this distance is thought of in terms of Ariadne's 'real world' rather than the inches between the figures on the *uestis*; contrast 'artistic' use of *procul* in the ecphrasis of Aeneas' shield (Virg. *Aen.* 8. 635 *nec procul hinc Romam*, 642 *haud procul inde ... Mettum*, 666 *hinc procul addit | Tartareas etiam sedes*).

ex alga Unlike at 168 (see n.), *alga* has a specific point here, indicating Ariadne's precise position, which given 67n. (and the fact that tides are imperceptible in the Mediterranean) is not 'the tide-mark' (Quinn) but the water's edge, where the waves are bringing in seaweed. It seems that in a hopeless attempt to get closer to Theseus Ariadne has started to move into the sea towards him, as she does at 128-9. A vivid detail evoking desolation and loneliness (Ariadne has only the natural features of the beach for company, cf. 57 *harena* n.), as at Theoc. 11.14 ἐπ' ἄϊόνοϋς ... φυκιοέσσας, a probable influence on this passage since Polyphemus is another distraught lover alone on the shore and suffering from an internal wound inflicted by Venus/Aphrodite (Theoc. 11.15-16, cf. 72n.).

maestis Another recurrent word (of or transferred to Ariadne, 130, 202, 249; Fourcade (1979) 86 compares recurring *infelix* of Virgil's Dido). Appropriate to contexts of mourning (cf. *maeror*), it suggests Ariadne's irrevocable loss of Theseus, and at 210 *maesto ... parenti* links this to the fatal grief that Theseus also causes Aegeus. Ovid's Ariadne repeats the word of herself at *Her.* 10.134, 147. *maestus* is used elsewhere of the face (e.g. [Cic.] *Ad Her.* 3.27 *maesto et conturbato uultu*, Virg. *Aen.* 6.156 *maesto defixus lumina uultu*, Ov. *Met.* 6.304-5 *lumina maestis | stant immota genis*), but while its application to eyes also occurs at 68.55 *maesta ... lumina* it is rare outside Catullus (*TLL* VIII.47.79-48.14 gives only Prud. *Psych.* 699 *oculos*, V.Fl. 4.248 *lumina*). Rees (1994) 78-9 analyses the motif of the eyes, the physical organ of the gaze, as 'an index of emotion' in the poem (Ariadne's love begins in her eyes, 86, 91-2nn.; Aegeus refers to his eyes in the context of his love for Theseus, 219-20, 233).

Minois The patronymic alone is used to refer to Ariadne here and at 247; also in Ap. *Arg.* (2.999, 4.433, 1691; once together with her name, 3.998), in later Latin poetry (e.g. Prop. 2.14.7, Lygd. 6.41, Ov. *Her.* 16.349, *Met.* 8.174, *Ciris* 201, Sen. *Phaed.* 127) and in Nonnus (47.424, 48.548). The use of an alternative name may simply be for the sake of 'Hellenistic' learned display (though Ariadne's parentage is hardly obscure), *uariatio*, or alliteration with *maestis*, but it also hints at Theseus' adventures on Crete and the beginning of his relationship with Ariadne there (in the poem, 76-115), in which Minos is of course prominent.

ocellis The poem's first diminutive: though it is not always certain whether some nouns and adjectives should be counted as diminutives or not (Gow (1932)), other clear examples in the poem are 88 *lectulus*, 103 *munuscula*, 104 *labello*, 131 *frigidulos*, 283 *corollis*, 316 *aridulis*, 331 *languidulos*. Diminutives are frequent in

Catullus' long poems and polymetrics, but not in the epigrams (Ross (1969) 22-6, cf. also Ronconi (1953) 107-50); they are a feature of ordinary speech, but in Catullus' longer poems the way in which they import a personal, colloquial tone becomes stylised, a 'conscious poeticism' (Ross (1969) 25). For diminutives in the surviving fragments of other neoterics, who may have been following the innovations of poets such as Laevius (Gow (1932) 156), see Courtney on Cinna fr. 11 (which has three in one elegiac couplet). It certainly seems likely that the use of diminutives in 'higher' genres was considered particularly neoteric, since Augustan poets mostly avoid them and sometimes make generic distinctions (e.g. Horace has diminutives in *Satires* and *Epistles* but not *Odes* and *Epodes*) but the 'belated neoteric' *Ciris* is full of them (Lyne (1978) 26). In Catullus they are almost always used to convey some emotional attitude towards the thing referred to or described, whether affectionate or disparaging (see Fordyce on 3.18 for the possible range): the repeated association of diminutives with Ariadne gives an effect that in suggesting that everything about her is small and vulnerable is both pathetic and slightly patronising, and *ocellis* here is one of the first indications that the narrator's attitude to her can be distanced as well as sympathetic.

Diminutives for body parts are common in Latin (Gow (1932) 153, noting words diminutive in form but lacking synonyms, e.g. *capillus*, *papilla*); *ocellus* is relatively frequent in Catullus (also at 3.18, 31.2, 43.2, 45.11, 50.10, 19), though in the epigrams only *oculus* is used. *ocellus* survived into Augustan poetry better than most neoteric diminutives, being adopted by Propertius and Ovid with a fixed reference to the eyes of a woman, usually a beloved: see Axelson 41, 43.

61 saxeae ut effigies bacchantis The first simile in the poem, which like the last (Polyxena/sacrificial victim, 369) is a phrase simile filling less than one line (contrast developed ‘epic’ similes, 105-11n.) and emphasises the pathetic state of a heroine whose suffering is caused by a hero (Murgatroyd (1997) 83). *ut* is probably in anastrophe (43n.: ‘like the stone statue of a bacchant’) but alternatively *saxeae* might apply metaphorically to Ariadne (‘stony, like the statue of a bacchant’): for metaphorical words blurring the distinction between simile and surrounding narrative (‘trespass’), see Lyne (1989) 92-9. This would give particular prominence to one aspect of the simile, that Ariadne is ‘as if turned to stone’ because shock makes her unable to move. For this simple metaphor or comparison cf. e.g. Eur. *Med.* 28-9 ὥς δὲ πέτρος ἢ θαλάσσιος | κλύδων ἀκούει νουθετουμένη φίλων, Plaut. *Truc.* 818 *lapideus sum, commouere me miser non audeo*, Virg. *Aen.* 6.470-1, Ov. *Am.* 1.7.51, *Met.* 5.509 *mater ad auditas stupuit ceu saxeae uoces*, Stat. *Theb.* 5.723-4 *illa uelut rupes inmoto saxeae uisu | haeret*, Apul. *Met.* 6.14 *mutata in lapide Psyche*; it is the version used by Ovid (*Her.* 10.50 *quamque lapis sedes, tam lapis ipsa fui*) but whereas his Ariadne is assimilated to the rock on which she sits, Catullus’ is hard and stony in contrast to the soft surrounding sand (57), seaweed (60) and gently moving waves (67). Ariadne, however, is not just like stone but like a statue (cf. e.g. Eur. *Hec.* 560-1 μαστοὺς δ’ ἔδειχε στέρνα θ’ ὥς ἀγάλματον | κάλλιστα, *A.P.* 5.194.3-4 οἷα τε λόγδου | γλυπτὴν, Apul. *Met.* 3.10 *fixus in lapide steti gelidus nihil secus quam una de ceteris theatri statuis*); this adds to the notion of stillness that of artistic contemplation, as notably of Narcissus at Ov. *Met.* 3.419 *uultuque inmotus eodem | haeret ut e Pario formatum marmore signum*. Against these associations is set the idea of a bacchant: usually the relevant attributes in Bacchic comparisons are a wild, distracted emotional state, movement and perhaps noise (e.g. *Il.* 22.460 μαινάδι ἴση

(Andromache rushes out to the battlements in fear for Hector, cf. 63-5n.), Virg. *Aen.* 4.300-1 *totamque incensa per urbem | bacchatur* (Dido), Ov. *A.A.* 1.312 *ut Aonio concita Baccha deo* (Pasiphae), *Ciris* 167 *infelix uirgo tota bacchatur in urbe*). The first of these certainly applies to Ariadne, who is also to some extent ‘possessed’ like a bacchant since she is ‘maddened’ by Venus (71-2): the latter two do not. This paradox of the stillness of a figure which by its very nature ought to be moving is precisely what is exploited by real statues of bacchants, and also by the image of the sleeping bacchant in poetry (e.g. Eur. *Bacch.* 683-8, Prop. 1.3.5-6, Ov. *Am.* 1.14.21-2) and visual art (see McNally (1985)).

The usual comment on this simile (first in Muretus) is that Ariadne is like the statue of a bacchant in her combination of physical stillness and emotional turmoil; yet a stone statue does not really feel emotions (Laird (1993) 21 n.22 notes that the slightly tautological *saxea effigies* occurs in Tac. *Ann.* 2.61 of a statue that comes to life, the adjective emphasising the unexpectedness of this), and an emotional bacchant is not still. The simile therefore fascinates because it is irreducibly unstable – Ovid picks apart its two images for his Ariadne, who is *either* running about like a bacchant *or* as still as stone (Ov. *Her.* 10.47-50) – even before the reader remembers that Ariadne is actually a work of pictorial art who is here compared to another one. The fact that this is a simile, only possible in language, encourages the reader to reflect on what is possible in poetry but not in visual art (cf. 50-75n.): the images of stone statue and flexible tapestry are both created for the reader by the poet’s words, which also create the human Ariadne who alone is able to feel the emotions that are the primary point of the comparison.

The simile is also proleptic: as the poem’s first hint of the Dionysiac (cf. 63 *mitram* n.) it foreshadows the appearance of Bacchus and his (moving, noisy)

followers at 251-64. Ariadne's marriage to Bacchus may mean that she becomes in some sense a bacchant herself (see Panoussi (2003) 114-21); she begins to be presented in this way in Greek vase-painting from the late fifth-century onwards (Webster (1966) 29, Eisner (1977) 178), and appears leading groups of bacchants at Prop. 2.3.18 and in Nonnus.

eheu Bergk's correction of transmitted *heue* makes this an interjection from the narrator, like 71 *a* (since there is no explicit indication that it might be spoken by Ariadne, and the simile implies that she is silent as well as still). Such an exclamation of pity might seem to show a different attitude from the detached artistic appreciation implied by e.g. the simile and 63-5 (see n.; so e.g. Armstrong (2006) 191), but it could also be similarly self-indulgent, reacting with satisfaction to the effectiveness of an artistic creation which can move even its creator. The alternative, *euhoē* (first Aldine edition) would have to be construed with *bacchantis* '...the statue of someone crying the Bacchic cry *euhoē*' (cf. 255 *euhoē bacchantes*). But the distance from *bacchantis* tells against this, as does the way *eheu* works with the repeated *prospicit* that sandwiches it: though the relation between exclamation and verb is not as clear as in Hor. *Carm.* 3.2.8-9 *et adulta uirgo | suspiret, eheu*, where *eheu* can practically be taken as the object of *suspiret* (West 'let them sigh their sighs') or direct speech after it, *prospicit, eheu | prospicit* implies that the narrator recognises the 'futility' (Ellis) of Ariadne's insistent gaze. However, in that *eheu* sounds similar to *euhoē* it could also be another anticipation of the Bacchic scene, even a thin echo standing in the same relation to *euhoē* as a statue of a bacchant does to a real bacchant (cf. Laird (1993) 21 '*Eheu* could be a live rendition of the frozen Maenad crying, 'Euhoē').

61-2 prospicit, ... | prospicit et For the epanalepsis see 27 *ipse ... diuum genitor* n. Greek examples repeat nouns; the earliest extant example in Latin involves a verb (Cic. *Progn.* 4.5-6 *acredula uocibus instat, | uocibus instat*, cf. also 66.75-6 *quam me afore semper, | afore me a dominae uertice discrucior*, Lucr. 2.955-6 *uincere*, 5.298-9 *instant*, Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.39-40 *ibit*) but ‘verbs did not become common in this construction until Ovid’ (Wills 131: see further 176-8), who has an example in one of his treatments of Ariadne: *Her.* 10.33 *nec languere diu patitur dolor; excitor illo, | excitor et summa Thesea uoce uoco*. Although it is typical for the repeated verb in the new line to be followed by *et* or another conjunction, that usually leads into a new action, as in Ov. *Her.* where the point is precisely that Ariadne’s *dolor* prompts her to break out of her inactivity and try a new way of reaching out to Theseus; here, though we might perhaps understand that as Ariadne continues to look her internal anguish gets worse (Baehrens), the emotional state described after *et* does not sound very different from that in 54. Especially since *prospicit* is in any case a near-repetition of 52 *prospectans* and of the sense of 53 *tuetur*, the repeated verb is more likely to strike the reader as an illustration of the depicted Ariadne’s frozen state (50-75n.).

62 magnis curarum fluctuat undis The image recurs of Ariadne in love at 97-8. It is also used at 65.4 *tantis fluctuat ipsa malis*, and is shared by Lucretius (3.298 *capere irarum fluctus*, 6.33-4 *et genus humanum frustra plerumque probauit | uoluere curarum tristes in pectore fluctus*, 6.74 *magnos irarum uoluere fluctus*); Virgil alludes to Catullus’ diction particularly at *Aen.* 4.531-2 *ingeminant curae rursusque resurgens | saeuit amor, magnoque irarum fluctuat aestu* (Dido), 8.19 *magno curarum fluctuat aestu*. Here waves are of course appropriate to Ariadne’s surroundings (cf. 67 *fluctus salis* n.); it is as if the narrator, deducing Ariadne’s

emotional state from visual clues on the *uestis*, is inspired by the depicted waves to apply this particular metaphor. This could reflect a technique available to a visual artist, as when the turbulent brushstrokes in the background of a Van Gogh self-portrait symbolise the subject's psychological state. The verbal artist might be demonstrating what the visual artist can achieve, or conversely showing that a poet has still more power because he can deploy something visual in the verbal trick of metaphor; but as the picture in question here is in fact created by the poet's own words (50-75n.), it is he who gains the credit for the linking of internal and external waves in either case.

curae = generally 'painful emotions' (πάθη, Kroll) as well as the problems they cause at least since Enn. *Sat.* 14 Vahlen² *sine cura laetus lautus* (see further *TLL* IV.1469.65ff.). Like 54 *furores* (see n.), Ariadne's *curae* here and at 250 could be anger, grief, incredulity etc. as well as residual love of Theseus (called *curae* at 72, 95; cf. 2.10, 66.23, 68.18, 51). The plural *curarum* and the image of seething waves in fact suggest turbulent and indefinable emotions jumbled together, with those that rise to the surface at one moment soon to be replaced by others; even this psychological description implies an element of undepictable movement and time.

63-5 Deliberately casting off outer clothes, like tearing hair or disfiguring the face, can be a sign of grief on hearing bad news: e.g. *Hymn. Hom.* 2.40-2 (Demeter on hearing the abducted Persephone cry out). But Ariadne is apparently just not thinking about her clothes (68-9); cf. *Ov. Her.* 20.207-8 (Acontius describes his first sight of Cydippe) *te dum nimium miror, nota certa furoris, | deciderint umero pallia lapsa meo*, which has the same details – albeit rhetorically presented by their subject – of a fixed gaze at another person completely distracting someone's attention from the

immediate physical concerns of his/her own body, and a stunned human figure (206 *restiterim fixis in tua membra genis*) off which the still fluid clothing falls. Tartaglino (1986) argues that Catullus may be alluding to Andromache's reaction to the death of Hector (*Il.* 22.460-72), and in particular the detailed description of the loss of clothing (468-72). In Homer this is only one article, but that is a headdress (cf. 63 *mitram*); as it is said to have been given to Andromache by Aphrodite on her wedding-day its loss symbolises the tragic end of her marriage (see Richardson *ad loc.*), so the evocation of Andromache would increase the pathos of Ariadne's situation, both deprived of Theseus and not yet even married to him. Cf. also 66 *delapsa* n. On a more realistic level, Ariadne's dishevelment is appropriate for one who has just woken from sleep, perhaps preceded by sex (Quinn (1962) 43).

On the triple line-initial anaphora cf. 19-21, 38-42nn. and 257-9 (*pars*). The patterning of the other words is even more regular than in 39-41: after the *non* each line has two adjectives, two nouns and one verb as in 'golden' and similar lines (7n.), and each time the verb is a participle with Ariadne as its subject while one noun-adjective pair describes a part of her body and the other an item of clothing. As in 38-40, every line has a molossus after the main caesura (1 *prognatae* n.). This draws attention to the presence of the narrator, gazing at Ariadne's body and slowly revealing it to the reader: while a viewer of the *uestis* would see the extent of Ariadne's state of undress immediately, the reader does not know until 66, and the effect is of the narrator removing garments one by one in 63-5 with the slow regularity of a strip-tease, especially since to the movement down Ariadne's body (63 *uertice* n.) the progression from 64 *amictu* to 65 *strophio* adds an inward one. The contrast between this control and Ariadne's carelessness causes critics to argue that 'Catullus' is separate from Ariadne here (e.g. Jenkyns (1982) 116-17, Griffin (1985)

98), enjoying her distress aesthetically rather than identifying with it (but cf. 59 *immemor*, 61 *eheu* nn.). Certainly the reader is particularly aware at this point that he is looking at Ariadne in the presence of someone else, the narrator, a fact which adds an extra frisson to the voyeurism of gazing at nakedness; see Fitzgerald's comparison to wall-paintings in which a satyr or Pan has come across a sleeping nymph or Bacchant and lifted her clothes to look at her front while the viewer of the picture sees a rear view, also naked (Fitzgerald (1995) 147).

63 flauo Ariadne is blonde in Hesiod (*Theog.* 947 χρυσοκόμης δὲ Διώνυσος ξανθὴν Ἀριάδην) and καλλιπλόκαμος in Homer (*Il.* 18.592), but the detail here is more likely to be influenced by the general tendency for mythical heroes and heroines to be called fair-haired (see Pease on Virg. *Aen.* 4.590). In Catullus cf. 98 *flauo* ... *hospite* (Theseus), 68.130 *flauo* ... *uiro* (Protesilaus) – both in contexts where sexual attractiveness is stressed – and 66.62 *flauī uerticis exuuiāe* (Berenice); these are the earliest extant examples of *flauus* applied to hair (*TLL* VI.1.888.48-889.40). Apart from 65 *lactentis* (see n.) this is the only colour word in the initial descriptive passage of the ecphrasis (52-75), and there is no suggestion of how the materials of the tapestry conveyed the colour; contrast e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 8.659 *aurea caesaries* ... *atque aurea uestis*, of the Gauls on Aeneas' shield.

retinens 'holding in place' (*OLD* s.v. 4, cf. 311), rather than simply 'continuing to wear': it suggests that the *mitra* was already loose and fell off because Ariadne did not make a deliberate attempt to hold on to it. The *Ciris*'s two imitations of this line (170 *non niueo retinens bacata monilia collo*, 511 *purpureas flauo retinentem uertice uittas* (cf. also 309)) use the participle of less appropriate items, and in the latter case of one that is in no danger of coming adrift (see Lyne *ad loc.*).

subtilem Used literally, ‘woven from fine threads’ (*OLD* s.v. 1). The varied adjectives used of the clothes in 63-5 all add to the eroticism of the description: the overlapping meanings of ‘fine’ (*subtilem*, perhaps also 65 *tereti*, see n.) and ‘light’ (64 *leui*) imply both ease of removal and possible transparency. The references to high-quality textiles may remind us that the subtle embroidery or weaving of the *uestis* has depicted all these garments, and perhaps suggest the craftsmanship of the poet behind this (cf. 10 *pineae* ... *texta* n.).

uertice Following the path the fallen clothes have taken, the narrator leads the reader’s gaze downwards from head to foot (67 *pedes*). Laird (1993) 26 suggests that this may be one way in which this pictorial ecphrasis obeys rhetoricians’ rules for descriptions, citing Aphthonius, *Progymnasmata* 37.9-11: see further Kenney on *Moretum* 32-5.

mitram The first item in the description, so to the reader the first to be lost (63-5n.): as in more modern societies, headgear is both an outer item which is easy to remove, and something whose removal is symbolic. On the *mitra* in general see *RE* XV.2.2217-20, Olson (2008) 53. In Greek a μίτρα can be various sorts of ‘headband’ with which women tie up their hair, but is usually felt to be Near Eastern in origin: in the earliest surviving references, Alcman 1.67-8 *PMG* calls the μίτρα ‘Lydian’, and Sappho 98b Voigt refers to it as a recent import to Ionia from Sardis. In Latin too it can have ‘Eastern’ connotations, especially associated with ‘Eastern’ effeminacy when worn by men (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 4.216 and Servius *ad loc.* *utebantur et Phryges et Lydi mitra*) but these can blend with the idea that Greece too is part of the ‘luxurious East’ (e.g. Lucr. 4.1123-30), or a *mitra* may simply be an appropriate object within the world of Greek myth (e.g. Ov. *Fast.* 4.517 *mitraque capillos presserat*, of Demeter). The last of these adequately explains Ariadne’s *mitra* here, but her

situation may activate further associations. She has just woken up (56), and *mitra* may have been the name for a piece of cloth keeping the hair in place in bed (Eur. *Hec.* 923-6, Prop. 2.29.15-16): the suggestion that she might have bothered with a nightcap on Dia would add an ironically humorous aspect to the narrator's detachment here. The garment is also associated with Bacchus and bacchantes, and Tatham (1990) therefore argues that like the simile of 61 (see n.) its presence foreshadows Ariadne's Bacchic future; however, the fact that she is describing as *losing* it makes this suggestion less compelling. In Hellenistic and later Greek poetry, meanwhile, a μίτρη can be a piece of cloth wrapped round the body rather than the head (e.g. Ap. *Arg.* 1.288, Call. *Hymn* 1.21, 4.222, *Epigr.* 39.3). Since Apollonius' Medea wears one around her breasts (Ap. *Arg.* 3.867, 1013) it could be a piece of etymological play to use the word in its more usual sense just before referring to a breast-band. And at Ap. *Arg.* 4.1024-5 ἔτι μοι μίτρη μένει ... ἄχραντος καὶ ἀκήρατος, Medea's μίτρη has become a girdle symbolising virginity; the loss of a μίτρη prefigures the loss of virginity at [Theoc.] 27.55 and stands for it at Mosch. *Eur.* 164 λῦσε δέ οἱ μίτρη, the climax of the poem. Here the narrator only mentions the *mitra* to say that Ariadne has lost it and does not care about it: there could be a punning allusion to Moschus, involving the loosened garments of a sexually vulnerable heroine on the seashore.

64 contecta ... pectus A 'retained' accusative dependent on a past participle as if it were deponent (also 65 *uineta papillas*). These examples represent a typical use, apparently an idiomatic survival of the Latin middle voice, with verbs of dressing and undressing in which the accusative object is part of the agent's body and the item of clothing or similar is in the ablative (e.g. Enn. *Ann.* 519 Skutsch *succincti corda*

machaeris; common in Virgil, e.g. *Ecl.* 7.32 *suras euincta cothurno*); different are 207-8 *mentem ... consitus*, 296 *restrictus membra*, representing the adoption of the Greek ‘accusative of respect’. See LHS II §44, Skutsch (1977), Harrison (1991) 290-1. The generalised *pectus*, ‘chest’, teases the reader slightly before 65 *papillas* confirms that Ariadne’s breasts are visible.

uelatum can be explained as ‘quod uelatum fuerat’ (Kroll, comparing Tib. 1.6.67-8 *quamuis non uitta ligatos | impediatur crines*); the pleonasm with *contecta* is defensible in terms of Catullus’ style elsewhere in the poem (e.g. 44 *fulgenti splendent*, 49 *tincta ... purpura*, 192 *multantes uindice poena*, 221 *gaudens laetanti pectore*) and could also suggest layers of wrapping falling off Ariadne. *uelare* occurs commonly with *amictus*, especially in poetry (e.g. 266 *uelabat amictu*), and also contributes to the sound patterning in these lines (‘*lěv-* is answered by *věl-*’ (Jenkyns (1982) 117)).

However, *uelatum* breaks the otherwise perfect grammatical symmetry of 63-5 (see n.): it is formally parallel to *flauo* and *lactentis*, and a conjecture which similarly emphasised the beauty and probably the colour of what was exposed would be worth considering. Unfortunately such a conjecture is elusive. *uesanum* (Riese) involves understanding *pectus* in an emotional sense inappropriate to this purely physical description, while *laniatum* (Owen), *uiolatum* (Haverfield) and *uariatum* (Nisbet) express ugliness, not beauty (breasts ‘lined and coloured with veins’, as Nisbet describes them, might possibly be erotic but would be incongruous with the kind of beauty implied by *lactentis papillas*); there has also been no suggestion that this still, shocked Ariadne has been behaving violently or beating her breast to make it *laniatum* or *uiolatum*, and a contrast between her breasts and those of the mothers of Achilles’ victims (351 *uariabunt pectora palmis*) is just as effective as an

anticipation. Kakridis' *decoratum* cannot describe naked flesh, and Fea's *bullatum* ('wearing the *bulla* of childhood') is anachronistic and irrelevant. *niueum per* (Maehly) and *niueum tum* (Baehrens *olim*) have the required sense (and cf. Mart. 14.149.2 *niueo pectore*), but the extra monosyllables are not only otiose in meaning, they again spoil the symmetry of 63-5 by breaking the pattern of six-word lines and the run of molossi. Schwabe's *nudatum*, recently accepted by Nuzzo and Trappes-Lomax, is just as tautological as the transmitted text. McKie's *praeclarum* is better, but still not specifically visual enough to stand in the text: it means 'outstanding', 'magnificent' quite vaguely even when applied to beauty (of the *facies* = general 'appearance', Lucr. 5.1174, Sall. *Iug.* 2.2), and only appears once of a particular body part, the *uultus*, with similar vagueness: Lucr. 4.1033 *nuntia praeclari uultus pulchrique coloris*.

amictu Like *pectus*, vague epic diction, contrasting with the more specific *mitra* and especially *strophium*. *amictus* could refer to almost any garment wrapped around the upper body (Croom (2000) 91, cf. Ernout-Meillet s.v. *amicio*) and is used of the *uestis* itself at 266.

65 tereti Usually understood as 'round', i.e. 'curving' around or 'encircling' the breasts. This sense would share with 63 *subtilem* and 64 *leui* the connotations of smooth cloth against Ariadne's body, and is supported by Catullan usage (the bacchants' cymbals, 262; the Fates' distaff weight, 314; the tomb of Achilles, 363; the bride's arm, 61.174). But 'fine', again with reference to the fine threads of the fabric (63 *subtilem* n.) is also a possibility (Baehrens; cf. N—H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.28 for this 'rare meaning'), both here and at Ov. *Fast.* 2.320 *teretem zonam*. This would bring the meaning of adjective even closer to *subtilem* and *leui*.

strophio Non. 538 *strophium est fascea brevis quae uirginalem horrorem cohibet papillarum*. Either *strophium* or *fascea* (the latter seems to have become the more common word: *TLL* V.296.81-297.27) could refer to this piece of underwear, a long strip of cloth or leather wound around and/or under the breasts to support or confine them ('brassière', Quinn; 'stomacher' (Jenkyns (1982) 117) is closer). Artistic representations could show Aphrodite/Venus (as well as prostitutes or entertainers) tying or untying such a breast-band (*LIMC* s.v. 'Aphrodite in periphēria orientali' nos. 170-81, cf. Goldman (2001) 235), but a reference to one belonging to a mythical heroine is unexpected. The references to Medea's breast-band in Ap. *Arg.* 3 (63 *mitram* n.) were probably influential, but Catullus uses a more precise word which is not elsewhere found in high genre poetry (in Greek στρόφιον occurs mostly in comedy (Pherecr. fr. 106, Ar. *Lys.* 931, *Thesm.* 139, 251, 255, 638, fr. 647), in Latin in Nonius' citations (Turp. Phil. 196, Cic. *orat.* fr. 24, Var. *Men.* 463.2), once more in each of Cicero and Varro (Cic. *Har.* 44.5, Var. *De uit.* 47.1) and once in Plautus (*Aul.* 835)). The realism is intimate and perhaps, in these mannered lines of otherwise epic diction, humorous. Ariadne's *strophium* could easily have slipped downwards if loosened in her sleep (see the accounts of experiments with tying breast-bands in Croom (2000) 93, Goldman (2001) 235).

lactentis ... papillas Beautiful skin is conventionally called *lacteus* (e.g. Stat. *Silu.* 2.1.50-1 *heu lactea colla | bracchiaque*), and a similar meaning of *lactens* = 'milk-white' is demanded by Petron. 86.5 *impleui lactentibus papillis manus*, since the *papillae* there belong to a boy; cf. also *A.P.* 5.56.5 *μαζοὶ γλαγόντες*, in a conventional list of beautiful attributes, and Watt (1984) 131, who suggests reading *lactens pectore* at Mart. 12.38.4, and note that 'white' *papillae* must be breasts, not nipples (on this distinction see Horsfall on Virg. *Aen.* 11.803). This is presumably

the primary meaning here, since there is no suggestion elsewhere in the poem that Ariadne is pregnant, let alone lactating, which alongside ‘suckling’ is the usual meaning of the participle; the only surviving version in which she does conceive by Theseus is the ἰδιον ... λόγον attributed by Plutarch to Paion of Amathusia (*Thes.* 20), in which she dies in childbirth on Dia. *lactens* might also convey ‘full’ shape (Thomson; Ellis compares ‘swelling’ grain at Virg. *Georg.* 1.315, Ov. *Fast.* 1.351, where however there is an obvious analogy between milk and sap). But the choice of word does highlight the sterility of Ariadne’s relationship with Theseus: cf. 92n., 198. The appearance of bare breasts links three contrasting descriptions in the poem: also the Nereids (18, cf. 53n.), the Trojan mothers (351).

uincta Normal of being clothed (*OLD* s.v. 2a), though possibly the sense that Ariadne is ‘released’ from her breast-band contributes to the narrator’s or reader’s voyeuristic enjoyment. Isid. *Orig.* 19.33.3 *strophio lactantes cincta papillas* is probably misremembering (he attributes the line to Cinna), although *cincta* would be equally acceptable with this meaning (e.g. Apul. *Met.* 2.8 *balteo suo cincta*).

66 The line is filled with words for totality, yet, strictly speaking, *omnia quae* refers only to the items mentioned in 63-5; the conflict with the suggestion of complete nakedness in *toto ... corpore* again foregrounds the question of how much of Ariadne’s body is visible (64n., cf. 129n.). *omnia, toto, passim* emphasise metaphorically Ariadne’s complete lack of concern for herself, balancing the description of her focus on Theseus at 69-70 *toto | toto ... tota*.

omnia quae ‘all of which’, a straightforward phrase, more common in prose than poetry. It opens a line with this resumptive sense also at 76.9 *omnia quae ... credita*, several times in Lucretius (2.321, 1033, 4.608, 5.465, 6.760), apparently once

in Propertius (1.3.25, but see Heyworth, *Cynthia ad loc.*), once in Virgil (*Georg.* 1.167); in the one surviving pre-Catullan example of its appearance in this position (Cic. *Arat.* 371 *omnia quae Cancer praeclaro detulit ortu | cedunt obscurata*) it refers forward, ‘everything that ...’. The effect is slightly deflating (cf. 56 *utpote ... quae* n.), as if the narrator suddenly tires of his slow and painstaking description in 63-5: cf. also 11.13 *omnia haec*.

delapsa Further emphasising the ease and fluidity with which the clothes slid away. If of the transmitted readings at *Il.* 22.468 Catullus read $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon$ rather than $\beta\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon$, this would provide a close parallel and possible model (Tartaglini (1986) 153-5; 63-5n.).

passim ‘in all directions’. Cf. the combination of *omnis* and *passim* used of cargo scattered in a shipwreck at Plaut. *Trin.* 834, *Culex* 356-7.

67 ipsius ante pedes ‘before her very feet’, drawing attention to the central figure as at 43n., and emphasising that despite 66 *passim* the clothes have not gone far, yet Ariadne does nothing to retrieve them. The detail also implies that the *fluctus salis* are close to Ariadne’s feet, i.e. that in the picture she is standing at the very edge of the sea (cf. 60 *ex alga* n.); the spectator or reader must presumably infer that she rushed there after waking up, and that her clothes, which are touched by the water (*alludebant*) fell off once she got there. *ipsius ante* (a rare combination) also opens a line at Virg. *Aen.* 1.114 *ipsius ante oculos* (Orontes sees the destruction of his ship) with the same focus on helplessness in the face of one’s surroundings.

fluctus salis ‘Salty waves’, *fluctus salsi*, occur at Acc. *trag.* 562 Ribbeck³, Plaut. *Trin.* 821, Virg. *Aen.* 5.182, 237-8, 775-6 (also *undae salsae*, Lucr. 6.891, 895); but ‘waves of the salt [sea]’ is probably Grecising, imitating e.g. *Od.* 12.68

κύμαθ' ἄλως, *Hymn. Hom.* 33.15 κύματα ... λευκῆς ἄλως, *Ap. Arg.* 1.107 κῦμ' ἄλως εὐρείης. The poetic metonymy *sal* = 'sea' appears first in Ennius (*Ann.* 378 Skutsch, cf. *trag.* 179 Jocelyn) as well as at Lucr. 4.438 and frequently in Virgil, probably inspired by the Greek use of ἅλς ('salt' (masculine) and derivatively, in poetry, 'sea' (feminine): see Chantraine s.v.). Also at 128 *salis* ... *undas* (the phrase is otherwise most closely paralleled at Ov. *Pont.* 1.1.70 *unda salis*), and cf. 6 *uada salsa* n. *salis* introduces the idea of taste or smell, senses that cannot literally be appealed to by either verbal or visual art (cf. 52 *fluentisono* ... *litore* n.). For the relationship between physical and emotional waves affecting Ariadne see 62n.; the contrast between the seething billows of *curae* inside her and the playful wavelets around her feet emphasises the indifference of the natural world (cf. 164-8, 178-9, 184-7).

alludebant Both 'playing with' (see above) and, since *ad-* is 'from the point of view of the sea itself' (Pease on Cic. *N.D.* 2.100), 'lapping up against'. The verb occurs several times of the action of a body of water on an object which is either at its edge (Ov. *Met.* 4.342, Plin. *N.H.* 26.39, Sen. *Oed.* 267, Minuc. Fel. 3.3) or trailing on top of it (Stat. *Theb.* 9.336, with reference to Europa's feet as she rides the bull); see further *TLL* I.1698.65-1699.1 and cf. Tarrant on Sen. *Thy.* 156-7. The construction with an accusative object (66 *omnia*) is paralleled at V.Fl. 6.664-5 *ac uelut ante comas ac summa cacumina siluae | lenibus adludit flabris leuis Auster*. The expressiveness of the *spondeiazon* (3n.) is hard to pin down: it might indicate slow, regular lapping of the waves (Baehrens, Kroll), but also seems to cut across the word's sense of 'playing' and to be more in sympathy with Ariadne's stillness and misery (Quinn).

68 sed OGR have *si*; monosyllables at the beginning of the line are very easily exchanged in transmission ('Kenney's Law', see Heyworth (2007b) 410 and cf. Kenney (1958) 65). Elsewhere in the poem both *sed* (ζη) and *sic* (Rossbach) often start lines, including those like this one which refer back to something which has just been described while also moving on to a new point (e.g. 147 *sed simul ac cupidae mentis satiata libido est*, 200 *sed quali solam Theseus me mente reliquit*; 246 *sic funesta domus ingressus tecta paterna*). Here however *sed* works with the change of subject from 67 *fluctus* to 69 *illa* to demonstrate that a contrast is being made between the action of the waves on Ariadne's clothes and her own complete lack of care for them; in comparison *sic*, together with the recapitulation of nouns from 63-4 (*mitrae, amictus*), creates a relatively flat line. *sed neque tum* is also supported by *Ciris* 116 (see below) and is paralleled elsewhere (Cic. *Fam.* 5.20.8, Ov. *Am.* 3.7.60, Tac. *Ann.* 3.29), *sic neque tum* never (PHI 5.3).

neque tum ... neque tum At 126-8 and 312-13 anaphora of *tum* indicates successive moments, but here both iterations of *tum* refer to the single point in time captured on the *uestis*, the *tum* of 56 and 249. See 19-21n. on the ambiguity there and cf. Catullus' use of anaphoric *iam* to focus on one important moment at 62.4 *iam ueniet uirgo, iam dicetur hymenaeus*, 63.73 *iam iam dolet quod egi, iam iamque paenitet*. The repeated negativity of *neque* works in a similar way to the words for totality in 66 (see n.) to emphasise Ariadne's complete dereliction, here mental rather than physical; cf. the combination of *nullo ... nec ... nulla ... nulla* and *omnia ... omnia ... omnia* at 184-7n. The echo of the whole line at *Ciris* 116 *sed neque tum ciues neque tum rex ipse ueretur* would be clear even if Haupt's *tum ... tum* for transmitted *tunc ... tunc*, an emendation made on the strength of this imitation, were

incorrect. On Catullus' use of *neque* and *nec* before vowels and consonants see Ross (1969) 39-46.

fluitantis The reader probably first associates this with the adjectives describing the lightness of Ariadne's garments in 63-5 (63 *subtilem* n.); 68-70 imply the same contrast as 60-7 between the movement of the clothes and the heroine's own single-minded stillness, and *fluito* can be used of clothes 'flowing' over the body or sails, awnings etc. 'fluttering' in the wind (e.g. Tac. *Germ.* 17 *ueste ... non fluitante ... sed stricta*, Drac. *Romul.* 2.84 *pedes fluitans uestis laxatur ad imos*, Prop. 3.18.13 *pleno fluitantia uela theatro*; cf. *fluo* in similar contexts, e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.320, Ov. *A.A.* 3.301). However, the reader will also remember that the *amictus* is now 'floating' in the sea, another meaning of *fluito* (*TLL* VI.1.954.75-955.25); this is perhaps prompted by the closeness in sound and sense between *fluitantis* and 67 *fluctus salis*, as if the garment has become part of the waves whose movement it now shares.

69 uicem curans Best taken simply as participle governing direct object, with genitives *mitrae* and *amictus* dependent on *uicem*: Ariadne does not care about 'the fate of' or 'what happened to' her clothes. Cf. e.g. Cic. *Att.* 6.3.4 *Curionis et Pauli meorum familiarium uicem doleo*, Suet. *Aug.* 66 *uicem suam conquestus est*. When *uicem* is used in a very similar sense but after an intransitive verb or adjective, e.g. Liv. 34.32.6 *ne nostram uicem ... irascaris*, it seems to be an adverb (*OLD* s.v. 8 'In the place, part, or turn (of)' etc.); that there is often no sharp dividing line can be seen from examples such as Cic. *Fam.* 11.19.1 *meam et uestram uicem timeam necesse est*. In any version of this construction *uicem* is rare in poetry outside comedy (although cf. ablative *uice* with the same meaning at e.g. Ov. *Tr.* 4.1.9, Sen. *Med.* 287, Hor.

Epod. 17.42) and may therefore have a matter-of-fact tone contrasting with the emotional poeticism of the rest of 69-70; cf. 56 *utpote ... quae*, 66 *omnia quae* nn.

69-70 toto ... toto ... tota *totus* is used with words for ‘mind’ or ‘heart’ to express concentration at e.g. 62.14, 66.24, 68.25 (see Otto 270), but anaphora of *totus* is rare: here it works with the other emphatic features in these two lines (see below) to create a vivid picture of Ariadne’s obsession. Cf. 66n., 92-3 *cuncto ... funditus ... imis ... tota*, 184-7n. and see also 19-21n. on triple anaphora.

ex te ... Theseu | ... pendebat *pendere* indicates the fixed concentration with which someone’s consciousness has ‘attached’ itself to a particular object. (ἐκ)κρεμάννυμι can be used in exactly the same way, e.g. Eur. *El.* 950 Ἄρεος ἐκκρεμάννυται. However, with simply *pectore ... animo ... mente* and *te* (cf. Curt. 3.6.10 *spiritus meus ex te pependit*) this case lacks the common indications of physical listening or looking, e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 4.79 *pendetque iterum narrantis ab ore*, Sil. 8.93 *effigiem fouet amplexu ... | ... ab imagine pendet*, V.Fl. 1.481 *peruigil Arcadio Tiphys pendebat ab astro*, leaving the reader to associate it with the more explicit descriptions of Ariadne’s fixed gaze (52-3, 61-2). The unexpected, mid-sentence apostrophe to Theseus is of a typical ‘epic’ kind, comparable to 253 (Ariadne), 299-301 (Apollo), 68.105-8 (Laodamia); contrast the more hymnic 22-30 (see 19-30n.). At least since schol. *Il.* 16.787 critics have argued over whether such apostrophes indicate the narrator’s attitude to the character addressed as well as being a conventional, metrically convenient device: here it is easy to see the narrator aligning himself with Ariadne to appeal to Theseus (cf. e.g. Behr (2005) on apostrophe in the *Aeneid* implying ‘shared perspectives’ with characters). This also helps to fix Theseus’ role in the inner story as a character to whom addresses are

directed (also by Ariadne and Aegeus, just as he is obsessively watched by both of them) rather than one who speaks for himself.

pectore ... | ... animo ... mente The three nouns are not simply synonymous, but more important than the precise sense of each here (e.g. Ellis ‘sensuously ... the affections ... the thought’) is the effect conveyed by the list that all aspects of Ariadne’s inner self are concentrated on the single idea of Theseus. The double expression at 68.37-8 *mente maligna | ... aut animo non satis ingenuo* works in a similar way, while the same trio of *pectus*, *animus* and *mens* is used at 63.45-7 to explore Attis’ state of mind as he awakes after his self-castration. Cf. also similar triplets at Plaut. *Capt.* 387 *id ... persequar corde et animo atque uiribus*, Sil. 2.515-16 *inuadit mentes et pectora nota pererrat | immittitque animis numen* and, with ‘all’ as well as the list, Deut. 6.5 (Vulgate *diliges Dominum Deum tuum ex toto corde tuo et ex tota anima tua et ex tota fortitudine tua*), quoted Mk 12.30, Mt 22.37, Lk 10.27. The three internal ‘organs’ balance the three body parts in 63-5 (cf. 66n.); the repetition of *pectus* from 64 and the similarity between *toto ex .. pectore* and 66 *toto ... e corpore* make the contrast between the dishevelment of Ariadne’s body and the focus of her mind still more specific.

70 perdita Common of people ‘hopelessly’ in love: cf. *perdite* at 45.3, 104.3, and 91.2 *hoc perduto amore*. However it also more generally indicates the desperation of Ariadne’s situation (cf. e.g. Ov. *Tr.* 3.5.23 *quid in his ego perditus oris ... agam*), and in particular, linked to juxtaposed *pendebat* by obtrusive alliteration, implies a narratorial comment on the uselessness of her dependence on Theseus. Ariadne applies it to herself at 177 *quali spe perdita nitor?*

71-5 Many commentators see a stronger division after 70 than after 75. As Kroll, Quinn and Syndikus 145 emphasise, 71-5 form a transitional section, moving backwards in time towards the flashback of 76ff. However, the narrator's decision to explain at this point how Ariadne came to be in her depicted state is not arbitrary. The emotional climax created by the expressive features and motif of 'totality' in 69-70 (see nn.) implies an exhausted narrator who, having explored all that he can see and presented it to the reader with multifarious devices of verbal art, cannot hold his or the reader's attention on the picture any longer. He has to move on, and does so not only by beginning a new subject but by returning to the narrative mode, with a preterite tense (71 *externauit* n.) and details of heroic, epic action (73-5). However, these lines contain further signs of closure (71 *assiduis ... luctibus*, 72, 74-5nn.): like 50-1, they could be an end or a beginning, and it is only at 76ff. that the reader discovers that on leaving the ecphrastic mode the narrator will embark on a completely different piece of epic narration rather than returning to Peleus and Thetis.

71 a misera This exclamation is crucial for the transition away from the initial picture of Ariadne, since via *quam* the rest of 71-5, containing no main verb, depend on it and in turn motivate 76 *nam*: cf. the transitional use of hymnic address at 22-30. See 57 *miseram* n. on the adjective and 61 *ehēu* n. on narratorial interjections: for similar pitying exclamations when the gods of love affect human fate (Kroll) cf. 94-8n. and Ap. *Arg.* 1.616 ὦ μέλεαι (the Lemnians afflicted by Aphrodite).

In both Greek and Latin exclamatory *a* (ᾶ) is almost entirely poetic (in Latin prose only Var. *Men.* 361, Cic. *Rep.* 1.59, *De orat.* 2.285) and usually associated with adjectives/adverbs. Following Homeric ᾶ δειλέ etc., these often express pity (not always: see Lightfoot on Parth. fr. 2.12). Of Catullus' seven uses of *a* (cf. 135), four

involve *miser* (also 15.17, 61.132, 63.61), and the two words continue to occur together in various poetic genres, e.g. Tib. 1.9.3, 2.1.79, Virg. *Georg.* 4.526, Ov. *Her.* 11.110, *Met.* 10.632, Luc. 6.724 (narratorial interjection), Mart. 7.65.3, V.Fl. 6.498. The evidence of this line together with Calvus fr. 9 Courtney *a uirgo infelix, herbis pascere amaris* and Virgil's imitations at *Ecl.* 6.47, 52 suggests that *a* may have been particularly associated with the addresses of neoteric narrators to their heroines, and possibly with 'neoteric' emotion more generally: see Ross (1969) 51-3, Clausen on Virg. *Ecl.* 10.47. See also Kershaw (1980), (1993).

assiduis ... luctibus by balancing 54 *indomitos ... furores* introduces an element of ring-composition, giving some closure to this first picture of Ariadne (71-5n.). *assiduis* already begins to move backwards in time: it initially sounds appropriate for feelings 'persistent' in Ariadne's heart in the unchanging moment shown on the *uestis*, but the tense of *externauit* and then the details of 73-5 indicate that it actually describes *luctus* that had afflicted Ariadne constantly since Theseus' arrival in Crete. This also means that *luctus* cannot simply be 'grief' for Theseus' loss; although unlike 54 *furores*, 62, 72 *curae* (see nn.), the word is not typically used of painful love, here it seems to be assimilated to the *curae* sown by Venus in 72.

externauit Cf. 165 *externata malo*. The etymology of this rare word and the possible implications of this here are controversial: for detailed discussion see Landolfi (1995). Non. 154, quoting this line, defines *externauit* as *consternauit, id est dementem facit*, and TLL, OLD, Ernout-Meillet accept a derivation, parallel to that of *consternare*, from *sternare*, an intensive form of *sternere*. If this aspect of the sense is felt here Ariadne would be 'flattened' or 'overthrown' by Venus, and this allows Duban (1980) 786-8 to link *externare* with the uses of other derivatives of *sternere* in the poem (110, 355 *prosternere*; 163 *consternere*, 332, 403 *substernere*)

and in particular with the defeat of the Minotaur (110 *prostravit*), caused by Theseus just as he causes the ruin of Ariadne. Corssen's etymology, cited by Ellis, which based on the equivalence *sternuere*/πτάρνυσθαι connects *sternare* with πτύρεσθαι, 'start, shy' like a horse, would have similar overtones: cf. Ov. *Ibis* 430 *externati solis agantur equi*. However, *externare* also seems to have been closely associated with *externus*, at least in ancient etymology: the grammarians Dositheus (431.4 Keil) and Charisius (5.30 Keil) see it as corresponding to ἀλλοτριῶσθαι 'be alienated'. *TLL* s.v. allows for meanings more associated with *externus* than *sternere*, and Ernout-Meillet s.v. mention that the influence of *externus* came to affect the way the word was understood and, perhaps, spelt. In that case the line between this association and a 'true derivation' from *sternere* becomes blurred (especially since the prefix *ex-* can hardly avoid implying some sort of outward movement), and here Ariadne should be understood as 'driven out of her mind' or 'beside herself'. This is an appropriate reading of Ovid's two other uses of *externatus* (*Met.* 1.641, 11.77), in both cases describing the reaction of people confronted with their new, metamorphosed selves, and of *externari* at Apul. *Apol.* 43, of the soul intoxicated by music or perfume. Based on this Harmon (1973) 320-2 describes Ariadne as 'alienated from her nature' because she is (she thinks) going to die frustrated and unfulfilled, while Theodorakopoulos (2000) 121 links the word with her loss of clothing (63-8) and the waves that affect her internally and externally (62, 67nn.) to emphasise the fluid boundaries of Ariadne's self.

The perfect tense is initially surprising after 70 *pendebat* (a pluperfect might be expected); it is best understood as preterite, indicating a move towards epic narration. See 73n.

72 spinosas ... serens in pectore curas *curae* produced by Venus must be love, or at least love and its consequences: cf. 62n. and see Pichon s.v. on the quasi-technical sense of *curae* in elegy. Troubles that are sown appear at Soph. *Ai.* 1005 ὅσας ἀνίας μοι κατασπείρας φθίνεις, and thorns in the soul at Hor. *Epist.* 1.14.4-5 *certemus, spinas animone ego fortius an tu | euellas agro* (where however ‘thorn’ = ‘moral fault’, as also at Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.212), but the combination is apparently unparalleled. Since *spinousus* and ἀκανθώδης when used figuratively elsewhere refer to ‘thorny’ arguments or ‘crabbed’ style (e.g. Var. *L.L.* 8.51, Cic. *Fin.* 3.3, Lucian *Dial. Mort.* 20.8), with the only possible exception being the Suda’s ἀκανθώδης βίος, the overall effect is of a vividly ‘live’ metaphor of seeds planted in the past growing over time into thorny plants. Catullus might be developing the more conventional image of Aphrodite’s arrow in Polyphemus’ heart at Theoc. 11.16 (cf. 60 *ex alga* n.), since the verb used for the goddess’s action there is παῖξε from πήγνυμι, which can mean to plant seeds (Theophr. *H.P.* 6.6.9, 7.4.10). *in pectore*, as well as emphasising the invasiveness of Venus’ cruelty and contrasting with 69 *ex te pectore*, implies soft internal flesh into which the thorns push. The repeated sibilants are anticipated by 71 *assiduis ... luctibus ex-*, while the shape of the line, enclosed by adjective and noun (5n.) and centring on a present participle, mirrors 54 and again links the end of this description of Ariadne to the beginning (71 *assiduis ... luctibus* n.).

Erycina From the shrine at Eryx in Sicily, whose goddess, probably originally the Phoenician Astarte, was identified as Aphrodite by Western Greeks and then as Venus by the Romans: see Galinsky (1969) via index s.v. ‘Venus Erycina’, *RE* VI s.v. ‘Erycina’. Venus Erycina was well-known at Rome, with temples founded 217 BC on the Capitol and 181 BC near the Colline gate (see *LTUR* V.114-16): this may explain why poetic uses of the title are confined to Latin and do not occur in

Greek. It appears as a substantive referring to Venus first here and then at Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.33, Ov. *Am.* 2.10.11, *Met.* 5.363, Sen. *Phaed.* 199, of which only the *Met.* example has a Sicilian context. The only specific explanation that has been offered for Catullus' use of *Erycina* is the suggestion of O'Hara (1990) that in the context of *spinosas ... curas* an etymological play is intended on the resemblance with *ericius*, the word for a hedgehog or spiked military apparatus, whose adjectival form is *ericinus* (attested in Augustine). The line is the first of four each containing one proper name, a pattern that is associated with epic beginnings at e.g. 1-5, 76-85, but also closes a ring opened with the similar decorative arrangement of proper names in 52-4 (52 *Diae* n.).

73 illa tempestate ... quo tempore This line is usually printed as *illa tempestate, ferox quo ex tempore Theseus*, with the humanistic conjecture *quo ex* replacing OGR *—que et*, and taken to mean that Venus was planting *curae* 'from that time [onwards], the time when fierce Theseus [arrived]'. This sense has precedents in Hellenistic poetry: Call. *Hymn* 2.47-8 ἔξετι κείνου, | ἐξότ' ἐπ' Ἀμφρυσσῶ ζευγίτιδας ἔτρεφεν ἵππους, Ap. *Arg.* 4.520 ἐκ τόθεν, ἐξότε. However, comparison with these supposed parallels and in particular with 35.13-15 *quo tempore legit incohatam | Dindymi Dominam, ex eo misellae | ignes interiorem edunt medullam* in fact show that this sense of 'ever since' would require *ex illa tempestate, quo tempore*, as Friedrich and Fordyce point out; it can only be taken so here either by simply declaring that the two positions of *ex* are equivalent (Quinn), or by moving *ex* to between *illa* and *tempestate* (Baehrens, recently followed by Goold). But it is not clear that 'ever since' is a meaning required by the context at all. By its very nature sowing is a one-off activity, and the tense of *externauit* (see n.) indicates that what will be specified in

73 is not a period of time but the particular point at which Venus attacked Ariadne. Therefore the sense required is in fact simply ‘at that time, the time when fierce Theseus [arrived]’. Kroll and Thomson realise this: Thomson accordingly prints Froehlich’s *ferox qua robore*, with *qua* = *tempestate*, ‘when’, and *tempore* replaced with a word dependent on *ferox* (Thomson also considers *corpore*). However, although the repetition of an antecedent in the relative clause is prosaic (Baehrens, Quinn), this emphatic demarcation of an earlier moment is highly appropriate both for the text’s first move away from the single point in time depicted on the *uestis*, and for an identification of the crucial moment when Theseus arrived and Ariadne fell in love, here seen as the same thing: cf. 86 *simul ac*, 171-6n. *tempestat* and *tempus* here are near-synonymous (cf. 66.11 *qua ... tempestate* and Cic. *De orat.* 3.153 on *tempestat* = *tempus* as a poetic archaism which could be used occasionally in prose), though *tempus* might be understood as more specific (see further Heusch (1954) 51-3), especially when the two words occur so close to each other: in that case the antecedent is more precisely defined by the noun in the relative clause, ‘at that time, at the exact moment when’, cf. 96.2 *dolore ... quo desiderio*. The simplest solution is therefore to remove *ex* and return to the text offered in ζη *illa tempestate, ferox quo tempore*. OGR *feroxque et* is easily explained as a combination of vowel confusion and dittography of *t* at the beginning of *tempore*.

ferox ... Theseus Much discussed: is the epithet ‘savage’, referring to Theseus’ treatment of Ariadne, or a quasi-Homeric standing epithet emphasising his bravery against the Minotaur? Cf. the debate over 51 *heroum ... uirtutes* n. Probably this is a case of disputed focalisation (Gaisser (1995) 597, cf. 76-115n.) as this transitional section of text moves from description of Ariadne, who would see

Theseus as ‘cruel’, to narration of Theseus’ adventure, in which either the hero himself or the narrator focalises *ferox* as ‘high-spirited’.

74-5 Theseus has previously been seen rowing away from Dia (53, 58-9); now his earlier voyage from Athens to Crete is described in two lines describing respectively departure and arrival (*egressus* balancing *attigit* at the beginning of each line), with the actual journey elided. Cf. the selected moments from the Argo’s voyage at the opening of the poem (1-11n.). This journey is also balanced with Theseus’ return to Athens, the beginning of the flashback from the scene on Dia with the end of the flashforward, by the parallelism of 246 *ingressus* with 74 *egressus* and the repetition of *ferox Theseus* from 73 to 247. On the closural effect of the shape of 75 see 42n; the end of a journey is another obvious closural marker.

74 curuis e litoribus The epithet-noun combination is attested at Acc. *trag.* 569 Ribbeck³ and becomes standard in Latin epic (see Horsfall on Virg. *Aen.* 3.16); neither it nor the poetic plural (already in Enn. *Ann.* 375 Skutsch *litora lata sonunt*) need have anything to do with the shape of Piraeus and its three harbours, as Ellis thinks.

Piraei Piraeus was not developed as the port of Athens until Themistocles’ fortifications in 492/3 (Thuc. 1.93.3-7). Greek writers avoid referring to Piraeus in the mythical period, and Paus. 1.1.2 claims that Theseus did not set out from Piraeus but from Phaleron. Since many of Catullus’ educated Roman readers would have visited Athens and landed at Piraeus, the anachronism might be a quick way of evoking a strong Attic atmosphere. The Latin ending is typical for Roman writers’ use of this name (Lyne on *Ciris* 468).

75 attigit ‘arrived at, reached’ (*OLD* s.v. *tango* 7a, *attingo* 6a, *contingo* 3a), but as with 172 *tetigissent* (referring to the same action), 63.2 *Phrygium ut nemus citato cupide pede tetigit* (the end of Attis’ journey), there is a sense of the crucial, light ‘touch’ which led to disaster. Cf. 11.24 *tactus aratro est*, where the verb again emphatically opens a closural line. Perhaps also metapoetic, as the narrator just ‘touches on’ this moment in the story (*OLD* s.v. 9a).

iniusti regis Minos is suggestively called ὀλοόφρων at *Od.* 11.322 in the context of Ariadne and Theseus, but the developed image of him as an evil tyrant (here the combination of *iniusti* with *regis* suggests that he was cruel even to his own people) has been understood since [Plat.] *Minos* 318de, Plut. *Thes.* 16 as a specifically Athenian point of view. As at 76ff., such an attitude here could therefore be ascribed to the focalisation of Theseus (Gaisser (1995) 597) or of the Athenians more generally; the Athenian atmosphere has already been evoked by 74 *Piraei*. More specifically, calling Minos ‘unjust’ is appropriate when the reader is about to hear of the excessive retribution he demanded for Androgeon’s murder (76 *nam* could be read as explaining *iniusti*, cf. 52 *namque* n.) and draws attention to the inconsistency in the tradition about Minos, which made him in life an exemplary lawgiver (e.g. [Plat.] *Minos loc. cit.*, Strabo 10.4.8), in death an apparently fair judge of the Underworld (e.g. *Od.* 11.568-71, Virg. *Aen.* 6.432-3, Hor. *Carm.* 4.7.21-2). Ovid’s Ariadne enters the debate at *Her.* 10.69 *iusto ... parenti*, and *iustus* appears twice of Minos in the Scylla section of Ov. *Met.* 8 (58, 101, where see Hollis).

Gortynia Minos was king of all Crete, including Gortyn, the island’s second city; but his capital (*Od.* 19.178) and the Labyrinth were consistently thought to have been at Cnossus. Perhaps another touch of anachronism (74 *Piraei* n.), since Gortyn was capital of the Roman province of Crete-Cyrene. In Latin poetry *Gortynius*

regularly means ‘Cretan’ (e.g. Virg. *Ecl.* 6.60 *stabula*, *Aen.* 11.773 *spicula*), including in other contexts involving Minos (*Ciris* 114 *Gortynius heros*, Stat. *Theb.* 4.530 *arbiter ... Gortynius*): see further Lyne on *Ciris* 114.

tecta OGR *tempta* could easily have been corrupted from either *templa* or *tecta* (via *tepta* and *tēpta*). As there would be no reason for Theseus to visit Cretan temples and *templa* ‘temples’ + genitive singular of a mortal would be very odd, *templa* is defended as ‘royal palace’ based on Enn. *trag.* 87-8 Jocelyn *o Priami domus*, | *saeptum altisono cardine templum*. But that usage is unparalleled and presumably intended to convey the palace’s ‘sacrosanct status’ (Trappes-Lomax); *tecta* (cf. 37, 246, 276) is the far safer emendation. Cf. also Claud. 28.634 *semiuiuri Gortynia tecta iuuenci*.

76-115: events on Crete

This first ‘digression’ from the properly ecphrastic description of Ariadne on the beach is formally marked off at the beginning by *nam perhibent olim* (76n.), and at the end by the abrupt question at 116ff.; it is also framed by Theseus’ journey from Athens to Crete (73-5) and Ariadne’s from Crete to Dia (116-23). Between these two points the narrative of events on Crete is a highly selective and varied series of scenes. They might fairly be called ‘tableaux’ (Quinn, Boucher (1956) 197-8) but their vividness is generally not visual: in the mention of scents (87), description of emotions and motivations (81-3, 92-9, 101-2), use of simile (89-90, 105-9), specification of different points in time (86 *simul ac*, 91-2 *non prius ... quam*), spatial vagueness (103-4n.), and eventually in the evocation of the *inobseruabilis* Labyrinth

itself, the section goes further than 50-75 (see n.) in exploring narrative possibilities alien to a straightforward description of visual art.

