

COMMENTARY

1

Structure: 2 + 5 (question and answer) + 3 lines, articulated by *namque, quare*.

The poet dedicates his *libellus* to his friend Cornelius Nepos (l. 3 n.). As Zicàri 1965 pointed out, the tone of C.'s dedication, unlike Meleager's Μοῦσα φίλα, τίμι τάυδε φέρεις πάγκαρπον ἀοιδάν; (*AP* 4.1.1) and Martial's *cuius vis fieri, libelle, munus* (3.2.1), is easy and relaxed, not bookish: C. himself occupies the scene from the very start, and hence his book is a concrete thing, an object in his hand. The poem's programmatic quality is obvious; less obvious is the fact that here C. *demonstrates* the qualities, or some of them, which he most admired in Greek, and vindicates for Latin, poetry. For example, he claims – by exercising it – the freedom to write poetry in conversational idiom; notice the introductory question-and-answer, and the repeated use of diminutives, such as *libellus* (which is not merely a metrically convenient substitute for *liber*; see Mart. 10.1.1–2); and again, *esse aliquid*; (l. 3 n.); parenthetical *Iuppiter*, as an exclamation (cf. 66.30); the idiom *quidquid hoc libelli; habe tibi*, a legal formula (precise but humdrum); and *lepidum*, 'nice' (to look at, as in Plaut. *Pseud.* 27–8 *lepidis litteris, lepidis tabellis lepida conscriptis manu*). The implication is that 'the lyric can be about ordinary life and in the language of the people; and poetry of this kind deserves serious criticism' (Copley 1951; see also Gordon Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* [1968]: chapter 2). Furthermore, C. claims for himself a high degree of metrical freedom; take lines 2–4, where the 'basis' of the line (in this metre consisting of the first two syllables) is varied each time: trochee, followed by spondee, followed by iambus. A few Latin writers (including Varro before C.; Martial after him) adhere rigorously to the

spondaic basis in hendecasyllables; C. by his practice here draws attention to the principle of free variation, and almost flaunts it by applying it in successive lines at the very outset.

For a change of tone in the last two lines of the poem, see ll. 9–10 nn. It may be that C. at first conceived of his poem as ending with the word *libelli*, which echoes so neatly the *libellum* of l. 1, and which again draws attention to brevity. If so, these eight lines would furnish a good example of the ‘cyclic’ structure so often used in C.’s short poems; and Bardon (1943: 15) has complained that the final wish in ll. 9–10 spoils the clear effect of the repetition of the leading idea of ll. 1–2. Yet Bardon himself has drawn attention (*ibid.*, 18) to the frequent occurrence in C. of a structure wherein the last two lines of a ten-line poem are in some way sharply distinguished from the rest; this ‘8 + 2’ structure, with some variations, he finds in a great many of the ‘polymetric’ poems. For an example see M. Zicàri’s discussion of poem 2, cited in the Bibliography to that poem; the slight change in tone or direction, adumbrated in the final two lines, more or less, of a short poem, is characteristic of C. Seen in this light, the slightly disconcerting asymmetry and redirection, implicit in the ending of poem 1, will prove acceptable and necessary after all. It is doubtful whether such asymmetry can be taken as a sign of early composition (and on the obvious implication, for dating, of *iam tum*, see l. 3 n.); on the other hand, the nature of the claim made for the book is scarcely such as could have envisaged the collected works as we have them. (For a discussion of the chronology of the *liber Catulli*, see the Introduction, pp. 3–10.) The poet’s obvious delight in the outward aspect of his new book suggests a first publication; and the tone of the initial ‘movement’ of the poem is, as Zicàri remarks, ‘juvenile’ rather than mature.

1 *cui*: on the question whether C. wrote *quoi* (he probably did) see Fordyce. *V* had *qui* for *cui* at 2.3 (corrected by *O*’s variant), and also at 24.5 and 67.47. At 17.14 *cuiiocum* (cf. *V*) may preserve an original *quoi*; if so, we have here an early error in C.’s text. *Quoi* is possibly also the cause of *V*’s *qua* at 71.1. If at 64.254 *V*’s *qui* points to *quoi* standing for *cui*, then *O*. Skutsch receives additional support (though he does not use it) for his emendation *cui Thyades* in that line.

dono: the first two lines pretend to depict C. as having just received the first copy of a small volume (*libellus*) of his own poems. It is the physical appearance of the book that is stressed in line 2, and therefore probably also in line 1. We may reasonably conclude that *dono* conveys ‘to whom am I in fact presenting ...?’, which suits the notion of a little scene in which C. himself is the chief actor, even though parallels can be found for taking the indicative *dono* as equivalent to *donem*. (Kr. cites Plaut. *Most.* 368 *quid ego ago?* and Cicero, *Ad Att.* 16.7.4 *nunc quid respondemus?*).

lepidum novum: cf. Plaut. *Epid.* 222 *vestita, aurata, ornata ut lepide, ut concinne, ut nove!*

- 2 *arida*: on the feminine form see App. Crit. Petrarch's friend Guglielmo da Pastrengo (Pastrengicus), who died in 1362 (before GR and perhaps O were written), supports Servius on *Aeneid* 12.587 in spelling *arida*. It is true that for his citation of lines 1–2 Pastrengicus (*De Or. Rerum* 88b) refers not to C. but to Isidore, our manuscripts of whom give *arido*; but he also quotes lines 5–7, and some marginalia, from C. directly, and these further quotations make it clear that he saw a Catullus Ms, probably V. Therefore, he either found *arida* in his Isidore Ms, or corrected from Servius (unlikely) or, as Haupt suggested, from the text of C.; see E. (note in the App. Crit. of his text-edition) and also B.L. Ullman, 'The Transmission of the Text of Catullus,' *Studi in onore di Luigi Castiglioni* (Florence, 1980): 1041–2. A third possibility (not entertained by Ullman) is this: *arida* V, *aridā*^O A, *arido* OGR. If Martial 8.72.2 has *aridi* in the masculine, this is hardly decisive for the gender which, as Servius remarks, is (regularly) masculine in Virgil though (oddly) feminine in Catullus. Friedrich noted that the cacophonous sequence *arido modo* was to be avoided; he comments on the strenuous effort made by Cicero, *Pro Milone* 61, to avoid even the less harsh sequence of sounds *populo modo*. For the fem. *arida* see Scaliger, *Castigationes* 4, in reply to A. Statius (cited by Gaisser 1993: 174 and n. 127); Scaliger rightly says that the explicit testimony of Servius about C.'s irregular usage should outweigh the unannotated readings of medieval Mss, which are all that the 'other sources' amount to.
- 3 *Corneli*: this is Cornelius Nepos the historian, as we know from Ausonius (see App. Crit.). Like C. himself, and many other men of letters in the Rome of the day, Nepos hailed from Cisalpine Gaul; the elder Pliny, in his *Naturalis Historia*, calls him *conterraneus meus* (in the Preface) as well as *Padi accola* (3.127). His *Chronica* (apparently a prose work) seems to have taken the form of a comparative chronology of Greek and Roman history; Aulus Gellius (17.21.3) says that in Book 1 Nepos dated the poetic contest between Homer and Hesiod 160 years before Rome was founded, and also says that Nepos declared Archilochus to have lived at the same time as the early Roman king Tullus Hostilius. If, then, the chronology was 'universal' in the sense that it sought to place Greek and Roman events and personalities from long ago on a single time-scale, the point of *omne aevum* becomes clear, while the adjective *laboriosis* (l. 7) begins to seem highly appropriate. We do not know when the *Chronica* was published; *iam tum* of course suggests that it was more than a few years before this poem was written.

On Nepos and Catullus, and their literary circle, see Wiseman 1979: 154–66.

- 4 *esse aliquid*: cf. Cicero, *Ad Fam.* 6.18.4 *si est talis <orator>, ego quoque aliquid sum*; also *Ad Att.* 4.2.2 *si umquam in dicendo fuimus aliquid*, TD 5.104 *eos aliquid putare esse*.

nugas, 'nonsense' – a depreciatory word (Plautus so uses it, and cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.19.42), and not primarily a description of a recognized poetic genre; C. calls his short poems *nugae* and *ineptiae* in order to stress their playful and witty nature. Martial's literary application of the word probably recalls C. The collection – if indeed it was a collection – of *nugae*, praised some time ago (*iam tum . . .*, line 5) by Cornelius Nepos, need not be supposed to include, for example, the grim atmosphere of poem 11, or even the serious introspection of poem 8.

- 5 There is no thought of numerical opposition between *unus* and *tribus*, which would be pointless; there is however some such contrast between *omne* and *tribus*. This in turn rules out a factitious opposition between *unus* and *omne*; so we must take (as the rhythm of the line also suggests) *unus-Italorum* together, in the sense 'first of Italians to . . .' (as opposed to Greeks, e.g., Apollodorus, who had written summaries of world history). Both Horace (*Od.* 3.30) and Propertius (3.1.3) claim to be the first to introduce Greek literary genres into Italy.

The initial *i* in the noun *Italia* is lengthened, against its natural value (so that the word may appear in hexameters) by Callimachus in Greek, and (after C.) in Latin by Virgil (*Aen.* 6.61; see E. Norden ad loc.).

- 6 *explicare*, 'unroll'; it is interesting that it is of a *chronicle* (by Atticus) that Cicero (*Brut.* 15) writes *ut explicatis ordinibus temporum uno in conspectu omnia viderem*; see note on 3 above.
cartis here = 'rolls'; these consisted of *cartae* (sheets of papyrus) glued together in a *volumen*.
- 7 *laboriosis*, 'involving weary work.' This 'non-personal' use (cf. Ter. *Heaut.* 807, Cicero *De legg.* 3.19) is quite regular, contrary to what is said of Calvus' use of the word by Gellius, 9.12.10 (F.).
- 8 *Est* is implied after *libelli*; but cf. V. *Aen.* 1.78 *quodcumque hoc regni*. The phrase is slightly disparaging, as is *qualecumque*. For the punctuation see the final para. of the n. on l. 9.

