

Finally there is a difficulty of production.<sup>17</sup> At verse 62, Phaethon and Clymene prepare to exit into the central door of the *scaenae frons*. At verse 54, the chorus have already begun to enter the theater through the same door (for the technique compare Aesch. *Cho.* and Soph. *El.*) and not from the parodos. Scholars have detected an awkward situation. Webster<sup>18</sup> wants an entrance from the parodos. This contradicts verse 54 (ἐξω δόμων) and will not do. Hourmouziades<sup>19</sup> is reluctant to have two actors stand idly by the door while the chorus enter, cross the *logeion*, and reach the orchestra "without noticing their presence." He prefers an entrance by a side door. Diggle<sup>20</sup> argues that the chorus "begin to appear from the door of the palace" at 54 and by 62 are arrayed in the orchestra. This excessively accelerates the action; and such stage business would detract from the spoken dialogue. Rather, at 54, the double central door would begin to open. At 62, the flute-player would lead the fifteen housemaids

across the *logeion*, down a step or two, into the orchestra past the actors who would enter the *scaenae frons* before the singing of the first ode began. The situation could be managed. It could also have been eliminated in rehearsals.

The authenticity of the tragedy is indubitable. How does one explain its peculiarities? The play was never performed and thus never parodied and never painted. Either Euripides submitted the script to the archon eponymous who rejected it<sup>21</sup> or he never completed it and, with the *Bacchae* and *Iphigenia in Aulis*, it survived in his *Nachlass*. A rejection accords with the low esteem in which his contemporaries held him.<sup>22</sup> The absence of Phaethon at Volterra and the lack of quotations from the play for four hundred years suggest that it was in no pre-Alexandrian edition nor in the repertoire of roving acting companies. *Ca.* 420 B.C., therefore, is the date of composition and not of performance.<sup>23</sup>

WILLIAM M. CALDER III

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

as he always should when treating any ancient artifact, where the cameo is today and so I could not examine it. The Florentine sarcophagus (Diggle, p. 214) is Uffizi No. 432.

17. Diggle's discussion (pp. 94-95) is obscured by two slips. At p. 94, 29 for "their entrance" read "their exit," and at p. 95, 5 for "Phaethon enters" read "Phaethon exits."

18. See T. B. L. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London, 1967), p. 222. In establishing any stage direction, we must always begin with what the text says.

19. See N. Hourmouziades, *Production and Imagination in Euripides* (Athens, 1965), pp. 22-23.

20. See Diggle, pp. 94-95.

21. For what would have happened, see A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1968), p. 84. A rejected script would never reach the Metroon but would remain in private hands.

22. See V. Martin, "Euripide et Ménandre face à leur public," *Fondation Hardt, Entretiens VI* (Geneva, 1960), 245 ff.

23. I am grateful for beneficial advice to K. Dunbabin, W. Schindler, W. J. Slater, and J. Vaio.

## CATULLUS 76: ELEGY OR EPIGRAM?

David O. Ross (*Style and Tradition in Catullus*, Cambridge, 1969) claims that stylistic analysis proves *c.* 76 to be an epigram. He bases his analysis on "vocabulary, metrical features, and other stylistic criteria" (p. 170) and on literary history. But it seems clear that he begins by assuming that 76 is an epigram primarily because it is embedded amidst the epigrams and that his job is to sweep away the notion that it is an elegy. Three points only are connected by Ross with 76: violation of Hermann's Bridge, spondaic lines, and the use of *que-que*. This is a thin collection; nor does it lead very far in his direction.

Hermann's Bridge (p. 129) turns out to be violated once in the elegiacs (65-68), three times in the epigrams proper, and once in 76 (Ross considers 76 an epigram), there being 325 lines in the elegies and 319 in the epigrams. But Golden Age verse is cited (p. 129) as being "indifferent to it [Hermann's Bridge]," and Vergil violates it frequently. On this basis Ross simply cannot make any point out of the pitiful handful of examples culled from poems 65-116. On the other hand, one suspects that literary criticism could show that, as in the case of certain elisions, forces other than genre requirements have produced this small number.

