CATULLUS AND THE POLEMICS OF POETIC REFERENCE (POEM 64.1–18)

Omnia iam vulgata—the polemical nature of Catullan verse, and its place in the tradition of Callimachean programmatic invective, are now fully acknowledged. Critics have given attention both to this poet's negative and to his positive attitudes.[1] In favourable contrast to the miserable Hortensius (Poems 36, 95) stand the positive models, neoteric confrères of Catullus (Calvus, Poem 51; Cinna, Poem 95), pursuing their poetic art with adherence to the new standards: erudition, care of composition, and a delight in all that is clever, witty and urbane. Here we find the personal, polemical Catullus, highly self-conscious and aware of the new course on which Roman poetry was set, embedding in the polymetrics and epigrams statements which, while immediate and a part of the poet's world, constitute in their entirety a traditional literary manifesto.

The Alexandrian poet, and his neoteric Roman successor, is, I think, polemical in two ways. The first, as sketched above for Catullus, is essentially declarative—it lies in a statement of poetic purpose, a defining of affiliation, or a rejection of prior genre. Callimachus' prologue to the *Aetia* is the chief model, and every Roman poet with claims on the Alexandrian poetic ethic was to produce an adaptation or modification of the Callimachean lines.[2] The second method is one which may be viewed as a demonstration of polemical attitude. Without intruding into his verse the poet, through allusion and through alteration or conflation of his models, sets himself in a tradition and may thereby provide a commentary on his own place in that

[1] Antediluvians survive, of course, and will doubtless continue to flourish. So the latest piece on the densely programmatic Poem 50: "Mögen wir carmen 50 auch heute noch mit Ergriffenheit lesen, so ist es doch erst einmal nicht für uns geschreiben, sondern es ist das persönliche und uneingeschränkte Bekenntnis des Dichters an Licinius Calvus: Mein Freund, ich liebe dich" (W. Kissel, "Mein Freund, ich liebe dich [Catull, c. 50]," *Würz. Jahrb. f. d. Altertumswiss.* n.f. 6b [1980] 59).

[2] E.g. Cat. 95; Virg. *Ecl.* 6.1–8; Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.12–15, *Odes* 1.6, 2.12; Prop. 2.1. Most conveniently, see W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom*, Hermes Einzelschriften 16 (1960) passim.

American Journal of Philology Vol. 103 Pp. 144-164
0002-9475/82/1032-0144 $01.00

tradition, and ultimately on his own poetic art. Virgil, the master of this practice, provides an acknowledged instance in the Sixth Eclogue:

> a, virgo infelix, quae te dementia cepit!
>
> (*Ecl.* 6.52)

Theocritus and Calvus molded into a single Virgilian line.[3] Here the poet's purpose is to indicate the active tradition of his own verse, and in some ways to demonstrate the superiority of the poetry which subsumes and transforms that tradition. To that extent the practice is polemical.

What I propose here is an examination of perhaps the most literary and allusive lines of Catullus—the opening of his epyllion. The purpose is to expose this portion of the poem as Catullus' major polemical demonstration of his literary affiliations. Why these lines? The reason will, I believe, emerge as we detect the complex of references and allusions that inhabit the opening tableau. But, in any case, the description of the Argo's departure seems deliberately chosen as a vehicle for polemical expression. Nowhere else does it play a significant part in the account of the marriage of Peleus and Thetis (a matter to which we shall return), and, even more significantly, in its previous treatment, the episode offered Catullus precisely the literary range which would be appropriate to the creation of an intensely erudite and polemical narrative. On the Greek side, Euripides' *Medea,* the *Argonautica* of Apollonius and Callimachus' *Aetia*[4]—these are the natural stages of influence in the maturation of the high neoteric style. At the same time, archaic Latin poetry, not just the *Medea* of Ennius, but other Ennian verse, as well as that of Accius, is incorporated into Catullus' proem in ways which, far from constituting mere literary reference, argue for the superiority of the narrative of the New Poet.

It is, of course, by no means a novel observation that the opening of Catullus 64 draws from previous literary expression; Quinn, with others, notes: "The first sentence is shot through with reminiscences of Ennius' version of Euripides' *Medea.*"[5] Nor are all of the allusions with which we shall deal missed by the commentators and critics.

[3] On this see Z. Stewart, "The Song of Silenus," *HSCP* 64 (1959) 190; R. F. Thomas, "Theocritus, Calvus, and *Eclogue* 6," *CP* 74 (1979) 337–39.

[4] We will come to deal specifically with Callimachean influences later; in general, on connections between Apollonius and Callimachus see Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* II p. xli–xlii.

[5] *Catullus, The Poems* (London and Basingstoke 1970) 299.

None of them, however, includes *all* of them, and this in itself reveals a common attitude: what is lacking is a systematic examination of the *nature* of poetic reminiscence in these lines.[6] Accordingly it will be an integral assumption of this study that reference to earlier poetry is potentially far from casual (an assumption which, I trust, the results will vindicate), but has a specifically polemical function: to demonstrate the importance of the poet's models, and often to indicate the superiority of his own treatment.

Peliaco quondam prognatae vertice pinus
dicuntur liquidas Neptuni nasse per undas
Phasidos ad fluctus et fines Aeetaeos,
cum lecti iuvenes, Argivae robora pubis,
auratam optantes Colchis avertere pellem
ausi sunt vada salsa cita decurrere puppi
caerula verrentes abiegnis aequora palmis.
diva quibus retinens in summis urbibus arces
ipsa levi fecit volitantem flamine currum,
pinea coniungens inflexae texta carinae.
illa rudem cursu prima imbuit Amphitriten;
quae simul ac rostro ventosum proscidit aequor
tortaque remigio spumis incanuit unda,
emersere freti candenti e gurgite vultus
aequoreae monstrum Nereides admirantes.
illa, atque <haud> alia, viderunt luce marinas
mortales oculis nudato corpore Nymphas
nutricum tenus exstantes e gurgite cano.

I

Catullan 'Correction'

The phrase is used advisedly. When Ennius wrote his *Medea* he worked closely with the Euripidean model. Although his tragedy was in no real sense a 'translation,'[7] it did find its model in a single work.