The content and style of these scenes evoke various viewpoints and suggest various reasons for this selection. Although 76 *nam* indicates that the narrative is explanatory of Ariadne's emotional state in 52-75, by evoking a wider context in terms of place, time and Theseus' actions the initial details about the conflict between Athens and Crete then imply that this epic story is being told for its own sake, and introduce new foci of sympathy other than Ariadne, notably the public one of suffering Athens (76-80). The detailed parallelism with the beginning of the poem (Schmale (2004) 159-61) also suggests a return to epic objectivity: after the opening 'Alexandrian footnote' (76n.), a ship carrying a 'select' group (78n.) sets off on a heroic quest amid abundant proper names referring to the start and end of the journey and the king of the destination (85 *Minoa*, cf. 3 *Aeeteos*). The emergence of the solitary hero Theseus at 81 is like that of Peleus at 19, while the hymnic address followed by exclamations in 94-100 is parallel to the hymnic address followed by questions in 22-30 (94-8n.).

The narrative proceeds rapidly but straightforwardly as far as 85 before it is interrupted by a falling in love, just as the Argonautic story was at 19: as there, the narrative movement almost halts at the moment of first sight (87-90n.). The switch of attention back to Ariadne now implies that the purpose of this digression is after all to explain her state as depicted on the *uestis*, and the treatment of this earlier Ariadne is reminiscent of that first description. Full of tumultuous emotion – note the wave imagery at 62 and 97-8 – she gazes at Theseus while the narrator and reader gaze at her, lingering over her sensuous attractiveness (87-90, 100 *fulgore expalluit auri*). Yet after the sense of an epic beginning in 76ff., lines 86-99 also read as a delaying

episode in Theseus' epic quest, the typical result of an epic hero's encounter with a foreign woman, even though in this myth Ariadne is a crucial helper – a detail Catullus' version all but omits (113 *tenui ... filo* n.).

The incongruities of 76-99 therefore complicate how we read the final part of this section, in which 'the perspectives are shifting and sometimes unclear' (Gaisser (1995) 598): 101-2 and the simile of 105-9 seem to take us back to Theseus' perspective and priorities, but it is possible to emphasise 101 *cum*, 105 *nam* (Konstan (1977) 41, Syndikus 148) and therefore to see the whole story of the victory over the Minotaur as told to illustrate the psychological impression that it makes on Ariadne (Kroll on 99). Perhaps, just as Theseus in 52-75 was *immemor* and *ferox* in the eyes of Ariadne on Dia, he is now idealised by Ariadne on Crete, who may even be the focaliser of the simile as, unable to see what happens inside the Labyrinth, she imagines how an epic hero might fight (105-11n.). But the possibility remains that in the entire 'digressive' section of the Ariadne and Theseus story (76-248) the focalisation that matters most is really that of the narrator (or poet) giving his 'personal commentary on what he is supposed to see in the embroidery' (Deroux (1986) 251); and the complexity is further increased if we remember that apart from its apparent introduction of a public, Athenian point of view, there was no indication of which unspecified bearers of oral tradition the apparently objective *perhibent* (76) might refer to. All this shows how difficult it is to try to use this passage in a moral judgement of Theseus' character by referring to his admirable qualities of courage and civic loyalty (81-2) as vouched for by 'Catullus'; though narrator-text, this cannot after all be seen as a straightforwardly objective assessment to be contrasted with the character-text of Ariadne's speech.

By the end of the passage there is a disturbing sense that the narrative may be getting out of control; with every change of subject it moves further in content and technique from the description of the depicted Ariadne, while the parallelism with the opening raises the possibility that the whole poem, not only the ecphrasis, may have to keep restarting in a potentially infinite series of new beginnings. It therefore seems appropriate that the narrative threatens to get stuck in the Labyrinth in lines 112-15, which describe Theseus' journey out of the maze, yet themselves draw the reader back into it by beginning with the hero's emergence *multa cum laude* and ending with the possibility of failure in *inobseruabilis error*. The Labyrinth becomes a powerful metaphor for this convoluted, bewildering poem: see generally Gaisser (1995), Theodorakopoulos (2000), and for other metaliterary uses of the Labyrinth cf. on the *Aeneid* Fitzgerald (1984), Doob (1990) 227-53, on Ov. *Met.* Boyd (2006) 175-84, all with further bibliography. Without a clearer narrative 'line' akin to Ariadne's thread (cf. Miller (1992)), the reader runs the risk of getting permanently lost; 116 *sed quid ego ... digressus* suggests that whether he (or even she?) is rescued is in the power of the capricious narrator.

76 nam perhibent olim 'Alexandrian footnote' marking the beginning of a new narrative: cf. 1-2 *quondam ... dicuntur* nn. and especially 212 *namque ferunt olim*. Claud. Don. on Virg. *Aen.* 11.20 cites *perhibent* as typical in such expressions (*in huiusmodi incertis solet poeta non interponere auctoritatem suam, sed dicere 'fama est' aut 'dicunt' aut 'perhibent'*); it already has this function at *trag. inc.* 101 Ribbeck³ *Ioue patre prognatus est, ut perhibent, Tantalus*. Here, the device is the first of a series of overt appeals to verbal tradition (117 *commemorem*, 124 *perhibent*,

212 *ferunt*) that mark off the narrative of 76-250 from the descriptions in 50-75 and 251-64 of what the *uestis* actually shows (50-75n.).

crudeli peste coactam In addition to Catullus, Plut. *Thes.* 15.1, Diod. 61.1, Apollod. 3.15.8 state that plague (and famine) forced the Athenians to agree to send the human tribute. Although all these accounts attribute the plague to divine support of Minos' claim, *crudeli* and *coactam* here help to evoke sympathy for Athens as an oppressed victim. Gaisser (1995) 597 understands this as the result of focalisation through Theseus (cf. 73 *ferox* ... *Theseus*, 75 *iniusti regis* nn.); alternatively, *perhibent* suggests a more general pro-Athenian tradition.

crudelis and *pestis* recur together at 69.9 of Rufus' armpits: deliberate self-parody (in either direction?) seems possible.

77 Minos imposed the tribute in revenge for the death of his son Androgeon (or Androgeus: see below). In most accounts Androgeon comes to prominence as an athlete at the Panathenaia (Diod. 4.60.4, Apollod. 3.15.7, where see further Frazer), and there are many versions of the Athenian responsibility for his death: his athletic success encouraged Aegeus to send him to fight the Marathonian bull, which killed him (Apollod. *loc. cit.*, Paus. 1.27.10); or it caused Aegeus to be afraid of his political influence and to have him murdered (Diod. 4.60.4-5, cf. the mysterious circumstances mentioned at Plut. *Thes.* 15 Ἀνδρογέω περὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἀποθάνειν δόλφ δόξαντος); or it provoked his death at the hands of jealous rival competitors, possibly when he set out to take part in the funeral games for Laius at Thebes (Apollod. *loc. cit.*, schol. [Plat.] *Minos* 321a, cf. Diod. *loc. cit.*; Servius on Virg. *Aen.* 6.14, Lactant. Placid. on Stat. *Ach.* 192 specify Athenian and Megarian athletes). Hyg. *Fab.* 41.1

states that Androgeon died in battle with the Athenians, though that leaves Minos with no reason for fighting Athens in the first place.

Catullus' brief allusion using the neutral *poenas exsoluere* and in *caedis* an unspecific word for violent death, allows the reader's attention to focus on the horror of the revenge (78-9) rather than the rights and wrongs of Minos' case. Virgil uses similar techniques at *Aen.* 6.20 *in foribus letum Androgeo; tum pendere poenas | Cecropidae iussi (miserum!)* etc.; *Ov. Met.* 7.458 *Androgeique necem* seems to be heading the same way, but then adds without further explanation *iustis ulciscitur armis*.

Androgeoneae The usual form of the name is Ἀνδρόγεωσ, Latin *Androgeus*; Catullus' adjective must be based on the alternative Ἀνδρόγεων, *Androgeon*, which is attested in the *Suda* (s.v. Ἀνδρόγεωσ: Ἀνδρόγεωσ καὶ Ἀνδρόγεων οὐδετέρως), reconstructed by West at *Hes. fr.* 145.9 M—W, and extant once in Latin (*Prop.* 2.1.62 *Androgeona*). Virg. *Aen.* 7.410 *Acrisioneis* similarly invites the hypothesis of **Acrision* as a variant of *Acrisius* (see Horsfall *ad loc.*). On the employment of an adjective rather than the genitive of the noun see 1 *Peliaco* n.: it is here especially imposing as it fills the first half of a four-word line (15n., cf. the three-word pentameter 68.74 *Protesilaeam Laodamia domum*) and forms a line-enclosing noun-adjective pair with *caedis* (5n.).

78-80 Three consecutive *spondeiazontes* (3n.): unique in Latin. Gow on Theoc. 13.42 lists fourteen examples in all Greek hexameter poetry, all Hellenistic or later except *Il.* 2.717-19, 11.49-51. Here the rhythm helps to slow down the narrative as it focuses on the horrific details of the Athenians' punishment, a description that ends with another *spondeiazon* at 83.

78 The tribute is usually (since Sappho according to Servius on Virg. *Aen.* 6.42 = Sapph. 206 Voigt) said to have consisted of seven young people of each sex. Virg. *Aen.* 6.21-2 *septena ... | corpora natorum*, Hyg. *Fab.* 41.1 *septenos liberos suos* apparently mention only seven altogether, though the use of the distributive complicates the sense. Catullus' line does not state the numbers, but with its two-word references to the youths and girls balanced around *simul et* it resembles phrases emphasising the parity between the two groups: Diod. 4.61.3 κόρους ἑπτὰ καὶ τὰς ἴσας κόρας (cf. Apollod. 3.15.8), Plut. *Thes.* 15.1 ἡϊθέους ἑπτὰ καὶ παρθένους τοσαύτας, Paus. 1.27.10 παρθένους ... ἐς Κρήτην ἑπτὰ καὶ παῖδας ἴσους. A recurrent locution is δις ἑπτά: Bacchyl. 17.2 (see Maehler *ad loc.*), Eur. *Her.* 1327, Isoc. *Hel.* 27, Plat. *Phaed.* 58a.

Against this background, the balance between *electos* and *decus* suggests that the terms are to be taken as equivalent (Kroll, Nuzzo). In that case, since *decus* + partitive genitive is a vague indication of distinction, 'the glory of' (cf. e.g. Sall. *Hist.* 1.13 *omnium partium decus in mercedem corruptum erat*, Sil. 4.221 *Laurentumque decus*; more commonly it refers to only one person, e.g. Cic. *carm.* 30.1 Büchner *decus Argolicum ... Vlixes*, Lucr. 3.3 *Graiae gentis decus*), *electos* might also imply selection by quality; in Hellanicus' account Minos came to Athens to choose the victims himself (Hellanic. *FGrHist* 323a F 14 = Plut. *Thes.* 17.3 ἐκλέγεσθαι). On the other hand, the almost Tacitean *uariatio* in grammar might tease the reader about a possible variation in meaning; if *electos* suggests 'chosen by lot' (Plut. *Thes.* 17.2, 3, 18.1, Virg. *Aen.* 6.22, Ov. *Met.* 8.171) the contrast with the 'picked' Argonauts (4 *lecti iuuenes* n.) would be all the more ironic (the construction *decus innuptarum* is also reminiscent of 4 *Argiuae robora pubis*; see further 76-115n.). The general effect, however, is to create sympathy for Athens as it sends away people who are felt

to be the ‘best’ simply because they are young and doomed; the idea of perfection also implies sacrificial victims (cf. 79 *dapem dare* n.). *innuptarum* adds the conventionally pathetic note of the pathos of death before marriage, and the whole line can be read as a grim echo of 62.6 *cernitis, innuptae, iuuenes*, evoking a more typical, happier setting for matched groups of girls and young men.

79 supplies the accusative and infinitive expected since 76 *perhibent*, and the noun in agreement with 76 *coactam*; the grammatical suspense created by the delay emphasises the gruesome climax of the sentence.

Cecropiam Athens or Attica, from its first king, Cecrops: Plin. *N.H.* 7.194, Apollod. 3.177, schol. Ap. *Arg.* 1.95. The name recurs at 83 and as an adjective, the original and more common form in both Latin and Greek, at 172. It possibly appears at Plaut. *Trin.* 928 *Cecropia insula*, but the text may be corrupt; Catullus is otherwise the earliest Latin writer to use it, and is more likely to have taken it from Greek, where Κεκρόπιος is first extant in Euripides (*Hipp.* 34, *Supp.* 658, *El.* 1289, *Ion* 936, 1571, fr. 481.10) and appears in Hellenistic poetry (Call. *Hymn* 3.227, Ap. *Arg.* 1.95, both Κεκροπίην); after Catullus it is regularly used by Latin poets, perhaps because its shape is metrically useful in dactylic verse. Although probably not itself an archaic form, then, the name was felt to evoke the atmosphere of the earliest stage in Athens’ history and even to be strictly the ‘most correct’ name at this stage in mythical chronology (Ellis), since Theseus was sometimes thought to have invented the name ‘Athens’ when carrying out his synoecism of Attica (Plut. *Thes.* 24, cf. Thuc. 2.15); contrast 74 *Piraei* n.

solitam esse The young people were sent regularly, either annually (Virg. *Aen.* 6.21, Hyg. *Fab.* 41.1, Euseb. *Praep. Eu.* 5.18.5, Servius on Virg. *Aen.* 3.74,

6.14, Eustathius on *Od.* 11.320) or every ninth year (Plut. *Thes.* 15.1, Diod. 4.61.3, Ov. *Met.* 8.171). Catullus' wording does not choose between the two but does suggest the tribute had been sent several times before Theseus went with it: some accounts specify that he arrived in Athens from Troezen in time to intervene the third time it was due (Ov. *Met.* 8.171, Plut. *Thes.* 15.1, 17.4, Apollod. *Ep.* 1.7, Servius on Virg. *Aen.* 6.14).

dapem dare Any reference to the Minotaur eating the Athenians will be horrific, but while several Greek accounts (Diod. 4.61.3, Apollod. 3.15.8; possibly Euripides' *Theseus*, see fr. 385 + 386) refer to the victims as βopά, 'food, prop. of carnivorous beasts' (LSJ s.v.), *dapem* takes the irony in a different direction. *daps*, an archaism surviving predominantly in poetry, is used for a formal banquet (as at 304), especially in a sacrificial context (*TLL* V.1.38.4-53); here *dare* also suggests sacrificial offering (*TLL* V.1.38.14, citing this line, suggests 'sc. *quasi deo*'). *daps* similarly of monsters dining on human flesh at e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 3.618 *domus sanie dapibusque cruentis*, Ov. *Her.* 9.68 *efferus humana qui dape paut equas*, and repeatedly of the cannibalistic feast in Seneca's *Thyestes*, while Hyginus' story of the Minotaur has *epulandum* (*Fab.* 41.1).

Minotauro Clausen (1988) 15-17 notes that *Minotaurus* occurs in Latin poetry only here and at Virg. *Aen.* 6.26, among other allusions to these lines (*Aen.* 6.20 *Androgeo ... poenas*, cf. 77; *Aen.* 6.27 *inextricabilis error*, cf. 115). In Greek Μινώταυρος is not attested before Diod. 4.61.3 and appears only in prose. Clausen plausibly argues that in 85 *Minoa* and 105 *Tauro* Catullus etymologises 'the strange form he had introduced into poetry.'

80 quis ... malis As at 31 *quae ... lucas* the connecting relative adjective introduces a noun referring generally to the situation described in the last few lines, which becomes the background for a new action.

angusta ... moenia Although *moenia* can be synecdochic for ‘city’ (*TLL* VIII.1327.59-1328.26, cf. 36 *moenia Larisaea*, 212-13 *moenia diuae | linquentem*), the adjective suggests a more precise understanding here: a ‘narrow’ or ‘confined’ space is one enclosed by walls. As well as being small because this is an early stage of its history (cf. *Ov. Fast.* 3.181 *moenia ... angusta*, of Romulus’ Rome), Athens is a small place before Theseus’ synoecism (79 *Cecropiam* n.); further pathos is conveyed by the fact that it would therefore be more affected by the regular loss of a few young people. Contrast 85 *sedesque superbas* of the oppressor.

uexarentur *uexare* = ‘ravage’, ‘devastate’, rather than just ‘annoy’ (see Gell. 2.6.1-8). Its basic sense of ‘attack constantly’, ‘buffet’ (*OLD* s.v. 1, 2) suits the effect of the repeated tribute: with *moenia* the image is of a city under siege.

81-2 ipse ... Theseus ... | ... optauit Theseus appears suddenly and dramatically as the saviour of Athens, and his moral responsibility for his actions is at this point clear (contrast 58 *immemor* n.). *ipse* makes him stand out as the hero among the group of young people in 78 (cf. 43 and 67 *ipsius* nn. and e.g. *Virg. Aen.* 4.141-2 *ipse ante alios pulcherrimus omnis | infert se Aeneas*). It also works with *optauit* to emphasise his deliberate choice to risk his life (*‘ipse = ultro’* Baehrens, cf. *OLD* s.v. 7). This is the best-attested version (*Plut. Thes.* 17.2, *Hyg. Fab.* 41.2), although *Apollod. Ep.* 1.7 states that Theseus was sometimes said to have been chosen by lot like the other victims, and in *Hellanicus* (78n.), where Minos makes the selection himself, he (naturally) chooses Theseus first. *optauit* = ‘chose’ (*TLL* IX.2.825.36-826.61, cf. e.g.

Virg. *Aen.* 3.109 *optauitque locum regno*), as at 120 *praeoptarit amorem*; but the repeated word also associates it with the ‘longing’ expressed by *optare* elsewhere in the poem (5 *optantes*, 22 *optato* nn.), especially the desire of the Argonauts for the goal of their heroic quest (5). The implication that Theseus actively *wants* to face the Minotaur will be confirmed by 101 *cupiens*, 102 *appeteret*.

pro caris ... Athenis The patriotism indicated here is often cited as the most admirable trait of Catullus’ Theseus, even if it might also influence his desertion of Ariadne (58 *immemor* n.); it can be thought of as a quality that Roman readers would easily understand and admire (Harmon (1973) 318-19). *pro* + city name evokes stereotyped phrases such as *pro patria*, and possibly even the formula for *deutio* (Liv. 8.9.8 *pro re publica*, cf. 8.9.4 *me pro legionibus deuoueam*): see Nuzzo, *Enn. Ann.* 191-2 *pro Romano populo ... animam de corpore mitto* with Skutsch, and on *deutio* Versnel (1976). For *carus* of one’s country or similar cf. e.g. Cic. *Catil.* 1.27, Hor. *Serm.* 2.2.104, Prop. 2.14.4, *caritas patriae* commonly in Cicero and other prose authors, and in particular the echoes of this line at Virg. *Aen.* 1. 24 *prima quod ad Troiam pro caris gesserat Argis* and Stat. *Theb.* 7.281 *nudaque pro caris opponere pectora muris*. Theseus’ devotion to the collective entity of Athens, the only thing he is ever said to care for, contrasts with the personal love for Theseus himself of Ariadne and Aegeus (to whom Theseus’ *figura* is *cara*, 220).

suum ... corpus ... | proicere *suum corpus* basically = *se* (TLL IV.1012.41-1014.10) or *suam uitam* (Baehrens) but emphasises the physical danger to which Theseus exposes himself. *suum* intensifies this point and contrasts the value that Theseus placed on his life and on Athens (cf. e.g. Liv. 21.41.16 *unus quisque se non corpus suum, sed coniugem ac liberos paruos armis protegere putet*); for the juxtaposition with *ipse* at the beginning of the line cf. 27 *ipse suos ... amores*, 67.30

ipse sui gnati minxerit in gremium, Cic. *carm.* 24.2 Büchner *ipse suum cor edens*, the Ovidian echo of this line at *Met.* 8.201-2 *librauit in alas | ipse suum corpus*, and Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 6.292-3.

proicere implies giving up control of an object, so ‘throw away’, ‘sacrifice’; similarly of self-sacrifice at Virg. *Aen.* 6.436 *lucemque perosi | proiecere animas* (Servius *ad loc.* *quasi rem uilem*), Luc. 4.516 *proieci uitam*. But the typical verb when one ‘risks’ or ‘endangers’ *corpus suum* is *obicere* + dative (e.g. Cic. *Deiot.* 14 *ille corpus suum periculo obiecit*, Phil. 12.9 *Gallia ... crudelitati M. Antoni suum totum corpus obiecit*; Liv. 7.33.7 *incolumes reuerti, qui sua corpora pro salute omnium haud dubio periculo obiecissent*, 35.49.13 *ipse corpus suum pro eo telis hostium obiceret*), whereas *corpus proicere* would usually mean ‘throw out a dead body unburied’ (e.g. Luc. 6.626 *corpora caesorum tumulis proiecta negatis*, Calp. *Decl.* 7 *corpora eorum extra uallum proici iussit*, cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 1.104 *proici se iussit inhumatum*, Lucr. 6.1155 *proiecta cadauera*, Prop. 1.22.7 *tu proiecta mei perpessa es membra propinqui*). It therefore works like 83 *funera ... nec funera* to imply that Theseus might as well be dead already.

82 potius quam For *optauit* + *potius quam* + subjunctive (‘required after *quam* in comparative clauses whenever the compared action is one that is to be, or was, purposely rejected’, Woodcock §253 n.ii), cf. e.g. Ter. *Andr.* 797-8 *sese inhoneste optauit parere hic ditias | potius quam honeste in patria pauper uiueret*, Plaut. *Aul.* 11-12 *inopemque optauit potius eum relinquere, | quam eum thesaurum commonstraret filio*; for a new subject in the comparative clause after *potius quam*, Nep. fr. 59 [Cornelia] *inimici nostri non peribunt atque, uti nunc sunt, erunt potius*

quam res publica profligetur atque pereat, Lucr. 6.1285-6 *multo cum sanguine saepe*
| *rixantes potius quam corpora desererentur*.

potius quam without intervening words is rare in ‘high’ poetic genres (Acc. *trag.* 314 Ribbeck³, *Ciris* 458, Prop. 4.3.25, three times in Ov. *Her.*, twice in Lucan; otherwise comedy, satire, Horace’s *Epistles* and Lucretius; common in prose); the reader may therefore be more likely to notice that *potius* and *quam* recur of Ariadne’s choice at 151-2 *potius germanum amittere creui* | *quam tibi fallaci supremo in tempore dessem*. As with *proicere optauit* compared to 120 *praeoptarit amorem*, the choices correspond and are opposed to each other: Theseus’ priority is heroic action, Ariadne’s is Theseus himself.

talía The vagueness suggests horror, as if the narrator would prefer not to have to spell out again the detail of 79: cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 7.21 (after an explanation of what Circe usually does to her guests) *quae ne monstra pii paterentur talia Troes*, Ov. *Met.* 6.563 (after Tereus’ rape and mutilation of Philomela) *sustinet ad Procnem post talia facta reuerti*.

Cretam The bare accusative of destination is regularly used for *Creta*, as for smaller islands (see LHS II §50). There are only a few counter-examples (e.g. Curt. 10.2.3 *in Cretam traiectis*, Liv. 42.35.7 *in Cretam item legatos tres ire placuit*, Sen. *Controu.* 9.4.1 *in Cretam Sabinus ierat*), although *in* is used when the name is accompanied by *insula* or *prouincia*. The appearance of *Athenis* and *Cretam* at the end of consecutive lines is the most obvious case of the use of *dispositio* of proper names throughout 73-85 to illustrate the conflict between Athens and Crete (cf. 1-3, 52nn.).

83 funera ... nec funera Reminiscent of the type of Greek oxymoron, occurring once in Homer at *Od.* 18.73 Ἴπρος Ἄϊρος but typical of tragedy, where a word (usually a noun) is immediately negated to suggest that the thing referred to lacks an essential quality: see Puelma (1977) 184 n.9 with further bibliography. The neatest form repeats the word with ἀ-privative or δυσ- attached, e.g. Aesch. *Pers.* 681 νᾶες ἄναες, Eur. *Hipp.* 1144 πότμον ἄποτμον, *Hel.* 213 αἰὼν δυσάϊων, *Phoen.* 1047 γάμοι δύσγαμοι; the negative word can come first, e.g. [Aesch.] *Prom.* 545 ἄχαρις χάρις, Soph. *Ai.* 665 ἄδωρα δῶρα, *O.T.* 1214 ἄγαμον γάμον. As most Latin words do not accept a negative prefix so easily Latin versions are rare, and usually involve varying grammatical forms (*trag. inc.* 80 Ribbeck³ *innuptis nuptiis*, Cic. *Phil.* 1.5 *insepultam sepulturam*, Lucr. 1.99 *casta inceste*; but 2.1054 *innumero numero*). But the same effect can be achieved, as here, with *non* or *nec*, e.g. Plaut. *Capt.* 2.221 *doli non doli sunt*, *CIL X* 8131.6 *nunc umbra nec umbra*, Ov. *Met.* 8.231 *at pater infelix nec iam pater*, cf. e.g. Eur. *I.T.* 512 οὐχ ἐκὼν ἐκὼν, Ar. *Ach.* 397 (parody of Euripides) οὐκ ἔνδον ἔνδον ἐστίν, *A.P.* 9.574.2 βίωτος οὐ βίωτος. Here the paradoxical form of the expression is combined with the unusual sense *funus* = ‘dead body’, first extant here (*TLL VI.2.36-67*, cf. e.g. Var. *R.R.* 1.4.5 *omnes domus repletae essent aegrotis ac funeribus*, Virg. *Aen.* 9.489 *funus lacerum*, Prop. 1.17.8 *haecine parua meum funus harena teget?*): this makes the reader look even further for the meaning conveyed. This is basically ‘living corpses’, as the young people are at this stage (*portarentur*) alive but considered as good as dead (cf. Apul. *Met.* 4.34 *uiuum ... funus*, of Psyche). Isoc. *Helen.* 213.27 calls them πενθουμένους ἔτι ζῶντας, and this passage may have influenced Catullus’ since it follows a very similar sequence of thought: Athens is in the process of sending the victims away (ἀποστελλούσης ~ *solitam esse ... dare*) when Theseus intervenes, thinking it better

to die (ἡγήσατο κρείττον εἶναι τεθνάναι ~ *suum corpus proicere optauit*) rather than (μᾶλλον ἢ ~ *potius quam*) to live as the ruler of a city forced to pay such a tribute; cf. also 173 *dira ... stipendia* n. Rather than the archaism *nec* = *non* (Munro), the adversative use of *nec* is appropriate for the way in which the first *funera* is immediately qualified: ‘corpses – but not corpses’, just as in Ov. *Met.* 8.231 (above).

Cecropia Transmitted *Cecropiae* would be a strange use of the possessive genitive with a place-name (‘corpses of Cecropia’). It is sometimes (Friedrich, Thomson) defended with reference to the possessive in the allusion at Ov. *Her.* 10.100 *impia funeribus, Cecropi terra, tuis*, but this is not a close enough parallel to be decisive. Baehrens’ *Cecropia* gives a more usual expression with ablative of point of departure, ‘carried from Cecropia’, responding to the accusative of destination *Cretam* (82); the omission of any preposition is here a poeticism, and as Baehrens points out a gloss of *e* over *Cecropia* might produce *Cecropiae*. Alternatively Heyworth’s *Cecropidum* would be a more normal genitive use: the patronymic otherwise occurs first at Virg. *Aen.* 6.21, in a context of repeated allusion to this passage (79 *Minotauro* n.).

portarentur Of being transported in a ship, but with overtones of the specialised use of *porto* to describe the carrying of a body in a funeral procession (*TLL* X.2.47.81-48.13, citing this line); cf. e.g. Ov. *Tr.* 1.3.89 *sine funere ferri* (exile as death), Prop. 3.18.32 *huc animae portet corpus inane tuae* (Charon paradoxically ferries Marcellus’ body since his soul has risen to the stars).

84 atque ita A common narrative formula (‘and so’), more tractable in verse than *itaque* (cf. Axelson 92-3): repeated at 315.

naue leui ... lenibus auris Both phrases in the style of Homeric formulae for natural or everyday objects (2 *liquidus ... per undas* n.), but while *lenis* is often used of wind in the same fairly colourless way (*TLL* 7.2.1145.20-37, cf. esp. Cicero's neoteric imitation at *Att.* 7.2.1 *flauit ab Epiro lenissimus Onchesmites*), *leuis* of a boat is more specifying; it is used technically by historians to distinguish particular kinds of 'light' ships (e.g. *Liv.* 32.21.27 *centum tectae naues et quinquaginta leuiiores apertae*, *Tac. Ann.* 11.18.4, *Curt.* 9.4.11), and occurs elsewhere in poetry with *alnus* (*Virg. Georg.* 2.451) or *ratis* (*Tib.* 1.4.46) rather than *nauis*. It implies speed as well as lack of weight, and *lenibus* too suggests an easy voyage; the complex sound-pattern, dominated by smooth *ls* and *ns*, that unifies the whole line (to Nuzzo's *naue ... nitens*, *leui ... lenibus*, *naue leui ... nitens ... lenibus* add *nitens ... lenibus*) illustrates the ship at one with the favouring winds. This might have a tone of tragic irony, since the Minotaur's victims would have preferred not to reach Crete so easily; or perhaps Theseus' eagerness overrides this (see below; 81-2, 101 *cupiens*, 102 *appeteret*). The ship's smooth progress resembles that of the Argo in 7 and especially 9 *leui ... uolitantem flamine currum* (see 76-115n., and cf. 63.1 with 1-3n.); contrast the sense and sound of 58n., describing Theseus' later voyage away from Dia.

nitens nitor occurs in maritime contexts of physically 'leaning on' the oars (e.g. *Acc. trag.* 629-30 Ribbeck³ *remisque nixi properiter nauem in fugam | transdunt*), but here and at *Prop.* 4.6.63 *illa petit Nilum cumba male nixa fugaci* this is felt only as a subsidiary sense after 'relying on' (*OLD* s.v. 3) the ship and 'aiming towards' (*OLD* s.v. 8) the goal of the journey (85).

85 magnanimum ad Minoa In the context of the series of quasi-Homeric epithet-noun combinations in 84-5, the reader is predisposed to understand *magnanimum* as a

conventional adjective that, like its literal Homeric equivalent *μεγάθυμος*, might apply to any hero, especially a king: ‘great-hearted’ could express a general atmosphere rather than a moral judgement, and the word makes much of its impact simply by being long and weighty and alliterating with *Minoa* (cf. Matthews (1981) 284). However, Minos has been described as *iniusti regis* (75, see n.), and his cruel treatment of Athens has been explained in detail. Against this background the usual (but vague) positive overtones of the adjective (‘noble in spirit, brave, bold, generous’, *OLD* s.v.) might indicate a sudden shift to Cretan focalisation (similarly *superbas*: and the focus is about to switch to Ariadne) but are more likely to be seen as ironic: ‘Minos is no more *magnanimus* than the Minotaur’s meal is a *daps*’, Knopp (1976) 208. For other ironic uses of various sorts cf. e.g. 58.5 *glubit magnanimos Remi nepotes*, Virg. *Georg.* 4.4 *magnanimosque duces* (bees), *Aen.* 12.144 *magnanimi Iouis ingratum ascendere cubile* (Juno speaks), Pers. 6.21-2 *hic bona dente | grandia magnanimus peragit puer*.

Cressey (1981) and Matthews (1981) argue that *magnanimus* translates *ὀλοόφρων*, the only epithet applied to Minos in Homer (*Od.* 11.322). But they implausibly assume that a word which is regularly used of heroes in general would be interpreted in this single case not only in the light of Homeric usage of *ὀλοόφρων* but also of its Stoic etymology (Cleanth. fr. 549 *SVF* = schol. *Od.* 1.52) from *ὄλος* (so ‘with comprehensive mind’) rather than *ὄλλυμι* (‘with destructive mind’). See also Giangrande (1984).

sedesque superbas ‘lordly’ (‘herrlich’, Friedrich) is a useful translation of *superbus*; the adjective is not always pejorative, and when applied to buildings etc. usually directs attention to their physical grandeur (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.639 *arte laboratae uestes ostroque superbo*, 7.12-13 *tectisque superbis | urit odoratam*

nocturna in lumina cedrum). But it can also easily be transferred to a building from its owner (e.g. Lucr. 4.1178 *postisque superbos unguis amaracino* (an *exclusus amator*), Hor. *Epod.* 2.7 *superba ciuium potentiorum limina*), and Minos could naturally be described as ‘proud’ of his palace and ‘disdainful’ of the lives of his victims. The alliteration is again important (see above), as is the chiasmic shape of the line, whose impressiveness suggests the impact that the sight of Minos’ palace makes on Theseus as he arrives (*uenit*). The whole line in fact closely repeats the sense, structure and ethos of 75 (see n.), closing the first ring of explanatory flashback before 86-99 expand on 71-3.

86-99 The ‘tableau’ of Ariadne falling in love at first sight draws on Ap. *Arg.* 3, combining motifs from the passages where Eros shoots Medea at her first sight of Jason (3.275-98) and later when she watches Jason leave Aeetes’ hall, then broods alone, worrying about his safety (3.442-71). Both Catullus and Apollonius influenced the equivalent passages in Virgil’s treatment of Dido (*Aen.* 1.712-22, 4.1-89; see Oksala (1962) 175-7, Fourcade (1979) 78-87). But whereas the love of both Medea and Dido is caused by epic gods in personified form, the divine references here seem conventional or metonymic (72 *Erycina*, 94-8): this is ‘a purely human story’ (Webster (1966) 30), perhaps scientifically explicable (91-2n.).

86 hunc As at 60 *quem* (see n.), the emphatically positioned accusative pronoun puts Theseus back into a subordinate narrative position as the object of Ariadne’s gaze.

simul ac ... conspexit Love at first sight (cf. Peleus, 19n.) is typical in many ancient contexts (see esp. Rohde (1900²) 158-64, Timpanaro (1978)), perhaps since, as Kroll comments, love was often understood as a sensual reaction to perceived

beauty: this is the assumption behind particular philosophical explanations (Bartsch (2006) 57-114). The emphasis on sight also suits a situation where two people are unable to speak to each other because of social convention (e.g. Theoc. 2.66ff., Musae. 86ff.), or where they are physically separated (e.g. Prop. 4.4.21, Ov. *Met.* 8.19ff., *Ciris* 130-2). But here no context is given for the circumstances of Ariadne's first sight of Theseus; contrast e.g. Philochorus' rationalising version of the story (Plut. *Thes.* 19.3), in which Ariadne is struck by Theseus' appearance and skill when he takes part in Minos' funeral games for Androgeus.

cupido ... lumine Singular *lumen* can be 'glance' (e.g. Ov. *Met.* 2.787 *obliquo ... lumine*, Sen. *Med.* 232 *lumine immisso*), but here, as often, this is indistinguishable from a poetic singular form of *lumina* = 'eyes' (92, 122, 188, 220, 233, 242; cf. 51.12, 66.30, 68.55; cf. singular for paired body parts at 104 *labello*, 129 *surae*). The literal meaning 'light' anticipates the fire imagery of 91-3 *flagrantia ... lumina, flammam, exarsit*: Konstan (1977) 56-7 suggests that Catullus responds to Apollonius' use of ἀμάρυγμα, literally 'sparkle' but then 'flashing glance', of Medea's glances at Jason at *Arg.* 3.288 (see further 91-2 *flagrantia ... | lumina* n.). The adjective seems proleptic (Ariadne can only become full of desire for Theseus after she has seen him), further conveying the suddenness of her emotion, but also suggests that her eyes are generally 'desirous' because she is predisposed to love even before finding an object: *Ciris* 132 *o nimium cupidis Minon inhiasset ocellis* is similarly ambiguous. This is apparently the only other application of *cupidus* to the eyes (Lyne *ad loc.*, *TLL* IV.1427.83-1428.8); Catullus also uses it of ears (61.55 *aure*), Propertius and Ovid of arms and hands (Prop. 2.22.37, Ov. *Her.* 13.115 *lacertis*, *A.A.* 1.116, 452 *manus*, *Met.* 11.63 *ulnis*), Ovid of lips (*Met.* 6.467 *ore*). All these uses can be thought of as transferred from *cupidus* of an internal or

metaphorical ‘organ’: Plaut. *Bacch.* 1015, Ter. *Heaut.* 367, Juv. 7.58 of the *animus*, 147 and 398 below of the *mens*, Enn. *trag.* 115 Jocelyn (a possible influence here, since Medea is described) of the *cor*.

86-7 uirgo | regia Catullus uses *uirgo* only in poems 61-2 and 64-8: almost always the sense of actual virginity is important and the word often refers to a bride. Calling Ariadne *uirgo regia* emphasises both her youthful innocence and her high status; both aspects make her vulnerable and both are developed in 87-90. *regia uirgo* is applied to herself by Medea at Ov. *Met.* 7.21 at the parallel point in her story (see also 98 *in ... hospite suspirantem* n.), and is similarly used at e.g. Ov. *Met.* 2.570 of Coronis, 2.868 of Europa just before their (attempted) rapes.

87-90 The temporal clause governed by *simul ac* encourages the reader to expect an answering main clause of rapid narrative, but is instead followed by a leisurely relative clause (*quam ... alebat*) further developed by a simile (*quales ... colores*). When the consequence of Ariadne’s first sight of Theseus is eventually narrated in 91-3 it therefore comes as more of a surprise, better representing how the situation described in 87-90 was abruptly ended. The digression at a dramatic moment looks like a miniature version of the Homeric technique of e.g. *Od.* 19.395-466, where the background (how Odysseus got the scar by which Eurycleia has just recognised him) is narrated between a crucial sight and its consequences.

The world Ariadne inhabits in these lines contrasts pathetically with the setting in which we have just seen her on bleak, salty, lonely Dia. The picture of soft, sweet-smelling, flower-like attractiveness creates a powerfully Sapphic atmosphere (cf. in particular Sapph. 94 Voigt with its flowers, perfumes and soft bed,

στρώμ[αν] ... μολθάκαν), within which the maternal embrace is far from straightforwardly innocent (88 *in molli complexu matris* n.). The combination of an emphasis on virginity (*castus*) and youth (*lectulus*, *in molli complexu matris*) with images suggesting sexual desirability is typical of the presentation of the bride in the characteristically Sapphic genre of wedding-song (Klingner (1956) 82-3, Dettmer (1997) 123-4, cf. Fedeli (1972) 14-20; see further 88 *in molli complexu matris*, 89-90nn.). Alternatively, a more ‘epic’ way of reading of this combination would be to remember Nausicaa’s first appearance in bed at *Od.* 6.15ff., or to associate 89-90 with descriptions of a *locus amoenus* in which a girl might pick flowers before being raped (e.g. *Hymn. Hom.* 2.4-18). Virg. *Aen.* 1.691-4 similarly includes bed/sleep, childhood, softness, sweet-scented herbs and flowers, a maternal embrace and sexual overtones (since this is Venus), and like these lines has ‘many mutes and liquids’ (Austin *ad loc.*); it probably drew on this passage as well as 61.6-7. *Ciris* 3-4 *Cecropius suavis exspirans hortulus auras | florentis uiridi sophiae complectitur umbra* combines imitation of these lines and of the Virgilian passage (see Lyne *ad loc.*), implying that the poet perceived a connection.

87 suavis ... odores Probably actual perfumes, as at 6.7-8 *cubile ... | sertis ac Syrio fragrans oliuo*, 68.144 *fragrantem Assyrio uenit odore domum*; but perhaps because it is Ariadne’s the bed has the natural pleasant fragrance said to emanate from an attractive woman (cf. 13.11-12 with Quinn, and e.g. *Il.* 6.483, Prop. 2.29.15-18, Musae. 133; frequently of goddesses, e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.403-4). The same ambiguity is possible in the case of sweet-smelling θάλαμοι in Homer (*Il.* 3.382, belonging to Paris; *Od.* 4.121, Helen) and *Hymn. Hom.* 2.244, 288 (Metaneira). All these scented beds and bedrooms occur in marital or other sexual contexts (cf. Lyne on *Ciris* 512),

so the appearance of *castus* between *suavis* and *odores* is paradoxical, or suggests that Ariadne's virginity makes her even more desirable.

Catullus has *suavis* exclusively of smells (also 13.10, 61.7), a regular use (*OLD* s.v. 2). The adjective (and related adverbs) almost drops out of poetry after Virg. *Ecl.* (once in *Georg.*) and Hor. *Serm.* (*suauiter* once in *Epist.*), apparently because it was felt to be archaic and/or colloquial (Axelson 35-7, Ross (1969) 76-80, Mamoojee (1981)). *odores* opens the most striking pattern of rhyming line-endings in the poem: it rhymes with one of its possible point of comparison, 90 *colores* (89-90n.), and then with 94 *furores*, 99 *timores*.

exspirans For *spiro* and compounds used of the exuding of scents (mostly in poetry), cf. e.g. Lucr. 4.123-4 *quaecumque suo de corpore odorem | exspirant acrem*, Virg. *Georg.* 4.31 *grauiter spirantis copia thymbrae*, *Aen.* 1.403-4 *ambrosiaeque comae diuinum uertice odorem | spirauere*, Manil. 4.673, Juv. 7.208. The idea of 'breathing out' contributes to the presentation of the bed itself as a living thing (cf. 87-8 *castus ... | lectulus, alebat* nn.) and makes it clearer that the *odores* are conceived of as physical vapours, like the *aura* of 90 (see n.).

87-8 castus ... | lectulus *castus*, 'sexually chaste', is transferred from Ariadne (cf. 66.83 *casto ... cubili*, 68.6 *lecto caelibae* and e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 8.412, V.Fl. 2.137) but also helps to personify the bed; cf. *exspirans, alebat* nn. For the diminutive *lectulus* see 60 *ocellis* n.; although elsewhere *lectulus* is applied to all sorts of beds, the idea of smallness here connotes youth. This *lectulus* represents Ariadne's life on Crete, while Theseus' bed as she imagines it at 163 stands for her fantasised future in Athens (Paschalis (2004) 70); on her desert island, which lacks any buildings at all (184), Ariadne has failed to effect the bridal transition from one bed and home to

another. Cf. Apollonius' Medea kissing her bed as she leaves Colchis, *Arg.* 4.26. Like the bed of 163 (see n.), this bed is also a *mise en abyme* for Thetis' *puluinar* (47); its fragrance, compared to *colores* (see n.), is parallel to the purple cloths of 49 and 163, and 90 *distinctos* to 50 *uariata*, 88 *complexu* to 266 *complexa*. Cf. also *Ciris* 439-40 *pronuba nec castos accendet pinus odores, | non Libys Assyrio sternetur lectulus ostro*, echoing the language of these lines in the rhetorical position parallel to 163 (Scylla laments the marriage she has not gained); this suggests how similar to a marriage bed Ariadne's Cretan *lectulus* already is (87-90 n.).

88 in molli complexu matris is as vague and suggestive as might be expected of such a universal idea as the mother's embrace; Friedrich imagines a mother bending over her daughter's bed to hug her. The marriage ritual of the bride being torn from her mother is evoked (cf. 118 *complexum* n.). But the detail also encapsulates the mixture of innocence and sexuality here, as to some extent any mention of a mother will, since mothers are both associated with innocent childhood and by definition sexually experienced. *mollis* suits the luxurious, indoor setting (cf. the παρθενική ἀπαλόχρως who remains inside with her mother at Hes. *Op.* 519-23) but of bodies generally implies sexual attractiveness (e.g. 68.70 *molli ... pede*; cf. 129). Just as at Virg. *Aen.* 1.691-4 (87-90n.), these overtones are amplified by the identity of the mother; if the reader registers that this is Pasiphae, Ariadne will seem even more ripe for overwhelming, disastrous sexual passion (so e.g. Harmon (1973) 322).

alebat suggests Ariadne's growing to maturity as a result of being 'fed'; the *lectulus* again appears alive. The nourishment it produces seems to be the *odores* of 87, which Ariadne might be breathing in (~ feeding on); or the verb could be parallel to *progignunt, educit* with Ariadne herself growing from the bed like a flower (89-

90n.). Alternatively, as the bed almost merges with the embracing mother in this line, it might appear as a mother suckling a baby: *alo* can be used in all these contexts.

89-90 The antecedent of *quales* is ambiguous. The first possibility is 86 *uirgo*: the comparison of a beautiful woman with a flower or other attractive plant is conventional (Rohde (1900²) 164 n.3) and particularly associated with wedding songs, where it conveys an appropriate combination of fertility (which has produced the flowers) and virginal fragility (of the flower itself): see e.g. Theoc. 18.29-30, Men. Rhet. 2.404.4-8. In Catullus cf. 61.21-5, 57, 87-9, 62.39-41, often with the idea of the flower being nurtured in a safe place as Ariadne is in 87-8; this ‘garden’ imagery is Sapphic (see esp. Sapph. 105 Voigt and Winkler (1990) 180-7, Stehle Stigers (1977)). The alternative antecedent is 87 *odores*: a reader choosing this option will presumably supply the ‘unimportant middle term’ of the comparison (Quinn), understanding that the scents of the bed are like [the scents of] the plants. This is easy for the obviously fragrant myrtle, but the combination with *colores* for flowers (see n.) creates a striking effect of synaesthesia between smell and sight (Rees (1994) 75, Fitzgerald (1995) 161-2).

89 Eurotae ... flumina OGR have *Europae*; there is evidence for a Cretan cult of Europa featuring myrtle (see Ellis’s excursus here), and it would be appropriate to mention here a heroine who was raped while picking flowers (though there is no myrtle in Mosch. *Eur.*) and who was the mother of Minos; but there is no river that is famous as ‘Europa’s’. It is much more likely that the structure of the phrase and the plural *flumina* = ‘streams’ require a river-name (cf. 3 *fluctus* n.), whence *Eurotae* of the *editio princeps*. Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.498 *qualis in Eurotae ripis* and see Bulloch on

Call. *Hymn* 5.24, Clausen on Virg. *Ecl.* 6.82-4 for evocative uses of the name in poetry. However, no evidence survives of a specific link between the Spartan river and the plant, only general references to myrtle growing in Laconia (Paus. 3.22.12, *Culex* 400 *Spartica myrtus*, Hesych. s.v. μυρταλίζ). Either the name alludes to a lost mythical detail, or it is basically decorative and the name of any other lush and exotic area would have done as well (cf. 61.22 *myrtus Asia*), or it is not in fact the right text: a different river-name could have been glossed by *Europ(a)e* here.

progignunt Baehrens' *praecingunt*, accepted by Mynors, is an almost equally plausible ancestor of transmitted *pergignunt*, but by requiring *quales ... myrtus* to be taken as nominative makes the transition to 90, in which the alternative comparand *distinctos ... colores* is the object, 'impossibly harsh' (Quinn). This grammatical reorganisation, and the sense of the verb, also disrupt the precise parallelism between the comparisons in 89 and 90, each expressed in a near-'golden' five-word line (7n.); cf. similar parallelism in 63-5n. A compound of *cingere* ought moreover to describe something which can be surrounded on all sides, like a lake, rather than a river with two banks. *progignunt*, as well as echoing 1 *prognatae* of trees, is also parallel in sense to the verbs used of the environment producing flowers in other Catullan bridal contexts (289-2 *ferunt, creat, parit*; 61.25 *nutriunt*, 62.39-41 *nascitur, firmit, educat*), emphasising the aspect of the image that concerns fertility (89-90n.) and helping to merge the simile with the surrounding metaphorical language, since it continues the idea in *alebat*.

myrtus Appropriate because of its softness and scent (89-90n.), myrtle also, through its association with Venus, contributes eroticism (also at 61.21-5). Like most tree-names (N—W I §122) *myrtus* has both fourth- and second-declension forms, so that the choice between the variant readings here is arbitrary.

90 The expansion of the original comparison with a loosely attached alternative (-*ue*), typical of epic similes since Homer, here implies a relaxed narrator exploring descriptive possibilities (87-90n.). As this line specifies no place to contradict *Eurotae* and 89 no time to contradict *uerna*, the two comparisons are felt as aspects of the same scene (myrtles and flowers by the Eurotas in spring) rather than as true alternatives, a further aspect of the fluid, ‘soft-focus’ effect of 87-90 (see Fitzgerald (1995) 161-2).

auraue ... uerna Cf. 62.41 *aurae* (89-90n.). The *odores* of 87 find a parallel in this other current of air (especially since *aura* can also mean ‘scent’: *OLD* s.v. 6), further pointing up the slippage from one sense to another in this simile (89-90n.). *uerna* recurs of *aura* only at Ov. *Her.* 6.109 *mobilis Aesonide uernaque incertior aura*, suggesting that Ovid borrows a phrase from this poem to describe a Jason who behaves much like Catullus’ Theseus (59n.); however, influence either from or on Lucr. 1.10-11 *species patefactast uerna diei | et reserata uiget genitabilis aura fauoni* is likely (with this line cf. Lucr. 1.7-8 *tibi suavis daedala tellus | summittit flores*).

distinctos educit ... colores ‘draws out [of the ground] various colours [of flowers]’, or ‘various flowers’ (cf. 62.42 *quem [florem] ... educat imber*); *colores* is on the edge of synecdoche for *flores*, as at Prop. 1.2.9 *aspice quos summittit humus formosa colores*, Tib. 1.4.29 *quam cito purpureos deperdit terra colores*, Virg. *Georg.* 4.306 *ante nouis rubeant quam prata coloribus*. Cf. ὄνθος = ‘colour’, the opposite development in meaning: Gow on Theoc. 15.116, citing comparably ambiguous cases. *distinctos* means ‘of various colours’ (‘distinctos inter se’, Baehrens), although later it is more often applied to the ground being ‘variegated’ with coloured flowers (Ov. *Met.* 5.266 *innumeris distinctas floribus herbas*, *Culex* 71 *distincta coloribus arua*).

91 The sudden end to the relaxed description is emphasised by the rhythm: *flagrantia* breaks a series of no fewer than five lines (86-90) with a molossus after the main caesura (1 *prognatae* n.).

91-2 non prius ex illo ... declinauit | ... quam Ariadne caught sight of Theseus suddenly (86 *simul ac ... conspexit*), but continued to gaze at him for some time (evoked for the reader by the narrative delay in 87-90n.): *ex illo ... declinauit*, with its expressive *spondeiazon* (cf. 15 *admirantes* n.) and combination of *ex* and *de-*, evokes an erotic image of Ariadne's gaze travelling slowly down Theseus' body until it leaves him and she is left (too late) with modestly downcast eyes. Ov. *Met.* 7.86-8 *spectat et in uultu ueluti tum denique uiso | lumina fixa tenet: ... | ... nec se declinat ab illo* (Medea's love for Jason returns when she sees him again) probably alludes.

flagrantia ... | lumina At Ap. *Arg.* 3.286-8 Medea looks at Jason with 'sparkling' glances (ἀμαρύγματα, cf. 86 *cupido ... lumine* n.) after her heart has been set on fire by Eros' arrow; similarly at 3.444-6 she looks at him with 'smouldering' heart (σμήχουσα). Here the process is reversed (Konstan (1977) 56-7): while Ariadne gazes at Theseus, the flame spreads from her eyes to her *corpus* and *medullae*. Love as fire and love at first sight are combined by the theory of vision as fire, found in e.g. Plat. *Tim.* 45b-46a, 67d-68b, Empedocles fr. 84b D—K and probably Pythagorean: the eye emits a ray of fire which enables it to receive similar fire from its surroundings (see Onians (1954²) 76-8, van Hoorn (1972) 43-8). Like 86 *cupido ... lumine* (see n.), this detail helps to suggest that Ariadne is already desirous before she sees Theseus; the implied scientific background and the lack of reference to the gods here also present Ariadne's passion as purely human, the result of a natural causal chain. *flagro* of the eyes first at Cic. *Arat.* 9.3, referring to a

constellation's 'eyes', i.e. stars; it is later applied in poetry and prose to real eyes 'burning' with various emotions (*TLL* VI.1.846.76-81).

92 cuncto ... corpore Cf. 66 *toto ... corpore* (same position): 92-3 like 66 are filled with words for totality, linking the descriptions of Ariadne's complete physical and emotional devastation. It is unusual to mention the whole *corpus* as the place where love is felt, but it makes the metaphor here particularly 'live' (see below). *pectore*, supported by Baehrens, would bring this passage into line with Virg. *Aen.* 7.356 *toto percepit pectore flammam*, Ov. *Met.* 7.17 *uirgineo conceptas pectore flammam*, Petron. 127 *toto conceptit pectore flammam*, but would weaken this effect as well as the strongly marked alliteration, which presumably also led Catullus to write *cuncto* rather than *toto*: cf. Virgil's *percepit pectore*, and see Housman on Manil. 1.416 on the common manuscript substitution of one fifth-foot dactylic word for another.

conceptit flammam The image of love as an internal flame is ubiquitous and *concipere flammam* (or *ignem*), 'receive a flame', is an ordinary idiom for 'catch fire' (e.g. Cic. *De orat.* 2.190, Caes. *B.C.* 2.14.2). But the combination activates the meaning *concipere* = 'conceive', in ironic contrast with the actual sterility of Ariadne's relationship with Theseus (Curran (1969) 175, Duban (1980) 781, Godwin). Cf. 65 *lactentis*, 198 *nascuntur* nn. Ov. *Met.* 7.9 *conceptit ... ualidos Aetias ignes*, alluding to this line (cf. 7.17, quoted above), has a different sort of irony given the fate of Medea's children.

93 funditus atque If *atque* is in its natural place here, *funditus* goes with *conceptit* and has its wider sense of 'utterly'; if *atque* is postponed to second place in the clause, like 43 *at* (see n.), it goes with *exarsit* and has this sense as well as its literal

meaning ‘from the bottom’. It adds to the pleonasm either way (with *cuncto* or with *tota* and *imis*). Enjambment of one word is fairly frequent in the poem (23 *heroes* n.) and *funditus* is linked to *flammam* by alliteration after the alliterative pattern of *c* in 92; on the other hand three words for completeness in the same clause would be parallel to 66 *omnia ... toto ... passim*, with a similar sense of climax; cf. also *funditus* and *imus* emphatically together at Lucr. 3.38 *funditus humanam qui uitam turbat ab imo*. The fact that this would be the only postponement of *atque* in Catullus is not a strong point against it in a small corpus which postpones *at*, *sed* and others, especially at the beginning of a line (see further Friedrich); moreover, although in Augustan poets *atque* is more resistant to postponement than other non-enclitic conjunctions (see Platnauer 93-6 and Heyworth, *Cynthia* on Prop. 3.13.39, Gibson on Ov. *A.A.* 3.282, both emending the only possible examples in their poets), there is one example in Virgil, *Ecl.* 6.37-8 *iamque nouum terrae stupeant lucescere solem | altius atque cadant summotis nubibus imbres* (convincingly defended by Clausen *ad loc.*) and several in Hor. *Serm.* 1. The probable imitation at *Ciris* 164 *et ualidum penitus concepit in ossa furorem* is (pace Friedrich) not conclusive either way, since it combines *concepit* from 92 here with the bones from 93. Irreducible ambiguity between the two possibilities seems appropriate: Ariadne’s body has become one undifferentiated fire.

imis ... medullis For love affecting the bones, often combined with fire imagery, cf. e.g. Archil. 193 West² δύστηνος ἔγκειμαι πόθῳ | ἄψυχος, χαλεπῇσι θεῶν ὀδύνησις ἔκηντι | πεπαρμένος δι’ ὀστέων, Theoc. 3.17 with Gow, Virg. *Georg.* 3.258-9, *Aen.* 1.660, Prop. 3.17.9, Ov. *Met.* 14.700, *Ciris* 164 (see above) with Lyne. The point that passion is felt in the innermost parts of the body is obviously taken further by going inside the bones to the marrow (e.g. 45.16 *ignis*

mollibus ardet in medullis, Virg. *Aen.* 4.66 *est mollis flamma medullas* with Pease, Ov. *Am.* 3.10.27 *tenerae flammam rapuere medullae*) and then by the addition of *imis*: Ov. *A.A.* 3.793-4 *ex imis resoluta medullis* | *femina*, Stat. *Silu.* 2.7.127 *imis altius insitum medullis*; cf. 35.15 *ignes interiorem edunt medullam*, 66.23 *quam penitus maestas exedit cura medullas*, Eur. *Hipp.* 255 μὴ πρὸς ἄκρον μυελὸν ψυχῆς, Ov. *Her.* 4.70 *acer in extremis ossibus haesit amor*, Sen. *Phaed.* 282 *sed uorat tectas penitus medullas*, [Sen.] *H.O.* 450 [*amor*] *penitus sedet fixus medullis*. See also N—H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.8 *penitus*, Onians (1954²) 151-2, and cf. 76.21 *quae mihi surrepens imos ut torpor in artus*.

exarsit For *exardesco* ‘burst into flames’ of falling in love cf. Ov. *A.A.* 2.353-4, Juv. 6.103-4, Tac. *Ann.* 11.12 *in C. Silium, iuuentutis Romanae pulcherrimum, ita exarserat ut*

94-8 On this sort of embedded hymnic address cf. 19-30n.; formal markers here include title (*sancte*), relative clause describing typical activity/power (*curis ... misces*), mention of alternative cult centres (96) and hymnic anaphora (*quaeque ... quaeque*). As at 22-30 the turn away from narrative has a partly transitional function: at 97ff. the narrator returns to Ariadne at a slightly later point in her story. The reflection on the destructive power of the gods of love, often with an address, is reminiscent of choral odes in tragedy (e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 781-800, *Trach.* 497-530, Eur. *Med.* 627-44, *Hipp.* 525-64, 1268-82, *I.A.* 543-57); important for Catullus will have been the narratorial interjection at Ap. *Arg.* 4.445-9 beginning σκέτλι’ Ἔρως, μέγα πῆμα. The context there is the murder of Apsyrtus, and such apostrophes to Love and/or Aphrodite/Venus often include a comment on the crimes which they force their victims to commit (e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 791-4, Virg. *Ecl.* 8.47-50, *Aen.* 4.412); here

only the pain that Ariadne herself undergoes is mentioned (97ff.), but perhaps there is an element of tragic foreshadowing, since she too will cause the death of her brother (cf. 150, 181nn.). Apollonius also includes the first-person apotropaic element that is typical of the tragic examples (448-9, cf. e.g. Eur. *Med.* 633-43, *Hipp.* 528-9, *I.A.* 552-7), whereas here, as at 22-4, the narrator does not complete the hymn by asking the gods addressed to do anything; the prayer element is replaced by the exclamations of 97-100, which are also formally parallel to the questions to Peleus at 25-30 (in particular, with *qualibus* ... | ... | *quantos* ... | *quanto* cf. *teque* ... | ... | ... | *tene* ... | *tene*).

94 heu Initially with *sancte puer*, as *heu* and *eheu* can introduce exclamations which are simply noun-phrases, whether accusative or vocative (e.g. 77.5-6 *heu heu nostrae crudele uenenum* | *uitae*, *heu heu nostrae pestis amicitiae*, 101.6 *heu miser indigne frater adempte mihi*). However, as they are also often followed by questions (e.g. 30.6 *eheu quid faciant...?*) the force of this *heu* is still felt with *qualibus*, *quantos*, *quanto*, ‘oh what waves’ etc. Cf. 61 *eheu*, 71 *a misera* nn. for the narrator’s interjection.

miseros agitans ... furores Transmitted *misere* (adverb) almost always refers to *undergoing* something painful or unpleasant. This is true even when the verb qualified need not itself have a negative meaning (e.g. Hor. *Serm.* 1.9.8 *misere discedere quaerens*, 14 ‘*misere cupis*’ inquit ‘*abire*’, Gell. 9.15.9 *Iuliano autem male ac misere rubente et sudante*; cf. also *misere* of people ‘desperately’ in love in comedy, e.g. Plaut. *Cist.* 131, Ter. *Andr.* 520). The application of *misere* here to the verb of *inflicting* pain is therefore highly suspect, and gives an additional reason for conjecture here besides the rarity of the colloquial *misere* in classical poetry (Hor. as

above add only Lucr. 3.861, 898, Sil. 2.463 and see Hall (1989) 31 and n.21, emending Ov. *Tr.* 3.10.63). Markland's *miseros agitans* is palaeographically straightforward (see Trappes-Lomax); cf. *misero ... furori* at Ov. *Met.* 3.479 (Narcissus), Mart. 12.49.7. It also gets rid of the elision of a long vowel before a similar short one ('very rare and cacophonous', Winbolt 171) in an inessential prefix.

in miti corde i.e. in the heart of the victim, 'calm' before being stirred up (*agitans*). *immiti corde* is usually read as a characterisation of Love equivalent to Ap. *Arg.* 4.445 *σχέτλιε*, but unlike 294 *post hunc consequitur sollerti corde Prometheus*, Sil. 5.206-7 *sola, Appennini residens in uertice | diras expectat caedes immiti pectore Iuno* it would come at an unnatural point in the sentence, separated from its noun; *in miti corde*, a purely orthographical change (e.g. O has *īmiti* here, 48 *īmediis*) gives a locative ablative placed between the verb and object as at 72 *serens in pectore curas*, 99 *tulit languenti corde timores*. Cf. also 54 *in corde gerens ... furores*, 250 *animo uoluebat ... curas*: these repeated descriptions of Ariadne's emotional state make a reference to Love's own heart in an otherwise similar phrase even less likely.

