

the iconographic tradition, now easily accessible in the *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, which shows no trace of such a memorable production as the one usually imagined. There is no reason to contradict their united witness. I suspect that the widespread adoption of the notion of decapitation owes little to inherent probabilities and much to certain preconceived notions about Euripides' art. Ever since Schlegel we have all been taught to believe that this play is satirical, antimythological, and unheroic. Aegisthus' decapitation seemed of a piece with the items in this description. It is high time to reexamine the play without these inherited preconceptions.<sup>6</sup>

DAVID KOVACS  
*University of Virginia*

6. W. Steidle's essay in his *Studien zum antiken Drama* (Munich, 1968), pp. 63-91, should be required reading for all who write on this play. In another article, "Castor in Euripides' *Electra* (*El.* 307-13 and 1292-1307)," *CQ* 35 (1985): 306-14, I discuss two other passages in this play where the gratuitous assumption of satirical intent has been responsible for editors' rejecting the witness of our manuscript and printing patent nonsense on the grounds that it is mordant satire.

I would like to thank CP's anonymous reader for several helpful suggestions.

## ON CATULLUS 95

Gooldio meo  
olim magistro  
sodali nunc atque collegae  
lustrum tertium decimum explenti

Smyrna mei Cinnae, nonam post denique messem,  
 quam coepta est nonamque edita post hiemem,  
 milia cum interea quingenta Hatriensis in uno  
 <versiculorum anno putidus evomuit,>  
 Smyrna cavas Satrachi penitus mittetur ad undas,  
 Smyrnam cana diu saecula pervolunt:  
 at Volusi annales Paduam morientur ad ipsam  
 et laxas scombris saepe dabunt tunicas.  
 parva mei mihi sint cordi monumenta <sodalis>:  
 at populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho.

This is the text of Catullus' ninety-fifth poem as printed in the new edition by G. P. Goold,<sup>1</sup> and it is, I believe, the closest we can come to what the poet wrote. In virtually all other recent editions, by contrast, we find instead some mutilated or dismembered version, neither as sharp in sense nor as elegant in expression as we expect a poem of Catullus' to be—especially one that is itself a piece of literary criticism and ought therefore to exemplify no less than preach. I do not fuss over the spelling of Cinna's title (though I agree that Priscian's authority [*GL* 2:23, 42] should prevail over the manuscripts') or over the supplement in the fourth verse (though Munro's does seem to me by far the most attractive).

1. *Catullus* (London, 1983).

nor do I propose to argue at length for the supplement in the penultimate verse. The two textual decisions that have restored sense and elegance to the poem are to read *Hatriensis in*, with Housman, for the manuscripts' *Hortensius* in line 3, and to retain the last couplet as the conclusion rather than print it as a second poem. Many scholars have separated the last couplet.<sup>2</sup> No one has yet argued for the conjecture, and no one, save Goold, has printed it. In defending his text I rely principally on arguments drawn from an analysis of the poem's structure.

Since the beginning of the last century scholars have been disturbed by the presence of *Hortensius* in Catullus 95. They were not puzzled about his identity: he is unquestionably Q. Hortensius Hortalus (cos. 69), the leading exponent of the Asianic style at Rome, the only orator of his day who could stand comparison with Cicero, and a poet besides. The problem lay rather in the striking imbalance within the poem's economy that *Hortensius* causes: whereas in the first set of two couplets Catullus contrasts Cinna with *Hortensius*, in the second he contrasts the same man with *Volusius*; and in the concluding couplet's summary, unmindful of the pair of poets he has just named, he opposes Cinna to only one of them.<sup>3</sup> The run of the lines, when carefully considered, only increases the disquiet aroused by *Hortensius*. Their parallel structure is very marked: within each set each poet receives one full couplet, first Cinna, then the other.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, as the language shifts, the point of comparison progresses logically: in the first set, numbers measure the pains taken by the two over their work; in the second, rivers mark the extent of the fame they will win as a consequence. How inept Catullus would prove to be if he had formed the neatly parallel and logical structure in order to contrast different pairs of poets on different grounds! Three is an exceedingly odd number to employ in a comparison. And besides, what difference does Catullus reveal between *Hortensius* and *Volusius* that would justify including both?

