Latin Literary Translation in the Late Roman Republic

Christopher Brian Polt

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Classics.

Chapel Hill
2007

Approved by:

Advisor: Professor James J. O'Hara

Reader: Professor Sharon L. James

Reader: Professor William H. Race

©2007
Christopher Brian Polt
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT
Christopher Brian Polt: Latin Literary Translation in the Late Roman Republic
(Under the direction of James J. O'Hara)

Translation has been a part of Latin literature since its beginning with the *Odusia* of Livius Andronicus. Throughout the late Roman Republic literary translators – those translators who aim at creating innovative pieces of literature rather than following their source texts verbatim – develop their art and a variety of techniques for appropriating Greek poetry. This study shows that each Latin literary translator draws on their predecessors and finds unique solutions to their individual problems. It demonstrates that each translator also adapts their source texts in different ways according to their periods, genres, styles, and purposes. It looks at the ancient terminology, theory, and practice of translation and shows that, while there is no consistent vocabulary or system of translation in Rome, literary translation is nevertheless highly-developed and subtle throughout the Republic. It examines the translations of the Preneoteric translators Quintus Lutatius Catulus and Gnaeus Matius, Cicero and Varro Atacinus, and Catullus.

To Rachel and Derek

Ὧν ἡ σοφία παρασκευάζεται εἰς τὴν τοῦ ὅλου βίου μακαριότητα,
πολὺ μέγιστόν ἐστιν ἡ τῆς φιλίας κτῆσις

-Epicurus

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank James O'Hara, without whose sage advice, gentle encouragement, and steady guidance I could not have completed this thesis. I am most grateful to the other members of my committee, Sharon James and William Race, for their patience in reading and help in refining my work. I am also grateful to Rosanna Warren for first showing me how rich translation can be. Finally, I would like to thank all the graduate students in Classics at UNC, in particular: John Henkel and Erika Zimmermann-Damer, for helping me shape some ideas in their infancy; Derek Smith, for keeping my spirits high and always being willing to listen; and Rachel Boehme, for inexhaustible and kind support in times of need.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP ON ROMAN TRANSLATION, ANCIENT TRANSLATION THEORY, AND THE ORIGINS OF LITERARY TRANSLATION IN THE 3RD AND 2ND CENTURIES BC.....1

CHAPTER I: THE PRENEOTERIC TRANSLATORS: QUINTUS LUTATIUS CATULUS AND GNAEUS MATIUS.....27

QUINTUS LUTATIUS CATULUS FR.1 AND CALLIMACHUS EPIGR.41.....28

GNAEUS MATIUS'S *ILIAS* AND HOMER'S *ILIAD*.....64

CHAPTER II: MARCUS TULLIUS CICERO AND PUBLIUS TERENTIUS VARRO ATACINUS.....74

VARRO ATACINUS'S *ARGONAUTAE* AND APOLLONIUS RHODIUS'S *ARGONAUTIKA*.....75

VARRO ATACINUS'S *EPHEMERIS* AND ARATUS'S *PHAENOMENA*.....102

CHAPTER III: CATULLUS AND THE INCORPORATION OF TRANSLATION WITHIN A POETIC *CORPUS*.....109

CATULLUS *C.*51 AND SAPPHO FR.31.....110

CATULLUS *C.*66 AND CALLIMACHUS *AETIA* FR.110.....139

APPENDIX A: OVID'S *NAVITA, RECTOR,* AND *AURIGA*.....171

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....173

INTRODUCTION: THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP ON ROMAN TRANSLATION, ANCIENT TRANSLATION THEORY, AND THE ORIGINS OF LITERARY TRANSLATION IN THE 3RD AND 2ND CENTURIES BC

publica materies privati iuris erit, si
non circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem,
nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus
interpres, nec desilies imitator in artum,
unde pedem proferre pudor vetet aut operis lex
Horace *Ars Poetica* 131-135[1]

Yet common matter thou thine own may'st make,
If thou the vile broad trodden ring forsake.
For, being a poet, thou may'st feign, create,
Not care, as thou wouldst faithfully translate,
To render word for word: nor with thy sleight
Of imitation, leap into a streight,
From whence thy modesty, or poem's law
Forbids thee forth again thy foot to draw.
trans. Ben Jonson[2]

For if you don't just lazily saunter about
On easy paths of the public domain you'll earn
Your rightful ownership of part of it,
So long as you're not a pedissequous slave
Following foot for foot one foot at a time
Into the trap of timorous hyper-correctness.
trans. David Ferry[3]

I open this study with these three epigraphs for two reasons, one minor and one major. First, Horace's statement about translation in *Ars Poetica* vv. 131-135 is one of

[1] For a fairly literal modern translation of this passage, see below, n.65. All translations in this study are my own, unless otherwise noted.

[2] Gifford (1875, 89).

[3] Ferry (2001, 161).

our only two relatively substantial surviving sources for understanding how the Romans viewed the art of literary translation, and as such is vital to keep in mind from the outset of our discussion. Second, and more importantly, the translations of this passage of Horace by Ben Jonson and David Ferry demonstrate the broad range of possibilities that literary translation necessarily entails. It is not my intention here to make any judgment about the value of either of these English renderings: I leave it to the reader to decide which is the better, which the lesser, and why this is so. I intend only to offer a glimpse at what two different authors, writing in two different periods,[4] with two different purposes can and choose to do when bringing the work of a foreign tongue into their own native speech. Regardless of what we believe their aims were, or should have been, we can recognize most easily in our own language the very fact that translation is not so much a mechanical process as an art in which an infinite number of choices resides. One would be hard pressed to find two more disparate versions of the same verses. Jonson's translation is quite literal, stiff and contrary to Horace's own precepts.[5] Ferry's, conversely, is loose in the extreme and the reader is sometimes at pains to see Horace's words or sense through Ferry's own. And yet, we can see that, for good or ill, both translators have made Horace their own.

Latin literary translation is no different, at least in this fundamental respect. Romans who translated Greek texts, poetry and prose, faced many of the same choices that Jonson and Ferry did, and in each case it is easy to see the variability that comes

[4] Jonson's translation was published posthumously in 1640. For a brief history of this publication, see Gifford (1875, 76).

[5] Jonson's fidelity in translating has long been an object of criticism. Gifford (1875, 77) quotes Henry Ames: "Ben Jonson, (with submission to his memory,) by transgressing a most useful precept, has…trod so close upon the heels of Horace, that he has not only crampt, but made him halt, in (almost) every line."

along with the different approaches to translation that these authors take. In this study I attempt to shed some light on the complexity of these approaches, as well as on how Roman literary translators draw on their genres, their predecessors, their periods, and their own personal poetics in order to make the texts of Greek authors their own, innovative poetry. But first, we must lay some necessary groundwork, beginning with a brief history of the work done thus far on translation in Rome.

In 1913, Classical scholarship on translation received a boon in the groundbreaking work of Friedrich Leo.[6] Leo was the first to analyze descriptively, rather than prescriptively, Livius Andronicus's *Odusia*, a translation of Homer's *Odyssey* into Saturnian verse. He saw in Livius's poem a work of unique innovation and showed that Livius aims not at a translation faithful to the original but rather one fully appropriated to a new context and culture.[7] Leo's analysis was decades ahead of its time and, although it was developed more fully later on by Fraenkel and Mariotti,[8] Leo's initial work on Livius's role as a translator established much of the framework for studies on Classical translation.

Livius, however, was exceptionally fortunate in his early reception as a literary translator and it was not until Hans Richter finished his dissertation in 1938 that there was a comprehensive, albeit incomplete, study of Roman literary translation. Richter compiled an extensive list of Roman translations, both extant and lost, from the 3rd

[6] Leo (1913).

[7] Possanza (2004): "In analyzing the fragments of Livius's translations, Leo employed a descriptive approach, as now advocated by Translation Studies, in order to discover Livius's methods as a translator. And when he finished his analysis of this translator whose work was to serve as the paradigm for the Latin translation of Greek poetry, Leo concluded that readers must break free from the modern conception of translation as faithful reproduction" (47).

[8] Fraenkel (1931) and Mariotti (1951).

century BC to the 7th century AD. He suggested that there were numerous types of translation in antiquity, which vary according to audience, genre, topic, and purpose, and demonstrated the versatility of translation as both a practical craft and a literary art. Finally, perhaps his greatest contribution to the field was the first systematic compilation and analysis of translation terminology in Latin.[9] Richter's work provided some of the fundamental tools necessary for later scholarship on ancient translation theory and practice.

With the exception of Livius, individual Roman translators still suffered much from neglect or derision for a number of decades, as did translators of other languages in fields outside Classics.[10] In the 1950s and 1960s, however, scholars such as Mariotti, Traina, and Handley[11] picked up where their predecessors had left off, applying some of the same descriptive critical approach to translation that Leo and Fraenkel had set forth. Although still sometimes critical of the translators for their lack of fidelity, these scholars brought attention gradually to an area of study that had remained untouched for too long.

[9] Richter's discussion of translation terminology sometimes lacks subtlety in distinction and flexibility in incorporating the often-contradictory usages of the same vocabulary by ancient critics and translators, but it is nevertheless exceptionally useful as a source for later scholars and as the first consistent attempt to demonstrate that the Roman terms do not generally imply the same fidelity and purpose that our "translation" did early in the 20th century.

[10] For the history of the reception of translation generally, see Bassnet-McGuire (1991, 1-7 and 39-75). Hillaire Belloc's remarks in 1931 are indicative of the general trends in the status of translation for the next three decades: "The art of translation is a subsidiary art and derivative. On this account it has never been granted the dignity of the original work, and has suffered too much in the general judgement of letters. This natural underestimation of its value has had the bad practical effect of lowering the standard demanded, and in some periods has almost destroyed the art altogether. The corresponding misunderstanding of its character has added to its degradation: neither its importance nor its difficulty has been grasped" (3).

[11] Mariotti (1952), Traina (1970), and Handley (1968). Handley's work is remarkably even-handed towards Plautus and was especially important for the reevaluation of New Comedy as adaptation, though it seems at the expense of the Latin plays to have led to an overemphasis on source studies until only fairly recently.

Since the 1970s there has been a growing acceptance of translation as an independent and worthwhile art, especially with Kubiak's dissertation and the outstanding work of Greene, Adams, and Possanza.[12] The application of Translation Studies to Classical authors, a more nuanced understanding of the different goals and traditions of translation in antiquity, and the greater acknowledgement of the skill and innovation of Roman translators have laid the groundwork for this project and for what will continue to develop as a rich area of study with much to offer. I hope that this current study will contribute something, however slight, to that development.

I aim in this project to demonstrate three facts: (1) that the Romans had no coherent definition of what constitutes a translation, of what purposes translations serve, or of what methods are necessary for a successful translation; (2) that every Roman translator adapts techniques from his predecessors and innovates to suit his own purposes, genre, and style; and (3) that Catullus is the first and only Roman poet to appropriate independent translations completely within a larger poetic *corpus*.

In a study on Roman translation and adaptation, it seems appropriate at the outset to appropriate another author: *haec thesis est omnis divisa in partes tres*. Each of the three chapters is devoted to a different author or set of authors, the first to the Preneoterics Lutatius Catulus and Gnaeus Matius, the second to Varro Atacinus and, briefly, Cicero, and the third to Catullus. In addition to the three main chapters, I also

[12] Kubiak (1979), Greene (1999), Adams (2003), and Possanza (2004). It is interesting as an interdisciplinary phenomenon that this growth of studies on translation within Classics coincides with the emergence of Translation Studies as an independent discipline: "In 1978, in a brief Appendix to the collected papers of the 1976 Louvain Colloquium on Literature and Translation, André Lefevere proposed that the name *Translation Studies* should be adopted for the discipline that concerns itself with 'the problems raised by the production and description of translations'...Since 1965, great progress has been made in Translation Studies. The work of scholars...seems to indicate the emergence of clearly defined schools of Translation Studies, which place their emphasis on different aspects of the whole vast field. Moreover, translation specialists have benefitted a great deal from work in marginally related areas" (Bassnet-McGuire 1991, 1-6).

include in this introduction an extended discussion of the ancient terminology and theory of translation, as well as a brief overview of the work of Livius Andronicus, Ennius, Plautus, and Terence as the originators of Roman translation.

In the first chapter, I begin by sketching the poetic milieu of the late 2nd century BC and the introduction of Hellenistic epigram to Rome. I then discuss Lutatius Catulus fr.1, a translation of Callimachus *Epigr*.41, focusing especially on the translator's active reliance on and purposeful manipulation of his source. I explore the different techniques that Catulus employs in adapting Callimachus and demonstrate that many come directly from his predecessors in New Comedy, particularly Plautus. After a brief excursus on Plautus's techniques as an adaptor I return to Catulus and show that his unusual choice of models – New Comedy for his style and Callimachus for his theme – is actively polemic and allows him to rewrite Callimachus in anti-Callimachean terms. I conclude my discussion with an *apologia* for Catulus as a translator, since his status as such is still much in debate, and I show that his first fragment is unique among Preneoteric epigrams as the earliest extant Roman translation of Greek poetry that is neither epic nor drama. I then move on to the fragments of Gnaeus Matius's *Ilias*, which, as I show, demonstrate approaches to translation far more in common with Livius Andronicus's epic *Odusia* than with Roman New Comedy.

In the second chapter, I open with a brief overview of Cicero's translations, since he has already received a fair amount of attention by other scholars. I then examine the fragments of Varro Atacinus's *Argonautae*, a translation of Apollonius Rhodius's *Argonautika*. I show that Varro creates a translation far closer to the original than any of his predecessors', though he adds a distinctively Neoteric flavor to many of his

renderings. I also show that most of his fragments demonstrate a remarkably modern attempt to suppress the translator's voice and maintain Apollonius's style and nuances. I then explore the two fragments of Varro's *Ephemeris*, a translation of the second part of Aratus's *Phaenomena*, and reveal that Varro's techniques in translating Apollonius are the same ones he employs in rendering Aratus.

In the third chapter, I discuss two of Catullus's poems: *c*.51, which is a translation of Sappho fr.31, and *c*.66, which is a translation of the end of Callimachus's *Aetia*, fr.110. I show that in both translations Catullus plays with his audience's expectations in the opening verses in which he appears to present a literal rendering only to undercut that expectation immediately. This playful repositioning excepted, Catullus's approach to translation tends to follow a middle course, as the poet remains very faithful to his source in most of the poem but departs in pointedly in certain places in order to shift subtly the tone of the whole work. Catullus also creates a unique tool for translation, a sort of appendix to each poem which is entirely his own creation and allows him both to comment on his source text and to incorporate the translation into his larger *corpus*.

Before we can go any further, we must first define some terminology which we will use throughout the following pages. Let us begin where our predecessors have:[13] what do we mean by the term "translation"? Roman Jakobson's has long been the standard and most basic definition: "Interlingual translation or *translation proper* is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language."[14] Such a broad definition, however, is useful only for the most basic understanding of all that translation entails, so we must further clarify the term as it applies to ancient works, in particular

[13] Richter's (1938, 7) opening section is entitled "Was verstehen wir heute unter 'Uebersetzen'?"

[14] Jakobson (1959) 233.

those relevant to this study. In addition, almost every Latin author is a translator *extraordinaire* according to this definition, since any Roman intertextuality with Greek sources is, by its very nature, an "interpretation of verbal signs by means of another language." For the purposes of this study, we will define[15] "translation" as an adaptation of a work from a source language into the target language of the author while repeatedly and consciously evoking the original throughout the text.[16] The "source language" is the language of the translation's model, in this case Greek, and the "target language" is the language into which the model is being adapted, in this case Latin.[17]

We know of a number of translations from antiquity and, although most exist only in passing references, a handful have come down to us either in scattered fragments or, more rarely, in full.[18] We can divide these into three broad categories: multilingual inscriptions and public records, which we will call "documentary translations";

---

[15] Translation is notoriously difficult to define, and I do not suggest here that my own attempt is flawless. There is something inescapably subjective about what should be called a translation and what should not, especially in a literary culture as thoroughly steeped in tradition and allusion as that of the Romans, and I do not doubt that some of the reason for a lack of coherent translation theory in antiquity is partially the result of this difficulty. We must ultimately weigh each individual work on its own merits and judge whether it demonstrates a preponderance of those traits which are common to other translations.

[16] Catullus's *c*.51 is a translation under this rubric, as it consistently looks back to Sappho fr.31 throughout the poem. Catullus's *c*.64, on the other hand, is not a translation, despite the concentration of allusions in the opening lines. Although the poet clearly refers to Euripides's and Ennius's *Medea*, the points of intersection are infrequent past the eighth line and the poem becomes more an original, allusive work than primarily a reworking of a single text. The plays of Roman New Comedy likewise are not translations, although they do seem to refer repeatedly to their originals, since the playwrights extensively rework, delete, and add entire scenes, sometimes from multiple sources and sometimes from personal innovation. Highly intertextual authors like Catullus and Plautus use the same techniques as translators, occasionally meeting the above definition in single poems or scenes, but their work is primarily allusive rather than translational. For a further clarification of some of the common features of translations, see my defense of Lutatius Catulus fr.1 as a translation, pp.57-64.

[17] Neither "source language" nor "target language" are my own terms, and each has been in use in Translation Studies for several decades; see Bassnet-McGuire (1991, 1-7). Nevertheless, I have defined them here for the sake of clarity.

[18] A number of lists of translations, lost, fragmentary, and extant, have been produced and are a useful starting point for any study of translation in antiquity. See Richter (1938, 42-67) and Muckle (1942), though note that the latter is concerned primarily with philosophical works and limits his list accordingly. For a list of Cicero's prose translations, see Jones (1959) and Powell (1995, 279-280).

translations which aim at information transmission with little or no concern for the style of the original, which we will call "technical translations;" and translations which demonstrate both a high degree of artistry and an attempt by the translator to appropriate the work into a new context for his own purposes, which we will call "literary translations."[19] It is the last of these three that is the focus of this study.

One final matter that is of the greatest importance for our understanding of Roman translation is the problem of audience. The diversity of types and goals of the translations we have just defined necessarily implies a variety of different audiences, both those whom the author had in mind when writing and those who actually experienced the translation.[20] The audiences for the first two categories are broad, since the first consists

[19] Although this study is primarily concerned with the last of these three, the first two categories are important aspects of ancient translation theory and deserve fuller attention than we can offer here. A few brief notes at this point may be helpful.

There is, to my knowledge, no comprehensive study of bi- and trilingual inscriptions as evidence for translation techniques and theories in antiquity. For an extensive and excellent study of bilingualism in the Roman world, see Adams (2003). There are too many smaller studies on individual inscriptions to list here, but a few of the more prominent references are useful. For a brief discussion and relevant bibliography on the translation of the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, see Witgil (1982), as well as Meuwese (1920). For a discussion of the trilingual inscription at Philae by Cornelius Gallus, see Mazzarino (1982). For other inscriptions and sources such as the Greek translations of the *senatus consulta* and legal documents from Egypt, see Brock (1979, n.6).

Most texts that would fall under the category of technical translation have been lost, and so it is impossible to determine the degree to which they ignored the style of their originals. I would tentatively place most of Cicero's prose translations in this category, though perhaps erroneously, since Cicero's statements against literal translation occur alongside some of these; a fuller study is long overdue and necessary before any proper judgement can be made about the quality of Cicero's prose translations. Traina (1989) remarks: "Si è affermato [by Müller (1964) and Traglia (1971)] che Cicerone suole tradurre letterariamente Platone, letteralmente Epicuro: perché diverso è il suo atteggiamento, ammirativo ed emulativo verso il primo, polemico verso il secondo" (108), though I am hesitant to agree that Traina's is the real reason for Cicero's variation in translation styles. For the fragments of Cicero's translations of Xenophon's *Oekonomika* and Plato's *Timaeus*, see Baiter & Halm (1861). Powell (1995, 279-280) lists all prose translations found in Cicero's philosophical works. For a discussion of Cicero's techniques in translating prose, see Powell (1995) and Wright (2003). Although generally post-Classical, the translations of Greek texts in the *Hermeneumata Pseudo-Dositheana* schoolbooks are also technical translations, since they are made for instructive rather than artistic purposes. For a good discussion of these, see Dionisotti (1982) and Korhonen (1996). For other potential technical translations that are not extant, see Richter (1938) and Muckle (1942).