95 sancte puer *sanctus* of a god is usually colourless, simply indicating divine status in a solemn (or mock-solemn) tone: Catullus also has 268 *sanctis ... diuis*, 298 *pater diuum sancta cum coniuge*, 36.3 *sanctae Veneri Cupidinique*, 68.5 *sancta Venus*. But since *sanctus* is standardly applied not to children but to parents or others who have been 'hallowed' by time (*OLD* s.v. 3d), *sancte puer* is a paradoxical collocation (recurring only at *Culex* 26, 37, of Octavian), and therefore an appropriate introduction to the description of Love's double-edged activities. It is a more flattering address than Apollonius' *σχέτλι' Ἐρώς* (see 94-8n.), with which it invites comparison because of its identical rhythm, place in the line and consonantal sounds.

curis hominum qui gaudia misces The idea of the god of love causing both pleasure and pain is widespread from Sappho's Ἔρος ... γλυκύπικρον onwards (fr. 130 Voigt); also possibly relevant here is Ap. *Arg.* 3.290 γλυκερῇ ... ἀνίη, of Medea just after she has been shot by Eros and looked at Jason (cf. 86, 91-2nn.). Catullus uses very similar phrasing to characterise Venus at 68.18 *quae dulcem curis miscet amaritiem*. Here the abstract *curis* and *gaudia* rather than more sensuous ideas of 'bitter' and 'sweet', and *hominum* for the contrast between the gods and humanity, also link this to the even more generalised *topos* of the mixture of good and bad divinely ordained for the human condition (e.g. *Il.* 24.527-33). Again the presentation of Love is slightly more positive than in Apollonius' address (94-8n.), where Eros is μέγα στύγος ἀνθρώποισιν, bringing only bad things (οὐλόμεναι ἔριδες, στοναχαί, γόοι, ἄλγεα ἄλλα).

96 Another hymnic relative clause (see Norden (1913) 168-76) here adds a second divine addressee. Gods are similarly identified by a relative clause without being named at e.g. Theoc. 16.83-4 (Persephone), Ap. *Arg.* 1.411 (Apollo). Catullus introduces Venus/Aphrodite in the same way at 36.12-15 *quae sanctum Idalium Vriosque apertos | quaeque Ancona Cnidumque harundinosam | colis quaeque Amathunta quaeque Golgos | quaeque Durrachium Hadriae tabernam*; Wray (2001) 77 persuasively argues that 'Even in Phalaecians, Catullus can show Volusius how hexameter poetry ought to sound ... like Callimachus, Theocritus, Apollonius and, of course, like Catullus himself when he writes hexameters'. The line in fact reworks Theoc. 15.100 δέσποιν' ἅ Γόλγως τε καὶ Ἰδάλιον ἐφιλάσας, the opening line of an ecphrastic inset song describing Adonis' scented, flowery bed (cf. 87-90): the goddess's Cypriot haunts of Golgi and Idalium appear in Latin for the first time in

Catullus, also at 36.12-15 (above) and 61.17 *Idalium colens*. Idalium had a sacred grove, hence *frondosum*; Virgil introduces this detail at *Aen.* 1.692-3 *altos | Idaliae lucos*, extending the allusion to 87-90 (see n.) with a reminiscence of this line.

Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 465 comment that the appearance of a translation of Theocritus embedded within an Apollonian allusion ‘is a mark of how Catullus constructs a shared tradition within his third-century Greek models’; cf. 111n. for the inclusion of Callimachus in this passage too.

97-8 qualibus incensam iactastis ... | fluctibus The exclamation moves from general descriptions of Love and Venus (*miscet, regis*) to how they treated Ariadne on this particular occasion (*iactastis*). She is *incensam mente* because of what happened in her last appearance in 91-3 (*incensus* here is more actively metaphorical than at 19, 253), and is now tossed on emotional waves, as on Dia (62n.).

98 in ... hospite suspirantem *in* + ablative = ‘over’ is paralleled with *suspiro* at Ov. *Fast.* 1.417 *hanc cupit, hanc optat, sola suspirat in illa*; for this use after other verbs of emotion or its physical manifestation cf. 119 *misera in gnata deperdita lamentata est*, 22.17 *tam gaudet in se*, 61.97-8 *in mala | deditus uir adultera* and e.g. Lucr. 3.647 *in pugnae studio quod dedita mens est*, Prop. 1.13.7-8 *perditus in quadam*, Hor. *Carm.* 1.17.19 *laborantes in uno | Penelopen uitreamque Circen* with N—H, Ov. *Am.* 1.9.33 *ardet in abducta Briseide magnus Achilles*, the many Ovidian examples cited by McKeown *ad loc.* and especially the allusion to this line at Ov. *Met.* 7.21 *quid in hospite regia uirgo | ureris?* (cf. 86-7). Thomson explains *hospes* as ‘outsider’, comparing 81.4 (though that usage is not as clear as he claims *ad loc.*); but the more usual ‘guest’ is implied when Ariadne uses the word at 176 (see n.). The implication

that Theseus and his companions were in some way treated as Minos' guests is bizarre; perhaps we should infer something similar to the awkward diplomatic situation between Aeetes and the Argonauts in Ap. *Arg.*

flauo Theseus is heroically blond: cf. 63 *flauo* n. The visual detail is appropriate after the emphasis on sight in 86-7, 91-2.

saepe (emphasised by the repetition in 100) implies an extended period of time; it becomes clearer that the narrative has left behind the crucial moment of first sight. Cf. *saepe* at 124n.

99 A pivotal line (cf. 11n.) from the description of Ariadne falling in love (86-98) to that of Theseus' encounter with the Minotaur (100-15). As an exclamation it is linked to 97-8, and its content is similar, but there is no longer any reference to the addressees of 94-6; Ariadne is now the subject (*illa*). *timores* initially seems just another word to describe her painful feelings as she first falls in love (fear that Theseus may not love her? fear of betraying her family? fear of the unknown? the possibilities clearly justify the plural), especially since it is linked by rhyme and preceding *corde* to 94 *furores*; but 100-4 invite the reader to reinterpret it as fear for Theseus' safety in the Labyrinth.

languenti corde Cf. 188 *languescant lumina*, 219-20 *languida* ... | *lumina*, 331 *languidulos* ... *somnos*. However, *languor* and cognates are not as 'sentimental' (Fordyce on 219) and metaphorical as English 'languid', 'languishing' but retain a strong sense of physical exhaustion.

100 quam tum Transmitted *quanto* can be explained as ablative of measure of difference with *magis* 'how much more', but might at first sight confusingly appear to

go either with *saepe* (ungrammatical) or with *fulgore* (producing a strange sense). Faernus' *quam tum* (with *saepe*, 'how often then') is much clearer and palaeographically very plausible, since *quā tū* could very easily have been read as *quāto*, especially under the influence of *quantos* in the previous line. It provides a correlative for 101 *cum* which helps to move the narrative time forward from Ariadne falling in love to Theseus ready for the Minotaur in 101-2 (cf. 19-21 *tum ... tum ... tum* n.); it is supported by the imitation at *Ciris* 81 *quotiens* (~ *quam saepe*) *mirata novos expalluit artus*; and it produces an elegant varied anaphoric tricolon in 97-100 *qualibus ... quanto ... quam saepe*. Oksala (1962) 77 compares the narrator's exclamation at Virg. *Aen.* 4.408-10 *quis tibi tum, Dido, cernenti talia sensus, | quosue dabas gemitus*.

magis fulgore expalluit auri 'she turned paler than the sheen of gold'; *fulgore* ablative of comparison. People in love, like those suffering from fear or disease, are often said to turn pale (see Rohde (1900²) 157 n.2 and cf. N—H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.5); cf. esp. Apollonius' Medea at the parallel moment, *Arg.* 3.297-8 ἀπαλὰς δὲ μετετροπᾶτο παρειᾶς | ἐς χλόον, ἄλλοτ' ἔρευθος. But the colour indicated by *pallor* and *palleo* is yellow not white (cf. Prop. 4.7.82 *numquam ... pallet ebur*, Lucr. 4.336 *palloribus* of jaundice, and for further discussion Fordyce on 81.4), and the words regularly apply to gold: e.g. Ov. *Met.* 11.110 *saxum quoque palluit auro*, Mart. 8.44.10 *arca palleat nummis*. Skin affected by *pallor* is compared to gold at 81.4 *inaurata pallidior statua*, Stat. *Silu.* 4.7.15, Sil. 1.233, and to other yellow objects at e.g. Theoc. 2.88 καί μεν χρῶς μὲν ὁμοῖος ἐγίνετο πολλάκι θάψω, Ov. *Met.* 4.134 *oraeque buxo pallidiora gerens*; probably a realistic reference to the colour in such circumstances of 'Mediterranean' olive skin, as e.g. Kroll, Quinn

suggest. Here, however, the comparison also suggests that Ariadne remains attractive in her distress, and perhaps connotes her status in the poem as a figure of visual art.

101 saeuum ... monstrum The only extant example of *saeuus* applied to *monstrum* outside Senecan tragedy, where this is quite frequent (*H.F.* 241, 245, 1280, *Med.* 191, *Phaed.* 1204, *H.O.* 878-9). Theseus' focalisation (102n.) is probably already felt from *cupiens*: this is his characterisation of the Minotaur, contrasting with Ariadne's *germanum* (150), *fraterna caede* (181) although similar to her *indomito ... tauro* (173n).

cupiens Theseus' eagerness is for battle with the Minotaur, not for Ariadne: contrast both her *cupido ... lumine* (86n.) and the sexual longing she attributes to men in general (146 *cupiens animus*).

contra contendere With *contendere* the preposition is a fairly frequent alternative to *cum* or *in*. The word order adjective-(intervening words)-preposition-(intervening words)-noun is rare (cf. Platnauer 101), and one might consider reversing the order of *cupiens* and *contra* to remove it; but it is perhaps made easier by the fact that like other disyllabic prepositions, *contra* often occurs in anastrophe, especially in poetry (N—W II.946), and sometimes with further displacement: cf. Virg. *Aen.* 5.370 *solus qui Paridem solitus contendere contra* with Williams. The order apparently occurs with another disyllabic preposition at Ov. *Pont.* 4.14.15 *talia succensent propter mihi uerba Tomitae*; Heyworth and Hutchinson emend Prop. 4.8.31 *altera Tarpeios est inter Teia lucos*, replacing *est inter* with *inter stat* (see Hutchinson and Heyworth, *Cynthia ad loc.*).

102 ‘Death or glory’; cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 10.862-5 *aut hodie uictor spolia illa cruenti* | ... | *aut, aperit si nulla uiam uis, | occumbes pariter*. Slightly different, but probable models here, are Ap. *Arg.* 4.205 ἢ ἐ κατηφείην ἢ καὶ μέγα κῦδος ἀρέσθαι and 3.428-9 τῷ καὶ ἐγὼ τὸν ἄεθλον ὑπερφιάλόν περ ἑόντα | τλήσομαι, εἰ καί μοι θανέειν μῶρος. Jason speaks both: this rhetorical line is clearly focalised through Theseus. In *Arg.* 3 Jason addresses Aeetes at the equivalent point in the story, before facing his heroic challenges, but in *Arg.* 4, verbally closer, he is merely exhorting the Argonauts to protect Medea, evade Aeetes’ pursuit and escape safely; Theseus can be seen as superior to the Apollonian Jason since he restores Jason’s rhetoric to a more heroic context (Clare (1996) 71-2), but Konstan (1977) 69-70 also suggests that something of Apollonius’ irony (since the ultimate consequence of the Argonauts’ returning to Greece with Medea will be the death of Jason’s children) reaches Catullus here, where Theseus achieves not only *praemia laudis* but, through his betrayal of Ariadne, the death of his father.

appeteret further emphasises Theseus’ keenness (101 *cupiens* n.): the verb is used of things deliberately sought, including death at Sen. *Epist.* 3.24.23, Suet. *Ner.* 2. *oppetere* ‘encounter’ more frequently has *mortem* as its object, so that *oppetere mortem* basically = ‘to die’ (*OLD* s.v. *oppetere*, s.v. *mors* 1e; e.g. Enn. *trag.* 183 Jocelyn *utinam mortem obpetam priusquam ...*); but GR *oppeteret* could not also apply to *praemia laudis*. It may represent a corruption to the more common idiom.

praemia laudis Depending on the force of the genitive and sense of *laus*, either ‘rewards consisting in praise’ (Friedrich, Fordyce, cf. Cic. *Mil.* 81, *Ver.* 2.5.125, Manil. 4.141), or ‘rewards for praiseworthy action’ (Baehrens, cf. Stat. *Theb.* 6.909 *praemia laudum*); the same ambiguity at *Il. Lat.* 717. Virg. *Aen.* 1.461 *sunt hic*

etiam sua praemia laudi, the only remaining appearance of *praemia laudi(s)*, almost certainly alludes to this line. Theseus achieves his *laus* in 112; see also 157n.

103-4 Ariadne prays for Theseus' success (105 *nam* relates to *non ingrata ... frustra*) by vowing gifts to unspecified gods; *munuscula diuis* | *promittens* and *suscepit uota* refer to the same action. It is not clear where this takes place: at Ap. *Arg.* 3.467-70 Medea's prayer to Hecate that Jason should survive his encounter with the fire-breathing bulls arises out of a soliloquy as she sits crying in her bedroom, but *tacito ... labello* may suggest that Ariadne is in a public space, perhaps a temple, like Dido at Virg. *Aen.* 4.56-67 (see below). It seems that *frustra* reinforces the sense of *ingrata*, as at e.g. 111 *nequiquam uanis*, 164 *ignaris nequiquam* (where see n. for further examples). This looks like characteristic Catullan pleonasm, but is awkward, since *non* has to negate both *ingrata* and *frustra*, *tamen* referring back to Ariadne's fears for Theseus: 'but she did not promise unacceptable gifts to no purpose' (Quinn). Alternatively one could replace *frustra* with an adjective for *diuis* such as Fea's *superis* (so Trappes-Lomax), but this would have little expressive power, while the sequence *non frustra ... nam* is attractive (*frustra ... nam* is common; for the version with negated *frustra* cf. Ov. *Her.* 16.18-21 *nec te frustra promiserit, opto, | hoc mihi quae suasit, mater Amoris, iter; | namque ego diuino monitu – ne nescia pecces – | aduehor*).

munuscula Catullus consistently uses *munera* rather than *dona* for offerings to the gods or the dead (66.38, 82, 92, 101.3). The diminutive (cf. *labello*; 60 *ocellis* n.) connotes Ariadne's youth (at e.g. Cic. *Att.* 1.8.3, Virg. *Ecl.* 4.18, Hor. *Epist.* 1.7.17 the word is used of gifts appropriate to a child), perhaps also her limited resources of possible gifts as a young girl acting secretly. Catullus' other use of the word is

68.145 *sed furtiua dedit tacita munuscula nocte*, which may have another coincidence of vocabulary with this passage if *tacita* for transmitted *mira* (Lain (1986)) is right. Here *munuscula* cannot have the same meaning but may have a similarly erotic tone: Ariadne naturally prays for Theseus to survive *because* she desires him, so the aim of her vows is not very different from that of Dido's offerings at Virg. *Aen.* 4.56-67, though those are on a grand, epic scale, very different from *munuscula*.

tacito ... labello On silent prayer in Greece and Rome see van den Horst (1994). Ancient prayers were normally uttered aloud: unless a physical impediment was involved (*Od.* 5.444 and schol., Odysseus in the sea) or the deities addressed, usually the Furies, were thought to be dangerous to name (e.g. Aesch. *Choeph.* 95-6, *Eum.* 1035, 1039, Soph. *O.C.* 489), silent or whispered prayers were assumed to be motivated by a desire not to be overheard. This might be because of the danger of counter-prayer, violence etc. (e.g. *Il.* 7.195, Hdt. 2.181.4 (see Pulleyn (1997) 184-8), Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.29), but this overlaps with the more common association of silent or muttered prayer with the wish to conceal a request for divine assistance in dishonourable activities, e.g. magic, crime, illicit sex. See Versnel (1981) 25-6 with further refs. and e.g. Sen. *Epist.* 10.5 *turpissima uota dis insusurrant; si quis admouerit aurem, conticiscent, et quod scire hominem nolunt deo narrant* and similar opinions at *Ben.* 6.38.2-5, Mart. 1.39.5-6: particularly revealing is Apul. *Apol.* 54 *tacitas preces in templo deis allegasti: igitur magus es; aut quid optasti?* Satire and related genres often contrast such prayers with a 'respectable' prayer uttered aloud, e.g. Hor. *Epist.* 1.14.14, 1.16.57-62, Pers. 2.3-16, Juv. 10.289-91 (see Mayor *ad loc.*). Here Ariadne's silence is presumably motivated both by shame (cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 9.98-100 ἄφωνοι θ' ὡς ἐκάστα φίλτατον | παρθενικὰ πόσιν ἧ | υἱὸν εὖχοντ', ὦ Τελεσίκρατες, ἔμμεν, Tib. 2.1.83-4, [Tib.] 3.11.17-18 *optat idem iuuenis quod nos*,

sed tectius optat; | nam pudet haec illum dicere uerba palam and, less clearly of prayer, 62.37) and by the necessity of concealment from her family (cf. [Tib.] 3.12.15-16 *praecipit et natae mater studiosa quod optat: | illa aliud tacita iam sua mente rogat*). *tacitus* in relation to prayer sometimes implies complete silence ([Tib.] 3.12.16 *tacita ... mente*, Sen. *Ben.* 2.1.4 *tacite malumus et intra nosmet ipsos precari*), sometimes muttering (Luc. 5.104-5 *tacito mala uota susurro | concipiunt*); with *labello* here it possibly suggests something similar to Pers. 5.184 *labra moues tacitus* (of Jewish prayer), Soph. *O.C.* 131-3 ἀφώνως, ἀλόγως τὸ τῶς | εὐφήμου στόμα φροντίδος | ἰέντες. Cf. Luc. 6.701 *tacitae ... linguae* (praying to Hecate).

suscepit Though recently defended by Nuzzo as a metaphorical description of Ariadne transferring her inner ‘fire’ into her promises, transmitted *succendit* would be unparalleled with *uota* and would rather suggest burning the offerings once the prayers had been answered. The reference here is to the initial making of vows, for which *uota suscipere* is the standard phrase, paralleled in poetry at e.g. Ov. *Met.* 7.449-50 *uota | publica suscipimus*, 9.305 *uotaque suscipiunt*. Statius’ *suscepit* involves a marginally simpler process of corruption than the normal orthography *suscepit*, but this is not a good enough reason for supplying this archaic form as a conjecture, even if it should be printed where it survives at e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 6.248-9 *tepidumque cruorem | succipiunt pateris* (Servius *ad loc.* *succipiunt antique, nam modo suscipiunt dicimus*).

105-11 A full-blown epic simile (as also at 269-77), with *uelut* and *sic* and shift of syntax (108 *illa ...*), but unHomerically preceding the actual narration of Theseus’ defeat of the Minotaur (110-11) and replacing a full account of the fight (Williams (1980) 48-9, Murgatroyd (1997) 76, Schmale (2004) 166). This has a strong

distancing effect, giving appropriate mystery to the unwitnessed encounter taking place deep in the Labyrinth, and contributing to the narrative's avoidance of subjective engagement with Theseus, who initially appears only as the inanimate wind (107 *turbo*). 105 *Tauro* (see n.) and the details that suggest the anthropomorphism of the tree (105 *bracchia*, 106 *sudanti cortice* nn.) are clues to the subject, some developed by respension in 110-11. Similes comparing a killed or wounded warrior to a falling tree are frequent in the *Iliad*, several offering parallels to particular details here: see 13.178-80 for location on top of a mountain (cf. 4.482-7 specifying low-lying land by a marsh), 13.389-91 = 16.482-4 for combination of oak and pine with only the latter given further description, 14.414-17 for an oak destroyed by a natural force, there a thunderbolt, 5.560. *Il.* 17.53-8 is particularly close, sharing with this the specification of place, trembling branches, doubly described wind (ἄνεμος σὺν λαίλαπι πολλῇ) and uprooting followed by lying flat (βόθρου τ' ἐξέστρεψε καὶ ἐξετάνυσσ' ἐπὶ γαίῃ), and is notable for the pathos with which it invests the carefully-tended olive tree; if the reader of Catullus remembers this, it will increase the surprising effect of a simile type which in the *Iliad* illustrates the pathos of human death being applied to the Minotaur.

Further effects arise from the relationships with each of Apollonius' three tree similes. At *Arg.* 3.1374-5 the earthborn men, Jason's equivalent of the Minotaur, kill each other like pines or oaks beaten down by storms, while 4.1682-6, describing the bronze giant Talos overcome by Medea's evil eye, also has the mountain location for its tree (a pine), the marked change of grammatical subject (ἡ δ'...) and the two-stage falling process: Catullus attributes all the work to the wind itself, removing any human element from the simile, while in Apollonius the tree has been half cut through by woodcutters and is then blown over. Catullus thus alludes to two of

Medea's victories, either to contrast Theseus' capability without Ariadne with Jason's dependence on Medea (Clare (1996) 72, cf. 113n.) or to remind the reader that Theseus also depends on a woman whom he exploits (Pavlock (1990) 122). Features are also shared with Apollonius' third tree simile at *Arg.* 3.967-71, where Jason and Medea are like two oaks or pines stirred by the wind; while that simile is the first indication that Jason is attracted to Medea, here the appearance of trees and wind in the more usual violent context illustrates Theseus' focus on the Minotaur rather than on Ariadne (101-2). Of Virgil's tree similes *Aen.* 2.626-33, 4.441-6 and 5.448-9 probably show Catullan influence: see Oksala (1962) 192 for parallels of diction and syntax with the *Aen.* 4 Aeneas/oak simile, which might suggest an interesting comparison of context (Ariadne offers prayers for the man who is killing her brother; Anna appeals to the man who will kill her sister ...).

105 nam Theseus' victory is introduced as an illustration of the effectiveness of Ariadne's prayers: see 103-4n. and cf. 52 *namque* n.

in summo ... Tauro Specification of place in a simile already occurs in Homer (e.g. *Il.* 2.145 πόντου Ἰκαρίοιο). In Hellenistic poetry it provided the opportunity for display of geographical knowledge and decorative use of names; like other types of rhetorical specificity, it also aims to convince the reader that the simile is true or appropriate. The Taurus is a mountain range stretching from Cilicia to western Armenia: though thickly wooded, it seems more likely to have been chosen here as a pun on *taurus* 'bull'; cf. also 79 *Minotauro* n.

bracchia Not uncommon of the 'limbs' of a tree in either technical literature (e.g. Cato *Agr.*, Plin. *N.H.*, Colum.) or poetry (see further Perutelli (1985)); but as Perutelli also shows (pp. 15-17), a case of simile 'trespass' in this context (61n.),

combining with *in summo ... Tauro*, 106 *sudanti cortice* to remind the reader of the Minotaur. Within a simile, which necessarily foregrounds issues about the extent of similarity and the ways in which it can be described, this may also raise questions about the monster's strange status: could *bracchia* be applied to the arms of this hybrid in any more direct sense than to the branches of a tree?

106 coniferam Transmitted *cornigeram* is usually emended to *conigeram*, but while this may well be the direct predecessor of *cornigeram* in the manuscript tradition it is probably not what Catullus wrote. *coniger* would occur only here; *conifer* is attested at Virg. *Aen.* 3.680 *coniferae cyparissi* and not again until Nemesianus and Claudian, and either could potentially translate κωνοφόρος (mentioned by Kroll, this occurs in Theophr. *H.P.*, at *A.P.* 6.165.4 and in lexicæ, so could well have appeared in a Hellenistic poem known to Catullus). Catullus has one other compound in *-ger*: 63.23 *Maenades ... hederigerae*, where the reference is to something that is worn (*gerere*). Of his five in *-fer*, 394 *letifero belli*, 11.6 *sagittiferos Parthos* refer to something brought or carried, while 4.13 *Cytore buxifer*, 7.4 *lasarpiciferis ... Cyrenis*, 29.19 *amnis aurifer Tagus*, though not precisely parallel to this case, all similarly refer to something that naturally grows in the place described. Since, as Trappes-Lomax points out, the closely parallel *pomifer*, *malifer*, *florifer*, *fructifer* all exist where equivalent forms in *-ger* do not, and the same noun does not seem to generate both *-ger* and *-fer* compounds, Fea's *conifer* should be printed. Salat (1993) argues that Catullus deliberately used the 'wrong' form in order to evoke *corniger* and a further reference to the Minotaur, but I am not convinced that this would occur to a reader not already confronted with a tradition corrupted to *cornigeram*.

sudanti cortice i.e. with resin dripping from the bark, as at e.g. Ov. *Met.* 10.308-9 *sudataque ligno | tura*, Plin. *N.H.* 23.151 *sudor uirgae corni arboris* and Virgil's imitation of this line, *Ecl.* 8.54 *pinguia corticibus sudent electra myricae* (cf. *Ecl.* 4.30 *durae quercus sudabunt roscida mella*). This seems to be the first application of *sudo* to a tree (though cf. Enn. *trag.* 165 Jocelyn *terra sudat sanguine*, Lucr. 6.942-3 *in speluncis saxa superna | sudent umore*); the same image occurs in Greek (Eur. *Ion* 1175 σμύρνῃς ἰδρώτα, *Ion* fr. 40), and Clausen (1988) 17 n.17 suggests that Catullus imitates a Hellenistic poet. The context of the simile evokes the basic sense 'sweat', and the grammatical shift to a qualitative ablative phrase instead of a second epithet (Kroll) might support this by implying a difference between a typical attribute (*coniferam*) and a detail that is true in the particular circumstances: the wind would hardly make the pine exude more resin, but fighting Theseus would cause the Minotaur to sweat.

107 indomitus turbo The whirlwind is 'ungovernable' (Fordyce), or simply 'violent' (as at 103.2, 4); cf. [Ov.] *Her.* 15.9 *indomitis ignem exercentibus Euris*. While the narrator makes Theseus himself equivalent to a *turbo* here, in 149 *turbine leti* Ariadne uses the word to refer to the encounter with the Minotaur as something from which Theseus had to be rescued, while in 173 *indomito ... tauro* she echoes *indomitus turbo* to describe the 'untamed' Minotaur itself. See DeBrohun (1999) 424-5 on the 'figures of confusion' created between Theseus and the Minotaur, and cf. the assimilation, by means of similar coincidences of vocabulary and imagery, of Hercules and Cacus in Virg. *Aen.* 8 (Lyne (1987) 27-35, Morgan (1998)).

contorquens flamine robur Almost parenthetical, describing the means by which *quercum aut ... pinum | indomitus turbo ... | eruit*, and specifying the 'part' of

wind or tree involved. *flamine* plays a very similar role at Enn. *Ann.* 432-4 Skutsch (also a simile) *concurrunt ueluti uenti, quom spiritus Austri | Imbricator Aquiloque suo cum flamine contra | indu mari magno fluctus extollere certant*, and *robur* = ‘trunk’ (of any species of tree; *OLD* s.v. 2a). *contorquens* = ‘twisting’, ‘wrenching’, appropriate to a *turbo*; cf. Virg. *Georg.* 1.481 *proluit insano contorquens uertice siluas*, of an eddying river in spate.

108 eruit The use of a dactylic verb first in the line and before a sense-pause to express sudden action may already occur in Ennius (*Ann.* 411 Skutsch *concidit et sonitum simul insuper arma dederunt*) and is frequent in Virgil and Ovid: cf. esp. Virg. *Georg.* 2.209-10 *antiquasque domos auium cum stirpibus imis | eruit: illae altum nidis petiere relictis*, which also echoes this line by the change of subject (making the pause particularly marked).

procul with 109 *cadit*: ‘falls some way off’. *procul* implies separation rather than great distance: cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 10.835-6 [Mezentius rests under a tree while] *procul aerea ramis | dependet galea*, 6.10 with Norden and Austin. But the connection of *procul* with *radicitus extirpata* is ambiguous: either the top of the tree falls at some distance from the roots, or the tree has been fully uprooted and carried by the wind to fall at some distance from where it grew.

radicitus extirpata Equivalent to Ap. *Arg.* 4.1684 *πρυμνόθεν ἐξαγείσα* (105-11n.); the adverb there perhaps recommends *radicitus* over *radicibus* here (contrast 288) but the participle does not help in choosing between transmitted *exturbata* (‘driven out’) and the second Aldine edition’s *extirpata* (‘rooted out’). The latter is more precise, occurring with *radicitus* at Sen. *Controu.* 10.4.2, Sen. *Dial.* 5.42.1, Colum. 2.2.11, 2.17.4, Ulp. *Dig.* 47.7.7; the etymological point of this

combination (commended by Nisbet (1978) 111) is sharper than that of *turbo ... exturbata*, and *exturbo* is not elsewhere used of trees.

109 This scene of devastation is hyperbolic for the combat between Theseus and the monster (unless we imagine that the Minotaur smashed the Labyrinth as it fell) but gives the simile effective closure by ‘zooming out’ to show the wide effects of the tree’s fall before the narrative leaves it behind.

late quaeuis cumque obuia frangens ‘smashing everything in its path, far and wide.’ Of the many attempts to emend *lateque cum eius*, most fill the metre by crowding the line with unnecessary details, often by reading transmitted *quae (que)* as nominative and introducing another finite verb into the participial clause (see app. crit.). Even the most colourless, Baehrens’ *late quaecumque habet* (printed by Goold) and Trappes-Lomax’s *late quae sunt cumque*, create the same awkward grammatical complication. With most modern editors I therefore print *late quaeuis cumque*, with which Ellis (1890) improved on Voss’s *late quaecumuis* (which involves a non-existent word). Parallel forms appear at Lucr. 3.388 *cuiusuis cumque animantis*, Mart. 14.2.1 *quouis cumque loco*; Catullus has forms in *-cumque* frequently (including in this poem 43 *quacumque*, 280 *quoscumque*) and parts of *quiuus* at 12.5, 44.4, 67.16, 103.2, 111.3 *cuiuis quamuis* (showing a similar willingness to pile up indefinites, though the syntax is different: Thomson ‘any woman ... to any man’). The conjecture is also close to the transmitted text, since (as Ellis argues) *que uis cum que* could easily be jumbled.

110 domito Literally ‘tamed’, reducing the Minotaur to an aggressive domestic animal subdued, and perhaps preparing for the picture in the next line, since if the original of 111 was the *Hecale* it described the bull of Marathon captured, not killed.

saeuum Used substantivally (‘the fierce creature’) only here, and repeated from 101. Corruption is possible but not certain: 63.85 *ferus* is comparable, despite the support given there by *ipse*, and the suggestion made by Ellis and Fordyce that *saeuum* may imitate the τὸν ἄγριον of a Greek original is persuasive in the context of the following line. Given this, an adventurous usage expressive of the monstrous nature of the hybrid seems a better choice than the manuscript conjecture *taurum* (recently recommended by Watt (2000) 66, Trappes-Lomax, McKie (2009) 97); *taurus* also of the Minotaur at e.g. Ov. *Met.* 7.434, Stat. *Ach.* 1.192.

prostrauit Parallel to *eruit* in the simile; also picks up sound and sense of 109 *prona cadit* (and cf. 108 *procul*), perhaps with etymological force. See also 71 *externauit* n.

111 This line was first recognised by Scaliger to be a near-translation of πολλά μάτην κεράεσσιν ἐς ἥερα θυμήναντα, quoted by Cicero at *Att.* 8.5.1 (an acquaintance’s blustering behaviour) without indicating author or poem. Following Haupt (1875-6) II.81 it is often attributed to Theseus’ fight with the Marathonian bull in Callimachus’ *Hecale* (see further Pfeiffer and Hollis *ad loc.* (fr. 732 Pfeiffer = 165 Hollis), Knox (2007) 167). If this is correct (and ἥερα/*uentis* is more appropriate to the *Hecale*’s outdoor setting than to the Labyrinth, while the whole detail may suit the captured Marathonian bull better than the dying Minotaur), the allusion elegantly comments on the similarity between these two Theseus myths, just as Callimachus assumed knowledge of the Minotaur story (see esp. fr. 17, 69 Hollis and Hollis *ad*

loc.). Cf. the adaptations of Euphorion and Theocritus at 30, 96nn.; meanwhile those who see the whole poem as a translation of a Hellenistic original attribute the line quoted by Cicero to that (Riese (1866) 505-6, Reitzenstein (1900) 101, Pasquali (1920) 18).

uanis ... uentis Transferred epithet (contrast the original adverb μᾶτην): it is the movement that is in vain. Winds often appear when wasted physical effort is described, e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 5. 377 *uerberat ictibus auras*, 446 *uiris in uentum effudit*, Luc. 4.726-7, Stat. *Theb.* 6.791 *rapiunt conamina uenti*, V.Fl. 1.421; one *topos* involves bulls testing their horns (Virg. *Georg.* 3.233-4 = *Aen.* 12.105-6 *uentosque lacessit ictibus*, Sen. *Dial.* 3.1.6 *taurorum cornua iactantur in uacuum*, Stat. *Theb.* 12.255 *cornibus aera findens*). But the linking of winds with uselessness also evokes the image of false words in the wind, especially at 59n. and 142, lines whose similarly ‘golden’ or near-golden shape gives them, like this line, a sense of finality (42n.); this creates further confusion between Theseus and the Minotaur (107n.).

iactantem cornua Responds to 105 *quatientem bracchia* in grammar and sound as well as sense (*cornua* suggests branches), helping to mark off the simile and its explanation as a unit (105-11).

112 pedem ... reflexit The exact collocation recurs only at Sidon. *Epist.* 2.10.4.23 *pedes ... reflectit*; but cf. Sen. *Thy.* 428 *reflecte gressum* and Ov. *Met.* 1.372 *flectunt uestigia*, Stat. *Theb.* 4.768 *flectere gressus*, Silu. 2.2.11 *flectere ... gressus*. While such expressions can simply mean ‘return’, here there seems to be a reference to the difficulty of Theseus’ winding journey back through the Labyrinth (*reflexit* echoed in 114 *flexibus*), and to his retracing of his exact path with the help of the thread (113). *pedem* also marks the start of an intensely metapoetic section (cf. 76-115, 116nn.).

sospes Presumably safe because he has the thread; cf. Ov. *Her.* 10.71 *ne uictor tecto morerere recuruo*, where Ariadne makes the point that despite having defeated the Minotaur Theseus would still have died without her help.

multa cum laude Theseus straightforwardly achieves what he wanted in 102; cf. the acclaim he receives after killing the Marathonian bull in Call. *Hec.* fr. 69 Hollis (111n.). The phrase is paralleled at e.g. Lucr. 6.95 *insigni capiam cum laude coronam*, Hor. *Carm.* 4.4.66-7 *multa proruit integrum | cum laude uictorem*, precisely at Tac. *Ann.* 4.4 *multa cum laude*.

113 errabunda regens ... uestigia Closely together: ‘his feet kept straying, but the thread kept guiding him back onto the right path’ (Quinn). Similar wording at Prop. 2.14.8 *Daedalium lino ... duce rexit iter*, Ov. *Her.* 10.72 *quae regerent passus, pro duce fila dedi*, both looking back to this line through Virg. *Aen.* 6.30 *caeca regens filo uestigia*. Virgil also repeats the adjective, found elsewhere in poetry only at Lucr. 4.692 (of *sonitus*), at *Ecl.* 6.58 *errabunda bouis uestigia* (of the father of the Minotaur!); see Clausen *ad loc.* for poets’ usual avoidance of forms in *-bundus* from first-conjugation verbs.

tenui ... filo Ariadne is usually said to have ‘shown’ Theseus the way out of the Labyrinth: some sources specify that, possibly at Daedalus’ suggestion, she provided a thread by which he could retrace his steps (e.g. Ov. *Her.* 10.72, 103-4, Apollod. *Ep.* 8-9, Plut. *Thes.* 19.1). That the thread is mentioned without Ariadne here is striking: even if the text constructs a reader capable of filling in this detail, attention is directed away from the practical help Ariadne gave to Theseus. The focus may rather be on her ability to move the gods (103-4; so Konstan (1977) 42); or Catullus may present a Theseus who did not need much help from her (Clare (1996)

71-3); or the text colludes with Theseus' ingratitude, 'forgetting' Ariadne's role in the escape until she asserts it at 149-51.

114-115 The use of surface features of the text to evoke entrapment conveys the sense that the Labyrinth threatens to overwhelm narrator and reader, as well as Theseus: see 76-115, 116nn. The effect is achieved by means of the few, long words, the rare adjectives (see below) that slow the reader down, the monotonous assonance of *e* and *i*, and particularly the rhythm: *egredientem* creates a rare pentasyllabic ending (elsewhere in the poem only 152 *alitibusque*, 205 *contremuerunt*) suggesting the difficulty of moving through the maze, while 115 has only one caesura, after the third trochee, resulting in an uncannily perfect coincidence between ictus and word accent (contrast 58n.). Virgil combines the same rhythmic features to describe the same situation at *Aen.* 5.589, ending *ancipitemque*, and 591 *frangeret indepressus et inremeabilis error*.

labyrinthēis Adjectival form recurring only in late authors (Mart. Cap., Sedul., Ennod., Coripp.). It would seem to translate *λαβυρίνθειος (not extant: λαβυρινθείους Sophron. *Anacreont.* 10.41).

tecti Also of the Labyrinth at Virg. *Aen.* 6.29, Ov. *Her.* 10.71, *Met.* 8.168; its victims are trapped in a *covered* building.

inobseruabilis error With *tecti*, 'the imperceptible wandering of the structure'. The adjective describes how the complex meandering baffles the observer (so also at its only other extant occurrence, Plin. *N.H.* 2.77 *Martis sidere, cuius est maxime inobseruabilis cursus*). Ellis and Fordyce cite the use of *obseruare* to refer to noting one's steps so as to be able to retrace them at Virg. *Aen.* 2.753-4 *uestigia retro | obseruata sequor*, 9.393-4. Virgil uses more common adjectives to imitate the

phrase when describing the Labyrinth at *Aen.* 5.591 *inremeabilis error*, 6.27 *inextricabilis error*.

116-23: Ariadne's journey to Dia

The narrator's abrupt self-questioning *quid ego ... commemorem* governs the syntax throughout these lines, which give a few details about a part of the story not previously covered, Ariadne's parting from her family, and then in the two *aut ut* clauses briefly narrate her journey to Crete, recapitulating information that has been given before (121-3n.). This is *paralipsis* or *praeteritio*, mentioning something while claiming not to mention it (Lausberg §§882-6); the use of a self-addressed rhetorical question to effect it is frequent in oratory (e.g. Cic. *Catil.* 4.8.16 *sed quid ego huiusce ordinis homines commemoro quos priuatae fortunae, quos communis res publica, quos denique libertas ea quae dulcissima est ad salutem patriae defendendam excitauit?*). The technique also occurs in letters (e.g. Cic. *Att.* 2.5.2, Plin. *Epist.* 4.14.8) and in the 'conversational' style of didactic prose authors (e.g. Plin. *N.H.* 30.13 *sed quid ego haec commemorem ... ?*), but in epic, as in historiography, is usually restricted to speeches (e.g. Enn. *Ann.* 314 Skutsch, Virg. *Aen.* 2.101, Sil. 6.110, Stat. *Theb.* 1.461, 4.781, 8.65, V.Fl. 8.158). We see here its usual effect of suggestiveness, making the listener or reader imagine the full implications of what is only briefly mentioned, in the confusing details of Ariadne's 'leave-taking' (117-19nn.).

Clare (1996) 73 and Armstrong (2006) 43 discuss a possible allusion here to Jason's words at Ap. *Arg.* 3.1096-1101 ἀλλὰ τίη τάδε τοι μεταμόνια πάντ' ἀγορεύω, | ἡμετέρους τε δόμους τηλεκλείτην τ' Ἀριάδην, | κούρην Μίνωος ..., in

which he avoids telling Medea the part of Ariadne's story that makes it a less persuasive *exemplum* (but a more accurate parallel) for Medea's future. Catullus' narrator would be filling in the gaps left by Jason, both in the references to Theseus' desertion in 121-3 and perhaps also in the scene with Ariadne's family (117 *genitoris filia uultum* n.), yet his association with the typically devious Apollonian hero might raise doubts as to his own reliability (see also Theodorakopoulos (2000) 128-9).

Apollonius also provides models for narratorial self-questioning (*Arg.* 1.648-9, 1220, 4.1388), but these occur when the main thread of the Argonautic narrative is resumed after minor digressions: rather than *praeteritio*, these are examples of *parabasis* (cf. Lausberg §§527, 848: Kroll quotes Rutil. 2.1 *cum ab alia re ad id, quod demonstrare instituimus, orationem atque actionem nostram reuocamus*). Here it turns out at 124 that the narrative is in fact reverting to Ariadne on the beach, but its swerves so far even within her story have been so unpredictable that this move is not guaranteed by any part of the extended rhetorical question in 116-23. *a primo digressus carmine plura*, in particular, teases the reader about the real identity of the main subject of the poem (see nn.); the question might appear at first to be a manoeuvre by which the narrator will end the ecphrasis and return to Peleus and Thetis (Schmale (2004) 170). Moreover, the use of a rhetorical trope and the syntax of indirect speech, characterisation of at least some part of the poem as a *carmen*, and allusion to such a speaker as Jason all highlight how far the poem has come by this point from true 'obedient' ecphrasis (cf. 50-75n.); the narrator is in fact discussing his relationship with the *res ipsae* of the mythical events, not the *opus ipsum* of the picture (categories from Becker (1995) 42). Finally, just as in oratorical examples of both *paralipsis* and *metabasis*, the device, while by its surface meaning suggesting that the subject-matter is getting out of control, really flaunts the speaker's ability to

do what he likes with it: Schmale (2004) 170 sees this in terms of a split between a controlling poet and a narrator whom the poet allows to be seen to fail.

116 sed quid ego Also in 164: the phrase is common in comedy as well as being standard in examples of this sort of *praeteritio*, in various genres (cf. 116-23n.). See Austin on Virg. *Aen.* 2.101, Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 201, Adams (1999) 102.

primo ... carmine Commentators claim that since the narrative goes on to return to the scene of Ariadne on the beach which opened the inner story, this must be what is referred to here, contrasting with the digression in 76-115. The reader may well come to such a conclusion after reaching 124ff. (116-23n.), but not from the literal meaning of these words, since ‘the first part of’ the *carmen* is simply the beginning of the poem: cf. Lucr. 6.937, Gell. 10.16.6 *in primo carmine* (both either ‘at the beginning of the poem’ or ‘in the first book’, with the same reference) and comparably Ter. *Ad.* 9 *in prima fabula*, Ov. *Fast.* 3.390 *extremo carmine*. Like other Latin poets Catullus regularly refers to his poems as *carmina* (65.16, 68.149, 116.2), including this one at 24. So the reader is invited to consider how many digressions have already occurred since the account of the launching of the Argo, and to notice the lack of similar apologetic comments at the poem’s other points of transition.

digressus A technical term in rhetoric: it usually implies that the topic turned towards is less important, ‘moving away’ from a main theme (e.g. Cic. *Inu.* 1.97 *de causa digredi nisi per locum communem displicet*) but can mean simply ‘moving on’ to something new (e.g. Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.4 *digredi a re et redire ad propositum*). Cf. Virg. *Georg.* 3.300 *post hinc digressus iubeo frondentia capris | arbuta sufficere* and Mynors *ad loc.* ‘of dropping a subject, not digressing’. The literal meaning of the word is connoted in Virgil, as if the poet is actually walking around his farm

(Conington, Thomas *ad loc.*); here, so soon after 114 *egredientem*, the narrative seems to be escaping from the Labyrinth, and yet *digressus* rather than *egressus* suggests that further wanderings are to come (cf. 76-115, 114-15nn., Theodorakopoulos (2000) 125).

plura Like other comparatives (e.g. *diutius*), quite common in this type of *praeteritio* (116-23n.); cf. e.g. Cic. *Sul.* 64 *sed quid ego de hoc plura disputem?*, [Sall.] *Ad Caes.* 2.9 *sed quid ego plura quasi de ignotis memorem?* The *plura* must be the details mentioned in the *ut*-clauses in this sentence (Baehrens), but there is again a sense that the narrator is making claims about the hierarchy of the different parts of his narrative that are not justified by the evidence (see above); these ‘more things’ are in addition to 76-115, but each new section of the poem could be seen as an equally unjustified addition to what went before.

117-18 No other literary or artistic depiction of this ‘farewell’ survives, and something more like Medea’s secret, nocturnal flight at Ap. *Arg.* 4.11-53 might have been expected from other clues (e.g. 180-1; cf. also Diod. 4.61.5 κλέψας τὴν Ἀριάδνην ἔλαθεν ἐκπλεύσας νυκτός). The suggestion that Ariadne’s family were aware of her departure (whatever their attitude to it may have been: 117 *genitoris filia uultum* n.), together with the allusion to wedding ritual (118 *complexum* n.), leaves the reader with a confused sense that Ariadne and Theseus may have been married before they left Crete (contrast most clearly 139-42). What is ‘not said’ is specified in an indirect question introduced by *ut* = ‘how’, as at Ov. *Met.* 4.279-80 *nec loquor, ut quondam naturae iure nouato | ambiguus fuerit modo uir, modo femina Sithon.* For the tricolon of indirect questions with anaphora of *ut* cf. 66.3-6 and e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 7.814-17, 8.288-93. But in these examples each *ut*-clause is independent of the

others, with its own verb; Évrard-Gillis 202-3 shows how here the first element of the tricolon is grammatically complete (*linquens genitoris filia uultum*), while in the second *consanguineae complexum* depends on *linquens*, and in the third *matris* depends on *complexum*, producing an effect of acceleration which contributes to the sense of an emotional crescendo towards *matris*; see also 121 *aut ut n.*

117 *linquens* On this key word cf. 59 *linquens n.*; its echo in 123 *liquerit* immediately underlines the parallel between Ariadne's abandonment of her family and Theseus' abandonment of her, leading Kinsey (1965) 917 to argue that 'blame' first attaches to Ariadne here.

genitoris filia uultum *uultus* = 'look', 'gaze' of the father at his daughter (*OLD* s.v. 3): cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 10.662 *spectatosque diu uultus inuita reliquit*, Sen. *H.F.* 1173-4 *cur meos Theseus fugit | paterque uultus*. It is implied that Minos does not embrace Ariadne as her sister and mother do (118); this may simply suit his kingly and paternal 'dignity' (so Clausen (1977) 220) or may indicate his displeasure. That in the usual version of the story Minos was angry with Ariadne is implied by *Od.* 11.322 ὀλοόφρονος (cf. 85n.) and especially by the 'correction' offered by Apollonius' Jason (Ap. *Arg.* 3.1000 ἐπεὶ χόλον εὔνασε Μίνως, 1100-1 ὡς Θησῆι τότε ξυναρέσσατο Μίνως | ἀμφ' αὐτῆς), so it is likely that Catullus re-corrects (see 116-23n.). This would also be implied by any allusion here to Medea's fears about her own father's attitude to her at Ap. *Arg.* 4.378 πῶς ἴξομαι ὄμματα πατρός; (180n.).

Juxtapositions like *genitoris filia* most commonly indicate family affection (cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 10.466 *genitor natum* with Harrison), so this case might either affirm such a relationship between Minos and his daughter or use it as a foil for the

‘unnaturalness’ of her action (Kroll, Fordyce, quoting Cic. *Deiot.* 2 *crudelem Castorem ... qui nepos auum in capitis discrimen adduxerit*); cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.590 *nato genetrix*, whose ‘intimacy’, noted by Austin, is hardly unproblematic in the case of Aeneas and Venus.

118 consanguineae ... matris At Ap. *Arg.* 4.30-3 Medea addresses an emotional farewell to her absent mother and sister, and Medea similarly mentions first her father, then more emotionally her mother and sister at Ov. *Her.* 12.109-12 *proditus est genitor ... optima cum cara matre relictas soror*. On the surface this is an equivalent reference to a young girl’s closest family relationships, but whereas Medea’s mother Eidyia is a shadowy figure (see Ap. *Arg.* 3.241-4) and her sister Chalciope’s role as mother of the sons of Phrixus is a fully integrated part of the Argonautic myth, if the reader here thinks of any particular sister of Ariadne it will be Phaedra (Apollod. 3.2 names four daughters of Minos and Pasiphae, but the first two, Acalles and Xenodice, appear nowhere else). The subsequent history of Phaedra’s marriage to Theseus (organised by Minos’ son and successor Deucalion to secure an alliance with Athens according to Apollod. *Ep.* 1.17, Diod. 4.62), her love for Hippolytus and eventual suicide adds dramatic irony to the simple pathos of this scene, especially in conjunction with the reference to *Thesei dulcem ... amorem* in 120. A similar effect was perhaps conveyed by Polygnotus’ painting at Delphi of the two sisters together (Paus. 10.29.3); cf. also medieval accounts, which, lacking the Greek sources, imagined that Phaedra left Crete with Theseus and Ariadne (perhaps in order to be married to Hippolytus) and that Theseus abandoned Ariadne because he preferred her sister: see Armstrong (2006) 9 and n.27, Holford-Strevens (1999) 386. Meanwhile, ‘any reference to Pasiphae in a context that plays at happy families has to

strike a discordant note' (Armstrong (2006) 202, cf. 88n.), especially since the reader may wonder what she thought about the death of her son, the Minotaur.

consanguineus in the restricted sense referring to siblings is mostly poetic, and rare as a substantive (for *consanguinea* = 'sister' only this line and Hier. *Epist.* 54.13 are cited at *TLL* IV.360.18-19); it may also act as a reminder of the unnatural 'blood relation' in this family. Cf. 150 *germanum*, 181 *fraterna caede* nn.

complexum The echo of 88 *in molli complexu matris* marks the end of Ariadne's comfortable childhood, while the evocation of the bridal imagery in that passage (89-90n.) underlines the suggestion here of the marriage ritual in which the bride was 'seized' from her mother (e.g. 61.56-9, 62.21-3). This image of a traditional wedding clashes with the indication in 120 that Ariadne acts on her own initiative out of *amor* (see further Konstan (1977) 77), which is anticipated by the active *linquens* (contrast 62.22 *retinentem*, if the right text).

denique is used both for what happens last (*OLD* s.v. 1) and for what is mentioned last and most emphatically (*OLD* s.v. 2): similarly e.g. Prop. 2.30.28-30 *antiqui dulcia furta Iouis, | ut Semela est combustus, ut est deperditus Io, | denique ut ad Troiae tecta uolarit auis*.

119 After the acceleration of 117-18 (see n.), a brief pause as the last branch of the tricolon is expanded in a momentary reference to the feelings of someone other than Ariadne. The mother's emotional state is not 'wholly irrelevant' (Trappes-Lomax, who would delete the line); this is a pathetic detail and a good parallel with Aegeus' role in 202-50. Both parents passively suffer as their children, thinking only of themselves (120), take unwelcome courses of action.

misera Clausen (1977) 222 argues that this is nominative (Lenchantin mentions the possibility), but a line with two adjectives for *quae* and none for *gnata* would be highly atypical in this poem full of ‘golden’ and other balanced lines; and *misera in gnata* is regular word order (48n.). *misera* indeed does not suit the state of mind indicated by 120, but is ‘perhaps spoken from the mother’s point of view’ (Ellis), or the narrator’s; the latter certainly knows, and the former may guess, how appropriate it will soon be for Ariadne (cf. 57n.).

in gnata For *in* + ablative for the object of an emotion see 98 *in ... hospite suspirantem* n. Ellis and Kroll are probably right that *in gnata* is *apo koinou* with both the participle (cf. e.g. Prop. 1.13.7 *perditus in quadam*) and the main verb (cf. e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* 2.49 *lamentatur in uulnere*). *gnata* (the more poetic word) varies 117 *filia*.

deperdita Kroll and Fordyce explain this with reference to the colloquial use of *pereo* and *perditus* (of which this is an intensified form) for people ‘hopelessly’ in love: cf. 70 *perdita* n. and 35.12 *deperit*, 100.3 *depereunt*. But as Syndikus 150 n.205 notes, this would be an odd way of describing a mother’s love and a more general ‘desolate [from grief]’ is more probable (Syndikus compares Cic. *Mur.* 86 *lacrimis ac maerore perditus*, Phaedr. 1.14.1 *inopia depriditus*). However, the fact that *perdita* occurs of the abandoned Ariadne (70, 177) adds to the effect of the powerful combination with *misera*: Ariadne’s choice immediately reduces her mother to a state which she will soon reach herself.

lamentata est Lachmann’s *laetabatur* has been surprisingly successful since printed by Haupt (see Clausen (1977) 221). But a reference to joy would be bizarre after *misera* and *deperdita*, and Friedrich’s argument (cited approvingly by Thomson) about a system of mistakes in Catullus’ manuscripts is misguided: palaeographical

parallels do not justify printing nonsense. OGR's *leta* could easily be the result of more corruption than a dropped ending, and Rossbach's *luctabatur*, whose imperfect tense is appealing, would probably be the most acceptable correction were it not for the existence of Var. At. fr. 9 Courtney *huic similis curis expe<r>dita lamentatur* (translating Ap. Arg. 3.664 τῇ ἰκέλῃ Μήδεια κινύρετο, resumption after a simile). 'Varro imitates Catullus' (Courtney *ad loc.*): but among the surrounding perfect subjunctives Conington's preterite of *lamentor* is preferable to Bücheler's present (as the imperfect is metrically impossible here). Clausen (1977) 222 n.13 compares 301 *aspernata est*. I therefore follow Ellis and Goold in printing *lamentata est* (also favoured by Clausen); we can easily imagine *lamentata* becoming *leta* by suspension of the *m* and *n* (*lāētata*) followed by haplography, and *est* being abbreviated and then lost.

120 omnibus his With Ariadne's priorities cf. 59.2-3 *illa Lesbia, quam Catullus unam | plus quam se atque suos amavit omnes*. The words also form a hexameter *incipit* after lists of various sorts at Virg. *Aen.* 6.665, Ov. *A.A.* 2.331, 3.297, *Met.* 6.121, Germ. *Arat.* fr. 2.6; cf. 66 *omnia quae n.*

Thesei Disyllabic; for the same synizesis in Latin genitive forms of Greek names cf. 229 *Erecthei*, 382 *Pelei* (possibly dative), and e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.41 *Oilei*, 120 *Ilionei*, 11.265 *Idomenei*. Godwin points out the ambiguity of the genitive with *amorem*: if objective, it is accurate, if subjective, probably Ariadne's 'wishful thinking' (see below). Cf. 19 *Thetidis ... amore* and 87.4 *in amore tuo ex parte ... mea*.

dulcem ... amorem *dulcis* is common in Catullus, especially in the long poems (it was felt to be more 'elevated' than *suavis*: 87n.). It describes *amor* also at

66.6, 68.24 = 96, 78.3; Catullus is the first extant poet to use the collocation, so its appearance at Virg. *Aen.* 6.455 might reinforce the more famous Catullan allusion in that passage (460). The sexual overtones of *dulcis* can be fairly strong: cf. 45.11-12 *dulcis pueri ebrios ocellos | illo purpureo ore sauiata*, 66.13 *dulcia nocturnae portans uestigia rixae*, 33 *dulci coniuge*, 68.106-7 *uita dulcius atque anima | coniugium*. Here it is probably focalised through Ariadne, as *praeoptarit* suggests, referring to her unrealised hopes for the future as at 141 *sed conubia laeta, sed optatos hymenaeos*.

praeoptarit Statius' conjecture gives exactly the right sense, and introduces another form of *optare* (5 *optantes*, 22 *optato* nn.). The synizesis is paralleled at Plaut. *Trin.* 648 *praeoptauisti amorem tuom uti uirtuti praeponeres*, Ter. *Hec.* 532; Trappes-Lomax (who would print *tum* for *dulcem* to avoid it) argues that it is inappropriate for a 'thoroughly literary and uncolloquial' poem, but this makes a rather arbitrary judgement about a poem that allows other colloquial/prosaic features (e.g. 8 *retinens*, 27 *suos ... amores*, 56 *utpote* nn.); Catullus might even be recalling Plaut. *Trin.*, which is the only other surviving instance (by PHI 5.3) of *amorem praeoptare*. The verb itself is prosaic with or without synizesis, occurring in verse elsewhere only at Plaut. *Capt.* 688 and, outside comedy, at Mar. Cap. 1.21. This appearance also supports the reading here, since Martianus claimed to be an admirer of Catullus and may have imitated him elsewhere (see further Trappes-Lomax).

121-3 Many words are repeated (or echoed by near-synonyms) from 52-67, giving a strong sense that the original picture of Ariadne is coming back into view: *spumosa ad litora Diae* ~ 52 *fluentisono ... litore Diae* (with the proper names of Dia and Theseus appearing in consecutive lines as at 52-3); *rati* ~ 53 *classe*; *somno* ~ 56

somno; liquerit ~ 59 linquens; immemori ~ 58 immemor; discedens ~ 53 cedentem, 58 fugiens. Cf. 133-4n., and the virtuosic parallelism between 52-4 and 249-50 (52 prospectans n.). The effect continues to a lesser extent in 124-31: 125 e pectore ~ 69 ex ... pectore; 128 salis ... undas ~ 67 fluctus salis; 130 maestam ~ 60 maestis.

121-2 aut ut ... | ... aut ut Reminiscent of Hesiodic ἢ' οἷη and especially its adaptation to ἢ' ὥς in the *Erotes* or *Kaloi* of Phanocles (frr. 1.1, 3.1 Powell; see further Asquith (2005) 272-6). In such catalogue poetry the formula is used to introduce a new tale about a different heroine (or hero), so this echo adds to the impression here of potentially endless new narrative ramifications. But in fact the repeated *aut ut* signals the next stage in the story of the same character, Ariadne (herself a heroine loved by a god, like the women in Hesiod's *Ehoiai* poem(s)), and this is the voyage to Dia, which for the narrator and the reader is a return journey. For the repetition of similar conjunctions within a few lines cf. also Theoc. 7.73-80 ὥς ... χῶς ... καὶ ὥς ... αἰσεῖ δ' ὥς ... ὥς τε, Ap. Arg. 4.733-5 ὅσα ... ὥς τε ... ὥς τε: in both the narrator summarises a character's words in indirect speech.

121 uecta rati Cf. 63.1 *super alta uectus Attis celeri rate maria* (1-3n.) and see esp. 50-75, 132-201n. for more links between Ariadne and Attis.

spumosa ad litora The collocation recurs only at Gratt. 425, Avien. *Arat.* 419; but cf. Virg. *Aen.* 5.124-5 *spumantia contra | litora*, *Ciris* 475 *spumanti litore*. This is the first extant occurrence of *spumosus* (cf. 12n. for *-osus*); it occurs regularly in poetry of the sea and rivers, occasionally in prose in medical contexts.