See App. Crit.: *al. mei* is of course not intended as a variant but as an explanatory note: 'my book, that is.' In *R*² these words have been erased by a later hand, and what was then left of them has been almost, but not quite, obliterated by a library stamp; but on close inspection traces can be seen. Even had they vanished completely, *m* comes to our rescue (as he often does in matters connected with the text of *R*) by picking up the words, and so proving that they had been inserted by *R*²; for although *m* is careless, he never invents.

- 9–10 Notice the change of tone: shy modesty is replaced by modest confidence.
- 9 The metrical defect in the line as transmitted caused the Humanists either to restore *o* (later adopted by most editors) or to substitute *quidem* for *quod*. Presumably the second of these remedies prompted Bergk's rewriting of the line (*qualecumque quidem est, patroni ut ergo*), which however is unconvincing

for several reasons. That *virgo* does not occur elsewhere in poems 1–60 is immaterial; these poems have no place for it except in the context of an address to the Muse. Secondly, the word *virgo* does occur twenty-two times in the more formal poems, 61 to 68, and *virgineus* twice; again, it fails to occur in the short elegiac epigrams 69–116. This only means that it belongs to the ‘high’ or ‘elevated’ style, and would therefore be appropriate to apostrophizing a god or goddess in a dedication. Thirdly, the word *ergo* absolutely cannot mean, and nowhere comes close to meaning, ‘by the agency of’ <a person>, as it would have to do on Bergk’s interpretation. On the contrary, in every instance quoted in *TLL* it means ‘for the sake of’ or ‘in consequence of’ a thing or an aim (except at *Aeneid* 6.670 where, since Anchises is dead and the meaning ‘on his account’ is in question, we are close to *genitivus rei*). In other words, the alignment of *ergo* is objective, not subjective. See further Clausen 1976: 38–43 (n. 2: ‘The evidence against Bergk is clear and damning’). Again, that ‘patron’ should be applied to the recipient of a dedication such as this hardly fits either the literary atmosphere of the time – however unsurprising it might be in a later generation – or C.’s utterly independent character. Bergk’s whole idea contradicts C.’s modest confidence in his work for its own merits – merits acknowledged, after all, by Nepos himself, as is clear not only from lines 2–6 here but also from Nepos’ *Life of Atticus*, written in the later 30s BC, i.e., during the time of Gallus and the young Virgil; in that *Life*, an obscure C. Iulius Calidus is singled out as the ‘most elegant’ Roman poet since <those two giants, it is implied> Lucretius and Catullus. Again, the Muse is in fact needed, in order to provide a divine addressee for the optative *maneant*. F. Cairns (1969) has pointed out that ‘a writer asking or wishing that immortality or long life be granted to his work traditionally makes his request or wish to a divinity.’ C. has conquered his doubts before publishing, but still ventures only a modest aspiration to fame (*plus uno saeculo*, l. 10); yet this claim itself, being so severely limited, seems hardly designed to flatter the ego of a *patronus*, if it was through his support alone that the work was to survive. Finally, for the apostrophe, cf. 36.11 (Venus), and also Horace *Odes* 1.4.14 and 1.26.6. For the Muse as the poet’s patron cf. also *Priapea* 2, where perhaps *quidquid id est* recalls C. The apostrophe is structurally in place: it gives the poem force, as an example of an epigrammatic device which we shall see C. employing in several poems that follow, namely the surprise ending or change of direction in the last two lines. On the question of metre, ‘the elision of *i* before *u* is extremely rare, the two vowels being of a “timbre très fermé” . . . Such an elision is totally absent from C.’s dactylic poems, for example’ (Monbrun 1976: 31–8). It is rare enough in C.’s non-dactylic poems; in 11.22 it is at the end of a line; in 14.8 and 29.22, it follows *si, nisi*.

The punctuation adopted here meets the difficulty, raised by Zicàri, that in Catullus and Martial there is never a heavy pause after the fourth syllable of a

phalaecean hendecasyllabic line; and it divides the clauses with equal balance, instead of overloading the former clause. There is a distinction between *quicquid*, which has 'quantitative,' and *qualecumque*, which has 'qualitative,' implications (see Pasoli 1977–8: 55). The punctuation encounters another difficulty, however: relative *quod* is postponed, in a rare hyperbaton. For hyperbaton of a similar sort, see perhaps Propertius 3.21.16; for other hyperbata in C., see 44.9, 64.101, 66.18 with F.'s n., 64.8 and 66.41 (both involving a relative pronoun, as here); cf. also 51.5, 57.8, 62.13 and 14, 64.66 and 216, 67.21, 110.3. For the order cf. 76.9 (*omnia quae*) and 'a much more drastic example' of postponed connecting relative, 68.131 (Wiseman 1979: 172 n. 40, who adds: 'though there is no precise parallel for its positioning inside a subordinate clause, the word-order is perfectly intelligible, and much less contorted than that of (e.g.) 44.9 or 66.18').

patrona virgo = the poet's Muse. The notion of *clientela*, with the consequent duty of *fides* (cf. 34.1 *in fide*), explains why C. can describe a good poet as *pius* (16.5) and a bad one as *impius* (14.7).

- Copley, F.O. 1951. 'Catullus, c. 1,' *TAPA* 82: 200–6.
 Pasoli, E. 1959. 'C. e la dedica a Cornelio,' *Quaderni di vita veronese* 11/12: 433–6.
 Zicàri, M. 1965. 'Sul primo carme di C.,' *Maia* 17: 232–40.
 Elder, J.P. 1966. 'C. 1, His Poetic Creed, and Nepos,' *HSCP* 71: 143–9.
 Gigante, M. 1967. 'Catullo, Cornelio e Cicerone,' *GIF* 20: 123–9.
 Cairns, F. 1969. 'Catullus 1,' *Mn.* 22: 153–8.
 Levine, P. 1969. 'C. c. 1: A Prayerful Dedication,' *CSCA* 2: 209–16.
 Singleton, D. 1972. 'A Note on C.'s First Poem,' *CP* 67: 192–95.
 Latta, B. 1972. 'Zu C.s Carmen 1,' *MH* 229: 201–13.
 Németh, B. 1972. 'How Does C.'s Booklet Begin?,' *ACD* 8: 23–30.
 Piernavieja, P. 1974. 'En torno al Carmen 1 de C.,' *Eclás* 18: 411–17.
 Goold, G.P. 1974. 'O Patrona Virgo,' *Polis and Imperium: Studies in Honour of E.T. Salmon*. Toronto: 253–64.
 Clausen, W. 1976. 'Catulli Veronensis Liber,' *CP* 71: 38–43.
 Monbrun, M. 1976. 'Quelques remarques sur le c. 1 de C.,' *Pallas* 23: 31–8.
 Pasoli, E. 1977–8. 'Sul teste e la funzione del carme 1 di C.,' *RAIB* 66.1: 53–60.
 Wiseman, T.P. 1979. *Clio's Cosmetics*. Chapter 11: 'The Dedication Poem.' Leicester: 167–74.
 Goold, G.P. 1981. 'Two Notes on C. 1,' *LCM* 6: 233–8. [A reply to Wiseman 1979.]
 Van Sickle, J.B. 1981. 'Poetics of Opening and Closure in Meleager, C., and Gallus,' *CW* 75: 65–75.
 Mayer, R. 1982. 'On C. 1.9, Again,' *LCM* 7: 73–4.
 Arkins, B. 1983. 'Further Thoughts on C. 1,' *LCM* 8: 18–20.
 Dettmer, H. 1983. 'A Note on C. 1 and 116,' *CW* 77 (1983): 19. [Refers to Van Sickle 1981.]

- Santini, P. 1983–4. 'Spunti per una interpretazione stilistica formale dei testi poetici latini (C. I),' *Anazetesis* 8–9: 1–10.
- Dettmer, H. 1984. 'A Fresh Look at C. 1.9,' *LCM* 9: 74–5.
- Decreus, F. 1984. 'C., c. 1, Cornelius Nepos et les *Aitia* de Callimaque,' *Latomus* 43: 842–60.
- Skinner, M.B. 1987. 'Cornelius Nepos and Xenomedes of Ceos: a Callimachean Allusion in C. 1,' *LCM* 12: 22.
- Syndikus, H.P. 1987. 'C. 1,' *SPFB* E 32 (1987): 178–80 Nechatová.
- Gratwick, A.S. 1991. 'C. 1.10 and the Title of His *libellus*,' *G&R* 38: 199–202.

2

Structure: 8 + 2 (one sentence only, of ten lines; a slight pause before l. 9). This, the best known perhaps of all C.'s lyrics, presents great difficulties of interpretation, partly because of a corrupt text. Debate reaches back to the early Humanists; the most penetrating account is still that of Zicàri 1963. He effectively defends B. Guarinus' emendations; see App. Crit.

Catullus is deeply in love (almost certainly, with Lesbia); and he chooses the trivial-seeming medium of an address to his beloved's pet bird to declare the depth of his passion (*dolor, ardor, tristes curae*). He is clearly not philandering, and by the same token he does not say that he longs to be in the bird's place; the *curae* are the real subject of the poem, and he finds it impossible to forget them in distraction as she does.

