

CATULLUS 13: A REEXAMINATION

nam unguentum dabo, quod meae puellae
donarunt Veneres Cupidinesque

[Catull. 13. 11–12]

Students of Catullus will have noticed recently a novel development in the interpretation of Catullus *Carmen* 13, the *unguentum* of which is assigned a sexual meaning.¹ According to this view, the poem cannot be successfully interpreted without assigning to *unguentum* this significance.² This new view makes *unguentum* into "sexual secretions," and goes on to aver that the poet Catullus is handing over to the addressee Fabullus "my girl" or "Lesbia."³ Though in Catullus' circle the bestowal of a female to another man as a sexual partner for an evening cannot be denied *prima facie*, elsewhere in Catullus' poems we find no such casual proffering of the *puella* (or of Iuventius for that matter) to old comrades such as the Fabullus of *Carmen* 13.⁴ For the poet to be so offering his *amores* in this poem the language would have to be unambiguous.⁵ Even if one were to grant that the poet wanted to say that he is offering his *puella* to his friend, can the words he wrote be made to yield this significance? Can *unguentum* mean "vaginal secretions," and can *accipies meos / meros amores* only mean "you shall have for yourself my girl [Lesbia]"?⁶ If so, then we will have reached a new insight into the operations of Catullus' circle and of his poetry, as well as a new level of candor and lack of prudery in our own criticism. But if not, then the line of thought that develops *unguentum*, hitherto innocent and charming, along these particular lines of sexual innuendo will be but further evidence of how extraneous preoccupations can distort ancient texts.⁷

The "revisionist" view makes the meaning of *unguentum* the key of the poem, and replaces clues to the writer's willed intent, namely, context, generic convention and the illocutionary force of the text, with a lexical double entendre.⁸ It suggests that such statements as "irrumator praetor" (10. 12–13) and "pedicabo uos et irrumabo" (16. 1) condition Catullus' ancient audience and ideally his modern

1. See R. J. Littman, "The Unguent of Venus: Catullus 13," *Latomus* 36 (1977): 123–28; J. P. Hallett, "Divine Uncion: Some Further Thoughts on Catullus 13," *Latomus* 37 (1978): 747–48. These are collectively called the "revisionist theory" for convenience.

2. "The meaning of *unguentum* is the key to the interpretation of the poem"; Littman, "The Unguent of Venus," p. 123. No attention is paid by the revisionist theory to the philological problem of assigning *unguentum* this new meaning.

3. Littman, "The Unguent of Venus," p. 127.

4. *Carm.* 11 is bitter recognition of the rupture with the profligate *puella*, and of course not such a granting of her favors to *moechi*; Catullus has no control any more of the *puella* in *Carm.* 11. *Carm.* 15 is typical of his jealous regard for the *puer*. Examples of these attitudes for both *puella* and *puer* could easily be multiplied, e.g., *Carm.* 58 and 24.

5. Not only would Fabullus have to comprehend, but also the *puella*. "Dabo unguentum" seems hardly comprehensible as a sexual promise except in a private code; poems are written in a public language.

6. Littman, "The Unguent of Venus," p. 127. I do not attempt here a full-scale demonstration of the philological uncertainty and difficulty with making *unguentum* signify "bodily secretion" in Latin. I trust that disproving the equivalence in the context of Catull. *Carm.* 13 will suffice.

7. E.g., M. Schuster, s.v. "Valerius Catullus," *RE* 7A (1948): 2354, on inferences from Catullus' "Keltenblut"; and 2361, on Catullus as a "Mensch nordischen Blutes," etc.

8. For a sense of modern literary critical theory's position on these, see J. Reichert, *Making Sense of Literature* (Chicago, 1977), pp. 63–67 ("Intention and Authors"); E. D. Hirsch Jr., *The Aims of Interpretation* (Chicago, 1976), pp. 33–35 (generic expectation and cognitive theory); *ibid.*, pp. 26–28 and especially pp. 52–53 (illocutionary force); also E. D. Hirsch Jr., *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven, 1967), pp. 68–71 (genre and authorial will).

audience for sexual references elsewhere in the corpus. But references of this sort are not veiled, but rather explicit, and not specifically bound to a simple sexual significance,⁹ whereas *unguentum* in *Carmen* 13 is so veiled that its ulterior and true significance has gone unsuspected for two millennia.¹⁰ One may observe that openness about the sexual practices referred to in these explicit passages might lead one to expect equal openness about such a meaning as the revisionist theory suggests for *unguentum*.¹¹ Directness of reference to sexual proclivity or practice in some Catullan texts should not however result in license to sexualize everything in a given poem, any more than preoccupation with music should engender a musical pun for Hamlet's last line, "the rest is silence." The specific context must suggest limits for interpretation.¹²

The revisionist interpretation of *Carmen* 13 fails for the following reasons.