122 Lachmann's unobjectionable *uenerit* is usually added to the beginning of the transmitted line, giving a main verb to the clause in 121; Friedrich shows that *uectus* very often combines with another verb of motion, e.g. 101.1-2. However, this leaves the ugly homoeoteleuton of juxtaposed noun and attribute *eam deuinctam*, and Shackleton Bailey (1994) 16 shows how statistically unlikely this is: the only comparable case in Catullus' dactylic verse is 66.15 *estne nouis nuptis odio Venus*, which clearly imitates a set phrase (cf. *noua nupta* in poem 61). *eam* in itself is acceptable (despite the rarity of oblique cases of *is* in poetry outside Lucretius: Axelson 70-4), since it is required for the change of construction here (Baehrens). Catullus has *eam* at 42.6 and 10 as well as 17.23 *eum*, 82.3 *ei*; more dubiously 63.43 *eum*, 84.5 *eius*, 63.54 *earum*. I therefore keep *eam* but follow the alternative route of breaking up the homoeoteleuton with an adjective for *somno*. Renaissance editors tried *dulci*, a reading of ζ (cf. *Ciris* 206 *dulci deuinctus lumina somno*), which is unlikely so soon after 120 *dulcem*; but the *Ciris* author probably read a similar word here, as Baehrens argues, comparing references to Ariadne's sleep at Philostr. *Imag.* 1.15 ὥς ἐν μαλακῷ κεῖται τῷ ὕπνῳ, Nonn. *Dion.* 47.320 ὕπνος ἐμοὶ γλυκὺς ἦλθεν ἕως γλυκὺς ὄχετο Θησεύς. Baehrens conjectured *molli*, probably based on Prop. 1.3.7 *mollem ... quietem*, but as this seems too close to 129 *molli* I prefer Laetus' *placido* (cf. Enn. *Ann.* 2 Skutsch below).

As this leaves no room for *uenerit*, there remains the question of whether 121 can stand as a complete clause with *sit* understood. This is not impossible (cf. 10.31 *uerum utrum illius an mei quid ad me*, Hor. *Serm.* 1.6.52-3 *felicem dicere non hoc | me possim*, *casu quod te sortitus amicum*, though both are highly colloquial), but it leaves a clause that sounds unpleasantly truncated in this context; the narrative would flow much better if the clause were completed with a main verb, so I also follow

Laetus in positing a lacuna after 121 (though he kept transmitted *ratis* in that line as subject of *uecta*). This line would have made an attractive parallelism between two two-line *aut ut* clauses (cf. pairs of lines at e.g. 124-31n., 132-5). I am much less convinced than Trappes-Lomax that the content concerned ‘one night of conjugal bliss on Dia’, though that would add bowdlerisation to the homoearchon of *aut ut* as a possible reason for omission.

deuinctam lumina somno For being ‘chained’ in sleep cf. e.g. *Od.* 23.17 [ὕπνος] μ’ ἐπέδησε ... βλέφαρ’ ἀμφικαλύψας, Mosch. *Eur.* 4 πεδῶα μαλακῶ κατὰ φάεα δεσμῶ, Enn. *Ann.* 2 Skutsch *somno leni placidoque reuinctus* and esp. Lucr. 4.453-4 *suavi deuinxit membra sopore | somnus*, 1027 *somno deuincti*; see also *TLL* V.1.859.23-8, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 11.238-9. Catullus and the imitation at *Ciris* 206 (see above) add *lumina*, suggesting that sleep is wrapped around Ariadne’s eyes like a blindfold: for the construction see 64 *contecta ... pectus* n.

123 immemori ... pectore Cf. 58 *immemor* n.; here the recurring epithet is more clearly focalised through the narrator, who seems to share Ariadne’s judgement of Theseus. The collocation (contrasting with *ardenti corde* of Ariadne in the next line) recurs once (PHI 5.3), at Sen. *Ben.* 1.3.1 *duro et immemori pectore* of those who are slow to show *gratia*.

discedens Cf. 134. The pointed contrast of prefixes with *coniunx* emphasises Theseus’ betrayal.

coniunx Emphatically left to the end of the line and of this very long sentence as the narrator anticipates Ariadne’s accusations (cf. esp. 182-3). *coniunx* can refer to a partner either in formal marriage or in a non-marital sexual relationship (Prop. 2.8.29 *abrepta ... coniuge* (Briseis), Sen. *Ag.* 1002 *captiua coniunx, regii*

paelex tori (Cassandra)), but in the latter case is often used rhetorically to imply that the union was like marriage, or was expected to lead to marriage, and therefore should not be or have been betrayed: cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 8.18 *coniugis indigno Nysae deceptus amore* (cf. 66 *coniugis*) with Clausen, Ov. *Her.* 3.37 *sed non opus est tibi coniuge*, 8.18 *rapta coniuge lentus eris?*

124-31: introduction to Ariadne's speech

The construction changes from indirect questions depending on *commemorem* to indirect statements depending on *perhibent*, marking the return to Dia by the narrator choosing 'to silence his own voice, as it were, by donning the veil of common poetic knowledge' (Armstrong (2006) 43). The eight-line period leading up to Ariadne's speech describes her external and internal state as she makes it (Schmale (2004) 171); it is divided into four two-line sections, 'a variety of shots of Ariadne against different backdrops' (Fitzgerald (1995) 157). Each section is divided in turn into one line governed by an infinitive and one giving an additional detail in a participial (24, 129, 131) or purpose clause (127), and they are arranged chiastically, with details of the sounds Ariadne makes coming first and last (124-5, 130-1), her movements in the middle (125-9). See further 124 *perhibent* n.

124 saepe may be understood either 125 *fudisse* or with *perhibent*. The former would indicate, in the same way as 126-8 *tum ... tum*, the repeated actions that are typical of Ariadne's emotional state (cf. 98 *saepe ... suspirantem*, 100 *saepe ... expalluit*), while the latter would indicate continuous repetition of the story in the

poetic tradition: cf. 24 *saepe ... compellabo*, Panoussi (2003) 116 n.54, and see below.

perhibent ‘Alexandrian footnote’ (cf. 2 *dicuntur*, 76 *perhibent* nn.); the return to Ariadne on the beach turns out not to be a return to ecphrasis, as the appeal to poetic authority replaces any reference to the picture on the *uestis* (50-75n.) Readers tend to feel that the passage of narrative time during the digressions of 71-123 has some equivalent in story time and that this is Ariadne at a later point than when she was left behind at 71 (cf. DeBrohun (1999) 420 and e.g. Quinn ‘By now Ariadne has grasped what has happened to her’); but rather than simply continuing the story of the depicted Ariadne beyond the depicted moment (the picture ‘coming to life’), the poetic tradition referred to actually seems to provide an alternative account (Armstrong (2006) 203 n.35). Though this Ariadne has much in common with the figure in 52-75 (121-3, 126-9nn.), not only does she speak and move as she could not have done in the picture, she also seems to differ in an important visual detail, her clothes and her attitude towards them (129n., cf. 63-7). As Kroll notes, the professed dependence on an earlier poetic source here is also problematic because this is the first surviving attestation of an angry, lamenting Ariadne. If this is not simply a joke typical of our unreliable narrator (116-23n.), then either Catullus refers to a lost Hellenistic Ariadne or the reader is invited to observe how ‘Ariadne’s lament, or most of it, has been uttered before’ by intertextual predecessors (Gaisser (1995) 601; cf. 132-201n.).

ardenti corde furentem reprises the fire imagery from the flashback (91-3, 97) rather than the wave and thorn imagery from the previous scene on Dia (62, 71-2). *ardeo* of ‘burning’ emotion (love, anger, eagerness or others) is frequent from Plautus onwards, applied either to the person, to the eyes or face, or to the *animus*,

pectus etc. (see *TLL* II.484.69-487.3), though not elsewhere in surviving classical Latin to the *cor*. Cf. e.g. Cic. *Rep.* 2.26 *animos ... ardentis*, Virg. *Aen.* 8.163 *mens iuuenali ardebat amore*, Stat. *Silu.* 2.3.19 *ardenti iam iam suspiria librat pectore*. On *furentem* cf. the *furores* of 54, 94; both noun and verb become much more prevalent to describe Dido in Virg. *Aen.* 4. For the combination of *ardor* and *furor* cf. 197 and e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 4.101 *ardet amans Dido traxitque per ossa furorem*.

125 Whereas in 50-75 Ariadne was a figure in a picture who was typically depicted as looking (52 *prospectans* n.), she is now a character from verbal tradition or report (124 *perhibent* n.), and she speaks. These *uoces*, however, seem to be inarticulate, repeated (*saepe*) cries, representing a midpoint between her silent prayers at 104 and her speech at 130ff. In 202, however, *has postquam maesto profudit pectore uoces* blurs this distinction by combining echoes of this line and of 130 (*haec, maestam*) to enclose the speech in ring-composition: and see below.

clarisonas ... uoces cf. 320 *clarisona ... uoce*: the parallel that seems to be drawn between the poem's two major inset speeches again suggests that this line may have some reference to Ariadne's speech after all (see above). On such poetic compound adjectives see 52 *fluentisono ... litore* n. The only other occurrence of this one is Cic. *Arat.* 280 *a clarisonis auris Aquilonis*; Kroll and Nuzzo speculate that it may be a calque on a compound beginning ὄξυ-, e.g. ὄξυβόας, ὄξύτονος, ὄξύφωνος.

imo ... e pectore Cf. 198 *nascuntur pectore ab imo*, another element of ring-composition and suggestion that this line has something to do with the way the lament is spoken. Elsewhere the *imum pectus* may be the source either of words (66.74 *condita*, Lucr. 3.57-8 *uoces*, Virg. *Aen.* 6.55 *preces*, Sen. *Tro.* 580 *condita arcana*) or of inarticulate sounds (Virg. *Aen.* 1.485 *ingentem gemitum*, 2.288 *gemitus*,

Ov. Met. 10.402 *suspiria*, Sen. Dial. 11.18.6 *gemitus*, Apul. Met. 1.7 *cruciabilem suspirium*, Mart. 10.80.3 *gemitus*, Sil. 9.152 *suspirans*). Virgil and Valerius Flaccus combine the two to describe the effort of speaking through sighs or tears (*Aen.* 1.371 *suspirans imoque trahens a pectore uocem*, 11.377, 840; V.Fl. 5.36, 6.496 *flebat et has imo referebat pectore uoces*), with the result that as here the hyperbole helps to merge the physical and emotional senses of *pectus*. Cf. also [Cic.] *Ad Her.* 4.68 *anhelans ex infimo pectore crudelitatem*, in an example of *demonstratio (enargeia)*.

fudisse Cf. 321 *fuderunt* (another link to the Fates' song) as well as 202 *profudit*, and Virg. *Aen.* 6.55 *funditque preces rex pectore ab imo*, V.Fl. 1.504 *tales fundit Sol pectore uoces*. The verb suggests 'frantic intensity': see Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 17.53. With *uoces*, *effundere* is more common, *profundere* less so than uncompounded *fundere*, which occurs at e.g. Cic. *Progn.* 4.2, Virg. *Aen.* 11.482, V.Fl. 5.16, Sil. 4.526; all are typical of epic poetry (Norden on *Aen.* 6.55 suspects 'ennianisches Colorit', cf. *Ann.* 553 Skutsch *effudit uoces*) as an equivalent of the Greek poetic use of χέω of the voice (LSJ s.v. III.1, e.g. *Od.* 19.521 χέει πολλῶν χεῶ φωνήν), though they can also occur in prose in emotional contexts, e.g. Cic. *Sest.* 118 *uoces quidem et palmarum intentus et maledictorum clamorem omnes profuderunt*. See further Fourcade (1979) 85-6.

126-9 Ariadne is trying to reach Theseus, either by scaling a cliff to keep his ship in view, or by running into the water after him. Both her gaze over the sea and her stepping into the edge of the water are paralleled in 52-75 (52-3, 61-2, 67), but here they are separated into different, although repeated actions: 126 *ac tum* initially sounds as if the narrative is moving on from 125 ('and then'), but that *tum* turns out to be correlated with *tum* in 128, 'at one time ... at another time'; see K—S II.71,

OLD s.v. 10, and e.g. Cic. *Luc.* 134 *tum hoc mihi probabilius tum illud uidetur*, and cf. double *nunc* in the allusion at Ov. *Her.* 10.19 *nunc huc, nunc illuc, et utroque sine ordine, curro*. Ovid in fact makes the distracted wandering described in these four lines typical of his Ariadne (*Her.* 10.19-20, 45-54), making an explicit comparison to Bacchic behaviour (48, cf. Catullus' simile, 61n.) and extends the detail of 126-7 into an eight-line account (25-32); cf. also Ariadne at Ov. *A.A.* 527 *Cnosis in ignotis amens errabat harenis*, Nonn. *Dion.* 47.299 ἡτίονας μεδέπουσα. Many details are also shared with Ovid's description of Phyllis at *Her.* 2.121-8: Ovid imitates Catullus, but Klingner (1956) 56-7, Puelma (1982) 236-7 argue that both may also have been influenced, either directly or through a Hellenistic predecessor, by Callimachus' account of Phyllis, known from fr. 556 Pfeiffer and an account in letter 86 of Procopius, p.565 Haury (quoted by Pfeiffer *ad loc.*). See Barchiesi (1992) 107-11 and cf. 176 *hospes* n.

126 The spondaic rhythm suggests effort (40n.).

praeruptos ... montes Cf. 297 *e uerticibus praeruptis* and Ov. *Her.* 2.132 *praerupta ... mole* (126-9n.). *praeruptus* 'sheer' is very common of mountains, valleys etc. in verse and prose (*TLL* VIII.801.69-802.28).

tristem Corrected from transmitted *tristes* (an easy assimilation) since *montes* already has an adjective (cf. 119 *misera* n.). Cf. 130 *maestam* for both sense and grammar; but this is the only appearance of *tristis* in the poem.

conscendere Cf. 128 *procurrere* and contrast *fudisse* and *dixisse* in the outer pair of the four two-line sections (124-31n.). This *uariatio* of tenses is elegant: Quinn (1963) 222-3, analysing Virgil's practice of 'stylistic' alternation of present and perfect in narrative, cites this as Catullus' only approach to it. Any further meaning

that the different tenses might carry is hard to pinpoint: they contrast Ariadne's movements with her utterances, but there is no external evidence for the assertion of Friedrich, Fordyce and Nuzzo that the present infinitives here represent what would have been imperfect tenses in direct speech. Probably, then, purely metrical variation (Kroll, Thomson).

127 aciem An intense 'gaze' (*TLL* I.401.82-402.14): cf. 63.56 *cupit ipsa pupula ad te sibi derigere aciem*.

in ... protenderet Ariadne stretches her gaze over the sea. This meaning can be achieved by adopting R's *protenderet*, where the prefix adds the idea of stretching 'out' (cf. 52, 249 *prospectans*, 61-2 *prospicit*, 241 *prospectum ... petebat*), and adding *in* to govern *pelagi uastos ... aestus* (already in ζη; omission of *in* after *-m* would be very easy). This seems a reasonable extension of the use of *protendere* of arms, hands etc., or of what they hold (*TLL* X.2.2264.64-2265.55): cf. Virg. *Aen.* 930-1 *oculos dextramque precantem | protendens*, and *acies* in this sense as object of *intendo* at Cic. *Tusc.* 4.38, *Luc.* 80, V.Fl. 3.571-2, as well as Tib. 1.7.19 *utque maris uastum prospectet turribus aequor*. The alternative is to understand OG's *pretenderet* as a corruption of *per tenderet*, so that *per* is the equivalent preposition. This was suggested by Baehrens and adopted by Lenchantin, Schuster, Eisenhut, Bardon and Nuzzo; it gives a better sense of 'over', but the word order adjective-*per*- (intervening words)-noun appears to be paralleled only at Lucr. 6.714 *is rigat Aegyptum medium per saepe calorem*, where *saepe* is shorter and less important to the meaning (see Munro *ad loc.*) than the verb here. Catullus has 101 *contra contendere monstrum*, but monosyllabic prepositions are generally treated with much less freedom than disyllabic ones, with Lucretius as an exception (Bailey (1947)

I.107). *per* can be separated from its (following) noun, but only in formulae of appeal of the type seen at e.g. Ter. *And.* 538 *per te deos oro*, where the intervening words are usually personal pronouns, or in the locution *per ... perque* (Marouzeau (1922-49) III.36-7, K—S I.584-5). *in ... protenderet* seems the safer choice.

pelagi ... aestus Another periphrastic variation on ‘the sea’, found also at Apul. *Met.* 5.21. Like *pontus* (179n.), *pelagus* is a transliteration (πέλαγος) and primarily poetic, first extant in Pacuvius and Lucilius; Catullus also has it at 63.16, 88 and it appears in Cic. *Arat.* and Lucretius. The different aspects of the sea involved with Ariadne’s two actions are pathetically contrasted: she can see *pelagi uastos ... aestus* but can only reach *tremuli salis aduersas ... undas*.

uastos Cf. 156 *uasta Carybdis* n. for the emptiness conveyed. The implication is that Theseus’ ship is a tiny speck, if visible at all: again time seems to have passed since the moment depicted on the *uestis* (124 *perhibent* n.).

128 tremuli refers to the gentle rippling of the sea near the shore, caused either by wind, as at Ov. *Her.* 11.75 *ut mare fit tremulum, tenui cum stringitur aura*, or by the waves themselves, and contrasting with the large-scale surge of 127 *aestus*. Catullus uses it elsewhere of people tremulous with old age (307, 17.13, 61.51, 154, 68.142) and here its force may be partly transferred from Ariadne’s agitation. Cf. also Ov. *Her.* 2.128 *mobile ... aequor* (126-9n.).

salis See 67 *fluctus salis* n. for the metonymy and genitive.

aduersas ... in undas i.e. the waves are moving on to the beach, in the opposite direction from Ariadne, and they prevent her from going any further: *aduersus* of water usually indicates an opposing current (e.g. Lucr. 4.423 *in aduersum flumen contrudere*, Ov. *Met.* 15.732 *per aduersas nauis cita ducitur undas*).

procurrere Cf. Ov. *Her.* 2.127 *in freta procuro* (126-9n.), V.Fl. 2.637 *ipse ultro primas procurrit ad undas* (both to meet an approaching ship), Sil. 11.491-2 *in medios rapienda ad gaudia uulgi* | *procurrit fluctus*, and Lucr. 1.969-70 *siquis procurrat ad oras* | *ultimus extremas* (the edge of the universe).

129 There is almost humorous detachment in the gratuitous, parenthetical nature of this titillating detail, and in the way the adjectives required by the ‘golden’ construction (7, 59n.) enhance its enjoyability; this is very much in the manner of 63-7, as the narrator returns briefly to visual description (but giving the reader an additional detail invisible to the viewers of the *uestis*). The inconsistency with that passage is not so much in the state of undress imagined (there was no mention there that Ariadne had lost her skirts) as in the self-awareness the action implies, contrasting with 68-9 *neque ... curans*; this sense of self-possession is also enhanced by the elegance of the ‘golden’ line, and seems incongruous with the irrationality of running into the water in the first place. Commentators and Perrotta (1931) 391 give Ap. *Arg.* 3.874-5 ἄν δὲ χιτῶνας | λεπταλέους (~ *mollia*) λευκῆς ἐπιγουνίδος ἄχρις ὄριον as Catullus’ model (of Medea’s maids running behind her as she drives to meet Jason), but the detail is fairly common in Hellenistic poetry: see also Ap. *Arg.* 4.45-6, 940-9 (see 18n.), Theoc. 14.35, 26.17 and esp. the similar care shown by Europa at Mosch. *Eur.* 126-8 ἐν χερὶ δ’ ἄλλη | εἴρνε πορφυρέην κόλπου πύχα ὄφρα κε μή μιν | δεύοι ἐφελκόμενον πολιῆς ἀλὸς ἄσπετον ὕδωρ (see Bühler *ad loc.*). It may originally derive from *Hymn. Hom.* 2.176-7 (see Richardson *ad loc.*, who compares the appearance of the same gesture in art).

mollia Continuing the *uariatio* in the description of the pleasant texture of Ariadne's clothing (63 *subtilem* n.); of the Fates' wool at 311, 318, and cf. 65.21 *molli ... ueste*.

nudatae Proleptic. Cf. also 17 *nudato corpore nymphas* n.: there is similar play here with how much of the body is visible (*surae* comparatively delayed).

tegmina surae Calves are less obviously erotic than the thighs of Ap. *Arg.* 3.875 (see above and cf. Hunter *ad loc.*) but of course still appealing to the reader or narrator disposed to find Ariadne attractive: cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 2.4.21-2 *bracchia et uultum teretesque suras | integer laudo*, where they are the most intimate body part that the speaker thinks he can get away with mentioning (cf. N—H and West *ad loc.*), Cynthia *nuda ... sura* at Prop. 2.19.15. The detail also implies that Ariadne does not run very far into the sea; this further undermines the irrationality of her action (see above). Kroll notes that the grammatical numbers are reversed: the lower part of Ariadne's robe is *tegmen surarum*.

130 haec and other parts of *hic* are regularly used before as well as after the quoted words to which they refer, both in epic (e.g. Enn. *Ann.* 45-6 Skutsch *exim compellare pater me uoce uidetur | his uerbis*: 'o gnata ...', Virg. *Aen.* 1.36-7 *Iuno ... | haec secum*: 'mene ...') and other genres (e.g. Cic. *Att.* 11.12.1 *his uerbis ad Caesarem scripsi*: 'de Quinto fratre ...'). For a comparable gap between *haec* and the beginning of the quoted speech (131n.) see Virg. *Ecl.* 6.67-9 *Linus haec illi diuino carmine pastor | floribus atque apio crinis ornatus amaro | dixerit*: 'hos ...'.

maestam Cf. 60 *maestis* n. for this repeated word; its reappearance at 202 *maesto ... pectore* helps to enclose the speech in ring-composition, and it also characterises Catullan speeches or speakers at 38.8, 63.49, 65.12, 66.29.

extremis ... querelis Both Ariadne (195) and Aegeus (223) refer to their own speeches as *querelae*; Catullus also has the word of the laments of Berenice (66.19). In elegy it comes to characterise the utterances of lovers (Pichon s.v. *queri*). Commentators generally interpret *extremis* as ‘last before death’, comparing Prop. 3.7.55 *flens tamen extremis dedit haec mandata querelis, | cum moribunda niger clauderet ora liquor*, but of course this is not strictly true (‘last as a mere mortal’ (Quinn) is not the same) and, more importantly, Ariadne’s conviction that she is about to die is not mentioned until 152-3, 169, 186-9. Rather, *extremis* = ‘desperate’, ‘pitiable’ (*OLD* s.v. 4b, e.g. Apul. *Met.* 5.25.1 *Psyche ... extremis affligebat lamentationibus animum*), and also suggesting ‘she finally broke out into lament’ (Kroll, cf. *OLD* s.v. 3), since the word appears as part of the *last* detail in this extended description of Ariadne (cf. 118 *denique* n.).

131 Ariadne sobs weakly as she speaks: this does not lead the reader to expect a lengthy and rhetorically forceful speech (Reitz (2002) 94). The line continues the pattern of ‘couplets’ in 124-31 (see n.) but creates an unexpected deferral of Ariadne’s first words after 130 *haec*; it is as if the narrator cannot resist including a final pathetic detail, demonstrating his competence in a five-word line of classic shape (7n.), before he hands over to Ariadne (cf. 322, a similarly self-contained narratorial comment, the last line before the Fates’ song begins).

frigidulos ... singultus The diminutive (60 *ocellis* n.) perhaps makes this a ‘neoteric’ version of Homeric κρυερόιο γόοιο (*Il.* 24.524, *Od.* 4.103, 11.212); it survives elsewhere only at *Ciris* 251 *frigidulam ... puellam*, 348 *frigidulos ... ocellos* and Aur. *ap.* Front. 2.11.3 van den Hout² *gallicinium frigidulum*, which last example perhaps suggests usage in colloquial speech. Sobs, onomatopoeically evoked here by

the *-ul-* assonance, are presumably cold because the quick intake of breath into an *udo ore* feels cold to someone crying, but the idea of cold is also appropriate for grief, closeness to death (but see 130 *extremis ... querelis* n.) and unfriendly environment. Yet a ‘cold’ speech would normally be a lame or unsuccessful one (*OLD* s.v. *frigidus* 8d, cf. s.v. *frigeo, frigescio, frigus* and the ‘frigidity’ of Sestius’ *oratio* in poem 44), so the word contributes to the misdirection of the reader’s expectations of Ariadne as a speaker.

udo ... ore Ariadne’s mouth is wet from the tears implied by *singultus* (cf. e.g. *Ov. Am.* 1.8.84 *udas ... genas*); contrast 316 *aridulis ... labellis* of the Fates and cf. 125n. The detail is unpleasant, perhaps childish (cf. *Pers.* 2.32 *uda labella*, of a dribbling baby) and emphasises the physicality of the act of speaking, again creating a tension with Ariadne’s articulate and literary speech. There seems to be a link between the tears Ariadne produces (which would also be salty) and the *undas* of 128 into which she runs (which would also be cold): see further Fitzgerald (1995) 158 on how ‘a system of parallels and contrasts plays across the boundary between human and natural’.

cientem ‘raising’ a sound, cf. 262 *tenuis tinnitus ... ciebant*; it typically describes the production of inarticulate noises or tears, e.g. *Lucr.* 5.1060 *dissimilis ... uoces uariasque ciere* (animals in pain), *Virg. Aen.* 3.344-5 *talía fundebat lacrimas longosque ciebat | incassum fletus*, 6.468-9 *talibus Aeneas ardentem ... lenibat dictis animum lacrimasque ciebat* (both at the end of quoted speeches).

132-201: Ariadne's speech

The longest section of the poem, with three main sub-divisions: 132-63, reproaches addressed to Theseus; 164-87, Ariadne's lament about her current situation, with no specified addressee; 188-201, her curse, invoking the Furies. Essentially 132-63 concern the past on Crete, 164-87 the present on Dia, and 188-201 the future in Athens, although this is complicated by e.g. 142-8 (prescription for the future based on men's typical behaviour), 152-3 (future: being eaten by beasts and birds), 160-3 (fantasised alternative present/future), 171-6 (past: Theseus' arrival in Crete), 180-1 (past: abandonment of Minos). However, indications of time passing during the speech itself are scarce (167 *prope iam*, 188-9 *non ante, nec prius* nn.). So, although the speech is not formally part of the ecphrasis but depends on 124 *perhibent*, and although Ariadne is clearly not in the psychological state described by 55, the sense that the speech takes place at a single, frozen moment leads the reader to identify that moment with the one depicted on the *uestis*. This seems to be something unique in ancient literature, a speech uttered by a character in an ecphrasis.

As in 50-75, there are indications of a more narrative mode towards the end (71-5, 188-201nn.), but the first two parts of the speech are a descriptive exploration of Ariadne's emotions, just as her appearance was explored in 52-70. This raises the question of how far we are again dealing with the narrator or poet 'displaying' Ariadne, and how far Ariadne herself has different aims for her speech. Like any character-text, Ariadne's words encourage the reader to treat her as a 'real person' by identifying connections of thought and imagining how what she says relates to her feelings. A reader may also 'judge' Ariadne, deciding (for instance) whether she is pitiable. But as with any character-text that is part of a genre also featuring narrator-

text (the Platonic ‘mixed’ kind, *Rep.* 3.394c), complications arise from the relationship between speech and narration. Ariadne’s style is not particularly differentiated from the narrator’s: her hexameters are just as carefully crafted (132-8n.). If we attribute to Ariadne the choice of what to say, we can also attribute to her the choice of how to say it, and this makes her a good Catullan poet. Jenkyns (1982) 119-21 concludes that her artistry undermines her ‘sincerity’: a wider understanding might be that it interferes in a particularly obtrusive way with our usual suspension of disbelief when encountering any character-text, particularly in verse. Secondly, Ariadne often sounds like the narrator more specifically: her speech refers to many themes and situations that also feature in the narrative. Sometimes her version of events appears to be the same (e.g. 133-4n.), sometimes different (e.g. 149ff., 171-6n.). We can, of course, attribute these repetitions and variations to the poet, or we can say that the narrator who described Ariadne now speaks for her. Involving Ariadne’s agency, we may in ‘realistic’ terms assert that she is describing her surroundings or remembering her experiences. Alternatively, we can think of her within the picture and ask whether what she describes is also depicted (e.g. 183n.), or even whether she is able to look out from the *uestis* to Peleus’ and Thetis’ wedding (141, 163nn.). But even such interpretations will usually be built up from *verbal* links, such as those between 183 and 58, or 141, 163 and the account of Peleus and Thetis. Rather than having seen the picture, we might construct Ariadne as having heard the narrator’s description, or read the poet’s poem. How else would she be able to echo *sed quid ego* (164-70n.)? We are reminded that the whole ecphrasis – including Ariadne as depicted figure and as speaker – is created in words (50-75n.).

Ariadne may have read other poems too (cf. similarly on Ovid’s heroines e.g. Knox (1995) 18-25). Her speech contains many other voices, including those of

Homer's Patroclus (154-7n.) and Sophocles' Ajax (177-83, 188-201nn.; a precedent for the better-known relationship between Ajax and Virgil's Dido). There are also likely to be important links undiscoverable to us with lost Hellenistic heroines (Callimachus' Phyllis (126-9, 176nn., see Puelma (1982)); possibly a Hellenistic Ariadne, see below and Lefèvre (2000)), and with Roman tragedy. But the speech engages most fully with the reproachful speeches of Medea to Jason at Eur. *Med.* 465-519 and Ap. *Arg.* 4.355-90; Ennius' version of the Euripidean speech is no doubt also involved, but is visible to us only in the questions at 177ff. Medea's allusive presence is a link with the Argonautic opening of the poem, as becomes particularly clear with the renewed evocation of the *Medea*-prologue at 171ff.; on Medea and Jason as a problematic *exemplum* in both the inner and outer stories of 64 (1-11n.) see esp. Zetzel (1983), Clare (1996), DeBrohun (2007). By blending the Euripidean and Apollonian Medeas (e.g. taking one series of questions from each: 132-8, 177-83), the speech comments on the similarity between them, and on Apollonius' presentation of his heroine as starting to become her 'later' Euripidean self; Ariadne's adoption of Medea's voice further encourages the reader to reflect on the similarities and differences between these two examples of the same mythical type, creating a tension between the judgement that Ariadne is fundamentally different from Medea (more innocent, weaker), and the eventual discovery that, like Medea, she has the power to avenge herself.

Unlike Medea, however, Ariadne is not heard by her betrayer. Soliloquies had always featured in epic, drama and other genres, but the combination of absentee address and exploration of emotion is unprecedented on this scale: Klingner (1956) 54-60, Lefèvre (1977) 26-8 are surely right to argue that Ariadne's speech demonstrates an influential extension of epic speech towards lyric, elegy and other

‘personal’ poetry. However, Ariadne is aware of her lack of an audience (164-70n.), and shows a recurrent interest in failures of communication (139-42, 143-8, 186), prompting us as readers to reflect that *we* can hear her. This allows us to understand her rhetoric as intended to persuade us of the rightness of her case (Reitz (2002)). But this metapoetic possibility fades in the final section, when Ariadne finds an audience within her own reality, the Furies (188-201n.); she now places self-conscious stress on the effectiveness, not the uselessness of her speech, emphasising not just Theseus’ crimes and her current state but also her words as mediating and representing this (195-8).

Ariadne is involved in important relationships with three other Catullan speakers. An intratextual one is Aegeus, Theseus’ other victim (188-201n.). A second is Attis in 63, who also laments on the seashore, literally and metaphorically severed from society (cf. 50-75n.): see e.g. Perutelli (1996) 266-7, Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 482-4, Panoussi (2003). The third is the ‘Catullus’ of the personal poetry: see esp. 143, 160-3nn. for poem 8, 154-7n. for poem 60, and Henry (1950-1) 53-4 for poem 76, comparing Catullus’ appeal to the gods with Ariadne’s. Here the most sustained relationship is with poem 30, which contains *perfide*, *immemor*, *certe*, *fallere* and *fallacum* (~ 151 *fallaci*), *neglegis* (~ 134 *neglecto*), *deseris* (~ 135 *deserto*, 187 *deserta*), accusations of lack of pity and of respect for the gods, opening rhetorical questions, image of promises carried off by the wind (cf. 142) and concluding threat of divine vengeance. Although 30 is addressed to an unfaithful friend, Alfenus, this relationship has been used in arguments that Catullus identifies himself with Ariadne and his betrayal by Lesbia with her abandonment by Theseus (e.g. Putnam (1961), Daniels (1967), Forsyth (1976) esp. 559). Such an ‘autoallegorical’ reading remains open, but should be qualified by an awareness of

the role played in the apparently ‘sincere’ personal poems by Catullus’ own rhetoric (see esp. Veyne (1988) esp. 34-5, Selden (1992)).

The influence of the speech on the Latin poetic tradition of lamenting heroines was fundamental: see generally Hross (1958). Ariadne is one of the most important literary predecessors of Virgil’s Dido, and traces of her speech are found particularly in Dido’s accusatory speeches at *Aen.* 4.305-30 and 365-87, her desperate soliloquy (534-52), and her curse (607-29); besides nn. below see Oksala (1962), Kilroy (1969), Fourcade (1979) and e.g. Clausen (1987) 40-60. The Ovidian speech nearest to that of Catullus’ Ariadne is Scylla’s (to Minos!) at *Met.* 8.108-42; his two sustained representations of the voice of Ariadne herself also engage closely with Catullus, in *Her.* 10 (see esp. Schmidt (1967), Jacobson (1974) 213-27, Landolfi (1997)) and at *Fast.* 3.471-506, where she remembers her Catullan past when apparently deserted by Bacchus (see esp. 132-3n.). Scylla’s final lament at *Ciris* 404-58 also uses the language of Catullus’ Ariadne (see Lyne *ad loc.*) and Seneca’s *Medea* occasionally reincorporates it into that myth (see esp. 181n.). A special case is the lament of Ariadne at Nonn. *Dion.* 47.320-418, which contains similarities with Catullus not appearing elsewhere in the tradition (see esp. 17, 59, 139-40, 160-3nn., Syndikus 152-4, Hross (1958) 165-73); this is evidence either for a common source in a Hellenistic account of Ariadne, or for Nonnus’ having read Catullus. For surveys of the critical debate on this issue see Knox (1998) 75-6 and cf. Miguélez Caverio (2008) 23-4, 95 n.341; add Herrera Montero (1996).

Other kinds of references to Ariadne in Latin poetry suggest she had a privileged place among lamenting heroines: cf. *Aetna* 21-2 *quis non periuriae doluit mendacia puppis*, | *desertam uacuo Minoida litore questus?*, *Lygd.* 6.39-42, and Ovid’s telescoped version of her speech at *A.A.* 1.536 *‘perfidus ille abiit; quid mihi*

fiet?’ *ait*. Perhaps because she continues to speak although her physical isolation and her imminent rescue both, in different ways, render her lament pointless, Ariadne remains the archetypal abandoned, lamenting woman: see Romani (1999), and Lipking (1988) on the postclassical tradition.

132-8 Ariadne first introduces two key accusations, perjury and cruelty; her rapid movement from *fides* and promises to an appeal for pity is similar to Dido’s strategy (Virg. *Aen.* 4.305-11). Lines 132-5 can also be seen to refer in order to the major sections of the speech (132-201n.): accusations based on Theseus’ past actions (*perfide, patriis auectam ... ab aris*), account of Ariadne’s current position (*deserto ... in litore*), curse (*neglecto numine diuum, deuota*). In opening with a series of questions Ariadne closely imitates Medea’s speech to Jason at Ap. *Arg.* 4. 355-90 (cf. Klingner (1956) 52-3, Syndikus 156), and is in turn followed by Dido speaking to Aeneas at Virg. *Aen.* 4.305-30 and Scylla to Minos at Ov. *Met.* 8.108-42; for all these heroines the initial reaction to imminent or real abandonment is to ask whether this can really be the hero’s intention. This disbelief is somewhere between the real (cf. 55) and the rhetorically useful, though for Ariadne the fact that Theseus is irretrievably gone means that the rhetorical purpose which it serves is that of winning the reader’s sympathy for and belief in her side of the case rather than persuading her addressee to stay: see Reitz (2002) esp. 94-5, Schmale (2004) 177-8. Catullus also uses repeated questions in very similar implied situations in the personal poetry at 30.1-3, 76.3-4 (see Granarolo (1967) 355-6; 132-201n.).

These lines are programmatic for the dense stylistic artistry of the speech, especially its use of repetition. The first two questions, each occupying two lines and introduced by *sicine*, include three detached vocatives, but these apparent

interruptions enhance rather than disrupt the syntactic pattern: *immemor* is accompanied by the markedly stylised *a* (see n.), while *perfide* has its own repetition nested within the repetition of *sicine* (see Wills 413-14 for this sort of ‘enclosure’), and is also assimilated to this word by dactylic shape, line-initial position and near-rhyme. The *i* sounds in these words dominate 132-4, then give way to assonance of *o* in 135. Alliterative words occur in pairs, many strikingly juxtaposed (*liquisti in litore, neglecto numine, deuota domum periuria portas*), others speaking to each other across greater distances (*patriis ... perfide, auectam ... ab aris, discedens ... diuum, crudelis ... consilium, praesto ... pectus*). Entire clauses are also doubled: Syndikus 158 shows how Ariadne’s fulsomeness typically consists in saying the same thing twice, and how anaphora (here of *sicine* and *nulla*) underlines this parallelism. There is also an abundance of affective epithets (Fourcade (1979) 89-90, contrasting with the relatively restrained Virg. *Aen.* 4.305-11). All this creates a high level of rhetorical and ‘musical’ finish (‘an intricate melodic theme and variation’, Fitzgerald (1995) 158), and the reader may see Ariadne herself as an artist so much in control of her words that they actually lack ‘passion and directness’ (Jenkyns (1982) 119). However, the effect that the artist of these lines is apparently aiming at is the portrayal of distress: dactylic speed, forceful questions, swift movement from one topic to the next, ‘shrillness’ of *i* sounds (Thomson), spitting alliteration of plosive *p*, *perfide* repeated out of vehement anger. This problem of deciding whether the verbal artistry is primarily referring to itself or to its subject is one which will confront the reader throughout the speech: 132-201n.

132 *sicine* ‘like this?’, an interrogative typical of reproachful speech: cf. Cic. *Flac.* 81, *Fin.* 1.34, Liv. 6.16.2, 7.15.1 (both speeches), Quint. *Decl.* 321.31, [Quint.] *Decl.*

2.18, 1.24. Its appearances in poetry outside comedy confirm its vigorous ‘spoken’ tone: e.g. Prop. 2.15.9 *sicine, lente, iaces?*, Sen. *Phaed.* 864. It always comes first in its sentence and frequently opens a speech, dramatising the way in which an utterance is prompted by the intolerable situation in which the speaker finds him/herself (e.g. Luc. 8.331 *sicine Thessalicae mentem fregere ruinae?*, Apul. *Met.* 9.5); here *sicine* mediates the long-delayed transition into speech by referring to the entire situation, already described at length, to which Ariadne’s words react (see further 133-4n.). All these effects are intensified by the anaphora of *sicine* in 132-4: this is unique in surviving Latin, but cf. Ov. *Met.* 11.727-8 *sic, o carissime coniunx, | sic ad me, miserande, redis?*, [Ov.] *Epic. Drus.* 127-8 *sicine dignus eras oculis occurrere matris? | sic ego te reducem digne uidere fui?*, Sil. 9.157-9 *sicine te nobis, genitor, Fortuna reducit | in patriam? sic te nato natumque parenti impia restituit?*, all of which combine allusions to this speech and Aegeus’ (217 *reddite*, 237 *te reducem*) in the context of laments for the dead: see Wills 141. This first *sicine* also emphasises the adjacent personal pronoun, adding to the expression of indignation at personal ill-treatment: there are many parallels in Plautus, e.g. *Pseud.* 320 *sicine mi abs te bene merenti male refertur gratia?*, and, as Nuzzo notes, three of the four appearances of *sicine* in Silius: 5.107, 9.157 (both speech-openers), 16.626.

Catullus’ only other use of *sicine* is 77.3 *sicine subrepsti mi* in the address to the perfidious Rufus: for Ross (1969) 74 n.174 this is evidence for ‘how closely Catullus associates himself with Ariadne’. See 132-201n.

patriis auectam ... ab aris Cf. Medea at Ap. *Arg.* 4.361 πάτρην τε κλέα τε μέγάρων αὐτούς τε τοκῆας | νοσφισάμην, Eur. *Med.* 800-1 ἐξελίμπανον | δόμους πατρώους. The *arae patriae* (for the frequent plural see Austin on Virg. *Aen.* 2.663 with refs.) symbolise ‘home’ as a sacred and stable place (see *OLD* s.v. *ara* 1d and cf.

arae et foci ‘hearth and home’), and might be imagined as the altar(s) within Minos’ palace, as a Roman house would have altars to the *lares* and *penates*; therefore *patriis* = ‘ancestral’ or ‘native’, but also ‘father’s’. Ariadne’s unwillingness to face her betrayal of her father (she finally confronts it at 180-1) might partly explain her tendentious *auectam*. This echoes 121 *uecta* (cf. 133-4n.), but by adding the prefix (cf. the difference between ‘carry’ and ‘carry off’ or ‘carry away’) Ariadne represents what has happened to her as an abduction: although *aueho* can be used relatively innocently, e.g. Plaut. *Men.* 1115 *quot eras annos gnatus, quom te pater a patria auelit?*, it typically refers to seizure and is often chosen to describe the abduction of a woman, e.g. Plaut. *Bacch.* 948 *is Helenam auexit*, Prop. 1.2.20 *auecta externis Hippodamia rotis*, Ov. *Am.* 1.10.1 *ab Eurota Phrygiis auecta carinis* (of Helen; cf. McKeown *ad loc.*), Tac. *Ann.* 6.34 *Iason post auectam Medeam. aris* then, with its suggestion of clinging to an altar and being dragged away, almost insinuates rape; it also anticipates the religious emphasis of 134-5. It is therefore appropriate to this emotive context and should not be weakened to *oris*. Cf. Enn. *trag.* 84 *Jocelyn cui nec arae patriae domi stant*, Virg. *Aen.* 3.332 *patriasque obtruncat ad aras*, 11.269 *patriis ut redditus aris*, Stat. *Theb.* 6.610, Sil. 13.80-1 *neque tot de milibus unum | ingentis populi patrias dimisit ad aras*, V.Fl. 5.449 and for similar ideas e.g. Cic. *S. Rosc.* 23 *nudum eicit domo atque focus patriis disque penatibus praecipitem, iudices, exturbat*, Hor. *Epod.* 16.19 *agros atque lares patrios*, Prop. 2.1.62 *restituit patriis Androgeona focus*.

132-3 perfide ... | perfide Catullus frequently repeats adjectives expressing strong denigration or praise of a person (Évrard-Gillis 135). The epanalepsis (cf. 27, 61-2nn.) is imitated at *Culex* 132-3 *perfide multum, | perfide Demophoon*: this repetition

from the fifth foot of one line to the first of the next is frequently used to allude to Catullus' Ariadne (see Wills 124-73). Here the first occurrence of the vocative interrupts the phrase *patriis ... ab aris* while the second is separated from its noun, *Theseu*, which is therefore rather unexpected: this disjointed syntax seems to express Ariadne's anger (132-8n.), and similar effects are frequently seen where *perfide* elsewhere appears in accusatory speeches in poetry, e.g. Prop. 2.34.9-10 *Lynceu, tunc meam potuisti, perfide, curam | tangere?*, Ov. Pont. 4.3.17 *an uiuam, perfide, nescis*, Stat. Theb. 6.197 *alio tibi, perfide, pacto*. This vocative form especially seems to have become particularly associated with the reproaches of a lover: cf. e.g. Prop. 4.7.13 (where Hutchinson compares Propertian *perfida*), Ov. R.A. 597 *perfide Demophoon*, the five occurrences in Ov. Her., Sil. 6.518 and especially Virg. Aen. 4.305 *dissimulare etiam sperasti, perfide* and 365-6 *nec tibi diua parens generis nec Dardanus auctor, | perfide*, where Ariadne's two uses of *perfide* 'are split between two openings of Dido's addresses, with careful regard for the fifth-foot and first-foot positions of the original' (Wills 136). Servius calls *perfide* (vocative) a *muliebre uerbum* and *amantum uerbum* (on Virg. Aen. 4.305, 366); see also Pichon 231.

perfidus summarises one of Ariadne's main charges against Theseus (132-8n.) and recurs at 174 *perfidus ... nauita*; similarly, Theseus is ὀρκιόπότης at Nonn. Dion. 47.389, 48.544 (see 132-201n.). For the influence within Latin literature of Ariadne's judgement cf. Ov. A.A. 1.536 *perfidus ille abiit*, Her. 4.59 *perfide Aegides*, Aetna 583 *perfide Theseu* and especially the Ovidian Ariadne's famous 'memory' of her Catullan predecessor's accusation at Fast. 3.473 *dicebam, memini, 'periure et perfide Theseu!'* (discussion in Conte (1986) 60-3, Miller (1993) 153, Barchiesi (1993) 346-50, Hinds (1998) 3-4, Landolfi (1997), Armstrong (2006) 55-6).

133-4 deserto liquisti in litore, Theseu? | ... discedens Ariadne repeats words from the narrator (52 *litore*, 57 *desertam*, 59 *linquens*, 69 *Theseu*, 121 *litora*, 123 *liquerit*, 123 *discedens*), as if after hearing his lengthy description of her she has gained a vocabulary in which she can describe her situation (132-201n.); this impression of reference to the preceding text is helped by *sicine* (132n.). See also 69n. on vocative *Theseu* (also at line-end): the narrator and Ariadne address him in the same way.

desertum litus is common in verse and prose (cf. esp. Prop. 1.3.2 *languida desertis Cnosia litoribus*), but again, next to *liquisti*, *deserto* here sounds like a transferred epithet (57 *desertam ... sola* n.).

134 neglecto numine diuum i.e. showing by his action that he did not care for the power of the gods by whom he had sworn: this combines the uses of *neglego* for any sort of disrespect of the gods (*OLD* s.v. 3a) and for failure to observe an oath, contract or duty (*OLD* s.v. 5c, with objects such as *fidem* or *ius iurandum*). The Medea of both Apollonius and Euripides support their references to broken promises by mentioning the gods Jason had invoked (Ap. *Arg.* 4.358-9 ποῦ τοι Διὸς Ἰκεσίοιο | ὄρκιοι; Eur. *Med.* 492-4, cf. 135n.). For *numen* + genitive or possessive adjective as the aspect of a god invoked in an oath cf. 76.3-4 *nec foedere in ullo | diuum ad fallendos numine abusum homines* and e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 6.323-4 *Stygiamque paludem | di cuius iurare timent et fallere numen*, Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.16 *iurandasque tuum per numen ponimus aras*; its appearance in the description of Jupiter's response to Ariadne's speech (204) adds to the suggestion that Ariadne's final appeal for divine punishment of Theseus is anticipated here (132-8, 135 *deuota* nn.). *numine diuum* occurs at the end of a hexameter four times in Virg. *Aen.* (2.336, 777, 5.56, 6.368) as well as Stat. *Theb.* 12.420 (and cf. in the same position *numine diuos* at Cic. *carm.*

6.70 Büchner, *numine diuae* Lucr. 2.623, Virg. *Aen.* 1.447, V.Fl. 3.235, *numine diui* Virg. *Aen.* 3.363); Kroll speculates that it may be Ennian.

The phrase may also anticipate 386 *spreta pietate*: see 147 *cupidae mentis* n.

135 immemor (a!) Cf. 58n. for *immemor*; here it is parallel to Medea's accusation of λαδιφοροσύναι at Ap. *Arg.* 4.356 (132-8n.), and clearly means 'deliberately careless'. The *memini* of Ovid's Ariadne at *Fast.* 3.473 (see 132-3n.) perhaps also alludes to the use of the epithet here, contrasting *memor* Ariadne with *immemor* Theseus: on the general topic of literary and personal memory in such situations see Armstrong (2006) 31-70.

On *a* see 71n. It expresses emotion, but in a highly mannered way (cf. 132-8n. and Jenkyns (1982) 119). As Kershaw (1993) 27 observes the appearance of *a* without *miser* or *nimis* is 'an uncommon usage' in Catullus, but *contra* Trappes-Lomax the evidence of Ov. *Her.* 9.153 *heu deuota domus* and Virg. *Georg.* 4.491 *immemor heu!* does not confirm that *heu* should be read here; the latter is a similarly uncommon usage of *heu*, which as a narratorial interjection might be alluding simultaneously to 71 *a misera* and 94 *heu miseros* as well as to this line.

deuota may mean 'dedicated as an offering' (e.g. 66.62 *deuotae flauī uerticis exuuiāe*) or more specifically 'dedicated to the *di inferi*' and thence 'accursed'; see further Watson (1991) 209. It need not always have reference to a formal act of cursing (cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.27 *deuota ... arbor*) but here turns out to anticipate 188-201.

domum periuria portas Cf. 148 *periuria*; for further examples of the word in amatory contexts see *TLL* X.1.1507.42-55 and Pichon s.v. The accusation of *periuria* is more specific than *perfidē*, since the *fides* that the *perfidus* does not

respect may be quite generally a social bond of obligation and the loyalty that sustains it (see Konstan (1977) 43); within this the focus on oaths between the parties is strongly reminiscent of Euripides' *Medea* (21-2, 160-3, 168-70, 492-5). Whereas elsewhere Theseus' promises to Ariadne are light enough to be carried in the wind (59, 142) and Aegeus' *mandata* slip from his mind like clouds blown away from a mountain (238-40), his broken oaths are seen here as freight that weighs down his ship, something that he 'carries home' instead of his passenger Ariadne. The metaphor has 'a curious parallel' (Fordyce) at Dem. 19.220 μὴ ... ὑμεῖς τὴν ἄρὰν καὶ τὴν ἐπιτοκίαν οἴκαδ' εἰσενέγκησθε. The image of Theseus' return to Athens, and *domus* in particular, foreshadows the narrative of Aegeus' death, especially 246-8, thus working with *deuota* to anticipate the end of the speech and its consequences.

136 nullane res This vivid way of saying 'nothing' also appears at 39.16 *nam risu inepto res ineptior nulla est*. Like similar expressions (*ulla res, quae res, haec res*), it is common in prose but almost disappears from poetry after Lucretius (by PHI 5.3 only at Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.12, Ov. *Pont.* 4.8.50, Juv. 7.187). Lucretius also uses it with *posse* (1.304, 443, 773).

136-7 crudelis flectere mentis | consilium? Cf. 175-6 *malus hic celans dulci crudelia forma | consilia*, where Ariadne accuses Theseus of having planned from the start to use and then abandon her. This is not necessarily the meaning here (*consilium* could be a 'plan' formed recently, e.g. while she slept), but Ariadne's emphasis on Theseus' deviousness is similar: *consilium* is stressed by its enjambment, by the fact that 137 is the first line of the speech not to open with a dactylic word, and by the variation from the more usual expression *flectere mentem* (cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 9.609

duram | *flectere non poterant, potuissent omnia, mentem*, Sen. *Phaed.* 273 *mentemque saeuam flectere immitis uiri* and for a similar variation Val. Max. 3.8.3 *speciosum mentis suae flecti non uult rigorem*). Dido similarly calls Aeneas *crudelis* in the third of the series of rhetorical questions with which she begins the first of her two speeches in the separation scene (Virg. *Aen.* 4.311, cf. 132-8, 132-3nn.), again in an accusation of inflexibility (not even winter conditions will prevent him from sailing: see Kilroy (1969) 54), and Ovid echoes the accusation at *A.A.* 1.531 *Thesea crudelem surdas clamabat ad undas*. Nonnus' Ariadne also accuses Theseus of cruelty behind superficial appeal (*Dion.* 47.367 ὅπόσον ἡμερόεις, τόσον ἄγριος ἔπλετο Θησεύς; cf. 132-201n.). See further Hross (1958) 32-7 on the *crudelis* motif in the speeches of abandoned women.

Trappes-Lomax argues at length for *crudele* despite the fact that, as he admits, 'lengthening *in thesi* before mute and liquid is otherwise rare and post-classical', but the improvements in style that he suggests this brings ('sandwiching' of the genitive *mentis* between *crudele* and *consilium*, avoidance of the consonant cluster *sfl*) do not justify his special pleading; and as Heyworth (2008) notes, the poems offers several cases of a genitive phrase preceding the noun on which it depends (75, 128, 147 *cupidae mentis ... libido*, 346). *crudelis ... mentis* is also parallel to 138 *immitte ... pectus*.

137-8 Ariadne now begins to mention positive qualities which Theseus lacks, or good courses of action which he could have taken (*clementia*, *miserescere*). The humility with which she makes these suggestions is probably sarcastic, as she is about to refer to what she expected from Theseus (141) and what he owed her (149-53); but

if we are to take seriously her later assertion that she would have been prepared to be his slave (158-63), it could be genuine; cf. 154-7n.

tibi ... fuit ... praesto ‘was available to you’; the mainly prosaic character of the expression could enhance either sarcasm or poignant simplicity. For *praesto* with an abstract subject and dative of person cf. Cic. *Phil.* 13.13 *animum ei praesto fuisse nec consilium defuisse*, *Fam.* 10.6.2 *fratris Furnique benevolentia fidelisque prudentia tibi praesto esset futura*.

clementia On this concept see Braund (2009) 30-44 (with further bibliography), esp. the historical survey at 33-8. *clementia* is the disposition to spare someone who is in one’s power. Its gaining of political meaning, where under the Empire it became one of the virtues standardly ascribed to the *princeps*, is due to Julius Caesar’s adoption of it as a slogan in the civil war; references to *clementia Caesaris* are common in Cicero’s Caesarian speeches of 46-45 BC (*Marc.*, *Lig.*, *Deiot.*) and in his letters from 49 BC onwards, and *Clementia* was first personified as a ‘divine quality’ when the Senate voted to build a temple to *Clementia Caesaris* in 45 (Clark (2007) esp. 247-9). If the poem’s date is as late as the early 40s (37 *coeunt* n.), Catullus could be alluding to the Caesarian sense. This would strengthen the impression that Ariadne is appealing to Theseus as if defeated by him, a meaning that is in any case supported by the (mainly military) pre-civil war attestations of the word: *clementia* is shown by Roman generals to conquered opponents (e.g. Sall. *Iug.* 33.4), or governors to subject peoples (e.g. Cic. *Ver.* 2.5.115). Cf. more literally Scylla at Ov. *Met.* 8.56-7 *saepe utile uinci | uictoris placidi fecit clementia uictis*, contemplating the possibility of surviving her city’s defeat to marry Minos. *clementia* does not otherwise occur in erotic contexts and is rare in poetry, except in its ‘imperial’ sense in Ov. *Tr.* and *Pont.*, and in Statius (with these lines cf. esp. *Theb.*

11.606 *estne sub hoc hominis clementia praesto?* uttered by the implacable Oedipus of himself); cf. however Ov. *Am.* 1.2, which is dominated by an argument for *clementia*, leading up to a reference to the imperial virtue (51-2), but without using the word.

138 immite ... pectus echoes 123 *immemori ... pectore* (cf. 133-4n.); the adjective also plays a small part in the parallelism between Theseus' crime and his punishment, since he is repaid for being *immitis* by the consequences of his father's belief that he is *amissum ... immiti ... fato* (245). Ovid's Scylla chooses the same epithet for Minos (*Met.* 8.110).

ut ... uellet miserescere 'might care to pity', 'might consider pitying' (*OLD* s.v. *uolo* 5a, b); the subjunctive and the construction with *uelle* (and after *fuit*) present this as a very remote possibility. The combination of references to pity and to flexibility in 136-8 finds an echo in Virg. *Aen.* 4.369-70 *num fletu ingemuit nostro? num lumina flexit? | num lacrimas uictus dedit aut miseratus amantem est?* (Oksala (1962) 183): Dido also seems to feel that the time when relenting was possible has passed.

139-48 can be read as Ariadne's statement of the case (see Reitz (2002) 95), first in specific terms (four lines), then as a generalisation (six lines).

139 at non When used to open a sentence, this phrase often marks a lively objection to a previous statement or question (cf. 178-9n.); in narrative it usually signals an emphatic change of scene or viewpoint. Here, similarly, it indicates the shift of rhetorical strategy from questions to statements. In dactylic poetry *at non* usually

appears at the beginning of a hexameter line; this may enhance any of these contrastive effects. Cf. also fr. 3 *at non effugies meos iambos*.

139-40 non haec ... promissa ... | ... non haec Ariadne again expresses similar ideas in two parallel clauses with anaphora (132-8n.); this recommends the correction of OGR's unmetrical *nec* to *non* (see further Friedrich). After the speculations of 136-8, the repeated demonstrative brings the speech powerfully back to the immediate situation in which it is spoken (Évrard-Gillis 84-5). The rhythm contributes to this effect, as the slow monosyllables open the spondaic line 139 and crash in again after *uoce mihi*, thus producing a contrast with the faster-paced questions of 132-8 and their anaphora of dactylic words (*sicine, perfide*). The anaphora resembles Medea's repeated ποῦ at Ap. Arg. 4.358-9 ποῦ τοι Διὸς Ἰκεσίοιο ὄρκια, ποῦ δὲ μελιχραὶ ὑποσχεσίαι βεβῶασιν (cf. 132-8n.), but Nonnus' Ariadne speaks in even more similar terms (Dion. 47.368-9 οὐ τάδε μοι κατέλεξεν ἔμὸν μίτον εἰσέτι πάλλων · | οὐ τάδε μοι κατέλεξε παρ' ἡμετέρῳ λαβυρίνθῳ): see 132-201n.

promissa is another word echoed from the narrator (59, with the same reference): 133-4n. Virgil evokes these lines in the laments of Aeneas and Evander for Pallas (*Aen.* 11.45-6 *non haec Euandro de te promissa parenti | discedens dederam*, 152 *non haec, o Palla, dederas promissa parenti*). At Ov. *Met.* 3.652-3 '*non haec mihi litora, nautae, | promisistis*' ait, '*non haec mihi terra rogata est!*' the playful Bacchus seems to catch something of Ariadne's language just when he is *not* being set down on Naxos (cf. 59 *pellit uada remis* n.).

quondam The pathetic, personal use (1n.), beginning to emphasise the contrast between 'then' and 'now' which dominates 139-48.

blanda ... | uoce An attempt to read GR *nobis* produces a comprehensible 139 but runs into difficulties in 140, since it necessitates taking *mihi* as part of the next clause (with odd word order and spoiling the anaphora of *non haec*) and therefore reading *miseræ* (see below): it also leaves *uoce* without an adjective. Theseus' speech is obviously emphasised here in contrast with his actions, but where *uoce* is elsewhere used alone it is with verbs like *uoco*, *hortor*, *precor* and means 'calling aloud' or 'loudly' (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.94, 6.247, 9.403, Ov. *Met.* 10.507; see Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 43), which seems inapposite for the *promissa* of a lover. *nobis* might be a gloss (Friedrich), originally added because *promissa dedisti* has to wait until the next line for its dative, or an accidental substitution under the influence of 138 *nostri* (McKie (1977) according to Thomson); it is perhaps more likely that it was inserted as a metrical filler after *blanda* had been lost due to the preceding *–ondā* (see Thomson). The expressive *blanda uoce* is parallel to Ap. *Arg.* 4.358 μελιχρὰ ὑποσχέσθαι (see above); the phrase occurs at Enn. *Ann.* 49 Skutsch *blanda uoce uocabam*, Ov. *A.A.* 1.703, *Culex* 279, and *blandus* is also an attribute of *uox* at e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.670, Ov. *A.A.* 3.795, where it applies, as often, to the persuasive words of lovers (in various contexts). See further Pichon s.v. *blandus*, *blandiri*, and esp. Ov. *Her.* 2.49 *credidimus blandis ... uerbis*, where the adjective is used by a heroine in the same situation as Ariadne. The smooth near-alliteration *blanda promissa* is also attractive.

mihi Catullus not infrequently has *mihi* or *tibi* at the end of a clause: cf. e.g. 51.5-6 *misero quod omnis | eripit sensus mihi*, 68.9, 70.1-2, 75.3, 91.5-6 *sed neque quod matrem nec germanam esse uidebam | hanc tibi*.

miseram Transmitted *misere* could be read as the adverb (Friedrich), but this is very rare in classical poetry (94n.) and produces a strained sense with *sperare*.