Notice above all the poem's *élan*. The continuity of the utterance can be illustrated by one fact: not until we come to l. 9, with *técum*, do we discover that *passer* is vocative. The address to the bird is carried down to the end of l. 8 before the poet draws breath, as it were, and even to the end of l. 10 (and of the poem) before he finishes the opening sentence (cf. poems 11, 25, 48, 49). In contrast to poem 1, careful development appears to be replaced by a torrent of words, a rush of feeling, and a progression not circular this time but essentially linear, though with discreet repetition of certain concepts. Here we have a clear 8 + 2 line structure (see intr. n. on poem 1), and once more the final couplet leads us in a direction not wholly foreseen (see below). In the order of exposition, as well as in the thought, poem 2 is an extremely sophisticated piece; its imbalance, though apparently 'natural,' is in fact contrived, and applied with great skill. In language there is a mixture of the colloquial (for which poem 1 paves the way) with occasional touches of strangeness or allusiveness. Engelbrecht 1909 protested, with apparently indignant surprise: 'This is not a lovesick poet's groan'; but he wrote when a still somewhat romantic view of C. prevailed (Fr.'s commentary, to which he often refers, had just been published). Much more to our taste is the

Baldwin, B. 1982. 'Catullan Interpretations: Some Pointers,' *Corolla Londiniensis* 2: 9–13.

Dettmer, H. 1984. 'C. 2B from a Structural Perspective,' *CW* 78: 107–10.

(See also bibliography on poem 2.)

3

Structure: 5 + 5 + 2 + 4 + 2.

On the death of the *passer*. This poem must of course be read as a companion piece to poem 2, whether or not the three lines we designate as poem 2^b form part of an intervening poem, now lost (and the vast majority of scholars believe that they do).

We saw in poem 2 how the poet surprises us in the ending, at least if we have had the traditional literary genres in mind and have formed our expectations accordingly. The same thing occurs, somewhat more obviously, in poem 3. (Here, however, the structural formula is not 8 + 2 but rather 16 + 2). The note of lamentation for the bird, which is struck at the outset, is to all appearance preserved up to the exclamations in line 16, after which the thought moves in a quite unexpected direction (see 11–12 n.). It is typical of C.'s wit to produce a *fulmen in clausula* of this kind – not, as we might expect, in the short poems usually styled 'epigrams' for metrical reasons (poems 69–116), but rather in the monostichic poems of the 'polymetric' section of the *liber* (poems 1–60); these in many respects cleave strongly to the epigrammatic formulae of Rhianus or Meleager, notwithstanding the difference in metre. (Latin elegiac epigrams hardly acquired this characteristic before the time of Martial; in C. himself, the elegiac epigrams, poems 69–116, are generally marked by unity of theme and treatment from start to finish.)

As we re-read the poem (which, because of the surprise, we are surely meant to do), it becomes clear that certain expressions had all along pointed to a witty conclusion. *Homines venustiores*, for example, has little to do with love: at 35.17 *venuste* indicates intellectual brilliance, at 36.17 *invenustum* the opposite. Cf. also 13.6, where *venuste noster* closely follows *sale et omnibus cachinnis*. In lines 11 and 12, both the sounds (*it per iter*) and the language, with the off-hand colloquialism of *tenebricosum* and *negant* (continued in *male sit*, and in the use in poetry of *bellus*), render the tone by degrees more and more quasi-comical and almost flippant, so that the threatening shades of Orcus, and of solemnity, are kept at arm's length. But the purpose which this creation of an unlamenting tone actually serves becomes clear only in retrospect, at a second reading, and after the last two lines have made their mark.

Despite the change of direction, there are certain indications of circular structure at the end, where *meae puellae* (l. 17) echoes lines 3–4 and *ocelli* reminds us of *oculis* (l. 5); so too the *flendo* of l. 18 reminds us of the opening word *lugete*. By such means the poem's artistic unity is finally asserted.

- 1 The plurals have seemed to editors to require explanation. But the Latin habit of mind, which gave to so many abstract nouns (e.g., *fides*, *Fides*) a divine embodiment, implies that the regular and the personified use of such nouns lie close together and could not always be sharply distinguished. Thus some editors think it necessary to print *Veneres* at 86.6, whereas others do not. Similar doubt attends the Graces (*gratiae*, *Gratiae*). Consequently it seems quite natural to use plurals even when personification is implied.

For the meaning of *venustiorum* cf. intr. n., para. 2. As Kr. points out, Venus is the patroness of all that can be called *venustus* (he quotes Plaut. *Stich.* 278 *amoenitates omnium venerum et venustatum*); hence, of *homines venusti* in any sense of the adj.

- 2 'All who feel for loveliness.'

quantum est + gen. is colloquial; cf. e.g., Plaut. *Capt.* 836 *quantum est hominum optumorum optume*, *Rud.* 706 *quantum est hominum sacrilegissime*. Cf. also 9.10 n. The idiom was metrically useful at the end of a hendecasyllabic line: see 10.24, 12.3, (13.10), 23.18, 27.2, 45.26.

- 5 *oculis*: a Hellenistic figure (Callim. *H.* 3.211 ἴσον φαέεσσι φιλήσαι, Mosch. 4.9 τὸν τίεσκον ἴσον φαέεσσι ἐμοῖσι); cf. 14.1, 82.2, 104.2, Plaut. *Mil.* 984, Ter. *Ad.* 903.

- 6 *mellitus*: a slang expression (48.1, 99.1; some eds. would read *mellitus puer* at 21.11). Cf. Cicero, *Ad Att.* 1.18.1, and later examples. Before C. the expression *meum mel* (in a similar sense) occurs in Plautus (*Poen.* 367; *melilla* at *Cas.* 135).

- 7 *ipsam*, 'his mistress'; cf. *ipsa* 2.9 and *ipse* = 'the master, the owner' 114.6; Plaut. *Aul.* 356 *ipsus*, *Cas.* 790 *ipsa*. We should take *ipsam* with *suam*; the enjambement will then be similar to that in lines 13–14. To take *ipsam* with *matrem* will not do: *matrem* gains nothing, and *suam* can hardly stand alone. At 32.1 I read *ipsimilla* ('my little mistress'); see App. Crit. and n. there, and cf. Petron. 63.3, 69.3, 75.11, 76.1).

puella here = any girl.

- 8 The second syllable of *illius* is always short in C.; B. expelled *illius* from 67.23, and I have followed him (see n. there).
- 9 Agreement of $R^2(m^2)$ with O points, as it often does, to a correcting variant (*al. siliens*) in X , reproducing a similar variant in A (note the unusual occurrence of a variant in O here). The superfluous *movebat* has slipped in, as a repetition of the end of line 8, because of the similarity of *illius* and *illuc*. The observation *al. vacat hoc verbum* must have come from X , who probably was the first to

make the blunder of introducing the word (*O* does not have it). Notice how *m* omits the word, following *R*²'s observation; but *m*² restores it, simply because it occurs in the text of his exemplar *R*, even though it has already been condemned (by *R*²).

- 10 *pīpiare* usually of infants' cries, or of the shrill chirping of very young birds (OLD s.vv. *pipio*, *pipito*); *titiare*, it has been claimed (see Birt, as quoted by Fr.), was appropriate to the natural song of birds, especially sparrows (Suet. fr. 161 Reifferscheid, *passerum est titiare*; see also A. Riese, *Anth. Lat.*, 762). The substitution, if such it was, is of course metrically necessary. On *pīpiare* and other forms, see Ellis, ed. *maior*² (1878): 350–1.
- 11–12 A parody of epic style; but *tenebricosum* is a colloquial, even somewhat vulgar form, which lightens the tone and firmly identifies it as mock-heroic. The humorous pseudo-solemnity of the whole passage is greatly deflated in the last two lines of the poem, where the *passer* is (or, if we read *vestra*, the shades of Orcus are) reproached for the trivial crime of reddening Lesbia's eyes. For the general idea, editors quote Greek parallels from *AP* 7 (199.3, 203.4, 211.3, 213.6).
- 12 *illuc*, not *illud*.
- (i) The bird is *now* going *by way of* the road (less probably, 'the journey') <to the place> *from* which, they say, no one returns. It makes little sense to say that one returns *from* the road, when the journey is not yet over. The bourne from which no traveller returns is of course a firm literary convention, and it is no road or journey but a *place* – the realm of Acheron – as the long list of allusions in Friedrich's edition will confirm. Hence *illuc*, not *illud*.
- (ii) Metrically, *illuc* is a spondee, *illud* a trochee. In a very important and influential article (1969: 38–43), Otto Skutsch showed that, in the group of poems 2–26 to which this belongs (though not in the dedication poem 1, which would naturally have been composed and added later), out of 263 hendecasyllabic lines there is not even one with a trochaic 'basis,' i.e., a trochaic first foot; whereas 260 (and I hope presently to show that the number should be 261) out of the 263 have a spondaic basis. Hence again *illuc* is to be preferred to *illud*.
- 12 For the sentiment: cf. Philetas fr. 6 (Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*) ἄτραπον εἰς Ἀίδαο / ἤνυσσα, τὴν οὐπω τις ἐναντίον ἦλθεν ὀδίτης and Theocr. 17.118–20 τὰ δὲ μυρία τῆνα . . . ἀέρι πα κέκρυπται, ὄθεν πάλιν οὐκέτι νόστος.
- 13 *at*, to indicate a transition involving a strong contrast: cf. 36.18 n. *vobis male sit* . . . To the Hellenistic parallels for ideas in this poem (see 11–12 nn.) we can now add a set of papyrus fragments from Euphorion's *Thrax* (frs. 413–15 *SH*) containing a series of curses called down on an unnamed enemy for the death of some victim, published in *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (ed. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons) 1983. Their tone (as was pointed out by Professor C. Brown, who kindly drew the papyrus to my attention) seems to be mock-heroic,

and the editors suggested that the victim is an animal; Lloyd-Jones (*SIFC* 77, 1984: 72) further suggests that it may be a pet bird; and he compares it with our poem.

male . . . *malae*: cf. *κακὸς κακῶς* (e.g., Ar. *Eq.* 2) and similar expressions (Plaut. *Aul.* 43 *mala malam aetatem exigas*). Cf. also 61.19, 78.4.