[6] Possible exceptions are: D. Braga, *Catullo e i Poeti Greci* (Messina 1950); F. Klingner, *Catulls Peleus-Epos*, Sitzungsb. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss. 6 (1956) (= *Studien zur griechischen und römischen Literatur* [Zurich 1964] 156–224). The first of these is less useful on the opening of Poem 64.

[7] *Pace* Cicero, *De Fin.* 1.4, who, however, somewhat contradicts himself at *Acad.* 1.10: *Ennius, Pacuvius, Accius, multi alii, qui non verba, sed vim Graecorum expresserunt poetarum.*

Not so the opening of Catullus 64. Here the poet had before him a number of models, and as a result we can at a number of points detect a polemical commentary on his part. In his alteration, suppression, or promotion of details, he can be seen to be 'correcting' one or the other of his models, either in favour of an alternative source or in absolute terms.

Catullus is emphatic on the building-material of the Argo:

pinus . . . dicuntur . . . nasse	1–2
abiegnis . . . palmis	7
pinea . . . texta	10

Pinewood hull and oars of fir. The commentators have noted the attention given to *pin(us)*: at the end of the first line, and the beginning of the final line of the extended opening period.[8] *Abiegnis* appears in between.[9] But is Catullus here concerned merely with artifice? To answer this we must briefly touch on the technical tradition of ancient shipbuilding. Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* 5.7.1–3) discusses woods suitable for this craft: ἐλάτη, πεύκη and κέδρος seem in general to be the best.[10] The ἐλάτη is the silver fir (Lat: *abies; Abies Cephalonica* or *pectinata*), and κέδρος needs no gloss. But πεύκη is a different matter; it does however (with πίτυς) seem to indicate some sort of pine (Lat: *pinus; Pinus Laricio, Pinea* or *Halepensis*).[11] In Greek a distinction seems generally to be made between ἐλάτη on the one hand, and πέυκη or πίτυς on the other.[12] Latin responds with *abies* for the former and *pinus* without distinction for the latter two. It is with this last distinction in mind that we should return to Catullus. His models, again, are Euripides and Ennius:

[8] Punctuating with Fordyce (*Catullus* [Oxford 1973] ad loc.), who connects the relative clause of lines 8–10 with the preceding sentence.

[9] In the light of this concentration, there may possibly be a play intended with *robora* (4). Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 4.441: *annoso validam cum robore quercum;* also *Geo.* 3.332.

[10] Theophrastus also makes a distinction between wood suitable for war-ships (ἐλάτη) and for merchant-ships (πεύκη), but that is not, I think, relevant to the present discussion.

[11] *LSJ* s.v. ἐλάτη and πεύκη. Also Steier, "Tanne," *RE* 2 IV (1932) 2216–23.

[12] Indeed, the difference between πεύκη and πίτυς seems to be in part a matter of literary taste; both are found in Homer, lyric and Aeschylus, but πίτυς may have come to appear prosaic, for it is absent from the works of Pindar, Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes (πεύκη, by contrast, is to be found some 20 times in Euripides, in differing senses: the tree, a torch, spear, the Trojan horse, etc.). Πίτυς is revived by Theocritus, who uses it interchangeably with πεύκη. Callimachus has both words, but Apollonius avoids πίτυς altogether.

μηδ' ἐν νάπαισι Πηλίου πεσεῖν ποτε
τμηθεῖσα πεύκη . . .

(*Med.* 3–4)

utinam ne in nemore Pelio securibus
caesae accidissent abiegnae ad terram trabes.

(*Scen.* 246–47 V)

For whatever reason, Ennius translated Euripides' πεύκη as *abies*.[13] *Abies*, however, should respond to ἐλάτη, not to πεύκη. Hence Catullus' 'correction' and so too his emphasis of *pinus*. For him *abies* remains, but where it belongs—as the material for the Argo's oars (*abiegnis . . . palmis*), for Catullus knew his Apollonius:

κόπτον ὕδωρ δολιχῇσιν ἐπικρατέως ἐλάτῃσιν

(*Arg.* 1.914)[14]

In good Alexandrian fashion, Catullus refrained from mentioning the Argo by name:

cum lecti iuvenes, Argivae robora pubis
auratam optantes Colchis avertere pellem
ausi sunt vada salsa cita decurrere puppi,
caerula verrentes abiegnis aequora palmis.
diva quibus retinens in summis urbibus arces
ipsa levi fecit volitantem flamine currum.

(64.4–9)

Euripides, Apollonius and Ennius had all named the ship, but Catullus has relied on his reader's familiarity with the tradition. But more interesting is his attitude towards the etymology of Ἀργώ. The subject was clearly a matter of dispute, and in his three models Catullus appears to have had two options. Apollonius, without making the connection explicit, leaves little doubt as to his view on the matter:

νῆα μὲν οὖν οἱ πρόσθεν ἔτι κλείουσιν ἀοιδοὶ[15]
Ἄργον Ἀθηναίης καμέειν ὑποθημοσύνῃσιν.

(1.18–19)

[13] The reason is a matter of speculation. H. D. Jocelyn (*The Tragedies of Ennius* [Cambridge 1967] ad 209) suggests caprice, sound-effect, or a desire on Ennius' part to imply a military expedition (cf. above, n. 10). In light of the pairing of these trees in the technical tradition, we cannot, I think, rule out simple error.

[14] Also at 2.661, 4.105, 504, 1633. The source for Apollonius is Homer, *Od.* 12.172.

[15] I follow Vian's text here, over Brunck's ἐπικλείουσι. From the wording at this point the matter of the construction of the Argo, and hence of its etymology, appear already to have been matters of contention.

αὐτὴ γὰρ καὶ νῆα θοὴν κάμε, σὺν δέ οἱ Ἄργος
τεῦξεν Ἀρεστορίδης κείνης ὑποθημοσύνῃσιν.

(1.111–12)

For Apollonius the derivation of the name is quite clear; it is naturally taken from the ship's builder.[16] Ennius, on the other hand, had a different view of the issue:

quae nunc nominatur nomine
Argo, quia Argivi in ea delecti viri
vecti petebant . . .