Most editors print *miserae*, but *iubeo* + dative of person is very dubiously attested before Tacitus: the only apparent examples (Cic. *Att.* 9.13.2, Liv. 27.16.8, Curt. 5.6.8, 10.8.4) are all amended by modern editors to accusatives, and this is also the best course here, as was realised in the *editio princeps*. On *miser* see 57, 119nn.; here it collapses the contrast of past and present found throughout 139-48, since ‘then she was *miser* in the sense of love-sick ... now she is *miser* in every sense of the word’ (Godwin).

sperare iubebas Reused at Virg. *Georg.* 4.325 *quid me caelum sperare iubebas?* in Aristaeus’ lament to Cyrene, which, as Thomas remarks on 315-32, shares several features with laments like Ariadne’s, including a ‘series of despairing questions’ (cf. 132-8). For *iubeo sperare* cf. e.g. Cic. *Deiot.* 38.8 *iubes enim eum bene sperare et bono esse animo*, *Att.* 13.17 *etsi tuae litterae ... recte sperare iubent*, Liv. 1.34.9 *excelsa et alta sperare complexa uirum iubet*, Luc. 4.510 *iubeant sperare salutem*, Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.78 *longos iussi sperare per annos*. The imperfect tense (contrast 139 *dedisti*) suggests repeated, reassuring encouragement.

141 The line is highlighted by its very unusual rhythm, with no strong caesura in either the third or fourth foot but a weak one in the third, supported only by the usually hardly noticeable caesura after the first syllable and by the rare one halfway through the fifth foot, which also means that the usual coincidence of ictus and accent in the last two feet is disrupted (see 58n.). On such tetrasyllabic endings (mostly Greek, often proper names) see Winbolt 135-6 and cf. 20 *hymenaeos*: this word accounts for a high proportion of them (ten times in Virgil, once in V.Fl., once in Silius). Goold notes that this line could even be read as glyconic + pherecratean, like the last two lines of a stanza in poem 61; Ariadne’s words (or the *promissa* of

Theseus that she claims to be quoting?) seem to imitate the wedding-song (the original meaning of *hymenaeos*: 20n.) that she had desired. The rhythm is preserved by Virgil's reworking at *Aen.* 4.316 *per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos*. Wills 354-62 shows how the figure of anaphora can itself be allusive, even when the repeated word itself is changed for a new context; the effect is particularly strong in this case because of the pathos already evoked by the repetition, emphasising the hopeless effort that each speaker puts into trying to achieve the goal of her words – in Ariadne's case the evocation of her wedding (*sed* contrasting dream and reality), in Dido's the winning over of Aeneas (*per* the essential word of appeal).

There is unlikely to be a difference in meaning here between *conubia* and *hymenaeos*, which both come to mean simply 'marriage': *conubium* was originally (the right to) intermarriage between two groups (*TLL*, *OLD* s.v. 1). The plural *conubia* is metrically convenient but also more common than the singular in prose (see Austin on Virg. *Aen.* 4.126). On *optatos* cf. 22n.; both adjectives here echo the description of Peleus' and Thetis' wedding (31 *optatae* ... *luces*, 33 *laetanti*; cf. also 325 *laeta* ... *luce*, 61.8 *laetus* (Hymen), 62.30-1), and *hymenaeos* was used of Thetis in 20. Ariadne seems to remember a scene of happy marriage that does not belong in her part of the poem, or even to see it from her position on the coverlet (132-201n.).

142 On the *topos* see 59n.; Ariadne repeats the narrator's *irrita* and evokes *uentosae* ... *procellae* with the equally pleonastic *aerii* ... *uenti*, and the shape is again near-'golden'. Here there is more emphasis on the action of the winds, which act on Theseus' words rather as the waves did on Ariadne's clothes in 66-7: in both cases the chaotic movement of nature, expressed in a line beginning with a straightforward, prosaic expression for 'all of which' (*quae cuncta* ~ *omnia quae*) renders useless an

aspect of civilisation which has been painstakingly evoked in the highly finished previous lines (139-41 ~ 63-5, both with anaphora), and the effect is even more powerful here when what has been evoked through this poetic artistry is the power of *words*. The language is also particularly reminiscent of 30.10 *uentos irrita ferre ac nebulas aerias sinis* (see 132-201n.).

Virgil echoes some aspects of this line at *Aen.* 9.312-13 *multa patri mandata dabat portanda, sed aurae | omnia discerpunt et nubibus irrita donant*, an example of the usual use of the *topos* in epic narration; for the image of tearing up cf. also Lygd. 6.27 *uenti temeraria uota, | aeriae et nubes diripienda ferant*. Ovid alludes closely to it at *Tr.* 1.8.35 *cunctane in aerios abierunt irrita uentos* (*aerios* Riese and Housman for transmitted *aequoreos*); this is the only other appearance of *aerii uenti* (though *aeriae aurae* is found in e.g. Lucretius, Virgil). The context is an invective to a faithless friend in which Ovid also goes on to include a version of the ‘birth from harsh landscape or wild beast’ *topos* (37-44, cf. 154-7 here).

irrita See 59n. for the frequent appearance of this word in the *topos*; here it is more clearly proleptic, ‘into nothingness’ (Fordyce).

143-8 Ariadne moves from her own absolute disappointment (142 *cuncta*) in a man in whom she had placed complete trust to the assertion that no man is to be believed when he speaks to a woman; the fact that such a progression of thought is so psychologically convincing (see e.g. Armstrong (2006) 206) probably explains why spurious generalisations are recommended by Aristotle as appropriate to abusive speech (*Rhet.* 2.1395a καθόλου δὲ μὴ ὄντος καθόλου εἰπεῖν, μάλιστα ἀρμόττει ἐν σχετλιασμῷ καὶ δεινώσει, first cited here by Achilles Statius). Cf. similarly Eur. *Med.* 412-13 ἀνδράσι μὲν δόλιαι βουλαὶ, θεῶν δ’ | οὐκέτι πίστις ἄραρε, Virg.

Aen. 4.373 *nusquam tuta fides*. More common (inevitably) is an assertion from a similarly disillusioned male perspective of *women's* untrustworthiness in love, e.g. 70.3-4 *sed mulier cupido quod dicit amanti | in vento et rapida scribere oportet aqua* (cf. 142), Prop. 2.28.8 *quicquid iurarunt, uentus et unda rapit*, presumably Soph. fr. 811 ὅρκους ἐγὼ γυναικὸς εἰς ὕδωρ γράφω. This is often combined with the *topos* that lovers' oaths are not taken seriously by the gods (on which see Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.4.21-2, the first explicit Latin attestation, and Otto s.v. *amare* 4), but that cannot be what is assumed here in a speech that concludes by successfully demanding divine punishment. However, 145-8 dramatise the contrast between past and present in a way that is highly reminiscent of epigrams which do use the *topos* (e.g. *A.P.* 5.6 = Call. *Epigr.* 27, *A.P.* 5.8 and cf. Cat. 70, 72); note in particular the 'turn' at 147 *sed simul ac* with 70.3 *sed* (imitating Call. *Epigr.* 27.3 ἀλλά), 72.5 *nunc te cognoui*, *A.P.* 5.8.5 νῦν δέ. Heavily end-stopped and divided by sense into three 'couplets', these lines show several features of epigrammatic style, especially the parallelism from couplet to couplet in 145-8 and between the first and second lines of the couplet 142-3, and the strong pause in sense after the hemiepes in 146 and 148, as if imitating pentameters. Ariadne continues to speak in densely wrought poetry, particularly marked here by chiasmus (the genders of *nulla uiro iuranti femina*; the finite verbs and infinitives *metuunt iurare ... promittere parcunt*; the sense of *nil metuunt iurare* answered by *nihil periuria curant* and *nihil promittere parcunt* by *dicta nihil meminere*). Note also the polyptoton in the parallel *nulla uiro iuranti ... nulla uiri sermones* and the balance of alliterative *promittere parcunt* with assonant *periuria curant*, as well as the echoes of words Ariadne has already used of Theseus specifically (*fideles* ~ 132-3 *perfide*; *iuranti, iurare, periuria* ~ 135 *periuria, mentis* ~ 136 *mentis, speret* ~ 140 *sperare*), and see further 146 *nil ... nihil n.* The gap

between Ariadne's distress and the formality of her speech (132-8n.) therefore becomes even wider in this section: her words are reminiscent either of an erotic epigram or of the 'performance' of poem 62 (see Fraenkel (1955) 5 n.11 on the similar symmetry in 62.42-4, 53-5) but themselves condemn persuasive words (see Jenkyns (1982) 120, Fitzgerald (1995) 156-7). On different kinds of embedded epigram in epic (sepulchral, dedicatory) see e.g. Barchiesi (1979), Dinter (2005), Harrison (2007) 217-25.

Ovid's Ariadne threatens to repeat her Catullan lament if Bacchus has really deserted her: *Fast.* 3.475 *nunc quoque 'nulla uiro' clamabo 'femina credat'* (132-201n.). *nunc quoque* perhaps comments on how, despite *nunc iam* here, Ariadne did not follow her own advice for long, but trusted Bacchus: not strictly a man, but certainly just another male (*uiro*).

143 nunc iam Transmitted *tum iam* sounds odd with the present tense *credat* and is inappropriate because Ariadne is referring to the time when Theseus' promises were shown to be false, not when they were made (Baehrens). The primary meaning required is 'from now on'; Trappes-Lomax argues that Froehlich's *hinc iam* expresses this more precisely (cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 2.148 *amissos hinc iam obliuiscere Graios*), but *nunc iam* too can have this sense, while also contrasting the present moment with the past (e.g. Cic. *Ver.* 2.3.5 *eam uitam quae mihi sua sponte antea iucunda fuerit nunc iam ... necessariam quoque futuram*), whereas *hinc iam* only refers forward. So here, at the beginning of the general statements in 143-8 *nunc iam* responds to *quondam* at the beginning of the statements about Theseus in 139-42, as in poem 8.9 *nunc iam illa non uult* contrasts with 3 *fulsere quondam candidi tibi soles*. The stress thrown by *nunc iam* on to the moment of utterance of Ariadne's speech and all times

later than it may also remind the reader of the uncertain relationship between Ariadne's time and the other times mentioned in the poem, especially, given the subject-matter here, the time of Peleus' and Thetis' marriage. Ov. *Fast.* 3.475 *nunc quoque* (143-8n.) also supports *nunc* here; the role it plays in the sentence is different (Trappes-Lomax), but that is part of the cleverness of Ovid's allusion.

uiro and *uiri* 144, in these heavily generalising lines, 'a man'; but also 'her man' = her husband or lover (cf. also 192n.).

femina is the normal word when speaking of 'any woman'; Catullus only uses it in generalisations (61.84, 180, cf. esp. 69.1 *femina nulla*).

144 speret ... esse clearly links the generalisation to Ariadne's case by picking up 140 *sperare*, but here it is not marriage that the hypothetical woman is forbidden to hope for, just that the man might be trustworthy at all. Friedrich claims that *esse* stands for *fore*; if so, the substitution is metrically necessary, but *esse* also increases the sense of bitterness, as if the words are not *fideles* even while they are being spoken.

sermone Not necessarily 'casual talk', but certainly with a wider remit than 143 *iuranti*; the woman should distrust *everything* the man says.

145 A noticeably dactylic line after the largely spondaic 143-4, expressive of the man's eagerness.

quis = *quibus* as at 80, 63.46, 66.37, 68.13 (all ablative). The possessive dative here, common in poetry, occurs also at e.g. 188 *mihi ... lumina*, 193-4 *quibus ... | frons*. The use of the plural after the generalising singulars *uiri*, *uiro* is easily comprehensible, as in the parallel cited by Friedrich: Eur. *Hipp.* 645-7 χρῆν δ' εἰς

γυναῖκα πρόσπολον μὲν οὐ περᾶν, | ἄφθογγα δ' αὐταῖς συγκατοικίζειν δάκη |
 θηρῶν. Slightly different, since *miles* is probably used in its collective sense
 'soldiery', is Ov. *Fast.* 2.199-200 *egreditur castris miles generosus ab isdem, | e quis*
dux fieri quilibet aptus erat.

aliquid The content of 145 and 147 makes it clear that this is the euphemism
 'something' = sex; cf. e.g. Prop. 2.4.2 *saepe roges aliquid, saepe repulsus eas*,
 Petron. 100 *etiam cum uoluerit aliquid sumere, opus anhelitu prodet* and further
 examples cited by Friedrich, and see Adams (1981) 126, Pichon s.v. *quiddam*.

cupiens animus A collocation found once elsewhere (PHI 5.3), Sall. *Iug.*
 64.6 *et animo cupienti nihil satis festinatur*. The adjectival use of *cupiens* is not
 common and occurs mostly in prose (*TLL* IV.1435.45-53); the aim of variation from
 147 *cupidae mentis* is clear. Cf. also 101n.

praegestit Rare, surviving also at Cic. *Cael.* 67 *praegestit animus iam uidere*,
primum lautos iuuenes ... deinde fortis uiros, Hor. *Carm.* 2.5.9 *ludere cum uitulis ... |*
praegestientis. In all three cases the prefix seems to have a temporal sense, in that the
 reference is to eager *expectation* (the Horace is the least certain, but see N—H and
 West *ad loc.*); similarly 46.7 *iam mens praetrepidans auet uagari*.

apisci = *adipisci*; the simple form is archaic, metrically useful here and at
 Lucr. 1.448, 6.1235 (both also at the end of the line), Manil. 3.146. Catullus also has
 a simple for a composite verb, usually for metrical reasons, at e.g. 53 *cedentem*, 150
creui, 227 *dicet*, and frequently *linquere*. In post-archaic prose writers (repeatedly in
 Tacitus) *apiscor* seems to be a 'mannered archaism' (Fordyce); see Shackleton Bailey
 on Serv. Sulp. *ap.* Cic. *Fam.* 4.5.6, Ogilvie on Liv. 4.3.7, Woodman and Martin on
 Tac. *Ann.* 3.31.2.

146 nil ... nihil Catullus frequently uses repeated *nil*, often in anaphora, exploiting the two metrical forms in all cases except 148: 6.12 *nil perstare ualet, nihil tacere* (Skutsch's text, printed by Goold), 17.21 *nil uidet, nihil audit*, 42.21 *nil proficimus, nihil mouetur*, 97.3 *nihil mundi hoc, nihiloque immundior ille* (though *nihilo* in the last is not guaranteed by metre). See discussion in Wills 463-4, including examples from other poets, both anaphoric, e.g. Stat. *Silu.* 4.3.111 *nil obstat cupidis, nihil moratur*, and chiastic, e.g. Sen. *Med.* 163 *qui nil potest sperare, desperet nihil*. Allusions to this line and to 148 are combined in Virg. *Ecl.* 8.103 *nihil ille deos, nil carmina curat*, of a recalcitrant lover.

metuunt iurare Cf. the advice given by Priapus at Tib. 1.4.21 *nec iurare time* and Dipsas at Ov. *Am.* 1.8.85 *nec, siquem falles, tu periurare timeto*, both of whom use the commonplace that lovers' perjuries go unpunished (143-8n.).

promittere parcunt 'they refrain from promising'; *parcere* + infinitive is largely poetic (*TLL* X.1.332.19-60).

147 sed simul ac Cf. 12 *quae simul ac* n.

cupidae mentis Cf. 86 *cupido ... lumine* n. and 398 *cupida de mente*; the second similarity may suggest that the epilogue describes horrors that already exist in the heroic age as depicted in the poem (see e.g. Richardson (1944) 55-6, Kinsey (1965) 927-8). For the *mens* 'as experiencing emotions, appetites etc.' (*OLD* s.v. 6) rather than in an 'intellectual' sense, cf. also 70, 97 (Ariadne), 223, 226, 236 (Aegeus), 254 (the bacchants), 330 (Peleus) and contrast Theseus' *mens* at 200-1n., 207, 209, 238, 248 (all with reference to remembering Aegeus' *mandata*) and especially 136 *crudelis ... mentis | consilium*.

satiata Appropriately unromantic, since *satiare* originally = ‘to satisfy hunger or thirst’. Lucretius similarly uses it of lovers (4.1102) but there to make the point that sex cannot satisfy, whereas here the meaning approaches ‘sated, weary of’, as at e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.37 *heu nimis longo satiate ludo* (Mars). Cf. also *saturare* at 220 and (of lovers) 68.83.

libido est Cf. fr. 2 *de meo ligurrare libido est*; Catullus also has *libido* in a sexual sense at 45.24. Nuzzo is probably right that Ov. *Her.* 1.75 *quae uestra libido est*, another ‘abandoned’ woman generalising about male sexual behaviour, alludes to this line; cf. also the sentiment attributed to (presumably) Cynthia at Prop. 3.19.1 *obicitur totiens a te mihi nostra libido*.

148 nihil ... nihil Adverbial, ‘not at all’, as at e.g. 15.6-7 *nihil ueremur | istos*; more virtuosic *uariatio*, since in 146 *nil* and *nihil* (contributing of course to the opposite sense) are most naturally taken as direct objects.

meminere Transmitted *metuere* would by itself be acceptable as a gnomic perfect (cf. 62.42, 44 *optauere*, 53, 55 *coluere*), but this is very difficult next to *curant* and in parallelism with 146 *metuunt, parcunt*. The repetition of the same verb is also unlikely when the line otherwise avoids repetition of vocabulary from 146 and is in any case describing the opposite scenario, and the sense of *dicta metuere* is itself strained: it would presumably require the reader to understand ‘they fear their words’ as ‘they fear the consequences of their (previous) words’. I therefore follow e.g. Goold, Thomson, Trappes-Lomax in preferring Czwalina’s *meminere*, which has a present sense and is suitably similar in meaning to *curant*; it also alludes to the *immemor* theme and is paralleled at 30.11 *si tu oblitus est, at di meminerrunt, meminit Fides* (cf. 132-3n.). The corruption to *metuere* would be easy, especially if *meminere*

were written with abbreviation bars (*mēinere* or *mētere*); particularly so after 146 *metuunt*.

periuria curant ‘care about’ + accusative is a regular use of *curo*, e.g. Cic. *N.D.* 2.167 *magna di curant, parua neglegunt*, Virg. *Ecl.* 8.103 (146n.)

149-53 The beginning of a new paragraph is marked by the lack of an opening connective and the change back to particulars and second-person address. Ariadne asserts what she has done for Theseus (149-51) and sarcastically presents his abandonment of her to her death as the way he has repaid her (152-3). This pattern of thought closely echoes Medea’s at Eur. *Med.* 474-91 and to a lesser extent at Ap. *Arg.* 4.360-72 (which, coming earlier in the story, ends with ‘Do not desert me’ rather than ‘You have deserted me’); it appears again in Dido’s words at Virg. *Aen.* 4.373-8, while it is summarised in one line at Ov. *Her.* 10.124. See further Hross (1958) 73-85 (‘*Eripui*-Motif’).

149-50 A combination of two slightly different motifs. Any abandoned woman might complain of what she has given up for her lover, especially home and family (*potius germanum amittere creui*, cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 4.320-3, Ov. *Her.* 3.51, 10.69-70 12.109-12 as well as Eur. *Med.* 483, Ap. *Arg.* 4.361), but the reference to practical help (*certe ego te ... eripui* and 151) is appropriate in fewer cases. It appears in Calypso’s complaint to Hermes about Odysseus at *Od.* 5.130-6 τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν ἔσαώσα ... , and particularly suits the congruent myths of Ariadne and Medea: Ariadne’s guiding Theseus out of the Labyrinth (see 113n.) is parallel to Medea’s use of magic to overcome for Jason both the fire-breathing bulls and the dragon that guarded the golden fleece (Eur. *Med.* 478-82, Ap. *Arg.* 4.364-7, cf. 149-53n.). Virgil’s Dido,

referring to help more like Circe's to Odysseus, nevertheless evokes the structure as well as the sense of these lines at *Aen.* 4.373-4 *eiectum litore, egentem | excepi et regni demens in parte locaui*.

149 Trappes-Lomax corrects the word order from the transmitted *in medio uersantem turbine* to *medio u. in t.* Adjective-(intervening words)-preposition-noun, though not as universal an idiom as he implies, is very common in dactylic verse, and particularly so when the adjective is *medius*: see e.g. *Virg. Aen.* 9.554-5 *haud aliter iuuenis medios moriturus in hostis | inruit*, *Ov. Met.* 4.512-13 *protinus Aeolides media furibundus in aula | clamat*, *Stat. Theb.* 4.680-1 *tempus erat medii cum solem in culmina mundi | tollit anhela dies*, and especially here 167 *mediis uersatur in undis*, whose echo of this phrase (see below) is sharpened by the emendation. More importantly, the change removes the rare elision *te in* (Catullus has *me/te/se* elided into *in* only at 31.6 and a marked five times in poem 55, so never in his dactylic verse), which sounds particularly harsh after *certe ego* (see below). This is replaced with the much more regular elision of *-em* at the strong fourth foot caesura: see Winbolt 173-9. *in* could easily have been absorbed into the preceding *m* and wrongly restored, especially since outside verse *in medio* is the more common phrase.

certe ego te *certe* introduces a tendentious reminder, as at 10.14, 30.7. It should be construed with the whole clause, but its position also causes it and *ego* to emphasise each other (cf. Adams (1999) 30.7 *certe tute iubebas*); Ariadne stresses her personal responsibility for Theseus' rescue. Despite the rare elision (Platnauer 74, cf. 94n.), *certe ego* is a favourite expression for Ovid (14 times, all but one at the beginning of the line). *ego te*, vividly drawing attention to the relationship or confrontation between two people, is common, especially in comedy, and its position

early in the sentence is also typical (especially after one initial word such as *non*, *numquam*, *si*, *at*, *cur*, *nam*); Catullus also has 221 *non ego te* (Aegeus and Theseus), 65.10 *numquam ego te* (Catullus and his brother). Cf. 24n.

medio *medius* can be used metaphorically for ‘the midst of’ an action, situation etc. (*OLD* 7), e.g. Cic. *De orat.* 1.3 *deuenimus in medium rerum omnium certamen atque discrimen*, Virg. *Aen.* 1.386 *medio sic interfata dolore est*. Here, as at Sen. *Epist.* 37.5 *in medio turbine rerum stupentem*, this is combined with the literal, spatial sense, since Theseus is imagined to be surrounded on all sides by the *turbo*, about to be sucked down or carried up into it (depending on whether it is a whirlpool or a tornado: see below); he could also have been ‘deep in the middle of’ the Labyrinth. Cf. also the phrase *in media morte*, indicating imminent danger of death: see Virg. *Aen.* 2.533 with Austin, and esp. Cic. *Ver.* 2.5.12 *ex media morte eripere* with 150 *eripui*.

uersantem *uersari* frequently has a middle sense, ‘to be involved in’ a situation (often bad), as at e.g. Ter. *Andr.* 649 *nescis quantis in malis uerser miser*, Cic. *Att.* 15.3.1 *in magnis uersamur angustiis*, [Caes.] *B.Alex.* 38.1 *cognoscit Caesarem magno in periculo uersari*. But within the metaphor *uersantem* also = ‘whirling round’, and this might further suggest Theseus’ wandering in the Labyrinth. At 167 *mediis uersatur in undis* describes Theseus’ literal position; again in the Ariadne story the motifs of wind and sea help to merge literal and figurative uses of language (cf. 59, 62nn. and see Jenkyns (1982) 128).

in turbine leti Ariadne is much less explicit than Euripides’ Medea, who lists the fire-breathing bulls, ‘sowing the field of death’, the dragon guarding the golden fleece, and killing Pelias by the hands of his daughters (478-87); Apollonius’ Medea mentions βουσίν, γηγενέεσσιν ... ἀέθλους and κῶας (*Arg.* 4.364-6), while Ennius’

may have had a *praeteritio* (Enn. *trag.* 274-5 Vahlen² *non commemoro quod draconis saeui sopiti impetum, | non quod domui uim taurorum et segetis arma manus*, not in Jocelyn: see Rosato (2005) 146-9). Nonnus' Ariadne refers to ἐμὸν μίτον and ἡμετέρῳ λαβυρίνθῳ (*Dion.* 47.368-9). In contrast, Catullus' version divides the details of the myth, putting the thread and the Labyrinth only at 113-15, in the narrative, Ariadne's agency only here, in her speech (cf. 113n.). *turbo*, like *uertex* (cf. 68.107 *uertice amoris*), is often used metaphorically with a defining genitive: for similar applications to a state of affairs cf. e.g. Cic. *Pis.* 20 *qui in maximis turbinibus ac fluctibus rei publicae nauem gubernassem*, Sil. 9.287 *fati tam saeuo in turbine*, Apul. *Met.* 8.31, 9.2. The version at Ov. *Met.* 7.614 *attonitus tanto miserarum turbine rerum* may have established *turbo rerum* as a set poetic phrase for misfortunes (see Tarrant on Sen. *Ag.* 197). Here *turbo* is usually understood as 'whirlpool' rather than 'whirlwind', presumably because of 156 *Charybdis* and the image of pulling up and out implied in 150 *eripui*, as well as the echo in this line of 167 and the maritime theme of much of the imagery associated with Ariadne and Theseus (see above). The application of the image is ambiguous. It might refer to the confusion of the Labyrinth, since that is what Ariadne helped Theseus to escape; but *leti* and the fact that *turbo* is later attested of the confusion of battle (e.g. Ov. *Am.* 3.15.6 *militiae turbine factus eques*, Sil. 4.370 (= 5.350) *turbine pugnae*) rather suggest the fight with the Minotaur. This is particularly since *turbo* ('whirlwind') appears at 107 in the simile describing the encounter, though there applied to Theseus himself: what happened inside the Labyrinth is again referred to only in figurative language (105-11n.), and with a confusion of detail, particularly between the two protagonists, for which *turbo* itself seems an appropriate image (107n., DeBrohun (1999)).

letum belongs to elevated poetic diction (see Jocelyn on Enn. *trag.* XXXIV, Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 389): also at 187, 68.91, cf. 394 *letifero*.

150-1 eripui evokes Medea's emphatic first-person aorists at Eur. *Med.* 474-87, especially 476 ἔσωσά σ(ε), also opening the line. It is in turn echoed at Virg. *Aen.* 4.374 *excepi et regni demens in parte locaui* (149-53, 149-50nn.), with the same structure of first-person verbs at either end of the line, the first elided into *et*.

potius ... quam Cf. 82 *potius quam* n.

germanum The Minotaur: cf. 181 *fraterna caede* and contrast 173 *indomito ... tauro*. If an abandoned heroine regretfully refers to having given up her brother for her lover, it ought to be in order to evoke pathos for herself, but the reader's awareness of the identity of Ariadne's brother jars with the ostensible rhetorical point (references without names to Ariadne's mother and sister have a similar effect: 88, 118nn.). The grotesqueness of the fact that the Minotaur has a human family is a necessary part of his mythical identity as Pasiphae's child, but critics have blamed Catullus for a lack of 'taste' here, and searched for further justification for Ariadne's choice of words.

Putnam (1961) 176 implies that Ariadne's emphasis on her brother in her accounts of abandoning her family for Theseus reflects the importance of Catullus' brother, whom he feels guilty about having deserted for Lesbia; but many readers will find this far more genuinely tasteless. A second possibility is to read *germanum* as a learned combination of two pieces of mythical data usually kept separate: cf. 29n. and 66.52-4, where Catullus, translating Callimachus fr. 110.52-4 Pfeiffer, calls Zephyrus (a winged horse) the brother of Memnon. The tone of such examples can be difficult to judge (see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.2.51, where Augustus is Cupid's *cognatus*), but

humour is a possibility which a reader may or may not want to admit at this point (cf. Kinsey (1965) 930).

Another line of approach (e.g. Ellis, Kroll, Konstan (1977) 68, most thoughtfully Klingner (1956) 53-4) suggests that the reference points to the story of Medea's brother Apsyrtus being killed in order to facilitate the Argo's escape from Colchis: in most versions Medea commits the murder herself, either at home (Eur. *Med.* 1334, Soph. *Colch.* fr. 343) or at sea, where Apsyrtus' dismembered body is thrown overboard to slow down Aeetes' pursuit (Pher. *FGrHist* 3 F 32a-c, Apollod. 1.133). The reader's attention is therefore drawn to a less obvious aspect of the parallelism between the myths of Ariadne and Medea: we may then notice that in Apollonius, whose version of the story is a closer parallel to Ariadne and the Minotaur since the killing of Apsyrtus is planned by Medea but executed by Jason, it is the scene to which Ariadne's speech alludes (132-201n.) that soon leads to the murder (Ap. *Arg.* 4.410-81). Since in that account the robe from the bed of Ariadne and Dionysus is one of the gifts given to Apsyrtus just before his murder (4.421-44), Catullus may even react to an awareness of the fratricidal aspect of both myths that was already present in Apollonius (Korenjak (1997) 22, Schmale (2004) 180 n.166). The reader might further observe that although in Euripides both Medea and Jason are aware that Medea killed her brother (Eur. *Med.* 167, 1334), Medea does not mention it to Jason in the reproachful speech evoked by Catullus here (132-201n.): Ariadne (less in control of herself?) uses more extreme arguments even than those of Medea to emphasise what she has given up for Theseus.

A further 'rhetorical' reading is developed by DeBrohun (1999) 421-4, who argues that since *germanus* also means 'true' or 'genuine' (senses derived from its primary meaning, 'full brother', which makes it not strictly applicable to the

Minotaur), Ariadne is contrasting her ‘true’ brother with her ‘false’ lover (150 *fallaci*), ‘heighten[ing] the nature of her own sacrifice by referring to her half-brother not as the monstrous Minotaur but as true brother, thereby making her treatment at the hands of Theseus appear even more pitiable’. In contrast, Reitz (2002) 95-6 suggests that in making Ariadne reach out for such an inappropriate example, Catullus is aiming an ironic dig at rhetorical practice.

Similar debates about tastelessness, wit, mythological learning, rhetoric and speaker’s state of mind, with allusion to this line as an additional complication, could be held over Ov. *Her.* 10.115 (Ariadne) *dextera crudelis, quae me fratremque necauit* and 4.115-16 (Phaedra) *ossa mei fratris claua perfracta trinodi | sparsit humi* (Palmer *ad loc.* ‘perhaps the most flagrant instance of bad taste in Ovid, but Catullus is to blame for it’).

amittere Frequent of ‘losing’ people to death (*TLL* I.1922.10-1923.11), but usually in the past participle: cf. 245 *amissum ... immiti Thesea fato*, 68.80. Its appearance in the infinitive with a verb of choosing evokes the older sense ‘send away’: Ariadne uses vague language to present herself as responsible for the death of her ‘brother’.

creui Ariadne emphasises her choice between family and Theseus (cf. 120): ‘I decided’ is the meaning conveyed in classical usage by *decreui*. Var. *L.L.* 7.98, Sen. *Epist.* 58.3 comment on the archaic nature of the simple form in this sense; metrically useful here, it also seems to have survived in formulae, either in legal contexts (Cic. *Leg.* 2.21, 3.8, 9, 28, Liv. 43.12.2) or with reference to battle, *cernere armis* etc. (Lucr. 5.393, Virg. *Aen.* 12.218, 709, [Tib.] 3.7.103, Liv. 8.7.7). At Tac. *Ann.* 15.14 it is presumably a conscious archaism: cf. 145 *apisci* n.

151 fallaci Applied to Theseus only here, though evoking the sense of 132-3 *perfide*. It is similarly rare in the speeches of other abandoned heroines in Latin poetry (Hross (1958) 119-21); but cf. Ov. *Fast.* 3.487 *Thesea culpabas fallacemque ipse uocabas* (Ariadne to Bacchus). Applied to unfaithful lovers, however, the adjective becomes a minor part of the *sermo amatorius* of elegy: e.g. Prop. 2.5.5, 24a.15-16, 4.7.20, Tib. 1.6.15, 3.6.51, Ov. *Am.* 2.9b.43. Cf. also 56 *fallaci ... somno* n. and 30.4 *fallacum hominum* (see 132-201n.), Catullus' only other uses of *fallax*.

supremo in tempore *supremus* + *tempus*, *dies*, *hora* etc. usually = 'one's last hour before death' (*OLD* s.v. 4b): as at 149 Ariadne implies that Theseus would definitely have died had she not rescued him, while the similarity with 169 *extremo tempore*, 191 *postrema ... hora*, of her own situation, makes the point that while she saved him from death, he has abandoned her to it. However, *supremus* can also mean 'critical, decisive', usually of a battle (*OLD* s.v. 7), which would be more literally appropriate here. V.Fl. 5.25-6 *haud aliter socii supremo in tempore Tiphyn | ante alios superesse uolunt* borrows the whole phrase in this sense.

deessem With *tibi* 'fail (to help)', as at e.g. Cic. *Att.* 1.16.17 *nunc magis in suo est occupatus, in quo ego ei non desum*. The scansion as a disyllable is common with this verb in poetry (e.g. Lucr. 1.43, 1111), and some older manuscripts, e.g. of Virgil, sometimes spell *dee-* as *de-*; see further *TLL* V.1.778.50-62, Ritschl (1866-79) III.268, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 1.77, Harrison on Virg. *Aen.* 10.378, Lindsay (1922) 150.

152 pro quo 'in return for which'; Ariadne makes use of the fact that *pro* can be used in this sense of either rewards or punishments, and spells out her sarcasm at 157.

152-3 dilaceranda feris dabor alitibusque | praeda In the extreme situations of epic and tragedy corpses are often left to be eaten, either on the battlefield or after death in a deserted place or among unsympathetic people. Ariadne is making a horrified prediction about her own future as do Cassandra at Eur. *Tr.* 450 θηρσὶ δώσουσιν δάσασθαι or Philoctetes at Soph. *Phil.* 1146-57, or as characters do about their loved ones at e.g. *Il.* 22.508-10, Soph. *Ant.* 29-30. Behind the tragic examples lies *Il.* 1.4-5 αὐτοὺς θ' ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν | οἰωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι, evoked here given the Iliad background to 154-7 (see n. and Stoevesandt (1994-5) 189 n.72). Zetzel (1978) argues that Catullus read δαῖτα for πᾶσι (the text preferred by Zenodotus according to Athenod. *Ep.* 1.12-13; see further Pfeiffer (1968) 111-13) and translated it by *praeda*, and that he chose this word rather than e.g. *cena* in order to allude to Aristarchus' (incorrect) objection to δαῖτα, that elsewhere in Homer δαῖς is used only of food of human beings, not animals. This is possible but not certain, since Catullus' precise expression here is not as close to Homer's as Zetzel argues: see Thomas (1979) and cf. Renehan (1979) (who argues that *praeda* instead translates ἐλώρια), Dee (1981).

It is common in the *topos* for there to be two sets of predators: the combination of beasts and birds is paralleled at e.g. *Od.* 24.292, Soph. *Phil.* 1146-7. The sense of the gerundive *dilaceranda* is comparable to the role played by passive participles at Soph. *Ant.* 205-6 καὶ πρὸς οἰωνῶν δέμας | καὶ πρὸς κυνῶν ἐδεστόν, Hor. *Epist.* 17.11-12 *addictum feris | alitibus atque canibus* or by infinitives at Eur. *Tr.* 450 (above), Soph. *Ant.* 697-8 μήθ' ὑπ' ὀμηστῶν κυνῶν | εἴας' ὀλέσθαι μήθ' ὑπ' οἰωνῶν τινος. A word for 'food' or 'a meal' (like δαῖτα in Zenodotus' Homer) is also common, but *praeda*, the standard word for the 'prey' of carnivores (*OLD* s.v. 2), is perhaps closest to βορά at e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 29, 1018.

Cf. esp. Virg. *Aen.* 9.485 *heu terra ignota canibus data praeda Latinis | alitibusque iaces* (Euryalus' mother), Ov. *A.A.* 3.35-6 *uolucres Ariadna marinas | pauit in ignoto sola relictā loco*; Ovid also alludes to Catullus when his Ariadne lists possible predators (*Her.* 10.83-8, although at least 85-6, possibly also 87-8 are interpolated), calls herself *praeda cibusque feris* (96) and later remembers the birds (123). The Ovidian Phaedra uses Catullan language to assimilate the fates of the Minotaur and Ariadne at the hands of Theseus (*Her.* 4.115-16 *ossa mei fratris claua perfracta trinodi | sparsit humi; soror est praeda relictā feris*; cf. 151 *germanum n.*).

153 neque iniecta tumulabor mortua terra Another commonplace, worry about the lack of proper burial for oneself or one's loved ones dying far from home. Various evocative funeral rituals may be mentioned (see e.g. *Od.* 24.292-6, Soph. *El.* 865-70, 1138-40, Eur. *Suppl.* 51-3), but Ariadne's focus on *iniecta terra* is appropriate to her solitary situation, since she pathetically emphasises that she will not even receive the token burial constituted by being covered with a thin layer of dust. Made when no fuller burial is possible, this gesture tends to appear in texts that emphasise the avoidance of ritual pollution for those coming near the corpse (see e.g. Soph. *Ant.*, esp. 255-6 with Griffith, Hor. *Carm.* 1.28.35-6 *licebit | iniecto ter puluere curras* with N—H). Ariadne may rather be thinking of the restlessness of an unburied person's soul (so Kroll, Quinn and Nuzzo here); see esp. Virg. *Aen.* 6.325-30 and the appearance of Palinurus, 337-83, making more explicit the apparent fate of Elpenor at *Od.* 11.51-80.

This is the first extant use of *tumulare*, which recurs in Ovid but otherwise not until post-Augustan poetry (unless Peerlkamp's conjecture *intumulato* at Hor. *Carm.* 1.28.24 is right). See Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 7.361 *quaque pater Corythi parua*

tumulatus harena est, where the verb similarly suggests the pathos of a burial that is hardly a full *tumulus*. On the other hand *inicere* may be a technical term for the essential ‘covering’ with earth: see e.g. Enn. *trag.* 138-9 Jocelyn *neque terram inicere neque cruenta conuestire corpora | mihi licuit*, Hor. *Carm.* 1.28.36, Virg. *Aen.* 6.365-6 *aut tu mihi terram | inice* and esp. Cic. *Leg.* 2.57 *quod nunc communiter in omnibus sepultis uenit usu, ut humati dicantur, id erat proprium tum in iis, quos humus iniecta contexerat ... prius quam in os iniecta gleba est, locus ille, ubi crematum est corpus, nihil habet religionis*. Cf. also the imitation at *Ciris* 441-2 *ne me illa quidem communis alumna | omnibus iniecta Tellus tumulabit harena*.

154-7 Theseus’ inhuman cruelty, Ariadne claims, implies inhuman parentage; perhaps her reference to the Minotaur and his monstrous birth leads her to this idea (cf. also 154 *leaena* n.), while the ironic contrast with the Aegeus we see in 212-45 operates here as well as in 159 (see n.).

The basic point is conveyed in proverbial expressions like Cic. *Tusc.* 3.12 *non enim silice nati sumus* (cf. Otto s.v. *silex* 2), but Catullus’ version is an important link in the chain of developed literary uses of the *topos*, in which harsh landscapes, wild beasts and monsters are suggested as possible parents: on the history of this in general see Pease on Virg. *Aen.* 4.366, Klingner (1956) 84-6, Hross (1958) 32-43, Antolín on Lygd. 4.85-94. The earliest is Patroclus’ reproach to Achilles at *Il.* 16.33-5 *νηλεές, οὐκ ἄρα σοί γε πατήρ ἦν ἰππότα Πηλεΐδης | οὐδὲ Θέτις μήτηρ· γλαυκὴ δέ σε τίκτε θάλασσα | πέτραι τ’ ἠλίβατοι, ὅτι τοι νόος ἐστὶν ἀπηνής*: this will be particularly evoked here after the Iliadic echo in 152-3, casting Ariadne as a victim of Achilles (like Polyxena?) and alluding to Achilles’ parentage in a poem in which his birth is predicted. Catullus takes the idea of the sea as mother from Homer, while making the

rocks part of the backdrop (*sola sub rupe*) for the lioness which, along with Scylla and the geographical precision, finds its source in Euripides: see *Bacch.* 988-91 τίς ἄρα νιν ἔτεκεν; | οὐ γὰρ ἐξ αἵματος | γυναικῶν ἔφυ, λεαίνας δέ γέ τινος | ἢ Γοργόνων Λιβυσσᾶν γένος (the chorus predict what the maddened Agave will say when she discovers Pentheus) and especially Eur. *Med.* 1342-3 λέαιναν, οὐ γυναιῖκα, τῆς Τυρσηνίδος | Σκύλλης ἔχουσιν ἀγριωτέραν φύσιν. This is addressed by Jason to Medea after she has killed her children rather than being part of her reproaches to him; she accepts the accusation at 1358-60. Catullus' allusion therefore produces a strange interpretative effect for a reader who has become used to seeing the Euripidean Medea in Ariadne. DeBrohun (1999) 427-9 links this with the other 'figures of confusion' in 149-57 (see 149 *in turbine leti*, 151 *germanum nn.*) and suggests that by momentarily evoking the voice of Jason rather than Medea, Ariadne implies that Theseus has the nature not only of Jason *qua* deserter but also of Medea *qua* child-murderer – as if he has inherited characteristics from his stepmother. The Homeric and Euripidean passages are also combined at 60.1-3 *num te leaena montibus Libystinis | aut Scylla latrans infima inguinum parte | tam mente dura procreavit ac taetra*, creating further complexity: 60 is a fragmentary poem with no determinate addressee or indeed speaker (see Skinner (1981) 72-4), yet the other links between Ariadne and the voice of the 'Catullus' of the personal poetry (132-201n.) encourage many readers to understand it as spoken by the same voice, meaning that this 'Catullus' now evokes Jason, as well as Medea via Ariadne.

Catullus' is the first extant appearance of the 'inhuman parentage' *topos* in Roman literature. His use of it in an erotic context is prefigured at [Theoc.] 23.19 κακῶς ἀνάνδρεμμα λεαίνας, of a cruel *eromenos*, and of Eros himself at Theoc. 3.15-16 νῦν ἔγνων τὸν Ἑρωτᾶ βαρὺς θεός· ἦ ῥα λεαίνας | μαζὸν ἐδήλαζεν,

δρυμῷ τέ νιν ἔτραφε μήτηρ (cf. also Theogn. 1321 σχέτλι' Ἔρως, Μανίαι τ' ἐτιθηγήσαντο λαβοῦσαι). Theoc. 3 was imitated by Virgil at *Ecl.* 8.43-5 *nunc scio quid sit Amor: duris in cotibus illum | aut Tmaros aut Rhodope aut extremi Garamantes | nec generis nostri puerum nec sanguinis edunt*, while Lygd. 4.84-95 applies the *topos* to his unfaithful beloved and Ovid in the exile poetry to faithless friends (*Tr.* 1.8.37-44, 3.11.3-4, *Ibis* 229-32). But Catullus may have been the first to use it in the address of an abandoned woman to her lover. It is repeated in this context by Virgil and Ovid: Dido at *Aen.* 4.365-7 *nec tibi diua parens generis nec Dardanus auctor, | perfide, sed duris genuit te cautibus horrens | Caucasus Hyrcanaeque admorunt ubera tigres*, while Ovid gives the *topos* to Ariadne (*Her.* 10.131-2), Dido (*Her.* 7.37-9), Scylla (*Met.* 8.120-5, cf. 155 *Scylla rapax n.*) and Byblis (*Met.* 9.613-15), and at *Met.* 7.32-3 makes his young Medea declare that *if* she did not help Jason it would be applicable to herself. Seneca's Medea, describing her own *furor*, looks back to Euripides through Catullus: *Med.* 407-10 *quae ferarum immanitas, | quae Scylla, quae Charybdis Ausonium mare | Siculumque sorbens quaeue anhelantem premens | Titana tantis Aetna feruebit minis?*

quaenam ... quod ... quae ... quae ... quae Of the major occurrences of the *topos* discussed above this is the only one to be entirely in the form of a question: only Eur. *Bacch.* 988-91 provides a partial parallel as Agave asks 'Who is this ...? Who gave him birth?' and then gives an answer. As Conrad (1965) 229 notes, the separation of *quaenam* from *leaena* (cf. 5n.) is effective since *quaenam* initially appears to stand alone: 'Who was she that gave birth to you ... a lioness?' The question is usually understood to be sarcastic, but Syndikus 159 thinks it has a more stunned and wondering tone, making the transition to 160-3 less sudden; cf. 137-8n.

Series of parallel cola with anaphora are a recurrent feature of Ariadne's speech (132-8n.; Syndikus 158 compares 171-6 *utinam ne, nec, nec*, 177 *quo, quali*, 186 *nulla, nulla*, 186-7 *omnia, omnia, omnia*, 188-9 *non, nec*), but this is the fullest example, reminiscent of the multiple anaphora in Attis' speeches in 63 (see esp. 21-5 (*ubi* × 6), 63-66 (*ego* × 6, *mihi* × 3) and 68-71 (*ego* × 6)) and in the polymetrics (e.g. 5.7-10 *deinde*, 11.2-9 *siue*, 23.1-2 *neque*, 23.9-11 *non*, 25.2-3 *uel*, 39.10-14 *aut*, 43.1-5 *nec*, 58b.1-4 *non*). The closest parallels are Catullus' other use of multiple repetitions of *quis*, with an even greater level of polyptoton, at 8.15-18, and 40.1-6 *quaenam te ... quis deus ... quid uis*; both are series of similarly aggressive questions.

154 sola sub rupe The detail evokes Ariadne's own position (loneliness also at 133 *deserto ... in litore*, 184 *sola insula*, 187 *omnia sunt deserta*; cliffs at 126) as well as being the only appearance here of the rocks which this *topos* often suggests as a possible parent (154-7n.). For *solus* = 'lonely' of a landscape see 57n.; this phrase is repeated by Virg. *Ecl.* 10.14 *illum etiam sola sub rupe iacentem* (the lovesick Gallus in Arcadia) and echoed by *Ciris* 518 *incultum solis in rupibus exigit aeuum* (Scylla's lonely existence as a bird), but *solus* does not occur of *rupes* elsewhere, though Lyne on *Ciris* 518 compares *Culex* 51 *desertas ... rupes*, Hor. *Carm.* 2.19.1 *remotis ... rupibus*.

leaena For Ariadne the idea of a lioness follows from the *feris* of 152. In alluding to Euripides (154-7n.) Catullus uses a Greek word: this and 60.1 are the earliest extant appearances of *leaena* = λέαινα (cf. Walde-Hofmann and Ernout-Meillet s.v. *leo*), first in prose at Cic. *Glor.* fr. 12 and Var. *L.L.* 5.100. The native Latin form is *lea*, while some grammarians state that *leo* was also used in the feminine; see *TLL* VII.2.1077.31-52, 1166.61-6.

155 mare From *Il.* 16.34 θάλασσα (154-7n.), but again perhaps suggested to Ariadne by her surroundings (154n.).

conceptum spumantibus exspuit undis *conceptum exspuit* = *concepit et exspuit*, implying that the sea also conceived Theseus: on this use of a participle to extend the statement about the subject see Woodcock §91. Lygd. 4.90 *nec te conceptam saeua leaena tulit* (154-7n.) combines the same construction with *leaena* from 154. *exspuere* appears elsewhere of the sea (*TLL* V.2.1909.59-70), but its basic meaning is ‘spit out’ from the mouth, appropriate for an image of unnatural birth and also suggesting that the sea rejects its monstrous child. With *spumantibus ... undis* it also anticipates the image of Charybdis; Ellis and Baehrens suggest that Catullus may be influenced by the use of ἐξεμεῖν of Charybdis at *Od.* 12. 237, 437.

Catullus also has *spumantibus ... undis* in a very similar context at 68.3 *naufragum ut eiectum spumantibus aequoris undis*, and the collocation is picked up by Virgil (*Georg.* 4.529, *Aen.* 3.268, 9.701-2), Lucan (9.117), Manilius (1.709) and Silius (2.591, 6.163, 12.621), mostly in the same case. Here the combination with *exspuit* makes an exceptionally onomatopoeic description of the hissing waves; the repetition of the syllable (–)spu– vividly illustrates the ‘spitting’, possibly with etymological force.

The image also suggests the birth of Venus, the reference to foam (cf. ἄφρός) evoking her Greek name; perhaps Catullus alludes to a lost text referring to the goddess’s parentage (cf. 154-7n. on the parentage of Love).

156 The repeated *quae* articulates three variations on *mare*, with each of which *conceptum spumantibus exspuit undis* is understood. As Baehrens observes, this is an

example of the rhetorical technique of amplifying a point by dividing it up into its parts (*enumeratio*: Lausberg §§669-74).

Syrtis The maritime contexts suggests that the reference is to the sandy shallows off the African coast between Cyrene and Carthage, proverbially dangerous for sailing: they are described at e.g. Ap. *Arg.* 4.1228-1392 (the stranding of the *Argo*), Sall. *Iug.* 78, Mela 1.7, Plin. *N.H.* 5.4. There are often said to be two Syrtes, the greater (identified with the modern Gulf of Sidra) and lesser (the Gulf of Gabes); see Polyb. 3.39.2; but the singular is also common, appearing in the first attestation of the name at Hdt. 2.32.2. Alternatively, *Syrtis* or *Syrtes* can be applied to the Libyan desert: see Butler and Owen on Apul. *Apol.* 72, N—H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.22.5. ‘Which Syrtis?’ might allude to these various possibilities: see below on Scylla.

Catullus is apparently the first to introduce the Syrtis into the ‘inhuman parentage’ *topos*, in which it recurs at Lygd. 4.91, Ov. *Met.* 8.120; the names of inhospitable places are common in the *topos* (154-7n.), but the inclusion of the Syrtis here may also have been influenced by its regular association with Scylla and Charybdis as paradigms of the dangers of navigation. This is mostly attested in poetic texts later than Catullus (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 7.302-3, Ov. *Am.* 2.11.18-20, 16.21-6, *R.A.* 739-40, *Fast.* 4.499, *Pont.* 4.14.9), but cf. also Cic. *De orat.* 3.163 *deinde uidendum est ne longe simile sit ductum: ‘Syrtim’ patrimoni, ‘scopulum’ libentius dixerim; ‘Charybdim’ bonorum, ‘uoraginem’ potius*, Sen. *Epist.* 31.9 *nec Syrtes tibi nec Scylla aut Charybdis adeundae sunt.*

Scylla rapax A monster living in a cave or on a rock on one side of the Straits of Messina, who snatched sailors from passing ships; in Homer Odysseus has to pass between Scylla and Charybdis (*Od.* 12.73-126, 201-59, 426-46), and the pair are usually mentioned together. On Scylla see further Roscher IV.1024-64, *RE* 2

III.A.1.647-59. In Homer she barks like a puppy, has twelve legs and six necks, each with a head with three rows of teeth, and is hidden in her cave from the waist down (*Od.* 12.86-97), while to Roman poets, including Catullus at 60.2, she is ‘a kind of monstrous mermaid somehow ending up in a bunch of yelping dogs’ (Quinn on 60.2); cf. e.g. *Lucr.* 5.892-4, *Virg. Ecl.* 6.75, *Aen.* 3.424-8, *Ov. Met.* 13.732-3 and see Roscher IV.1035-64 for similar representations of Scylla in art. Catullus has Scylla in the ‘inhuman parentage’ *topos*, both here and in poem 60, in allusion to *Eur. Med.* 1342-3, where Medea’s φύσις is called more savage than Scylla’s (154-7n.). Scylla recurs in this context at *Lygd.* 4.71-2, while in the version at *Ov. Met.* 8.120-1 she is conspicuously absent between the Syrtis and Charybdis: the speaker is the other Scylla, daughter of Nisus. The two Scyllas are identified at e.g. *Virg. Ecl.* 6.74-7, *Prop.* 4.4.39-40, *Ov. Am.* 3.12.21-2, separated at e.g. *Prop.* 3.19.21-8, *Virg. Georg.* 1.404-9 and at length, *Ciris* 54-91: the conflation may date from Hellenistic times (see Hardie (2009) esp. 121) and this question (‘which Scylla?’) might suggest an awareness of it.

Scylla is also proverbial for cruelty at e.g. *Cic. Ver.* 2.5.146 *non Charybdim tam infestam neque Scyllam nautis quam istum in eodem freto fuisse arbitror*. She is called *rapax* ‘predatory’ again at *Culex* 331, *Ov. Her.* 12.123, *Met.* 7.65 (cf. also *Sen. Thy.* 579 *rapax ... Charybdis*, appearing just after Scylla has been mentioned) and similarly *uorax* at *Ov. Ibis* 385; the meaning here seems appropriate for the point that is being made about Theseus’ own predatory nature.

uasta Charybdis A whirlpool on the opposite side of the straits from Scylla (see above), understood as being created by the sucking and vomiting action of a monster of unspecified shape, also called Charybdis, living on the seabed: descriptions at *Od.* 12.100-8, 201-4, 235-44, 430-41, *Ap. Arg.* 4.825-32, 922-3, *Virg.*

Aen. 3.420-32, 554-60, see further *RE* III.2194-5, Roscher I.1.887-8. Like the Syrtis, she appears here because of her association with Scylla (see above), recurring in the ‘inhuman parentage’ *topos* at *Ov. Met.* 8.121. The main figurative use of Charybdis is as a type of bottomless greed: e.g. *Cic. Phil.* 2.67 *quae Charybdis tam uorax?*, *Hor. Carm.* 1.27.19 with N—H. *uastus* also occurs of Charybdis at *Lucr.* 1.722, *Prop.* 2.26.54, *Manil.* 4.421 and in Virgil’s imitation of this line at *Aen.* 7.302-3 *quid Syrtes aut Scylla mihi, quid uasta Charybdis | profuit?*; of its various connotations (see *OLD* s.v.) those that might be appropriate to Charybdis are size (so Baehrens, Kroll) or awesomeness arising from emptiness or desolation (see Fordyce). Fordyce’s interpretation is supported by the fact that Charybdis is frequently described with a single vague adjective conveying mysterious horror: see e.g. *Od.* 12.260, 430 δεινὴν, 428 ὀλοήν, *Cic. Har.* 59 *immanem*, *Virg. Aen.* 3.420 *implacata*, *Ov. R.A.* 740 *dira* and more at *TLL Onom.* II.383.79-384.5.

157 The line expands 152 *pro quo*, repeating *pro* and making 149-53 and 154-7 two units which explore different ideas but finish with the same argumentative point. It is also parallel to *Il.* 16.35 ὅτι τοι νόος ἐστὶν ἀπηνής, to the result clause in 60.4-5, and to similar statements which conclude the ‘inhuman parentage’ *topos* by explaining what the person attacked has done to warrant it (see 154-7n.).

talía qui reddis ... praemia *talía praemia* = the details in 152-3, or Ariadne’s current situation more generally: the deictic *talía* is rhetorical, the equivalent of Ariadne gesturing to her surroundings and inviting the audience to judge Theseus based on what they see. The failed reciprocity is illustrated by the two appearances of *praemia* in the poem: Theseus wanted *praemia laudis* (102) for heroic action, but gave only *talía praemia* to the person who had helped him succeed.

praemia reddere is not common but occurs at e.g. Luc. 1.341-2, Val. Max. 5.3.3, Sil. 4.789, 7.202-3; cf. esp. the similar irony at Virg. *Aen.* 2.537-8 *persoluant grates dignas et praemia reddant | debita* (the dying Priam to Neoptolemus), [Sen.] *Oct.* 332-3 *'haec' exclamat 'mihi pro tanto | munere reddis praemia, nate?'*. Since the relative clause is characterising ('[bore you] as the sort of person who renders such rewards ...') the subjunctive might be expected, but where the clause is based on fact the indicative is the older form, and remains possible in classical Latin: see Woodcock §§155-9 and cf. e.g. Cic. *Ac.* 1.18 *sumne sanus qui haec uos doceo?*, Virg. *Aen.* 2.70-2 *quid iam misero mihi denique restat, | cui ... | Dardanidae infensi poenas cum sanguine poscunt?* The indicative is perhaps more vivid and assertive here, but writers can alternate between the two moods without any appreciable difference in meaning: in poem 62 Catullus has 14 *penitus quae tota mente laborant* (assuming T's text is right) but 21 *qui natam possis complexu auellere natam*, 27 *qui desponsa tua firmes conubia flamma*.

dulci ... uita To call life 'sweet' may be conventional: cf. *Od.* 5.152 γλυκὺς αἰών (which is, however, unique in Homer), Virg. *Aen.* 6.427-8 *in limine primo | ... dulcis uitae*, and comparative forms, e.g. 68.108 *uita dulcius atque anima*. However, the sensuous *dulci* is effective here after the harsh images of 149 and 152-6. It may also ironically echo 120 *Thesei dulcem ... amorem*, with the same focalisation through Ariadne (when in love with Theseus); although the essential rhetorical point is that all life is sweet, Ariadne implies that Theseus' continued existence would at that point have been sweet *to her*.

158 si ... non rather than *nisi* emphasises the negation (K—S II §216), further stressed by the juxtaposition of *non* and *cordi*.

tibi ... cordi ‘your desire’. For the expression *cordi esse alicui* see *TLL* IV.940.3-42. It is sometimes associated with the will of the gods (N—H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.17.14, Ogilvie on Liv. 1.39.4) but is used in all registers from the solemn to the everyday; it is common in comedy and prose but also occurs in epic in Virg. *Aen.*, Stat. *Theb.* and *Sil.*, and at *Ciris* 261, while elsewhere Catullus has 44.2-3 *quibus non est | cordi Catullum laedere*; at 81.5 *qui tibi nunc cordi est* of Juventius’ preferences, and 95b.1 *parua mei mihi sunt cordi monimenta <sodalis>*. It need not therefore contribute to an ironic tone here. It is debated whether *cordi* is to be understood as a predicative/final dative in the same way as *odio*, *muneri* etc. (see LHS II §69, Ernout-Thomas §98, Schmalz (1916)) or as a sort of locative, ‘near to one’s heart’ (e.g. Ellis on 44.3, Fordyce on Virg. *Aen.* 7.326). Pace Horsfall on Virg. *Aen.* 7.326, the locative explanation seems more likely because of the lack of comparable ‘predicative’ expressions with a word for a part of the body or other concrete object; cf. Woodcock §68 “‘This is to me for a heart’ would be nonsense’.

fuerant The pluperfect refers to a state existing in the past before an unexpressed past event occurred: ‘if *conubia nostra* had been (or “were”) *tibi non cordi* before you decided to abandon me’; cf. 159 *horrebas*. This idiom, most common with the pluperfect of *esse*, seems from its frequency in comedy and Cicero’s letters to have been colloquial; but it also occurs regularly in Virgil, Propertius and Ovid, perhaps because it was found metrically convenient, and in some cases the pluperfect simply seems to have the sense of an imperfect or preterite without this specific meaning. See further Fordyce here and on Virg. *Aen.* 8.358 *illi fuerat Saturnia nomen*, Williams on Virg. *Aen.* 5.397-8 *si mihi quae quondam fuerat ... | ... foret illa iuuentus*, McKeown on Ov. *Am. Epigr.* 1-2 *qui modo Nasonis*

fueraus quinque libelli | tres sumus, K—S I.141, Platnauer 112-14, Butler and Barber on Prop. 1.8.36, Housman (1972) 1067-9.

conubia nostra ‘the prospect of our marriage’, as 160-4 make clear. Cf. also 141.