(1) The poem is in the genre of the invitatory poem.¹³ Omission of a specific time furnishes grounds for thinking the poem a feigned invitation; still, the generic conventions obtain. Catullus lists them (food, wine, etc.) but by implying that the party will take place "one of these days" maintains his control and initiative in the relationship with Fabullus, and keeps the poem on the general level. In the context of an invitation, "contra accipies meos amores" (line 9) means "for my part I'll provide and you'll receive" *meos amores*. That is, Catullus will assure the presence of his love in some form as his contribution to the dinner. The secretions theory of interpretation requires that Fabullus be eager to meet this love of Catullus, but nowhere in the poem is there evidence that this is so.¹⁴ Indeed, the revisionist theory must entirely ignore the only "real" girl at this fictive party, Fabullus' *candida puella* of line 4, and relegate her to a degraded role in the unwholesome ambience that *Carmen* 13 becomes in their eyes.¹⁵ Likewise, a fashionable dinner party with wit and laughter, hallmarks of the *neoteroi*, is attenuated into a group grope that befits more a post-Catullan age and its obsessions rather than the witty circle we glimpse in Catullus' poems (e.g., 10).¹⁶

9. K. Quinn, *Catullus: The Poems* (London, 1970), p. 143 (on *Carm.* 16. 1), says of these explicit expletives, "A conflict between the literal and the colloquial meanings is exploited. Usually the colloquial meaning [e.g., "Go to hell!"] is the primary one."

10. I discount Martial, e.g., 3. 12; see section 8 below.

11. See n. 5.

12. See the useful remarks of Hirsch, *Validity*, pp. 88–89, e.g., "Any final, generic sense of the whole different from the speaker's would be extrinsic [i.e., "a wrong guess"] because it would be used to codetermine meanings. . . ." This is what has happened in the *unguentum* = secretion equivalency.

13. On invitations see *Anth. Pal.* 11. 44 (Philodemus to Piso, under whom our Fabullus served in Macedonia; cf. Catull. *Carm.* 28). See also n. 16 and C. J. Fordyce, *Catullus: A Commentary* (Oxford, 1961), p. 133.

14. Littman, "The Unguent of Venus," p. 127, n. 24, bends some remarks of K. Quinn along these lines; cf. his *Catullus: An Interpretation* (London, 1972), p. 231, which goes much farther than his commentary, *Catullus*, p. 133, where Fabullus is thought to be angling for an invitation to dinner, not an introduction to a girl.

15. Hallett, "Divine Unction," p. 748, seems to recognize this objection but passes over it.

16. For Catullus' circle, heightened quality of emotion such as is seen in the elegant strategems and underlying tenderness of *Carm.* 13 seems a component of civilized life detachable from the direct earthiness of, say, *Carm.* 56. Hence it is questionable whether such sexual implications as *cecidit* definitely has in *Carm.* 56. 7 should be recuperated from neutral words like *cenabis*, *Carm.* 13. 1, which for Hallett ("Divine Unction," p. 747) along with "the whole idea of eating" has sexual implications. *Cenabis* in *Carm.* 13 prominently signals "invitation" and gives the reader a clear indication at the first word of what kind of poem is under way. Cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 728; Cic. *De or.* 2. 246; Mart. 11. 52 (with no sexual overtone).