*Hortensius*' literary tastes confirm the conclusion drawn from internal analysis of 95. This has been not so much overlooked in the past as paid insufficient heed, and some of the evidence alleged is unclear, to be sure. *Hortensius*, Velleius tells us (2. 16. 3), wrote *Annales*. On the basis of a passage from Plutarch (*Luc.* 1. 5), F. Bücheler conjectured that these were in verse,<sup>5</sup> which would indeed make *Hortensius* a suitable companion for *Volusius*: a pair of poets each measuring his verse by the Persian chain. Yet the conjecture, though

2. These include A. Statius in 1566 (see G. B. Pighi, "Achillis Statii lectiones atque emendationes Catullianae," *Humanitas* 3 [1951]: 37–160); K. Lachmann, ed., *Q. Valerii Catulli Veronensis Liber* (Berlin, 1829); M. Haupt, *Quaestiones Catullianae* (Leipzig, 1837), p. 99 = *Opuscula*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1875), p. 72; id., ed., *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii Carmina* (Leipzig, 1853); R. Peiper, *Q. Valerius Catullus: Beiträge zur Kritik seiner Gedichte* (Breslau, 1875), p. 58; J. Vahlen, who followed Haupt in this when revising Haupt's edition (Leipzig, 1879); B. Schmidt, ed., *C. Valerii Catulli Veronensis Carmina* (Leipzig, 1887); F. Leo, "Coniectanea," *Hermes* 38 (1903): 305; G. Jachmann, in a review of W. Kroll's edition, *Gnomon* 1 (1925): 212–13; R. A. B. Mynors, ed., *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina* (Oxford, 1958); W. V. Clausen, "Callimachus and Latin Poetry," *GRBS* 5 (1964): 188–91; K. Quinn, ed., *Catullus: The Poems* (London, 1970); D. F. S. Thomson, ed., *Catullus: A Critical Edition* (Chapel Hill, 1978); J. Ferguson, *Catullus* (Lawrence, 1985), p. 300.

3. The identification of Antimachus with *Volusius* seems assured, since both are noted above all for their turgidity: on Antimachus, see below, n. 15; on *Volusius*, see verses 3 and 10.

4. Clausen, "Callimachus," pp. 188–91, noted these balances between the sets of couplets as well as others within the second set and also identified Parthenius as the likely model for such fine technique.

5. *Q. Ciceronis Reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1869), p. 15.

sometimes repeated, is extremely rash and implausible, and H. Bardon has advanced several convincing arguments for believing that the *Annales* were written in prose.<sup>6</sup> Nor do the three direct testimonia on Hortensius' poetry shed any light upon its stylistic allegiances. To make a case in their own defense, Ovid and Pliny—the one cataloging writers of lascivious verse (*Tr.* 2. 427–66), the other, men of affairs who also composed frivolous verse (*Epist.* 5. 3. 5)—both cite Hortensius amidst a group of neoterics, such as Catullus himself, Cinna, Calvus, Tigidas, Valerius Cato, and Gallus. Unfortunately, Hortensius' other companions in these catalogs include Catulus, Cicero, and Varro of Atax, who are certainly not neoterics. Nor does the mention of Hortensius at Gellius *Noctes Atticae* 19. 9. 7, where he is classed among Roman writers of lyric, permit a firm conclusion.

But there is one solid piece of evidence bearing on Hortensius' affinities, found just where it has the most weight for my argument: for whose opinion on this should we desire more than Catullus' own? As Catullus elsewhere records his view that Volusius is an atrocious poet (poem 36), so too he elsewhere addresses Hortensius in words suggesting that their tastes are kindred: *Hortale, mitto / haec expressa tibi carmina Battiadae* (65. 15–16).<sup>7</sup> The “poem translated from Callimachus” is of course the immediately following *Coma Berenices*. It is nearly inconceivable that a work in so marked a style, displaying an unusual (not to say bizarre) taste for allusive learning applied to an improbable subject, should be dedicated to one who did not share its aesthetic ideals, and quite inconceivable that it should be requested by such a one (cf. 17–18). This passage, then, implies that Hortensius was a neoteric—and therefore a most unsuitable foil to Cinna. L. Schwabe, who in 1862 stated most clearly the problem that Hortensius' presence creates for the balance of the poem, found no satisfactory solution, since he could accept neither the removal of the last couplet nor any of the emendations that had yet been proposed for the third verse.<sup>8</sup>

Sixteen years later H. A. J. Munro conjectured *Hatrianus in*, and Housman subsequently altered this to *Hatriensis in*, presumably because it is closer to the *dictus litterarum*.<sup>9</sup> Now Hortensius is banished from the poem. Now Cinna in each set of couplets is contrasted with the same Volusius, identified once by name and once by native city.<sup>10</sup> Now at least the poem becomes sharp and neat.