- 14 At 2.9 (where see n.) G^1 alone preserves (from X) a faulty variant reading; here, G^1 alone preserves a *sound* variant reading, from the same source. (It seems possible that R^2 , who saw X , was blind to the merits of the variant because he failed to recognize *orci* as the genitive singular of *Orcus*.) *tenebrae Orci* (Lucr. 1.115) is a solemn expression; here (as at Plaut. *Pseud.* 795) the effect is mock-solemn.

bella, 'pretty' – another slightly colloquial word, which further lightens the tone.

- 15 The effect of *mihi* is to transfer the girl's feeling for the bird to the poet.
 15–17 I find difficulties (later to be specified) in accepting the text as it is given in most editions, and have attempted to deal with these by
 (i) removing the period at the end of l. 15;
 (ii) placing l. 16 in a parenthesis, with a semicolon at the end of the line;
 (iii) reading *vestra* (referring to the shades of Orcus) in place of *tua*.

There is some indication of Ms authority for the change from *tua* to *vestra*. Avantius, in his *Emendationes in Catullum*, published in 1495, attributes four readings, differing from the universally received vulgate of his time, to an *antiquior codex* in which he found them. These are:

- (a) at 2.9, for *sicut ipsa possem*, read *sicut ipse possem*;
 (b) at 2^b.3, for *habet diu ligatam*, read *habet diu negatam*;
 (c) (here), for *tua nunc opera*, read *vestra nunc opera*;
 (d) at 3.18, for *timent* [not *tument*] *ocelli*, read *rubent ocelli*.

Two of these readings (b and d) prove, as McKie (5–6) has noted, that Avantius' *antiquior codex* was genuine: they reproduce what we now know to be the original reading of R . So there need be no doubt that the two remaining readings, including *vestra* here, really did appear in the codex that Avantius consulted.

Additional probability is added to the reading *vestra* by the metrical fact, just noted, that *tua*, an iambus, is metrically at odds with the spondaic basis used, not only in the rest of this poem (since we have decided that *illuc* is the better reading in l. 12), but, with only two exceptions (both explicable) in the entire 263 hendecasyllables of the group of poems 2–26. *Vestra*, on the other hand, being a spondee, conforms to the (nearly 100 per cent) rule of the group.

McKie, who of course did not contemplate the parenthesis and repunctuation I now suggest, envisaged the possibility that the reading *vestra* might be 'attractive to some,' as he puts it; but he adds (p. 6 n. 1): 'They must rely heavily, however, on Housman's "Vester=Tuus," *CQ* 3 (1909), 244–248.' But if

we do as I have urged, putting the preceding line in a parenthesis and altering the punctuation, there will be no need to rely on Housman. Parentheses in Catullus, often of an exclamatory sort, can be found at 1.7 (Iuppiter!), 29.21 (malum!), 61.152–3 (refrain, and apostrophe to Hymen, in mid-sentence), 64.135 (immemor a!), and 68.89 (nefas!), among other instances. At 68.141, Gordon Williams (1968: 712) suggested putting *atqui . . . aequuum est* between brackets and thus removing the need to indicate a lacuna after the line.

Now to translate – with slight omissions – the text I offer: ‘Shades of Orcus, you have taken my pretty bird away (A shameful deed! Poor little bird!); it is *your* fault that . . .’ Some early scribe (it may be suggested), not understanding the implied parenthesis, altered *vestra* to *tua* because he thought it referred to *passer*.

Goold 1969, who would altogether eliminate hiatus in Catullus, has constructed a plausible case for reading *quod, miselle passer*. He finds (p. 196) that *o factum male* cannot be balanced against *o miselle passer* because the first *o* is exclamatory but the second merely indicates the vocative, its real function being to ‘explain’ the pronoun ‘you’ (implied in *tua*). ‘Transpose the rhetorical situation into English, and the clumsiness of the repetition becomes self-evident: “O calamity, o sparrow, you have made her weep.”’ This begs the question whether the next line has to be attached to the end of line 16; Goold does not accept the possibility that both *o*’s are exclamatory, but merely remarks that ‘vocative *o* after exclamatory *o* is intolerable’; therefore he emends the second *o* to *quod*, on the grounds that *o miselle passer* ‘contravenes the stylistic practice of Catullus’ (p. 199) by placing vocative *o* before a noun and adjective; but in order to establish this ‘stylistic practice’ he must alter the manuscript reading accepted by scholarship at both 1.9 (where he chooses Bergk’s unacceptable rewriting of the line: see n.), and 31.12. But (i) hiatus with pathetic effect does seem to occur in Catullus (66.11; 68.158; 76.10 if we accept the *V* reading) and also in Propertius (2.15.1 *o me felicem! o nox*, etc.), and would be particularly effective here before the exclamatory repeated *o* (as for parenthetical exclamation in Catullus, there are in all about a dozen instances of this, some of which I have cited above), and (ii) the *wit* of the poem (and Catullus’ love poems rarely lack witty touches) depends partly on the final two lines with their surprise ending: at this point in the poem, Catullus is about to show the reader, in a couplet which surely ought to be self-contained, that the poem is not after all a lament for the bird but a reproach, addressed to some person or persons, for reddening the girl’s eyes with tears. To introduce this notion too early, in mid-line (as Goold would do), tends to blunt the point when it comes.

Two final arguments. First, the word *opera* should surely be linked to activity rather than to passivity. Qualified by *tua*, it would refer to the *prima facie* victim, the bird; by *vestra*, to the subject (plural) of the phrases *omnia bella devoratis* and *bellum passerem abstulistis*. Notice the sequence of active verbs: (i) in a

general statement, in the present tense, *omnia bella devoratis*; (ii) in a particular application, in the perfect tense, *mihi passerem abstulistis*; then (iii), in a climax, passing in time (and ascending in degree) from the wrong experienced by C. to that now experienced by the *puella*: *vestra nunc . . .* ('and now it is your fault, again, that . . .'). With the reading *tua* there is no real climax, and – what is extremely unlike C. – the word *nunc* becomes little more than a metrical space-filler. Secondly, the apostrophe *at vobis* (l. 13) is marked by a strongly adversative *at*. This should herald a change of direction that dominates the final (climactic) section of the poem. (Examples of *single* apostrophes that do this will be given in a moment.) Instead, if we transfer our attention at l. 16 to *miselle passer*, we get *two* apostrophes, each of three lines – one apostrophe following upon another – which seems to me much weaker. And I doubt if there are any examples in Catullus' shorter poems of a double apostrophe in any way comparable to this. Single apostrophes that turn the movement of a poem and provide a strong ending may be found at poem 27 (*at vos*), 35 (*ignosco tibi*), 36 (*nunc o . . .*), 37 (*tu praeter omnes*), 46 (*o dulces*), and 76 (*o di*). In poem 36 there is a strong mid-poem apostrophe to a goddess, returning however at the end, with adversative *at vos*, to the *Annales Volusi* with which we started.

Line 16 finds an echo in a ten-line inscription in memory of the dog Myia (CE 1512 Bücheler: see F., who gives the text).

- Skutsch, O. 1969. 'Metrical Variations and Some Textual Problems in C.,' *BICS* 16: 38–40. [Read *illuc*.]
- Goold, G.P. 1969. 'C. 3.16,' *Phoenix* 23: 186–203.
- Walters, K.R. 1976. 'Catullan Echoes in the Second Century AD, CEL 1512,' *CW* 69: 353–9.
- Moussy, C. 1977. 'Veneres Cupidinesque (C. 3.1),' *Mélanges offerts à L. Sédar Senghor*. Dakar: 305–14.
- Dahlén, E. 1977. 'Der tote Sperling der Lesbia: einige Randbemerkungen zu C.s Gedicht 3,' *Eranos* 75: 15–21.
- Cassadio, V. 1986–7. 'C. III.1 ss.,' *Museum Criticum* 21/22: 337–8.
- Mezzabotta, M.R. 1990. 'Johannes Burman, Catullus 3.11–14 and Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.33,' *LCM* 15: 190–1.
- Elerick, C. 1993. 'On Translating Catullus 3,' *Scholium* 2: 90–6.

4

Structure: 12 + 12 + 3.

The *phaselus* was a handy vessel, of varying size, used to convey goods, or passengers, or both, in the Mediterranean sea and on the Nile. At sea, for example, it could serve as a tender to ships which by reason of their

- Mette, H.J. 1962. 'C. Carm. 4,' *RhM* 105: 153–7.
- Putnam, M.C.J. 1962. 'C.'s Journey (Carm. 4),' *CP* 57: 10–19.
- Hornsby, R.A. 1963. 'The Craft of C. (Carm. 4),' *AJP* 84: 256–65.
- Seelbach, W. 1963. 'Zu lateinischen Dichtern,' *RhM* 106: 348–9.
- Richardson, L., Jr. 1972. 'C. 4 and *Catalepton* 10 Again,' *AJP* 93: 215–22.
- Leonotti, E. 1982. 'Osservazioni sulla struttura formale del c. 4 di C.,' *Anazetesis* 6–7: 1–7.
- Griffith, J. G. 1983. 'C., Poem 4: A Neglected Interpretation Revived,' *Phoenix* 37: 123–8.
- Watson, L.C. 1983. 'Two Nautical Points: (1) Hor. *Epod.* 1.1–2, (2) C. 4.20–1,' *LCM* 8: 66–9.
- Väisänen, M. 1984. *La Musa poliedrica. Indagine storica su C. 4.* Helsinki.
- Tourlides, G.A. 1989. 'Ερμηνευτικὸν σχόλιον εἰς Κάτουλλον (IV.7) (Athens, 1989).
- van Dam, H.-J. 1990. 'A Comma in C. IV,' *Mn.* 43: 446–9.
- Papy, J. 1992. 'Une imitation de Catulle 4: la *Dedicatio pennae Iusti Lipsi de F. de Montmorency*,' *LEC* 60: 253–61
- Ax, W. 1993. 'Phaselus ille – Sabinus ille,' *Literatur-parodie in Antike und Mittelalter.* Trier: 95–100.