(2) The revisionist theory adduces *Veneres Cupidinesque*, donors of the *unguentum*, as evidence of its erotic quality; this is valid. But an erotic connotation for *unguentum* does not automatically precipitate a physiological meaning for that word. Further, the revisionist theory holds that *Veneres Cupidinesque* as donors rule out that a dinner unguent is meant.¹⁷ Why? In a truly sophisticated and aesthetically responsive society, a dinner party is readily enhanced by the charm of its female participants, just as it would be shattered by reference to bodily functions, odors, or secretions. Venus elsewhere in ancient literature is associated with or supplies a commodity or *unguentum* itself with subsequent enhancement of its recipient. In the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius Venus sends Psyche to the underworld to bring back some of Proserpina's *formonsilas* in a pyxis; the parallel with unguent is evident, and so is the intangibility of the commodity.¹⁸ Further, Lucian adopted the idea.¹⁹ Finally, and significantly closer in time to Catullus, Sextus Turpilus, the last writer of *palliata*, presented in his *Leucadia* a boatman who transports Venus, who is disguised as an old woman, from Lesbos to the mainland for no payment. He is rewarded *unguenti alabastro*; "cum se inde totum ungueret, feminas in sui amorem trahebat. . . ." ²⁰ This is interesting for *Carmen* 13 because it shows a man handling an *unguentum* given from Venus, an intangible and compelling scent (real or imagined) that evokes a loving response. It is very likely to this kind of *unguentum Veneris* that Catullus refers.

(3) To support *unguentum* as sexual secretion of the female, numerous references are made to ancient literature, in connection with bodily odors. Exploration of these citations, however, reveals that they are uniformly unpleasant and off-putting in connotation; nowhere is an agreeable natural scent unambiguously referred to. An *unguentum*, as in *Lysistrata* 940–46, is associated with sexual activity, to be sure, but would surely replace or submerge a natural body scent.²¹ Such masking is the general purpose of *unguenta*, as their association with the laying out of a corpse indicates. The literature nowhere suggests that a bodily

17. "When Catullus says that this unguent is one given by Venus and the Cupids to his mistress, immediately we see that it is not the dinner unguent"; Littman, "The Unguent of Venus," p. 124. His argument is hard to accept. Venus figures on quite a number of ointment and perfume vessels. The receptacle for unguent (cf. Hug, s.v. "Salben," RE 2A [1920]: 1861) did not exhibit a specific shape for use at dinner tables. Unguents there, as well as for use at baths, athletic events, and cosmetic tables, were *aryballoi* (for perfumed oils) or *pyxides* (for nard, etc., also commonly called *alabastra*) with wide variants possible in form and decoration for each type. The *lekythos* was associated with marriage and burial in the Greek world; the *ampulla* with burial in the Roman world. For an *alabastron* with *μύρον* at a dinner party, see Matt. 26:7 (cf. Mark 14:3, Luke 7:37, John 12:3). It is spoken of as being broken in order to be used. Should this perhaps throw light on Mart. 3. 12. 2, "sed nil scidisti"? This is made obscene by Hallett, "Divine Uction," p. 747, with *scidisti* meaning "sodomized." Another line of thought on Mart. 3. 12. 1–2, "Unguentum fateor bonum dedisti / convivis here sed nihil scidisti," is that *scindere* has the meaning of to cut up or to carve, as in Sen. *De vita beata* 17 (*obsonium*), *De brevitae vitae* 12 ("aves in frusta"); *scindere* is cited with this meaning for the Martial passage by Lewis and Short.

18. Apul. *Met.* 6. 16.

19. Lucian *Dial.* 9. 2.

20. O. Ribbeck, *Comicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1898), p. 113. Cf. Serv. Dan. on Virg. *Aen.* 3. 279.

21. See Hallett, "Divine Uction," p. 748, and J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (New Haven, 1975), p. 135. Here the woman's "rose scent" is indeed what it is by virtue of the adjective *ρόδιον*. Nowhere does *μύρον* by itself mean secretion, and it does not figure in Henderson's index. For a Roman parallel to the *Lysistrata* ointment, should one turn to Catull. *Carm.* 6. 8?

secretion is enticing: quite the contrary. It is highly unlikely that *unguentum* or *μύρον* would be the word chosen to signify the liquid of the *campus muliebris*.

(4) Propertius 2. 29 is twice cited by the revisionary thesis. First, Cynthia's protest: "ut in toto nullus mihi corpore surgat / spiritus admisso notus adulterio," lines 38–39. This is made out to refer to a "mixture of scents" proceeding from Cynthia's intimate parts and owing to a mixture of her secretions and a male residue. But as "in toto corpore" shows, Cynthia here denies the lingering scent of another man on any part of her person; she is surely making reference to another's scent which the jealous lover could detect, such as hair dressing, perfume, pomade, body oil, etc., which could through lovemaking be transferred to Cynthia and linger.