The forms *Hatriensis* and *Hatrianus* are not free from obscurity. *Hatriensis* is barely attested: in the one other place it appears (*CIL* 15. 6420) it could be *atriensis* or *Atriensis*. *Hatrianus* is slightly more common, occurring, though not always with certainty, in Pliny the Elder (*HN* 3. 120 [v.l. *Hadrianus*]), Martial (3. 93. 9 [v.l. *Hadriacus*]), and Stephen of Byzantium (s.v. Ἀτρία). Clearly, the

6. *La littérature latine inconnue*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1952), pp. 249–50.

7. Note that virtually all the manuscripts read *Ortale* here and in line 2.

8. *Quaestionum Catullianarum Liber I* (Giessen, 1862), pp. 283–86, where he also enumerates the other scholars who had felt the problem as keenly as he.

9. Munro, *Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus* (Cambridge, 1878), p. 213; Housman in the apparatus criticus of J. P. Postgate, ed., *Gai Valeri Catulli Carmina* (London, 1889), repr. in *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, vol. 1 (London, 1894).

10. Although we have no direct proof that he hailed from Hatria, line 7 (*ipsam* in particular) makes sense only if the Paduan mouth of the Po is close to his home: Hatria, now inland Adria, lay on the coast in Roman times and looks to have been no more than three kilometers distant from the mouth.

problem of aspiration contributes to our difficulty, as does the confusion with a similarly named city in Picenum. Mommsen suggested *tout court* that the one in the Veneto was Atria, the other, Hadria.<sup>11</sup> This tidy division is problematic, however, since not only is it not clear sometimes which city is meant—and, even when it is, the manuscript evidence for the spelling is not reliable—but in addition the evidence provided by etymology, coins, and inscriptions points rather to an overlap between the forms.<sup>12</sup> Given such uncertainty, I grant that one of the unaspirated forms might be correct.

Against any form of the adjective, however, the same objection can be raised: the scansion *Hātr-*. Catullus himself writes *Hādriatici* (4. 6) and *Hādriae* (36. 15); and in thirty-odd other places in classical Latin poetry where one of the cognate adjectives or nouns is found, the syllable is long. Nonetheless, when we find that Propertius is inconsistent in this matter, writing both *Hādriaci* (3. 21. 17) and, in an unassailable passage, *Hādriae* (1. 6. 1), we need not hesitate in allowing Catullus to be so as well. Nor should the preposition *in* occasion any trouble: early Latin down through Cicero knows numerous examples of *in* instead of the bare ablative with the temporal sense of *intra* (Catull. 66. 35, for one).<sup>13</sup> Despite the various obstacles, then, we ought to read *Hatriensis* (or maybe one of the other forms), because the poem is intolerably awkward unless we substitute Volusius for Hortensius in the third verse.

One path for circumventing the problems with Hortensius has been to slice off the last couplet, declaring it to be a separate poem or fragment placed here by an ancient editor, presumably on account of its similar subject. This is a blind alley, however. For one thing, it eases the difficulties but slightly: it prevents the poet from appearing forgetful at the end but does not heal the imbalance and the inappropriateness caused by Hortensius. Like Schwabe, moreover, I believe that the divorce replaces one poem with two forlorn fragments, for the first eight lines by themselves, though not conspicuously incomplete, lack punch, whereas the final two are almost unintelligible without the preceding eight. If it comprises all ten verses, the poem has a shape very similar to that of poem 45: two sections that match one another closely, followed by a “cap,” a shorter section that both summarizes what has been objectively presented and brings it into the sphere of the poet and his readers. Wilamowitz observed that Catullus’ relation to Cinna, made manifest in the opening words, required him to take a personal stance toward the *Smyrna*, and that to express merely a cool and general artistic judgment is typical neither of Catullus nor of a good Hellenistic epigram.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, the parallel construction of the periods weds the last couplet firmly to the rest. In the first period (1–8), after a weighty participial phrase—it would be awkward to understand another *est* with *edita*—two independent clauses

11. *CIL* 5.1: 120–21, basing himself on the etymological connection made with *atrium* (Varr. *Ling.* 5. 161, Paul. Fest. p. 12 L., Serv. Auct. ad *Aen.* 1. 726) and on the abbreviation *MA* found in two inscriptions (nos. 2315, 2343) and taken to stand for *municipium Atria*.