159 saeua The adjective is used of particular utterances in the sense of ‘angry’ (e.g. Pac. *trag.* 14 Schierl *increpare dictis saeuis incipit*, Hor. *Epod.* 12.13 *uel mea cum saeuis agitat fastidia uerbis*), of laws or customs to mean that they are ‘harsh’ or ‘cruel’ to those they affect (e.g. Lucil. 574 Krenkel *Calpurni saeuam legem Pisonis reperiendi*, Stat. *Theb.* 11.661 *saeuis imbutum moribus aulae*, Juv. 7.229-30 *sed uos saeuas inponite leges, | ut praeceptori uerborum regula constet*). The word indicates Ariadne’s judgement of the *praecepta*, but also the quality in them to which she imagines Theseus’ reaction; for reacting with *horror* to what is *saeuus* cf. [Sen.] *H.O.* 1589-60 *non duces saeuos miseranda tellus | horreat*.

quod horrebas prisci praecepta parentis Ariadne suggests a reason why Theseus might have been reluctant to marry her: she momentarily appears to be making an attempt to justify his behaviour, though the rather derogatory image of *horrebas* suggests this is ironic. *parentis* is Aegeus; Ariadne imagines that Theseus’ father is *priscus* (= ‘old-fashioned’, ‘strict’, cf. 50n.) and has therefore issued *praecepta* (‘orders’) which Theseus shuddered at the memory of (e.g. ‘don’t marry a foreigner’); or perhaps that Theseus was worried that his father would issue such *praecepta* if he brought Ariadne home as his wife (e.g. ‘get rid of that woman or leave my house’). The strict father is a comic stereotype (e.g. Cic. *Cael.* 37-8: Fraenkel (1962) 261), and early Latin poetic style may be evoked here by the archaic triple alliteration (Wölfflin (1906)); *pr- pr- p-* also seems appropriate to a purse-

lipped old man. The reader will discover at 207-45 that Catullus' Aegeus is not noticeably *priscus* and gave Theseus very different instructions; so Ariadne, while getting Aegeus' character wrong, unwittingly anticipates how her curse will play out.

This is the standard interpretation, though there have been various unconvincing objections to different parts of it. The idea of 'don't marry a foreigner', as a general social rule, has encouraged some interpretations of *prisci parentis* as 'a father (-figure) who lived in former times', a lawgiver, either Cecrops (Sabellicus: see Gaisser (1993) 408) or Pittheus (Richardson (1963)). But the natural interpretation of *parentis* in a sentence in which *tu* is the implied subject is 'your father'; the only possible alternative might be 'my father', Minos (Cressey (1979)); but it is ludicrous to suggest that Minos would have issued *praecepta* against marriage with Ariadne, yet left Theseus the option of taking her away as a slave. Ariadne is fantasising: she does not know what Aegeus is really like, so her picture of him need have no relation to what we see elsewhere in the poem or the mythical tradition.

Cf. also Virg. *Aen.* 5.747 *cari praecepta parentis* (Anchises), Sil. 2.477-8 *namque metus magnique tenent praecepta parentis* (Hercules and Jupiter).

160-3 Ariadne again gets sidetracked into an enjoyable fantasy (cf. 141) as she asserts that if she could not have been Theseus' wife she would willingly have been his slave. The basic idea 'wife or slave' can be traced back to *Il.* 3.409 εἰς ὃ κε σ' ἢ ἄλοχον ποιήσεται ἢ ὅ γε δούλην (Helen contemptuously tells Aphrodite to look after Paris herself), while a fragment of Euripides' *Andromeda* gives a precedent for such an offer being made by a dependent woman to the hero in whose power she is: fr. 129a ἄγου δέ μ' ὦ ξέν' εἴτε πρόσπολον θέλεις εἴτ' ἄλοχον εἴτε δμώϊδα. Cf. also *Fragm. Grenf.* 28 εὐδοκῶ ζηλῶ δουλεύειν with Esposito. The structure of

these lines, in which the idea of being a slave is expanded with descriptions of possible tasks, is close to *Hymn. Hom.* 2.137-44, in which the disguised Demeter asks the daughters of Celeus to find her a home in which she might do the work of an old woman, offering various suggestions. But it is only after Catullus that we see signs of the offer of slavery becoming a commonplace for desperate women addressing their lovers: cf. *Ov. Her.* 3.69-80 (Briseis), *Prop.* 4.4.33-4 (where Hutchinson notes that Tarpeia mentions slavery first, then rises to the idea of marriage), *Ciris* 443-6, *Sen. Phaed.* 611ff. This makes the close similarity to Nonnus at this point particularly interesting: cf. *Nonn. Dion.* 47.390-6:

δέξό με σῶν λεχέων θαλαμηπόλον, ἣν ἐθελήσης ·	390
καὶ στορέσω σέο λέκτρα μετὰ Κρητὴν Ἀριάδνη,	
οἷά τε ληισθεῖσα · καὶ ὀλβίστη σέο νύμφη	
τλήσομαι, ὥς θεράπαινα, πολύκροτον ἴστον ὑφαίνειν	
καὶ φθονεροῖς ὅμοισιν ἀήθεα κάλπιν αἰρεῖν	
καὶ γλυκερῷ Θησῇ φέρειν ἐπιδόρπιον ὕδωρ –	395
μοῦνον ἴδω Θησῆα.	

This is the most precise set of correspondences between Catullus and Nonnus: 132-201n.

However, the general pattern of temporary softening from accusation to appeal and the evocation of a ‘second best’ finds parallels in the speeches of other abandoned women: cf. in particular *Virg. Aen.* 4.327-30 (Dido’s wish for a child), 429-34 (asking no longer for *coniugium* but at least for *tempus inane*). Ariadne’s words here are usually taken as less sarcastic than other parts of the speech where the tone admits of different interpretations (137-8, 154-7nn.), perhaps because her descriptions of her imagined tasks are so pleasant (the reader may doubt whether as a princess Ariadne has formed a realistic idea of slaves’ experience) and clearly sexualised: see esp. Glenn (1980-1). Slaves were of course sexually available to their

masters in both the real, Roman world and the mythological, epic one which Ariadne inhabits (Glenn cites the Homeric exceptions at *Il.* 9.132-4, 274-6, *Od.* 1.429-33 that imply the rule); but while Ariadne specifies tasks as if to emphasise that this is *not* what she means, the eroticism of the details gives away her desire (conscious or unconscious) for a sexual aspect to the relationship.

The unrealistic nature of Ariadne's fantasy, and in particular the evocation of a sensuously beautiful world far removed from her current situation, prompt the bitter self-upbraiding of 164ff. Glenn compares the psychological structure of 8.9-19, where rejection of the beloved (cf. 154-7 here) is followed by a veiled erotic fantasy (at 8.16-18 Catullus veers towards imagining the *puella* with another lover) which becomes increasingly passionate until the speaker abruptly reminds him/herself of reality (cf. 8.19 *at tu, Catulle, destinatus obdura*).

160 at tamen Better written as two words since another word often intervenes, e.g. 10.14 *at certe tamen*. For *at tamen* in an apodosis after a *si*-clause cf. e.g. Lucr. 3.172, 536 and see *TLL* II.1011.10-45 for further examples in verse and prose.

uestras 'yours and your family's', appropriate when Ariadne has just attributed to Theseus concern for his father's approval: cf. 176 *nostris ... sedibus*. Fordyce on 39.20 argues that just as *uos* is never simply equivalent to *tu* in classical Latin, so *uester* always has some sort of plural connotation. Of the four dubious cases identified by Housman (1972) 790-4, two are Catullan (39.20, Egnatius' tooth, on which see Heyworth in Harrison and Heyworth (1998) 94; 99.6, Juventius' anger), while the others are Ov. *Am.* 2.16.24 *uestros, curua Malea, sinus* (see McKeown *ad loc.*) and [Sen.] *H.O.* 1513.

potuisti evokes 136 *potuit* (same construction).

ducere ‘take’ but ironically evoking the meaning ‘marry’ (29 *ducere* n.).

161 quae picks up an antecedent *me* understood as the object of *ducere* in 160.

iucundo ... labore The oxymoron (‘a delightful chore’; cf. the proverb quoted at Cic. *Fin.* 2.105 *iucundi acti labores*) is teasingly vague. *iucundus* is part of Catullus’ erotic vocabulary (see esp. 62.26, 47, 68.15, 109.1 and the near-erotic use of the word among Catullus and his friends at 9.9, 14.2, 50.16), while ‘work’ can also have a sexual meaning, though *opus* is commoner in this sense than *labor* (Adams (1982) 156-7, *TLL* VII.2.793.7-15 and see esp. Hor. *Carm.* 3.15.3 *famosisque laboribus*). But when examples of *iucundo ... labore* are specified in the images of 162-3, erotically charged as they are, the possibility emerges that Ariadne is not herself aware of the sexual meaning of her words, and that the reader has read more into this line than the speaker consciously intended; cf. esp. 87-90 for Ariadne similarly on the edge of sexuality and innocence.

famularer serua Ariadne’s description of the humiliation she would willingly undergo is emphasised by the pleonasm and by the comparative rarity of both words: *famulari* for *seruire* appears once in Cicero (*Rep.* 3.37) but does not become common until late antiquity, despite its usefulness in dactylic verse (see *TLL* VI.1.262.3-9), while *serua*, rare in prose, is used by poets who avoid the more usual *ancilla* (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 5.284, 9.546, Sil. 16.568), although it is not as high-style as *famula* or *ministra* (Axelson 58). Neither *famulari* nor *serua* is included in Adams’ discussion of words for ‘service’ used sexually (Adams (1982) 163-4); although being a slave implies sexual availability (160-4n.), these words are not the major source of the innuendo in this line.

162 The washing of feet by slaves, frequently female, is attested in Greek and Roman texts of all periods. The intimacy of the gesture and its sexual potential are suggested by, e.g., Odysseus' request at *Od.* 19.344-8 that only a trusted older woman wash his feet. Other women imagining slavery to their lovers (160-3n.) do not suggest it, while even Nonnus' Ariadne is less specific, wishing to φέρειν ἐπιδόρπιον ὕδωρ (Nonn. *Dion.* 47.395). The 'obtrusive prettiness' of the image evoked (Jenkyns (1982) 118) is highlighted by the poetic texture: patterning of the two nouns, two adjectives and one verb (7n.), alternation of dactyls and spondees, and assonance of *l* and *u*. Paschalis (2004) 71-2 points out that like 163, the line also has an intratextual role to play, since the erotic combination of 'water' and 'bare legs' is reminiscent of the description of Ariadne at 129, a similarly patterned line (see n.).

candida 'shining white', 'spotless'. Accounts of washing sometimes include a proleptic adjective for 'clean' (e.g. *Ov. Fast.* 5.435 *cumque manus puras fontana perluit unda*), and 'clean' is a possible meaning of *candidus* (*OLD* s.v. 4d; cf. 39.1 *Egnatius, quod candidos habet dentes*). But in Catullus and other writers the adjective often connotes beauty (Clarke (2003) 52-7; see 13.4, 35.8, 68.70, 86.1), and this is felt here since (like other areas of flesh) the feet of both men and women are conventionally called 'white' or 'shining' when they are bare or beautiful: cf. e.g. the Homeric epithet ἀργυρόπεζα (of Thetis) and repeated line ποσσὶ δ' ὑπὸ λιπαροῖσιν ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα (various heroes, and one goddess, put on their sandals); Anacreont. 9.5 ὁ λευκόπους Ὀρέστης; various λευκοί feet in Euripides (*Cycl.* 74, *Med.* 1164, *Ion* 221, *Bacch.* 863); Hor. *Carm.* 4.1.27 *pede candido* (of dancers). Cf. also 61.111 *candido pede lecti*, referring probably to the ivory foot of the bed itself (cf. 49n.), but hinting at the bride.

The positioning of *candida* and *purpurea* at the beginning of their respective lines highlights the red/white colour contrast, recurrent in the poem (49n.)

permulcens ‘stroking’; the prefix has little force (perhaps a faint sense of thoroughness, ‘all over’). There are only a few other examples of *permulcere* of washing or anointing (Stat. *Silu.* 1.3.11, 4.4.32, Mart. Cap. 1.7 and medical contexts, see *TLL* X.1.1569.73-1560.10), of which the only pre-Catullan one is the description in Pacuvius’ *Niptra* of that most famous Homeric foot-washing scene, Eurycleia and Odysseus (see above): fr. 244-6 Ribbeck³ *cedo tuum pedem mi, lymphis flauis fuluum ut puluerem | manibus isdem, quibus Vlixi saepe permulsi, abluam | lassitudinemque minuam manuum mollitudine*. Catullus borrows *lymphis* and *permulcere* for a similarly elevated description of the same mundane action.

liquidis ... lymphis On the conventional epithet cf. 2n.; here ‘flowing’ is appropriate to the soft sensuality of the image and the movement of the water around the feet. *lympa* was probably *lumpa*, ‘water’, before it became confused with *λύμη* and used to mean a water-goddess (e.g. Var. *R.R.* 1.16; see Ernout-Meillet s.v.), but in attested literature it = ‘water’ only in poetry, usually in the plural, as here and at 27.5 (singular at 68.54). *liquidis ... lymphis*, the equivalent of Pacuvius’ *lymphis flauis* (see above), therefore contributes to the elevated tone; the alliterative collocation recurs only once, in a similarly erotic context, at Ov. *Met.* 3.451 *quotiens liquidis porreximus oscula lymphis* (Narcissus).

uestigia Like ἵχνοϛ, *uestigium* means first a footprint or, slightly less concretely, footstep (as at 113), then the foot itself; in both languages expressions involving a genitive of *pes*/ποῦϛ also invite the meaning ‘sole’. *uestigium* = ‘foot’, which is largely poetic (*OLD* s.v. 3), occurs first here, so that the echo of 113 *uestigia*

is particularly noticeable; it is as if Ariadne remembers one of the earlier aspects of her relationship with Theseus.

Cf. perhaps Lesbia's foot at 68.70-1 *quo mea se molli candida diua pede | intulit*, linked also to this line by *candidus* (Thomson (1961) 53-4, Daniels (1967) 354 make the connection). Glenn (1980-1) discusses the foot as a focal point in ancient descriptions of sexually attractive people, though in the case of women, at least, this may owe much to the fact that it was one of the few visible parts of the body.

163 As in 90 (see n.), the attachment with *-ue* of a second possibility suggests a leisurely exploration of ideas. However, the shape of this 'golden' line and its similarly patterned predecessor give closure (59n.), implying that Ariadne's fantasy has now played itself out; the break between 163 and 164 is the sharpest in the speech (see Schmidt (1967) 490-1).

Preparing a bed for a hero is another obvious servile task: cf. e.g. *Hymn. Hom.* 2.133-4 (160-3n.). But in Homer the expression πορσύνειν λέχος is usually used euphemistically of the wife 'sharing' the husband's bed (see e.g. Kirk on *Il.* 3.411), and it is adopted in this sense by Apollonius (*Arg.* 3.1128-9, 4.1107, 1119); while *consternere* is not attested with this meaning, any memory of the Greek usage, particularly if *Il.* 3.409-11 were also in a reader's mind (160-3n.), would add to the impression that Ariadne's real wish is to be spreading a bed for Theseus and herself. In other passages in which abandoned women wish to be slaves, the ex-lover's new bride often features: see *Ov. Her.* 3.71-3, 77-80, *Ciris* 443, Nonn. *Dion.* 47.392 and cf. also Medea in her false reconciliation speech at *Eur. Med.* 886-8, where she announces that she ought to have helped with Jason's marriage, stood by the marriage bed and attended the bride (Mastronarde *ad loc.* suggests that she makes herself 'a

virtual member of the bridal party, or servant of the groom's house'). The fact that Ariadne does not mention Theseus' bride when this seems such a bridal bed is confirmation that this is more a happy fantasy than a self-destructive wish for humiliation.

However, the line does remind the reader of another marriage bed, that of Peleus and Thetis, on which Ariadne is herself depicted (cf. 49 *purpura*, 50 *uestis*). The purple cloth, its colour suggesting defloration (49n.), is not in Nonnus' version of this detail (*Dion.* 47.391 *στορέσω σέο λέκτρα*) so would probably be an addition to any Hellenistic source. The sudden reminder of Ariadne's ecphrastic status draws attention, in the middle of the speech, to the paradox that it is uttered by a depicted figure. But the sense of disorientation created by the *mise en abyme* also seems to unbalance Ariadne herself, appearing to prompt 164: it is as if the idea of a purple bed-cover reminds her of Thetis' coverlet, on which she then sees herself and remembers where she is. Cf. the labyrinthine threat to the narrative at 114-15, leading to the narrator's own *sed quid ego ... ?* (116n.).

cubile Always in erotic contexts in Catullus (6.7, 29.7, 68.29) frequently of a marriage bed (61.107, 176, 66.21, 83, 67.23).

164-70 The second main section of the speech begins as Ariadne ceases to address Theseus: from the fantasy of 160-3 she pulls herself back to her situation (another *metabasis*, cf. 116-23n.) and asks herself why she is speaking at all. Cf. similarly Dido's turn from unheard command to self-address at Virg. *Aen.* 4.595 *quid loquor? aut ubi sum? quae mentem insania mutat?* (cf. 165 *externata malo* here) and esp. the opening of Cassandra's final paragraph at Lyc. *Al.* 1451-3 *τί μακρὰ τλήμων εἰς ἀνηκόους πέτρας, | εἰς κῦμα κωφόν, εἰς νάπας δασπλήτιδας | βαύζω, κενὸν*

ψάλλουσα μάστακος κρότον; There are many aspects to the irony here. One resembles that experienced by the reader of the *Alexandra* when Cassandra's question suddenly suggests that her whole speech and therefore the whole poem may be pointless; another consists in the fact that despite the question Ariadne, like Dido, goes on speaking, apparently to herself. The rationality of Ariadne's language here (esp. 165-6) sharpens this point, as does the fact that what she is calling into question, the habit of lamenting to the natural environment, is a very conventional refuge, particularly in tragedy, of characters in just her sort of situation. Cf. Eur. *Med.* 56-8 with further parallels in Page *ad loc.*, Ennius' version at *trag.* 222-3 Jocelyn *cupido cepit miseram nunc me proloqui | caelo atque terra Medesai miserias*, Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 601. The all-seeing sun or sky are the most common addressees: replacing them with *aurae* here brings Ariadne's comment closer to the *topos* of the wind carrying off useless words (59, 142nn.). Cf. similarly Call. fr. 714.3-4 Pfeiffer (unknown context) ἢ ὅτε κωφαῖς | ἄλγεα μαψαύραις ἔσχατον ἐξερύγη.

Ariadne dismisses several possible audiences (see Reitz (2002) 96-7): the breezes are unsatisfactory as they cannot hear or reply (164-6), while Theseus is far away (167) and no other mortal is present (168). The elimination first leads Ariadne to conclude that she has no audience (169-70), but then also appears to prompt 171 *Iuppiter omnipotens*, a brief address to an immortal hearer. Cf. the similar reflections on her loneliness in 177-87 (see further 167-8nn.), leading to the appeal to the Furies at 188ff. Ariadne in fact has or will soon have a third divine hearer, Bacchus: a second-time or mythologically knowledgeable reader knows this, although the text has not yet mentioned it (Schmale (2004) 184; contrast Nonn. *Dion.* 47, where the reader is aware before Ariadne's lament begins that Dionysus is listening). For the reader who does think of Bacchus here, the inaccuracy of Ariadne's statements here

creates dramatic irony. This section has various similarities with the soliloquy of the shipwrecked Palaestra in Plaut. *Rud.* (esp. 199-206; cf. also 177-83n.), but Catullus is probably adopting the typical complaints of a shipwrecked character rather than alluding directly; however, as Reitz (2002) 100-1 demonstrates, there is a comparable irony, since the audience of the *Rudens* already knows that Palaestra will be safe.

Moreover, the evocations of dramatic texts here imply a more basic dramatic irony, that a character thinks herself unheard when she is really addressing a large number of people in the audience, and alone when she is really sharing the theatrical space with them. Here it might seem to be the reader who is in the position of the audience, ‘hearing’ Ariadne. But as Laird (1993) 28-9 points out, there is yet another level of irony since those who have gathered to *watch* Ariadne, the Thessalian viewers of the coverlet, cannot in fact hear her: is the point really that Ariadne cannot be heard or addressed because she is in a picture?

The marked echo of 116 *sed quid ego ...?* further unsettles the reader: the heroine’s voice seems to merge with the narrator’s just after the appearance of the purple cloth in 163 has reminded the reader that it is only through the narrator that he can hear the words of the static, depicted Ariadne (Schmale (2004) 182; cf. 163, 132-201nn.).

164 Imitated by Virg. *Aen.* 2.101 *sed quid ego haec autem nequiquam ingrata reuoluo?* There too the sense of *nequiquam* is reinforced by the adjective, as in some of Catullus’ other descriptions of the wind as a symbol of futility (111 *nequiquam uanis iactantem cornua uentis*, 65.17 *ne tua dicta uagis nequiquam credita uentis*) and of wasted words (101.4 *et mutam nequiquam alloquerer cinerem*). Cf. also the same technique at Lygd. 4.14 *et frustra immeritum pertimuisse uelit*, Call. *Hymn*

6.89-90 τὰ δ' ἐς βυθὸν οἷα θαλάσσης | ἀλεμάτως ἀχάριστα κατέρρεεν εἶδατα πάντα and probably 103-4 (see n.), and the related pleonasm of 77.1 *frustra ac nequiquam*.

sed quid ego On this expression cf. 116n.

ignaris ... auris The proverbial idea of words falling on deaf ears, i.e. finding no audience at all (see Otto s.v. *auris* 2, s.v. *surdus*) is combined with personification of part of the natural environment. From the parallels cited above and at 164-70n. cf. 101.4 *mutam ... cinerem*, Call. fr. 714 Pfeiffer *κωφοῖς ... μαψάύραις*, Lyc. *Al.* 1451-2 εἰς ἀνηκόους πέτρας, | εἰς κῶμα *κωφόν*; Nuzzo adds *A.P.* 16.198.6 κωφοῖς πέμπε λιτὰς ἀνέμοις, addressed to a statue of a bound Eros. *ignarus* is less specific, 'without knowledge': see *TLL* VII.1.275.56-64 for its absolute application to inanimate things (e.g. Ov. *Met.* 1.452 *fors ignara*; not elsewhere with the idea of not *hearing*) and cf. the similarly general 155 *nullis sensibus*, 166nn.

conqueror Indicative because she is criticising herself for (already) addressing the breezes, not wondering whether she ought to address them (in the future): contrast 117 *commemorem* as the narrator asks whether he should go on to narrate various events, and cf. rather the indicative in other versions of this self-critical break-off formula (116-23n.), e.g. Enn. *Ann.* 314 Skutsch *sed quid ego haec memoro*, Lucil. 1014 Krenkel *sed quid ego haec animo trepidanti dicta profundo*, Virg. *Aen.* 2.101 (quoted above), Ov. *Her.* 9.143, V.Fl. 8.158, Apul. *Met.* 7.3.16 *sed quid ego pluribus de Fortunae scaevitate conqueror*; indicative also at Lyc. *Al.* 1453, Virg. *Aen.* 4.595 (164-70n.). The contrast with 160 *potuisti*, 161 *famularer* further underlines the sense of a sharp return to reality.

165 *externata malo* ‘overthrown by suffering’ or ‘out of my mind with suffering’: see 71 *externauit* n. Ariadne cites – in an ironically rational way – her irrational emotional state as the reason for her address to an unhearing audience: cf. 196-7, where *uae misera* similarly interrupts the syntax.

nullis sensibus auctae ‘endowed with no feelings’ (Fordyce). This meaning of *auctus*, a more colourless version of the ‘blessed with’, ‘enhanced by’ seen at 25n., appears several times in Lucretius, always similarly at line-end and preceded by an ablative, e.g. 1.631 *nullis sunt partibus aucta* (atoms), 1177 *tantis uiribus auctos* (gods); twice in the argument that the *anima* lacks the five senses the ablative is *sensibus* (3.626, 630). If Catullus is here alluding to that passage or to Lucretian style more generally, the overtones of rationalising argument are appropriate to Ariadne’s moment of self-awareness, and sharpen its incongruity with her distraught emotional state.

As speech as well as hearing seems to be implied in the next line (see n.), *sensibus* = ‘feelings’ or ‘faculties’ here rather than strictly ‘senses’ (cf. *OLD* s.v. 5-9).

166 *mittere uoces, uocem, uerba* etc. = ‘speak’ (*TLL* VII.1174.75-1175.41). *reddere* with a similar object often = ‘reply’ (*OLD* s.v. *reddo* 6), and is usually interpreted as such here, esp. in the light of the Virgilian imitations at *Aen.* 1.409 *ueras audire et reddere uoces*, 6.689 *notas audire et reddere uoces*, both of human (divine) interlocutors. Given *nullis sensibus auctae*, this is probably right – Ariadne complains that the inanimate breezes can neither hear her *uoces* nor answer with *uoces* of their own – but the fact that both *missas* and *uoces* have to be understood with both verbs might also suggest that the *aurae* cannot even ‘repeat’ Ariadne’s own *uoces* back to her (*OLD* s.v. *reddo* 5, cf. esp. *Lucr.* 4.577-8 *sex etiam aut septem loca*

uidi reddere uoces | *unam cum iaceres*, of echoes); the idea that the breezes snatch away her words without even giving a sympathetic echo (and what could give an echo, if she is facing out to sea?) only increases the sense of futility. *reddere uoces* occurs at line-end here, at Lucr. 4.578, Cic. *Arat.* 3.4, Var. At. fr. 15.5 Courtney, *Ciris* 255 and the two Virgilian examples cited; Norden on *Aen.* 6.689 justifiably surmises ‘also aus dem alten Epos’ (cf. 198n.).

167-8 Exactly the same pattern of thought as 182-7, at the other end of this central part of the speech: Theseus on whom she might have relied is sailing away, and there is no-one else on the island to help her.

167 ille A pointed ‘he’, given further emphasis by *autem*, as Ariadne for the first time refers to Theseus in the third person; as at 174-6 and 182-3 she seems to avoid naming him.

prope iam mediis ... in undis A precisely appropriate expression which needs no emendation. *mediis ... in undis* (common, especially in poetry: see Nuzzo), usually means ‘in the open sea’; but the modification with *prope iam* here makes *mediis* specific, ‘halfway’ from Dia to Athens. Cf. Ov. *A.A.* 2.9-10 *mediis tua pinus in undis* | *naugat*, at a ‘halfway point’ in the poem. It would indeed be bizarre for Ariadne to make a simple statement, ‘he is halfway back’ (and anyway if she can no longer see Theseus’ ship (cf. 126-7, esp. *uastos* n.) she does not know his exact position, and a reader may well think it unlikely that Theseus has had time to get so far if Ariadne could still see the ship when she awoke (53-7)); but this is not what she does. She upbraids herself with the vivid *prope iam*, a common expression in prose, comedy and Lucretius for ‘pretty much’ (cf. *OLD* s.v. *prope* 8a, McKeown on Ov.

Am. 2.31). It modifies both the certainty and the hyperbole of *mediis* = ‘halfway’ as at e.g. *Lucr.* 6.1271 *ulceribus taetris prope iam sordeque sepulta* it apologises for the metaphor in *sepulta*, or at *Apul. Apol.* 46 *ac prope iam omnium uultu et murmure explosum uideret* it suggests that *omnium* might not be literally true. Moreover, while in most occurrences of the phrase *iam* has little temporal force, here it probably adds ‘by now’, with further self-criticism. Ariadne tells herself that while she has been wasting time addressing Theseus, he, on the other hand (*autem*), must by now be pretty much halfway home.

uersatur Cf. 149 *uersantem* n.; here perhaps ‘is tossing’.

168 nec quisquam An echo of 166 *nec ... nec*, cf. also 165 *nullis*; as Ariadne begins to sound the theme of the emptiness of her surroundings the repeated negative words anticipate the pattern in 184-7 (cf. 167-8n.). The closest verbal parallel between this passage and Palaestra’s soliloquy (164-70n.) is between this line and *Plaut. Rud.* 206b *neque quisquam homo mi obuiam uenit*, but little can be made of this given the frequency of *nec/neque quisquam* and, in comedy, of *quisquam* + noun (see below on *mortalis*).

apparet Ariadne probably means little more than ‘is present’, though *uacua ... in acta* may suggest that she has scanned the beach; but the visual word ironically reminds the mythically aware or second-time reader that Bacchus is on the coverlet, if not yet on the shore, and visible to the viewers of the picture, although not yet to Ariadne.

uacua ... in acta While 60 *ex alga* has a specific reference (see n.), the point here is that no-one is visible on the whole, empty beach: *alga* in this sense would be an unparalleled synecdoche, and Heinsius’ *acta* should therefore be adopted (see

McKie (2009) 75-9, who comes to the same conclusion). This transliteration of ἀκτὴ (in Greek ‘promontory’, but in Latin merely ‘beach’) occurs several times in Cicero, while its two attested appearances in epic are similar to this one (Virg. *Aen.* 5.613 *in sola ... acta*, V.Fl. 5.96 *in prima ... acta*) and it also appears in Prudentius’ description of the desertion of Ariadne (*Symm.* 1.136), though that has no other clear indications of a debt to Catullus. The phrase *uacua ... in acta* also corresponds to 57 *in sola ... harena*, 133 *deserto ... in litore* and to e.g. *Aetna* 22 *desertam uacuo Minoida litore questus*, Luc. 8.62 *lustrat uacuas Pompeius harenas*.

mortalis Unexpected after *quisquam* (which more commonly stands alone, at least in classical Latin), especially with the slight delay. The extra emphasis thereby thrown on to *mortalis* makes the reader more likely to notice the dramatic irony that Bacchus, not a mortal, is in fact present or about to arrive, though he is not apparent to Ariadne. *quisquam ... mortalis* could be pronoun + adjective or adjective + noun, with no difference in meaning: cf. 17 *mortales n.*

169 sic i.e. 169-70 sum up and comment on what is described in 164-8 (cf. 132 *sicine n.*); after describing her situation Ariadne now reflects on the possibility that it was divinely caused. As this is the first time she has blamed anyone except Theseus for her situation, the new idea also helps to signal the new section in the speech (164-70n.). Cf. also the narrator’s references to the gods in 71-2 and 94-8, each coming rather late in a description of Ariadne’s experiences; the divine force referred to here, however, is only the vague and lightly personified *fors* (170n.).

nimis Not just ‘very’ but ‘too much’ (cf. 22 *nimis n.*): the same sense of injustice at fate’s *excessive* cruelty motivates both this word and 170 *etiam* (see n.). Cf. the similar complaint at 60.5 *a nimis fero corde*.

insultans ‘mocking’; cf. N—R on Hor. *Carm.* 3.29-49 for the ‘sport’ of Fortune. But the original sense ‘jump on’ also remained in use (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 12.338-9 *miserabile caesis | hostibus insultans*) and may colour the word here, contributing to the personification of *saeua fors* by suggesting a being who tramples on a prostrate Ariadne. Supply e.g. *mihi* or *in me*; Ellis argues that *insultans* may go directly with *extremo tempore* ‘mocking my last hour’, but this use with the ablative is very dubious (*TLL* VII.1.2044.5).

extremo tempore usually = ‘finally’ (*OLD* s.v. *extremus* 3), but here must be ‘my last hour’ (or ‘in my last hour’: see above), although expressions with *extremus* in this sense more often have a defining genitive, as at 217 *extrema ... fine senectae* and e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* 5.56 *extremum tempus aetatis*, Ov. *Met.* 6.675-6 *longaeque extrema senectae | tempora*; see further *TLL* V.1.2002.41-2003.29, 2006.75-2007.25. As at 191 *postrema ... hora*, Ariadne is convinced she is about to die, and considers that this circumstance makes the mocking behaviour of *fors* even more cruel. Cf. also 130 *extremis ... querelis*, 151 *supremo in tempore*, 171 *tempore primo*, 191 *postrema ... hora* nn.

saeua For fate described as *saeuus* or *saeuiens* cf. e.g. Sall. *Cat.* 10.1, Hor. *Carm.* 3.29-49 with N—R, Liv. 25.38.10, Luc. 9.237-8, Apul. *Met.* 5.5.2 with Kenney. See also *TLL* VI.1.1130.4-16 for epithets applied to *fors*, among which those referring to cruelty are frequent (*saeua* reappears once, V.Fl. 3.392 *si fors saeua tulit miseros*). Here the enjambment of *saeua | fors* gives the expression powerful emphasis. (It causes Nisbet (1978) 102-3 to suspect the text, but cf. 246-7 *paterna | morte* and 288-9 *altas | fagos*.)

170 fors ‘fate’ in a generalised sense, hardly more than ‘chance’. Except in the form *forte*, less common than *fortuna*, and not often personified in literature even to the extent seen here: but cf. Cic. *Pis.* 3 *sit sane fors domina campi*, Sen. *Phoen.* 631-2 *et spes et metus* | *fors caeca uersat* and further examples at *TLL* VI.1.1129.33-45. However, *Fors Fortuna* had been one of the *Fortunae* worshipped at Rome since at least mid-Republican times: see Clark (2007), esp. 196, 235-6.

etiam of course emphasises not the adjacent *nostris*, but the whole clause: *fors*, Ariadne says, has not only brought her to imminent death (*extremo tempore*) but has *even* grudged her an audience.

nostris ... questibus As Ariadne’s words are *querelae* at 130 and 195; cf. also 164 *conqueror*. That *queror* and cognates became marked as the appropriate way to refer to Ariadne’s speech is suggested by Ov. *Met.* 8.176 *desertae et multa querenti*, *Aetna* 22 *desertam uacuo Minoida litore questus*.

inuidit ‘has grudged’; cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 11.43-4 *inuidit fortuna mihi, ne regna uideres* | *nostra*, Ov. *Pont.* 2.8.59 *quod quoniam nobis inuidit inutile fatum*, Apul. *Apol.* 21 *mihi fortuna diuitias inuidit*. Fate can also be *inuidus* in a sense closer to ‘envious’, e.g. Sen. *H.F.* 524 *o fortuna uiris inuida fortibus*: see further Horsfall on Virg. *Aen.* 11.43-4.

auris ‘ears’, i.e. ‘anyone who could hear me’. Catullus’ spelling is irrecoverable, but the transmitted *-is* rather than *-es* sharpens the pun on 164 *auris*, also at the end of the line: as pointed out in 165-6, the *aurae* have no *auris*, and the ironic echo completes 164-70 on the theme of not being heard.

171-6 Ariadne’s wish that Theseus had never come to Crete alludes to the same famous opening of Euripides’ and Ennius’ *Medea* as the beginning of the poem (1-

11n.). The allusion is formally marked by *utinam ne*, by the long sentence describing several different actions (articulated by *nec* twice as Euripides by *μηδέ* twice, Ennius by *neue* once), by the pluperfect subjunctives, by the nautical content of 171-4, and by 177 *nam* (Enn. *trag.* 215 Jocelyn *nam*, Eur. *Med.* 6 γάρ); it is prepared for by the fact that the allusion in the poem's opening lacked the form of a wish, which these lines now provide. Enn. *trag.* 244 Jocelyn *utinam ne umquam ꝥmedeꝥ cordis cupido corde pedem extulisses* (uncertain context) may also be present (*tempore primo ~ umquam*), and Ariadne immediately goes on to an even closer reminiscence of Ennius in the questions of 177-83 (see n.). There, however, she echoes Medea's own voice, while here she briefly takes that of the Nurse. This may suggest that Ariadne is able to assess her own story as if she were observing it happen to someone else (see Armstrong (2006) 210 and cf. 1-11n.), which would suit the rationality of 164-70; it might also be a comment on how closely the Nurse is in sympathy with Medea in the two tragic sources. The fact that the allusion here contaminates Theseus' ship with the Argo is of course another use of the Medea myth and its texts to bind the inner and outer stories together (1-11, 132-201n.), but it is disconcerting to be reminded yet again of Peleus and Thetis and the narrator's voice after 163 and 164 (see nn.), and especially of the chronological contradiction between Theseus' ship and the Argo as first ship (11, 53 *cum classe* nn.).

For Ariadne it is not Theseus' departure from Athens (which would be parallel to the sailing of the Argo) that was the fateful moment, but his arrival in Crete. This concern with finding the original cause of their misfortunes dominates the appearances of the *utinam ne* motif (see Hross (1958) 43-9) for many lamenting heroines. Ariadne's emphasis recalls Ap. *Arg.* 4.32-3, where Medea wishes that Jason had been killed at sea before arriving in Colchis. However, in an earlier

monologue Medea had wished either that she had never seen Jason, or (going a stage further back) that Chalciope's sons had never reached Greece (3.773-6); Euripides' Nurse had similarly mentioned two moments, the Argo passing the Symplegades and the trees being felled to build it, while Ennius had corrected this *hysteron-proteron* (1n.) and at [Cic.] *Ad Her.* 2.34 and Cic. *Inu.* 1.91 Ennius' version is referred to as a classic case of looking *too* far back to find the beginning of an action. Here Ariadne identifies three actions, each referred to in two lines: though the verbal structures of each 'couplet' are not completely parallel (but note 173 *ferens*, 175 *celans*), each ends with a pluperfect subjunctive followed by a dactylic noun and a spondaic one. Ariadne refers to three different aspects of Theseus' arrival to form a rhetorical crescendo which contains elements of chronology and of spatial arrangement but which is primarily emotional: the arrival of Athenian ships in Crete (as if they could be any Athenian ships); an unnamed *perfidus nauita* tying up his ship; the appearance of the attractive, deceptive *malus hic* himself in her own family home. Of course, the way remained open for other heroines to point to other moments. Among the many appearances of the *utinam ne* motif in Ov. *Her.* (Phyllis, 2.57-60; Phaedra, 4.67-8; Dido, 7.139-40; Canace, 11.21-2; Medea, 12.7-12) note esp. 10.99ff., where Ariadne refers to several points in the story in impeccable chronological order, beginning *uiueret Androgeos utinam!* The Ariadne of Ov. *Fast.* 3.477-8, meanwhile, wishes to return only to the grief she felt when deserted by Theseus (see Armstrong (2006) 254-5). And Virg. *Aen.* 4.657-8 *felix, heu nimium felix, si litora tantum | numquam Dardaniae tetigissent nostra carinae* alludes closely to 172, using the same subjunctive, but in a sentence that is not actually a wish: while Ariadne and Medea simply wish their stories had never started, Dido can imagine an alternative existence.

The narrator had also identified Theseus' arrival in Crete as the beginning of Ariadne's woes (73-5), but Ariadne is retelling 76-85 here too; as at the beginning of her speech (133-4n.) she seems to have heard the narrator's account. Some words are simply echoed (*Cecropiae, Cretam, tetigissent ~ attigit*), other details reappear through Ariadne's focalisation (*sedes superbas* become *nostris sedibus*, the heroic *ferox Theseus* is *perfidus nauita* and *malus hic*, and his patriotic motivation (81-3) is replaced by *celans dulci crudelia forma consilia*). But in 173 *indomito ... tauro* and *dira ... stipendia* Ariadne briefly seems to be as sympathetic to Athens as the narrator was; cf. the complexities of focalisation in 73-85 itself (see e.g. 73 *ferox ... Theseus*, 75 *iniusti regis*, 76-115nn.).

171 Iuppiter omnipotens The epithet first at Plaut. *Poen.* 275, first applied to Jupiter at Enn. *Ann.* 447 Skutsch *Iouis omnipotentis*; it may be a calque on *παγκρατής* and seems characteristic of poetic rather than ritual language (see Fraenkel (2007) 140-1, Courtney on Valerius Soranus fr. 2). This nominative/vocative phrase for the beginning of a line becomes an epic building-block, typically opening speeches (Virg. *Aen.* 2.689, 4.206, 5.687, 9.625, Petron. 122.156, Stat. *Theb.* 3.471). It can sometimes be quite strongly reproachful (cf. Servius on *Aen.* 4.206), but here, though apparently prompted to address a god by her lack of a mortal audience (164-70n.), Ariadne does not seem particularly concerned whether 'almighty' Jupiter might have the power to effect her wish and change the past: there is nothing after these words to suggest that she has any particular addressee in mind until 192. However, a reader of 204ff. will remember this exclamation.

tempore primo ‘to start with’; the phrase highlights the difficulty of identifying the real beginning of a chain of events (171-6n.) since it sounds initially as if it will contrast 171-2 with the next two pairs of lines, but then seems to go with all of them (so Friedrich), since they all describe the same event. It has the same reference as 73 *quo tempore*, while for Ariadne it forms a clear contrast with 169 *extremo tempore*, 191 *postrema ... hora*; see Gardner (2007) esp. 172-3 for a Kristevan account of Ariadne’s references to time. There may also be a comment on the fact that this is an allusion in the middle of Ariadne’s speech to the very *beginning* of a source-text.

172 A ‘golden’ line (7, 59nn.), further marked by the alliterative juxtaposition of names. Ariadne here aligns the relationship between herself and Theseus with the conflict between their two nations, and the words *Cnosia* and *Cecropiae* do indeed ‘touch’. If Catullus is drawing attention to characteristic features of his own hexameter style by using such a line in his allusion to Ennius and Euripides, Virgil does the same when he produces an imitation which is not a ‘golden’ line and replaces one of the proper names with a pronominal adjective: *Aen.* 4.658 *numquam Dardaniae tetigissent nostra carinae* (171-6n.; see further Clausen (1987) 60).

Cnosia Minos’ capital was considered to have been at Cnossus (*Od.* 19.178), which is also relatively near the sea: but like 75 *Gortynia* (see n.) the adjective probably means simply ‘Cretan’ here, as regularly in Latin poetry (e.g. Prop. 2.12.10 *pharetra ... Cnosia*, Virg. *Aen.* 6.23 *Cnosia tellus*). Although Κνώσσιος is the more common form in Greek, in Latin it seems from manuscript evidence that only the spelling with one *s* occurs; the word is largely confined to poetry. This is its first extant appearance, and its second (unless Prop. 1.3.2 is earlier) may be Virg. *Georg.*

1.222 *Cnosiaque ardentis decedat stella Coronae*, where an allusion to this line is likely (see Thomas *ad loc.*), as also in Phaedra's wish at Ov. *Her.* 4.68 *Cnosia me uellem detinuisset humus* (cf. 171-6n.). For *Cnosia* rather than *Gnosia* see Housman (1972) 1142-3.

Cecropiae Cf. 79 *Cecropiam* n.

tetigissent Beached ships of course would literally 'touch' the shore, while anchored ones might not; as Friedrich shows with parallels from nautical contexts, the primary meaning here is 'reached'. But the sense of a light, disastrous 'touch' is important too: see further 75 *attigit* n.

puppēs Probably plural for singular (53 *cum classe* n.). This may not be synecdoche (on which see 6n.): ships are turned round to approach land stern-first at e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 6.3-5. By being repeated from line 6 the word forms a verbal link between the two passages alluding to the *Medea* opening (171-6n.).

173 indomito ... tauro *indomitus* = 'untamed', 'untamable', and therefore 'wild', appropriate of an animal, or 'invincible'; cf. 54, 107 and contrast 110 *domito ... corpore*. The description is very different from Ariadne's other references to the Minotaur at 151 *germanum* n., 181 *fraterna caede*; a reader's interpretation of those passages will be affected by the fact that here she does apparently face her brother's monstrous nature. See 171-6, 107nn.

nec For the anastrophe cf. 43 *at* n.; by allowing *indomito* to come first in the line it contributes crucially to the sense that this line belongs with the five-word type involving two nouns, two adjectives and one verb, common in the poem (7n.; c. 63-5n. for versions with *non*). and particularly noticeable here after the 'golden' 172.

Catullus also has postponed *nec* or *neque* at 210, 379, 68.55, 68.116 (always second in the line, as frequently with other postponed conjunctions).

dira ... stipendia A unique collocation (PHI 5.3) which Ellis thinks may translate Isoc. *Hel.* 213.27 οἰκτρὸν ... φόρον; this is plausible given the likely influence of the Isocrates passage on 76-85 (83n.). While *dirus* belongs to the vocabulary of ‘high’ poetry, *stipendium* (from *stips* + *pendere*, Ernout-Meillet s.v.) is the technical term for various kinds of payment including a tax levied on conquered territories (*OLD* s.v. 3). *stipendia* therefore highlights the horror of the situation by referring to the human victims as if they were cash, and, as Fordyce and Nuzzo note, by implying a regular payment (partly by means of the plural). *dira* suggests that Ariadne shares this horror and is not using *stipendia* as a euphemism (cf. 171-6n.). Alternatively, it could be focalised through the Minotaur (Theseus brings not the expected, welcome payment but one of death).

stipendium also occurs in Plautus and at Enn. *Ann.* 215 Skutsch *Poeni stipendia pendunt*, Hor. *Epod.* 17.36 *quae finis aut quod me manet stipendium?*, *Lydia* 116 *uarios, Veneris stipendia, flores*, but is otherwise absent from poetry until the fourth century. This may have been due to prosody, as it seems that the first *i* was naturally short and only arbitrarily treated as long by the three dactylic poets (see Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 215, Ernout-Meillet s.v.); however, after such a metrical innovation had been made by both Ennius and Catullus the word might have been expected to become available in the Latin dactylic vocabulary, so the fact that it did not is perhaps due to its stylistic level.

174 perfidus Cf. 132-3 *perfide* ... | *perfide* n. Like Ariadne, Virgil's Dido also follows her two vocatives with one nominative *perfidus* (*Aen.* 4.421); see Wills 26-30.

in Creta religasset ... funem 'tied up his ship's rope in Crete'. The action belongs to the world of nautical epic: particularly with the implication in *perfidus* ... *navita* that he moors the ship himself (cf. 183n.), it aligns Theseus with Homer's Odysseus or Apollonius' Argonauts (e.g. *Od.* 10.96 πέτρης ἐκ πείσματα δῆσας, *Arg.* 1.965 πρυμνήσια νηὸς ἀνάψαι).

Various constructions may follow *religare funem* (*retinacula*, sim.) or *religare nauem* (*classem*, sim.): *ad* + accusative (Caes. *B.C.* 3.15.2 *neque naues ad terram religandi potestas fiebat*), bare ablative (Sen. *Med.* 612 *barbara funem religauit ora*), *ab*, *e* or *in* + ablative (Luc. 7.860-1 *nullus ab Emathio religasset litore funem* | *navita*, Vit. 10.15.6 *funes praecinctura e transuersis erant religati*, Ov. *Fast.* 4.331 *querno religant in stipite funem*). The degree of specificity also varies: the emphasis may be on the object to which the rope is tied (Hor. *Serm.* 1.5.18-19 *retinacula mulae* | *nauta piger saxo religat*) or more generally on the place where the ship is moored (Ov. *Met.* 13.439 *litore Threicio classem religarat Atrides*, 14.248 *nos quoque Circaeο religata in litore pinu*). *in Creta* seems acceptable as an example of the latter, despite the lack of a word for 'shore'. Gratwick's *intortum* is based on the patterned construction of lines in this passage, but the fact that 172 and 173 have two nouns and two adjectives each does not imply that this line must too; *in Creta* rather balances the specificity of 172 *Cnosia*, 176 *nostris*.

With GR's *Cretam* the meaning would have to be 'untied his ship's rope for the journey to Crete', but that seems a stretch for *in Cretam* and requires a very doubtful meaning for *religare*. Kroll notes that *re-* can undo the action of a simple

verb (e.g. *recludere*), but the only possible parallel for this with *religare* (see Gratwick (1979)) is 63.84 *ait haec minax Cybele religatque iuga manu*, where Baehrens may be right to suspect the text (suggesting *releuatque*). Even if we accept that line as a unique instance of *religare* = ‘untie’, it would hardly support that interpretation here since in seafaring contexts *religare* = ‘moor’ is so common.

nauita Probably archaic, a regular alternative to *nauta* in poetry (already also at Lucr. 5.223, Cic. *carm.* 3.4 Büchner); see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.13.12. *perfidus* specifies that this *nauita* must be Theseus rather than one of his crew: for a similar reference to a mythical character by a marked use of an occupation-word cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.15.1-2 *pastor cum traheret per freta nauibus | Idaeis Helenen perfidus hospitam* with N—H. Here the generalised description both belittles Theseus and anticipates Ariadne’s attempt in 176 to make her story fit a general mythical paradigm (see n.).

175 malus hic Vivid and substantival, ‘this wicked man’, perhaps with overtones of the colloquial use of *malus* = ‘accursed’ found elsewhere in Catullus, e.g. 3.13-14 *malae tenebrae | Orci*, 33.5-6 *cur non exilium malasque in oras | itis*; cf. esp. 29.31 *quid hunc malum fouetis*; hence practically ‘this bastard’. Euripides’ Medea, similarly, frequently uses κακός of or to Jason, as he remarks himself (452 λέγουσ’ Ἰάσον’ ὡς κάκιστός ἐστ’ ἀνὴρ). Goold and Thomson print O’s *haec*, presumably on the grounds that Theseus is not in sight (so Trappes-Lomax, Gratwick (1979) 114); but neither are his *crudelia consilia*, although their consequences are, while *dulci crudelia forma | consilia* makes a better balanced piece of interlaced word order without *haec*, and Ariadne’s use of the deictic for someone who is very much on her mind is natural, especially in her accusatory tone. *hic* is also strongly supported by

the allusion at Virg. *Aen.* 4.10 *nouus hic ... hospes* (176n.); Aeneas is not in sight either.

celans For being hidden by a *forma* cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.76 *quem forma precaria celat*.

dulci ... forma On Catullus' use of *dulcis* see 120n. Here *forma* is both specifically Theseus' physical beauty and generally his outward appearance as contrasted with the *crudelia consilia* with which these words are intertwined: the juxtaposition *dulci crudelia* particularly emphasises his duplicity.

175-6 crudelia ... | consilia echoes 136-7 *crudelis mentis consilium* (see n.). Nonnus' Ariadne also accuses Theseus of cruelty behind superficial appeal, just after she wishes she had never fallen in love with him: *Dion.* 47.366-7-8 αἶθε μιν οὐκ ἐπόθησα δυσίμερος · εἰς Παφίην γὰρ | ὁπόσον ἡμερόεις, τόσον ἄγριος ἔπλετο Θησεύς. Cf. 132-201n.

176 in nostris ... sedibus echoes 160 *uestras ... sedes*; Theseus' transgression against hospitality (see below) is presented as a betrayal of Ariadne's entire family.

requiescet Appropriate of a *hospes*; e.g. Virg. *Ecl.* 1.79 *mecum poterat requiescere noctem*.

hospes Appositional with *malus hic* and predicative with *requiescet*, 'as a guest'; the position at the end of the line and of the long exclamatory sentence is very emphatic, further highlighted by the sibilance throughout this line. With *requiescet* and *in nostris ... sedibus*, *hospes* must mean 'guest' rather than 'stranger': Ariadne claims that Theseus' betrayal of her was also a breach of hospitality. Readers may be reluctant to believe that Theseus stayed as a guest in Minos' palace until it was time

to be eaten by the Minotaur, but the narrator too at 98 *in ... hospite suspirantem* (see n.) seems to assimilate Ariadne's story to a mythical type exemplified more clearly by Demophoon-Phyllis, Paris-Helen or even Jason-Medea; cf. also Prop. 2.24.43-4 *paruo dilexit spatio Minoida Theseus | Phyllida Demophoon, hospes uterque malus* and for the '*perfidus hospes*' motif in accounts of these myths in Latin literature Della Corte (1973). He sees the Demophoon-Phyllis story as particularly influential on the others given Call. fr. 556 Pfeiffer νυμφίε Δημοφώων, ἄδικε ξένε: this formulation may have influenced Catullus here given the other evidence that his portrayal of Ariadne may have drawn on the Callimachean Phyllis (126-9n., 132-201n.). Alternatively, Skinner (1994) suggests that Catullus emphasises the hospitality theme to contrast the behaviour of his Theseus with that of the pious guest in the *Hecale*; cf. also Ap. Arg. 4.33 ξεῖνε in Medea's regretful apostrophe to Jason (171-6n.).

Virgil's Dido echoes this line at an ironically early point in her relationship with Aeneas: *Aen.* 4.10 *quis nouus hic nostris successit sedibus hospes?*

177-83 Her attention returning to her immediate plight, Ariadne explores her options in a series of despairing questions. She begins with a generalising introductory pair in 177, to which three yes/no questions (*–ne, an, an*) in the deliberative subjunctive suggest possible answers (178-83). Each of these is itself answered in the negative (the first with a statement, the second two with questions, all with indicative verbs), each with its answer occupying two lines. Ariadne then adds a further two-line statement (184-5) dispensing with a fourth possible answer to the questions of 177; this leads her to conclude that her situation is hopeless and death inevitable (186-7).

The lines exemplify a rhetorical pattern identified by Fowler (1987) as typical of the 'desperation speech'. Fowler points to the origins of such speeches in certain

Homeric soliloquies and provides an exhaustive discussion of Greek examples, particularly in tragedy; the desperation speech can also be traced through rhetorical prose, New and Roman comedy (e.g. the soliloquy of Palaestra in Plaut. *Rud.*, on which see 164-70n. as well as nn. below), Roman tragedy and epic, and the novel. The self-questioning part of such a speech is particularly widespread since it is an extension of ‘what shall I do?’ or ‘what will happen to me?’, which characters in all sorts of crises may ask (see Fowler (1987) 17 n.28, 18 n.31); the extended version found here, in which various possibilities for action are suggested and rejected, may be known as (*ad*)*dubitatio*, *aporia*, *aporesis* or perhaps *diaporesis* (Fowler (1987) 6 n.3, Lausberg §§776-8). Oratorical examples of *addubitatio* provide many relevant variations, e.g. ‘what could I have done? x? y? I could only do z’, or ‘what is he to do unless you acquit him? x? y? therefore acquit him’; cf. e.g. Gorg. 11a.20-1 Buchheim (*Palamedes*), Aeschin. 3.209, Dem. 18.28, 28.18, Cic. *Mur.* 88-9, Diod. 13.31.1. Ariadne’s version is essentially that found in tragic desperation speeches such as Soph. *Ai.* 430-80, in which, having described his/her situation, a speaker asks what can be done next and systematically excludes all other options but the most extreme or miserable (usually death).

Within this tradition Catullus alludes primarily to Eur. *Med.* 502ff. and Ennius’ translation at *trag.* 217-18 Jocelyn (Ennius’ *domum paternamne? anne ad Peliae filias?* seems to omit the answers to the follow-up questions, but this may be due to Cicero’s abbreviating the quotation: Jocelyn *ad loc.*, Rosato (2005) 113-20). This is combined with evocation of other parts of Eur. *Med.* and of Medea’s second set of desperate questions (378-81) in her speech at Ap. *Arg.* 4.355-90 (cf. 132-8n.). Despite Ariadne’s focus on her guilt for past actions (accepted by Kinsey (1965) 917-18 as a reason to apportion ‘blame’ to her), the allusive presence of Medea here is

likely to lead a reader to notice how much *less* guilty Ariadne is, as if her very attempt to be Medea reveals her shortcomings in this role (Armstrong (2006) 45); this is particularly clear when she refers to the death of her ‘brother’ the Minotaur at the point where Medea could have referred (but in Euripides did not) to her murder of Apsyrtus (181n.). However, Ariadne’s point should also be understood in terms of the common tendency in desperate *addubitatio* to mention the various family members, friends or allies one cannot flee to or expect help from (cf. e.g. Eur. *Suppl.* 1094-1101, *Her.* 1281-90, Cic. *Mur.* 88-9, Virg. *Aen.* 2.79-62 and examples quoted at 182-3n. as well as Medea, Ajax and Gracchus); this frequently creates ironic effects, as it does here, if e.g. either speaker or addressee has betrayed or killed the people in question. Therefore, while Zetzel (1983) 265 is right to note that it was not Catullus but C. Gracchus, in a speech made shortly before his death in 121 B.C., who had first introduced a reference to the death of a brother into an allusion to Medea’s words (Gracch. fr. 61 Malcovati⁴, quoted at Cic. *De orat.* 3.213-19 alongside Ennius’ Medea), this is not itself the strongest evidence that Catullus is also alluding to Gracchus here (cf. rather 177 *quo me referam*, 178-9nn.).

While Medea’s questions are explicitly intended to shame the listening Jason (Eur. *Med.* 501), Ariadne’s soliloquising is in fact more typical of desperation speeches in tragedy (usually the chorus is present but not addressed); like their Homeric precursors, such speeches are essentially conventional dramatisations of the speaker’s thoughts as he/she comes to a decision or realisation. The desperation speeches of Dido at Virg. *Aen.* 4.534-52 and Scylla at Ov. *Met.* 108-42 are also soliloquies (cf. 132-201n.). Ariadne’s isolation, however, goes beyond that of any of these characters: in these lines the sort of moral impossibilities that concern a Medea or an Ajax are blended with the simple fact that she is stranded on a desert island.

This means that physical isolation becomes a metaphor for personal isolation (Putnam (1961) 179, Thomson (1961) 56, Romani (1999) 117-19) and physical death for social death (Romani (1999) *loc. cit.*, Panoussi (2003) 116-17, Gardner (2007) 173); but it also threatens to undermine entirely Ariadne's use of the convention of *addubitatio*, since her first question *quo me referam?* has such an obvious, practical answer ('nowhere') which ought to render all further questions pointless.

177 The opening interrogation, with general reference to the situation: for two or more consecutive questions at this point cf. e.g. Aesch. *Suppl.* 777-8, Soph. *Ai.* 403-4, Eur. *Med.* 386-8, *Hel.* 293, *Alc.* 863, Men. *Sam.* 568, Ter. *Phorm.* 728-9, Enn. *trag.* 81-3 Jocelyn, Sall. *Iug.* 14.15 as well as Gracch. 61 Malcovati⁴ and Ennius' *Medea* (*trag.* 217-8 Jocelyn), where in typical Roman tragic fashion the single question in the original is doubled (see Vahlen and Jocelyn *ad loc.*). In most cases the questions have essentially the same meaning and are asked in general enough terms to prompt the whole series of subsequent suggestions, but here, strictly speaking, *quo me referam?* is answered in 178-9, while *quali spe ... nitor?*, raising the wider possibility of an outcome that would not involve Ariadne leaving the island under her own steam, is answered in 180-3.

nam i.e. 'I wish Theseus had never come to Crete; *for* [he has left me in this situation and] where am I to go?' Monosyllables at the beginning of the line are often corrupted (cf. 68 *sed* n.), and *nunc* (Spengel) or *iam* (Baehrens) might be expected given the 'now' in Medea's speech (Eur. *Med.* 502 νῦν, Enn. *trag.* 217 Jocelyn *nunc*) and in some other examples of the first question in similar passages (Soph. *Ai.* 457, *El.* 812): see 177-83n. But *nam/enim* or γάρ are also typical of such questions (e.g. Soph. *Ai.* 1006, Eur. *Alc.* 941, Gorg. 11a.20 Buchheim, Ap. *Arg.* 3.779, Cic. *Flac.* 4),

and Ov. *Met.* 8.113 *nam quo deserta reuertar?* essentially confirms the transmitted reading. Cf. also 171-6n.

quo me referam? Some form of ‘where shall I go?’ is common as an opening question in an *addubitatio*, either combined with ‘what shall I do?’, reiterated in some way (e.g. Plaut. *Aul.* 713 *quo curram? quo non curram?*), or alone. The idea is usually ‘where shall I go [since I cannot remain here]?’ and/or ‘where shall I turn [for help]?’; *τρέπομαι* and *(me) uerto*, the verbs used by the two tragic Medeas, are common (e.g. Eur. *Alc.* 943, Dem. 28.18, Men. *Epitr.* 905, Ter. *Hec.* 516, Cic. *Mur.* 88, [Cic.] *Inu. Sall.* 1, Charit. 3.3.6). But Catullus shares the use of a *fero* compound with Gracch. 61 Malcovati⁴ *quo me miser conferam? quo uertam?*, and may be consciously adapting this famous speech (so Zetzel (1983) 265), varying the prefix in allusion (cf. 119n.). *se refero* elsewhere = ‘return’ (*OLD* s.v. 3a), but apparently = ‘go’ here; non-reflexive *reddo* need not always have a sense of going ‘back’ (e.g. Ov. *Fast.* 6.430 *curaque ad heredem Laomedonta redit*, ‘and its care passed to his heir, Laomedon’). But the unexpectedness of the verb might also make more plausible the theory of Armstrong (2006) 45 n. 24 that a secondary meaning of ‘What source should I refer to?’, marking the intertextuality, could be understood here, despite the reflexive *me*.