Second, Propertius 2. 29. 15–18 is cited: "afflabunt tibi non Arabum de gramine odores / sed quos ipse suis fecit Amor manibus." This is assigned the expected obscene meaning.²² But mere observation of the tenses (perfumes *will* waft which Love *has made*) and the plural *manibus* (*digito* would fit the meter) show that sexual secretions can hardly be the primary level of significance. This same sequence of tenses, future—present perfect, can be seen in Catullus 13: "dabo quod donarunt," also *Carmen* 12. 14–17, *miserunt mihi*, a similar sentiment in a different situation. The bestowal to the girl precedes in time the proffering to or by the poet in each case. Unless we are prepared to think that Catullus 13 is evidence for the *puella* being a nymphomaniac, whose bodily secretions can be thought of as a reliable feature of this or any dinner party she attends, the perfect tense *donarunt* here means a gift like that of Venus in Turpilus' *Leucadia*.

(5) If sexual secretions were meant, and if Catullus is handing over his girl for Fabullus' tactile enjoyment, it seems ungenerous and hardly characteristic of the host who thinks of everything for his guests' delectation to assert that Fabullus will wish himself all nose. An additional organ or organs might more logically be employed if *unguentum* means something besides the alluring scent of the *puella*'s person in a general way. Or should we further pursue the sexual metaphor and say that Catullus is implying that Fabullus is impotent?²³ Obviously, there is no end to fantasy once the constraints of context are removed.

(6) If the poem is, as A. Baehrens long ago asserted,²⁴ addressed to the *puella* of Catullus as much as to Fabullus, the girl's reaction (whether she is Lesbia or not), even in a "concrete, earthy and sensual" atmosphere of Catullus' world,²⁵ would very likely be negative. If in part addressed covertly to "mea puella" it is demeaning of her if the revisionist theory is true, and ill accords with the delicate compliment paid to her by means of comment on her *unguentum* as traditionally and correctly interpreted.

22. Regarding Prop. 2. 29. 17–18, the revisionist theory does not seem to bear in mind that the words are addressed by a cupid to Propertius, with no woman present at their interview. Further, the perfumes in question will be ones emanating from Cynthia, the cupid says, when she awakens. Surely the cupid is not suggesting that she awakens from sleeping with another man to be discovered by Propertius; Cynthia also denies this, 37–38. On 2. 29. 37–38, the word *nullus* is read by Littman ("The Unguent of Venus," p. 125) as *nullius* in order to gain evidence for "another man"; there is no MS evidence for this, or for making the scent "sperm"; is semen meant?

23. Could Mart. 3. 12 imply the same thing about his Fabullus?

24. *Catulli Veronensis Liber* (Leipzig, 1885), pp. 130–31.

25. Littman, "The Unguent of Venus," p. 124.

(7) The poem obviously has as one of its aims to frustrate Fabullus. The dinner is to be "one of these days," the guest is to be obliged to provide the food, wine, wit, laughter, and a, or the, girl; nowhere is it explicit, as the revisionists require, that the girl of the poet be present: only her *unguentum*, be it her lingering perfume or the aura of her person itself, is incontrovertibly cited. Thus Catullus can mean, as Baehrens supposed,²⁶ that he will talk about his love and make her present in that way: "sed contra accipies meos / meros amores." The feast for Catullus may be completely Barmecidal. Whatever is of substance will be provided by the guest Fabullus in an inversion of the structure of a dinner party. His contribution to the party will be offset (and set off) by the superb scent with its abundant implications, including sexual. The general connection between perfume and an aura of beauty or general sexual attractiveness (Fabullus, too, has his share: *venuste noster*, line 6) in ancient classical and other cultures is too well known to be thrown out in favor of anatomical functions never elsewhere referred to without distaste, affected or real. If the girl of the poet is present, she will but tantalize Fabullus; if she is absent, recalled through Catullus' conversation, she will be even more alluring. One cannot decide with sureness if she is or is not going to be there: part of the pleasant toying with Fabullus' reactions and expectations, and hence with our own. By turning the girl into a secretion, most of the wit generated by foiling expectation is dissipated in favor of a grossness of which it is difficult to speak.