(*Scen.* 249–51 V)

This etymology, somewhat less likely than Apollonius', may indeed be Ennius' own construction.[17] And Catullus, to whom both possibilities were known and therefore available? Fordyce noted: "Catullus makes no reference to Argus the shipwright, who built the Argo under Athena's guidance (Apoll. 1.18–19, 111–12)."[18] In the matter of contending etymologies, however, this must constitute more than mere omission, for Catullus first makes clear his model:

αὐτὴ γὰρ καὶ νῆα θοὴν κάμε, σὺν δέ οἱ Ἄργος
τεῦξεν . . .

(*Arg.* 1.111–12)

ipsa[19] levi fecit volitantem flamine currum.

(Cat. 64.9)

Not merely is there "no reference" to Argus, but, through reminiscence of Apollonius' line, suppression of the co-worker, and hence of the etymology which it implies. And what of his attitude to the Ennian variant? Again, Catullus demonstrates his model:

quae nunc nominatur nomine
Argo, quia *Argivi* in ea *delecti viri* . . .

(*Scen.* 249–50 V)

[16] This, naturally enough, appears to be the oldest extant etymology: Pherek. fr. 106 *FGrH;* also Apollod. 1.9.16.1; Ptol. Heph. 2 p. 185 Westerm. See Jessen, "Argo," *RE* 2.721–23.

[17] Such is the view of Jocelyn (above, n. 13) ad 212–13. It appears only in Latin (Cic. *Arat.* 277, *Argolicam . . . navem;* Manil. 1.694, *Argivumque ratem*), although Ennius may have adapted it from a view connecting the name with the place Argos: Hegesander ap. Tzetzes, *Lycophron* 883; Hegessipus ap. *Et. Magn.* 136.31; Schol Theoc. 13.21 Again, cf. Jessen (above, n. 16).

[18] Fordyce (above, n. 8) ad 64.9.

[19] Noted by W. Kroll (*C. Valerius Catullus* 3rd ed. [Stuttgart 1959]) ad loc.

cum *lecti iuvenes, Argivae* robora pubis

(Cat. 64.4)

The crew is specified, the model is apparent, but here too the etymological gloss, in this case that of Ennius, is removed. F. Klingner claimed that Catullus did not need to give the origin of the name Argo,[20] but that is to assume that there is a single derivation, which, as we have seen, is hardly the case. As in his reaction to Apollonius, so with Ennius, Catullus has indicated his general model while suppressing a crucial detail—in both instances the etymology of the ship's name.

In rejecting these two variants, Catullus, I believe, points to a third:

> τὴν δὲ ναῦν Ἀργὼ προσαγορευθῆναι κατὰ μέν τινας τῶν μυθογράφων ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸ σκάφος ἀρχιτεκτονήσαντος Ἄργου καὶ συμπλεύσαντος . . . ὡς δ' ἔνιοι λέγουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ τὸ τάχος ὑπερβολῆς, ὡς ἂν τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀργὸν τὸ ταχὺ προσαγορευόντων.
>
> (Diod. Sic. 4.41.3)

This is the first attestation of the etymology connecting the name to the adjective ἀργός (= 'quick', 'swift'), although it was clearly current before Diodorus (ἔνιοι λέγουσιν). It survives elsewhere only in scholia and in Hyginus, clearly derived from a common scholiastic source.[21] Unlike the other derivations, it is never found alone, but always as an alternative to the more obvious options. We are quite clearly dealing with the coinage of an antiquarian mind, for, although apparently a product of the Hellenistic period,[22] this derivation depends on a gloss (ἀργός = 'swift') which is exclusively Homeric.[23] Scholarly polemics are also suggested, in that a connection with the shipbuilder Argus (or the place Argos) is infinitely easier and more natural.

In short, while a speculative proposition, it would not be entirely guesswork to see in the formulation of this etymology the hand of Callimachus. Argonautic episodes appeared in at least two sections of

[20] *Studien* (above, n. 6) 159. I can find no basis for the claim of N. Scivoletto ("La Protasi del c. 64 di Catullo," *Giorn. Ital. di Philol.* 12 [1959] 346–48) that 64.4 is to be seen as an endorsement of the Ennian etymology.

[21] Hyg. *Astr.* 2.37. Also Schol. Eur. *Med.* 1; Serv Auct. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.34; Schol. Stat. *Theb.* 5.475; the wording in these commentaries is similar.

[22] It is not mentioned by Pherekydes (above, n. 16).

[23] The exceptions are only apparent: Tymnes, *Anth. Pal.* 7.211.1 is itself a Homeric usage, and Cornutus, *N.D.* 16 is, like Diod. Sic. 4.41.3, an antiquarian context, in which modern usage is distinguished (ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοί).

the *Aetia* (1, fr. 7.19-21 Pf., 'Argonautarum reditus et ritus Anaphaeus'; 4, fr. 108-9 Pf., 'Ancora Argus navis Cyzici relicta').[24] And from the little we have of Callimachus on this theme it seems that he at least twice involved himself in the creation of new or polemical etymological explanations while dealing with the Argonauts. Fr. 14 Pf. is a citation from Pliny: *Corcyra Homero dicta Scheria et Phaeacia, Callimacho etiam* Drepane (*N.H.* 6.52). Pfeiffer has suggested that Callimachus may have associated this with the sickle (δρεπάνη) of Demeter, since at fr. 43.70 he connected Zancle in Sicily with the same implement used by Cronus to castrate his father.[25] Apollonius is at variance with this etymology.[26] We cannot here be certain that the Callimachean construct is original with him. That, however, cannot be said of his treatment of Pagasae, port of departure for the Argo; of this Hyginus records:

> factam esse Pindarus ait in Magnesiae oppido cui Demetrias nomen est, Callimachus autem in iisdem finibus ad Apollinis Actii templum, quod Argonautae proficiscentes statuisse existimantur in eo loco qui Pagasae vocatur ideo quod Argo ibi primum compacta dicitur, quod est Graece παγᾶσαι.
>
> (Hyg. *Astr.* 2.37)[27]

Apollonius, who also has Pagasae as the starting point for the Argo, as well as for her final beaching (*Arg.* 1.238, 4.1781), makes no allusion to such an etymology. What is significant here is that this Callimachean explanation of the name Pagasae (πήγνυμι) is identical in nature to the derivation of Argo which we are proposing as Callimachean:

ἀργός	('swift')	→	Argo
πήγνυμι	('construct')	→	Pagasae

In final support, it should be noted that Hyginus, in the sentence preceding his discussion of the Callimachean explanation of Pagasae, also gave precisely the derivation with which we have been dealing:

[24] As Pfeiffer noted (ad fr. 109), these sequences attain a certain prominence, in that they (almost) frame the four books of the *Aetia*.