[20] The question of ideal and real audience is a complicated one and beyond the scope of this study. For a full discussion, see Tompkins (1980).

primarily of public documents that would have been available to most levels of society and the second are useful primarily to those without access to the original text, either physically or because they do not have an adequate knowledge of the source language.[21] The audience for literary translations, however, most likely was not reading the text mainly for the information it contained, but rather as exceptionally allusive literature for which a knowledge of the model is necessary for a full appreciation of the translator's art.[22] Although there were probably many in the audience of literary translations who did not or could not read the original, I believe the expectation of the translators of these texts was that their audience must be familiar with their source, as well as with the differences between it and the translation.[23] We will assume that the audiences for each of the translators discussed in this study were bilingual and well-acquainted with the original texts.[24]

---

[21] This hypothesis of a unilingual audience is certain in the case of the *Hermeneumata Pseudo-Dositheana* and other texts aimed primarily at linguistic education. See n.57 for Pliny's and Cicero's express opinions regarding the usefulness of translation for giving a more nuanced understanding of Latin and Greek.

[22] There is also the possibility that some audiences read the translations independently of their source text but still for their literary value, as is the case in the many courses on Classics in translation increasingly offered at American universities. I do not doubt that this scenario is true, but I do believe that the translators themselves had in mind a bilingual audience that would be able to compare what they were doing with what their source text had done.

[23] In early Roman drama, for example, the majority of listeners seem unlikely to have had ready access to the original Greek plays, and translation serves both to breach the language barrier and to entertain with subject matter and language that is relevant to the receiving audience. There is a number of points in Plautus, however, which suggest a fair amount of audience familiarity with the original Greek plays; see n.142 for a brief discussion of this point. In Neoteric translations, the audience certainly is expected to be more learned, and probably bilingual, and so the adaptation serves a purpose more artistic than practical.

[24] "But how is this acknowledgement [of the imitated source] to be made? Not in footnotes, as with Gray's *Pindarick Odes* or Eliot's *The Waste Land*, but by making it clear by the tenor of your writing that you are working in a certain tradition, and are fully aware of the resources of your medium, which you assume also to be known to your readers. This is how Alexandrian and Augustan poets worked. They assumed in the reader a sufficient understanding of Alcaeus or Hesiod or Theocritus to feel sure that he would not bring a charge of *κλοπή* out of pedantic half-knowledge, and would know when the *mimesis* had been successfully executed" (Russell 1979, 12).

At the beginning of a section of his study of Germanicus's translation of Aratus entitled "Literary Translation Reconsidered," Mark Possanza offers a fine excursus on the fundamental characteristics of literary translation:[25]

> Literary translation, the transformation of a literary text written in one language into an "equivalent" literary text written in another language, is a creative process and the products of literary translation, when executed by competent hands, are unique creations in their new linguistic and cultural environment. The translator-poet creates, not by inventing what is recognized as new and original in the world of literary texts but by recreating, in another language and another culture, the semantic content, the formal features, and the aesthetic qualities of the source text. What distinguishes literary translation from other types of translation is the goal of achieving an *aesthetic* effect comparable to that of the source text. That goal guides translator-poets as they work to recreate the affective power of the source text in a radically different linguistic and cultural context and make the difficult choices forced upon them by their inability to give equal treatment to all aspects of the source text (lexical, semantic, acoustic, syntactic, structural, stylistic, allusive).

The main goal of literary translation is not creation, but *re*creation, the reshaping of the source text for a new audience and purpose.[26] The literary translator cannot hope, or even want, to do what his model does, because it has already been done. Rather, he looks to appropriate it for himself and alter it according to his own needs and desires.[27] A literary translator may indeed still want to preserve as much of his source as possible while transferring it into his own language, as we will see Varro Atacinus does, but he still must

[25] Possanza (2004, 29).

[26] "The novelty which the 'last comer' can seek lies not in the subject, nor even in the words, but in the mysterious 'arrangement' (*σύνθεσις*, composition) which for many ancient critics was the most decisive, and most difficult to analyse, of the elements of literature" (Russell 1979, 5).

[27] Russell (1979) remarks: "...acknowledgement [of the imitated source], of course, must be combined with appropriation: a paradoxical but essential point. You must make the thing 'your own', *privati iuris* (Horace, *Ars Poetica* 131), and the way to do this is to select, to modify, and at all costs to avoid treading precisely and timidly in the footprints of the man in front" (12).

rely on his own poetics and that of his culture in order to create a successful, independent piece of literature.[28]

As we move through the various literary translators studied here, we will focus on this recreation and appropriation. In the case of each author, we will discuss how the translator calls attention to the source text and then signals to his audience the way in which he positions his own work in relation to it, either as a reproduction of sense of the original in a new context, or as a development of different ideas with the same subject, or as an oppositional polemic reappropriation. Before we can do these things, however, we must look at how the Romans themselves viewed translation and deal with the first of this project's aims, namely to demonstrate that there is no consistent vocabulary, methodology, or purpose for translation in antiquity.

In his seminal work on Roman translation, Hans Richter asks a most fundamental question: "was wollten die alten Römer, um deren Uebersetzungen sich unsere Arbeit dreht, ausdrücken mit den Worten, die wir mit 'Uebersetzen' wiederzugeben pflegen?"[29] This present study does not propose to offer a satisfactory answer. However, we need to explore briefly some of these terms to demonstrate that there is no unified ancient concept of translation.

---

[28] Possanza (2004) notes a case in which one presumably literary translator of the *Iliad*, Attius Labeo, makes a remarkably poor choice in following his source too closely at the expense of good poetry: "The Greek text is *Iliad* 4.35: *ὠμὸν βεβρώθοις Πρίαμον Πριάμοιό τε παῖδας* ('[if]...you should eat up Priam and the children of Priam'), which Labeo translates, *crudum manduces Priamum Priamique pisinnos* ('Raw you'd munch both Priam himself and Priam's papooses' in the memorable version of Basil Gildersleeve). Labeo's literalism extends not only to word-for-word equivalence, including the enclitics *–que* and *τε*, but also to word order and syntax, and even to the alliterative pattern of the Greek found in the succession of three *p*-sounds in the second half of the line: the Latin replicates the Greek like a strand of DNA. The price of such literalism is high: *manduces* and *pisinnos* are intolerable offenses against the lofty decorum of Latin epic diction" (31). Whether the rest of Labeo's translation was chock full of such literary *faux pas* is impossible to know, but this single line serves as a fine example of literary translation gone awry.

[29] Richter (1938) 10.

The vocabulary of Roman translation is extensive.[30] There are at least eleven verbs for "to translate" which appear throughout most of Roman literary history: *aemulari*, *exprimere*, *imitari*, *interpretari*, *reddere*, *tradere*, *traducere*, *transcribere*, *transferre*, *transponere*, and *vertere*.[31] Much of the time these terms are accompanied by various modifiers which fall into three broad groups, depending on the context and purpose of the author in using the term: references to source/target languages (*e Graecis*, *ex Graeco*, *in linguam Latinam*, *Latino sermoni*, *Latina voce*), descriptions of fidelity (*verbum* [*de*, *ex*] *verbo*, *ad verbum*, *totidem verbis*, *ut interpres*, *versibus foedissimis*), and value judgements (*barbare*, *bene*, *commode*).[32] There is little agreement in the employment of these terms: the same author uses different words to mean the same thing and the same words to mean different things; different authors working in the same period and genre use the same verbs with directly opposing definitions; and later authors completely redefine the terms of their predecessors. Let us begin by looking at the two most common translation verbs, *transferre* and *vertere*.

The term *transferre* has a broad semantic range and the authors who use it do so with little precision. Frequently the word implies "literal translation,"[33] but sometimes[34]

[30] For a full list of the ancient terms for translation, see Richter (1938) 10-15.

[31] For brief discussions of the meanings and nuances of each of these words, see Richter (1938, 10-15), Traina (1989, 96-99), and Kytzler (1993, 42-46).

[32] Again, for the appearance of these see Richter (1938, 10-15), Traina (1989, 96-99), and Kytzler (1993, 42-46).

[33] Cicero *Epistulae ad Atticum* 6.2.3: *itaque istum ego locum totidem verbis a Dicaearcho transtuli* ("So I took the passage over from Dicaearchus just as it stood," trans. Shackleton Bailey, 1999). Likewise, Pliny *Naturales Historiae* 18.65: *…Sophocles poeta in fabula Triptolemo frumentum Italicum ante cuncta laudaverit ad verbum tralata sententia…* ("…the poet Sophocles in his play *Triptolemus* praised Italian corn before all other kinds, in the phrase of which a literal translation is…" trans. Rackham, 1961). Note that in each case the verb is accompanied by a modifier with *verbum* that implies literal translation.

it suggests only "technical translation."[35] Cicero usually favors the former definition, but there is one especially problematic passage from *De Finibus* 1.7 that deserves fuller attention:

> quamquam si plane sic verterem Platonem aut Aristotelem ut verterunt nostri poetae fabulas, male, credo, mererer de meis civibus si ad eorum cognitionem divina illa ingenia transferrem.[36]

Two terms for translation, *vertere* and *transferre*, stand next to each other in this passage. The former, as we will see shortly, usually implies relatively loose rendering which follows sense rather than form,[37] but the latter, in Cicero at least, almost always suggests literalism. Cicero must be using one of these terms inconsistently here, and the most likely candidate for this redefinition is *transferre*.[38] Pliny the Younger offers a comparable example in which these two terms are used side by side to mean the same

---

[34] Pliny *Naturales Historiae* 25.7: *Pompeius autem omni praeda regia politus transferre ea sermone nostro libertum suum Lenaeum grammaticae artis iussit* ("Pompeius however on getting possession of all the royal booty ordered his freedman Lenaeus, a man of letters, to translate these into Latin" trans. Jones, 1956). Also, Quintilian *Institutiones Oratioriae* 9.102: …*Rutilius Gorgian secutus, non illum Leontinum, sed alium sui temporis, cuius quattuor libros in unum suum transtulit*… ("…Rutilius, following Gorgias – not that famous one from Leontini, but a different one from his own time, whose four books he translated into one book of his own…"). Pliny's reference does not indicate the way in which Lenaeus translated, but we can assume that treatises on antidotes would not need or want literal translation. Quintilian, on the other hand, makes it clear that Rutilius translated (*transtulit*) four books into one and must have condensed the original greatly.

[35] Technical translation in Rome also implies non-literal adaptation for content rather than for form. Traina remarks: "Ai margini dello spazio letterario (benché importante per altri campi come la storia della scienza e della lingua) resta la traduzione tecnica, che in quanto subordina la forma al contenuto e ha finalità eminentemente pratiche, si pone in antitesi con la traduzione letteraria…Si potrebbe affermare che se la traduzione a Roma non conosce praticamente la bella fedele…conosce invece la brutta infedele" (1989, 114).

[36] "Yet even supposing I gave a direct translation of Plato or Aristotle, exactly as our poets have done with the plays, would it not, pray, be a patriotic service to introduce those transcendent intellects to the acquaintance of my fellow-countrymen?" trans. Rackham (1931).

[37] See below, pp.19-20, on Cicero's theory of translation, especially *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* 14.

[38] An argument could be made that Cicero uses *transferre* consistently and instead redefines *vertere*, but this seems unlikely. He qualifies his usage of *vertere* as *ut verterunt nostri poetae fabulas*. Although *nostri poetae* is vague, none of the extant authors of *fabulae* can generally be considered to be literal translators.

thing.[39] In these contexts, the sense of the term becomes much more free than usual and is equated with a different meaning.

Another important issue with the definition of *transferre* as a translation term is the semantic change that occurs over time. Donatus, discussing Terence's plays, remarks: *duae ab Apollodoro translatae esse dicuntur comico: Phormio et Hecyra* ("Two are said to have been translated from the comic playwright Apollodorus: *Phormio* and *Hecyra*").[40] Richter rightly balks at Donatus's use of the term,[41] which cannot in this context denote either literal or technical translation. The term *transferre* undergoes a strong shift in meaning between the late Republic and the middle Empire.

The word *vertere* usually implies a loose rendering rather than a literal translation,[42] and its semantic range is somewhat more limited than *transferre*.[43] However, it is also an especially problematic term for translation, even within the same period and genre: Plautus and Terence use it to describe the act of adapting Greek originals to Roman New Comedy, but their meanings are antithetical. At the opening of his *Asinaria* in vv.10-12 Plautus remarks on his source:

> huic nomen graece Onagost fabulae;
> Demophilus scripsit, Maccus vortit barbare;

[39] Pliny *Epistulae* 7.9, for which see below, n.57.

[40] Donatus *Commentum Terenti* 10.

[41] "Wenn Terenz 'transtulit,' dann kann transferre nicht heißen 'übersetzen' in unserem Sinn" (Richter 1938, 10).

[42] For examples of the usage of *vertere* in this sense, see Richter (1938, 11-12) and Traina (1989, 97-98).

[43] Powell (1995) remarks: "The words *vertere* and *convertere* are used of the activity of translation, but are in themselves very general and non-technical and do not imply anything about the degree of closeness or freedom" (278). Although he is certainly correct in pointing out that these terms are general and non-technical, most contexts in which we find them are used specifically of relatively loose renderings and thereby imply a lower degree of closeness than that suggested by *exprimere* or *interpretari*, whose usual contexts almost always disdainfully refer to literal translation.

Asinariam volt esse, si per vos licet.[44] 12

Plautus distinguishes between the original author and the translator, and even pokes fun at his adaptation with mock humility by saying that he translated *barbare*.[45] The word *vertere* here cannot mean anything other than "adapted," or else the joke does not work. In addition to this context, it has already been shown that Plautus's adaptations, though demonstrating remarkable fidelity in some passages, are quite free in many places.[46] Plautus uses the term *vertere* to define his work as freely adapted from a Greek source.[47]

Terence, in contrast, uses the term *vertere* to attack Luscius Lanuvinus precisely because he translates too closely[48] and thereby makes bad Latin plays out of good Greek ones: *bene vortendo et easdem scribendo male / ex Graecis bonis Latinas fecit non bonas* ("by translating well and writing the same things poorly, he made bad Latin plays out of good Greek ones").[49] Lanuvinus's faithfulness to his original is the offensive issue for Terence. Terence's use of *vertere* requires a completely different definition of the term in direct opposition to Plautus's notion. The word, in this context, must mean "to translate

[44] "The name of this play in Greek is 'Onagos'; Demophilus wrote it, Maccus translated it with his barbarous tongue. He wants it to be called 'The Ass-dealer', if you please."

[45] Although the usual definition of *barbare* for this passage and its companion at *Trinummus* 19 is "in a foreign language" (*OLD* s.v. *barbarus*) or, more simply, "*Latine*" (*TLL* s.v. *barbarus*), it is reasonable to assume that this is not just a *hapax* usage and instead represents an ironic joke (i.e., Plautus has translated *barbare* from Greek, a language that would have been a *lingua barbara* to his Latin-speaking audience).

[46] For discussions of Plautus's freedom in translating and a comparison with the Greek original, see Handley (1968), Bain (1979), and Damen (1995).

[47] Though it is possible to argue that Plautus's joke extends to *vortit* (i.e., Plautus has *literally* translated uncouthly), this interpretation seems unjustified in light of the frequent use by later authors of *vertere* for loose translation. For an example of this usage, see Cicero *De Finibus* 1.7, pp.19-20.

[48] The adverb *bene* further identifies *vertere* as "to render literally." If the term simply means "to translate loosely," Terence's complaint makes no sense: Lanuvinus apparently is able to *bene vertere*, but clearly he does not *translate well* in Terence's opinion.

[49] Terence *Eunuchus* 7-8.

literally."[50] Even adaptors of similar source material working in the same period and genre disagree about the meaning of terminology.

The inconsistency within the usages of *transferre* and *vertere* is representative of the widespread lack of uniformity in Roman terminology on translation.[51] Whereas these terms are relatively abundant, exact explanations of the various types and purposes of translation are almost completely lacking. We have already seen that a set of terminology to distinguish between different types of translations does not exist: authors use *transferre* of technical didactic treatises,[52] of philosophical works,[53] and of comedies.[54] Likewise, *vertere*[55] and *exprimere*[56] are used to refer to a myriad of genres, ranging from

[50] Terence's other complaints in prologues against Lanuvinus affirm this definition. See especially the lines immediately following the accusations at *Eunuchus* 9-13 and *Andria* 9-21, in which Terence contrasts Lanuvinus's *diligentia* (i.e., fidelity to the original) with the mock self-deprecatory charge of his own *negligentia*.

[51] For a more complete picture of the wide variability for the rest of the terms, see Richter (1938) 12-15 and Traina (1989) 97-99. Although some, like *exprimere*, are used fairly consistently, many take on slightly different meanings in each of their incarnations and do not allow for uniform definitions.

[52] Pliny *Naturales Historiae* 18.22: *…et Poenus etiam Mago, cui quidem tantum honorem senatus noster habuit Carthagine capta ut, cum regulis Africae bibliothecas donaret, unius eius duodetriginta volumina censeret in Latinam linguam transferenda…* ("…and also the Carthaginian Mago, on whom indeed our senate bestowed such great honour, after the taking of Carthage, that when it gave away the city's libraries to the petty kings of Africa it passed a resolution that in his case alone his twenty-eight volumes should be translated into Latin…" trans. Rackham, 1961).

[53] Cicero *Epistulae ad Atticum* 6.2.3. Cicero says he translated exactly from Dicaearchus's *Τροφωνίου Κατάβασις* for use in his *De Re Publica* at 2.8. See above, n.33.

[54] Donatus *Commentum Terenti* 10.

[55] Quintilian *Institutiones Oratoriae* 10.5.2: *vertere Graeca in Latinum veteres nostri oratores optimum iudicabant* ("Our orators of old used to think it very good to translate from Greek into Latin"). Suetonius *Vita Terenti*: *tu quoque, qui solus lecto sermone, Terenti, / conversum expressumque Latina voce Menandrum / in medium nobis sedatis vocibus effers* ("You also, Terence, who alone with your choice speech brought Menander, rendered and translated in the Latin tongue, to us when we sat hushed"). Cicero *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* 14, for a translation of which see below, n.63.

[56] Cicero *Academica* 1.10: *an quia delectat Ennius Pacuvius Accius multi alii qui non verba sed vim Graecorum expresserunt poetarum* ("Or because there is delight in Ennius, Pacuvius, Accius, and many others who have translated not the words but the force of the Greek poets?"). Pliny *Epistulae* 4.18: *…quod quaedam Latine aemulari et exprimere temptavi* ("…because I tried to imitate and literally translate certain works into Latin"). Terence *Adelphoe* vv.10-11: *eum hic locum sumpsit sibi / in Adelphos, verbum de verbo*

rhetorical prose to high poetry. Authors use the same vocabulary regardless of the different aims of translations. In addition, the only explicit statements of the purposes of translation show it as a means to an end, rather than as an independent form of literature.[57] Yet, there are clearly a variety of types of translation to serve different purposes. Technical translation receives no discrete treatment, and official translations[58] that are, by necessity, literally rendered are never mentioned by commentators.[59] Literary creation stands out as one of the prime goals of translation from the beginning of Latin literature. Livius Andronicus's *Odusia*, Catullus's renderings of Sappho and Callimachus, and Germanicus's *Aratea* are prime examples of literary translation, *ars gratia artis*. Yet,

---

expressum extulit ("He took up that passage for himself here in his 'The Brothers,' and he brought it out literally translated word for word").

[57] Pliny's advice in *Epistulae* 7.9 to a man named Fuscus sets up translation as an exercise to improve writing and understanding: *quaeris, quem ad modum in secessu, quo iamdiu frueris, putem te studere oportere. utile in primis, et multi praecipiunt, vel ex Graeco in Latinum, vel ex Latino vertere in Graecum; quo genere exercitationis proprietas splendorque verborum, copia figurarum, vis explicandi, praeterea imitatione optimorum similia inveniendi facultas paratur; simul, quae legentem fefellissent, transferentem fugere non possunt* ("It is a very advantageous practice (and what many recommend) to translate either from Greek into Latin, or from Latin into Greek. By this sort of exercise one acquires noble and proper expressions, variety of figures, and a forcible turn of exposition. Besides, to imitate the most approved authors, gives one aptitude to invent after their manner, and at the same time, things which you might have overlooked in reading cannot escape you in translating" trans. Melmoth, 1963). Cicero in *De Oratore* 1.155 likewise advises translation, both to improve one's sensitivity to nuanced diction and to develop new coinages: *postea mihi placuit eoque sum usus adulescens, ut summorum oratorum Graecas orationes explicarem. quibus lectis hoc adsequebar, ut cum ea quae legeram Graece, Latine redderem, non solum optimis verbis uterer et tamen usitatis, sed etiam exprimerem quaedam verba imitando, quae nova nostris essent, dum modo essent idonea* ("Afterward, it seemed a good idea – and this was the practice I adopted when I was a bit older – to take speeches of the great orators from Greece and reformulate them. The advantage of choosing these was not only that, when rendering in Latin what I had read in Greek, I could use the finest words that were nevertheless common, but also that, by imitating Greek words, I could coin certain others that were new to our language – provided they were appropriate" trans. May & Wisse, 2001). For a discussion of translation as an educational exercise, see Clark (1957) 170-172.