5

Structure: 6 + 5 + 2 (see below, p. 218–19).

To Lesbia: let us enjoy our brief life and the love that our elders disapprove of and the malicious would destroy.

Critics in the past assumed that this was a spontaneous outburst of emotion, of which poem 7 was a more 'literary' reworking. For a time, critical discussion in the journals bore chiefly on the pragmatic question whether finger-counting or abacus-counting was in C.'s mind. More recently, however, interest has shifted to the poem's structure and to a more thoroughgoing evaluation of C.'s artistry.

To a considerable extent, this poem makes its effect by the manipulation of sounds – especially vowel sounds. These are carefully arranged in such a way as to reinforce the structural organization. It is often claimed that there are two distinct parts: lines 1–6 and 7–13. Certainly, after two self-contained statements of three lines each (marked by the repetition *unius . . . una*), we come to an obvious break. At this point the utterance of C.'s passion seems to turn into a game of numbers, the poem's 'second theme.' Does the development of this theme continue to the end of the poem, as some would have it? To me, the *aut* of l. 12 implies a restatement: 'Or rather . . .'; the preceding five lines will be taken as a climactic unit, with a fairly heavy pause after *ne sciamus*, and in l. 12 we should see, I think, a re-entry

of the shadow of the *senes severiores*: 'ne quis malus . . .' The implication is that l. 12 recapitulates the first theme, whereas the final line resumes the second theme: 'tantum . . . basiorum.' If this is so, we have in the two concluding lines a sort of capping-piece which, detached by its *aut*, stands a little apart from the rest of the structure. Lines 1–3 employ the language of the account book: *assis facere* (cf. 42.13) and *aestimare* (both expressions are first found in C.) are much more precise than *pili facere* (10.13, 17.17) and still more so than *parvi putare* (23.25) and the like (notice also *aestimatio*, meaning an exactly assessed value, at 12.12). But in 4–6 there is no business language at all. With l. 7, however, we return to accountancy; clearly some method of computation is envisaged as the thousands succeed to hundreds; but in the climax immediately after the technical expression *facio* (in the sense of 'assess,' 'calculate,' or 'make up the number') comes the explosive *conturbabimus*: we shall go bankrupt. C. uses the very vocabulary of the *senes*, to whom the poem bids defiance, in order to confound their malignant calculation. What other end could the use of such language serve in a love poem, or at least in this one?

The final summing-up in 12–13 reminds us of poem 45, in which the third section recapitulates the whole, lines 21–2 referring to 1–8 and 23–4 to 10–16. But there is a further link between these two poems: the use of sounds. In both of them open *a*'s are an index of triumph: see 5.1 and 2; 45.20 and 22 (and the refrain as well). In both, *o* sounds announce a male speaker or speakers: Septimius in 45, here the *senes*, whose grumbling is also voiced in the displeasing *s* and *r* sounds of l. 2. An obvious point is the effect of *occidit brevis lux*, with a decreasing number of syllables in each successive word and the chopped-off monosyllable at the end of the line – a very rare thing in hendecasyllables (it is repeated, significantly, at 7.7) – followed at once (to drive it home) by *nox est*. Notice also the phrase *perpetua una dormienda*, with its repetition of the vowel sounds *u* and *a*, together with the use of extended, 'lingering' words (*perpetua, dormienda*), the (somehow) powerfully soporific elision of *-a* before *una*, and the abrupt challenge of the ensuing *da mi*, announced in faint tones in the antecedent *-mienda* and echoed later in the minor key of *dein mille*. Such are the mechanics of a poem once thought of as a delightful impromptu.

1 *vivamus*, 'let us really live.' This extended sense was established before C.:

Varro, *Men.* 87 Büch. (other parallels in F.).

atque, 'that is to say.'

2 *rumores*, not 'gossip' here but rather 'grumbling' or 'muttering' (Kr.: 'malicious comments').

severus of course = 'strict,' not (in our sense) 'severe'; cf. perhaps *saevus* in

poem 103, where see nn. Lucretius uses *noctis signa severa*, thinking above all of the *fixity* of the stars' courses (5.1190). The comp. implies 'unduly strict'; but, as Kr. points out, metrical considerations also apply; cf. 3.2, 9.10.

3 *assis*: cf. 42.13.

5 The comma inserted in my text after *nobis* seems necessary if *nobis* is to be taken as referring (in idea) both to *lux occidit* and to *nox est dormienda*. (Some editors punctuate *nobis cum* . . .)

nobis (in a general sense) = human beings. As Q. remarks, the frequentative 'aorist' perfect tense of *occidit* confirms this.

6 *una* (not, of course, *una* = 'together') combines with *perpetua* to qualify *nox*. Notice the clever use of sound ('wavering' alternations of *u* and *a*) to suggest endless sleep, in contrast with the brutal cutting-off indicated by monosyllables (*lux*, at the end of the line, followed at once by *nox*).

7 On the history of the word *basium* (first used by C.; possibly an importation from his native province), see F.; later it became part of the colloquial language (hence *bacio*, *baiser*, etc.). See also poem 7, intr. n.

8 Both *deinde mi*, in the first part of the line, and *da*, in the second, result from attempts by R^2 to restore the metre by original conjecture. As in the great majority of such cases, the R^2 corrections are picked up by *m* (not merely by m^2), which shows that they belong to R^2 's first diorthosis (see 2^b.3 n.). In a letter of Coluccio's (Novati, III. 36), to which a date between 1392 and 1394 is assigned by the editor, this line is quoted, as McKie (190) notes, in the form given to it in the R^2 corrections: *deinde mi altera da* . . . This does not, however, give more than a *terminus ante quem* for the corrections. We simply do not know how soon Coluccio began to correct his codex *R*, or even whether he had the copy made as soon as he received *X* or waited for some years to find a suitable scribe; the large clear lettering of *R* appears to meet the needs of a Coluccio whose eyesight was beginning to fail, towards the end of his life (which hardly suggests the year 1375, thirty-one years before Coluccio's death, to which McKie would implicitly assign it). (On p. 197 and n. 1, McKie refers to the year 1392 – quoting Novati, II. 386 – as the time at which complaints of failing eyesight first occur.) It is possible that *R* itself is to be dated as late as ca. 1392–3, and probable (at least) that Poggio or another copied *m* from *R* in the years 1397–8. Thus, if Coluccio returned to *R* to make a second diorthosis shortly after the scribe of *m* took his copy – therefore, when the readings of *R* were 'in the air,' so to speak, in Coluccio's circle – there could be as little as five years between what I formerly called 'early' and 'late' corrections in R^2 .

10 *fecerimus*, fut. perf. indic.: note the archaic quantity of the *i*: in later poets it is always short; in Cicero, however, it is as a rule long. *facio* here = 'count, add up.'

- 11 *conturbabimus*, 'go bankrupt' (always intransitive, in this sense).
illa, 'how much.' ('What *that* sum is – a kind of demonstrative *ille*.) Cf. line 13
tantum.
 Some editors punctuate *conturbabimus, illa, ne ...*; but see n. on
conturbabimus (above).
- 12 *invidere*, 'cast the evil eye on.' In number magic, to be able to count your
 adversary's possessions gave you the power to put a spell on them.
- 13 *cum ... sciat*, 'inasmuch as he knows.'
tantum ... basiorum, 'the sum of ...'

Grummel, W.C. 1954. 'Vivamus, mea Lesbia,' *CB* 31: 19–21.

Pratt, N.T. 1956. 'The Numerical Catullus 5,' *CP* 51: 99–100.

Grimm, R.E. 1963. 'C. 5 Again,' *CJ* 59: 15–21.

Commager, S. 1964. 'The Structure of C. 5,' *CJ* 59: 361–4.

Fredricksmeier, E.A. 1970. 'Observations on C. 5,' *AJP* 91: 431–45.

6

Structure: 5 + 9 + 3 (see below).

Intercalated between two of the most ardent poems arising out of C.'s own passion for Lesbia, this occasional piece removes us temporarily from all deeper and more personal feeling. Who Flavius was is unimportant: Catullus is – *lepido versu* – rallying a friend, in the hope of finding out the name of his present *innamorata*. That the poem is an early composition may be guessed, not from its position in the collection or the fact that Lesbia fails to appear in it directly or indirectly, but from the touch of rhetorical terminology which, in line 11, it appears to contain: *argutatio* and *inambulatio* both belong to the propaedeutic of the orator's craft (see l. 11 n.), and (as I have suggested in discussing poem 1) the prosaic and logical manner of exposition, articulated by *nam* (line 6) and *quare* (line 15), may well do so too. It may most reasonably be supposed that Flavius was occupied in pursuing the *tirocinium fori*, which Catullus himself, as seems inherently probable, came to Rome in the first instance to undertake, though from various hints he drops we may be pretty sure that he is distinctly half-hearted about it.

The poem exhibits a certain circularity of structure, as Bardon (1943: 15) has noted: in lines 1–3 (according to Bardon; I prefer the division 1–5) the theme is 'let's talk of your love-affair'; in 4–11 (or 6–14, on my interpretation) the evidence for the affair itself is presented; finally (11–17 by Bardon's reckoning, or perhaps 15–17) we return to the theme 'let's talk of your love.'