[25] On this see Wilamowitz, *Hellenistische Dichtung* II (Berlin 1924) 171; also Pfeiffer ad fr. 14, 43.70.

[26] At *Arg.* 4.983-86 he appears to have used the language of Callimachus (fr. 43.70-71, on Zancle) while discussing Phaeacia. On this see Pfeiffer ad fr. 43.70; Wilamowitz (above, n. 25) 171.

[27] See Pfeiffer *ad Aet.* 1, fr. 18.12; the sense of the final word in Hyginus is clear, whether we accept Muncker's παγῆναι or Schneider's πεπῆχθαι.

> nonnulli propter celeritatem graece dixerunt Argo appellatum.
> (*Astr.* 2.37)

For a number of reasons, then, there is a strong possibility that this etymology was the contribution of Callimachus. Be it so or not, Catullus, I believe, while deliberately suppressing the derivations favoured by Apollonius and Ennius, at least alludes to this variant (of which he was doubtless aware); for throughout the opening lines of the poem he places great emphasis on the swiftness of the vessel:[28]

> ausi sunt vada salsa *cita decurrere* puppi 6
> caerula *verrentes* abiegnis aequora palmis 7
>
> ipsa *levi* fecit *volitantem* flamine *currum*[29] 11
>
> *torta*que remigio *spumis incanuit* unda 13

Such emphasis may be seen as constituting a multiple gloss on the etymology Ἀργώ/ἀργός. The day has passed when we needed to justify *per se* such linguistic subtlety in neoteric or Augustan poetry, and in any case this particular variety has been well documented.[30] A parallel example from the *Aeneid* is conveniently representative:

> femina, quae nostris errans in finibus . . .
> (*Aen.* 4.211)

Pease proposed that Virgil here intended (while suppressing the actual name) an allusion to a common etymology:[31]

[28] It is noteworthy that in Ennius' lines, Catullus' primary model, there is no such emphasis. Ellis (*A Commentary on Catullus* [Oxford 1889] ad loc.) remarks on *cita:* "not merely otiose like Homeric θοῇ νηΐ, but signalizing the ease and quickness of this first voyage."

[29] *Currum* is striking. Contrary to *ThLL* 4.1520.49, it is the *only* instance of the word meaning 'ship'; *Ciris* 26 refers to a car camouflaged as a ship, and is therefore not parallel (as is noted by R.O.A.M. Lyne, *Ciris, A Poem Attributed to Vergil* [Cambridge 1978] ad loc.). The commentators all point to the regular metaphorical use of ὄχος, ὄχημα, etc. in tragedy, and this is of course quite possibly the source of Catullus' *currus*—although it is interesting that the usage never caught on. We may be missing some information; in *Pythian* 4, a poem which appealed to Callimachus (cf. fr. inc. sed. 716 and Pfeiffer ad loc.), chariots and ships appear together (17–18), and the Argo's anchor is referred to as θοᾶς Ἀργοῦς χαλινόν (25).

[30] For Catullus, see D. O. Ross, "Uriosque apertos: A Catullan Gloss," *Mnemos.* 26 (1973) 60–62; for Virgil, J. Marouzeau, "Virgile Linguiste," in *Mélanges, A. Ernout* (Paris 1940) 259–65; W. F. Jackson Knight, *Roman Vergil* (London 1944) 197–201; J. S. T. Hanssen, "Virgilian Notes," *SO* 26 (1948) 113–25.

[31] A. S. Pease, *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus* (Cambridge, Mass. 1935) 540 (Addenda ad 4.211); Also Hanssen (above, n. 30) 121.

errans → πλανῆτις → Διδώ

The same process is required of the reader:

cita, decurrere, volitantem, etc. → ἀργός → Ἀργώ

In the case of Catullus particularly, the familiarity of the etymological debate provides a check.

The suggestion is that Catullus was allusively referring to this etymology; further that he may have had Callimachus in mind while doing so. There is, I believe, additional support for this second claim. Catullus, of the Argonauts:

ausi sunt vada salsa cita decurrere puppi 6

At issue is the verb, *decurrere.* The commentators give parallels for its transitive force, but only for the simplex,[32] and the real problem surely lies with the prefix *de-*. Ellis seems to have acknowledged this ("*Aen.* v. 212 *Prona petit maria et pelago* decurrit *aperto* suggests that the idea may be that of running down a slope of water").[33] Fordyce too cites the Virgilian line, but how close is it? R. D. Williams has, I think, explained it correctly: "'down' to the shore from the high seas (decurrit)."[34] That is what suits Virgil's context, and, moreover, it is what we expect of *decurrere:* the Latin equivalent of κατατρέχειν, 'to sail shore-wards.'[35] This obviously cannot be the sense of Catullus' *decurrere,* and so the Virgilian instance will hardly constitute a parallel. K. Quinn does seem to confront the issue: "the transitive use and the sense of 'race through or across' seem to have belonged to the technical language of navigation, chariot-racing, etc."[36] This appears to be a reference to *ThLL* 5.229.21-26 (*de qualibet motione . . . de navigatione*), where the occurrence at Cat. 64.6 (cited as 64.11) is cited. But the Catullan instance is to be distinguished in its generality, in that each of the others in that entry refers to a course which has been

[32] E. G. Plaut. *Merc.* 547, *pelagi cursores* (where the nominal form also distinguishes it from Catullus' *decurrere*); Virg. *Aen.* 3.191, *currimus aequor,* 5.235, *aequora curro.*

[33] Ellis (above, n. 28) ad loc.

[34] *The Aeneid of Virgil, Books 1–6* (Basingstoke and London 1972) ad loc. For this common meaning of the verb with ships, see *ThLL* 5.228.54ff. Those who invoke *Aen.* 5.212 as a parallel for Catullus seem unconcerned by the ablative (*pelago*).