[58] For a discussion of these literal translations, see Brock (1979).

[59] Brock (1979) remarks that the *fidus interpres* mentioned by Horace at *Ars Poetica* 133, identical to Cicero's *interpretes indiserti* at *De Finibus* 3.15, is "the hack translator, who produced slavish renderings of legal and business documents" (69). The adjectives are not specific enough, and there is no other contextualizing information, to justify this identification. These official translators were probably in the background of these two men's thoughts, but it seems more likely, from the literary context which they are discussing, that the *interpretes* are simply any authors who translate too closely.

despite the apparent prevalence of these sorts of translations, no ancient author discusses literary translation as a separate tradition.[60] The Roman commentators on translation do not distinguish between the different purposes and types of translation.

The ancient methodology for translation is equally obscure and poorly defined, as is to be expected in a tradition lacking both standard terminology and distinction between different types and purposes of translation. The ancients could not prescribe a consistent method, even for any single category of translation, because they did not conceive of any set goals for the translator. As a number of scholars have noted,[61] there is no independent work that sets out the principles of ancient translation theory. Only two authors, Cicero and Horace, offer any clear precepts about how a translator should approach his work. Cicero's advice occurs in two passages, *De Finibus* 3.15 and *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* 14, both of which are short and important enough for quotation in full:

> nec tamen exprimi verbum e verbo necesse erit, ut
> interpretes indiserti solent, cum sit verbum quod idem

[60] One exception might be found in Cicero's *Academica* 1.10. He remarks that translations of Greek philosophical works can allow those who speak only Latin to understand the original texts, but they can also please those who can understand both languages in the same way that adaptations of Greek tragedies do: *immo vero et haec* [i.e., translations] *qui illa non poterunt et qui Graeca poterunt non contemnent sua. quid enim causae est cur poetas Latinos Graecis litteris eruditi legant, philosophos non legant? an quia delectat Ennius, Pacuvius, Attius, multi alii, qui non verba sed vim Graecorum expresserunt poetarum? quanto magis philosophi delectabunt, si, ut illi Aeschylum, Sophoclem, Euripidem, sic hi Platonem imitentur, Aristotelem, Theophrastum?* ("The truth rather is that both those who cannot read the Greek books will read these and those who can read the Greek will not overlook the works of their own nation. For what reason is there why accomplished Grecians should read Latin poets and not read Latin philosophers? Is it because they get pleasure from Ennius, Pacuvius, Accius and many others, who have reproduced not the words but the meaning of the Greek poets? How much more pleasure will they get from philosophers, if these imitate Plato, Aristotle and Theophrastus in the same way as those poets imitated Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides?" trans. Rackham, 1967). Note, however, that Cicero only talks about the *effects* of translations, not their *purposes*. In addition, he does not make a distinction between translations suited to transmitting information (i.e., literally translated texts for a monolingual audience) and those suited to enjoyment by a bilingual audience (i.e., texts which change the original and are to be appreciated for their reinterpretations of the source).

[61] "There was no compact theory of translation written in antiquity, no system or handbook we can study. All we find are remarks made at random in different texts" (Kytzler 1993, 42). See also Possanza (2004, 62-64).

> declaret magis usitatum; equidem soleo etiam, quod uno Graeci, si aliter non possum, idem pluribus verbis exponere.[62]
>
> converti enim ex Atticis duorum eloquentissimorum nobilissimas orationes inter seque contrarias, Aeschinis et Demosthenis; nec converti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sententiis isdem et earum formis tamquam figuris, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis. in quibus non verbum pro verbo necesse habui reddere, sed genus omne verborum vimque servavi.[63]

Cicero's methodology for translation in both passages is remarkably vague, and the only clear opinion he offers is that the adaptor must not be an *interpres*, a literal translator. In the first passage Cicero is discussing the translation of rhetorical and philosophical vocabulary,[64] but in the second passage he means specifically translation of larger passages or whole works. Despite the gulf between these two enterprises, his approach to each is the same: the translator must preserve the *vis*, the sense, rather than the words of the original. How one goes about accomplishing this, Cicero does not say, but this is his only fundamental rule for approaching translation.

Horace's advice in *Ars Poetica* 128-135 is identical in sense and similarly worded:

> difficile est proprie communia dicere; tuque 128

[62] "Though all the same it need not be a hard and fast rule that every word shall be represented by its exact counterpart, when there is a more familiar word conveying the same meaning. That is the way of a clumsy translator. Indeed my own practice is to use several words to give what is expressed in Greek by one, if I cannot convey the sense other[wise]" trans. Rackham (1931).

[63] "That is to say I translated the most famous orations of the two most eloquent Attic orators, Aeschines and Demosthenes, orations which they delivered against each other. And I did not translate them as an interpreter, but as an orator, keeping the same ideas and the forms, or as one might say, the 'figures' of thought, but in language which conforms to our usage. And in so doing, I did not hold it necessary to render word for word, but I preserved the general style and force of the language" trans. Hubbell (1960).

[64] The practice of translating into Latin individual Greek technical terms lies beyond the scope of this study, due both to the size of such an undertaking and the different problems, largely linguistic and lexical, faced by such translators in antiquity. For fuller discussions, see Sedley (1999, 227-246), and Farrell (2001, 28-51) on Lucretius and Powell (1995, 273-300) on Cicero.

rectius Iliacum carmen deducis in actus,
quam si proferres ignota indictaque primus.
publica materies privati iuris erit, si
non circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem,
nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus
interpres, nec desilies imitator in artum,
unde pedem proferre pudor vetet aut operis lex.[65]

As Kytzler has pointed out, Horace's advice is not aimed specifically at translators.[66] Likewise, neither Cicero's two explicit statements about approaches to translation nor the oblique references of Terence,[67] Quintilian,[68] and Pliny[69] to the benefits of translation offer a coherent framework for translation methodology.[70] Except for the broad caution of avoiding verbatim renderings, entirely dependent on a single passage from Cicero and Horace's later adaptation of the same phrasing, ancient theory on translation is completely lacking.

However, a lack of explicit theory by no means indicates either an absence of practice or deficiency in sophistication. Translations and works reliant upon translation techniques, covering the entire spectrum of fidelity and purpose, flourished in Rome.

[65] "It is hard to treat in your own way what is common: and you are doing better in spinning into acts a song of Troy than if, for the first time, you were giving the world a theme unknown and unsung. In ground open to all you will win private rights, if you do not linger along the easy and open pathway, if you do not seek to render word for word as a slavish translator, and if in your copying you do not leap into a narrow well, out of which either shame or the laws of your task will keep you from stirring a step" trans. Fairclough (1970).

[66] "We shall not omit to admit that this formula is not a part of translation theory but constitutes advice for authors, more precisely for Roman authors imitating great Greek models. Horace underlines in the context that imitation of Greek models is essential for Roman authors; but he also points to the fact that this imitation must be a creative handling of the inherited material, not a slavish translation" (Kytzler 1993, 44).

[67] See above, pp.16-17.

[68] See above, n.55.

[69] See above, n.57.

[70] Possanza (2004) remarks: "…the comments of the authors named above on the usefulness of translation as a compositional exercise to enhance the student-orator's fluency, together with Cicero's exhortation to translate *non verba sed vim*, cannot be organized into any form of systematic treatment that deserves to be called 'Latin translation theory'" (62).

Each translator also faced unique problems with a wide variety of solutions, both borrowing from their predecessors and innovating for new situations. Roman translation theory stagnated from its very beginnings in Terence's attacks on Luscius Lanuvinus through Boethius and beyond,[71] but the practice of Roman translation was established with remarkable sensitivity at the outset and developed with the same speed and ingenuity as the rest of Latin literature.[72] In the remainder of this study, we will see the poetics of Latin translation develop and mature greatly, sometimes in slow steps and sometimes in inspired leaps, eventually culminating in Catullus's appropriation of translation within a *corpus* of "original" poetry.

Although there is no systematic ancient theory, we can infer a few general principles applicable to all Roman translators which will be helpful for our understanding of the development of Latin literary translation. The first, and most important, of these is the implicit acceptance of the translator as an active and individual poetic force. All Roman translators change their source, to varying degrees,[73] actively reshaping models for a variety of purposes. Likewise, the translator is visible in creating these changes,

[71] For a discussion of the persistence of disdain for verbatim translation and the general lack of other precepts in translation theory, both in Cicero and Horace and through to Jerome, see Kytzler (1993).

[72] Possanza (2004) argues that Roman translation reached its height of sophistication with its founder, Livius Andronicus, and never changed afterwards: "Momentous changes were to occur in the poetics of Latin poetry after Livius, beginning with Ennius's adoption of the hexameter for epic poetry and culminating in the assimilation of the literary values espoused by the Hellenistic poets Callimachus, Aratus, Apollonius, and Theocritus. But the poetics of Latin translation remained essentially the same: Germanicus's method of translating Aratus's *Phaenomena* does not differ in any significant way, apart from his use of the hexameter, from Livius's method of translating the *Odyssey*" (56). I cannot speak for Germanicus's translation, which is outside the scope of this project, but we will see unmistakably that no two translators between Livius and Germanicus translate in the same way.

[73] The point here is not simply that translation requires changes. Translation is, by its very nature, change; Roman Jakobson (1959) notes: "…on the level of interlingual translation, there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code-units of messages" (233). Rather, the point is that the Roman translator changes the substance of the original in addition to the words, fundamentally altering the nature of the source to create a new piece of literature.

sometimes explicitly in personal statements or a *sphragis* appended to the text, sometimes simply through changes in style or additions to and deletions from the source. Finally, the translator purposefully sets his work in relation to his model, expecting his audience to recognize and evaluate the changes that he makes and modifying his text in order to accept, develop, or reject the ideas of the original.[74]

Now that I have laid the groundwork for this study, let us look briefly at the origins of Roman translation before we move on to the Preneoteric period and the development of translation technique in the late Republic. Much of this material has already been dealt with by others, but a little summary is necessary for a full understanding of the advances made by later authors.

Livius Andronicus is the father of Roman literary translation[75] and his *Odusia* is the earliest Latin translation, literary or otherwise, that has come down to us.[76] His work is extremely fragmentary,[77] but through painstaking analysis Leo, Fraenkel, and Mariotti[78] have demonstrated the sophistication of Livius's translation technique, which

[74] Russell (1979), although commenting on the act of imitation rather than translation, summarizes some principles that are relevant: "We may now attempt to summarize, largely on the basis of what we have seen in 'Longinus', the main criteria of successful *mimesis*, as they were generally conceived. We can state, I think, five principles: (i) The object must be worth imitating. (ii) The spirit rather than the letter must be reproduced. (iii) The imitation must be tacitly acknowledged, on the understanding that the informed reader will recognize and approve the borrowing. (iv) The borrowing must be 'made one's own', by individual treatment and assimilation to its new place and purpose. (v) The imitator must think of himself as competing with his model, even if he knows he cannot win" (16).

[75] Leo (1913, 59-60).

[76] Kytzler (1989, 43) says that the Twelve Tables might be considered to be "the first traces of translation in Rome," though I find such a statement difficult to believe and, at any rate, largely unsupported.

[77] Only thirty-six fragments of the *Odusia*, of which most are a single line or less, have survived. Of these thirty-six, four are hexameter lines quoted by Priscian and appear to be from a later edition unlikely to have been written by Livius. See Courtney (1993, 45-46) for these lines and a brief discussion of the hexameter edition. We will look briefly at this version of "Livius Refictus" later in the first chapter.

[78] Leo (1913), Fraenkel (1931), and Mariotti (1952).

we will summarize briefly here.[79] First, Livius Romanizes to a remarkable degree, far more than any other translator after him. In dealing with Greek names, he replaces *Μοῦσα* with *Camena*, *Κρόνος* with *Saturnus*, and *Ὀδυσσεύς* with *Ulixes*, just to name a few.[80] He also Romanizes formulaic Greek phrases: Homer's *ἔνθα δὲ Πάτροκλος, θεόφιν μήστορ ἀτάλαντος* becomes *ibidemque vir summus adprimus Patroclus*,[81] replacing the Homeric divine comparison with one appropriate to aristocratic elogia from Livius's period.[82] Second, he archaizes in his rendering of patronymics, replacing Greek *–ιδης* termination names with extended, honorific phrases, as in his use of *Saturni filie* for *Κρονίδη*.[83] Third, he conflates verses and rewrites the original with passages from elsewhere in his source. Thus his use of both *νύμφης ἐν μεγάροισι Καλυψοῦς* and *Ἄτλαντος θυγάτηρ* to create *apud nympham Atlantis filiam Calypsonem*.[84] Fourth, he replaces Homer's hexameter verse with Saturnians, again shifting the poem from a Greek into a native Italian context. Finally, he takes great pains to make his opening verse deliberately close to that of his

[79] What follows is an abridged version of Possanza's (2004, 46-56) summary, though I have left out much which is irrelevant for later translators, such as Livius's linguistic archaism.

[80] For a fuller list and discussion, see Possanza (2004, 47-48). For the complex reasons behind Livius's choice of *Camena*, see Waszink (1956) and for *Ulixes* see Possanza (2004, 48-49). Regarding substitutions like *Saturnus* for *Κρόνος*, Possanza (2004) remarks: "Although the identification of Greek with Latin divinities had already taken place before Livius wrote – in the case of *Camena* and *Morta* Livius may have been the innovator – the translator still had to decide whether he wanted to use the native or the foreign name. And his decision to use the native name was a momentous one because the substitution can be seen as part of an overall translation strategy which brings the source text closer to the linguistic and cultural world of the translator's audience" (48).

[81] Homer, *Odyssey* 5.3.110: "there [lies] Patroclus, a counselor equal to the gods" trans. Possanza (2004, 49); Livius fr.13: "and in the same place [lies] Patroclus, a man supreme, the very first" trans. Possanza (2004, 49).

[82] Possanza (2004, 49).

[83] Livius fr.2 corresponds to *Odyssey* 1.45.

[84] Homer, *Odyssey* 4.557: "in the halls of the nymph Calypso;" *Odyssey* 1.52: "daughter of Atlas;" Livius fr.17: "at the house of Calypso, the daughter of Atlas."

source text, calling clear attention to his model while at the same time using subtle changes to point out to his audience that the poem is as much Livius's as Homer's.[85]

Livius, then, shows a consistent translation technique and poetic program. He appropriates Homer completely into his own native Italian context, cleverly turning a Greek work into a Roman one. Ennius, in contrast, retains much of the style of his Greek sources and calls attention to their foreignness rather than converting them into Italian works.[86] Paradoxically, Ennius's adaptations also seem much more free than Livius's *Odusia*, and so are not, strictly speaking, "translations," but nevertheless his tragedies are of great importance for the development of translation technique. It is beyond the scope of this study to explore Ennius's contributions in any great depth, and there is unfortunately very little scholarly work on Ennius's translation technique, but it is helpful to note a couple of important points about his adaptations of Greek plays.

First, and most importantly, Ennius adapts Greek meters for use in Latin literature. As we will see later on, meter is one of the key determining factors that help to distinguish translations from simply allusive literature and determine levels of fidelity. Ennius's choice to adapt Greek plays with Greek meters marks the most important and long-lasting turning point in the development of Latin literature in general and translation specifically, as it irrevocably brings source text and translation closer to each other.

Second, Ennius begins the tradition of correcting his source text and altering the Greek originals not just to make them Roman works, but also to make them distinctly modified in content as well as style. In the opening to his *Medea Exul*, for instance,

---

[85] For a concise discussion of the effect of Livius's fidelity in the opening line, see Goldberg (1995, 64-65).

[86] "With respect to epic, the fragments of Livius Andronicus's translation of the *Odyssey* reveal a tendency, as one scholar put it, to latinize Greek, while Ennius in his *Annales* hellenizes Latin" (Habinek 1998, 43). Ennius's hellenizing tendencies in his *Annales* appear likewise in his adaptations of Greek drama.

Ennius rearranges Euripides's opening, putting the events in chronological order rather than in the disjointed order of the original.[87] Whereas Livius's work tends to maintain the order and arrangement of the source text, Ennius freely adapts by deleting and moving verses to fit his own purposes.

Plautus and Terence both continue in the tradition that Ennius establishes, using many of the same approaches in adapting their own originals. Unfortunately, Terence's originals are largely lost and comparison between his plays and anything more than individual verses of the Greek plays is impossible. Nevertheless, we can judge from Luscius Lanuvinus's apparent criticisms that *contaminatio*, the mixing of multiple Greek plays within a single Latin one, was common in his work. Terence seems to have taken scenes somewhat piecemeal and worked them together, thus developing Ennius's approach for a larger context. With Plautus we can make more certain judgements about his translation technique, since we at least have one substantial passage from Menander's *Dis Exapaton* to compare with Plautus's *Bacchides*.[88] We will explore Plautus a little more fully in the first chapter, but here it is perhaps sufficient to state that he works in a way similar to Terence and Ennius, sometimes keeping remarkably close to his sources but also freely rearranging, adding, and deleting individual verses and entire scenes to suit his purposes.

[87] See Arkins (1982, 121).

[88] For an excellent discussion of the ways in which Plautus reworks Menander, see Handley (1968).

CHAPTER I: THE PRENEOTERIC TRANSLATORS: QUINTUS LUTATIUS CATULUS AND GNAEUS MATIUS

The poets of Roman epic, tragedy, and comedy are the *auctores* of Latin literary translation, but the development of the tradition does not begin and end with them. The Preneoteric poets who come only a generation after the heyday of New Comedy exerted enormous influence on the course that translation and its techniques take in the late Republic. Although the Neoterics draw on Ennius and Plautus, much of their innovation in literary translation finds its roots in the early experimentation of Latin epigram and in the first hexameter versions of Homer. In order to understand how and why the Neoteric poets translate as they do, we must first explore the contributions of their immediate predecessors.

However, one problem hinders a full understanding of the influence of Preneoterics on later translators: between the death of Terence in 159 BC and the publication of Catullus's *libellus* in the mid-50s BC, regrettably little remains of the literature, of which only a miniscule amount is close adaptation of Greek originals. Nevertheless, it is perhaps better to risk some error in dealing with fragments than to ignore these poets for fear of wandering astray.

Of the extant poets from this period, only four can reasonably be called translators: Quintus Lutatius Catulus, Gnaeus Matius, Ninnius Crassus, and Naevius.[89] The last two in their present state can offer no substantial insight into the development of

[89] Naevius the translator, whose only two extant lines of poetry are preserved by Charisius and Priscian, is not to be confused with the late 3rd century BC tragic and comic playwright Cn. Naevius.

Latin translation,[90] but the first two provide a wealth of information despite their fragmentary natures. We will examine closely the remnants of their translations, paying careful attention to the ways in which the poets both follow and deviate from their sources. We will turn first to Catulus, examining his first epigram, especially in its relationship to Roman New Comedy and Plautus specifically, and then we will look at Gnaeus Matius's *Ilias* and its relationship to earlier epic tradition, specifically Livius Andronicus's *Odusia*.

QUINTUS LUTATIUS CATULUS FR.1 AND CALLIMACHUS EPIGR.41

The extant poems of the "circle" of Lutatius Catulus[91] are preserved almost entirely in a single quotation by Aulus Gellius.[92] They provide a glimpse into the development of Latin literature in this period, especially in terms of the growing influence of Alexandrian Greek poetry among the Roman aristocracy. A brief discussion of what little is known of this shift in poetics is useful for contextualizing Catulus.

Although there was some initial experimentation with Hellenistic epigram in the middle of the 3rd century BC,[93] the beginnings of this movement lie a couple of

[90] Nothing is known about either poet, except that they translated the *Iliad* and *Cypria* respectively. The original for the latter is lost, and only one and a half lines of the former have come down to us; until fortune yields more fragments, these authors must be left at the wayside.

[91] Evidence for a coherent poetic circle is lacking and, though the matter is far from certain, it seems unlikely that such a circle existed. See Ross (1969, 142 n.61) for a summary of the arguments and a brief bibliography on the subject.