Present subjunctive and future indicative are of course closely related in form and meaning in both Latin and Greek, and either may occur in this sort of question: but 180 *sperem*, 182 *consoler*, as well as Euripides’ *τρέπωμαι*, perhaps suggest that *referam* and 178 *petam* are better understood as subjunctive.

quali spe ... nitor? Cf. 180 *sperem* and 186 *nulla spes*, the final answer to this question. Cf. Palaestra at Plaut. *Rud.* 204 *nunc quam spem aut opem aut consilii quid capessam?*, 209 *quae mihi est spes qua me uiuere uelim?* Eur. *Med.* 498

ἐλπίδων δ' ἡμάρτομεν is Medea's complaint immediately before her series of questions; but Ariadne's equivalent hope for faithful marriage was referred to in 140 *sperare*, 144 *speret*, whereas now she cannot even hope for escape from death. For *nitor* + *spe* cf. Cic. *Ver.* 2.2.71, *Att.* 3.9.2, Quint. 6.pr.9.

nitor is probably present indicative in a deliberative question (LHS II §172a, Ernout-Thomas 242-3, Bennett (1910-14) I.21-4; see Kroll on 1.1 *cui dono*, actually a dubious case); the question is answered by suggestions of possible future events, so it should refer to the future. *nitar* would match the other subjunctives in 177-83 (so Trappes-Lomax; printed by Cazzaniga, Bardon, Eisenhut), but as the 'deliberative' indicative and subjunctive are found together elsewhere (e.g. Cic. *Quinct.* 54, *Att.* 16.8.2 *Romamne uenio an hic maneo an Arpinum ... fugiam?*, Virg. *Aen.* 4.534-5), *nitor* can be kept. Alternatively *nitor* could be the ordinary present indicative 'what hope do I rely on?', with the idea of futurity contained only in *spe*; see Austin on Virg. *Aen.* 4.534 *quid ago?*

perdita Cf. 70 *perdita* n. A nominative adjective describing wretchedness is common in the initial question of a desperation speech, e.g. Eur. *I.A.* 442 δύστηνος, *Phoen.* 1615 δυσδαίμων, Ter. *Phorm.* 728 and *Hec.* 517 *misera*, Gracch. 61 Malcovati⁴ and Cic. *Mur.* 88 *miser* (again in 89): for the adjective attached to the second of a pair of questions cf. Sall. *Iug.* 15 *quid agam? aut quo potissimum infelix accedam?*, Charit. 3.3.6 τί πάθω; τί γένωμαι δυστυχής; The only application of *perdita* to the Virgilian Dido occurs in a later question in her desperation speech (*Aen.* 4.541).

178 Idaeosne petam montes? Like Medea (177-83n.), Ariadne first asks whether she can go home: but in her different situation the physical impediment to her getting

there at all is treated separately first, before her betrayal of her father (180n.; and cf. Ov. *Her.* 10.61-4). A name standing for ‘Cretan’ must therefore lie behind OGR *idoneos ne*. Based on R² *Idmoneos* and/or ζ *Idomeneos*, conjectures meaning ‘of Idomeneus’ enjoyed an eighteenth- and nineteenth-century vogue (Corradinus’ *Idomeneos*, with its dubious synizesis of the Greek genitive, was followed by Lachmann’s *Idomeneus*, with a genitive attested at *Il.* 13.424 but not in Latin; Bücheler’s *Idomenei*, the regular Latin genitive, brought back synizesis) and were still being defended by Fraenkel (1962) 256 as closer to the paradosis; but besides the anachronism that Idomeneus was Ariadne’s nephew, the son of her brother Deucalion (Apollod. 3.3.1), his name is not used elsewhere to mean ‘Cretan’ (Kroll). Mount Ida, meanwhile, is a towering landmark in the centre of Crete, and the source of Catullus’ specific expression is probably Call. *Hymn* 1.6 Ἰδαίοισιν ἐν οὐρεσι: the plural (also at 51) is in Greek not otherwise used of the Cretan Ida (McLennan *ad loc.*), though in Latin cf. Plin. *N.H.* 16.142 *Idaeis montibus*, with Cretan reference. *Idaeus* also occurs at Lucr. 5.663 *Idaeis ... e montibus altis* of the Trojan Ida and in Cicero of Cybele (e.g. *Ver.* 2.5.186), and is well attested in later texts with reference to either location (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 3.105 *mons Idaeus*, Cretan). The corruption would have occurred through the easy addition of an *n*-stroke and an attempt to make a Latin word.

With the verb cf. Sen. *Med.* 451 *Phasin et Colchos petam ...?*

178-9 Ariadne’s question about the physical possibility of getting to Crete is answered with a statement. The transmitted reading *a gurgite lato | discernens ponti truculentum ubi diuidit aequor* would have to be read as a question like those in 180-1 and 183, but Ellis’s rendering shows how near nonsensical would be the use of *ubi*

to pick up *montes*: ‘Those mountains where a boisterous sea separates me, alas, with its waste of water and keeps me away.’ Enn. *Ann.* 302 Skutsch is sometimes cited in defence of *ubi*; the earlier part of Ennius’ sentence does not survive, but Cicero’s quotations of the line provide much more appropriate antecedents (*Tusc.* 1.45 *ii qui Oceani freta illa uiderunt*, ‘*Europam Libyamque rapax ubi diuidit unda*’, *De nat. deor.* 3.24 *quid Oceani feruore illis in locis* ‘*Europam Libyamque rapax ubi diuidit unda*’?), as does Horace’s allusion (*Carm.* 3.3.45-7 *nomen in ultimas | extendat oras, qua medius liquor | secernit Europen ab Afro*). The presence of *ubi* here can be explained as arising from a scribal misreading of – *ū di*–(with dittography) rather than a Catullan reminiscence of Ennius; it should therefore be deleted. The use of the interjection *a* would also be anomalous (no address nor emotive adjective: contrast 71 *a miser*, 135 *immemor (a!) nn.*). Emendation to *an* (Ellis) would keep the question; but far more likely is *at*, typical of *subiectio/hypophora* (Lausberg §§771-5), in which a speaker answers a series of his/her own questions: cf. e.g. Cic. *Mur.* 89, *Flac.* 4, instructions for the technique at [Cic.] *Ad Her.* 4.34, Quint. 9.2.15 *domus tibi deerat? at habebas. pecunia superabat? at egebas*, and 65.10-11 *numquam ego te, uita frater amabilior, | aspiciam posthac? at certe semper amabo*. This reading also makes the structure of 178-81 a precise match for Gracch. 61 Malcovati⁴ *in Capitoliumne? at fratris sanguine madet. an domum? matremne ut miseram lamentatem uideam et abiectam?*; cf. 178-83, 177 *quo me referam?* nn.

The repetition of the prefix in the synonymous *discernens* and *diuidit*, and the close similarity of *gurgite lato* and *ponti truculentum aequor*, make this perhaps the fullest instance of pleonasm in the poem (but cf. esp. 64, 192, 221, 313-14); Ariadne describes the sea as a completely unbridgeable barrier. Kroll’s comment on *truculentum*, ‘she understandably forgets that she has already risked the threatening

sea', is revealing. Transported to Dia as a helpless passenger (121 *uecta*), she speaks here as if she has no memory of her journey but has simply woken up to find herself there, just as the viewers of the *uestis* and readers of the poem have found her.

gurgite lato Both words contribute to Ariadne's picture of the threatening sea, huge (*lato*) and violent (*gurgis* originally = *turbulent* water); this is the only extant appearance of the collocation in classical authors (PHI 5.3). Cf. 183 and see also 14 *gurgite* n.

discernens ... diuidit Sc. *me* with both (as in 160), *ab eis* (i.e. *montibus*) at least with the participle, which also goes closely with the instrumental *gurgite lato*: 'separating me from them with a wide expanse of turbulent water'. With this cf. Lucr. 1.720-1 *angustoque fretu rapidum mare diuidit undis | Italiae terrarum oras a finibus eius*: the sea, like other geographical features, is very often said to 'divide' people or places (from others). *diuidit* can be understood with *ab eis* supplied again, or in a more absolute sense 'cuts me off': Friedrich and Kroll compare Virg. *Aen.* 3.381-3 *Italiam ... | ... | longa procul longis uia diuidit inuia terris*.

truculentum 'angry'; in the sense that the sea is always dangerous (6 *ausi sunt* n.), but also in that she imagines it as actively inimical to her escape: cf. e.g. Petron. 114.9 *amplexus amantium iratum diuidet mare*. For the adjective cf. 63.16 *rapidum salum tulistis truculentaque pelagi* and other applications to inanimate nature at Tac. *Ann.* 2.24 *truculentia caeli praestat Germania*, Apul. *Met.* 6.15 *sanctissimi nec minus truculenti fontis* (the Styx); cf. Ov. *Her.* 11.9 *multoque suis truculentior Euri* (of Aeolus); it is regularly applied to animals.

ponti ... aequor On *aequor* see 12n.: this hostile sea contrasts with the benign *aequor* of the Nereids (see also 183n.). In its sense of 'flat surface' *aequor* forms many similar poetic periphrases, most for the sea (*TLL* 1.1023.71ff.), some for

other plains (e.g. *campi aequor*, *aequora caeli*). Lucretius ends lines with *aequora ponti* (1.8, 2.772, 6.440) or *aequore ponti* (2.781, 6.628) and also has *ponti | aequora* in enjambment at 4.410-11, 5.1000-1; but even the metrically useful line-ending formula recurs surprisingly few times in later poetry (Virg. *Georg.* 1.469, Lygd. 4.85, Ov. *Met.* 2.872, Manil. 4.649, 5.158), while Catullus' *ponti ... aequor* appears again only at Drac. *Laud.* 1.149. *pontus*, a Latinisation of πόντος first extant at Enn. *Ann.* 217, is an exclusively poetic word (see Skutsch *ad loc.*), appearing in Catullus also at 36.11 in the mock-elevated prayer to Venus (cf. 96n.).

180 an patris auxilium sperem? Cf. Eur. *Med.* 502 πότερα πρὸς πατρὸς δόμους;, Enn. *trag.* 218 Jocelyn *domum paternamne?*, Sen. *Med.* 452 *patriumque regnum* as well as Ap. *Arg.* 4.378 πῶς ἴξομαι ὄμματα πατρός; Medea in each case asks whether she could hope to be welcomed by her father if she returned to his house, given her treatment of him (cf. also e.g. Soph. *Ai.* 462-5, 1008-10 and 177-83n.): Ariadne, having just established that she cannot get home unaided, asks whether she can expect her father to come and pick her up (as Nonnus' Ariadne asks who can carry her away from the island: *Dion.* 47.382-4). The idea is particularly ironic in the context of the allusion to Medea given Aeetes' hostile pursuit of his daughter, which Medea in *Arg.* 4 is trying to escape.

quemne ...? In answering her second suggestion with a question rather than a statement Ariadne raises the emotional level as she moves from the physical to the moral impediments to escape: cf. also 178-9n. Adding the question as a relative clause mirrors Eur. *Med.* 503 οὐδ' σοὶ προδοῦσα καὶ πάτρην ἀφικόμην; (cf. also Ov. *Met.* 8.116 *quem tibi donavi?*). *quemne* = *eiusne quem* (similarly 183 *quine*). The compressed construction, which puts an incredulous or sarcastic emphasis onto the

pronoun ('the same father whom I abandoned?'), is common in Plautus, subsequently found occasionally in poetry (see LHS II §246, Holtze (1861-2) II.262); sometimes the relative clause hardly seems a question at all, as at 68.90-2 *Troia ... | quaene etiam nostro letum miserabile fratri attulit* (Heinsius' text; see Fordyce *ad loc.*). –ne can also be attached to a conjunction, e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 4.538 *quiane auxilio iuuat ante leuatos?* In context Dido's words contain a slight reminiscence of Ariadne, but Turnus' at Virg. *Aen.* 10.672-3 *quid manus illa uirum, qui me meaque arma secuti? | quosne (nefas) omnis infanda in morte reliqui ...?* are a stronger allusion; see Harrison *ad loc.*

ipsa reliqui As Baehrens points out *ipsa* means something like 'mea sponte', while (re)linquo is the word Ariadne uses for Theseus' desertion (133, 200, cf. 59 *linquens* n.); she represents her abandonment of her father as a comparable crime. But a comparison with Medea's προδοῦσα 'betraying' in the line evoked actually highlights the fact that Ariadne's guilt is far less than Medea's: 177-83n. Cf. also Eur. *Med.* 483 αὐτὴ δὲ πατέρα καὶ δόμους προδοῦσ' ἐμούς, Ap. *Arg.* 4.361-2 πάτρην τε κλέα τε μεγάρων αὐτούς τε τοκῆας | νοσφισάμην, earlier in the respective speeches, and Attis at 63.50-1 *patria o mei creatrix, patria o mea genetrix, | ego quam miser relinquens* (132-201n.).

181 Trappes-Lomax suggests transposing *respersum* and *fraterna* to avoid the possibility that readers will first take *respersum* with *quemne* before realising their mistake; but any such misapprehension would disappear on reading the next word, *iuuenem*, and the 'sandwiching' word order produced by the transposition does not seem enough of an advantage to justify changing the transmitted reading given that

this is not the only line in the poem in which two adjective + noun pairs are adjacent rather than interlaced: cf. e.g. 17, 75, 218, 227, 346, 390.

respersum ... fraterna caede Ariadne speaks as if when she left Crete with him (*secuta*) Theseus was still spattered with the Minotaur's blood. This concrete sense of *caedes*, primarily poetic, is first found in this poem (also 360, 368: *TLL* III.51.10-60); it occurs with *spargere/respergere* at e.g. Prop. 2.8.34, 2.30.21; Ov. *A.A.* 2.135-6, *Met.* 6.657, *Tr.* 4.4.64; Sen. *Ag.* 976. The combination of 'stained' + 'blood' + description of relationship is common in similar emotive imagery, usually describing guilt: cf. e.g. Cic. *S. Rosc.* 68 *respersas manus sanguine paterno*, Hor. *Serm.* 2.5.16-17 *cruentus sanguine fraterno*, Liv. 4.32.12 *respersos sanguine colonorum suorum*, Ov. *Am.* 2.14.28 *Colchida respersam puerorum sanguine* etc. In Virg. *Aen.* 4.21 *sparsos fraterna caede penates* the allusion to this line highlights the differences between Dido and Ariadne: see Nappa (2007) 384 and cf. 176 *hospes* n. Cf. also 399 *perfudere manus fraterno sanguine fratres* (another link to the crimes of the epilogue: 147n.), and Aegeus at 230 *ut tauri respergas sanguine dextram*.

On the Minotaur as Ariadne's brother see 150 *germanum* n. Again, in a passage that alludes to Medea, the reader will probably remember the murder of Apsyrtus (perhaps the Apollonian detail of Jason deliberately staining Medea's clothes with her brother's blood, Ap. *Arg.* 4.471-4), but will in that case also notice that it is not mentioned in the parallel passage of Eur. *Med.* (though the combination of references to leaving father and to dead brother here do perhaps evoke Medea's earlier cry at Eur. *Med.* 166-7 ὦ πάτερ, ὦ πόλις, ὦν ἀπενάσθη | αἰσχρῶς τὸν ἐμὸν κτεῖνασα κάσιν; Nuzzo suggests that there may be an allusion to the final alliteration in *caede secuta*). Instead the reference to the Minotaur's death here replaces Medea's reference to her killing of Pelias at the hands of his daughters (Eur. *Med.* 504-5); this

is an episode with no analogue in Ariadne's story and the contrast again suggests Ariadne's relative innocence. But Gracch. 61 Malcovati⁴ *at fratris sanguine madet* may also be evoked: so Zetzel (1983) 265, cf. 177-83, 177nn. Seneca's Medea does refer to her brother at the equivalent point, in diction alluding to Catullus: Sen. *Med.* 451-2 *patriumque regnum quaeque fraternus cruor | perfudit arua?* (also 456 *secuta*).

iuuenem See 58n. The word gains point from the fact that Ariadne's brother was *not* a *iuuenis*.

182-3 Women (and dependent men) making desperation speeches often emphasise their lack of the usual protectors: cf. e.g. Electra at Soph. *El.* 813-14 (brother, father), Hecuba at Eur. *Hec.* 159-61 (husband, children), Oedipus at Eur. *Phoen.* 1616-18 (wife, sons), Adherbal at Sall. *Iug.* 14.15 (father, brother, relatives); this is one version of the *topos* of asking what friends one might approach (177-83n.). Similarly, Helen and Dido specifically ask whether they might be able to find protection with a *new* husband: Eur. *Hel.* 294-7, Virg. *Aen.* 4.534-6. It is against this background that we should read 182 after the references to father and brother in 180-1: the question is, technically, asked in general terms, 'can I comfort myself with a husband's faithful love?'. But of course there is already an ironic hint of Theseus (esp. *fido*), and with the emphatic *quine* (cf. 180 *quemne* n.) and the following description Ariadne makes it clear that the only *coniunx* in question is the specific one who is deserting her and has in fact caused her desperate situation in the first place.

coniugis ... fido ... amore Perhaps echoing Medea's sarcasm as, after her questions, she summarises the situation Jason has left her in: Eur. *Med.* 510-11 θαυμαστόν δέ σε | ἔχω πόσιν καὶ πιστόν ἢ τάλαιν' ἐγώ. Cf. also 123 *coniunx* n.

While ideas of *amor* and *fides* are often found together, the collocation here is not common: cf. only Tib. 2.2.11 *uxoris fidos optabis amores* (with Murgatroyd and Maltby), Ov. *Her.* 2.21-2, Front. *Epist.* 1.1.4, Prud. *Ham.* 779. But the single word *fido* probably does not import the imagery of political alliance and *amicitia* with which Catullus uses *fides* etc. in the epigrams: see Ross (1969) 91 n.217.

memet Catullus also has 21.11 *temet*; the archaic suffix to the personal pronoun (see LHS I.464, N—W II.361-6) is common in Plautus but appears in e.g. Cicero only in combination with another pronoun (usually *ipsum*). It is more common in texts with a more ‘colloquial’ tone (e.g. Hor. *Serm.*, Apul. *Met.*) but continues to be used occasionally as an intensifier in epic (see Austin on Virg. *Aen.* 4.606, 1.207) and is quite frequent in Senecan tragedy.

183 A recapitulation of 58 *immemor at iuuenis fugiens pellit uada remis* (see n.); even if Ariadne can no longer see Theseus when she says this (167n.), she is in fact describing part of the scene on the *uestis* (see 132-201n.).

lentos curuans in gurgite remos ‘bending the pliant oars in the water’. As Fordyce explains, *lentus* = ‘yielding under pressure’, so if ‘yielding’ is emphasised it means ‘flexible’ (cf. the poplar at 290, vine at 61.102), if ‘under pressure’ then ‘tough’. Similar descriptions of bending oars confirm that here *lentos* primarily repeats the idea of *curuans*, i.e. it is proleptic (Ap. *Arg.* 2.591-2 ἐπεγνάμπτοντο δὲ κῶπαι | ἥντε καμπύλα τόξα, βιαζομένων ἡρώων, Virg. *Aen.* 3.384 *Trinacria lentandus remus in unda*, Manil. 4.284 *remis agere et lentas inflectere tonsas*, Sen. *Ag.* 437-8 *properat iuuentus omnis adductos simul | lentare remos*, *Ciris* 461 *flectitur in uiridi remus sale*); however *in gurgite*, like *in unda*, *in ... sale* and the descriptions of toiling rowers in the Apollonius and Seneca, also suggests an effort being made

against the resistance of the water (cf. Williams and Horsfall on *Aen.* 3.384). This particularly suits *fugit* as Ariadne imagines the effort Theseus puts into his flight, as at 58 *fugiens pellit uada remis*; again Theseus is described as if he were rowing his own ship (cf. also 174n.). Oars are also *lenti* at *Ov. Tr.* 4.1.9, *Sen. Phaed.* 306, *Mart.* 3.67.4; cf. *Claud.* 17.42 *lentandis*.

curuans in (Trappes-Lomax) should be read because *incuruo* means ‘bend’, not ‘bend in’; it also makes the sense of the ablative *gurgite* clearer (locative, not instrumental as in 178) and is supported by the use of *in* at *Aen.* 3.384, *Ciris* 461 (above), *Aen.* 5.209 (below). The two appearances of *gurgite* here and in 178 contrast with its two appearances at 14, 18 (cf. 179 *aequor n.*); but as there the idea of turbulence (178 *gurgite lato n.*) seems appropriate to the action of the oars (cf. *Virg. Aen.* 5.209 *in gurgite remos*, *Stat. Ach.* 1.26 *sub gurgite remos*, also line-endings).

184-7 Ariadne’s culminating description of her situation. Like 178-83, the lines fall into pairs: 184-5 are linked to what has gone before by the argumentative conjunction *praeterea*, but while 184 deals with another possible answer to the questions of 177, 185 with its generalisation of an earlier point (that of 178-9) has a summarising effect, leading smoothly into the summing-up in 186-7. Although Thomson is right that all four lines are devoted ‘to the idea of loneliness and desertion’, the increasing abstraction of the descriptions in these short, asyndetic clauses is crucial to the sense of closure: from *insula* and a (non-existent) *tecto* via *egressus* and the *pelagi ... undis* to *fugae ratio*, *spes* and then the replacement of any true noun with *omnia*, after which the only thing left in the landscape seems to be *letum*. Ariadne is dissociating herself from her surroundings even as she describes them, and after facing the

prospect of death is concerned with appropriately supernatural matters in the final section of her speech (188-201).

The negatives *nullo* and *nec* in 184-5 set up the twofold anaphora of *nulla* in 186, to which the threefold anaphora of *omnia* in 186-7 then responds; while the fact that this apparent antithesis is not in fact an antithesis of meaning adds to the sense of inevitability. The repetition seems appropriate to the homogeneity typically emphasised in literary descriptions of lonely landscapes (Schmale (2004) 183); see also Évrard-Gillis 113-15 on Catullus' use of repeated adjectives to link nouns that are synonyms, or at least express similar ideas (cf. e.g. *totus* in 69-70). Lines 186-7 contain a tricolon crescens whose last member, *ostentant omnia letum*, is further marked by the displacement of the word in anaphora until after the new verb: as well as creating a chiasmus in 187, this word order contrasts with the positions of the previous occurrences of *nulla* and *omnia* either at the start of the line or after the caesura or bucolic diaresis (Évrard-Gillis 94-5).

Some of these stylistic techniques find possible models in Apollonius' description of the desolate Syrtis at *Arg.* 4.1237-49; cf. esp. 1237-8 *πάντη γὰρ τέναγος, πάντη μνιόεντα βυθοῖο | τάρφεα* with 1239-40 *οὐδέ τι εἶσι | ἔρπετον οὐδὲ ποτητὸν αἰρείεται*, and 1247-9 *οὐδέ τιν' ἄρδμόν, | οὐ πάτον, οὐκ ἀπάνευθε κατηυγάσσαντο βοτήρων | αὖλιον, εὐκῆλῳ δὲ κατείχετο πάντα γαλήνῃ*. In the soliloquy of the shipwrecked Palaestra in Plaut. *Rud.* (164-70, 177-83n.) cf. also the question followed by description (with anaphora) at 204-6 *nunc quam spem aut opem aut consili quid capessam? | ita hic sola solis locis conpotita sum. | hic saxa sunt, hic mare sonat*; anaphora of negatives at 208 and 210; and 214 *algor, erro, pauor, me omnia tenent*. Ovid's Ariadne in *Her.* 10 uses the short sentences, asyndeton, anaphora and interplay of *omne* with negatives: 59-62 *uacat insula cultu: | non*

*hominum uideo, non ego facta boum. | omne latus terrae cingit mare: nauita
nusquam, | nulla per ambiguas puppis itura uias.*

184 Further possible sources of *spes* are dismissed. Not only are there no humans visible (cf. the similar 168), there are not even any signs of habitation to give Ariadne the hope of meeting any; or, alternatively, she complains of the lack of any shelter that might help her survive. Cf. Plaut. *Rud.* 210 *nec cibo nec loco tecta quo sim scio*, 214 *nec prope usquam hic quidem cultum agrum conspicio*; Ov. *Her.* 10.59 *uacat insula cultu*.

praeterea Not prosaic, as Kroll thinks (e.g. four appearances in Catullus, 20 in Virg. *Aen.*, 15 in Ovid); Axelson 138 n.8.

nullo colitur sola insula tecto The transmitted text is defended (e.g. by Ellis, Friedrich, Quinn, Vahlen (1907-8) 119-20, Arkins (1994) 222) as *nullo litus, sola insula, tecto*, with reference to the ‘inserted apposition’ construction familiar in Roman poetry from Virg. *Ecl.* onwards (e.g. *Ecl.* 1.57 *raucae, tua cura, palumbes*: see Solodow (1986)). But it would be neither inserted nor an apposition – the *litus* is not the same as the whole *insula* – and with no verb the relationship of *nullo tecto* to *litus* is extremely strained (Quinn, vaguely, ‘descriptive ablative’). A verb, meaning ‘is provided with’, is therefore needed to replace *litus*, and *colitur* (Palmer 1879) provides an elegant solution; Nuzzo and Trappes-Lomax object to the sense, but though ‘is inhabited by no building’ sounds odd in English it seems well enough paralleled by the examples adduced by Palmer in his edition *ad loc.* (esp. Plin. *N.H.* 3.9.8 *crebris dextra laeuaque accolitur oppidis* and the analogous Sen. *Tro.* 826 *Olenos tectis habitata raris*). It is also very close palaeographically to the paradosis (haplography of very similar *lo* and *co*, common confusion of *r* and *s*, and a scribe

would of course be thinking of seaside words like *litus*; see also Thomson), and a plausible source for Ov. *Her.* 10.59 (above).

For *sola* of lonely places cf. 57 *in sola ... harena* n. and 154 *sola sub rupe*; the usage occurs in Palaestra's speech at Plaut. *Rud.* 205 *ita hic sola solis locis compotita* (cf. 164-70, 177-83nn.).

185 'nor does a way out lie open through the encircling waves of the sea' (ablative of route, probably a kind of instrumental ablative). As Kroll notes, while this is reminiscent of 178-9 (especially its 'sea' periphrasis), the point made here is more general, that not only return to Crete but escape in any direction is impossible: Ariadne's last concrete description has a closural simplicity. Cf. Ov. *Her.* 10.61 *omne latus terrae cingit mare*. Ovid's use of elements of this line and 186 in his description of Daedalus and Icarus at the beginning of *A.A.* 2 may also be deliberate, especially since that is another Cretan story: 32 *egressus non dabat ille uiro*, 36 *nec tellus nostrae nec patet unda fugae*.

egressus might just recall 114 *egredientem*, 116 *digressus*; Nonnus' Ariadne at the equivalent point explicitly compares her situation to Theseus' in the Labyrinth, wishing for a thread that would lead her from Naxos to Athens (*Dion.* 47.384-7).

pelagi ... cingentibus undis Cf. 127 *pelagi uastos ... aestus* n. *cingo* is regularly used of the sea around islands or Ocean around the world (*TLL* III.1066.5-23), cf. Ov. *Her.* 10.61 (above); of *undae* also at Virg. *Aen.* 9.790, Ov. *Met.* 13.925.

186 nulla fugae ratio, nulla spes The final answers to 177, respectively to *quo me referam?* and *quali spe perdita nitor?* Cf. the bald οὐκ ἔστι with which Medea answers her self-addressed questions the first time she asks herself about possible

places of refuge at Eur. *Med.* 386-9; also Soph. *Ai.* 470. *est* is easily supplied from 187 *sunt*.

fugae ratio = ‘means of escape’ (*OLD* s.v. *ratio* 14); other extant occurrences are in contemporaries of Catullus, and with a meaning more like ‘plan for escaping’ (*OLD* s.v. *ratio* 10; Caes. *B.C.* 2.31.1, Cic. *Att.* 8.1.3).

In *nulla spes* the final short vowel is treated as long before *sp-* (in arsis). Contrast 357 *undā Scamandri* and cf. 67.32 *supposita speculae* and in iambic metres 17.24 *pote stolidum*, 22.12 *modo scurra*, 44.18 *nefaria scripta*, 63.53 *gelida stabula*; see Housman (1972) 1140. Short open vowels before *sp-* *sc-* *sm-* *st-* are often kept short in Lucretius and Hor. *Serm.*, sometimes in elegy (see Platnauer 62-3 and Heyworth, *Cynthia* on Prop. 2.13.19) but in poetry outside Catullus are usually avoided altogether (see Skutsch (1985) 57-8, Horsfall on Virg. *Aen.* 11.309): the only examples of comparable lengthening seem to be Tib. 1.5.28 *pro segete spicas*, Gratt. 142 *generosa stirpibus arbor*, 259 *uulpina species* (but see also Bailey on Lucr. 3.493, Heyworth, *Cynthia* on Prop. 3.11.46).

omnia muta For descriptions of the silence of desolate places cf. e.g. Prop. 1.18.1 *deserta loca et taciturna querenti*, Curt. 10.5.7 *mox uelut in uasta solitudine omnia tristi silentio muta torpebant*, Sen. *H.F.* 536 *mutis tacitum litoribus mare*. Putnam (1961) 178 points out that Catullus elsewhere associates *mutus* with death: 96.1, 101.4. *mutus* originally = ‘inarticulate’, thence ‘dumb’ and then ‘silent’; the idea of possible hearers explored in 164-8 is alluded to, and the implied contrast with Ariadne’s own speech (emphasised by *omnia*; Ariadne is in fact the only thing on the island that is *not* silent) again sounds the theme of the failure of communication. For the second-time reader there is also an ironic contrast with the Bacchic noise of 251-64 which raises further questions about the particular moments in Ariadne’s story to

which the poem and the *uestis* give access: everything is silent when Ariadne makes her speech, but everything is not silent in the picture (cf. also 52 *fluentis*ono n.).

187 ostentant omnia letum For Ariadne's expectation of death cf. 152-3. *ostentant* is used vividly, 'display', approaching 'threaten' (cf. *TLL* IX.2.1145.68-1146.2). Pac. *trag.* 54 Schierl *mortem ostentant* (of enemies) supports this reading against Orelli, who refers to Virg. *Aen.* 1.91 *praesentemque uiris intentant omnia mortem*, commenting 'Vergilius hoc loco fortasse legerat *intentant*'; Virgil rather alludes to Catullus with variation of prefix (119, 177nn.; Wills 436) and synonym. On the high stylistic level of *letum* see 149n. Here it has a closural function as the very last word of the lament proper: death, Ariadne thinks, will be the result of the situation explored in the whole speech so far and especially in 177-87 (see 177-83n. on death as the expected conclusion in a desperation speech). But it also helps to effect the transition to the curse via *tamen* and the fuller descriptions of death in 188-9.

188-201 The final curse has an urgency and sense of purpose which is lacking from the earlier sections of the speech. For the first time Ariadne is confident that her words are actually being heard, and the 'marked rise in the quality of the rhetoric' here (Quinn) is accordingly intended to persuade her divine audience to do what she wants and punish Theseus. The lines are clearly articulated in three long periods, and vividness, pleonasm and especially the order of words and ideas are used throughout to establish in convincing terms Ariadne's view of the relationships among the key characters and concepts involved (see also 190-1n.): herself, the Furies, Theseus; her suffering, Theseus' abandonment of her, the Furies' punishment of him. The final four lines in particular, by linking all of these, form a highly effective conclusion to

the curse and therefore to the whole speech. With 195 *querelas* the rhetoric also becomes extremely self-conscious: Ariadne's primary evidence for the genuineness of her suffering and need for justice is (the sincerity of) her lament itself.

On the goddesses addressed here see esp. *RE* suppl. VIII, *LIMC* and Roscher I.1 s.v. 'Erinyes'; the Greek Erinyes/Eumenides seem to have been already well-known in Roman literature (esp. tragedy, as shown by e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 4.471-3, Prop. 2.21.39 *tragicæ ... Erinyes*; see Goldberg (2005) 115-43), often under the name *Furiae* (see *RE* VII s.v. 'Furiae', Jocelyn (1967) 218-19 and esp. Cic. *N.D.* 3.46). In both Greek and Roman evidence from Homer onwards they are regularly invoked in curses or described as fulfilling curses, and may even be thought of as curses personified (in Latin sometimes identified with *Dirae*). Particular models for Ariadne's appeal to them here are Ap. *Arg.* 4.384-90, Medea's imprecations at the end of her speech to Jason (cf. 132-8, 149-53, 177-83nn.) and Soph. *Ai.* 835-44 (Ajax's speech before his suicide), which similarly summons the goddesses, describes them, invites them to take notice of the speaker's sufferings (837 $\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ ~ 195 *audite*) and asks them to take vengeance; cf. 177-83n. for allusions to Ajax's earlier desperation speech.

As goddesses of curses and vengeance the Furies were associated with the punishment of various crimes: three have particular relevance here. At *Il.* 19.259-60, Hes. *Op.* 803-4, Alc. 129.13-20 Voigt they are linked with oaths and the punishment of perjury: cf. 132-3 *perfide*, 139-48. Their association with violations of family bonds (e.g. kin-murder, adultery) would be appropriate here since Ariadne thinks of Theseus as a (promised) husband (139-41, 182-3), and taking this further, the treatment of faith in love as comparable to family loyalty might be seen as particularly Catullan (so Konstan (1977) 79); see also 192n. But above all, the

relevant crime is murder: the curse arises from Ariadne's conclusion in 187 that she is about to die, and at 200-1 it is strongly implied that she considers Theseus guilty of murdering her. The dying or the ghosts of the dead typically call upon the Furies for vengeance on their murderers, and sometimes a dying person threatens to come back *as* a Fury (see further Watson (1991) 29 n.131), an idea evoked by Ariadne's assimilation of herself to her audience in several details here (192-7); cf. Dido at Virg. *Aen.* 4.384-6 *sequar atris ignibus*

Ariadne's curse may also be compared more generally to other curses uttered by dying people, whether or not the Furies are involved: besides Ajax and Virgil's Dido (*Aen.* 4.607-29) cf. e.g. Eurydice at Soph. *Ant.* 1304-5 or the boy at Hor. *Epod.* 5.89-102 and see further Watson (1991) 27, Speyer (1969) 1194-5. The ubiquity of this phenomenon is partly a result of the practical consideration that speakers with no other means of revenge often resort to curses (Watson (1991) 6-7); more schematically, the dying seem to gain a compensatory power from their weakness, or from their soul being about to cross into the supernatural realm (cf. Cic. *Diu.* 1.63 *animus ... appropinquante morte multo est diuinior*). Hence perhaps Ariadne's emphasis on physical and emotional weakness (188-9, 196-7) as well as approaching death. Relevant too is the close relationship of prophetic vision with imminent death (e.g. Patroclus' and Hector's predictions of their respective killers' deaths at *Il.* 16.852-4, 22.358-60, and the Virgilian version at *Aen.* 10.739-41); prophecy and curse are overlapping concepts (Watson (1991) 23-4). Cf. also 76.17-18, where Catullus seems to express a belief that the gods are more likely to answer the prayers of the dying.

Literary prophecies and curses may or may not be fulfilled within the scope of the text itself (as e.g. Patroclus' is within the *Iliad* while Hector's is not). Whereas

the rest of the speech either looks back at the events narrated in 76-115 or is concerned with Dia and the scene depicted on the *uestis*, the curse is much less descriptive or ecphrastic (132-201n.): it demands narrative resolution, raising the question whether readers of the poem or viewers of the tapestry will see its effect. For a first-time reader the only clues to the next part of the story are the final *suosque* and the idea that Theseus will somehow cause death *tali mente*; but the method of the curse's fulfilment is also foreshadowed in the verbal links that, with ironic appropriateness, assimilate Ariadne to Aegeus (188, 196, 197, 199).

188-91 Ariadne announces in deliberate and forceful terms her intention to ask the gods to punish Theseus: cf. Iliona at Pac. *trag.* 152 Schierl *di me etsi perdunt, tamen esse adiutam expetunt | cum prius quam intereo spatium ulciscendi danunt*. The urgency of *non ante* and *nec prius*, together with the close association of her prayer (*comprecere*) with her *postrema hora*, imply that Ariadne equates the end of her speech with the end of her life. In realistic terms this seems unreasonable, but it is appropriate for her role in the poem and the myth, suggesting a self-consciousness of the fact that once her speech is over she has no further actions to perform (except being married to a god, of course).

188 non tamen ante The combination marks the rise in energy and Ariadne's refusal to accept the *letum* of 187 unavenged (188-201n.): similarly in Iphis' speech before his suicide, Ov. *Met.* 14.724.

mihi languescent lumina morte With sensuous chiasmic alliteration, Ariadne imagines a rather gentle death: among other forms of physical weakness including drunkenness and lovesickness (cf. 99), *languor* and cognates are particularly

associated with (death from) illness, exhaustion or old age. Cf. (with a similar construction) Lucretius' plague victim, 6.1218 *languebat morte propinqua*. For *languor* affecting eyes cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 1.716, Sen. *Controu.* 9.2.7, V.Fl. 4.388-9, Mart. 14.5.1 and esp. 219-20 *languida ... | lumina* of Aegeus.

189 nec With the paired negatives opening 188-9 Ariadne resists the situation described with repeated negatives in 184-7.

prius *uariatio* of *prius* and *ante* may occur with separate *quam* clauses (e.g. Cic. *Fin.* 4.65, Liv. 28.41.9, Ov. *Pont.* 11.7-10) or, as here, with a shared one (e.g. Lucr. 4.836-7, Virg. *Aen.* 4.24-7, Prop. 1.15.29-31).

a fesso secedent corpore sensus The general idea is that of a life-force leaving the body at the moment of death, like the Homeric *ψυχή*. For *sensus* ('sensation', 'consciousness') in such descriptions cf. e.g. Cic. *Sest.* 47, *Tusc.* 1.24, *Amic.* 14, Lucr. 3.527, 546 etc.; debates over whether *sensus* can remain after death are frequent. The plural suggests the physical senses, appropriate after the evocation of sight in 188. For the verb cf. Lucr. 2.34 *nec calidae citius decedunt corpore febres*, Ov. *Met.* 3.467 *o utinam a nostro secedere corpore possem*, Luc. 5.760 *attonito cesserunt pectore sensus*. *fesso* mirrors 188 *languescit* (being very close in meaning, *fessus* and *languidus* etc. are often found together), and as such could mean little more than 'dying', as at Tac. *Ann.* 2.71 *dein fesso corpore*, of Germanicus. But Ariadne presumably expects that physical exhaustion and starvation will cause her death, and as often (cf. *OLD* s.v.) *fessus* also connotes mental weariness; since Ariadne seems to think that death is imminent (188-91n.), the suggestion is that *fesso corpore* describes her current situation and therefore that the speech itself has exhausted her.

At *Ciris* 448 *fessae fugiunt de corpore uires* the probable imitation of this line supports the transmitted location of lines 448-53 in Scylla's speech (see Lyne *ad loc.*), but perhaps also Schrader's *fesso*.

190-1 The repetitions of sense here allow interweaving of the key concepts of the exalted gods (*diuis, caelestum*), Ariadne's injured state (*prodita, postrema hora*), her appeal (*exposcam, comprecer*) and, following from the combination of these factors, her confidence in the rightness of her cause and the gods' power to avenge (*iustam, fidem*). This rhetoric associates Ariadne's will with that of the gods, far above Theseus in both moral rectitude and power.

190 iustam Cf. 406 *iustificam ... mentem ... deorum*, where the narrator apparently shares Ariadne's view that the gods are just.

exposcam 'implore' rather than 'demand' when addressed to the gods (*TLL* V.2.1772.10-26); *ex-* intensifies. See also *TLL* V.2.1772.46-59 for the construction with *ab*. Repeated in the narrator's summary of the curse at 203 *supplicium saeuis exposcens anxia factis*.

prodita echoes 177 *perdita*, but is stronger: Ariadne reinforces the point of *iustam* by emphasising that she is the wronged party. Cf. also Ov. *Her.* 10.117-18 *in me iurarunt somnus uentusque fidesque: | prodita sum causis una puella tribus*.

multam 'penalty', generalised from its original sense 'a fine'. Possibly connected with *multus, melior* (Walde-Hofmann s.v., de Vaan s.v. *multus*), *multa* has cognates in other Italic languages and is explained as Sabine by Varro *ap.* Gell. 11.1.5, Oscan by Paul. Fest. 143. Cf. 192 *multantes* n.; the noun is even rarer than the verb in classical poetry, occurring elsewhere only at Ov. *Fast.* 5.291 (stricter

sense). The effect is to present Theseus as a common criminal: a rhetorically effective deglamourising of Ariadne's opponent, particularly noticeable in its contrast of register with the otherwise exalted tone of 190-1 (esp. the juxtaposed *caelestum*).

191 caelestumque fidem ... comprecere 'invoke the protection of the gods'. Ariadne first appeals to divine justice in general terms (cf. 190 *diuis*), not specifying the infernal Furies until 192. *caelestis* is an elevated though not exclusively poetic word, first extant at Enn. *Var.* 23 Vahlen²; it is repeated at 204 (cf. 190 *exposcam* n.). This form of the genitive is common in poetry, since *caelestium* can only occur in hexameters if elided; see N—W II.65. *fides* with a verb of invocation = 'help, protection', frequently of the gods (*TLL* VI.1.663.63-667.60 esp. 665.73ff., see Fraenkel (1916) 193-8, Heinze (1929) and cf. also 34.1 *Diana sumus in fide*); but a contrast is also felt here with *perfidus* Theseus.

postrema ... hora A variation on 169 *extremo tempore* (see n.) and a unique collocation in classical authors (PHI 5.3); Virg. *Ecl.* 8.19-20 *dum queror et diuos, quamquam nil testibus illis | profeci, extrema moriens tamen adloquor hora* (= *Ciris* 405-6) alludes to the whole couplet 190-1 with the more usual *extrema hora*. Catullus has *postremus* in a similar context at 101.3 *postremo ... munere mortis*.

192-7 Ariadne describes the Furies vividly, as if she could see them, then summons them, as if in order to see them. The colourful picture distracts the reader for a moment from Ariadne's sufferings (Jenkyns (1982) 119), but then lends its power to the emphatic assertion of them in 195-7: continuing to assimilate herself to the gods she is invoking (190-1n.), Ariadne sounds like a Fury herself, bringing forth *querelas*

pectore ab imo as they produce *pectoris iras*, and affected by burning passion (197) like the Furies' traditional torches.

192 quare Connectives implying a logical link are much more frequent in the curse than in the lamenting part of the speech: cf. 188 *tamen*, 188-90 *ante ... prius ... quam*, 198 *quoniam*. Culminating in 200-1 *quali ... tali*, they all emphasise the justice of Ariadne's claim.

facta uirum multantes uindice poena As often in prayers, a summary of the addressees' powers: for this motif in invocations of the Furies cf. e.g. Soph. *El.* 113-14 αἱ τοὺς ἀδίκους θνήσκοντας ὁρᾷ, | αἱ τοὺς εὐνὰς ὑποκλεπτομένους, *Ai.* 836 αἰεὶ θ' ὁρώσας πάντα τὰν βροτοῖς πάθη (where 'seeing' implies 'avenging'). As in the latter, their infliction of punishment is referred to in general terms (cf. also Cic. *N.D.* 3.46 *Furiae deae sunt ... uindices facinorum et sceleris*). *facta uirum* therefore = 'human crimes' (for this negative sense of *factum* see *TLL* VI.1.127.16-128.9 and cf. e.g. 30.12 *facti ... tui*); it more often means 'deeds of heroes', κλέα ἀνδρῶν (e.g. Lucr. 5.328, Ov. *Am.* 3.1.25, Sil. 10.496), so the combination with *multantes* again deflates Theseus' heroic status (190 *multam* n.). *uirum* also suggests 'husbands' (cf. 133n.); given Ariadne's generalisations about *uiri* at 143-8, the phrase evokes perjury or violation of quasi-familial bonds as offences that might particularly deserve the Furies' punishment in this case (188-201n.).

The verbal excess of *multantes uindice poena* conveys the goddesses' devastating power. On *multantes* see 190n. The verb, first found in Naevius, appears elsewhere in classical poetry only at Virg. *Aen.* 11.839 (see Horsfall *ad loc.*), Sen. *Med.* 192; see further Axelson 68 on poetic diction for 'to punish'. *multare poena* also at Cic. *Tusc.* 1.100, Colum. 1.8.16, 12.3.11, Justin. 3.1.1.7. *uindex* is first used

as an adjective here (probably an extension of an appositional use when applied to things, see *OLD* s.v. 3b): later at e.g. Ov. *Met.* 1.230 *uindice flamma*, Sen. *Med.* 532, Luc. 10.21 *uindice fato*.

193 Eumenides The propitiatory euphemism, which is common in Greek literature from the late fifth century onwards (see esp. Lloyd-Jones (1990), Henrichs (1991), *RE* suppl. VIII.88) appears regularly in Latin poetry after Catullus; the only earlier example extant is Lucil. 176 Krenkel, but Ennius translated Aeschylus' *Eumenides* (see Jocelyn) and it was the title of one of Varro's Menippean satires. Cicero also mentions the name (*De nat. deor.* 3.46). Via a reader's awareness of e.g. Aesch. *Eum.*, Soph. *O.C.* it may evoke the goddesses' associations with Athens, especially as a city famous for its justice, and therefore be an appropriate choice as Ariadne appeals for punishment of an Athenian offender (Armstrong (2006) 212); contrast Medea at Ap. *Arg.* 4.386 Ἐρινύες.

anguino redimita capillo The association of chthonic deities and monsters with snakes is widespread, and the Erinyes may at an early stage have been imagined as snakes: see *RE* suppl. VIII.124-5 and e.g. *Eum.* 128 δεινῆς δρακαίνης, Eur. *I.T.* 286 Ἄιδου δρόκαινα. Paus. 1.28.6 claims that Aeschylus first represented the Furies with snakes in their hair; if so, he may have humanised them so that they could be acted by the chorus in *Eum.* See Garvie on *Choeph.* 1049-50 πεπλεκτανημένοι | πυκνοῖς δρόκουσιν, which seems to be the first extant literary description of the detail. But that passage might in fact refer to arms wreathed with snakes, as apparently at Eur. *El.* 1345 χειροδρόκοντες, or to another part of the body; vaguer references in tragedy include Eur. *Or.* 256 δρακοντώδεις κόραι, *I.T.* 287 δειναῖς ἐχίδναις ἐστομωμένα, and snakes appear on arms, heads or both in artistic

representations of the goddesses from the fifth century on (*LIMC* s.v. ‘Erinys’, Prag (1985) pll. 31-3). In Roman poetry the association of snakes with hair predominates: either the snakes are the hair (Tib. 1.3.69-70 *impexa feros pro crinibus angues*, see Smith *ad loc.*; Claud. *Rapt.* 1.39 *crinita sontibus hydrys*), or they are entwined with it (e.g. Virg. *Georg.* 4.482-3, Hor. *Carm.* 2.13.35-6, Ov. *Met.* 4.454); some references are ambiguous. Here the first is more likely; *anguinus* usually means ‘of a snake, consisting of snakes’, while this rare use of *redimitus* ‘wreathed round’ of hair itself (rather than a garland etc. around the hair) finds its best parallel in Lygd. 4.87 *nec canis anguina redimitus terga caterua*, of the snakes growing from Cerberus’ back.

194 The combination of *frons* and *pectus* shows how the Furies’ outward appearance clearly demonstrates their inward nature (cf. 34): this makes them opposite to the deceitful Theseus whom they will punish (Schmale (2004) 186). *praeporto* is extant (apart from two late, Christian occurrences, see *TLL* s.v.) only in poetry contemporary with Catullus: Cic. *Arat.* 209, 430, where it means literally ‘carry in front’, and Lucr. 2.621 *telaque praeportant uiolenti signa furoris*, where as here it means ‘display’ (subject *tela*, object *signa*), and similarly describes the threatening manifestation of rage, though *signa* there softens the metaphor.

expirantis is accusative plural with *iras*, intransitive: ‘blasting out’. Cf. e.g. Lucr. 6.639-40 *per fauces montis ut Aetnae | expirent ignes* and see *TLL* V.2.1902.59-74. The *pectus* is both the site of the lungs and the seat of the emotions (cf. 125n.), and the whole expression goes back to the understanding of the breath as itself constituting emotion, especially anger: cf. e.g. *Il.* 3.8 etc. μένεα πνείοντες, Eur. *Phoen.* 876-7 ἐκ δ’ ἔπνευσ’ αὐτοῖς ἀράς | δεινάς, *Bacch.* 620 θυμὸν ἐκπνέων with Dodds, Onians (1954²) 49-56. Catullus may also have been influenced by tragic

descriptions of the Furies' breath (noxious snores at Aesch. *Eum.* 53-4, bloody and fiery breath at *Eum.* 137-9, Eur. *I.T.* 298 πῦρ πνέουσα καὶ φόνον), while the breath of snakes was also supposed to be poisonous (see e.g. Hor. *Serm.* 2.8.94-5 with Lejay, Spaltenstein on Sil. 6.158): the Allecto/Amata scene at Virg. *Aen.* 7.346-53 uses a similar combination of imagery (esp. 351 *uipeream inspirans animam*). The hissing and spitting alliteration of *s* and *p* suggests that it is the snakes that breathe the *iras*.

195 Combinations of imperatives beginning with 'come' are of course common in invocations: but cf. esp. Soph. *Ai.* 834-5, Virg. *Aen.* 4.611-23 (188-201n.).

huc huc aduentate Cf. 61.8-9 *huc | huc ueni* and e.g. Virg. *Georg.* 2.4-7, Ov. *Ibis* 67 *huc, precor, huc uestras omnes aduertite mentes*, Eins. *Ecl.* 1.36 *huc huc, Pierides, uolucris concedite saltu*, *Priap.* 14.1-2, as well as cases of doubled *procul* (the opposite of *huc*); gemination in general is an important feature of ritual language (Norden on Virg. *Aen.* 6.46). But repeated *huc* occurs in other sorts of address in Senecan tragedy (cf. also e.g. Petron. 23.3, repeated δεῦρο at Ar. *Au.* 259, *Eccl.* 952, 960, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 680), so does not always have sacral connotations: see Wills 110-11.

meas audite querelas Alluded to by Virg. *Aen.* 4.612 *et nostras audite preces* (also at the end of the invocation and preceding the request; cf. 188-201n.) and by Ov. *Fast.* 3.471 *en iterum, fluctus, similes audite querelas* (cf. 132-201n.). There Ariadne echoes the end of this speech at the beginning of her new lament, i.e. picking up where she left off; Ovid marks the allusion with *similes*, and perhaps sees similar self-consciousness already in Catullus' Ariadne, who is able to characterise her whole

speech as *querelae* (cf. 130n., 223) and present it to the Furies as the primary evidence in her case (196-8).

196 quas ego *ego* second in the clause emphasises *quas*: see Adams (1999). Ariadne's argument for the importance of her *querelae* is sharply articulated (cf. 198 *quae*).

uae misera In earlier Latin *uae* is followed by a dative (occasionally accusative), usually a personal pronoun or similar and sometimes with an emotive adjective: N—W II.985-6, Hofmann (1926) 13, cf. Caper, *De orthog.* 101.6. It is colloquial and rarely appears in classical authors (see N—H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.3-4). Where it does, it is either in casual contexts, following the old usage (e.g. 8.15 *scelesta, uae te*), or, as here, with a less clearly colloquial tone, to emphasise either an adjective (Ov. *Am.* 3.6.101 *huic ego uae demens narrabam fluminum amores*, *Med.* fr. 2 Ribbeck³ *feror huc illuc uae plena deo*) or a whole sentence (Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.3-4 *uae meum* | *feruens difficili bile tumet iecur*, Ov. *Met.* 11.723), without affecting the cases of the surrounding words. It has a particular association with (self-pitying) *miser* both in comedy, where *uae misero* (–ae) *mihi* is a common phrase, and in this later use: Virg. *Ecl.* 9.28 *Mantua uae miserae nimium uicina Cremonae*, Ov. *Her.* 3.82, 8.8, 21.69, *Ibis* 205, Calp. Sic. 3.51. On *miser* see 57n. and cf. Ov. *Fast.* 3.486 *me miseram, quotiens haec ego uerba loquar?* (132-201n.).

extremis proferre medullis Cf. 93 *imis exarsit tota medullis*: Ariadne's curse comes from the same depths as her original love. Passion may be felt in the marrow (93n.) or the *pectus* (e.g. 69), but words or cries are usually brought forth only from the latter (125, 198, 202, cf. 194nn.); cf. only Apul. *Met.* 7.2 *medullitus ingemebam*. Ariadne's violent description is reminiscent of the similarly striking 72

(see n.) and prepares for the climactic excess of 197. *extremis*, ‘uttermost’, though an unusual use, should not therefore be normalised to (*ex*) *imis*: cf. Ov. *Her.* 4.70 *acer in extremis ossibus haesit amor* and perhaps Prop. 1.11.6 *ecquis in extremo pectore restat amor* (with Heimreich’s text; see Heyworth, *Cynthia ad loc.*). Cf. also Aegeus at 223 *multas expromam mente querelas*. *proferre* described the equivalent action to *expirantis praeporat* (192-7n.) and also works together with 198 *nascuntur* (Duban (1980) 783-4); cf. e.g. Sen. *N.Q.* 7.32.1 *nondum tota se nequitia protulit: adhuc nascitur*, Luc. 9.902-3 *calido cum protulit ouo | inplumis natos*, and see *TLL* X.2.61-73.

197 Summing up, Ariadne describes her emotional state to the Furies as the narrator has repeatedly described it to the reader: cf. 54, 93-4, 124 as well as 250 and her earlier comment, 165 *externata malo*. Every word indicates lack of control, yet the line contains a neat tricolon crescens. The particular pattern here is a tragic one which usually describes exile: Eur. *Hec.* 811 ὄπολις ἔρημος ἀθλιωτάτη βροτῶν, *Hipp.* 1029 ὄπολις ὄοικος φυγὰς ἀλητεύων χθόνα (interpolated: Barrett compares *fr. tr. adesp.* 284 ὄπολις ὄοικος πατρίδος ἐστερημενος), Acc. *trag.* 415 Ribbeck³ *exul inter hostis, exspes expers desertus uagus* (Medea), Ov. *Her.* 6.162 *erret inops, exspes, caede cruenta sua* (Hypsipyle’s curse on Medea), Sen. *Med.* 123 *incerta, uecors, mente non sana feror*; an exile-like situation very comparable to Ariadne’s at Ov. *Met.* 14.217 *solus, inops, exspes, leto poenaque relictus* (Achemenides); cf. also Antigone facing death, Soph. *Ant.* 876 ἄκλαυτος ἄφιλος ἀνυμέναιος ἃ ταλαίφρων, and see below.

cogor Cf. Aegeus at 216 (with *extrema ... senectae* in 217 as *extremis ... medullis* in 196 here). *cogor* is particularly common in Propertius and Ovid (see

Pichon s.v.); the necessity or victimisation that it usually expresses can be tendentious, especially where speaking or writing is at stake, e.g. Lucr. 1.370-1 *ne te deducere uero | possit, quod quidam fingunt, praecurrere cogor*, Prop. 1.16.13 *grauibus cogor deflere querelis*, Ov. Met. 9.545-6 *superata fateri | cogor* (Byblis).

inops ‘helpless’: given the content of the rest of the line this could = ‘mentally distraught’, like *inops animi* (cf. Virg. Aen. 4.300-1 *saeuit inops animi totamque incensa per urbem | bacchatur* with Pease, Fourcade (1979) 95). But there is no defining genitive, and her helplessness is also physical.

amens, ardenti caeca furore The typical repetition of negative prefixes in lines of this kind (see above) supports Nisbet’s text, which aligns *inops* and *amens*. Moreover when *amens* and *caecus* appear together elsewhere they apply to the same thing, usually the person (Cic. Sest. 7.17 *caecus atque amens tribunus*, Luc. 7.747 *amentes aurique cupidine caecos* (interpolated)), sometimes the emotion (Luc. 10.146-7 *pro caecus et amens | ambitione furor*, cf. Val. Max. 9.1 ext. 4 *caecam et amentem luxuriam*); cf. also Acc. trag. 450 Ribbeck³ *heu! cor ira feruit caecum, amentia rapior ferorque*. Cf. 124 *ardenti corde furentem* n. for the emotional sense of *ardeo* and combination with *furor*, *furere*, and on *furor* see 54n.; *furor* is itself *ardens* at Apul. Met. 9.2 *ardentique prorsus furore*, Lact. Phoen. 18 *ardens caedis amore Furor*. While unqualified *ardens* of Ariadne would be possible (cf. Hor. Serm. 1.4.48-9 *at pater ardens | saeuit*), it would mean ‘blazing with anger’, which is not the point made in the rest of the line.

For being mentally *caecus* with a specified passion see TLL III.44.7-28; *furore* at Virg. Aen. 2.244, Liv. 22.28.14, cf. Hor. Epod. 7.13 *furorne caecus*. Ariadne calls herself ‘blind’ although on the *uestis* she characteristically sees (52 *prospectans* n., cf. Rees (1994) 197); the description here evokes the idea of being

blinded by the emotional impact of a sight. At 207-8 *ipse autem caeca mentem caligine Theseus | consitus* Ariadne's curse causes Theseus too to suffer from mental blindness: cf. the reciprocity of 200-1n.

198 Cf. Lucr. 3.57 *nam uerae uoces tum demum pectore ab imo | eliciuntur et eripitur persona, manet res*, of a person's character being clear in their words only in adversity; *quae quoniam* also seems to give a Lucretian flavour (see below). If Catullus is alluding to Lucretius, this fits the emphasis here on honesty in implied contrast with Theseus' deceit (194n.). Cf. 165 *nullis sensibus auctae*, 166nn. for another possible Lucretian allusion in a context involving *uoces*, and see Munro on Lucr. 3.57, Friedrich 396-7 for lists of *loci similes* in Lucretius and Cat. 64.

quae quoniam Relative pronoun + *quoniam* is a frequent formula in Lucretius, usually at the beginning of the line: *quae quoniam* at 1.21, 607, 2.512, 4.1092, 5.150. It is of course appropriate to Ariadne's argumentative style here (192 *quare* n.). Catullus also has 99.15 *quam quoniam poenam misero proponis amori*; otherwise the locution is prosaic except for *Priap.* 6.35, an interpolation in Manilius (4.119), and 14 times in later Ovid (*Met.*, *Tr.*, *Pont.*).

uerae 'just', containing true accusations, so that *uera querela* = *uerum crimen*. It also works with *nascuntur*: Lee 'since they are true children of my inmost heart' (cf. e.g. Ter. *Heaut.* 988-9 *nunc filia | postquamst inuenta uera*). The assonant echo of *uerae nascuntur* in 199 *uanescere* evokes the common opposition of *uerus* and *uanus* 'groundless', 'untrue', e.g. Ter. *Eun.* 103-4; Ariadne asks that her words, being *uerae*, should not disappear unfulfilled like Theseus' (59, 142)

nascuntur Ironic given the sterility of Ariadne's relationship with Theseus (cf. 65 *lactentis*, 92 *concepit* nn.).

pectore ab imo Cf. 125 *imo ... e pectore* n. Line-ending *pectore ab imo* also at Lucr. 3.57 (see above), Virg. *Aen.* 1.485 and 6.55, where Norden postulates an Ennian source (cf. 166n.).