- 14 *si potest quid esse (perditius)*: for *si quid est* with the comparative, cf. 13.10, 23.13, 82.2; *V's potes* is understandable, but wrong.
 15 *tamen*, 'after all.' *hoc* = what you have tried so far.
 16 *potest <feri>*: cf. 72.7 for this ellipse.
 17 *ferreo* = *duro* ('brazen' is the usual English equivalent). Notice the growling effect of the *r*'s in 16–17 (F.); cf. *Lucretius* 5.1064–5.
 18 *si potestis* really = 'to see if'; i.e., indicative loosely used for subjunctive.
 24 *pudica et proba* (ironical): cf. *Hor. Epod.* 17.40.

Perrotta, G. 1931. 'Il carme 42 di C.,' *A&R* 12: 45–58.

Fraenkel, E. 1961. 'Two Poems of C.,' *JRS* 51: 46–53 [Poems 42, 8.]

Augello, G. 1991. 'C. e il folklore. La flagitatio nel c. 42,' *Studi di filologia classica in onore di C. Monaco*. Palermo: 723–35.

43

Structure: (with the punctuation in the text) 4 + 4, with repetition of the fourth line of poem 41 as the fifth line here.

The main *rhetorical* point of the poem is the extended *litotes* in lines 2–4. On the interpretation in general see the intr. n. to poem 41.

- 1 *puella*: cf. 41.1.
naso: cf. 41.3. A long nose was thought of as especially ugly in girls: *Hor. S.* 1.2.93 (*nasuta*).
 2–3 *bello pede . . . nigris ocellis . . . longis digitis*: for these marks of beauty, which the *puella* is said to lack, F. compares *Ov. Am.* 3.3.7 *pes erat exiguus* [contrast *Hor. S.* 1.2.93 *pede longo*], *Prop.* 2.2.5 *longaeque manus*, 2.12.23 *caput et digitos et lumina nigra puellae*; add to these *Ov. AA* 1.622 *et teretes digitos exiguumque pedem*. Cf. also *Hor. Od.* 1.32.11 and *AP* 37 on *nigri oculi* (in men, not women).
 4 B. rightly points out that *elegans* is not appropriate to the description of a strictly *physical* defect, and assigns it to her manner of speaking.
 5 See 41.4 n.
 6 *provincia* = Gallia Cisalpina (in contrast to Rome; the girl, unlike Lesbia, was beautiful only by 'provincial' standards – if at all).
narrat, 'tells the tale' (cf. *Hor. S.* 2.7.5), or simply 'says' (*Ter. Heaut.* 520 'nil' *narras?*).
 7 *nostra* does not *necessarily* imply that C. was still on good terms with Lesbia, though he probably was (see intr. n. to poems 41 and 43, and cf. 58.1).
 8 *saeclum*: 'generation,' rather than 'world' (F., who however has a good n. on the connotations of the word).

Here *m* is again careless: for *et* he reads *atque*. He corrects himself at once, but annuls his self-correction; this hasty erasure is properly ignored by *G*².

P. Murgatroyd, 'A Note on the Structure and Punctuation of C. 43,' *EMC/CV* 29 (1985): 121–3.

44

Structure: 9 + 8 + 4.

An address to his country-house in the hill country northeast of Rome. C. has been invited to dinner by Sestius (to be identified with Cicero's friend and associate P. Sestius: see F.). He realizes that if he accepts he will be expected to have read – and be willing to praise – his host's latest speech; but, having read it in anticipation of the invitation, he finds that it offends him from a literary point of view. A severe cold comes to the rescue, and enables C. to make his excuses.

A pleasant, straightforward *pièce d'occasion*; but the pun on *frigus*, meaning either 'cold' or 'preciosity of style,' for which, according to F., the poem is 'merely a vehicle,' is not quite everything it possesses in the way of a point. Besides the indications that C. is parodying legal language (no doubt because of Sestius' reputation in the Forum), and also to some extent the archaic formulas of invocations to the gods (since he adopts the form of an address to the abode of his *lares*, so to put it), the reference to a vegetable diet in l. 15 hints obliquely at the connection of Antius (l. 11), the subject of Sestius' eloquence, with a recent attempt to revive the sumptuary legislation, directed against electoral corruption; such laws traditionally (i) aspired to restrict the number of guests a candidate for office (*petitor*: see l. 11) might entertain at the same dinner, and (ii) prescribed that the dishes served at such political entertainments must consist largely of vegetables. Syme 1963 identifies Antius with the author of a *lex sumptuaria* of this kind; see the bibliography below, both for this and for the parodies of legal and sacral language, mentioned above. See also line 10 n.

1 *fundus*: see 6–7 n.

seu Sabine seu Tiburs: cf. Suet. *vita Horati* p. 47 R., quoted by F.: *in secessu ruris sui Sabini aut Tiburtini*; Horace's villa, like C.'s, was not strictly in fashionable Tibur but rather just outside it, in the unpretentious Sabine farming country on the side away from Rome. If you wanted to stretch a point – and flatter the owner – you could call it 'Tiburtine' (Suetonius' *aut*, like C.'s *seu*, implies 'if you prefer to think of it in that way').

- 1 The identifications are quite uncertain. 'Socration' may well have been a Greek in fact; Piso (l. 2) liked having Greeks about him (Cicero, *In Pisonem* 22 and 67). For the possibility (suggested by Fr.) that C. uses *Socration* as a pseudonym for the philosopher Philodemus, see F.'s n.

sinistrae <*manus*>: *dextra manus* = 'right hand' in our (metaphorical) sense, but C. substitutes *sinistra*, 'thieving hand,' as in 12.1. The word *duae* is not merely a 'colloquial addition, contributing nothing to the sense,' as Kr. opines, but serves to add an element of ridicule to the abuse.

- 2 *Pisonis*: cf. poem 28 on his relations with Veranius and Fabullus, and see the intr. n.

scabies famae: in his poems of invective (poem 21, for example) against Furius and Aurelius, C. uses the contemptuous notion 'starveling' as a part of his rhetorical armament; here, even if the 'point is just that Porcius and Socration are not starving, or likely to starve' (F.), it is still available for the purposes of *diffamatio*. There is therefore no need to follow F. in translating ('most naturally') 'itching greed whose object is the *mundus*.' Whether in C.'s time *mundus* (the noun) could mean *human* world, as opposed to universe (or *cosmos*), in the limited sense in which Lucr. uses it, is discussed at length by F.; he views with some favour Bücheler's emendation *mundae* (adj. = 'tidy').

- 4 *verpus* = ψωλός (an Aristophanic word: 'with the prepuce drawn back,' L. and S.; figuratively signifying 'lustful'). Cf. 28.12 *verpa*; the two poems are linked by language as well as by subject (cf. 15.14–19 and poem 40; see notes on the latter).

- 5 Notice the asyndeton, which, as F. remarks, corresponds to μέν . . . δέ in Greek, and would be replaced by a subordinate clause (e.g., 'whereas . . .') in English.

- 6 *de die*, as F. says (see his n.), 'implies taking time off the normal [working] day'; his translation is 'in the day-time.'

- 7 *quaerunt in trivio*: typical Catullan exaggeration; cf. poem 58 (esp. l. 4). *vocationes*, 'invitations.' Cf. 44.21 *vocat*, 'invites.'

Giardina, G.C. 1984–5. 'Note a C. [c. 47],' *MCr* 19–20: 193–7.

Dettmer, H. 1985. 'A Note on C. 47,' *CW* 78: 577–9.

48

Structure: (2 + 1) + (1 + 2). Notice the chiasmic arrangement of positive and negative conditional clauses, especially in lines 1–2 and 5–6.

To Juventius: 300,000 kisses. The huge number itself indicates C.'s penchant for extravagance in language. As I remarked in discussing poem 16, it is the present poem – not poem 5 or 7 – that is the source of the references there to *versiculi molliculi* on the subject of 'many thousands' of kisses (see 16.4 n).

Other poems besides poem 16, notably the (nearby) 15 and 21, and possibly also poem 81 (where see nn.), connect Aurelius at least to C.'s interest in Juventius. (Poem 16 is clearly C.'s reply to a lampoon, or more probably a pair of lampoons, from Furius and Aurelius, which had already been circulated, at least among mutual friends, so that C. feels he must answer them publicly. In spite of the disparaging language C. habitually uses about F. and A., it is clear from poem 11 that they do not regard themselves as his enemies – they say that they will go to the ends of the earth with him – while he for his part is willing to entrust to them, as he professes, albeit somewhat contemptuously, his final message of renunciation, to be delivered to Lesbia.)

1 *mellitos*, colloquial; a favourite word of C.'s; cf. (e.g.) 99.1 (of Juventius) and 3.6 (of Lesbia's pet bird).

oculos: see 9.9 n.

2 In the elaborately indirect *si quis* . . . , C. surely means 'if you yourself should . . .' Kr.'s alternative explanation – that C. is hinting that his relationship with Juventius was 'not unhindered' – is too literal, and extends this very slight poem's field of reference too far, to be credible.

3 *milia*, sc. *basiarum*. Notice what Q. calls 'the obsessive repetition' *usque basiare* . . . *usque basiem*.

4 The reading *nec numquam* in V cannot be supported, as Q. maintains, by V's *nec* . . . *nullo* at 76.3; see n. there.

5 *aridis*: Kr., rightly dismissing the emendation *Africis*, proposed by Markland (*Ep. Crit.* [1723] 157; see B.), cites Aug. CD 4.8 *seges ab inittis herbidis usque ad aridas* (= 'fully ripe') *aristas*; V. *Aen.* 7.720 *densae* . . . *aristae*; and Ov. *M.* 2.213 *seges arida*. (The thickness of the crop is obviously more 'eye-catching' when it is in the ear than when it is still in the blade; so the adj. has point.)