[92] That is, four of the five epigrams are preserved by Gellius at *Noctes Atticae* 19.9.10; the second fragment of L. Catulus, his epigram on Roscius, is quoted only by Cicero at *De Natura Deorum* 1.79.

[93] Ross (1969) notes that Ennius experimented with elegiac distichs in his epigrams, but that "Ennius, in these verses, owed nothing to Hellenistic epigram" (139). For the period immediately following Ennius, he remarks: "What became of the distich in the generation or so after Ennius is not known, but it seems likely

generations later in the last half of the 2nd century BC. At some point in this period,[94] anthologies of Hellenistic epigrams by Archias, Antipater of Sidon, and Meleager, among others, found their way to Rome, where they were immediately taken up by the literate elite. Callimachus had long been known in Italy,[95] and his epigrams likewise seem to have found an audience in the Roman aristocracy around the same time as Meleager's.[96] Attracted by the innovations of the epigrammatists, many amateur Roman poets[97] began adapting and imitating these newly-introduced poems, mostly with respect to their amatory themes and light tones.[98] Among these, and seemingly the best,[99] were those

---

that, being a literary innovation and having a precedent for its use perhaps only in epitaph, it lay dormant" (138). Van Sickle (1988) argues that Hellenistic epigram deeply influenced the Saturnian and elegiac epitaphs of the elite from this period, but judging from the general dearth of literary evidence it seems unlikely that the non-epigraphical epigram had much impact on these elogia. Nevertheless, we must be careful in following Ross's assertion that "the beginnings of epigram at Rome are entirely Roman, and this Roman character…remained basic and unchanged even for Catullus, even after the arrival in Rome first of Hellenistic epigram and then of Callimachus" (1969, 139). The evidence here best supports a middle path: although it would be unreasonable to argue that the Alexandrian literary epigram had influenced, or even been introduced to, Roman poets from the 3rd century BC, it is equally unlikely that the genre was entirely Roman and was unchanged by the apparent influx of Hellenistic epigram in the 2nd century BC.

[94] For a detailed discussion of the dating of Meleager's *Garland* and its subsequent introduction to Rome, see Cameron (1993, 47-56). The precise year and circumstances are unknown, but Cameron's conjecture of 101-90 BC is reasonable.

[95] Ennius knew of at least the *Aetia*. See Clausen (1964, 185-187) for a brief summary of the polemic allusions to Callimachus at the opening of the *Annales*.

[96] Catulus fr.1, which we shall examine in much greater detail shortly, is a translation of Callimachus *Epigr*. 41. Although Clausen (1964, 187) calls Catulus's poem "the diversion of an idle hour" and Ross (1969, 152) says "the fact that Catulus translated an epigram of Callimachus is no indication of a special interest in that poet," this dismissive attitude seems unnecessary. The lack of evidence does not allow us to judge how much influence Callimachus exerted on Latin poets prior to the Neoterics. It would be no more just to say that this poem is no indication of further exposure to Callimachean epigram than to argue that the only epigram of Meleager to have come to Rome is *Anthologia Palatina* 12.127, on which Catulus fr.2 draws. It is not unlikely that Catulus had access to other epigrams of Callimachus, either as an independent collection or from Alexandrian anthologies.

[97] Discussing the three epigrams found in graffiti at Pompeii, Ross (1969) remarks: "The great importance of these epigrams lies in the fact that they show the extent to which Hellenistic epigram must have been read and imitated in Italy at the end of the second century B.C. and the beginning of the first" (149).

[98] See Wheeler (1934, 70-71).

epigrams written by Lutatius Catulus and his contemporaries. Although little is known about these poets themselves, some of their methods in adapting the Greek sources are readily apparent. Generally, they select themes from Hellenistic epigrams, of which some are identifiable,[100] and modify the original poems, to varying degrees, in order to suit their own purposes. The most important feature of their poetry is the fact that they show an increasing acceptance of Hellenistic epigram,[101] as well as a growing desire to Romanize, and adapt for personal use, Greek originals from genres outside epic and New Comedy. Although previous translators of these two genres had gone a long way in developing their art, the Preneoteric epigrammatists, and Catulus in particular, represent the first consistent attempt to adapt Greek sources for personal poetry.

Lutatius Catulus fr.1,[102] a version of Callimachus *Epigr*.41,[103] is the first, and largest, extant translation from the Preneoteric period. Scholars have frequently criticized Catulus for the freedom with which he adapts his source,[104] but close attention reveals

---

[99] Aulus Gellius at *Noctes Atticae* 19.9.10 himself says that he thinks no verses in Greek or Latin are more charming than those he quotes: *quibus mundius, venustius, limatius, tersius, Graecum Latinumve nihil quicquam reperiri puto* ("I think that one can find nothing, either in Greek or in Latin, more elegant, more charming, more polished, and more refined than these poems"). Though Gellius may be exaggerating slightly, Ross (1969, 149) seems right in taking his word that these are the best of the Latin Hellenistic epigrams from this period.

[100] For a more complete discussion of the dating and sources of Catulus's contemporaries, see Wheeler (1934, 66-71), Ross (1969, 139-152), Cameron (1993, 51-56), and Courtney (1993, 70-78). For the sources of the Pompeian graffiti epigrams, see Ross (1969, 147-149).

[101] "It is the impulse lying behind these efforts that interests us, for the impulse implies an appreciation of the Greek. From the very beginnings of Roman literature the Romans had had the same general kind of erotic writing at their disposal in Callimachus and in many others, but if the extant evidence does not deceive us, a hundred years passed by before they were moved to utilize it" (Wheeler 1934, 71).

[102] All references to the fragmentary poets in this study (including Lutatius Catulus, Valerius Aedituus, Gnaeus Matius, and Varro Atacinus) follow Courtney's numbering.

[103] All references to the epigrams of Callimachus in this study follow Pfeiffer's numbering.

[104] Pascucci (1979) sums up this sentiment: "è chiaro che il poeta latino non ha tradotto, ma liberalmente adattato l'esemplare greco" (122). For similar views, see Wheeler (1934, 70), Pinto (1956, 223), Ross

that his rendering is in fact a careful translation, though he appropriates Callimachus's poem to his own style and purposes. Let us proceed to compare the two epigrams.

Catulus's epigram describes the flight of the speaker's soul and the subsequent dilemma in deciding what the speaker should do next:

aufugit mi animus; credo, ut solet, ad Theotimum	1
devenit. sic est; perfugium illud habet.	
quid si non interdixem ne illunc fugitivum	
mitteret ad se intro, sed magis eiceret?	
ibimus quaesitum. verum, ne ipsi teneamur,	5
formido. quid ago? da, Venus, consilium.[105]	6

Callimachus's epigram:[106]

ἥμισύ μευ ψυχῆς ἔτι τὸ πνέον, ἥμισυ δ' οὐκ οἶδ'	1
εἴτ' Ἔρος εἴτ' Ἀίδης ἥρπασε, πλὴν ἀφανές.	
ἦ ῥά τιν' ἐς παίδων πάλιν ᾤχετο; καὶ μὲν ἀπεῖπον	
πολλάκι· 'τὴν δρῆστιν μὴ ὑποδέχεσθε, νέοι.'	
†οὐκισυνιφησον†· ἐκεῖσε γὰρ ἡ λιθόλευστος	5
κείνη καὶ δύσερως οἶδ' ὅτι που στρέφεται.[107]	6

(1969, 149-151), and Maltby (1997, 44). For opposing opinions, see Pinto's brief summary of previous scholars (222, 226 n.130), Cameron (1993, 52), and Courtney (1993, 76).

[105] "My soul has fled me; I believe, as usual, to Theotimus
he's gone. That's how it is; he has that refuge.
What if I didn't forbid him from taking that fugitive
in to himself, but instead said to toss him out?
We'll go to look for him. But we'll be bodily caught,
I'm afraid. What do I do? Advise me, Venus."

[106] For the text of Callimachus I follow Pfeiffer (1949). The only textual issue of note is the reading of †*οὐκισυνιφησον*†, for which no solution thus far proposed stands out as correct. Schneider's (1870) suggestion of *Θεύτιμον δίφησω* seems unlikely and relies far too much on the Latin translation, for the dangers of which methodology see Bing (1997). The conjecture of Gow and Page (1965) for the presence of *διφήσω* in this place seems plausible, judging by what follows in the couplet, though a foot of the hexameter is still missing. Scaliger's and Reiske's creation *ex nihilo* of the name *Κηφισσόν* is unwarranted and should be abandoned for the same reason as Schneider's emendation. For the purposes of this study, I believe we can with moderate certainty infer from context that something close to Jacobs's *δίφησον* existed in the text.

[107] "Half my soul's living still, half's in Love's or Death's
clutches – I don't know which, only that it's gone.
Is it chasing one of the boys again? Over and over
I've warned them, 'Have nothing to do
with that runaway.' Steered by lust, worthy of stoning,
she's off, I know, on her usual rounds." trans. Nisetich (2001, 174).

The opening verse of Catulus's epigram is the most important for understanding his approach as translator. As we saw in Livius Andronicus's *Odusia*, and will see in the cases of most other Roman translators whose openings are extant, the relationship between the first verse of the translation and the rest of the poem is similar to the relationship between the first poem in a collection and the rest of the work. The opening verse is, in essence, programmatic: it is the first opportunity the poet has to indicate his source, to set the tone for what is to follow, and to cue the audience to his intentions.

Catulus does all three of these in the space of a few words. He begins with *aufugit mi animus*, which corresponds to Callimachus's *ἥμισύ μευ ψυχῆς*. Catulus makes several lexical and syntactical changes: he introduces a main verb long before the original, makes Callimachus's[108] soul whole and the nominative subject, and replaces the partitive genitive *μευ* with a dative of separation.

Yet, despite these differences, much in the translation points to the source. First, Catulus retains the meter of the original. We will not know until the caesura in the second verse that both poets are writing elegiac couplets, but the three opening words signal that the first verse is a dactylic hexameter. Catulus also keeps the rhythm close: in the first three words of each poem there are six syllables, consisting of a single dactyl and one and a half spondees (though not in the same order), and each phrase is set off by the

---

Note that Nisetich leaves the problematic †*οὐκισυνιφησον*† out of his translation altogether; assuming Jacobs's *δίφησον*, the translation should include "Help me search" directly after the quoted warning to the boys.

[108] Throughout this study I will for the sake of brevity use the name of each poet to indicate both the author and the *persona* of the poem at hand.

subsequent strong third-foot caesura.[109] Second, although the syntax has shifted, the phrase *mi animus* offers a close lexical, phonetic, positional parallel to *μευ ψυχῆς*: the root meanings of each word are identical,[110] the first and last syllables are *m* + vowel and vowel + *s* combinations, and the *ego*-reference and soul are identically placed in the second and third positions, respectively.

These two points seem relatively unimportant, but their effect as connectors between the epigrams should not be overlooked. Two useful comparanda, the opening verses of Germanicus's *Aratea* and of Ovid's *Amores*, demonstrate this feature well. In both cases the poets indicate the sources through precise metrical and lexical control. Though their intentions are different, their results are the same: the audience familiar with both the source text and the target text immediately recognizes the similarities and is cued to a purposeful interaction with specific source material.

Germanicus's *Aratea* is a translation of Aratus's *Phaenomena*. In the opening verses each poet describes the source of his work: Aratus refers to Zeus, the origin of both *phaenomena* in general and the *Phaenomena*, and Germanicus nods in Jupiter's direction through a reference to Aratus:

> ab Iove principium magno deduxit Aratus
>
> *ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, τὸν οὐδέποτ' ἄνδρες ἐῶμεν*[111]

[109] Catulus's opening: ––/–∪∪/–|; Callimachus's opening: –∪∪/––/–|

[110] Catulus is also playing with Callimachus's *πνέον*, related to *animus* in the sense of "wind" (*OLD* s.v. *animus* 3) and a pun on the Greek *ἄνεμος* ("wind").

[111] Germanicus: "From great Jupiter Aratus drew his beginning"; Aratus: "Let us begin with Zeus, whom we men never leave..." trans. Possanza (2004, 105-106).

A close comparison of these verses is unnecessary,[112] but a few words on metrical, lexical, and syntactical similarities will be useful. First, from the outset the audience knows that both the poems are in dactylic hexameters. As with Catulus's rendering of Callimachus's opening, Germanicus keeps the rhythm close, though not identical, to that of his source: both his and Aratus's first nine syllables contain two dactyls and one and a half spondees.[113] Germanicus follows precisely Aratus's *ἐκ Διός* with *Ab Iove*, but he departs slightly in the next word, *principium*. Though thematically identical with *ἀρχώμεσθα*, the accusative noun *principium* takes the place of Aratus's verb. Despite this syntactical change, the connection between the two verses is strong and the translation clearly signals its debt to the source text through metrical and lexical similarities.

Ovid's *Amores* are clearly not a translation, and yet the poet exploits the same principles of the programmatic opening verse to great effect.[114] The source for Ovid's reference is the first verse of Vergil's *Aeneid*:

> arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam
>
> arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris[115]

Ovid makes use of the same metrical play as both Catulus and Germanicus, though his is far closer: the first three words of each poem are set off by a strong third-foot caesura and

[112] For an excellent discussion of the two openings, see Possanza (2004, 107).

[113] Germanicus's line: –∪∪/–∪∪/––/–|; Aratus's line: –∪∪/––/–∪|∪/–

[114] For a fuller discussion of the opening lines and Ovid's reappropriation of Vergil, see McKeown (1987, 7-12).

[115] Ovid: "Arms and violent wars in weighty meter I was preparing..."; Vergil: "Arms and a man I sing, who first from the coasts of Troy..."

have the same metrical form.[116] Although the only lexical correspondence is *arma*, Ovid nevertheless expects the audience to recognize the work he is invoking by this singular verbal parallel and close rhythm. Even in this case, where the adapting poet does not attempt to create strong lexical and phonetic parallels, still the audience receives a clear cue that the author is interacting with a source text.

Ovid's technique has an additional implication for understanding Catulus's rendering, in that Ovid enters into a playful polemic by evoking a source text and then reworking it for purposes that stand opposed to those of the original. Ovid employs his source only to turn it on its ear in the next verse, wittily reappropriating Vergil for a *recusatio* of epic. Catulus, as we will see shortly, likewise takes an epigram of Callimachus and reshapes it in terms which are anti-Callimachean, engaging polemically with the Greek poet's own literary program. This approach to appropriation, the use of close but not identical metrical and lexical parallels, allows the poet to signal interaction with another text. Catulus makes his intentions clear: he purposefully renders his first verse in order to call to the audience's attention Callimachus's *Epigr*. 41.

While the fidelity Catulus displays in his opening verse signals his source and establishes his poem in relation to a previous tradition, his changes define his intentions in developing and appropriating that tradition. The most fundamental of these changes, the replacement of Callimachus's two soul-halves with a single *animus*, has already been noted by a number of scholars, as has its effect.[117] Catulus makes the image less abstract, personifying the speaker's soul and making it a character in his dramatic conceit. This is

[116] The opening feet of both lines: –⏑⏑/–⏑⏑/–|

[117] See Ross (1969, 150), Courtney (1993, 76), and Maltby (1997, 53).

likewise the effect of the main verb *aufugit* in place of *ἥρπασε*: the soul, which is initially just an object of theft in the source, becomes an independent entity in the translation.

Later in his epigram, Callimachus creates a slight but important shift that is relevant to Catulus's reworking of the *ψυχή*. Callimachus initially believes that half his soul has been taken, but then comes to the conclusion that it might have run away on its own (*ἦ ῥά τιν' ἐς παίδων πάλιν ὤχετο*). There is some confusion here: at first objectified and halved, the *ψυχή* of Callimachus's speaker becomes in the third verse both whole and the subject. The personification intensifies in the fifth verse when the speaker calls his soul worthy of stoning (*λιθόλευστος*). He changes his mind a number of times, presenting an inconsistent viewpoint on both the nature and whereabouts of his soul.[118] The effect complicates the situation and continuously redirects the audience: Callimachus's speaker moves from one thought to the next, developing his general ignorance of the situation into the eventual conclusion that his soul, or at least a part of it, has left and it therefore deserves punishment once he finds it again.[119]

Catulus removes all such confusion and remains consistent throughout the poem. He ignores the theft of Hades and Eros that Callimachus poses, instead drawing *ὤχετο* up to the first pentameter in *devenit*. In the same way he makes the soul the subject of *habet*, which he pulls from the soul's active hiding in Callimachus's final verse (*που στρέφεται*). His representation of the soul creates a coherent idea, as well as a lover who is in no

[118] Hutchinson (1988) remarks: "Fundamental to Callimachus's epigrams is the brevity which almost defines the genre. The smallness of their compass makes particularly sharp and devastating their sudden changes of register, subject, or speaker, the sudden revelations and surprises in their movement…The poem [*Epigr*. 41] is excitingly volatile and unstable; its movements are vigorous and startling" (75-76).

[119] "…a single line of thought is developed persistently. The whole poem is given a firm sequence by its progression from bewildered ignorance to moral certainty: *οὐκ οἶδ'*, 'I don't know' appears in the first line, *οἶδ'* 'I know' in the last. The modulations are thus bold but purposeful; the abrupt strokes surpringly cohere into a harmonious design" (Hutchinson 1988, 76).

doubt about his current situation. Catulus does not question whether his soul has been taken or has departed of its own accord, but only wonders about what he should do next. Unlike Callimachus, whose progression from puzzlement to clarity we follow as it occurs, Catulus looks on the problem in hindsight; he objectively reflects on, rather than gradually realizes, the loss of his soul.

Catulus almost completely removes the content of Callimachus's second verse from his version, developing a consistent representation of his soul by removing Hades, Eros, and the potential theft. There is an added effect in this purposeful deletion: Catulus pares down the number of actors in the situation as well. Callimachus's poem contains at least eight characters: the speaker, the two separate pieces of his soul, Eros, Hades, at least two young men to whom the soul could have gone, and one addressee to whom †*οὐκισυνιφησον*†[120] is a command. Catulus has half as many: the speaker, the soul, Theotimus, and Venus. Catulus's epigram excludes external help, besides divine intervention, and places the scene wholly within the realm of the speaker's internal mental struggle. Whereas Callimachus seeks tangible help to hunt down his renegade soul, Catulus turns only to himself and Venus. Catulus thus personalizes the poem; that is, he focuses it entirely on the *persona*'s thoughts, rather than on individuals and actions external to the situation, by making the poem a more intimate scene in which only three characters are directly involved.

Some of the changes in the second couplet are also a result of this attempt at personalization. Catulus's warning is very close to the original: *interdixem ne illunc fugitivum / mitteret ad se* is identical in thought to Callimachus's *ἀπεῖπον / πολλάκι "τὴν*

[120] See above, n.106, for the possible emendations, of which I assume *δίφησον* to be correct for the purposes of this argument. Gow and Page (1965, 159) suggest that such a reading would require the addressee of the command to be the speaker, but I see no reason why another, external addressee cannot be assumed.

δρῆστιν μὴ ὑποδέχεσθε, νέοι," and, although the original direct discourse becomes indirect, the rest of the phrase is similar. The negative command *ne* and the accusative *illunc fugitivum* are identical to *μὴ* and *τὴν δρῆστιν*, and *mitteret ad se* is lexically close to *ὑποδέχεσθε*. It is noteworthy, however, that Catulus abandons Callimachus's plural *νέοι* in favor of the singular reference to Theotimus. Catulus contemplates a single incident in the past between himself and the young man, whereas Callimachus quotes a warning he has given frequently to multiple young men. The change from direct to indirect discourse further isolates the speaker and centers the whole scene on him. The poem, in effect, becomes a completely internalized monologue instead of a one-sided dialogue with the silent addressee of †*οὐκισυνιφησον*† that refers to previous dialogues with other *νέοι*. Catulus makes the whole scene about his present problem rather than the repeated dealings that Callimachus has had with many individuals.

Catulus also adds an unnecessarily repetitive phrase in *sed magis eiceret*, a thought already implicit in the initial command. Catulus makes Callimachus's command far more rhetorical and balanced, inserting the logical conclusion of *ne…mitteret ad se* and placing it in an antithetical position. This artificial expansion of syntax is something that Catulus seems to draw from his predecessors in New Comedy. It also appears to be a stylistic feature of early Latin poets and translators; we will see in the next two chapters that Neoteric translators favor closer renderings and avoid such artificial expansion.

In the final couplet Catulus deviates from his source in a number of places. The phrase *ibimus quaesitum* parallels Callimachus's †*οὐκισυνιφησον*†,[121] but thereafter the translation diverges greatly. Catulus abandons the tone of punishment found in

[121] Assuming, again, that Gow and Page (1965, 159) are correct in their suggestion of a phrase of seeking.