[35] *LSJ* s.v.; or, more prosaically, καταπλεῖν, the opposite, of course, being ἀναπλεῖν, "to sail out to sea."

[36] Quinn (above, n. 5) ad loc.

carried completely through to its conclusion, with actual distances being uniformly mentioned or implied.[37]

In short, I can find no wholly satisfactory parallel for Catullus' use of *decurrere*. Callimachus, *Aetia* 4, fr. 108 Pf. is an apostrophe to the harbour of Cyzicus,[38] where the Argo put in to take on drinking-water:

'Αργὼ καὶ σέ, Πάνορμε, *κατέδραμεν* καὶ τεὸν ὕδωρ.

Is it not possible that Catullus, the translator of the very next episode of the *Aetia*, applied the same verb to his Argo?[39]

II

Catullan Conflation

It has already emerged that Catullus, in the opening lines of Poem 64, had in mind not a single model, but a variety or complex of models—a complex which at times merges and is transformed into a new and individual form of expression. We may now proceed to examine systematically Catullus' method of conflating these various models. Again, in that this practice requires the poet to accept, reject or modify his predecessors' treatments, the spirit is essentially polemical.

1

Peliaco quondam prognatae vertice pinus 1

The carefully constructed double reference of this opening line has gone unnoticed. First Ennius. As is generally recognized, he 'corrected' the time-sequence of Euripides, removing the hysteron-proteron[40] that appears at the beginning of that poet's *Medea:*

[37] Epit. *Alex.* 85, *iam stadia CCCC decurrerant;* Symm. *or.* 6.3, *multo itinere decurso;* Ammian. 17.1.4, *sursum versum decurso* (sc. *Rheno*), 24.6.2, *classis stadiis triginta decursis.*

[38] Following *Dieg.* 5.33–39, although some would see in Πάνορμε an apostrophe to an eponymous hero; see Pfeiffer ad loc.

[39] Although we do not know how Catullus read his Callimachus, it seems reasonable to allow that he knew of this episode.

[40] Page, following the scholiast's criticism of Timichidas (*Euripides, Medea* [Oxford 1952] ad loc.), objects to the term, claiming that Euripides presents "a logical sequence of thoughts." Which he does, but it is still, I think, a hysteron-proteron. See also F. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen,* 2nd ed. (Berlin 1912) 97–99.

εἴθ' ὤφελ' Ἀργοῦς μὴ διαπτάσθαι σκάφος
Κόλχων ἐς αἶαν κυανέας Συμπληγάδας,
μηδ' ἐν νάπαισι Πηλίου πεσεῖν ποτε
τμηθεῖσα πεύκη . . .

(Eur. *Med.* 1–4)

Thus for Ennius the timber of Mt. Pelion is the first stage:

Utinam ne in nemore Pelio securibus . . .

(Enn. *Scen.* 246)

Catullus followed this lead, at the same time elevating the geographical reference, by use of a new adjective: *Peliaco . . . vertice.*[41] Thus recognition of Ennius' reorganization. Concurrently, however, he has preserved reference to the Euripidean original, by reduplicating the alliteration found at *Med.* 3, but absent from the Ennian version:

Πηλίου πεσεῖν ποτε / . . . πεύκη
*P*eliaco . . . *p*rognatae . . . *p*inus

Also noteworthy is the apparent parallel between Πηλίου . . . *ποτε* and *Peliaco* quondam.[42] In the very first line of his poem, then, Catullus has artfully indicated two of his primary sources by conflating them into single line while yet preserving recognizable traces of the two originals.

2

dicuntur liquidas Neptuni nasse per undas 2
Phasidos ad fluctus et fines Aeetaeos 3

Two mannered lines, the first with its epithet-noun rhyme at main caesura and line-end,[43] the second containing unusual Greek proper

[41] So Quinn (above, n. 5) ad loc.

[42] Apparent in that Euripides' ποτέ is in virtual tmesis with μηδ' at the beginning of the line. For the recent claim that Catullus' *quondam* (as well as *dicuntur*, 2) may be influenced by Cic. *Arat.* 420–21 (*vir* quondam *Orion manibus violasse Dianam*/ dicitur), see D. P. Kubiak, "Catullus 64.1–2," *AJP* 102 (1981) 41–42. On ποτέ as a common feature of the opening of epyllia, see W. Bühler, *Die Europa des Moschos*, Hermes Einzelschriften 13 (1960) 47–48.

[43] The first of almost fifty such rhymed lines in the poem. This ratio of 12 percent is far in excess of Ennius' practice (less than 5 percent in the *Annals*), as of Virgil's (5 percent in both *Aen.* 9 and in the 'neoteric' *Aen.* 4). The higher incidence of end-stopped lines in Catullus (as against Virgil) accounts, no doubt, for some of the difference, but clearly the pattern produces a highly mannered effect which appealed to Catullus.

names, medial alliteration and consciously varied word-order. The general source, and in part the constellation, as some commentators have noted,[44] in part belong to Apollonius:

> Κολχίδα μὲν δὴ γαῖαν ἱκάνομεν ἠδὲ *ῥέεθρα*
> *Φάσιδος.*
>
> (*Arg.* 2.1277–78)

From here too Catullus no doubt took the spondeiazon of 64.3, for Αἰήταο appears at the end of the following line, *Arg.* 2.1279.[45] Yet a further model seems to exist for Catullus, and one which may also have been in Apollonius' mind; again, it is the archetype:

> εἴθ' ὤφελ' Ἀργοῦς μὴ διαπτάσθαι σκάφος
> Κόλχων ἐς αἶαν κυανέας Συμπληγάδας . . .
>
> (Eur. *Med.* 1–2)

First, Euripides and Apollonius: Κόλχων ἐς αἶαν; Κολχίδα μὲν δὴ γαῖαν.[46] Catullus, at the beginning of 64.3, has clearly drawn from the diction of Apollonius, *Arg.* 2.1277–78 (*Phasidos ad fluctus;* ἠδὲ ῥέεθρα / Φάσιδος); on this diction, however, he has apparently imposed the word-order of Euripides, *Med.* 2 (*Phasidos ad fluctus;* Κόλχων ἐς αἶαν). This claim is supported by two facts: first, Catullus obviously had the Euripidean opening before him at this point, and, secondly, this is the *only* clear example in Catullus of the simple word-order: proper name in the genitive + preposition + governed noun.[47]

3

> ausi sunt vada salsa cita decurrere puppi 6
> caerula verrentes abiegnis aequora palmis. 7

Here, as elsewhere at this point of the poem, Catullus seeks for variation in his description of the ship's voyage. It is noteworthy that in the

[44] Best by Kroll (above, n. 19) ad loc.