7 *osculationis*: cf. 7.1 *basiationes*, and see n. there.

49

Structure: unitary (a single sentence).

A note to Cicero, professing gratitude. There is no external evidence, either for the occasion of the poem, or for the personal relations between Cicero and Catullus. Much debate has focused on the question whether C.'s gratitude is sincerely meant or 'ironical,' as well as on the other question whether the gift or favour for which Cicero is thanked was literary or forensic. My own view, expressed in an article published some years ago (see Bibliography), can be very briefly summarized as follows. The most important thing in the poem is the insistence (by repetition, at the end of the line) on *poeta*,

- 7 Observe the superiority of *O*'s reading here. The word *lecticulus* is attested by Celsus 2.12.2 in a medical context; note *morbosi* in the preceding line. The 'cosy' effect (L.) of its juxtaposition with the other diminutive in *-ulus* (*erudituli*) is of course deliberate. For the literary ('grammatical') interests of the pair, notice (i) Caesar's *De analogia*, (ii) poem 105 on Mamurra.

Suet. *Aug.* 78 refers to *lecticula lucubratoria*; cf. also Plin. *Ep.* 5.5.5 for a similar use of *lectulus*.

- 8 For the extended sense of *vorax*, cf. 29.2 n.
adulter: Suet. *Iul.* 50–2 (containing inter alia the scurrilous verses to this effect sung at Caesar's triumph). On Mamurra, see 29.6–8.
- 9 See App. Crit. (It may be right to omit *et*; possibly, as B. suggests, *sociei* became *societ* and was later expanded by doubling of the *i*.) Tr. 'rivals who <nevertheless> also <have the benefit of each other's> share in.'

Birt, T. 1896. 'C. und Petron,' *RhM* 51: 468–70.

Scott, E.A. 1976. 'Gemelli (C., c. 57.6),' *RhM* 119: 349–51.

Lebek, W.D. 1982. 'Gemini und gemelli: Anthologia Latina² (Riese) 457.8 und C. 57.6,' *RhM* 125: 176–80.

58

Structure: unitary (single sentence).

A communication to the Caelius of Verona mentioned in poem 100: C. has heard that Lesbia, whom he once loved with all his heart, is living an abandoned life with her lovers in Rome.

Like poem 11, this renunciatory poem is addressed not to Lesbia herself, but to someone else. It is nevertheless the saddest and the bitterest in tone of all the Lesbia poems; notice the heartbroken repetition *Lesbia illa, illa Lesbia*. C.'s disillusionment is complete. The repetition of the name, together with the reference to himself in the third person (cf. poem 8 for the pathos involved in this), and the declaration of his own devotion, are all associated with the past (perfect) tense in *amavit*; but with *nunc . . . glubit* (the poem's only other verb) we turn to the harsh present, and the poem ends, as poem 11 also does, with a sudden shower of cold realism in the shape of ugly words. The phrase *Remi nepotes* clearly implies that Lesbia is in Rome; it also suggests that neither C. nor Caelius is there, certainly not Caelius. Of course, *glubit* (and the surrounding language) should by no means be taken literally; 'Lesbia' (whoever she was) was no prostitute (cf. 37.14 and see n. there.) It is a typical piece of Catullan passionate exaggeration.

- 1 *nostra* = *mea*; cf. 43.7. Here again *m* seems to have blundered into the right reading.
- 2 *unam*: compared by F. (on 10.17) to *unus* with superlative or comparative. What we should think of, also, is 31.11 *quod unum est pro . . .*; Lesbia outweighed (in herself alone) all others in the eyes of C.
- 3 *plus quam se atque suos*: besides Cicero, TD 3.72 (quoted by Kr. and F.), cf. *Brut.* 295 *hunc quem tu plus quam te amas*.
- 4 *quadriuiis*: Prop. 4.7.19 *saepe Venus trivio commissa est*.
angiportis, 'alleys, lanes' (between two houses). *m* heedlessly misses R²'s correction, and reads *agi-* with R.
m alters R's unmetrical reading to *-uiis* (a typical example of his independence in correction).

- 5 *glubit*, 'peels' (of *verpi*, etc.; *sens. obsc.*)
magnamini Remi nepotes, 'the (degenerate) descendants of great-souled Remus.' The mock-epic language enhances the brutality of the picture. For *Remi nepotes* (= present-day Romans) there are parallels: see 28.15, 29.5 and 9, 34.22, 49.1. Clearly C. is at Verona when he hears the news of Lesbia's goings-on *in Rome* (the last line is designed to make this point); Caelius, a Veronese friend (see 100.1–2), is with C. at Verona, in all probability. The date is likely to be close to, or somewhat later than, that of poems 41 and 43 (see the intr. n. to both poems).

GR offer some evidence of an abortive attempt at correction on the part of X. We can plausibly reconstruct the archetypal (A) reading as follows: *magna*amiremi/ni** (O supposed that this meant that the *ni* should be added at the end, and so did X, who however tried to make a word out of *amiremini*.)

The reading *magnanimos Remi* makes (it seems) its earliest appearance in *Ven. Marc.* 12.28 (No. 116), a Ms apparently of the 1460s. Jocelyn 1979: 87 attributes it to *Vat. Lat.* 1608, which is firmly dated as late as 1479.

Pearse, P.J. 1910. 'Miscellanea: C. 58.1,' *PCPS* 85: 6–7. [Punctuate: *Caeli Lesbia, nostra Lesbia illa.*]

Lenz, F.W. 1963. 'Catulliana,' *RCCM* 5: 62–7.

Bodoh, J.J. 1976. 'C. 58,' *AC* 45: 627–9.

Penella, R.J. 1976. 'A Note on (de)glubere,' *Hermes* 104: 118–20.

Arkins, B. 1977. 'C. 58.5,' *LCM* 2: 237–8.

– 1979. 'Glubit in C. 58.5,' *LCM* 4: 85–6.

Jocelyn, H.D. 1979. 'C. 58 and Ausonius Ep. 71,' *LCM* 4: 87–91.

Skutsch, O. 1980. 'C. 58.4–5,' *LCM* 5: 21.

Randall, J.G. 1980. 'Glubit in C. 58; Retractio,' *LCM* 5: 21–2.

Sobrino, E.O. 1984. 'Catulo, c. LVIII,' *EClas* 26: 189–91.

- 9 *postilla* is archaic.
 10 *horribilis*, with an implication of rough seas; cf. 4.8 *horridam*, and perhaps 11.11 *horribile aequor* (but the text is doubtful). See intr. n.

- Bell, A.J. 1915. 'Note on C., 84,' *CR* 29: 137-9.
 Harrison, E. 1915. 'C., LXXXIV,' *CR* 29: 198-9.
 Schuster, M. 1917. 'Zur Deutung des Arriusepigramms,' *WS* 39: 76-90.
 Jones, D.M. 1956. 'Catulli Nobile Epigramma,' *Proc. Cl. Assoc.* 53: 25-6.
 Ramage, E.S. 1959. 'Note on C.'s Arrius,' *CP* 54: 44-5.
 Einarson, B. 1966. 'On C. 84,' *CP* 61: 187-8.
 Kortekaas, G. 1969. 'Arrius en zijn uitspraak van het latijn,' *Hermeneus* 40: 269-86.
 Levin, D.N. 1973. 'Arrius and His Uncle,' *Latomus* 32: 587-94.
 Baker, R.J., and Marshall, B.A. 1975. 'The Aspirations of Q. Arrius,' *Historia* 24: 220-31.
 - 1977. '*Avunculus liber* (C. 84.5),' *Mn.* 30: 292-3.
 - 1978. '*Commoda* and *Insidiae*: C. 84.1-4,' *CP* 73: 49-50.
 Vandiver, E. 1990. 'Sound Patterns in C. 84,' *CJ* 84: 337-40.

85

Structure: unitary monodistich (see below).

This poem represents the ultimate stage in a process of condensation of thought and expression, earlier stages in which are represented by poems 72 and 75. Its merits are strength and economy. Images, which are often held to be the lifeblood of poetry, are wholly lacking, except for the long-extinct metaphor in *excrucior*. The 'figure of grammar' is another matter; see Colaclidès 1969. A notable feature is the heavy proportion of verbs: 'quand la tension est extrême, les verbes dominant,' remarks J. Bayet (*Fondation Hardt, Entretiens*. Vol. 2 [Geneva, 1953]: 33). Of the structure it may be said, 'while the form is dual, the idea it expresses is triple' (D. Daiches, *The Study of Literature* [New York, 1948]: 148). In the first place, we have a triad of increasing *cola*, with pauses after *amo* and *requiris*. Again, each line is internally divided by two pauses: in l. 1, the second of these comes after *faciam*; in l. 2, the second comes after *fieri*. This serves to emphasize, as well as to mark, the main contrast on which the poem hinges: not the contrast *odi-amo*, as is commonly supposed, but the much more potent one between the active and passive forms of the verb *facio*; see n. on l. 2. In terms of rhythm, the choriambic phrase *odi et amo* is exactly balanced against the concluding verb *excrucior*; taken together, these two summarize

the poem. The prosaic *fortasse*, and the conversational tone of *id faciam* (cf. Hor. S. 1.1.64, where *id* in *id facit* = *miserum esse*), are well suited to the 'dialogue' in very plain terms which occupies the middle ground of the couplet. For a view of the 'interlocutor' (the subject of *requiris*) as being C.'s 'ideal self,' see Bishop 1971. The anticipated question, however, is both a poetical and a rhetorical device, and need not strictly be taken to embody the notion of a dialogue.

1 *quare id faciam* = *quare oderim et amem* (F.); *id faciam* is colloquial.