λιθόλευστος, and he has already assimilated the final pentameter with *habet* in the first couplet. Catulus compresses the idea that the soul is wandering somewhere (που στρέφεται) into the phrase *fugitivum habet*, using the straightfoward statement to replace Callimachus's οἶδ'. The expression *verum, ne ipsi teneamur, / formido* seems like a complete innovation, but upon closer examination it appears to be Catulus's attempt to solve the problem of the missing halves of the original's soul. As noted above, Catulus focuses the action of the scene on three individuals: the speaker, the personified soul, and Theotimus. The last person occupies the same place in both poems as the passive recipient of the refugee, and thus the conflict centers around the other two. Whereas Callimachus chooses to divide his soul into two separate objects, Catulus emphasizes the division between the soul and the speaker himself. The emphatic *ipsi* stands in opposition to *animus*:[122] the speaker has already lost his soul, and he fears that he will lose his physical self as well if he goes searching. This solution allows Catulus to evoke Callimachus's sharp divide while maintaining his coherent concept of the animate soul, making the situation less abstract while further focusing it on the speaker.

The final phrase, the invocation to Venus, is found nowhere in the original. Here, Catulus ends his epigram with a distinctive Roman signature. The gods in the source text, Hades and Eros, are removed as agents of theft, and in their place stands a highly Roman deity who acts as a source of aid. By replacing the extra addressee of †οὐκισυνιφησον† with the non-physical assistance of Venus Catulus personalizes the poem as well as marking it as a Roman work fully appropriated from the Greek original.

[122] Pascucci (1979) picks up on this, but he does not note the connection between this distinction and the halves of Callimachus's ψυχή. He remarks: "*ipsi* del v.5 serve a isolare il poeta, restituito alla sua essenza di anima e di corpo, opponendolo ad *animus*" (121).

The insertion of Venus also has implications for Catulus's self-positioning within the tradition of previous translators. As we have already seen, Livius Andronicus attempts to Romanize every Greek name possible in his translation. Catulus, however, removes both Hades and Eros from his translation and does not provide an equivalent, since he also leaves out the conceit of the theft. He adds Theotimus and Venus, neither of whom appears in the original. Even if he could not include Hades for some reason, Catulus could have easily supplied a Roman equivalent for Eros: both *Amor* and *Cupido* could stand in place of the Venus. Catulus thus rejects Livius's method of replacing a Greek name with a corresponding Romanized one.

However, one connection with Livius's naming technique may be found in a special case of an added metronymic. Livius creates an extra name, *Moneta*, in fr.30 when he describes Ulysses's praise of Demodocus at *Odyssey* 8.480-481:

> nam divina Monetas filia docuit
>
> οὕνεκ' ἄρα σφέας
> οἵμας Μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε[123]

The Greek equivalent of *Moneta*, *Μνημοσύνη*, appears nowhere in the *Odyssey*.[124] Livius seems to have substituted his extended patronymic phrase, which he always retains from the original, in order to heighten the solemnity of his translation. He avoids *Camena*, which he uses to render *Μοῦσα* in fr.1, and instead supplies a related but not identical name. Catulus's Venus may provide a comparable example to this approach. Catulus includes the mother of the Roman Eros-equivalent in place of a parallel to Eros, connecting the translation and source text through divine filiation. The effect of Catulus's

[123] Livius Andronicus: "For the divine daughter of Moneta taught..."; Homer: "For this the Muse has taught them..."

[124] Possanza (2004, 48).

maternal reference is not quite the same as Livius's, though. Whereas Livius solemnifies his translation with the metronymic, Catulus seems to play a game of oneupmanship by including the mother of Callimachus's god. This maneuver also shifts the tone of the translation from confusion to sympathy. Catulus replaces Eros, who may or may not have caused the loss of the speaker's soul, with Venus, who may or may not help the speaker recover his soul.

Thus far we have seen many techniques Catulus uses in adapting Callimachus: he makes abstract ideas more tangible, personalizes the situation in order to intensify the emotions and characters involved, removes inconsistencies in the original to develop a single idea more fully, and Romanizes his epigram to mark it as a Latin appropriation. The most complex issue at hand in Catulus's version, however, is his expansion of a single idea into the rest of the poem. This expansion is clear in Catulus's extended personification of the *animus*, especially in his development of the active role played by the soul. Catulus displaces *ὤχετο* and *που στρέφεται* into a much earlier position at *devenit* and *habet*, and he further expands this concept in the heightened distinction between *ipsi* and *animus* that replaces Callimachus's two halves of the soul. He colors the poem with this idea of the soul's active agency, applying it to the entire translation. In effect, he takes the ideas of the original author and guides them in a specific and new direction, appropriating the poem completely to his own purposes.

Catulus also exploits this expansion in the characterization of the *animus*. Callimachus employs the word *δρῆστιν* at the center of his epigram, but, although he implies it slightly in *λιθόλευστος*, the image of the fugitive slave is as fleeting as the theft in the first pentameter. This is not the case with Catulus's epigram: *fugitivum*, the

equivalent of Callimachus's δῃῶστιν, is the key word to understanding Catulus's use of expansion as a translation technique. Whereas the idea of slavery occurs only once in Callimachus, there are a number of strong echoes in the translation: *aufugit*, *perfugium*, and *fugitivum*. The placement of these slave references is also noteworthy. The epigram is divided into two equal sections: the first three verses deal exclusively with the actions of the *animus*, while the last three center on the speaker's indecision. All three slave references occur in the first section and are equally spaced so that one falls on each verse and in a different emphatic position; *aufugit* stands at the opening of the verse, *perfugium* directly after the strong caesura of the pentameter, and *fugitivum* at the end of the verse. Catulus thus takes the idea of the runaway slave and applies it purposefully throughout the poem to the actions of the *animus*.

The extended development of the runaway slave image is also relevant to Catulus's use of the themes and language of Roman New Comedy in translating a non-comic original. Catulus places the emphasis of the poem on the emotion of the speaker.[125] In doing so, he employs the language of New Comedy in order to cast his speaker as an *amator adulescens* caught up in the typical lover's dilemma. Whereas Callimachus initially robs his speaker, then makes him a jilted lover whom his personified soul has left, and finally gives him complete clarity as to what he needs to do once he finds his soul, Catulus presents his speaker in a constant state of abandonment and impotence. This, ultimately, is the prime trait of the *adulescens amator* in New

[125] "…Catulus is more interested than Callimachus in conveying that 'I' actually felt some emotion" (Courtney 1993, 76).

Comedy: he is motivated by his inability to act, fully aware of the situation and his helplessness but unable to do anything without external aid.[126]

There are a few changes from the source text which we have not yet examined, namely the question *quid ago?* and the added value judgements *credo, ut solet*, and *sic est*. As Pascucci and Perutelli have both pointed out,[127] these phrases are highly suggestive of the comic lover. It is unnecessary to follow paths already well-trod by these scholars, but it is helpful to demonstrate Catulus's expansion technique further by pointing out some of the phrases which are informed by Callimachus's ὀρῴστιν and which come from the source text but have no comic undertones in the original.[128]

The addition of *magis eiceret*, as well as providing rhetorical balance, is reminiscent of phrases found in both Plautus and Terence.[129] Catulus amplifies Callimachus's simple warning, tacking on a comic expression and providing a sort of *expolitio*: Catulus warned the young man not to take in the runaway slave, just as Callimachus did, but he also takes up the role of the *amator adulescens* and tells Theotimus to cast the fugitive out. Catulus appropriates the admonition to rejection and makes it a comic, in addition to a Callimachean, statement.

---

[126] See Duckworth (1952, 237-240) for a fuller discussion of the traits of the *adulescens amator*.

[127] Pascucci (1979, 123-124) and Perutelli (1990, 261-262).

[128] There are a number of phrases which do not appear in the original epigram and which have comic leanings, but these are largely irrelevant for understanding Catulus's subtle shift of the original. Although they certainly Romanize the translation and help to define it in a new context, these additions simply serve to strengthen the comic themes and replace what Catulus edits out of Callimachus. For these phrases, *formido…ne* and *dare consilium*, and their specific relationship to comedy, see Perutelli's (1990, 261) summary of Pascucci's points, numbers 4 and 6.

[129] As Pascucci (1979) notes: "Sul terreno propriamente lessicale va notato che *eiceret*, nel senso di *amatorem domo extrudere* (*Th. L. L.* V. 2, col. 306, 33) figura in Plaut., *Asin*. 632: *hinc med amantem ex aedibus eiecit*" (124). Perutelli (1990) adds: "Per quanto riguarda *eicere*, in Terenzio c'e addirittura il nesso *animum eicere* in *heat*. 955" (262).

Catulus further casts Callimachus in a comic light in both his uses of *mitteret ad se intro*[130] and *ibimus quaesitum.*[131] Although the expressions parallel closely Callimachus's original statements, each is expressed in terms distinctly reminiscent of Roman New Comedy. Again, Catulus redefines Callimachus's poem and makes it his own by employing non-Callimachean, comic diction.

We have seen that one of Catulus's most prominent translation techniques is the expansion of a single idea throughout his translation and the creation of a personalized reading of Callimachus, both of which techniques occur through his use of Roman New Comedy. Whether we choose to situate Catulus's surviving epigrams early in his career or late,[132] the *floruit* of Roman New Comedy is removed, at most, by only a single generation. The influence of this genre on Catulus's subject matter and diction has already been well demonstrated.[133] However, the influence of comedy on Catulus goes beyond merely thematic and lexical levels. The playwrights of Roman New Comedy are, first and foremost, innovators who appropriate large amounts of material from Greek source texts and adapt them for a new audience and context. Plautus and Terence are, in effect, translators of sorts, even if we do not call any one of their plays a work of

---

[130] Pascucci (1979) remarks: "*mitteret ad se intro* trova riscontro in Plaut., *Truc*. 756: *mittin me intro?*, con avverbio di sicura connotazione volgare, rafforzato da ulteriore indicazione locale (come per es. in Plaut., *Merc*. 813: *amicam adduxit intro in aedis*), nel gusto di ogni *Umgangssprache*" (124-125). Likewise, Perutelli (1990): "*Mittere intro* è ben attestato anche in Terenzio (*eun*. 83 e 442): il pleonasmo della doppia designazione locative (ma con altri verbi) no" (262).

[131] Again, Pascucci (1979) notes that the phrase is "avvicinabile in qualche modo a Plaut., *Rud*. 766: *ibo aliquot quaeritatum ignem*" (124). Perutelli (1990) adds: "In Terenzio abbiamo *heaut*. 315 *is quaesitum* e *Ph*. 462 *percontatum ibo ad portum*. Va inoltre rilevato che l'uso di *ire* al futuro e alla prima persona risponde in pieno alla convenzione drammatica, perché annuncia l'uscita di scena del personaggio" (262).

[132] Wheeler (1934, 69) argues for an earlier (but largely untenable) date, ca. 130 BC, Mariscal (1993, 59) and Castorina (1968, 17) favor 120 BC, and Cameron (1993, 51-56) dates all the fragmentary epigrams of Catulus's circle around the import of Meleager ca. 100 BC. Though no precise consensus can be expected, Cameron's argument certainly casts doubt on the necessity of dating Catulus earlier than 115.

[133] For a full discussion, see Pascucci (1979) and Perutelli (1990).

translation proper. The techniques that Plautus and Terence employ in adapting their originals, however, are also taken up by later authors and translators and these playwrights exert enormous influence through the end of the Republic in their roles as intermediaries between Greek originals and Roman audiences. Many of Catulus's approaches to translation are influenced by those of New Comedy.[134] A brief digression on Plautus's translation techniques will, therefore, help us better understand how Catulus approaches translation.

Since their fairly recent discovery, the larger fragments of Menander's *Dis Exapaton* have received much scholarly treatment, especially with reference to Plautus's *Bacchides*.[135] Although much has been written concerning the Roman playwright's faithfulness in adapting and originality in altering his sources,[136] the issue of Plautus's techniques as translator needs further comment. Let us examine how Plautus adapts on a small scale within individual scenes so that we can clarify his influence on later translators.

The first substantial fragment of Menander against which Plautus's adaptation can be reasonably compared, *Dis Exapaton* 11-30, corresponds with *Bacchides* 494-525. The fragment opens in the middle of the scene, during which the father 'Philoxenus'[137] and the slave Lydos reveal to Sostratos, the *adulescens amator*, that his friend Moschos has

[134] Pascucci remarks: "una tecnica del *vertere* non dissimile da quella plautina, semplificando l'originale, variandolo e in parte ampliandone qualche motivo a discapito d'altri" (122).

[135] See especially Handley (1968), Gaiser (1970), Questa (1970), Bain (1979), and Damen (1995) for fairly complete bibliography on the subject.

[136] Indeed, one scholar remarks astutely on this trend in New Comedy scholarship: "The central problem has been to assess their degree of fidelity to their Greek models or, to put it another way, to determine their originality" (Bain 1979, 17).

[137] The name of the father in the original is not known. In all such cases of lost names relevant to this study, I will use Plautus's equivalent in single quotes.

been canoodling with a courtesan named 'Bacchis.' Sostratos is devastated, not knowing that there are two courtesans of the same name and thinking that Moschos has betrayed him and taken up with his own beloved 'Bacchis.' Therefore, 'Philoxenus' and Lydos ask the young man to intercede and stop Moschos from being in such a relationship. At this point, the fragment begins:

σ]ὺ δ' ἐκεῖνον ἐκκάλε[ι 11
]ν, νουθέτει δ' ἐναν[τίον
αὐτόν τε σῶσον, οἰκίαν θ' ὅλην φιλῶν.
Λυδέ, προάγωμεν. (Λυ.) εἰ δὲ κἀμὲ καταλίποις -
*('*Phil.*') προάγωμεν. ἱκανὸς ο[ὗ]τος. ΛΥ. αὐτῶι, Σώστρα[τε,* 15
χρῆσαι πικρῶς, ἔλαυν' ἐκεῖνον τὸ[ν] ἀκρα[τῆ·
⟨ἅ⟩παντας αἰσχύνει γὰρ ἡμᾶς τοὺ[ς] φίλους.[138] 17

Plautus's corresponding section:

Ph. Mnesiloche, hoc tecum oro ut illius animum atque ingenium regas; 494
serva tibi sodalem et mihi filium. *Mn*. factum volo. 495
(*Ph*.) in te ego hoc onus omne impono. Lyde, sequere hac me. *Ly*. sequor. 499[139]
melius multo, me quoque una si cum illoc reliqueris. 496
Ph. adfatim est. (*Ly*.)[140] Mnesiloche, cura, i, concastiga hominem probe,
qui dedecorat te, me, amicum atque alios flagitiis suis.[141] 499

---

[138] "Moschos' Father: .....] you must fetch him out,
.....] and face him, tick him off,
And rescue him and all his family
Who love him. Lydos, let's be off.
Lydos: But if
You left me here too...
Moschos' Father: Let's be off. He'll be
Enough!
Lydos: Savage him, Sostratos, assail
That libertine! He shames us all, his friends!" trans. Arnott (1997).

[139] Barsby (1986) rightly places v.499 after v.495 and concludes that a transposition occurred because of the usual practice of ending a scene with this departure formula (139).

[140] So first Hermann (1845), then Leo (1895), Questa (1965) and Barsby (1986) rightly assign these verses to Lydus, as the logical flow of the scene demands.

[141] "PH: Try, Mnesilochus, I beg you, to reform his mind and heart;
Save yourself a friend and me a son. MN: I'll do it willingly.
PH: On you then I lay this burden. Lydus, follow me. LY: All right.
Better far though if you left *me* also here along with *him*.
PH: He will do. LY: Take charge, Mnesilochus, castigate the fellow well:
By his scandals he's disgracing you, me, and his other friends" trans. Barsby (1986).

The fidelity of Plautus is remarkable: even with the rest of the original scene lost and the first two verses of the fragment mutilated, it is clear that Plautus closely adapts this passage from Menander. The two most noticeable changes, those of meter and name, are largely unremarkable. The practice of renaming characters is common in Roman New Comedy and, although sometimes purposefully exploited for comic effect,[142] the alteration is nominal. Likewise, the metrical change is insignificant: the iambic trimeter is the most common meter in Menander,[143] and the trochaic septenarius is likewise the most common in Plautus.[144] Although Plautus avoids using Menander's metrical scheme, the pace and feel of the original are unchanged and the adaptation is still colloquial and fluid.[145]

In terms of sentiment, Plautus changes very little of the opening verses. In fact, even much of the diction and syntax remains the same. Plautus's *adfatim est* is almost identical to Menander's *ἱκανὸς οὗτος*.[146] Lydus's request to Philoxenus, though moderately expanded, retains much of the syntax of the original: the future less vivid conditional

---

[142] Especially interesting in this context is the change of the name "Syros" to "Chrysalus": as Handley (1968, 9) and Bain (1979, 21) point out, the pun at *Bacchides* v.704 is distinctively Plautine. Also noteworthy is the sly reference to surpassing Menander's original Syros at *Bacchides* v.649, an ingenious joke at the expense of Plautus's predecessors that could suggest a greater degree of audience familiarity with the original than is usually assumed.

[143] Handley (1968, 8).

[144] Halporn (1963, 77).

[145] Bain, on *Bacchides* vv.526-561, remarks: "Here and in the scene which ended at l. 499, Plautus does not render Menander's iambic trimeters with their Latin equivalent, iambic senarii, but prefers to use longer lines with a different rhythm, trochaic septenarii, the Latin equivalent of trochaic tetrameters. This is a characteristic procedure of Roman dramatists" (24-25). He goes on to argue, however, that "Plautus by altering the metre has already determined that the tone will be more elevated and pathetic than that of the original" (25). This seems unlikely, since the trochaic septenarius is Plautus's most common meter and it is certainly not used exclusively to demarcate elevation in tone.

[146] Although *adfatim* is not, strictly speaking, an adjective like *ἱκανὸς*, see Plautus *Trinummus* v.1185, as well as *OLD* s.v. *affatim* c, for a similar adjectival usage of the adverb.

εἰ...καταλίποις is identical to the future less vivid *si…reliqueris*, and the crasis of *κἀμὲ* corresponds precisely with *me quoque*. Likewise the departure formula (*Lyde, sequere hac me*), though modified slightly, follows the original (*Λυδέ, προάγωμεν*) in the placement of the vocative. Even the vocative *Σώστρα[τε* at the beginning of Lydos's final statement is paralleled in Plautus's *Mnesiloche*.

Plautus is clearly not aiming at a literal rendering, though: he takes the original and makes it his own, purposefully departing from Menander when it suits his purposes. First, Plautus tends to expand ideas and to state explicitly what is implied in the original, making them more tangible. Second, he personalizes the situations in his scenes, involving his characters more deeply and openly in the emotions found in Menander. Third, Plautus favors artificial, balanced syntax far more than Menander. Fourth, Plautus Romanizes his characters' expressions, using idiomatic expressions to replace difficult Greek phrases or to mark the scene as more Roman. Finally, Plautus constantly strives to call attention to the theatricality of his plays, developing monologues that are both more explicit and less natural than those in his source.

The first of Plautus's translation techniques, the expansion of his original and emphasis on tangibility, can be seen clearly in two sets of phrases: *ἀυτόν τε σῶσον, οἰκίαν θ' ὅλην φιλῶν* v.13 and *serva tibi sodalem et mihi filium* v.495, and *⟨ἅ⟩παντας αἰσχύνει γὰρ ἡμᾶς τοὺ[ς] φίλους* v.17 and *qui dedecorat te, me, amicum atque alios flagitiis suis* v.498. In the latter example, Plautus names those individuals who make up all the friends (*ἅπαντας...φίλους*). Although *amicum* reflects *φίλους* and could easily have replaced it precisely in the plural, Plautus abandons it and draws out the list of the victims of Pistoclerus's actions. He also develops this effect in the other phrase, in which he

replaces *οἰκίαν θ' ὅλην φιλῶν* with the expanded *tibi sodalem et mihi filium*. In adapting Menander, Plautus tends to avoid indefinite collectives in favor of specifying the characters involved in his scenes.