199 uos Emphatically positioned, and working with *nostrum* and 196 *ego*; pronouns are often important in prayers to forge the relationship between speaker and addressee that the speaker hopes will lead to the prayer being answered (cf. 24n.).

nolite pati *noli(te)* + infinitive is prosaic (see Axelson 135) and the phrase is therefore all the more marked as borrowed from oratorical language, where it typically occurs in perorations: cf. Cic. *S. Rosc.* 154 *hanc pati nolite diutius in hac re publica uersari*, Font. 47 *nolite pati, iudices ...*, Mil. 103 *nolite, obsecro uos, acerbio rem mihi pati reditum esse quam fuerit ille ipse discessus*, Sall. *Iug.* 14.25 *nolite pati regnum Numidiae ... tabescere*.

nostrum ... luctum Cf. 71 *assiduis ... luctibus* n., 226 *nostros ... luctus*, where Aegeus similarly desires that his grief should not go unnoticed (Traill (1981) 236), and esp. 247-8 *qualem Minoidi luctum | obtulerat mente immemori, talem ipse recepit*, which combines allusions to this line and to 200-1 (see n.), moving the correlatives to describe not Theseus' *mens* itself but the results of his attitude.

uanescere 'come to nothing', have no effect. This sense is elsewhere applied to utterances (e.g. Ov. *Am.* 1.8.80 *culpa* ('charge'), 2.14.41 *dicta*, Her. 1.79 *crimen*, Quint. *Inst.* 4.3.8 *expositio*), whereas when used of emotions *uanescere* or *euanescere* (the rarer simple form appears first here) usually mean 'fade, no longer affect one' (e.g. Ov. *A.A.* 2.358 *uanescitque absens et nouus intrat amor*, Sen. *De ira* 8.6 *cum iam ira euanescit*). By using *luctus* where one might expect another reference to her

speech, Ariadne identifies her feelings with her words (132-201n.). Cf. also Medea at Ap. *Arg.* 4.387-8 τὰ μὲν οὐ θέμις ἀκράαντα | ἐν γαίῃ πεσέειν.

200-1 Ariadne had referred ironically at 157 to reciprocity between herself and Theseus: now she concludes her curse by invoking the so-called *lex talionis*, on which see Dihle (1962), Hirzel (1910) 407-82 and esp. for its role in curses Watson (1991) 42-6. This principle requires some sort of reference to similarity, and is often expressed with correlatives: cf. esp. Soph. *Ai.* 840-1 ὥσπερ ... τὼς (see also 201 *seque suosque* n.) and for *qualis* and *talis* e.g. Prop. 1.3.39-40 *o utinam tales producas, improbe, noctes | me miseram quales semper habere iubes*, Just. 14.10.4 *dii ... tales ... uobis exitus dent, quales uos ducibus uestris dedistis*. Ariadne's formulation of the *lex talionis* covers both the more common notion of making the punishment fit the crime, and the variation of making it appropriate to the nature of the offender (as e.g. at Prop. 4.5.2, Ov. *Am.* 1.8.113-14 an alcoholic *lena* is cursed with thirst): Theseus is not simply to suffer as he has made Ariadne suffer (as Medea curses Jason, Ap. *Arg.* 4.385-7 ἐκ δέ σε πάτρης | αὐτίκ' ἐμαί σ' ἐλάσειαν Ἐρινύες· οἶα καὶ αὐτὴ | σῇ πάθον ἀτροπίῃ), but to *cause* suffering to himself and his own through a *mens* of a similar kind. The point is underlined by the repetition of *mente*, correspondence of the active verbs *reliquit* and *funestet* and their objects, and sequence of alliterated *me mente* followed by *seque suosque*. The Furies typically afflict their victims mentally, driving them mad, but Ariadne is asking that Theseus' *mens* should remain consistent, but now cause him to injure himself.

Ariadne does not specify any particular characteristic of Theseus' *mens*: for an adjective with *quali* and *tali* we might supply *crudeli* (136) or *perfido* (132-3). But the beginning of the speech, evoked through ring-composition throughout these lines

(*mente* ~ 135 *mentis*; *quali, tali* ~ 132, 134 *sicine*, 200n.), also offers *immemor* (135, cf. 58n.), and this is what the narrator adds to his recapitulation at 247-8 *qualem Minoidi luctum | obtulerat mente immemori, talem ipse recepit*. These lines are of course crucial for the causal and ethical link, which Catullus seems to have been the first to make, between Ariadne's abandonment and Aegeus' death: Ariadne probably means here that Theseus should injure himself through his cruel lack of concern for others, but her curse is fulfilled by his being simply 'forgetful' of Aegeus' instructions. Klingner (1956) 60-6 analyses this in terms of the ambiguity of *immemor*, but the ambiguity of *mens* (cf. 147 *cupidae mentis* n.) is equally important. It seems that Ariadne uses it here in the 'ethical' sense, but her divine auditors understand it in the 'intellectual' sense, as if, after the emphasis she has laid on the importance of what she *says* here (132-201, 195nn.), they take her at her word. Alternatively, Ariadne may be deliberately speaking in a riddling, oracular way in order to offer the Furies such possibilities for inventive interpretation, or she may even have some sort of prophetic insight as to how her words will be fulfilled: on the relationship between curses and prophecies, especially of the dying, see 188-201n.

200 solam Theseus me ... reliquit The penultimate line of the speech contains a clear reminiscence of its second line, 133 *deserto liquisti in litore, Theseu?* The word order *solam Theseus me* highlights the central personal conflict. *solam reliquit* = 'abandoned', gaining strength from the repetitions of both words in the ecphrasis (*sola* of the island at 57, 154, 184; on (re)linquo see 59 *linquens* n.) and from the parallelism with *funestet*, which comes close to implying that 'leaving' Ariadne was equivalent to killing her. Cf. also Prop. 2.24.46 *et modo seruato sola relictā uiro est*,

of Medea: Ov. *A.A.* 3.36 *in ignoto sola relictā loco* and Lygd. 6.41 *ignoto sola relictā mari*, both of Ariadne, allude to both Propertius and Catullus.

201 deae The renewed address, again immediately preceding the verb, has a similar effect to 199 *uos* (see n.) of harnessing divine power on Ariadne's side; cf. also 190-1n.

funestet stands out among the otherwise straightforward vocabulary of 200-1. The verb first appears here and at Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 11 *funestari contionem contagione carnificis ueto*, Font. 31 *humanis hostiis eorum aras ac templa funestant*, Mil. 90, Fin. 2.94. In Cicero and elsewhere it means 'pollute with death', but here, without further contextual clues, it seems to be 'make *funestus*' more generally, perhaps 'doom to death', 'plunge into mourning'; its oracular vagueness (is Ariadne asking for Theseus' own death or not?) is rendered more threatening by the two objects *seque suosque* and the possibility that it might apply to each in a different way. Juv. 8.18 has *funestat ... gentem*, but *se funesto* seems to be unique. A possible model is the exploitation of the double meaning of ἀὐτοσφαγής at Soph. *Ai.* 839-42 (even though at least 841-2 are almost certainly spurious, see Stanford and Garvie *ad loc.*), though that threatens the curses' victims with death at the hands of their close family rather than with the deaths of their family; both are curse-themes (Watson (1991) 35 n.158, 36 n.164). Contrast the explicitness of Dido's first allusion to these lines (see below): she wants Aeneas to see his family die (Virg. *Aen.* 4.617-18 *uideatque indigna suorum | funera*) and then die himself (620). The riddle is solved at 246-7 *sic funesta domus ingressus tecta paterna | morte*; cf. also 234 *funestam ... uestem*.

seque suosque Correlative *–que* was probably a native Latin usage, but almost all its appearances in extant texts are due to its revival by Ennius (or an epic predecessor) in imitation of Homeric τε ... τε (see Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 170, correcting Fraenkel (1922) 209-10 = (2007) 142-4). For full discussion of the figure in poetry see esp. Wills 372-85, Hellegouarc’h (1964) 259-97, Christensen (1908), and for its use in Catullus (seven times), Ross (1969) 63-5 (though his distinction between neoteric/Alexandrian and Ennian/Homeric uses is difficult to sustain). Doubled *–que* tends to be used with words which are ‘related in sense or type’ (Austin on Virg. *Aen.* 4.83), often to construct all-encompassing formulae like Enn. *Ann.* 592 Skutsch *patrem diuomque hominumque* (= Homeric πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, 27n.); cf. 17.9 *caputque pedesque*, 76.8 *dictaque factaque*. Related is the frequent use of *–que –que* to join pronoun + pronominal adjective, as here (Christensen (1908) 172-3); the fuller formula seen at 66.40 *adiuro teque tuumque caput* is typical of another marked speech-act, the oath, on which see Wills 264-8. The universalising move is common in curses, which very often invoke punishment on an offender and his family: Watson (1991) 33-5. It is also closural, an effect enhanced by the position of the *–que –que* pair at the end of the hexameter (a typical *sedes*, perhaps originally because of the metrical usefulness of a short syllable in the fifth foot (Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 170), though later also for allusive reasons). Cf. esp. Virg. *Aen.* 4.629 *pugnent ipsique nepotesque*, the last words of Dido’s curse, which combine allusion to Ariadne with possibly Catullan hypermetre (cf. 298 *coniuge natisque* and see Wills 376). For a different kind of closure see also Catullus’ final *non bona dicta* to Lesbia, linked to Ariadne’s words by alliteration, paired jussive subjunctive and *–que*: 11.17 *cum suis uiuat ualeatque moechis*.

(98,285 words)

Bibliography

(i) *Editions of and commentaries on Catullus (cited by editor's name only except where indicated)*

editio Veneta (c. 1472) ['1472']

Avantius, H. (1502) *Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius ... in aedibus Aldi* (Venice) ['Ald.']

— (1515) *Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius ... in aedibus Aldi* (Venice) ['Ald.²']

— (c. 1535) *Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius ... apud V. Trincavellum* (Venice) ['Trinc.']

Baehrens, E. (1876-85) *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig)

Bardon, H. (1973) *Catulli carmina* (Stuttgart)

Calphurnius, I. (1481) *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii opera et Statii Sylvae* (Vicenza)

Cazzaniga, I. (1944) *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Paravia and Turin)

Corradinus de Allio, J.F. (1738) *Caius Valerius Catullus in integrum restitutus* (Venice)

Eisenhut, W. (1983) *Catulli carmina* (Leipzig)

Ellis, R. (1878²) *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Oxford)

— (1889²) *A commentary on Catullus* (Oxford)

Fordyce, C.J. (1961) *Catullus* (Oxford)

Friedrich, G. (1908) *Catulli liber* (Leipzig)

Godwin, J. (1995) *Catullus: poems 61-68* (Warminster)

Goold, G.P. (1989²) *Catullus* (London)

Guarinus, A. (1521) *In C. Valerium Catullum Veronensem per Baptistam patrem emendatum expositiones* (Venice)

Haupt, M. (1853) *Catulli Tibulli Properti carmina* (Leipzig)

Kroll, W. (1923) *Catull* (Leipzig)

Lachmann, C. (1829) *Q. Valerii Catulli Veronensis liber* (Berlin)

Lee, G. (1990) *The poems of Catullus* (Oxford)

Lenchantin de Gubernatis, M. (1933) *Il libro di Catullo* (Turin)

Müller, L. (1870) *Q. Valerii Catulli carmina* (Leipzig)

Munro, H.A.J. (1878) *Criticisms and elucidations of Catullus* (Cambridge and London)

Muretus, M.A. (1554) *Catullus et in eum commentarius* (Venice)

Mynors, R.A.B. (1958) *Catulli carmina* (Oxford)

Nuzzo, G. (2003) *Gaio Valerio Catullo: Epithalamium Thetidis et Pelei (c. LXIV)* (Palermo)

Owen, S.G. (1893) *Catullus with the Peruigilium Veneris* (London)

Palmer, A. (1896) *Catulli Veronensis liber* (London and New York)

Parthenius, A. (1485) *Valerii Catulli Veronensis poetae liber* (Brescia) ['Parth.']

Postgate, J.P. (1889) *Catullus: carmina* (London)

Quinn, K. (1970) *Catullus: the poems* (London)

Riese, A. (1884) *Die Gedichte des Catullus: herausgegeben und erklärt* (Leipzig)

Rosbach, A. (1854) *Q. Valerii Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig)

Schuster, M. (1949) *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig)

Schwabe, L. (1866¹) *C. Valerii Catulli liber* (Giessen)

Statius, A. (1566) *Catullus cum commentario* (Venice)

Syndikus, H.P. (1990) *Catull: eine Interpretation. 2. Teil: Die grossen Gedichte (61-68)* (Darmstadt)

Thomson, D.F.S. (1997) *Catullus: edited with a textual and interpretative commentary, Phoenix suppl. 34* (Toronto)

Trappes-Lomax, J.M. (2007) *Catullus: a textual reappraisal* (Lampeter)

Voss, I. (1684) *Caius Valerius Catullus et in eum Isaaci Vossii observationes* (London)

(ii) *Other sources of emendations discussed*

- Allen: in T. Frank (1926) Review of Kroll, *AJPh* 47: 200-1
- Bergk, W.T.: in A. Roszbach (1854) *Q. Valerii Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig)
- Bücheler, F. (1859) 'Coniectanea critica (11)', *RhM* 15: 437 [line 178]
- (1866) 'Clara obscura (Martialis, Lucilius, Varro Atacinus)', *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 12: 610 [line 119]
- Conington, J. (1861): cited in Ellis app.
- Czwalina, J.: in Baehrens comm.
- Ellis, R. (1890) 'Catull. LXIV 109', *Philologus* 49 (1890) 270 [line 109]
- Faernus, G. (1566) *Notae in Catullum*, in Statius
- Fea, C. (1827) *Horatius Flaccus: Opera* (Heidelberg) xviii-xxii
- Fink, R.O. (1963) 'Catullus LXIV, 109', *AJPh* 84: 72-4
- Froehlich, J. (1849) 'Q. Valerii Catulli Veronensis liber: Vorschläge zur Berichtigung des Textes', *Abhandlungen der 1. Classe der königlichen bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 5.3 (Munich) 233-75
- Goold, G.P. (1973) *C. Valerii Catulli carmina. Lectorum in usum edidit G.P. Goold* (Groton, Mass.) [line 16]
- Gratwick, A.S. (1979) 'Quam lepide lexeis compostae ... Catullus 64.174', *CQ* 29: 112-16
- Harrison, S.J. (2010): *per litteras*
- Haverfield, F.J.: in Owen (1893) 177
- Haupt, M. (1837) *Quaestiones Catullianae* (Leipzig) 73 [line 28] = Haupt (1875-6) I.53-4
- Heinsius, N. (1742) 'Notae in Catullum', *Adversariorum libri IV* (Haarlem) 645
- Hermann, K.F.: in Baehrens comm.
- Heyworth, S.J. (1998): in Harrison and Heyworth (1998) 105-6 [line 11]
- (2006-10): in conversation [lines 45, 83]
- Kakridis, J.T. (1924) 'Zu Catull LXVIII 63-65', *PhW* 44: 501
- Laetus, J.P.: see Trappes-Lomax
- Madvig, J.N. (1871) *Adversaria critica ad scriptores Latinos* (Copenhagen) II.28-9 [line 109]
- (1876³) *Cicero, De finibus* (Copenhagen) 721 [line 23]
- Maehly, J.: in Baehrens comm.
- Markland, J.: in A. Stachelseid ed. (1881) 'Unedited conjectures of Markland', *Hermathena* 4: 153
- McKie, D.S. (2009): in McKie (2009) 105-9 [line 64], 131 n.414 [line 109]
- Meineke, A. (1852) *Vindiciarum Straboniarum liber* (Berlin) 152-3
- Nisbet, R.G.M. (1978): in Nisbet (1978) 101 [line 42]
- (1995) 'Four conjectures on Catullus 64' in Nisbet (1995) 386-7 [lines 64, 197]
- Orelli, J.C. von (1833) *Eclogae poetarum Latinorum* (Zurich)
- Orioli, F. (1822) *Epistola ad C. Valerium Catullum* (Bologna) 18-19
- Palmer, A. (1879) 'On Ellis's Catullus', *Hermathena* 3: 293-363 [line 184]
- Peerlkamp, P.H. (1843) *P. Vergilii Maronis Aeneidos Lib. II* (Leiden) 110
- Pleitner, K. (1876) *Studien zu Catullus* (Dillingen) 43
- Pontanus, J.J.: see Gaisser (1993) 127-9
- Puccius, F.: see Thomson 49-50, Gaisser (1993) 52
- Ritschl, F. (1857) *Index lectionum hibernarum Bonn* 1857: 5-6 = Ritschl (1866-79) III.595-7
- Sabellicus, M.: see Thomson 47, Gaisser (1993) 48-52
- Schulze, K.P. (1904) *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* 21: 1344
- Schrader, J.: see Puelma (1977) 156 n.1
- Spengel, L. (1827) 'Specimen lectionum in Catulli carmina', *Archivium philologicum* 3.4 (Munich) 93-127
- Traill, D.A. (1992) 'The text of Catullus 64.24', *CPh* 87: 326-8
- Vahlen, J. (1896-7) *Index lectionum hibernarum Berlin* 1896-7: 7-11 = Vahlen (1907-8) 220-4

(iii) *Short titles and abbreviations*

Axelson	Axelson, B. (1945) <i>Unpoetische Wörter</i> (Lund)
Chantraine	Chantraine, P. (1968-80) <i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque</i> (Paris)
CIL	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum</i> (Berlin 1863-)
D—K	Diels, H. (1954 ⁷) <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> , ed. W. Kranz (Berlin)
de Vaan	de Vaan, M. (2008) <i>Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages</i> (Leiden)
Ernout-Meillet	Ernout, A. and Meillet, A. (1979 ⁴) <i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine</i> , rev. J. André (Paris)
Ernout-Thomas	Ernout, A. and Thomas, F. (1953 ²) <i>Syntaxe latine</i> (Paris)
Évrard-Gillis	Évrard-Gillis, J. (1976) <i>La recurrence lexicale dans l'oeuvre de Catulle: étude stylistique</i> (Paris)
FGrHist	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , ed. F. Jacoby (Leiden 1923-)
K—S	Kühner, R. and Stegmann, C. (1955 ³) <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache</i> , ed. A. Thierfelder (Leverkusen)
Lausberg	Lausberg, H. (1998) <i>Handbook of literary rhetoric</i> , trans. M.T. Bliss, A. Jansen and D.E. Orton (Leiden)
LHS	Leumann, M., Hofmann, J.B. and Szantyr, A. (1977) <i>Lateinische Grammatik</i> (Munich)
LSJ	H.G. Liddell and R. Scott (1968 ⁹) <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , rev. H. Stuart Jones, with supplement (Oxford)
LIMC	<i>Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae</i> (Zürich and Munich 1981-99)
LTUR	<i>Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae</i> , ed. E.M. Steinby (Rome 1993-9)
Maltby	Maltby, R. (1991) <i>A lexicon of ancient Latin etymologies</i> (Leeds)
N—H	Nisbet, R.G.M. and Hubbard, M., commentaries on Horace, <i>Odes</i> 1 (Oxford 1978) and 2 (Oxford 1978)
N—R	Nisbet, R.G.M. and Rudd, N. (2004) <i>A commentary on Horace: Odes, book III</i> (Oxford)
N—W	Neue, F. and Wagener, C. (1892-1905 ³) <i>Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache</i> (Leipzig and Berlin)
M—W	Merkelbach, R. and West, M.L. (1967) <i>Fragmenta Hesiodica</i> (Oxford)
OLD	<i>Oxford Latin dictionary</i> , ed. P.G.W. Glare (Oxford 1968-82)
Otto	Otto, A. (1890) <i>Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer</i> (Leipzig)
Pichon	Pichon, R. (1902) <i>De sermone amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores</i> (Paris)
Platnauer	Platnauer, M. (1951) <i>Latin elegiac verse: a study of the metrical usages of Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid</i> (Cambridge)
PMG	<i>Poetae melici Graeci</i> , ed. D.L. Page (Oxford 1962)
RE	<i>Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , ed. A.F. von Pauly, rev. G. Wissowa et al. (Stuttgart 1894-1980)
Roscher	Roscher, W.H. ed. (1884-1927) <i>Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie</i> (Leipzig)
SVF	<i>Stoicorum veterum fragmenta</i> , ed. H.F.A. von Arnim and M. Adler (Leipzig 1903-24)
TLL	<i>Thesaurus linguae Latinae</i> (Leipzig 1900-)
Walde-Hofmann	Walde, A and Hofmann, J.B. (1938-56 ³) <i>Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch</i> (Heidelberg)
Wills	Wills, J. (1996) <i>Repetition in Latin poetry: figures of allusion</i> (Oxford)
Winbolt	Winbolt, S.E. (1912) <i>Latin hexameter verse</i> (London)
Woodcock	Woodcock, E.C. (1959) <i>A new Latin syntax</i> (London)

(iv) *General*

- Adams, J.N. (1981) 'A type of sexual euphemism in Latin', *Phoenix* 35: 120-8
— (1982) *The Latin sexual vocabulary* (London)
— (1999) 'Nominative personal pronouns and some patterns of speech in Republican and Augustan poetry', in J.N. Adams and R.G. Mayer eds. *Aspects of the language of Latin poetry* (Oxford) 97-133
- Adkin, N. (2002) 'Catullus 64.18: *nutricum tenus*', *MH* 59: 209-210
- Aloni, A. (2001) 'The poem of Simonides' Plataea elegy and the circumstances of its performance', in D. Boedeker and D. Sider eds. *The new Simonides: contexts of praise and desire* (Oxford) 86-105
- André, J. (1949) *Études sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine* (Paris)
- Antolín, F.N. (1995) *Lygdamus: Corpus Tibullianum III.1-6*, trans. J.J. Zoltowski, *Mnemosyne* suppl. 154 (Leiden)
- Arkins, B. (1994) 'Textual questions in Catullus', in *SLLRH VII* (Brussels) 211-26
- Armstrong, R. (2006) *Cretan women: Pasiphae, Ariadne and Phaedra in Latin literature* (Oxford)
- Asquith, H. (2005) 'From genealogy to *Catalogue*: the Hellenistic adaptation of the Hesiodic catalogue form', in Hunter R. ed. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: constructions and reconstructions* (Cambridge) 266-86
- Austin, R.G., commentaries on Virgil, *Aeneid* 1 (Oxford 1971), 2 (Oxford 1962), 4 (Oxford 1955), 6 (Oxford 1977)
- Bailey, C. (1947) *Titi Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex* (Oxford)
- Balland, A. (1976) 'Sur la nudité des Nymphes', in *L'Italie préromaine et la Rome républicaine: Mélanges offertes à Jacques Heurgon* (Rome) 1-11
- Barchiesi, A. (1979) 'Palinuro e Caieta: Due "epigrammi" virgiliani (*Aen.* V.870 sg.; VII.1-4)', *Maia* 31: 3-11
— (1992) *Epistulae heroidum 1-3: P. Ovidii Nasonis* (Florence)
— (1993) 'Future reflexive. Two modes of allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*', *HSPH* 95: 333-65
- Barrett, W.S. (1964) *Hippolytos: Euripides* (Oxford)
- Bartsch, S. (2006) *The mirror of the self: sexuality, self-knowledge and the gaze in the early Roman empire* (Chicago and Bristol)
- Bassett, S.E. (1919) 'Versus tetracolos', *CPh* 14: 216-33
- Behr, F.D'A. (2005) 'The narrator's voice: a narratological reappraisal of apostrophe in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Arethusa* 38: 189-221
- Becker, A.S. (1995) *The shield of Achilles and the poetics of ekphrasis* (Lanham, Maryland)
- Bendz, G. (1948) 'La construction du type « rebus in arduis »', *Eranos* 46: 42-53
- Bennett, C.E. (1910-14) *The syntax of early Latin* (Leipzig and Boston)
- Biondi, G. (1980) 'Mito o mitopoesi?', *MD* 5: 125-44
- Bömer, F. (1969-2006) *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen: Kommentar* (Heidelberg)
- Boucher, J.-P. (1956) 'À propos du Carmen 64 de Catulle', *REL* 34: 190-202
- Boyd, B.W. (2006) 'Two rivers and the reader in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8', *TAPhA* 136: 171-206
- Braga, D. (1950) *Catullo e i poeti greci* (Messina and Florence)
- Bramble, J.C. (1970) 'Structure and ambiguity in Catullus LXIV', *PCPhS* 16: 22-41
- Braund, S.M. (2009) *De clementia: Seneca* (Oxford)
- Bruère, R.T. (1951) 'Palepharsalus, Pharsalus, Pharsalia', *CPh* 46: 111-15
- Buchheim, T. (1989) *Gorgias von Leontinoi: Reden, Fragmente und Testimonien*, Philosophische Bibliothek 404 (Hamburg)
- Büchner, C. (1982) *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium* (Leipzig)
- Bühler, W. (1960) *Die Europa des Moschos* (Wiesbaden)
- Bulloch, A.W. (1985) *Callimachus: the fifth hymn* (Cambridge)
- Butler, H.E. and Barber, E.A. (1913) *The elegies of Propertius* (Oxford)
- Butler, H.E. and Owen, A.S. (1914) *Apulei Apologia, siue Pro se de magia liber* (Oxford)
- Cahen, E. (1930) *Les hymnes de Callimaque* (Paris)
- Campbell, M. (1991) *Europa: Moschus* (Hildesheim)
- Cairns, F. (1984) 'The Nereids of Catullus 64.12-23b', *GB* 11: 95-101
- Christensen, H. (1908) 'que-que bei den römischen Hexametrikern (bis etwa 500 n. Chr.)', *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie* 15: 165-211

- Clare, R.J. (1996) 'Catullus 64 and the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius: allusion and exemplarity', *PCPhS* 42: 60-88
- (2002) *The path of the Argo: language, imagery and narrative in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (Cambridge)
- Clark, A. (2007) *Divine qualities: cult and community in republican Rome* (Oxford)
- Clarke, J. (2003) *Imagery of colour and shining in Catullus, Propertius and Horace* (New York)
- Clausen, W.V. (1977) 'Ariadne's leave-taking: Catullus 64.116-20', *ICS* 2: 219-23
- (1982) 'Catulli Veronensis liber', in *CHCL* II (Cambridge) 193-7
- (1987) *Virgil's Aeneid and the tradition of Hellenistic poetry* (Berkeley)
- (1988) 'Catulliana', in N. Horsfall ed. *Vir bonus discendi peritus: studies in celebration of Otto Skutsch's eightieth birthday*, *BICS* suppl. 51 (London) 15-17
- (1994) *A commentary on Virgil, Eclogues* (Oxford)
- Conington, J. (1898⁵) *The works of Virgil: Eclogues and Georgics* (London)
- Connely, W. (1925) 'Imprints of Sappho on Catullus', *CJ* 20: 408-13
- Conrad, C. (1965) 'Traditional patterns of word-order in Latin epic from Ennius to Vergil', *HSPH* 69: 195-258
- Conte, G.B. (1986) *The rhetoric of imitation* (Ithaca)
- Courtney, E. (1990) 'Moral judgements in Catullus 64', *GB* 17: 113-22
- (1993) *The fragmentary Latin poets* (Oxford)
- Cressey, J. (1977) 'Ploughing for grapes: Catullus 64.38-42', *LCM* 2: 153-4
- (1979) 'Find the knave: Catullus 64.159', *LCM* 4: 137-8
- (1981) 'Catullus and Minos (64.85)', *LCM* 6: 19-21
- Croom, A.T. (2000) *Roman clothing and fashion* (Stroud)
- Crowther, N.B. (1970) 'οἱ νεώτεροι, poetae novi, and cantores Euphorionis', *CQ* 20: 322-7
- Culler, J.D. (1981) *The pursuit of signs: semiotics, literature, deconstruction* (London)
- Curran, L.C. (1969) 'Catullus 64 and the heroic age', *YClS* 21: 171-92
- Daniels, M.L. (1967) 'Personal revelation in Catullus 64', *CJ* 62: 351-6
- De Jong, I.J.F. (2001) *A narratological commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge)
- DeBrohun, J.B. (1999) 'Ariadne and the whirlwind of fate: figures of confusion in Catullus 64.149-57', *CPh* 94: 419-30
- (2007) 'Catullan intertextuality: Apollonius and the allusive plot of Catullus 64', in M.B. Skinner ed. *A companion to Catullus* (Oxford) 293-13
- Dee, J.H. (1981) 'Iliad 1.4f. and Catullus 64.152f.: further considerations', *TAPhA* 111: 39-42
- (1982) 'Catullus 64 and the heroic age: a reply', *ICS* 7: 98-109
- Deroux, C. (1986) 'Some remarks on the handling of ekphrasis in Catullus 64', in *SLLRH IV* (Brussels) 247-58
- Dettmer, H. (1997) *Love by the numbers*, Lang Classical Studies 10 (New York)
- Dihle, A. (1962) *Die goldene Regel* (Göttingen)
- Dinter, M. (2005) 'Epic and epigram: minor heroes in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *CQ* 55: 153-69
- Dodds, E.R. (1960²) *Bacchae: Euripides* (Oxford)
- Doob, P.R. (1990) *The idea of the Labyrinth* (Ithaca and London)
- Dover, K.J. (1971) *Select poems: Theocritus* (London)
- Duban, J. (1980) 'Verbal links and imagistic undercurrent in Catullus 64', *Latomus* 39: 777-802
- Dyer, R.R. (1994) 'Bedspread for a *hieros gamos*: studies in the iconography and meaning of the ecphrasis in Catullus 64', in *SLLRH VII* (Brussels) 227-55
- Elder, J.-P. (1951) 'Notes on some conscious and subconscious elements in Catullus' poetry', *HSPH* 60: 101-36
- Eisenhut, W. (1973) *Virtus Romana* (Munich)
- Eisner, R. (1977) 'Ariadne in art, prehistory to 400 BC', *RSC* 25: 165-81
- Elsner, J. (2007) *Roman eyes: visibility and subjectivity in art and text* (Princeton)
- Esposito, E. (2005) *Il fragmentum Grenfellianum (P. Dryton 50)* (Bologna)
- Évrard-Gillis, J. (1976) *La recurrence lexicale dans l'oeuvre de Catulle: étude stylistique* (Paris)
- Ewbank, W.W. (1933) *The poems of Cicero* (London)
- Faber, R. (1998) 'Vestis ... variata (Catullus 64.50-1) and the language of poetic description', *Mnemosyne* 51: 210-15
- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R.L. (2004) *Tradition and innovation in Hellenistic poetry* (Cambridge)
- Fedeli, P. (1972) *Il carme 61 di Catullo* (Friburgo)
- (1980) *Il primo libro delle elegie: Sesto Propertio* (Florence)
- Feeney, D.C. (1991) *The gods in epic: poets and critics of the classical tradition* (Oxford)
- (2007) *Caesar's calendar: ancient time and the beginnings of history* (Berkeley and London)

- Ferri, R. (2003) *Octavia: a play attributed to Seneca* (Cambridge)
- Fitzgerald, W. (1984) 'Aeneas, Daedalus and the Labyrinth', *Arethusa* 17: 51-65
- (1995) *Catullan provocations* (Berkeley)
- Floratos, C.S. (1957) *Über das 64 Gedicht Catulls* (Athens)
- Fordyce, C.J. (1977) *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos libri VII-VIII* (Oxford)
- Forsyth, P.Y. (1976) 'Catullus: the mythic persona', *Latomus* 35: 555-66
- Fourcade, J. (1979) 'Dolor Catullianus (II)', *Pallas* 26: 77-102
- Fowler, D.P. (1991) 'Narrate and describe: the problem of ekphrasis', *JRS* 81: 25-35
- (1997) 'Virgilian narrative: story-telling', in C. Martindale ed. *The Cambridge companion to Virgil* (Cambridge) 259-70
- (2002) *Lucretius on atomic motion: a commentary on 'De Rerum Natura' book two, lines 1-332* (Oxford)
- Fowler, R.L. (1987) 'The rhetoric of desperation', *HSPH* 91: 5-38
- Fraenkel, E. (1916) 'Zur Geschichte des Wortes *fides*', *RhM* 71: 187-99 = Fraenkel (1964) I.15-26
- (1922) *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin)
- (1955) '*Vesper adest* (Catullus LXII)', *JRS* 45: 1-8
- (1957) *Horace* (Oxford)
- (1962) Review of Fordyce, *Gnomon* 34: 253-63
- (1964) *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* (Rome)
- (2007) *Plautine elements in Plautus*, trans. T. Drevikovsky and F. Muecke (Oxford)
- Fraenkel, H. (1945) *Ovid: a poet between two worlds* (Berkeley)
- Frazer, J.G. (1921) *The library: Apollodorus* (London and New York)
- Furley, W.D. and Bremer, J.M. (2001) *Greek hymns*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 9 (Tübingen)
- Gaisser, J.H. (1993) *Catullus and his Renaissance readers* (Oxford)
- (1995) 'Threads in the Labyrinth: competing views and voices in Catullus 64', *AJPh* 116: 579-616
- (2009) *Catullus* (Malden, Mass. and Oxford)
- Gale, M.R. (2000) *Virgil on the nature of things* (Cambridge)
- Galinsky, G.K. (1969) *Aeneas, Sicily and Rome* (Princeton)
- Gallo, A. (1986) 'Le pitture rappresentanti Arianna abbandonata in ambiente pompeiano', *RSP* 2: 57-80
- Gardner, H. (2007) 'Ariadne's lament: the semiotic impulse of Catullus 64', *TAPhA* 137: 147-179
- Garvie, A.F. (1986) *Aeschylus: Choephoroi* (Oxford)
- (1998) *Ajax: Sophocles* (Warminster)
- Genette, G. (1980) *Narrative discourse*, trans. J.E. Lewin (Oxford)
- Geymonat, M. (1982) 'Onomastica decorativa nel carme LXIV di Catullo', *MD* 7: 173-5
- Giangrande, G. (1972) 'Das Epyllion Catulls im Lichte der Hellenistischen Epik', *AC* 41: 123-47
- (1976) 'Catullus 64.35', *LCM* 1: 111-12
- (1977) 'Catullus 64', *LCM* 2: 229-31
- (1984) 'A non-existent problem in Catullus', *MPhL* 6: 45
- Gibson, R.K. (2003) *Ars amatoria book 3: Ovid* (Cambridge)
- Glenn, J. (1980-1) 'Ariadne's daydream (Catullus 64.158-63)', *CJ* 76: 110-16
- Goldberg, S.M. (2005) *Constructing literature in the Roman republic* (Cambridge)
- Goldhill, S.D. (1991) *The poet's voice* (Cambridge)
- Goldman, N. (2001) 'Reconstructing Roman clothing' in J.L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante eds. *The world of Roman costume* (Madison, Wis.) 213-37
- Gow, A.S.F. (1932) 'Diminutives in Augustan poetry', *CQ* 26: 150-7
- (1952²) *Theocritus* (Cambridge)
- Granarolo, J. (1967) *L'oeuvre de Catulle. Aspects religieux, éthiques et stylistiques* (Paris)
- Granarolo, J. (1972) 'Liens entre le baroque decorative et la poésie à la fin de la République romaine', *Euphrosyne* 5: 429-35
- Griffin, J. (1985) *Latin poets and Roman life* (London)
- Griffith, M. (1999) *Antigone: Sophocles* (Cambridge)
- Guillemin, A.-M. (1941) 'L'évolution d'un cliché poétique ("*non ...*")', *REL* 19: 101-12
- Hall, J.B. (1989) 'Problems in Ovid's *Tristia*', in J. Diggle, J.B. Hall and H.D. Jocelyn eds. *Studies in Latin literature and its tradition in honour of C.O. Brink*, PCPhS suppl. 15 (Cambridge) 20-38

- Hardie, P.R. (1987) 'Ships and ship names in the Aeneid', in M. Whitby, P.R. Hardie and M. Whitby eds. *Homo viator: classical essays for John Bramble* (Bristol) 163-71
- (1993) *The epic successors of Virgil* (Cambridge)
- (2009) 'The self-divisions of Scylla', *Trends in Classics* 1: 118-47
- Harmon, D.P. (1973) 'Nostalgia for the age of heroes in Catullus 64', *Latomus* 32: 311-31
- Harrison, S.J. (1991) *Vergil: Aeneid 10* (Oxford)
- (2005) 'Altering Attis: ethnicity, gender and genre in Catullus 63', in R.R. Nauta and M.A. Harder eds. *Catullus' poem on Attis: text and contexts* (Leiden and Boston) 11-24
- (2007) *Generic enrichment in Vergil and Horace* (Oxford)
- Harrison, S.J. and Heyworth, S.J. (1998) 'Notes on the text and interpretation of Catullus', *PCPhS* 44: 85-109
- Haupt, M. (1875-6) *Opuscula* (Leipzig)
- Hauray, J. (1905-13) *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia* (Leipzig)
- Heinze, R. (1929) 'fides', *Hermes* 64: 140-66
- Hellegouarc'h, J. (1964) *Le monosyllabe dans l'hexamètre latine*, Études et Commentaires 50 (Paris)
- Henrichs, A. (1991) 'Namenlosigkeit und Euphemismus. Zur Ambivalenz der chthonischen Mächte im att. Drama', in H. Hofmann and A. Harder eds. *Fragmenta dramatica* (Göttingen) 161-201
- Henry, J. (1873-92) *Aeneidea* (London)
- Henry, R.M. (1950-1) 'Pietas and fides in Catullus', *Hermathena* 75: 63-8 and 76: 48-57
- Herrera Montero, R. (1996) "'Vice uersa.'" La influencia de Catulo en Nonno de Panópolis', in A.M. Aldama ed. *De Roma al siglo XX. Actas del I Congreso de la Sociedad de Estudios Latinos, celebrado en la Residencia Universitaria de Jarandilla de la Vera (Cáceres), los días 26-28 de enero de 1995* (Madrid) I.305-9
- Heslin, P.J. (1997) 'The scansion of Pharsalia (Catullus 64.37; Statius, *Achilleid* 1.152; Calpurnius Siculus 4.101)', *CQ* 47: 588-93
- (2005) *The transvestite Achilles: gender and genre in Statius' Achilleid* (Cambridge)
- Heusch, H. (1954) *Das Archaische in der Sprache Catulls* (Bonn)
- Heyworth, S.J. (2007a) *Sexti Properti elegos* (Oxford)
- (2007b) *Cynthia: a companion to the text of Propertius* (Oxford)
- (2008) Review of Trappes-Lomax, *BMCRev* 2008.09.32
- Hill, D.K. (1963) 'Ivory ornaments of Hellenistic couches', *Hesperia* 32: 293-300
- Hinds, S. (1998) *Allusion and intertext: dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry* (Cambridge)
- Hirzel, R. (1910) *Die Talion*, *Philologus Supplementband* 11
- Hollis, A.S. (1977) *Ovid, Metamorphoses book 8* (Oxford)
- (2009²) *Hecale: Callimachus* (Oxford)
- Hoffer, S. (2007) 'The use of adjective interlacing (double hyperbaton) in Latin poetry', *HSPH* 103: 299-340
- Hofmann, J.B. (1926) *Lateinische Umgangssprache* (Heidelberg)
- Holford-Strevens, L. (1999) "'Her eyes became two spouts': classical antecedents of Renaissance laments", *Early Music* 27.3: 379-93
- Holtze, F.W. (1861-2) *Syntaxis priscorum scriptorum Latinorum usque ad Terentium* (Leipzig)
- Hopkinson, N. (1982) 'Juxtaposed prosodic variants in Greek and Latin poetry', *Glotta* 60: 162-77
- Horsfall, N., commentaries on Virgil, *Aeneid* 3 (Leiden 2006), 7 (Leiden 2000) and 11 (Leiden 2003)
- Housman, A.E. (1972) *The classical papers of A.E. Housman*, collected and edited by J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear (Cambridge)
- Hross, H. (1958) *Die Klagen der verlassenen Heroiden in der lateinischen Dichtung* (Munich)
- Hunter, R. (1991) 'Breast is best: Catullus 64.18', *CQ* 51: 254-5
- Hutchinson, G. (2003) 'The Catullan corpus, Greek epigram and the poetry of objects' *CQ* 53: 206-221
- (2006) *Elegies: book IV: Propertius* (Cambridge)
- Jackson, S. (1999) 'Apollonius' *Argonautica*: the Theseus/Ariadne desertion', *RhM* 142: 152-7
- Jacobson, H. (1974) *Ovid's Heroides* (Princeton)
- Janan, M.W. (1994) 'When the lamp is shattered': desire and narrative in Catullus (Carbondale)
- Jenkyns, R. (1982) *Three classical poets* (London)
- Jocelyn, H.D. (1967) *The tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge)
- Kaibel, G. (1878) *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta* (Berlin)
- Keil, H. (1857-80) *Grammatici Latini* (Leipzig)

- Kenney, E.J. (1958) 'Notes on Ovid', *CQ* 8: 65
- (1984) *The ploughman's lunch. Moretum, a poem ascribed to Virgil* (Bristol)
- (1990) *Cupid and Psyche: Apuleius* (Cambridge)
- (1994²) *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores: Medicamina faciei femineae: Ars amatoria: Remedia amoris* (Oxford)
- Kershaw, A. (1980) 'Emendation and usage: two readings of Propertius', *CPh* 75 (1980) 71-2
- (1993) 'A' at Catullus 66.85', in *PLLS VII* (Leeds) 27-9
- Kilroy, G. (1969) 'The Dido episode and the sixty-fourth poem of Catullus', *SO* 4: 48-60
- Kinsey, T.E. (1965) 'Irony and structure in Catullus 64', *Latomus* 24: 911-31
- Kirk, G.S. (1985) *The Iliad: a commentary. Vol. I, books 1-4* (Cambridge)
- Klingner, F. (1956) *Catulls Peleus-Epos* (Munich)
- Knox, P.E. (1986) 'Adjectives in -osus and Latin poetic diction', *Glotta* 64: 90-101
- (1995) *Heroides: select epistles: Ovid* (Cambridge)
- (1998) 'Ariadne on the rocks: influences on Ovid, *Her.* 10', in P.E. Knox and C. Foss eds. *Style and tradition: studies in honour of Wendell Clausen*, *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 92 (Stuttgart and Leipzig) 72-83
- (2007) 'Catullus and Callimachus', in M.B. Skinner ed. *A companion to Catullus* (Oxford) 151-71
- Konstan, D. (1977) *Catullus' indictment of Rome: the meaning of Catullus 64* (Amsterdam)
- Korenjak, M. (1997) 'Τηλεκλείτη Ἀριάδνη: Exemplum mit Folgen. Zu einem mythologischen Beispiel bei Apollonios Rhodius', *WS* 110: 22
- Krenkel, W. (1971) *Lucilius: Satiren* (Leiden)
- Kubiak, D.P. (1981) 'Catullus 64.1-2', *AJPh* 102: 41-2
- Lain, N.F. (1986) 'Catullus 68.145', *HSPH* 90: 155-8
- Laird, A. (1993) 'Sounding out ecphrasis: art and text in Catullus 64', *JRS* 83: 18-30
- Landolfi, L. (1995) 'Externata malo (Cat. c. LXIV, 165)', *Pan* 13b: 43-52
- (1997) 'Le molte Arianne di Ovidio: intertestualità e intratestualità in *Her.* 10; *Ars* 1, 525-64; *Met.* 8, 172-82; *Fast.* 3, 459-516', *QUCC* n.s. 57: 139-72
- (1998) 'La coltre "parlante": Cat. carm. 64 fra ecfrasi ed epillio', *Aufidus* 35: 7-35
- Lees, M.E. (1921) 'The ablative case in Vergil', *CQ* 17: 183-5
- Lefèvre, E. (1977) 'L'unità dell'elegia properziana', in *Atti del Colloquium Propertianum 1976* (Assisi) 25-51
- (2000) 'Alexandrinisches und Catullisches im Peleus-Epos', *Hermes* 128: 181-201
- Lejay, P. (1911) *Q. Horati Flacci Satirae* (Paris)
- Lightfoot, J.L. (1999) *The poetical fragments and the 'Erotika pathemata': Parthenius of Nicaea* (Oxford)
- Lindsay, W.M. (1922) *Early Latin verse* (Oxford)
- Lipking, L. (1988) *Abandoned women and poetic tradition* (Chicago and London)
- Löfstedt, E. (1956²) *Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins* (Lund)
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1990) 'Erinyes, Semnai Theai, Eumenides', in E.M. Craik ed. 'Owls to Athens': *essays on classical subjects presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford) 203-11
- Luck, G. (1976) 'Aratea', *AJPh* 97: 213-34
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1978) *Ciris: a poem attribute to Vergil* (Cambridge)
- (1987) *Further voices in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford)
- (1989) *Words and the poet* (Oxford)
- Lynn-George, M. (1988) *Epos: word, narrative and the Iliad* (Basingstoke)
- Mackail, J.W. (1930) *The Aeneid: edited with introduction and commentary* (Oxford)
- McLennan, G.R. (1977) *Callimachus: Hymn to Zeus* (Rome)
- Maehler, H. (2004) *Bacchylides: a selection* (Cambridge)
- Malcovati, E. (1976-9⁴) *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta liberae rei publicae* (Paravia)
- Maltby, R. (2002) *Tibullus: Elegies* (Cambridge)
- Mamoojee, A.J. (1981) 'Suavis and dulcis. A study of Ciceronian usage', *Phoenix* 35: 220-36
- Marouzeau, J. (1922-49) *L'ordre de mots dans la phrase latine* (Paris)
- Mastronarde, D.J. (2002) *Medea: Euripides* (Cambridge)
- Matthews, V.J. (1981) 'Catullus 64.85', *LCM* 6: 283-4
- May, G. (1910) *De stilo epylliorum Romanorum* (Kiel)
- Mayer, R. (1980) 'On Catullus 64.21', *PACA* 15: 16-19
- Mayor, J.E.B. (1881³) *Thirteen satires of Juvenal* (London)
- McKeown, J.C. (1987-?) *Ovid, Amores: text, prolegomena and commentary* (Liverpool/Leeds)
- McKie, D.S. (1977) *The manuscripts of Catullus: recension in a closed tradition*, diss. (Cambridge)
- (2009) *Essays in the interpretation of Roman poetry* (Cambridge)

- McNally, S. (1985) 'Ariadne and others: images of sleep in Greek and early Roman art', *ClAnt* 4: 152-92
- Miguélez Caverio, L. (2008) *Poems in context: Greek poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200-600 AD* (Berlin and New York)
- Miller, J.F. (1993) 'Ovidian allusion and the vocabulary of memory', *MD* 30: 153-64
- Miller, J. Hillis (1992) *Ariadne's thread: story lines* (New Haven)
- Morgan, L.L. (1998) 'Assimilation and civil war: Hercules and Cacus, *Aeneid* 8', in H.-P. Stahl ed. *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan epic and political context* (London) 175-98
- Munro, H.A.J. (1886²) *T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri vi* (Cambridge)
- Murgatroyd, P. (1980) *A commentary on the first book of the elegies of Tibullus* (Pietermaritzburg)
- (1994) *Tibullus, Elegies II* (Oxford)
- (1997) 'The similes in Catullus 64', *Hermes* 125: 75-84
- Mynors, R.A.B. (1990) *Virgil, Georgics: edited with a commentary* (Oxford)
- Nappa, C. (2007) 'Catullus and Vergil', in M.B. Skinner ed. *A companion to Catullus* (Oxford) 377-98
- Newman, J.K. (1990) *Roman Catullus and the modification of the Alexandrian sensibility* (Hildesheim)
- Nisbet, R.G.M. (1978) 'Notes on the text of Catullus' *PCPhS* 24: 92-115 = Nisbet (1995) 76-100
- (1995) *Collected papers on Latin literature*, ed. S.J. Harrison (Oxford)
- Norden, E. (1903) *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI* (Leipzig)
- (1913) *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig)
- Obbink, D. (2001) 'The genre of *Plataea*: generic unity in the new Simonides', in D. Boedeker and D. Sider eds. *The new Simonides: contexts of praise and desire* (Oxford) 65-85
- O'Connell, M. (1977) 'Pictorialism and meaning in Catullus 64', *Latomus* 36: 746-56
- O'Hara, J.J. (1990) 'Vergil's *Acidalia mater* and Venus Erycina in Catullus and Ovid', *HSPH* 93: 335-42
- (2007) *Inconsistency in Roman epic* (Cambridge)
- Ogilvie, R.M. (1965) *A commentary on Livy, books 1-5* (Oxford)
- Oksala, P. (1962) 'Das aufblühen des römischen Epos. Berührungen zwischen der Ariadne-Episode Catulls und der Dido-Geschichte Vergils', *Arctos* 3: 167-97
- Olson, K. (2008) *Dress and the Roman woman* (London and New York)
- Onians, R.B. (1954²) *The origins of European thought* (Cambridge)
- Ott, W. (1973) *Metrische Analysen zu Catull Carmen 64* (Tübingen)
- Palmer, A. (1898) *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides: with the Greek translation of Planudes* (Oxford)
- Panoussi, V. (2003) '*Ego maenas*: maenadism, marriage and the construction of female identity in Catullus 63 and 64', *Helios* 30: 101-26
- Parry, M. (1971) *The making of Homeric verse: the collected papers of Milman Parry*, ed. A. Parry (Oxford)
- Paschalis, M. (2004) 'Middles in Catullus 64: the pivotal *uestis*', in S. Kyriakidis and F. De Martino eds. (2004) *Middles in Latin poetry* (Bari) 51-79
- Pasquali, G. (1920) 'Il carme 64 di Catullo', *SIFC* 1: 1-23
- Pavlock, B. (1990) *Eros, imitation and the epic tradition* (Ithaca)
- Pearce, T.E.V. (1966) 'The enclosing word order in the Latin hexameter', *CQ* 16: 140-71, 298-320
- Pease, A.S. (1935) *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quartus* (Cambridge, Mass.)
- (1955-8) *M. Tulli Ciceronis De natura deorum* (Cambridge, Mass.)
- Peden, R. (1987) 'Endings in Catullus' in M. Whitby, P.R. Hardie and M. Whitby eds. *Homo viator: classical essays for John Bramble* (Bristol) 95-103
- Perrotta, G. (1931) 'Il carme 64 di Catullo e i suoi pretesi originali Ellenistici', *Athenaeum* (1931): 177-222, 370-409
- Perutelli, A. (1985) 'I "bracchia" degli alberi. Designazione tecnica e immagine poetica', *MD* 15: 9-48
- (1996) 'Il carme 63 di Catullo', *Maia* 48: 254-71
- Pfeiffer, R. (1949-53) *Callimachus* (Oxford)
- (1968) *History of classical scholarship: from the beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic age* (Oxford)
- Pontani, F. (2000) 'Catullus 64 and the Hesiodic *Catalogue*: a suggestion', *Philologus* 144: 267-76
- Postgate, J.P. (1905) '*Pharsalia nostra*', *CR* 19: 257-60
- Powell, J.U. (1925) *Collectanea Alexandrina* (1925)
- Prag, A.J.N.W. (1985) *The Oresteia: iconographic and narrative tradition* (Warminster)
- Puelma, M. (1977) 'Sprachliche Beobachtungen zu Catulls Peleus-Epos', *MH* 34: 156-90
- (1982) 'Die Aitien des Kallimachos als Vorbilder der römischen Amores-Elegie' *MH* 39: 221-246
- Pulley, S. (1997) *Prayer in Greek religion* (Oxford)
- Putnam, M.C.J. (1961) 'The art of Catullus 64', *HSPH* 65: 165-205

- Quinn, K. (1962) 'Docte Catulle' in J.P. Sullivan ed. *Critical essays on Roman literature: elegy and lyric* (London) 31-63
- (1963) *Latin explorations* (London)
- Race, W.H. (1992) 'How Greek poems begin', *YCIS* 29: 13-38
- Rees, R. (1994) 'Common sense in Catullus 64', *AJPh* 115: 75
- Reitz, C. (2002) 'Klagt Ariadne? Überlegungen zur Rede der Ariadne in Catulls carmen 64', *Gymnasium* 109: 91-102
- Reitzenstein, R. (1900) 'Die Hochzeit des Peleus und der Thetis', *Hermes* 335: 73-105
- Renahan, R. (1979) 'New evidence for the variant in *Iliad* 1.5', *AJPh* 100: 473-4
- Ribbeck, J.K.O. (1897-8³) *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta* (Leipzig)
- Richardson, L., Jr. (1944) *Poetical theory in republican Rome* (New Haven)
- (1963) 'A note on Catullus LXIV.159', *AJPh* 84: 745
- Richardson, N.J. (1974) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford)
- (1993) *The Iliad: a commentary. Vol. VI, books 21-24* (Cambridge)
- Richmond, J.A. (1962) *The Halieutica ascribed to Ovid* (London)
- Riese, A. (1866) 'Catulls 64ste Gedicht aus Kallimachus übersetzt', *RhM* 21: 498-509
- Ritschl, F.W. (1866-79) *Friderici Ritschelii opuscula philologica* (Leipzig)
- Rohde, E. (1900²) *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Leipzig)
- Romani, S. (1999) 'Donne abbandonate sulla riva del mare. Arianna, figura del lamento', *Acme* 52: 109-27
- Ronconi, A. (1953) *Studi catulliani* (Brescia)
- Rosato, C. (2005) *Euripide sulla scena latina arcaica. La 'Medea' di Ennio e le 'Baccanti' di Accio* (Lecce)
- Ross, D.O. (1969) *Style and tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass.)
- (1975) *Backgrounds to Augustan poetry: Gallus, elegy and Rome* (Cambridge)
- Salat, P. (1993) 'Catulle 64.105-11: *coniger et corniger*', *Latomus* 52: 418-19
- Salvatore, A. (1965) *Studi catulliani* (Naples)
- Schierl, P. (2006) *Die tragödien des Pacuvius* (Berlin and New York)
- Schmale, M. (2004) *Bilderreigen und Erzähllabyrinth. Catulls Carmen 64* (Munich and Leipzig)
- Schmalz, J.H. (1916) 'Zum doppelten Dativ im Lateinischen', *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 36: 1123-5
- Schmidt, E.A. (1967) 'Ariadne bei Catull und Ovid', *Gymnasium* 74: 489-501
- Schroeder, O. (1914²) *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis selectis* (Leipzig)
- Schulze, W. (1958²) *Orthographica et Graeca Latina* (Rome)
- Sebesta, J.L. (1994) 'Mantles of the gods and Catullus 64', *SyllClass* 5: 35-42
- Segal, C. (1992) 'Tragic beginnings: narration, voice, and authority in the prologues of Greek drama', *YCIS* 29: 85-112
- Selden, D.L. (1992) 'Ceveat lector: Catullus and the rhetoric of performance', in R. Hexter and D.L. Selden eds. *Innovations of antiquity* (New York) 461-512
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (1977) *Epistulae ad familiares: Cicero* (Cambridge)
- (1994) *Homoeoteleuton in Latin dactylic verse* (Stuttgart and Leipzig)
- Skinner, M.B. (1981) *Catullus' Passer: the arrangement of the book of polymetric poems* (New York)
- (1994) 'Remembrance of a guest: Theseus in Callimachus' *Hecale* and Catullus 64', *LCM* 19: 147-8
- Skutsch, O. (1977) 'Accusativus Graecus', *Glotta* 55: 85-8
- (1985) *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford)
- Smith, K.F. (1913) *The elegies of Albius Tibullus* (New York)
- Snell, B. (1949⁶) *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis* (Leipzig)
- Solodow, J.B. (1986) '*Raucae, tua cura, palumbes*: study of a poetic word order', *HSPH* 90: 129-53
- Spaltenstein, F. (1986-90) *Commentaire des Punica de Silius Italicus* (Geneva)
- Speyer, W. (1969) 'Fluch', *RLAC* 7: 1160-1288
- Stanford, W.B. (1963) *Sophocles' Ajax* (London)
- Stehle Stigers, E. (1977) 'Retreat from the male: Catullus 62 and Sappho's erotic flowers', *Ramus* 6: 83-102
- Stoevesandt, M. (1994-5) 'Catull 64 und die Ilias. Das Peleus-Thetis-Epyllion im Lichte der neueren Homer-Forschung', *WJA* 20: 167-205
- Tarrant, R.J. (1976) *Agamemnon: Seneca* (Cambridge)
- (1985) *Seneca's Thyestes* (Atlanta, Ga.)
- Tartaglioni, C. (1986) 'Arianna e Andromacha (da Hom. *Il.* 22.460-72 a Cat. 64.61-7)', *A&R* 31: 152-7
- Tatham, G. (1990) 'Ariadne's mitra: a note on Catullus 64.61-4', *CQ* 40: 560-1

- Theodorakopoulos, E. (2000) 'Catullus 64: footprints in the Labyrinth' in A. Sharrock and H. Morales eds. *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman textual relations* (Oxford) 115-42
- Thomas, R.F. (1979) 'On a Homeric reference in Catullus', *AJPh* 100: 475-6
- (1982) 'Catullus and the polemics of poetic reference (poem 64.1-18)', *AJPh* 103: 144-64
- (1988) *Georgics: Virgil* (Cambridge)
- Thomson, D.F.S. (1961) 'Aspects of unity in Catullus 64', *CJ* 57: 49-57
- Timpanaro, S. (1978) 'Ut vidi, ut perii', in Timpanaro, *Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua latina* (Rome) 219-87
- Townend, G.B. (1983) 'The unstated climax of Catullus 64', *G&R* 30: 21-30
- Traill, D.A. (1981) 'Ring-composition in Catullus 64', *CJ* 76: 232-41
- Traina A. (1972) 'Allusività catulliana (due note al c. 64)', in *Studi classici in onore di Q. Cataudella* 3 (Catania) 99-114
- Treggiari, S. (1991) *Roman marriage* (Oxford)
- Vahlen, J. (1903²) *Ennianae poesis reliquiae* (Leipzig)
- (1907-8) *Opuscula academica* (Leipzig)
- van den Berg, C. (2008) 'The pulvinar in Roman culture', *AJPh* 138: 239-73
- van den Horst, P.W. (1994) 'Silent prayer in antiquity', *Numen* 41: 1-25
- van den Hout, M.P.J. (1988²) *M. Cornelii Frontonis Epistulae* (Leipzig)
- van Hoorn, W. (1972) *As images unwind: ancient and modern theories of visual perception* (Amsterdam)
- Versnel, H.S. (1976) 'Two types of Roman *deutio*', *Mnemosyne* 29: 365-410
- (1981) 'Religious mentality in ancient prayer', in Versnel ed. *Faith, hope and worship* (Leiden) 1-64
- Veyne, P. (1988) *Roman erotic elegy: love, poetry and the West*, trans. D. Pellauer (Chicago and London)
- Voigt, E.-M. (1971) *Fragmenta: Sappho et Alcaeus* (Amsterdam)
- Wackernagel, J. (1920-4) *Vorlesungen über Syntax* (Basel)
- (1953) *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen)
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1994) *Houses and society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Princeton)
- Watson, L. (1991) *Arae: the curse poetry of antiquity* (Leeds)
- (2003) *A commentary on Horace's Epodes* (Oxford)
- Watt, W.S. (1984) 'Notes on Martial', *LCM* 9: 130-1
- (2000) 'Notes on Catullus', *ZPE* 131: 65-8
- Weber, C. (1983) 'Two chronological contradictions in Catullus 64', *TAPhA* 113: 263-71
- Webster, T.B.L. (1966) 'The myth of Ariadne from Homer to Catullus', *G&R* 13: 22-31
- West, D.A., commentaries on Horace, *Odes* 2 (Oxford 1998) and 3 (Oxford 2002)
- West, M.L. (1966) *Theogony: Hesiod* (Oxford)
- (1982) *Greek metre* (Oxford)
- (1989-92²) *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati* (Oxford)
- West, S. (1965) 'Apollonius Rhodius 4.1773', *Hermes* 93: 491
- White, K.D. (1970) *Roman farming* (London)
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1924) *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos* (Berlin)
- Wilkinson, L.P. (1963) *Golden Latin artistry* (Cambridge)
- Williams, G.W. (1980) *Figures of thought in Roman poetry* (New Haven and London)
- Williams, R.D., commentaries on Virgil, *Aeneid* 3 (Oxford 1962) and 5 (Oxford 1960)
- Wills, J. (1996) *Repetition in Latin poetry: figures of allusion* (Oxford)
- Winkler, J.J. (1990) *The constraints of desire* (New York and London)
- Wölfflin, E. (1906) 'Die dreifache Alliteration in der zweiten Vershälfte', *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie* 14: 515-23
- Woodman, A.J. and Martin, R.H. (1996) *The Annals of Tacitus: book 3* (Cambridge)
- Wray, D. (2001) *Catullus and the poetics of Roman manhood* (Cambridge)
- Zetzel, J.E.G. (1978) 'A Homeric reminiscence in Catullus', *AJPh* 99: 332-3
- (1983) 'Catullus, Ennius and the poetics of allusion', *ICS* 8: 251-66
- Zicari, M. (1961) 'Catullus 64.11', *Philologus* 105: 314-16