R's self-correction is not clear enough to prevent *m* from following at first (he is already in great haste); but *m* corrects himself no less quickly, seeing the erasure and the superscript letter *o*. This is better than supposing, as McKie: 200 does, that here *m* deliberately follows *R*, erasures and all (a procedure more suited to the character of *m*²).

2 Contrast Ovid's much less powerful *odero, si potero; si non, invitus amabo* (*Am.* 3.11.35; the line is bracketed as spurious by Kenney, following Heinsius).

feri is not, as Kr. says, the exact equivalent of *me id facere*; on the contrary, the passive nature of the event is strongly stressed by contrast with the active in the question (*faciam*). What we have to supply with *feri* is not *a me* but *mihi*: 'It's happening to me (and I can't help it).'

excrucior: cf. 76.10, 99.12, and 66.76 *discrucior*.

Colaclidès, P. 1969. 'Grammaire et Poésie: C. 85,' *EMC/CV* 13: 65–8.

Bishop, J.D. 1971. 'C. 85. Structure, Hellenistic Parallels, and the Topos,' *Latomus* 30: 633–42.

Triantaphyllopoulos, J. 1979. 'C. 85,' *RhM* 112: 98.

Colaclidès, P. 1981. 'Odi et Amo – Une Lecture Linguistique de c. LXXXV de Catulle,' *Contemporary Literary Hermeneutics and Interpretation of Classical Texts* (ed. S. Kresic). Ottawa: 227–33.

Verdière, R. 1985. "Odi et amo. Étude diachronique et psychique d'une antithèse,' *Hommages à H. Bardon*. Brussels: 360–72.

Decreus, F. 1986. 'Le poème 85 de C. et les épigrammes 28, 35 et 19 (Pf.) de Callimaque,' *Hommages à Jozef Veremans*. Brussels: 48–56.

Hommel, H. 1986. 'Topos und Originalität in C.s Zweizeiler (c. 85),' *Studien zur Altengeschichte Siegfried Lauffer . . . I–III*. Rome: 421–36.

Ferguson, J. 1987. 'C. 85,' *LCM* 19: 138.

Arkins, B. 1987. 'A New Translation of C. 85,' *LCM* 12: 118.

Nussbaum, G. 1987. 'Odi et Amo – Again (C. 85),' *LCM* 12: 148.

Arkins, B., and Egan, D. 1988. 'Another Translation of C. 85,' *LCM* 13: 61–2 .

Greenwood, M.A. 1988. 'More Thoughts on C. 85,' *LCM* 13: 80.

(The principal argument against writing *veneres* with a small *v* lies in the possibility that C. may partly have had in mind Callim. fr. 200a Pf. τὰς Ἀφροδίτας ὑπερφέρει πάσας; but *surrripuit* embodies a different concept.)

87

Structure: balanced (2 + 2), with repetition.

Complete in itself, and not to be attached (as Scaliger suggested) to poem 75. One part of what is said in poems 72 and 75, which found no room for inclusion in the brief utterance of poem 85, is the subject of this poem: the one-sidedness of C.'s past love for Lesbia (note the emphasis on the perfect tense: *amata es; fuit; reperta est*). In the change of person, associated with repetition, F. sees 'emotion struggling with the restrictions of form.' For the stress C. lays on his own *fides*, see poem 76 n. The sting of this epigram lies, of course, in *ex parte mea*.

2 *vere* goes with *dicere*. In the light of *tantum . . . quantum* it cannot be right to punctuate, as Kr. does, at the end of line 1.

es: see App. Crit. (*V*'s *mea est* is perhaps influenced by line 4). Change of 'person addressed' would drive a wedge between the two couplets; F.'s defence of *est*, based on the order of the words in l. 2, is hardly strong enough to answer this objection.

3 *in* is omitted due to preceding *m* (76.3 n.)

tanto V, under the influence of the neuter *foedere*.

fides, foedere: cf. 76.3 n.

4 On the harsh diaeresis following *ex* (which separates noun from preposition) see 76.18 n. (also 111.2).

Heuze. P. 1987. 'À propos du c. 87 de C.,' CEA 20: 53–61.

88–91

A quartet of epigrams against Gellius (on whom see intr. n. to poem 74) accusing him of incest with his (step)mother and sister (*germana*, 91.5).

88

Structure: balanced (question and answer) 4 + 4. The poem is 'punctuated,' so to speak, by the repetition of *Gelli* at the same place in each quatrain.

For the parody of mythological language (see l. 6 n.) immediately after the pointedly prosaic *ecquid*, cf. 81.3 n.; there is bathos at the end as well.

added lines 2 and 3, which Gellius (like O) preserves. See the discussion in the Introduction, p. 43.

Dunbabin, R.L. 1917. 'Notes on Latin Poets: C. 92.3,' CQ 11: 136.

93

Structure: unitary monodistich. See Campanile 1975 for a useful analysis. To Julius Caesar: 'I have no desire to please you, or even to know the very first thing about you.' Not, surely, a mere expression of indifference; the pointed language suggests that C.'s epigram is a reply to some communication from Caesar (perhaps a polite request to C. to desist from attacking a friend of his father). What was the ground of C.'s offence? Possibly poem 29 (see the echo of *imperator unice* in 54^b); or 57; or even poems 41 and 43, as lampoons directed against Mamurra, though this seems less likely; not, at any rate, the 'Mentula' poems, which arise out of poem 29 apparently because C. could no longer afford to assail Mamurra under his real name (which, if we could assume it to be probable, would again point to poem 29 as the source of the trouble and the cause of Caesar's complaint).

The language is studiously offhand; see notes on l. 1. Of the proverbial expression in l. 2 it may be remarked that C. is much more apt to introduce proverbs into his epigrams than into either the 'polymetrics' or the long poems: see also poems 70, 94, 102, 105, with only one example (at 22.21) in the rest of the collection. (At 94.2 and 98.2 and 100.3, C. announces a proverb as such; see also 94.1–2 n. on the use of *vere* and *certe*.)

It may (or may not) be sheer accident that, among several quotations of C. in Quintilian, the two which are 'unattributed' (Wiseman 1985: 260), this one (at 11.1.38) and that at 9.4.141 (quoting 29.1), both refer to attacks on Caesar (here significantly described as *insania*; see 11.1.38, where also the phrase *aliquis poetarum* suggests a rather contrived forgetfulness as to the offending poet's identity).

- 1 *nil nimium studeo*, 'I'm none too anxious' (colloquial in language and tone). Cf. 43.4 *nimis*. Originally, *nimum* meant the same as *valde* (Kr., F.). This is a survival of that meaning.
velle placere, perhaps 'try to please'; *velle* is not, as Kr. would have it, wholly pleonastic; see the examples in F.

(Notice how the word *Caesar* is dropped into the most unemphatic position in the line.)

- 2 *scire*, etc.: this can be paraphrased 'know the first thing about you.' A proverb: see intr. n. Cicero, *Phil.* 2.41 *albus aterne fuerit ignoras*; cf. Apul. *Apol.* 16. The

origin of the phrase can just possibly be seen in Phaedr. 3.15.10, where it is a lamb that asks concerning its mother: *unde illa scivit, niger an albus nascerer? ater*, 'swarthy' (in complexion); cf. 39.12 *Lanuvinus ater*. There is of course no equation *albus* = 'good' and *ater* = 'bad'; see Campanile 1975: 38. Posch 1979: 322–6 gives a thoroughgoing account of the meaning of the phrase ('indifference' in general, the terms *albus* and *ater* being external, rather than moral, in reference). Ingemann 1981–2 challenges this view, claiming that a moral application would be more interesting; such application he finds in the Greek terms λευκός = homosexual, μέλας = manly (Ar. *Thesm.* 30–5 and 191). But he seems to miss, or ignore, the fact that C. is saying, above all, 'I don't greatly *care* to know ...'

See App. Crit. According to Avantius, Parthenius (in his lectures on Quintilian) was first to suggest *sis ater an albus*. For this and other claims (including that of Beroaldus, *Annotationes centum*, 1488) to have found or invented the correction, see Gaisser 1993: 103 and n. 135.

Campanile, E. 1975. 'Una struttura indoeuropea a Roma,' *SSL* 15: 36–44, esp. 36–9.

Posch, S. 1979. 'Albus an ater homo. Zu C. c. 93,' *Serta Philologica Aenipontana* 3. Innsbruck: 319–36.

Ingemann, V. 1981–2. 'Albus an ater – a double entendre in C. 93?,' *Classica et Mediaevalia* 33: 145–50.

94

Structure: unitary monodistich.

'Mentula' here and at 105, 114.1, and 115.1, can hardly be anyone but Mamurra, in view of 29.3 and 13. For the rather contrived pun on the name (see n. on l. 2) cf. 115.1 and 8. Notice in l. 1 the alliteration on *m* (a sound often used by C. to convey disapproval).

1 As variations on the punctuation adopted here (see the next n.), it is possible (a) to place a full stop at the end of the line (as Mynors does), so that *Certe* answers the question *moechatur?*; or (b) to take *moechatur* as a statement (Kr.); or else (c) to punctuate as follows: '*Mentula moechatur.*' *moechatur mentula certe.* (Schuster, Eisenhut). Against (a), the strong punctuation before a final spondee makes it decidedly preferable to continue the sense of *certe* into the next line; cf. 98.3, 100.3. See Norden on V. *Aen.* 6.389. Kr. may be right in suggesting that a stop after *certe* would weaken the effect of the chiasmus in the line.

1–2 *certe hoc est quod dicunt*, 'this undoubtedly is an example of the proverb ...' Cf. Ter. *Heaut.* 520 *quod dici solet*. In the passage 100.3–4 (*hoc est, quod dicitur, illud fraternum vere dulce sodalicium*), notice the use of *vere* to point