The second translation approach that Plautus demonstrates is a tendency to personalize the original and make his characters more emotionally involved. He replaces *οἰκίαν θ' ὅλην φιλῶν* with *tibi sodalem et mihi filium*, identifying explicitly the ways in which Pistoclerus's actions affect various characters differently. He also expands the role of the slave. In the original, 'Philoxenus' cuts off the slave Lydos before he finishes his request:

Λυδέ, προάγωμεν. (*Λυ.*) *εἰ δὲ κἀμὲ καταλίποις -* 14
('Phil.'*) προάγωμεν. ἱκανὸς ο[ὗ]τος.* 15

Plautus, however, allows his Lydus to complete his conditional request:

(*Ph.*) Lyde, sequere hac me. *Ly*. Sequor. 499
melius multo, me quoque una si cum illoc reliqueris. 496
Ph. adfatim est. 497

Menander's interaction between 'Philoxenus' and Lydos, though perhaps more realistic, minimizes the role of the slave, whereas Plautus's version gives more weight to Lydus and allows him to express his judgement of the situation in the judgment *melius multo*.

The third adaptation technique that Plautus displays in this passage is the expansion of phrases for rhetorical balance. Again, the phrase *serva tibi sodalem et mihi filium* expands the original and makes the tone more formal. Likewise, *cura, i, concastiga hominem* is far more artificial and balanced than Menander's colloquial *αὐτῶι, Σώστρα[τε, / χρῆσαι πικρῶς, ἔλαυν' ἐκεῖνον τὸ[ν] ἀκρα[τῆ*: Plautus's phrase begins with the vocative *Mnesiloche* and contains a staccato tricolon of imperatives whose first syllables form a heavy tribrach. Menander's phrase consists of two clauses: *χρῆσαι* is modified by

πικρῶς and takes as its object the unmodified *αὐτῶι* from the preceding verse; *ἔλαυν'* has no modifier and takes as its object *ἐκεῖνον* and its modifier *τὸ[ν] ἀκρα[τῆ*. Note, also, that the vocative is delayed until after the object *αὐτῶι*. Compared to Plautus's version there is little syntactical balance in Menander's.

Plautus also Romanizes Menander's original, using phrases that are both familiar and particular to his audience. Many such phrases, as in the case of this passage, exploit formulae that are characteristically Roman and find no parallels in the Greek.[147] The first phrase to indicate this Romanization is Plautus's *hoc tecum oro ut illius animum atque ingenium regas*. The corresponding phrase in Menander is unfortunately almost completely lost, but we can judge from what remains that the formal request does not exist and there are simple imperatives in its place: *σ]ὺ δ' ἐκεῖνον ἐκκάλε[ι /]ν, νουθέτει δ' ἐναν[τίον*. Plautus further formalizes and Romanizes the scene with the formula *in te ego hoc onus omne impono*, which lacks any parallel in the original.[148]

The final translation technique present in this passage is the emphasis on theatricality which replaces the realism of the original. Plautus creates this theatricality in two specific phrases in this passage, Mnesilochus's response *factum volo* and Lydus's *sequor* reply placed immediately after Philoxenus's stock depature command. Both of these are Plautine inventions: neither appears in the original, and such unnecessarily

[147] Bain (1979), commenting on Fraenkel's observations of Plautus's tendencies, states: "The formal language of Roman legal, governmental and religious institutions was exploited in a way that had no real analogy in Greek New Comedy…Also great use was made of military jargon, particularly in the mouth of slaves, and, as a corollary, of fantastically elaborate and grotesque descriptions of slave punishments" (20).

[148] Handley (1968) remarks: "Plautus is being Roman, formal and explicit with the arrangement: Menander was not, for the young man he imagined was much too overwrought by the situation to take it on in these terms" (10). I believe that Plautus is translating with particularly Roman phrases for the sake of his audience rather than to adjust the characterization of the young man, though the latter is also a possibility.

theatrical statements are rare in Menander in general.[149] We can see a similar theatrical reworking of Menander in the monologue immediately following this scene. Plautus is especially fond of theatricality and forces his audience continually to recognize the fact that they are watching a literary creation and not a realistic scene.[150] This is not to say that the scene becomes less poignant and that Plautus undercuts the personalization he achieves elsewhere in the passage. Rather, the characters are conscious of their artificiality in the same way that Catulus deliberately brings an internalized monologue to his audience.

Catulus thus takes much of his technique directly from Plautus. The temporal proximity and highly-developed translation techniques of Roman New Comedy, however, are not the only reasons that Catulus chooses to adapt as he does. I propose that there is a more intentional reason closely connected with Callimachus's own poetic program. Catulus's epigram is fundamentally a criticism of his source's polemic attitude towards a genre that in Callimachus's time had already long been hackneyed for Greeks, but in Catulus's time had only just reached its peak in the preceding generation for Romans. Catulus looks to Callimachus for his subject and to New Comedy for his style,

[149] Frost (1988), commenting on trends in Menander's exit formulae, states: "Exit instructions are generally obeyed in silence, but there are cases where the recipient gives an acknowledgement of the order before leaving. Such acknowledgement may serve one of two purposes: either to reassure an indignant or anxious instructor that the required action is in fact being performed, or to reflect the eagerness of the speaker to carry out his mission" (14).

[150] Referring to a scene from later on in the play when Mnesilochus finally confronts Pistoclerus, Bain (1979) notes: "There could in fact be no neater proof than this passage of the correctness of Fraenkel's thesis that Plautus expanded for comic purposes conventional situations of the Greek plays by accumulating formulae and prolonging unrealistically the length of time characters take to make contact on stage. Menander in this instance has no conventional formulae at all. Elsewhere in his plays we do meet what might be called 'stage-directional' phrases, but their occurrence is nowhere near as frequent in Menander as it is in Plautus. Menander here as elsewhere seems to be trying to avoid giving his audience any hint of theatricality. He wants an action which looks lifelike. Plautus here as elsewhere shows a positive delight in the theatrical and drags in conventional elements at the expense of characterization" (28).

diction, and translation technique, creatively refashioning his source in anti-Callimachean terms while showing that Roman New Comedy can still be drawn on innovatively.

Thomas[151] has convincingly argued that, in addition to puffed-up epic, Callimachus's poetic program demonstrates a clear disdain for dramatic literature, especially New Comedy. This view is vital for a more complete understanding of Catulus's Theotimus epigram and his approach to translation, and so a slightly digressive review of Thomas's argument is necessary.

Callimachus *Epigr*. 28 has been one of the key passages for our understanding of Callimachean aesthetics. Callimachus declares that he dislikes cyclic poems, the road more traveled, the wandering lover, and everything commonplace:

Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν, οὐδὲ κελεύθῳ 1
χαίρω, τίς πολλοὺς ὧδε καὶ ὧδε φέρει·
μισέω καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον, οὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης
πίνω· σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια.
Λυσανίη, σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλός -- ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν 5
τοῦτο σαφῶς, Ἠχώ, φησί τις· 'ἄλλος ἔχει.'[152] 6

The meaning of the first couplet is clear: Callimachus states his well-known distaste for epic in no uncertain terms.[153] The second couplet is somewhat more obscure. Thomas

[151] Thomas (1979).

[152] "I hate recycled poetry, and get no pleasure
from a road crowded with travellers this way and that.
I can't stand a boy who sleeps around, don't drink
at public fountains, and loathe everything vulgar.
Now you, Lysanies, sure are handsome...But before I've repeated
'handsome', Echo's 'and some...one else's' cuts me off." trans. Nisetich (2001).

[153] Though generally the meaning is clear, there is some debate about the targets represented by *κυκλικόν*; see Cameron (1995, 387-399)

notes two previous interpretations, each generally unsatisfying.[154] His conclusion is that the trouble ultimately lies with *περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον*, and that the answer to this puzzle rests in the diction of New Comedy, which employs *περιπατεῖν* more frequently than that of any other genre and generally points to the *adulescens amator*. He cites several key passages from Menander[155] in which the verb is used repeatedly to describe the *amator* engaging in a *paraclausithyron*. The *περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον* of *Epigr*. 28 refers to this easily recognizable stock-character.

Callimachus, therefore, presumably hates the stock comic lover, as well as the associated *δημοσία* – the repetitive conventions of New Comedy, which is "*ποίημα δημόσιον par excellence*."[156] The epigram then breaks down into three clearly-defined parts: a rejection of the epic genre, since everyone travels that road; a rejection of the comic genre (and dramatic literature in general), since it is concerned only with the commonplace and easily-accessible; and a personal statement similar to that which enters into other epigrams concerned with literary program, such as in *Epigr*. 59.[157] The poet places New Comedy in the same league with cyclic epic.[158]

---

[154] Giangrande (1969) claims that *περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον* stands in direct opposition to *Λυσανίη*, and in this antithesis lies the irony that the poet hates the "wandering beloved" and loves Lysianas, but the two are identical. This view assumes an equivalence between *καλός* and *περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον*, however, that seems altogether too imprecise. Wilkinson (1967) understands *ἀπὸ κρήνης / πίνω* to be a sexual metaphor which continues the sense of *περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον* and leads directly into the erotic tone of the last couplet, but he leaves out both *σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια* and the literary comments of the first couplet.

[155] Namely, *Misoumenos* A7, A17, and A21.

[156] Thomas (1979, 187).

[157] Thomas goes on to argue that *Epigr*. 59 and 48 are both attacks on drama generally and that there is an easy connection between the boredom of tragedy in schoolroom repetition and the probability of a well-known comedy of Menander being taught in a similarly monotonous way.

[158] "Callimachus' *περίφοιτος ἐρώμενος* is the frustrated lover who wanders about in New Comedy, and Callimachus' disdain for this character is representative of his rejection of that genre, precisely because it

Thomas goes on to discuss how the Roman followers of Callimachus, who so frequently decry epic but rarely include dramatic literature in their *recusationes*, viewed New Comedy. Mainly citing Horace, he points to several passages in which the poet criticizes the commonplace nature of comedy alongside references to the Callimachean program.[159] He then moves on to the *Ars Poetica*, where *Epigr*. 28 is partially reproduced in modified terms in 128-132:

> difficile est proprie communia dicere, tuque 128
> rectius Iliacum carmen deducis in actus
> quam si proferres ignota indictaque primus. 130
> publica materies privati iuris erit, si
> non circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem[160] 132

A further connection between the passages exists several verses later, when the poet commands his audience to avoid translating *ut scriptor cyclicus* (*τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν*). Horace's statement about *communia* (*δημόσια*) and the kind of literature that his audience should carefully adapt (*patulumque moraberis orbem = τίς πολλοὺς ὧδε καὶ ὧδε φέρει*) rejects the Callimachean program in Callimachean terms, effectively turning it on its head.[161] Thomas's conclusion is that Horace, and the Augustans generally, embrace the commonplace traditions which Callimachus rejects because the poetic technique of such traditions was reaching perfection in Rome, whereas in Alexandria their potential had long stagnated by the time of Callimachus.

---

deals in such common-places (*δημόσια*). We can freely translate: 'I also hate (along with bad epic) comedy and all its stereotypes'" (Thomas 1979, 184).

[159] Horace, *Satires* 1.4.45-52; *Epistles* 2.1.168-171.

[160] "It is hard to treat in your own way what is common: and you are doing better in spinning into acts a song of Troy than if, for the first time, you were giving the world a theme unknown and unsung. In ground open to all you will win private rights, if you do not linger along the easy and open pathway..." trans. Fairclough (1961).

[161] Thomas (1979) cites Brink: "As so often, therefore, when H. makes use of Callimachean language, he turns it upside down; he employs it to affirm what Callimachus had denied" (131).

What, then, of the Preneoteric poets who were only just being introduced to Hellenistic epigram and Callimachean aesthetics? The influence of subject matter and certain elements of style is clear in each of the five extant epigrams from Catulus's circle. For the most part, though, there is too little material to determine how exactly the Preneoterics felt about the influx of Hellenistic poetry and Callimachus's rejection of genres which were, on the whole, the mainstay of Roman literature up to their time. I suggest, however, that Catulus's Theotimus epigram provides a clue pertinent to the development of translation technique and Neoteric poetry. Catulus's appropriation of Hellenistic epigram by means of the language and techniques of New Comedy reaffirms the vitality of the latter while demonstrating the adaptability of the former. Catulus playfully rejects Callimachus's polemic program, using New Comedy to transform Alexandrian epigram into something wholly new that straddles both genres and refutes the claim that the *περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον* and his fellow stock characters are merely *τὰ δημόσια*.

We have already seen that Catulus refers repeatedly to his source and essentially translates the sentiments and much of the diction of *Epigr*. 41. When he does depart from Callimachus, he almost invariably replaces the original with expressions and images from Roman New Comedy, especially those of the *servus fugiens* and of the *adulescens amator*. The former is easily recognizable as an expansion of *τὴν δρῆστιν*, but the latter appears to have no relevant source, except for the general situation of the young man in love found in the source text. Instead, he appears only through the subtle changes that Catulus makes to the original. The reduction of characters in the dramatic conceit to the speaker, the soul, and Theotimus forces the audience to directs its attention to the

amatory conflict of the epigram rather than the search for the soul. Likewise, the redefinition of the soul in active, personified terms sets the epigram within a singular dilemma: the speaker, rejected by his soul and fully aware that Theotimus is to blame, is unsure of what his next step should be. Finally, the extended personalization focuses the entire epigram on the speaker's conflict, setting up a completely internalized monologue that the audience views externally in the same way as the audience of New Comedy views a play.

The simple fact that Catulus's speaker delivers a monologue on amatory abandonment is not, in and of itself, remarkable. The audience knows his type just as well as it knows any Calidorus, Phaedria, and Argyrippus, and it is already quite familiar both with his complaints and his inability to do anything about his dilemma without external help. What is interesting is that Catulus's speaker is an *amator* within a short, Hellenistic epigram. Catulus resituates the commonplace character through an epigram of an author who rejects this same commonplace character in another epigram. He demonstrates not only the possibility of reinventing the stock characters of New Comedy and their applicability to the developing genre of personal erotic poetry, but does so by playfully using Callimachus to refashion as new what was, in Callimachus's eyes, completely exhausted.

We can come to two broad conclusions from our analysis: first, that Catulus in translating Callimachus makes a number of active choices and draws on certain of his predecessors' techniques while rejecting others, demonstrating the variability within the Roman poetics of translation; second, that Catulus's translation displays a remarkable

level of sophistication and aims to appropriate his source to his own purposes, altering the original and creating an independent piece of literature in the process.

It is perhaps necessary at this point to address three interpretive issues, two dealing with the Preneoteric epigrammatists in general and one specifically concerning the definition of "translator" as it relates to Catulus. First, our evidence is scattered and incomplete. The extant Preneoteric poetry from Catulus's period consists of five epigrams by three obscure poets and may or may not be representative of the larger poetic *milieu* of the late 2nd century BC. Any conclusions drawn from such a small sample must necessarily be tenuous and generalizations should be applied with only the greatest care and restraint.[162]

The second problem is the context in which the Preneoteric epigrams are preserved: four of the five are cited in the same passage by Aulus Gellius, and this close proximity in source is likely to provide a skewed picture. The stylistic techniques found in these epigrams may demonstrate general trends of the period, but they may just as easily be isolated cases. Again, caution is essential in analyzing these poems.

The final issue, and the one that most concerns this study, is one of terminology: to what extent can any of these epigrams be called "translations" as opposed to "adaptations," and can the term be equally applied to all five epigrammatists and early Roman epigram in general? The scholarly consensus is that, while each clearly displays Hellenistic themes and reworks identifiable source texts, referring to them by any term

[162] Ross (1969) summarizes the issue well: "In discussing these poems, however, it must be remembered that there is hardly enough to allow more than general conclusions about stylistic features, and that any statement made…must be regarded as tentative at best, however likely it may seem" (143).

other than "loose translation" would be an exaggeration.[163] For the most part, this statement is correct, though one exception should be made in the case of Catulus's first epigram,[164] which presents a number of unique features that do not appear in the others and that qualify it as a translation, albeit a highly personalized one. A brief comparison between these features and those of another poem with a clear source, namely Valerius Aedituus's adaptation of Sappho fr.31, demonstrates this point more clearly.

In fr.1, Aedituus discusses the symptoms of love which he feels whenever he tries to speak to his beloved Pamphila:

dicere cum conor curam tibi, Pamphila, cordis,
  quid mi abs te quaeram, verba labris abeunt,
per pectus manat subito <subido> mihi sudor;
  sic tacitus, subidus, dum pudeo, pereo.[165]

Only the section of Sappho's poem that deal with the speaker's symptoms is relevant:[166]

τό μ' ἦ μὰν
καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν·
ὠς γὰρ ἔς σ' ἴδω βρόχε', ὤς με φώναι-
σ' οὐδ' ἒν ἔτ' εἴκει,

ἀλλ' ἄκαν μὲν γλῶσσα ἔαγε, λέπτον
δ' αὔτικα χρῷ πῦρ ὐπαδεδρόμηκεν,
ὀππάτεσσι δ' οὐδ' ἒν ὄρημμ', ἐπιρρόμ-
βεισι δ' ἄκουαι,

κὰδ δέ μ' ἴδρως κακχέεται, τρόμος δὲ

[163] See Wheeler (70), Ross (1969, 149-151), Pascucci (1979, 122), Pinto (1956, 223), and Maltby (1997, 44); for opposing opinions, see Pinto's brief summary of previous scholars (1956, 222, 226 *n*. 130), Cameron (1993, 52), and Courtney (1993, 76).

[164] Pascucci (1979) rightly remarks that this epigram "è il solo dei cinque, che possa essere messo a confronto con un singolo epigramma ellenistico" (117).

[165] "When I try to speak my heart's care to you, Pamphila,
what I would ask of you for myself, the words disappear from my lips.
Through my chest, suddenly and excitedly, sweat drips;
so, silent, excited, I die while I blush"

[166] See n.302 for a brief discussion of the text of Sappho chosen here.

παῖσαν ἄγρει, χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας
ἔμμι, τεθνάκην δ' ὀλίγω 'πιδεύης 15
†φαίνομ' ἔμ' αὔτ[α†[167] 16

There are several thematic similarities between Aedituus's epigram and Sappho's poem: *verba labris abeunt* v.2 corresponds to *γλῶσσα ἔαγε* v.9, *per pectus* v.3 to *ἐν στήθεσιν* v.6, *manat…sudor* v.3 to *ἴδρως κακχέεται* v.13, *subito* v.3 to *αὔτικα* v.10, and *pereo* v.4 to *τεθνάκην* v.15. Aedituus's reappropriation of Sappho's themes in his lover's symptoms is evident.[168]

However, the liberties that Aedituus takes far outnumber the few themes that he loosely adapts. Most of the poems generally considered to be translations share a few common features, and it will be useful to examine these individually in the case of both Aedituus's and Catulus's epigrams. In the following pages we will compare how each poet deals with meter, the programmatic opening line, thematic order, and style, and demonstrate that, whereas Catulus follows Callimachus closely in each of these, Aedituus departs drastically and all but ignores his source text except for the images he borrows from Sappho.

---

[167] "…that jolts
the heart in my ribs. For now
as I look at you my voice
is empty and

can say nothing as my tongue
cracks and slender fire is quick
under my skin. My eyes are dead
to light, my ears

pound, and sweat pours over me.
I convulse, greener than grass,
and feel my mind slip as I
go close to death" trans. Barnstone (1998).

[168] Courtney (1993, 72).

Meter is a defining aspect of any poem: it sets the piece clearly in a specific range of genres, it establishes expectations for content, and helps to clarify the traditions in which the poet follows. Meter is no less an important factor for unifying a translation and its source text, since both share basic features that often accompany metrical choices. Catulus's epigram is in elegiac couplets, like his source, Callimachus *Epigr*. 41. In addition, there are relatively few deviations from Callimachus's meter: except for the initial spondaic foot in l.2, the pentameters are identical, and there is a clear attempt to maintain roughly the same speed and dactyl-spondee ratio in the hexameters.[169] Aedituus, in contrast, abandons the Sapphic stanza, one of the most distinctive features of Sappho fr.31, in favor of elegiac couplets. This rejection of the source's meter not only affects the rhythm of the poem, it also alters the form and method of presentation. Aedituus abandons the possibility of employing the provocatively enjambed fourth verse of the Sapphic stanza in favor of balanced sets of elegiacs that eschew any enjambment and contain the sense of each thought entirely within the couplets.