12. The town near the mouth of the Po is said to have given its name to the *mare Hadriaticum* (Livy 5. 33. 8, Justin 20. 1. 9), whereas from the town in Picenum come coins of the third century B.C. stamped *HAT* (see Weiss, “Hadria,” *RE* 7 [1912]: 2164) and an inscription in archaic letters that says *Hatria* (*CIL* 9. 6389, no. 3). No inscription from either town spells out any form of an adjective.

13. Cf. *TLL* 7.1:778. 15–45, which needlessly glosses the *in* at 66. 35 “fere i. q. post.”

14. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1924), p. 298, n. 1.

describe Cinna's poem and then, introduced by *at*, the same number describe Volusius'. The second period (9–10) repeats this on a smaller scale: a verse on Cinna; then, introduced by *at*, another on Volusius. This produces a conclusion that satisfies as much by its structural rhythm as by its meaning.

Among the many proposals made for filling the lacuna at the end of line 9, Bergk's *Philetas* has obvious appeal, since it contrasts Philetas, as the type of refinement, with Antimachus, as the type of long-winded inelegance.<sup>15</sup> The presumptuous familiarity in saying "*my* Philetas" renders this unlikely, however. On the whole, the supplement *sodalis* (cf. 10. 29), provided by Catullus' *conciatadino* Avantius for the first Aldine edition (1502), seems best. If this is right, Catullus draws a triple contrast between Cinna and Volusius to justify the former's success and coming renown: the linked points of comparison are care in composition (small vs. swollen), subject and (by implication) narrative form (epyllion vs. annals), and intended audience (coterie of friends vs. the common people). About the nature of the literary criticism in poem 95 I shall have more to say elsewhere. I hope, however, that this study of the poem's structure and the questions that attend it has helped recapture the original form of the text.

JOSEPH B. SOLODOW  
Yale University

15. The principal passages in Roman literature indicating Antimachus' reputation for long-windedness are Cic. *Brut.* 191, Prop. 2. 34. 45, Quint. *Inst.* 10. 1. 53, Porph. ad Hor. *Ars P.* 146. Philetas' reputation for refinement is attested by Propertius, sometimes indirectly: 2. 34. 31–32, 3. 1. 1 (verse 8 defines what Philetas represents: *exactus tenui pumice versus eat*), 4. 6. 3–4 (cf. Callim. *Ap.* 105–12, a passage that also clearly influenced Catullus 95). It hardly needs to be stressed that poem 95 is Callimachean in its literary stance as well as its form and that in praising the *Smyrna* it both declares and demonstrates its own poetic ideals as well.

#### AENEAS AND THE OMEN OF THE SWANS (VERG. *AEN.* 1. 393–400)

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| aspice bis senos laetantis agmine cynos,       |     |
| aetheria quos lapsa plaga Iovis ales aperto    |     |
| turbabat caelo; nunc terras ordine longo       | 395 |
| aut capere aut captas iam despectare videntur: |     |
| ut reduces illi ludunt stridentibus alis       |     |
| et coetu cinxere polum cantusque dedere,       |     |
| haud aliter puppesque tuae pubesque tuorum     |     |
| aut portum tenet aut pleno subit ostia velo.   | 400 |

When Aeneas first lands at Carthage, his mother Venus, in disguise, is able to communicate her superior knowledge of events only through the humanly accessible medium of augury. She points to twelve swans that have escaped from the attack of an eagle and assures her son that just so the ships he thought lost are even now either safe in port or approaching port. Her words make it plain that there is a correspondence in detail between the omen and its fulfillment: thus to the harrying of the swans by the eagle *aperto . . . caelo* (394–95) corresponds the