[45] Noted by Klingner, *Studien* (above, n. 6) 158; Quinn (above, n. 5) ad loc.

[46] The connection between Euripides and Apollonius is not necessary to our argument, and may not be intentional; however, in that Catullus had both passages in mind, it seems likely that he noticed the similarity.

[47] This word-order may seem unexceptional, particularly since it was very much favoured by Virgil, particularly as a clausula (*Simoentis ad undam,* etc.); it is, however, unique in Catullus, the closest instances (64.2, *Neptuni nasse per undas,* 95.5, *cavas Satrachi penitus mittetur ad undas*) being less compact and therefore slightly different.

first eighteen lines there are eleven references to the sea. *Mare* is not used,[48] and the repetitions are artful.[49] In these lines, as Klinger has best observed, Catullus drew heavily from the high diction of earlier Latin poetry: *vada* for 'sea' is found first in Accius (*mystica . . . vada, inc. fab.* fr. 687 Ribb.), *salsus* is Ennian (*mare salsum , Ann.* 142 V; *aequora salsa, Scen.* 367), and *puppis* for 'ship' is first attested in Cicero's *Aratea* (389).[50] These instances show that there is a deliberately archaic, or epic, flavour to Catullus' description, but we should turn to two consecutive fragments from the *Annals* of Ennius, which appear to suggest that Catullus had a more specific model in mind:

> verrunt extemplo placide mare marmore flavo;
> caeruleum spumat sale conferta rate pulsum.
>
> labitur uncta carina, volat super impetus undas.
>
> (Enn. *Ann.* 384–85, 386 V)

The lines describe the departure of the Roman fleet, during activities against Antiochus in 190. The commentators refer in passing to the first fragment, pointing specifically to *verrunt* at Enn. 384 and *verrentes* in Cat. 64.7. However, the similarities do not end there, for there are several coincidences of words descriptive of sailing and the sea:

Ennius	*Catullus 64*	
verrunt	verrentes	(7)
caeruleum	caerula	(7)
volat	volitantem	(9)
sale	(vada) salsa	(6)
carina	carinae	(10)
spumat	spumis	(13)

These words are not particularly commonplace, and the coincidence is, I think, rather too high to be accidental. If so, then what we find in the lines of Catullus is a systematic sprinkling of Ennian diction in an otherwise eclectic description. For now, it must rest at this, but we shall return to Ennius' lines later, when we come to look at Virgil's debt to the opening of Catullus 64.

[48] Although it appears elsewhere in the poem (30, 155, 269), in these highly stylized opening lines it seems to be consciously avoided as too common. The same applies for *navis* (used at 84, but not in the proem).

[49] So *liquidas . . . undas* (2), *tortaque . . . unda* (13); *caerula . . . aequora* (7), *ventosum . . . aequor* (12), *aequoreae . . . Nereides* (15); *candenti e gurgite (14), e gurgite cano* (18).

[50] Klingner, *Studien* (above, n. 6) 158.

4

aequoreae monstrum Nereides admirantes 15

The commentators, among them, cite the relevant references, but none cites all of them, and this again demonstrates the flawed approach to Catullus' epyllion: this line, like others, and the setting it depicts represent a conflation of prior literary treatment, Catullus' own arrangement of a disparate set of models, and hence an implicitly polemical commentary on those models. The most obvious and direct influence is Apollonius' description of Thetis and the Nereids sporting around the Argo, and helping her through the Wandering Rocks (*Arg.* 4.930–63).[51] From there Catullus drew the actual Nymphs (Νηρηίδες, 4.930),[52] as well as their activity. But he has conflated these details with a passage containing more specific dictional and stylistic similarities. In the first book of the *Argonautica* the nymphs stand on Mt. Pelion, marveling at the strange phenomenon of the world's first ship:

ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῃσι δὲ νύμφαι
Πηλιάδες κορυφῇσιν ἐθάμβεον εἰσορόωσαι
ἔργον Ἀθηναίης Ἰτωνίδος

(*Arg.* 1.549–51)[53]

Catullus has appropriately replaced these nymphs with the Nereids, but, through the four-word hexameter,[54] and translation of their surprise (ἐθάμβεον/*admirantes*), he clearly intended a parallel. Through this double reference he has conflated disparate contexts from Apollonius.

A third model matters, one mentioned by Ellis[55] but apparently lost to subsequent critics. In the *De Natura Deorum* (2.89) Cicero

[51] See Kroll (above, n. 19) ad 64.12. Although the Nereids are frequent escorts of ships (Soph. *O.C.* 716; Eur. *El.* 433; *Culex* 345), the detail here clearly points directly to Apollonius.

[52] The patronymic is found first in Latin at Cic. *Arat.* 446 (*Nereides almae*), where, interestingly, Cicero has replaced Aratus' Doris and Panope (*Phaen.* 658) with the collective epithet.

[53] In separate entries, Kroll (above, n. 19) refers to these lines and to *Arg.* 930–63, but the crucial point of Catullus' blending of the two contexts is missed. Quinn (above, n. 5) ad loc. is the only commentator to mention both passages together.

[54] In that this is one of only four such lines in all of Catullus (all are in 64), it obviously represents a deliberate 'translation' of *Arg.* 1.550.

[55] Ellis (above, n. 28) ad loc.

preserves a brief plot summary, together with a number of lines from early in Accius' *Medea:*[56]

> utque ille apud Accium pastor, qui navem numquam ante vidisset, ut procul divinum et *novum vehiculum* Argonautarum e monte conspexit, primo *admirans* et perterritus hoc modo loquitur:
>
> tanta moles labitur
> fremibunda ex alto ingenti sonitu et spiritu;
> prae se undas volvit, vortices vi suscitat
> ruit prolapsa, pelagus respergit reflat.
> (Cic. *Nat. Deor.* 2.89 = Acc. *Med.* 391–94 Ribb.)