The second quality that consistently appears in Latin translations is the use of an opening verse or phrase that echoes the original in a significant way. Catulus's opening three words (*aufugit mi animus*) mirror closely those of Callimachus (ἥμισύ μευ ψυχῆς). In each case, a trisyllabic word precedes an almost identical phrase. Although their order is reversed, there is a dactyl-spondee pair immediately followed by a weak third-foot caesura. The accentual stress falls in the first, third, and sixth position in both openings. Overall, there are several similarities in this line that immediately point Catulus's audience to his original. Aedituus, on the other hand, does not attempt to provoke an immediate connection in the opening verse. His epigram comes largely from the middle

[169] Except for v.3, which Catulus renders as highly spondaic.

of Sappho's poem and, although there is a similarity in the second-person address and a slight correspondence between *ὡς γὰρ ἔς σ' ἴδω* v.7 and *cum conor curam tibi* v.1, nothing immediately recalls Sappho's opening and little echoes the opening of v.7, where the thematic correspondences between the poems begin.

Generally, Latin translations also maintain some semblance of the order of thoughts from the original text. Although some sentiments are left out or replaced in Catulus's rendering of Callimachus, the general flow of the epigram remains the same:

1. The speaker's soul has disappeared…
   Cat. - *aufugit mi animus* v.1
   Call. - *ἥμισύ μευ ψυχῆς...πλὴν ἀφανές* vv.1-2
2. …and retreats to some young man.
   Cat. - *ad Theotimum* / *devenit* vv.1-2
   Call. - *ἦ ῥά τιν' ἐς παίδων πάλιν ᾤχετο* v.3
3. The speaker previously gave a warning to young men to reject the refugee…
   Cat. - *quid si non interdixem ne illunc fugitivum* / *mitteret ad se intro* vv.3-4
   Call. - *καὶ μὲν ἀπεῖπον* / *πολλάκι "τὴν δρῆστιν μὴ ὑποδέχεσθε, νέοι"* v.4
4. …and now he must go and retrieve it.
   Cat. - *ibimus quaesitum* v.5
   Call. - †*οὐκισυνιφησον*† v.5

Aedituus's epigram rearranges Sappho freely:

1. When the speaker speaks/looks to the addressee…
   Aed. - *dicere cum conor curam* v.1
   Sapph. - *ὡς γὰρ ἔς σ' ἴδω* v.7
2. …he becomes speechless…
   Aed. - *verba labris abeunt* v.2
   Sapph. - *γλῶσσα ἔαγε* v.9
3. …and feels symptoms in his chest.
   Aed. - *per pectus* v.3
   Sapph. - *ἐν στήθεσιν* v.6
4. He experiences sweating…
   Aed. – *manat…sudor* v.3
   Sapph. - *ἴδρως κακχέεται* v.13
5. …suddenly…
   Aed. - *subito* v.3
   Sapph. – *αὔτικα* v.10
6. …and then death.
   Aed. - *pereo* v.4

Sapph. - *τεθνάκην* v.15

Beginning at the third correspondence, Aedituus makes a series of rapid jumps backward and forward in Sappho's text. It is also noteworthy that the correspondences are not precise: though the symptoms are similar, their accompanying modifiers come from places in Sappho's poem that are related to other themes. Aedituus speaker feels sweat run through his chest, while Sappho experiences a fluttering of the heart in her chest (*τό μ' ἦ μὰν / καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν*, 5-6); Aedituus's sweat is sudden, but Sappho's *λέπτον...πῦρ* (9-10) travels unexpectedly. Aedituus completely reworks the order and arrangement of Sappho's themes, drawing from the original but making a new poem rather than an adaptation.

Another feature that sets apart translations from adaptations is the extent to which the style of the original author is applied to the new rendering. The translator must invariably adjust his source to his own poetic style, but generally some attempt is made to keep the source within sight in order to indicate the tradition in which the poet is working. Differences in style between the two extant epigrams of Catulus help bring out this contrast between translation and "original" poetry.

Catulus fr.1 displays fairly colloquial language, avoiding elevated diction in favor of everyday speech, in the same way that Callimachus's *Epigr*. 41 does. Elisions are certainly present, though no more abundant than in the Greek.[170] Catulus keeps both

[170] In each poem only six vowels are dropped, and the spacing is fairly regular.

assonance and consonance to a minimum, in keeping with Callimachus. Catulus fr.2, on the other hand, displays a certain archaic and artificial flourish:[171]

> constiteram exorientem Auroram forte salutans
> cum subito a laeva Roscius exoritur,
> pace mihi liceat, caelestes, dicere vestra,
> mortalis visus pulchrior esse deo.[172]

Although the elisions are just as infrequent, they are placed exclusively in the first distich, and the first four feet of the first verse run together because of the elisions between the three long words. Likewise, the repetition in *exorientem…exoritur* and the extended consonance in *consti**t**e**r**am ex**o**r**i**entem **A**u**r**o**r**am f**o**r**t**e salutans / cum subito a laeva **R**o**s**cius ex**o**r**i**t**u**r* **vv.**1-2 lends the poem an archaic feel. Catulus consciously avoids such wordplay in his translation of Callimachus and follows the style of his source, but in his much more Romanized Roscius epigram he revels in the artificiality.

The most prominent stylistic feature of Aedituus's adaptation of Sappho fr.31 is the archaic quality of his Latin. Aedituus's epigram is abundantly alliterative: ***c**um **c**onor **c**uram tibi, Pamphila, **c**ordis* v.1, ***p**er **p**ectus manat **s**ubito <**s**ubido> mihi **s**udor; / **s**ic tacitu**s**, **s**ubidu**s**, dum **p**udeo, **p**ereo* vv.2-3. Likewise, there is a number of close repetitions and homoioteleuta: *subito <subido>*, *tacitus*, *subidus*, and *pudeo, pereo*. Sappho's original largely avoids such phonetic effects, but the Latin poet delights in wordplay that can only be called Ennian or Plautine. No comparable phonetic play exists in the original. Even the handful of remarkable stylistic effects that Sappho uses are

---

[171] For a discussion of Catulus fr.2, see Weber (1996). Some of my translation choices in n.171, including "from the west" for *a laeva*, and "I had stopped" for *constiteram*, are informed by Weber's nuanced reading.

[172] "I had stopped, by chance, to adore the rising Dawn,
when suddenly from the west rises Roscius,
and, if I can speak of your qualities, heavenly ones,
a mortal seemed more beautiful than a god."

ignored when they could have been adapted. To take one example, the brilliant hiatus at *γλῶσσα ἔαγε* does not appear in Aedituus's adaptation. The only comparable position in which this could be recalled is *mi abs*, but the monosyllable is elided and does little to evoke the original stuttering.

It is unnecessary to examine the remaining Preneoteric epigrams in this way, since the same general considerations apply to them. Overall, then, it is fair to say that most of the epigrams from Catulus's circle cannot rightly be called translations. Catulus's Theotimus epigram, however, clearly demonstrates a number of features that occur frequently in translations and set it apart from the other Hellenistic epigrams, even from his own "original" one.

GNAEUS MATIUS'S *ILIAS* AND HOMER'S *ILIAD*

Catulus's first epigram makes up one fragmentary branch of Preneoteric poetry and demonstrates both the adaptability and complexity of translation in the late 2nd century BC. Personal amatory poetry, however, is not the only or even the most prevalent setting for translations in the Roman Republic. Fragments of Gnaeus Matius are preserved, which represent the earliest extant examples of epic translation after Livius Andronicus and the switch from native Saturnian to Greek meters. Although Matius is a close contemporary of Catulus, his approach to translation clearly stems largely from Livius Andronicus rather than from Roman New Comedy, and his purposes and problems in translating are quite different from those of the epigrammatist.

No information about Gnaeus Matius has survived except the fact that he wrote mimiambs and a translation of the *Iliad* at some point before Varro wrote his *De Lingua Latina*.[173] Of his work only thirteen verses of mimiambs and, more important for this study, six and a half non-consecutive verses of his *Ilias* have survived. Again, the fragmentary nature of Preneoteric literature prevents us from forming a complete picture about translation in this period. Nevertheless, we can draw from the surviving verses a few conclusions about Matius's translation technique and its relationship to Livius Andronicus's own approach.

In the surviving fragments Matius favors one technique above all: rewriting Homer with Homer. In each of the extant verses we see Matius purposefully rendering the original with an eye to other passages in the *Iliad*. A number of scholars have already noted this tendency in Matius fr.1, which translates *Iliad* 1.56:[174]

> corpora Graiorum maerebat mandier igni
>
> *κήδετο γὰρ Δαναῶν, ὅτι ῥα θνήσκοντας ὁρᾶτο*[175]

Neither *igni* nor *mandier* have any equivalent in the original verse. Rather, Matius extracts the image of burning bodies from *Iliad* 1.52 several verses before: *αἰεὶ δὲ πυραὶ νεκύων καίοντο θαμειαί.*[176] He also draws on a phrase from a passage at *Iliad* 23.181-183, in which Achilles states that he will refuse Hector's body a proper pyre:

> *δώδεκα μὲν Τρώων μεγαθύμων υἱέας ἐσθλοὺς*
> *τοὺς ἅμα σοὶ πάντας πῦρ ἐσθίει· Ἕκτορα δ' οὔ τι*

[173] Courtney (1993, 99).

[174] See Ronconi (1973, 35) and Courtney (1993, 99)

[175] Matius: "She was grieving that the bodies of the Greeks were being devoured by fire"; *Iliad*: "…for she pitied the Danaans because she saw them dying" trans. Murray (1999).

[176] "…and ever did the pyres of the dead burn thick" trans. Murray (1999).

δώσω Πριαμίδην πυρὶ δαπτέμεν, ἀλλὰ κύνεσσιν.[177]

Both *ἐσθίει* and *δαπτέμεν* are possible sources for *mandier*, and in this case it may be that there is a lexical as well as technical connection between Matius and Livius Andronicus. The author of the hexameter version of Andronicus's *Odusia*[178] renders *ἔδων* at *Odyssey* 9.296-297, where Odysseus describes the Cyclops's eating of his companions, using *mandere*:

cum socios nostros mandisset impius Cyclops

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Κύκλωψ μεγάλην ἐπλήσατο νηδύν
ἀνδρόμεα κρέ' ἔδων[179]

It seems likely that Matius is also drawing on a passage from the truce and gathering of bodies at *Iliad* 7.428: *νεκροὺς πυρκαιῆς ἐπενήνεον ἀχνύμενοι κῆρ.*[180] The opening position and explicit mention of bodies in *νεκροὺς* corresponds to *corpora* and the sense of *ἀχνύμενοι* is closer to *maerebat* than is *κήδετο.*

Matius takes the original verse from the *Iliad* and reads it through the logical connection between 1.52 and 1.56: Homer has already mentioned that the bodies of the Greeks are burning by the time he discusses Hera's grief over the dead, so the goddess must be pitying the Greeks because she has seen them dying and placed on the pyre. Matius rewrites the verse to include the previous material, shifting the original slightly

[177] "Twelve noble sons of the great-hearted Trojans, all these together with you the flame devours; but Hector, son of Priam, I will not give to the fire to feed on, but to the dogs" trans. Murray (1999).

[178] "At some point not too long after Ennius, his establishment of the hexameter became so dominant that Livius was rewritten from Saturnians into that metre" (Courtney 1993, 46). Hereafter, I use Courtney's term 'Livius Refictus' to refer to the author of the hexameter version of Andronicus's *Odusia*.

[179] 'Livius Refictus': "When the wicked Cyclops had devoured our companions…"; *Odyssey*: "But when the Cyclops had filled his huge belly by eating human flesh" trans. Murray (1998).

[180] "…(the well-greaved Achaeans) heaped the corpses on the pyre, inwardly grieving" trans. Murray (1999).

from a broad statement about the persistent dying of Hera's Greeks to a focused, concrete image of what is physically happening to the bodies at the time that the goddess's lament is brought into the story. He also uses phrases from elsewhere to color his translation appropriately, keeping it Homeric but displacing elements to heighten the emotional effect. It is also noteworthy that Matius rewrites with multiple passages, whereas Livius Andronicus's general approach to this technique is to apply only one external passage to his reworking. This may be Matius's innovation, though not enough of either Livius or Matius survives for us to know for certain.

Matius rewrites in this same way to varying degrees in his other extant verses. Courtney notes another reworking of Homer with Homeric phrases by Matius in fr.6, which describes a man dying and falling to the ground. The poet renders a formulaic death-scene that appears five times throughout the *Iliad*:[181]

ille hietans herbam moribundo †tenit† ore

ὀδὰξ λαζοίατο γαῖαν[182]

Courtney suggests that Matius uses this elaboration to render the phrase describing Polydorus falling to his knees, *γνὺξ δ' ἔριπ'*, at *Iliad* 20.417.[183] The textual problem in *tenit* does not allow a definitive identification, but Courtney's suggestion seems the most likely correspondence. Matius replaces a bland phrase in the original with a more detailed Homeric formula from elsewhere, wholly reworking the text but doing so with his source in mind.

[181] Courtney (1993, 101). These five instances occur at *Iliad* 2.418, 11.749, 19.61, 22.17, and 24.738.

[182] Matius: "That man gaping holds the grass with his dying mouth"; *Iliad*: "…may they bite the earth"

[183] Courtney (1993, 101).

In addition to rewriting by incorporating phrases and images from elsewhere in the *Iliad*, Matius also reworks individual verses by pulling material from within those verses. In fr.3 he uses material close by to rework a phrase found several times in the *Iliad*[184] which describes the resumption of fighting after the bodies of the dead have been gathered and burned:

> dum dat vincendi praepes Victoria palmam
>
> *εἰς ὅ κε δαίμων*
> *ἄμμε διακρίνῃ, δώῃ δ' ἑτέροισί γε νίκην.*[185]

Matius maintains some of the original in his translation: *dum dat* corresponds to *εἰς… δώῃ* and *Victoria* personified corresponds to the subject *ὅ…δαίμων.* Matius, however, makes a number of crucial changes based on details within the verses of the original. First, he replaces the abstract *δαίμων* with *Victoria*. As Traina and Courtney have pointed out,[186] there simply is no Roman equivalent of the Greek concept embodied by *δαίμων.* Matius's solution is especially interesting in light of the approach taken by 'Livius Refictus' to the same problem in the passage at *Odyssey* 10.64 in which Aeolus receives Odysseus for a second time and is about to cast him off the island:

> inferus an superus tibi fert deus funera, Ulixes?
>
> *πῶς ἦλθες, Ὀδυσεῦ; τίς τοι κακὸς ἔχραε δαίμων;*[187]

---

[184] See *Iliad* 7.291-292, 377-378, and 396-397.

[185] Matius: "…until winged Victory gives the palm of winning"; *Iliad*: "…until a god judges between us, and gives victory to one side or the other" trans. Murray (1999).

[186] See Courtney (1993, 45 and 100).

[187] 'Livius Refictus': "Is it a god from below or above who brings death for you, Ulysses?"; *Odyssey*: "How have you come here, Odysseus? What cruel god attacked you?"trans. Murray (1998).

'Livius Refictus' attempts to maintain the abstract sense of the Greek term by using the most indefinite, most lexically and phonetically precise Latin equivalent. Matius abandons such an approach, avoiding both the attempt at equivocation by 'Livius Refictus' and the possibility of simply transliterating the term.[188] Instead, he solves the problem by replacing the term altogether and rewriting the verse with Homer's words. *Victoria* does not come *ex nihilo*: Matius draws the non-Homeric goddess[189] from the word *νίκην*. However, he maintains the objective form of the noun by replacing it with *palmam* in order to preserve *δώῃ* with an accusative. The word *vincendi* is likewise extracted from *νίκην* in order to clarify *palmam*, which is usually accompanied by some modifier that demonstrates for what type of victory the palm is intended.[190]

Matius does the same sort of intralinear rewriting of *Iliad* 12.462-463 in fr.4, which describes Hector rushing to attack:

> celerissimus advolat Hector
>
> *ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἔσθορε φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ*
> *νυκτὶ θοῇ ἀτάλαντος ὑπώπια*[191]

The word *θοῇ* corresponds to Matius's *advolat*, but it also provides the source for another portion of the phrase. As Courtney points out,[192] the adjective *celerissimus* does not come

[188] The two openings to the *Odyssey* suggested by Livius Andronicus and Horace provide another example of Latinization versus transliteration as a translation approach. Horace renders the Greek *ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα* (*Odyssey* 1.1) as *dic mihi, Musa, virum* (*Ars Poetica* 141), simply transliterating the name in the original. Livius Andronicus, however, chooses to appropriate the line completely by Latinizing it, rendering it as *virum mihi, Camenae, insece* (fr.1). For *δαίμων* and its transliteration *daemon*, see Apuleius *Apology* 27 and *De Platone* 1.12.

[189] "This is a post-Homeric and statuesque conception of Victory, who is not a deity at all in Homer" (Courtney 1993, 100).

[190] See *OLD* s.v. *palma* 5 and 6.

[191] Matius: "Swiftest Hector flew at him"; *Iliad*: "And glorious Hector leapt inside, his face like sudden night…" trans. Murray (1999).

from the syntactically equivalent *φαίδιμος*, but rather from *θοῇ*. Matius's choice of epithets here is also striking, as he seems to be reworking a Homeric standard by taking an epithet out of context and reapplying it where it does not usually appear. The epithet *celerissimus* is an equivalent of a set of phrases in Homer which mean "swift-footed,": *ποδάκρης*, *ποδώκης*, *πόδας ταχύς*, and *πόδας ὠκύς*.[193] These epithets are never applied to Hector in the *Iliad*, but instead are reserved almost entirely for Achilles.[194] The epithet "shining" (*φαίδιμος*) is used for a number of heroes, but it is attributed to Hector more frequently than to any other individual in the poem.[195] Matius seems to rewrite in his translation, reapplying an epithet usually attributed to Achilles to Hector. Since only the single hemistich survives, it is impossible to know whether Matius retained any sense of *φαίδιμος*, but we can at least see that he follows the same method found elsewhere in drawing from other words within the verse to rework related elements. Matius thus takes the same principle that Livius Andronicus uses of rewriting with an eye towards other passages in the text, but develops it a step further by expanding from within the verses he is translating.

In addition to rewriting his source with the author's own words, Matius also adapts Homeric ideas and words to make them more appropriate to his Roman audience. The first such case of this is in fr.1 at *Graiorum*. The original has *Δαναῶν*, which Matius

---

[192] Courtney (1993, 101).

[193] Whallon (1961, 107).

[194] "Four synonymous epithets meaning *swift-footed*...are used almost exclusively for Achilles in the *Iliad*, where they produce such conviction that he is fleet beyond all other mortals that Hector's hope to escape by running from him seems terrifyingly futile" (Whallon 1961, 107).

[195] "The epithet *shining*...is used for various warriors but for Hector five times as often as for anyone else" (Whallon 1961, 112).

could quite easily have kept by using *Danaum*. Although it could be argued that metrical requirements forbid the simple replacement of *Graiorum* with *Danaum*, there are several solutions readily available that would add the necessary long syllable (i.e., *corpora nam Danaum* or *corpora enim Danaum*, both of which would render the verse more literally and include the *γάρ* that Matius purposefully removes from his verse). We have no reason to believe that Matius, a *vir doctus* and *eruditus* to Gellius,[196] could not have reworked his translation otherwise if these solutions were not to his taste. Baebius Italicus, the author of the 1st century A.D. *Ilias Latina*, relies on precisely this equivalence between *Danai* and *Δαναοί* in the same description of the dying Greeks at vv.10-12:

> ille Pelasgum
> infestam regi pestem in praecordia misit
> implicuitque gravi Danaorum corpora morbo.[197]

Only seven verses later he uses the alternate genitive plural form *Danaum* (*castra petit Danaum*). It is clear, therefore, that Matius could have stayed closer to the original, but chose to alter his source.

The most likely reason for this choice is that Matius had a fine grasp of Homeric style and diction, as well as an understanding of the limitations and challenges in translating from archaic Greek to contemporary Latin. Homer repeatedly uses the term *Δαναοί*, but the reference is restricted as only a generalized term.[198] Matius seems to have noticed this usage and adjusted his translation accordingly. Rather than following Homer

---

[196] Aulus Gellius *Noctes Atticae* 7.6.5 and 15.25.1.

[197] "He sent against the hearts of the Pelasgians a plague baleful to the king, and entangled the bodies of the Greeks with grievous sickness."

[198] *LSJ* s.v. *Δαναοί* ("*the Danaäns*, subjects of *Δάναος*, king of Argos, but in Il. 1.42, al., for *the Greeks* generally…").

word for word, Matius chooses to adapt his translation in order to capture the generalized sense of the term *Δαναοί* in the *Iliad*.

Matius adapts *Iliad* 23.103-104 in the same way in fr.8:

an maneat specii simulacrum in morte silentum

ἦ ῥά τίς ἐστι καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισι
ψυχὴ καὶ εἴδωλον[199]

Matius removes Hades completely from the picture, just as Catulus does in his translation of Callimachus. Their purposes, however, are not the same. There is no Latin equivalent of the Homeric concept of Hades's halls, so Matius replaces the image with the more straightfoward *morte*.