(8) That Martial in 3. 12 may have written a parody of Catullus *Carmen* 13 with the idea of *unguentum* as sexual lubricant in mind²⁷ does not allow one to infer that Catullus' significance for *unguentum* was similar any more than a sexual travesty by, say, Allen Ginsberg on Thackeray makes the Victorian lubricious. Further, the Martial text as adduced by the revisionist theory is homosexual in its general appeal, wherein vaginal secretions would hardly seem appropriate; *unguentum* in this Martial poem is "ointment," dinner party quality or possibly bedroom quality, nothing else, and cannot be used in support of *unguentum* meaning female bodily secretion.

(9) Reference to Catullus' usage of the phrases *meos amores* and *adjective amores* is instructive. The revisionist theory prefers to read *meos amores* because it fancies it means "my girl."²⁸ So let us begin with the pronomial adjective. In Catullus 6. 16, 10. 1, 45. 1, and 64. 27 the phrase *tuos/suos amores* is used to signify girl friend or female lover. In 15. 1, 21. 4, 40. 7, and 38. 6 we see *meos amores*, all surely or very probably referring to males, and spoken in propria persona by Catullus.²⁹ Thus the phrase *meos amores* could mean in *Carmen* 13 a male lover; the unusual meaning sought by the revisionists for *unguentum* cannot rely on *meos amores* being a female, though context suggests that it probably is, just as it likewise suggests that *unguentum* cannot mean what the revisionists want it to mean.

26. Baehrens, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, p. 131.

27. Hallett, "Divine Unction," p. 747. See also n. 17. Cf. Mart. 11. 6. 16, *in malam partem* (*passer* = *membrum virile*.)

28. Most modern editors and commentators with great plausibility read *meros*, e.g., Kroll, Mynors, Thomson, Fordyce, Quinn. Note also that Mart. 14. 206 uses *meros amores* of the *cestos*, Venus' scented girdle. The context is homosexual, the influence Catullan.

29. On Catull. 38. 6, cf. F. O. Copley, "Catullus, c. 38," *TAPA* 87 (1956): 128-29: "my affection: for you, Cornificius"; *meos amores* does not probably refer to a beloved person here but to Catullus' feelings: plausibly the appropriate sense for c. 13 if we read *meos*.

Meros amores occurs nowhere else in Catullus; *amores* is elsewhere qualified with an adjective and covers a wide range of meaning.³⁰

If *meos amores* can mean boy friend, we could in an excess of fantasy see a picture presented to Fabullus of the lad attending the fictive party wearing Catullus' girl's perfume: surely a social event somewhat less bizarre than the picture presented by the revisionists of the dinner host who "offers Fabullus Lesbia's genitals"; the Roman etiquette on this would merit study.

(10) The revisionists take *dabo*, line 11, to mean "I will give" my girl's sexual organs to Fabullus.³¹ Context obliges one to question this interpretation. Fabullus is enjoined to bring food, girl, wine, wit, and laughter: ingredients for a social structure called a party, to be shared by all its participants. Fabullus is to bring them to the event, not to the host per se. Catullus on his part is to make a contribution to the party as a whole: but not the one usually assigned by social code to the host, and obliging him to provide food, wine, guests, and entertainment; Catullus will contribute the almost obligatory unguent: not a real unguent, to be handed round for the guests, but rather the girl's perfume's scent, intangible, and hence said to be a gift of heaven. Hence Catullus' exaggerated proclamation of poverty is not violated; his verb *dabo* means in the setting of an invitation and in the context of this structure's expectations, "I will provide for the company; I will set out for my guests." Since it is not Catullus' to give, for it belongs to the *puella* who received it, he contravenes the principal expectation one has about the verb *dare*: he who gives must be capable of giving. Second, he contravenes another expectation aroused by the structure of a party: the unguent is intangible. Catullus really "gives" nothing in the conventional sense of the word. By assuming the role of the inviting host, and by subsequently abdicating it as the poem progresses, Catullus in *Carmen* 13 wittily leads Fabullus on, pays the *puella* the compliment of preferring her company (or her perfume's) alone to a party, and composes an elegant poem frustrating the conventions of its generic form. "Dinner party invitation; but no time set, you bring the necessities, I'll bring out a scent—the savor of my love."