Cicero is using the shepherd's change from bewilderment to understanding as a paradigm for the philosopher in his observations of natural phenomena, and therefore he does not, unfortunately, cite the entire speech. However, from what we have, and from the summary preceding it (which, presumably, in some way reflects the language of Accius), this passage is clearly central to the *topos* with which we have been dealing. Indeed, Accius himself has in these lines combined previous treatments. The wonder and fear of the shepherd (*novum vehiculum . . . primo admirans et perterritus*)[57] finds its source in *Arg.* 4.317 (ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι νηῶν φόβῳ—the object being the Argo),[58] as well as in the surprise of the nymphs on Mt. Pelion (Πηλίαδες . . . ἐθάμβεον, 1.550).[59] But just as Catullus was to conflate this second passage with the description of the Nereids at *Arg.* 4.930–63, so Accius appears to have added a further reference to his account, significantly from this very same section of the *Argonautica;* Apollonius compared the Nereids to dolphins:

> ὡς δ' ὁπόταν δελφῖνες ὑπὲξ ἁλὸς εὐδιόωντες
> σπερχομένην ἀγεληδὸν ἐλίσσωνται περὶ νῆα . . .
>
> (*Arg.* 4.933–34)

[56] On balance this seems to have been the title (in spite of Prisc. *de metris Ter. CGL* III p. 424 K, *Accius in Argonautis ex persona pastoris . . .*). Some favour the possibility of an adaptation of a play by Sophocles, but the proximity of what remains to Apoll. *Arg.* 4.316–20 makes this, I believe, less likely. See Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin* II (London and Cambridge, Mass. repr. 1967) 456–57.

[57] These words are from Cicero's summary, but they presumably had some similarity with the unreported part of Accius.

[58] The general similarity between these two passages is noted by Ellis (above, n. 28) ad 64.15.

[59] The idea of surprise at this new phenomenon seems to be a particular feature of Apollonius, again perhaps telling against Sophoclean influence on Accius (see above, n. 56).

Accius, as E. Delage noted,[60] has himself adapted this, perhaps to a less happy context (additional support for the fact of adaptation), making the Argo herself appear like a dolphin to the watching shepherd:

> sicut lascivi atque alacres rostris perfremunt
> delphini . . . . .
>
> (*Med.* 403–4 Ribb.)

Already in Accius, then, we find a conflation of passages from the *Argonautica*.[61] What emerges from Catullus' treatment is a continuation of this practice, with possible reference to Accius included (cf. Accius: *admirans,* Catullus: *admirantes*).[62] In Poem 64.12–15 Catullus has restated a traditional motif, giving it an individual focus while preserving recognizable allusions to his literary predecessors.

III

Catullus and Virgil

If Catullus is the first major proponent of multiple reference in Latin poetry, then the master of that practice, as we suggested at the outset, was Virgil. In the unequalled range of his learning Virgil adapted and subsumed the whole poetic tradition that was his heritage: Greek epic, Hellenistic literature, archaic Latin poetry—and the neoteric poetry of the previous generation. While this is beyond the scope of the present paper, Virgil's method of conflation at one point provides us with an example, intrinsically of interest and possibly capable of being viewed as confirmation of the conclusions we have presented. At *Aen.* 8.91–93 appears the culmination of the process of reshaping and conflation that has been our subject:

> labitur uncta vadis abies; mirantur et undae,
> miratur nemus insuetum fulgentia longe
> scuta virum fluvio pictasque innare carinas.

[60] "Accius Imitateur d' Apollonius," *Mélanges . . . M. Octave Navarre* (Toulouse 1935) 113.

[61] Such practice may have been a hallmark of Accius' drama; on this, see W. H. Friedrich ("Zur altlateinischen Dichtung," *Hermes* 76 [1941] 120–28), who has argued that Accius combined Sophoclean and Euripidean contexts where related material was available.

[62] Delage (above, n. 60) connects the description of the water's turbulence at *Arg.* 1.540–43 with Accius *Med.* 391–94 Ribb. If so, these may be behind the spirit of Cat. 64.12–13: *quae simul ac rostro ventosum proscidit aequor/ tortaque remigio spumis incanuit unda.*

Aeneas' fleet is sailing up the Tiber, a river previously unacquainted with ships—this is clearly the emphatic implication of *insuetum,* and it is consonant with Virgil's depiction of pre-Trojan Italy as a land unfamiliar with the arts of civilization. Thematically, then, the situation is parallel with that of Catullus 64.1-15, amazement at the first ship; the parallelism is supported by similarities of diction (Cat., *admirantes;* Virg., *mirantur . . . miratur*).[63]

But the opening sentence of Virgil (*labitur uncta vadis abies,* 8.91) also has its antecedents. The Ennian reminiscence has long been recognized:[64]

> *labitur uncta* carina, volat super impetus undas[65]
>
> (*Ann.* 386 V)
>
> *labitur uncta* carina per aequora cana velocis
>
> (*Ann.* 478 V)

The similarities are immediately apparent, but what of the divergences? Again Virgil: *labitur uncta* vadis abies. The alteration, I would suggest, is influenced by Catullus 64.6-7, lines which, as we have seen (above, pp. 156f.), were themselves written with the same Ennian passage (*Ann.* 384-85, 386 V) in mind. Consider Catullus:

> ausi sunt *vada* salsa cita decurrere puppi,
> caerula verrentes *abiegnis* aequora palmis.
>
> (64.6-7)

Virgil has conflated *vada* and *abies*[66] with the Ennian phrase *labitur uncta. . . .* Treating a similar theme, he has not only adapted the diction of Catullus but has also included a clear reference to one of the sources of the Catullan lines.

[63] Noted, to my knowledge, only by one commentator of Virgil: K. W. Gransden, *Virgil Aeneid Book VIII* (Cambridge 1976) ad 8.91-92: "cf. Apollonius 1.544-52 and Catullus 64.1-15, where the sea-nymphs wonder at the Argonauts (*admirantes*)."