In the matter of spondaic verses, nine out of twelve occur in the elegies (65–68), constituting what Ross thinks is a striking feature. He goes to great trouble to state that two of the three examples in the epigrams (including 76) are due to neoteric contamination; then of 76. 13 (p. 131) he says, “it seems to me, [the spondaic line] cannot be understood in this way at all, but must rather have been allowed solely for its sonorous and unrelenting effect.” I would have said that the neoterics valued it for just that reason, thus removing 76 from the epigram to the elegy category.

The third and only other sign that 76 is an epigram is the use of *que-que* which is presented (p. 67) as a “... clear case of *que-que* as a neoteric mannerism,” thus classifying its use in the elegies and its absence from the epigrams. But on p. 65, Ross writes: “The only instance of *que-que* is 76. 8, where it can be called neither neoteric nor Ennian (it does not, like the others, come at the end of the line); it would appear here to be simply a metrical convenience.” We have here what I call the *ad hoc* negation. Its main use seems to be to preserve the thesis from disastrous attack by a fact or datum which will not conform to it; but once the use of such negation is sanctioned, then every fact or datum lies open to its effect, with the result that the entire thesis

must be regarded as suspect. Obviously then *que-que* is a clear sign by Ross’s own classification that 76 is an elegy, not an epigram. As to its final position, yes, in the polymetrics and the epics; but in 66. 40, the only undisputed elegiac example, it is in nearly the same position as at 76. 8, which is not final. If position is a valid criterion, then this is another clear sign that 76 is an elegy.

These are all the proofs that Ross can muster that 76 is an epigram and not an elegy. Violation of Hermann’s Bridge is ambiguous; use of spondaic lines leans heavily toward elegy despite the uneasy attempt to prevent it; the use of *que-que* is by Ross’s own classification a proof of neoterism and therefore of the poem’s being an elegy, despite Ross’s efforts to stave off that disaster. We must conclude then that 76 is by style demonstrably an elegy. Thus, however one may wish to segment the Catullan corpus, after the epics we do have a group of elegies, then a group of epigrams, then another elegy, then the rest of the epigrams. I do not present any reason why 76 is thus sequestered, but its sequestration seems to be an important clue to the way the Veronensis or its archetype was put together.

J. DAVID BISHOP

WHEATON COLLEGE  
NORTON, MASSACHUSETTS

### CICERO ATT. 2. 1. 5

In the year 60 B.C. Cicero and P. Pulcher were in the escort of a candidate for office. In their jesting interchange (“cum ipso etiam cavillor ac iocor”) Cicero made an indecent joke (implying incest between Clodius and his sister). In relating this incident to Atticus he added: “non consulare inquires dictum: fateor, sed ego illam odi male consularem.”

This is the first extant use of *consularis* (f.) for the wife of a consular senator. Doubtless Cicero did not confine that unusual usage to his private correspondence. The only early parallel is in a letter from M. Antonius to young Caesar (Suet. Aug. 69. 1). In defending

his relation to Cleopatra he referred to Caesar’s marriage to Livia: *feminam consularem*. Antonius could have remembered the interchange of 61–60 when Curio *filius* (*filiola*: Att. 1. 14. 5) was active in the defence of Clodius, and when Curio and Antonius were joined “in matrimonio stabili et certo” (Phil. 2. 44).

This usage does not reappear in extant documents before the second century after Christ, and by that time it has gained a quasi-official status.<sup>1</sup> In the opinion of Ulpian (*praefectus praetorio*, 222–28) it is properly applied only to wives of *consulares* (Dig. 1.

1. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsr.*, III, 469 f., n. 3. He notes the more frequent usage of *ὑπατική* in Greek inscriptions. Cf. TLL, IV, 572. 21.