(11) The revisionists take Catullus' hyperbolic statement about his poverty literally and do not see it as part of the stratagem to outwit Fabullus. Seeking to narrow *unguentum* to mean female sexual secretion, the theory asserts that Catullus "cannot supply an actual unguent which would be very expensive, but he can supply an actual unguent that not only is inexpensive, but is so remarkable that it will make Fabullus want to become all nose . . . What sort of unguent does Venus give? It is not some imagined ointment in a jar. . . ."³² First of all, this line of reasoning is flawed because to rule out "imagined ointment in a jar" (one thinks of Marianne Moore's "real toads in imaginary gardens") does not result in having ruled out other intangible aspects of what *unguentum* really means: scent. Second, the choice is not between (a) imagined ointments, (b) real and expensive dinner unguent, or (c) the revisionists' favorite, but rather between real unguent and the woman's own sweet scent, present or recalled. Finally, the assertion that unguent

30. Conjugal love: *ueteres amores* 96. 3, *tales amores* 64. 334, *optatos amores* 64. 372, *communes amores* 68. 69; human passion: *furtiuos amores* 7. 8; bisexual activity: *dulces amores* 78. 3.

31. Littman, "The Unguent of Venus," p. 124.

32. Ibid. How do we know that the unguent which Catullus will supply is "actual"?

is expensive is questionable; see, for example, Varro *De lingua latina* 7. 64 on Plautus *Cistellaria* 407: "... schoeniculae ab schoena, nugatorio unguento"; compare Festus apud Paulum Diaconum, p. 329 Mueller: "schoeniculae appellantur meretrices propter usum unguenti schoeni quod est pessimi generis." Thus not far from the time of Catullus it was possible to speak of "cheap perfume." But the *unguentum* of *Carmen* 13 is heaven-sent: the opposite of cheap and, it should be evident, in no way to be connected with a natural human secretion: unless qualified by an adjective, *unguentum* would appear to have a positive connotation. How could Fabullus understand the point advanced by the revisionists if he had recourse only to *Carmen* 13 and the Latin language?

(12) A calculus of values contradicting *unguentum* as secretion is available in *Carmen* 13 itself. Of this vexed ointment it is said: "seu [i.e., *uel si*] quid suavius elegantiusue est," in reference to *meos / meros amores*. The words *suavis* and *elegans* are well-known touchstones of aesthetic value in Catullus' polymetrics.³³ Reference to their connotation alone should have forestalled this gynecological detour. But once put into circulation, *unguentum* as female secretion will doubtless be hard to eradicate from the minds of even those who do not give assent to the dubious line of argument herein called into question.

For a final example of the fact that authorially willed intent and context are superordinate in exegesis to critical ingenuity, let us look briefly at a statement made in a later Latin drama by a prostitute to a customer who wants something special:

Prostitute: ecce cubile bene stratum et delectabile ad inhabitandum.

Customer: estne hic aliud penitus, in quo possimus colloqui secretius?

Prostitute: est etenim aliud occultum, tam secretum ut eius penetral nulli praeter me . . . est cognitum.

Lest the unwary critic begin to weave interpretations about the significance of *cubile*, *colloqui*, and *penetral* more appropriate to Martial or the *Priapea*, let us state at once that the writer is the nun Hrotsvith of Gandersheim, and the prostitute Thais, her customer being the desert saint Pafnutius, bent on making Thais a proclaimed saint too.³⁴ Erotic connotations can be read into the quotation, but the frontiers of responsible interpretation, respecting author and context, cannot be broached with impunity. *Madame Bovary* could be about Eskimos; but it is not. Neither is *unguentum* sexual secretion.

In light of these observations (and more could be adduced) it may be prudent to conclude that asserting that *unguentum* in Catullus *Carmen* 13 means female sexual secretion is not the same as demonstrating that it does, and that to give an unguent is not the same thing as to hand over the girl whose it is. *Non liquet*.

CHARLES WITKE

University of Michigan

33. On Catullan sophistication in form and in emotion, see C. Witke, *Enarratio Catulliana*, Mnemosyne Suppl. 10 (1968), pp. 27-28. For *suavis* and its programmatic significance, see D. O. Ross, *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, 1969), p. 79: "Catullus' use of *suavis* can be seen as a turning point in its history. . . ." Though not discussed by Ross, *elegans*, found only in the polymetrics (like *inelegans*), has a similar value. For *suavis* and *suavius* in connection with food, see Hor. *Sat.* 3. 8. 89, 92.

34. Hrotsvith *Pafnutius* (ed. Homeyer) 3. 4. 337.