[64] Since Macrobius, *Sat.* 6.1.51. Virgil elsewhere modified the Ennian line in a slightly different fashion (*natat uncta carina, Aen.* 4.398), this time retaining Ennius' *uncta carina,* but altering his main verb. On Virgil's drawing from Ennius here, see M. Wigodsky, *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry,* Hermes Einzelschriften 24 (1972) 49-50.

[65] Cf. too Virgil's *undae* at the end of 8.91 (although it is syntactically separate).

[66] Although *abiegnis* in Catullus is of oars; Virgil's metonymy of *abies* may be a polemical reference to the *abies/pinus* debate (see above, pp. 147-48). Incidentally the history of Virgil's use of *abies* has been roughly handled. Fordyce (*P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri VII-VIII* [Oxford 1977] ad 8.91) notes: "The metonymy of *abies* . . . appears first here, but may well be older." Indeed it is (Acc. *Epinausimache* 331 Ribb. *lucifera lampade abietem exurat Iovis*), as is recorded at *ThLL* 1.94.5-6. The author of that entry, however, has missed *Aen.* 8.91, citing Accius' as the only example.

IV

Ovid

Ovid's age, as well as his mentality, made him well suited to the art of multiple reference, and a relevant example exists. *Amores* 2.11, a propempticon to Corinna, opens in high fashion:

> Prima malas docuit mirantibus aequoris undis
> Peliaco pinus vertice caesa vias,
> quae concurrentis inter temeraria cautes
> conspicuam fulvo vellere vexit ovem.
> o utinam, ne quis remo freta longa moveret,
> Argo funestas pressa bibisset aquas!
>
> (*Am.* 2.11.1–6)

From here Ovid turns to Corinna and the present. The striking concentration of literary reminiscence in this proem, and in the poem in general, has not gone unnoticed.[67] Some influences, however, have not been noted, and, again, it is the *nature* of these references that is important, for Ovid has here demonstrated not only his knowledge of the separate treatments, but also his awareness of the very process of conflation carried out in the works of his antecedents. The Catullan influence (Cat. *Peliaco . . . vertice pinus;* Ovid *Peliaco pinus vertice . . .*) needs no argument.[68] Wilkinson also noted that the third couplet appears to be a reference to Euripides' *Medea.* Ennius' version should be added to this (*utinam ne . . . Scen.* 246 V; *o utinam, ne quis . . . Am.* 2.11.5).[69] Finally, in the first line of 2.11 (*mirantibus aequoris undis*), Quinn sees a reminiscence of Catullus 64.15 (*Nereides admirantes*).[70] Possible, but more likely, I think, that we have here Ovid's

[67] References to Euripides, Apollonius, Horace, Propertius and Tibullus have been noted: L. P. Wilkinson, *Ovid Recalled* (Cambridge 1955) 21–23; K. Quinn, *Latin Explorations* (London 1963) 266–73; W. Görler, "Ovids Propemptikon (Amores 2,11)," *Hermes* 93 (1965) 338–47.

[68] See Wilkinson (above, n. 67) 27; Quinn (ib.) 267.

[69] Although these could conceivably be independent translations of Euripides (εἴθ' ὤφελ' Ἀργοῦς μή . . .), it seems highly unlikely that Ovid did not have Ennius' famous lines in mind. Note too Ennius *Scen.* 247 V, *caesae . . .* (*abiegnae*), and Ovid's (*pinus*) . . . *caesa* (the verb is absent from Catullus 64). Could this be yet another instance of *abies* vs. *pinus*?

[70] Quinn (above, n. 67) 267. Incidentally, the opening of Catullus 64 was elsewhere much in Ovid's mind. At *Met.* 1.95 he tells of the absence of ships in the golden age: (*nondum*) . . . *montibus in liquidas pinus descenderat undas.* That ship being in effect the Argo, the repetition of Catullus' rhyme (*liquidas . . . undas,* 64.2) is surely not accidental.

own conflation of the Catullan context and the verses Virgil produced with Catullus in mind: *mirantur* et *undae,* / miratur nemus insuetum, *Aen.* 8.91-92.

If so, then the opening to Ovid's poem is to be seen as the final, all-inclusive instance of multiple reference and conflation on this theme, presented with typically Ovidian understatement as a mere exemplum, preceding the more immediate 'personal' elegy to Corinna.

V

Conclusions

It has been our claim that in the type of poetry of which Catullus 64 is representative the influence of antecedent verse is to be seen as far more than mere reference, that a great deal of the intent of the New Poetry is to modify, conflate and incorporate prior treatments. Through this method the poet rejects, corrects or pays homage to his antecedents, and—the ultimate purpose—presents his own as the superior version. The first fifteen lines of Catullus' epyllion (and this is, I believe, true for much of the poem)[71] are dense with an array of connected references whose nature requires that we view the poem in many ways as a vehicle for polemical poetic expression.

At this point it may be useful to return to a question which was briefly posed at the outset: why does Catullus begin a poem on the wedding of Peleus and Thetis with an account of the Argo's voyage? While it is true that Peleus was among the Argonauts, his place in that tradition is hardly central. More important is the fact that in opening the poem as he does Catullus has been compelled to alter what seems to be a set tradition:[72]

> This romantic story of love at first sight between the mermaid and the mortal is found only here. In the usual form of the legend, as it is told by Apollonius (i.558), Peleus is already the husband of Thetis and the father of Achilles when he goes with the Argo; in Valerius Flaccus (i.130) the wedding scene appears on the Argo's decor and (i.275 ff.) little Achilles is brought to see his father off.

This constitutes something more than mere rearrangement of detail, and, excluding the possibility of the poem's being a translation of a

[71] Many examples come to mind, Ariadne's soliloquy being the most obvious.
[72] Fordyce (above, n. 8) ad 64.19.

lost Hellenistic piece,[73] we are entitled to ask why Catullus, in his most ambitious and careful literary production, would take such liberties. It does not seem preposterous to suggest that Catullus found the story of the Argo, in the appropriate range of its previous treatments, an irresistible starting point for a poem with whose central themes it traditionally had little in common.

RICHARD F. THOMAS

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

[73] See Fordyce (above, n. 8) 272 for the arguments. T. B. L. Webster (*Hellenistic Poetry and Art* [New York 1964] 308–10) is, I think, unsuccessful in his (admittedly cautious) attempt to argue that the poem is a 'translation.'