One final aspect of Matius's translation is taken not from his predecessors, but rather is a matter of personal poetics. Matius tends toward an archaizing style, using extensive alliteration in most of his extant verses. This is evident in fr.8 in *specii simulacrum...silentum*, of which only *simulacrum* really has a direct correspondence in *εἴδωλον*. Likewise, *maneat...morte* are both innovations of Matius that find only moderate correspondences in the original verse: *maneat* is a development of the plain *ἐστι*, and *morte* replaces *Ἀΐδαο δόμοισι*. The same phenomenon is readily apparent in fr.3: there are six words in the verse, of which two begin with the same letter. Both *dum* and *dat* have clear sources in the original, but both *vincendi* and *praepes* are entirely Matius's expansions. When Matius translates and adds to the original, he adapts Homer to an archaic Latin style.

We can see, therefore, that Matius takes a number of his translation techniques from Livius Andronicus, who is a far more likely model for an epic writer to follow than

[199] Matius: "Or does there remain in death an image of the form of the silent..."; *Iliad*: "Even in the house of Hades there is something – spirit and phantom…" trans. Murray (1999).

Plautus or Terence. Just as Andronicus rewrites Homer by using Homeric phrases taken from elsewhere, so too does Matius color his translation with his source's own words. Matius also appropriates several words to contemporary Roman epic, adapting his source rather than simply copying words and concepts which have a number of other connotations that would not be found in a pure transliteration. This approach is similar to Livius's own etymologizing and Romanization in words like *Camenae* and *Ulixes*. And so, despite their close temporal proximity, Catulus and Matius, working in two different genres, approach translation by different means and for different purposes.

CHAPTER II: MARCUS TULLIUS CICERO AND PUBLIUS TERENTIUS VARRO ATACINUS

The translators who immediately follow the Preneoterics further develop their art, drawing on their predecessors and innovating for different genres and purposes. Cicero's *Aratea*, a translation of Aratus's *Phaenomena*, marks a substantial turning point in Roman poetics. Despite being the work of a young man,[200] it nevertheless demonstrates the extraordinary adaptability of the Latin language and the degree to which Roman translators can make the work of Greek authors their own. Because it is also one of the longest extant Roman translations I will not be able to give the *Aratea* adequate treatment in the space of this study.[201] For the remainder of this chapter we will focus on the work of Varro Atacinus, who, along with Cicero and Catullus, makes up the entirety of extant Neoteric literary translation.

As is the case with most of the Neoterics,[202] little is known about Varro Atacinus.[203] He was something of a polymath and his work spans a number of genres,

---

[200] See n.295 for the dating of Cicero's *Aratea*.

[201] Admirable work on Cicero has already been done by David Kubiak (1979), who, although he focuses on only a few passages in his discussion of the *Aratea*, nevertheless helps to establish many of Cicero's translation techniques. In addition, Emma Gee's (2001) work has shown that Cicero actively redefines Aratus through a Stoic lens. Nevertheless, a full treatment of Cicero's translations is still wanting and, in my opinion, long overdue.

It should also be noted that almost no work has been done on Cicero's *ad hoc* literary translations found in his other works, including sizable passages from Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and others. See Soubiran (2002, 266-294) for text and commentary on these translations.

[202] There is still much disagreement about whether Varro was a Neoteric. Crowther (1987) argues that Varro was certainly not a Neoteric, but maybe had more in common with the young Cicero than with Catullus and his circle. He bases this on two main points: (1) Varro did not write an *epyllion* and (2) his work, especially his satire and epic, seems more in keeping with Cicero and more traditional poets. I find

including epic, satire, and amatory poetry. He also wrote several translations, of which two fragments of his *Ephemeris*, based on Aratus, and fourteen and a half lines of his *Argonautae*, based on Apollonius Rhodius's *Argonautika*, have survived.

VARRO ATACINUS'S *ARGONAUTAE* AND APOLLONIUS RHODIUS'S *ARGONAUTIKA*

The *Argonautae* is a remarkable achievement, whether or not we believe Jerome's statement that Varro did not learn Greek until he was 35.[204] We have seen already in the cases of Lutatius Catulus and Gnaeus Matius that early Latin translators freely adapt and extensively rework their sources, and Varro continues in this tradition. Varro's purpose in translating, however, is quite different from that of the poets who come before him. In the extant lines of his translation of Apollonius we see an attempt at remaining closer to the original than in any of his predecessors. Although not always successful, Varro's work

---

this argument altogether unconvincing, though we should also be careful in following the opposite suggestion that Varro was in a specific Neoteric circle, for proponents of which see Crowther (1987, 262 n.3). I do not propose to provide a solution to this question here, both because it is beyond the scope of this study and because Varro's work is too fragmentary. For our purposes we will simply suggest that he consistently demonstrates many Neoteric tendencies.

[203] Some information about Varro's life can be patched together from the fragments and a handful of references by other authors. Jerome remarks that Varro was born in Gallia Narbonensis in 82 BC. Varro probably wrote his *Bellum Sequanicum* shortly after 58 BC, when Caesar's campaign ended. His other works are impossible to date, though Jerome mentions that Varro learned Greek when he was 35 and could not therefore have written his translations until after 47 BC. Courtney (1993, 237) suggests that Horace's attack on Varro's satires at *Sermones* 1.10.46, published around 35 BC, implies that Varro was dead by this time, but the evidence is inconclusive.

[204] *P. Terentius Varro vico Atace in provincia Narbonensi nascitur, qui postea XXXV annum agens Graecas litteras cum summo studio didicit.* ("Publius Terentius Varro is born in the district of Atax in the province of Narbonensis, who after living 35 years learned Greek letters with the greatest effort"). Crowther (1987) suggests that "Jerome's comments may be an oversimplification to account for Varro's later interest in Greek, for he may have been acquainted with the language at an earlier date, because of the Greek influence in the area in which he was born" (265). Jerome may simply mean "literature" rather than "language" by his phrase *Graecas litteras*.

shows a marked shift away from the extensive reworkings of the Preneoteric translators and towards a more carefully allusive style typical of the Neoterics. Varro seems to aim, first and foremost, at reproducing as much of the original as possible, sometimes even potentially verging on error because of rote technique. He purposefully places the attention on his source rather than on his own original poetics, even skillfully maintaining Apollonius's difficult wordplay. This concealment of his own authorial voice in translating is a remarkably modern innovation and demonstrates a branch of Roman literary translation entirely different from either the extremely free, personalized renderings of the Preneoterics or the mechanical verbatim versions of the *Res Gestae* and other legal documents. Varro renders his translations in such a way as to remain as close to his sources as possible while still presenting literary, rather than practical, Latin versions that imitate and preserve much of the artistry of the originals. And yet we also see in Varro's fragments occasional glimpses at sophisticated intertextuality, by which he incorporates the interpretations of his Latin predecessors into his translation and reads his original's text through intermediary sources.

In his third fragment Varro reproduces the geneaology of Nauplios, one of the heroes listed in Apollonius's opening catalogue of Argonauts:[205]

> ecce venit Danai multis <⏑⏑ –⏑⏑ –⏑> 1
> namque satus Clytio, Lerni quem Naubolus ex se,

[205] Two lacunae caused by a cut in the manuscript in the 8th century obscure half of the first and fourth lines (Lunelli 1969, 159). Blänsdorf (1995, 229) and Courtney (1993, 239), following Keil, propose *celebrata propago* for the lacuna in the first line and *–ia Amymone Europae* for the lacuna in the fourth line. As Lunelli (1969) points out, "le integrazioni proposte non sono letture, ma divinazioni" (159). Damen (1995) and Bing (1997) persuasively argue against such reverse emendation of Menander's *Dis Exapaton* and Callimachus's *Plokamos Berenikes*, respectively, from their corresponding Latin adaptations, on the grounds that ancient translations are not literal renderings. This argument is equally valid for emending Latin translations based on their sources, as Keil *et al* have done. It is impossible to identify how Varro read Apollonius and modified his source text if we use the same source text to modify Varro. Therefore, we will rely on the text here as Lunelli (1969) presents it, with lacunae present, refraining from comment on the possible implications of Keil's conjectures, "anche se non sono infondate" (Lunelli 1969, 159).

Lernum Naupliades Proetus, sed Nauplion edit
fil <∪∪ –∪∪ –∪∪ –> Danaique superbi[206] 4

Apollonius's corresponding section at *Argonautika* 1.133-138:

τῷ δ' ἐπὶ δὴ θείοιο κίεν Δαναοῖο γενέθλη, 133
Ναύπλιος· ἦ γὰρ ἔην Κλυτονήου Ναυβολίδαο,
Ναύβολος αὖ Λέρνου, Λέρνον γε μὲν ἴδμεν ἐόντα 135
Προίτου Ναυπλιάδαο, Ποσειδάωνι δὲ κούρη
πρίν ποτ' Ἀμυμώνη Δαναὶς τέκεν εὐνηθεῖσα
Ναύπλιον, ὃς περὶ πάντας ἐκαίνυτο ναυτιλίῃσιν.[207] 138

Like his predecessors, Varro remains faithful to his source in a number of ways. Except for the substitution of *Clytio* for *Κλυτονήου*, which I will address shortly, he keeps Apollonius's pedigree of Nauplios the same, following generally the reverse temporal order of the family line and even keeping the framing structure of *Δαναοῖο...Δαναίς* in *Danai...Danaique*. He also uses a number of precise verbal parallels: *venit* for *κίεν*, *namque* for *ἦ γὰρ*, *edit* for *τέκεν*, *fil<ia>*[208] for *κούρη*.

There are two other especially interesting cases of fidelity in this fragment. First, Varro retains the Greek terminations in *Naupliades* and *Nauplion*. Both are directly relevant to Varro's self-positioning within the tradition of previous translators. Livius Andronicus, we have already seen, appropriates all of his Greek proper names into a Roman context, using a native equivalent whenever possible. Thus, *Μοῦσα* becomes *Camena*, *Κρόνος Saturnius*, and *Ὀδυσσεύς Ulixes*. Even when dealing with names that have

[206] "And next comes <Nauplion?...> by many, <son> of Danaus,
For he was born of Clytius, whom Naubolus son of Lernus sired from himself,
And Proetus, Nauplius's son, sired Lernus, but <Amymone?> bore Nauplius,
<daughter> of <...?> and of proud Danaus"

[207] "Next to him came a scion of the race of divine Danaus,
Nauplius. He was the son of Clytonaeus son of Naubolus;
Naubolus was son of Lernus; Lernus we know was
the son of Proetus son of Nauplius; and once Amymone daughter of Danaus,
wedded to Poseidon, bare Nauplius, who surpassed all men in naval skill" trans. Seaton (1912).

[208] Although the lacuna extends into the first word of the fourth line, it seems safe to assume from the remnant *fil-* and the preceding *edit* that the original had *filia*.

no Latin equivalent, Livius uses Latin forms:[209] *in Pylum* for *Πύλονδ'*, *Patroclus* for *Πάτροκλος*, *Atlantis* for *Ἄτλαντος*, *Calypsonem* for what would have been *Καλυψώ*, and *Circai* for what would have been *Κίρκης*.[210] He likewise strives to retain, and even add, patronymic phrases in his translation: he chooses *pater noster, Saturni filie* ("our father, son of Saturn") for *ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη* ("our father, Kronos's son") and *nympham Atlantis filiam Calypsonem* ("the nymph Calypso, daughter of Atlas") for a conflation of *νύμφης ἐν μεγάροισι Καλυψοῦς* ("in the halls of the nymph Calypso") and *Ἄτλαντος θυγάτηρ* ("daughter of Atlas").[211] He does not simply transcribe patronymics and use the Greek *–ιδης* termination.[212] Varro, however, has no qualms about retaining the Greek forms of names. This tendency appears throughout Varro's fragments: he renders *Τῖφυν* with *Tiphyn*, *Ἀγχιάλη* with *Anchiale*, and *Οἰαξίδος* with *Oaxida*, as well as *Φαέθων* with the usual *Phaethon*.[213] Likewise, he keeps relatively close to the names that do not require unusual Greek terminations, transliterating and only mildly Latinizing the inflections:

[209] The only exception to this is Livius's use of *Latonas* and *Monetas* in fr.27 and fr.30 for the archaic genitive singular, which follows the Ionic Greek genitive form.

[210] In both *Calypsonem* and *Circai*, Livius changes the case of the original names. The equivalents provided above are not in the source text, but are the Greek form of the names as they stand in the Latin and should demonstrate clearly Livius's Latinization of forms. The examples above with syntactical equivalents come from: Livius fr.11 (= *Odyssey* 2.317), fr.13 (= 3.110), and fr.17 (= conflation of 4.557 & 1.52). The final two examples without syntactical equivalents come from fr.17 (= 4.557) and fr.34 (= 12.16).

[211] Livius Andronicus fr.2 corresponds to *Odyssey* 1.45, and fr.17 is a conflation of *Odyssey* 4.557 and 1.52.

[212] Possanza (2004) remarks: "Livius' decision to use the Latin names of Greek divinities ruled out the possibility of the direct borrowing of the patronymic adjective because that would have resulted in morphologically hybrid forms, a Latin name combined with the Greek suffix *–ιδης*, a development that was to come later in the history of Latin Literature" (50).

[213] Varro fr.4, fr.5, fr.5, and fr.11, respectively.

thus, *Lernum* for *Λέρνον*, *Naubolus* for *Ναύβολος*, and *Proetus* for what would in the nominative be *Προίτος*.[214]

Livius Andronicus's purposeful avoidance of Greek forms is a fundamental aspect of his translation technique. Livius is concerned above all with appropriating the Greek text entirely into his native Italian *milieu* and he Romanizes his source at every possible chance.[215] Varro actively avoids such Romanizing appropriation, calling attention to the foreignness of his subject, the nature of his work as a translation of a Greek original, and his own Neoteric style.[216]

In addition to departing from Livius in not Latinizing names, Varro also innovates in his use of patronymics. As we saw above, Livius retains and adds patronymics whenever he reasonably can. Varro, however, appears to limit his patronymics largely to forms with Greek terminations and removes many of Apollonius's patronymics from his translation, expunging them completely or replacing them with subordinate clauses. In the section of Apollonius that corresponds to fr.3 most patronymics are rendered through straightforward genitives or substantives terminating in *-ιδης*: *Κλυτονήου*, *Ναυβολίδαο*, *Λέρνου*, *Προίτου*, *Ναυπλιάδαο*, and *Δαναὶς*. Of these, Varro retains only *Lerni*, *Naupliades*, and *Danai*. The rest are rendered in a variety of more indirect ways: *Κλυτονήου* with the adjective *satus* and ablative of source *Clytio*, *Ναυβολίδαο* with the lengthy relative clause *quem Naubolus ex se*, and *Προίτου* with an understood *edit* which takes as its object

[214] As with Livius's rendering in fr.17 and fr.34, Varro does not keep *Proetus* in the same case as it is in the original, which has instead the genitive *Προίτου*. I have offered the nominative form simply for comparison.

[215] Possanza (2004) remarks: "And his decision to use the native name was a momentous one because the substitutions can be seen as part of an overall translation strategy which brings the source text closer to the linguistic and cultural world of the translator's audience" (48).

[216] Ross (1969, 101-102) notes each of these effects caused by Greek names and inflections in Catullus's longer poems. These can easily be applied to Varro's text, especially in light of Catullus's *c*.66 as a translation of Callimachus.

Lernum. Varro strives for variation in this passage, rendering the sense of the patronymics in Apollonius while avoiding the repetition of the genitive formula. Varro also removes the patronymic phrase at Apollonius 2.711-712 in fr.7, taking *Πλειστοῖο θύγατρες* out of his translation altogether. We can infer from these passages, therefore, that Varro avoids the sollemnifying and repetitive tone that Livius Andronicus so values in his translation of patronymic formulae, favoring rather an approach more in line with Neoteric *variatio*. His authorial intrusion into the translation, however, is still minimal despite these minor changes.

Varro usually maintains Apollonius's names as precisely as possible, but there are two passages in which he alters the length and metrics of a name and as a result creates an atypical form. In fr.4, which corresponds to Apollonius 1.400-401, Varro describes Tiphys the helmsman:

> Tiphyn aurigam celeris fecere carinae
>
> *ἐπὶ δ' ἔτρεπον αἰνήσαντες* 400
> *Τῖφυν ἐυστείρης οἰήμια νηὸς ἔρυσθαι.*[217] 401

As Courtney points out,[218] Varro seems to have understood Apollonius to have written *Τίφῡν εὐστείρης* and makes *Tiphyn* likewise a spondaic. The form of the name in Apollonius is usually read as trochaic, as it is in every other source, and so Varro seems to have simply understood Apollonius's quadrisyllabic *ἐυστείρης* to be instead a trisyllabic word without the diaeresized opening diphthong *ἐῦ*. Apollonius deliberately archaizes and

[217] Varro: "They made Tiphys the pilot of the swift ship"; Apollonius: "and with one consent they entrusted Tiphys with guarding the helm of the well-stemmed ship" trans. Seaton (1912).

[218] Courtney (1995, 240).

uses the epic form *ἐῦ*,[219] which appears to be the cause of the difference. Varro takes the usual form with the diphthong with which he was likely more familiar and reads the name *Τῖφυν* as a spondee because, except for the typically trochaic form of the name and the *lenis* over the first letter of *ἐυστείρης*, there is no indication of quantity and no metrical consideration that bars this reading.[220]

Varro has a second metrical variation later on in fr.11, corresponding to Apollonius 4.597-598, in which he describes the fall of Phaethon from Helios's chariot:

tum te flagranti deiectum fulmine Phaethon

ἔνθα ποτ' αἰθαλόεντι τυπεὶς πρὸς στέρνα κεραυνῷ 597
ἡμιδαὴς Φαέθων πέσεν ἅρματος Ἠελίοιο[221] 598

Varro creates a metrical variant in his disyllabic *Phaethon* and again, as with the unusual lengthening of *Tiphyn* and the reading of the first syllable of *ἐυστείρης* as a diphthong, the source of this change is an atypical synizesis. Metrically there is no problem with reading *Φαέθων* as a disyllable and, although it is almost always trisyllabic, synizesis of the name occurs elsewhere.[222] These changes, however, should not necessarily be assumed to be errors on Varro's part.[223] Apollonius himself plays with metrical variation in the passage Varro renders in fr.3: *Ναυβολίδᾱō* stands relatively close to *Ναυπλιάδᾱō*, and despite their

[219] See *LSJ* s.v. *εὐ* and Apollonius Dyscolus *De Adverbiis* 200.20 for the epic diaeresized form.

[220] It could also be argued that Varro purposefully changes the tradition and is not in error, though I think this possibility is less likely.

[221] Varro: "...then you, Phaethon, cast out by the burning bolt..."; Apollonius: "Where once, smitten on the breast by the blazing bolt, Phaethon half-consumed fell from the chariot of Helios" trans. Seaton (1912).

[222] Cf. Manilius *Astronomica* 1.736: *Phaethontem patrio curru per signa volantem* ("…Phaethon flying through the constellations in his father's chariot…"). Manilius also has a spondaic *Tiphyn* at 5.44-45 (*videre / Phasin et in cautes Tiphyn superare ruentem*, "…to see Phasis and to overcome Tiphys rushing towards the rocks"), but unfortunately it is impossible to judge whether this choice involves the same metrical variation that Varro displays or is simply the result of position.

[223] Courtney (1993) suggests that "perhaps his late acquaintance with Greek left some details fuzzy" (240).

lexical closeness the latter is a quadrisyllable and the former a pentasyllable. It is possible that Varro simply misread both *Τῖφυν* and *Φαέθων*, but it is equally possible that part of his translation technique involves the same kind of metrical variation that his source displays elsewhere. If Varro is in error, then it is a symptom of his tendency to follow his source as closely as possible. If, however, he purposefully renders these variants, they can easily be seen as elements of his Neoteric *variatio* and may even represent an affinity for transposing typically Apollonian approaches to portions of the text that in the original do not display them. Thus, he essentially intensifies the presence of the source author within the translation.

The second noteworthy instance of fidelity in Varro's first fragment lies in his use of *sed* v.3 for Apollonius's *δὲ* v.136:

Lernum Naupliades Proetus, sed Nauplion edit	3
fil <∪∪ –∪∪ –∪∪ –> Danaique superbi	4
Προίτου Ναυπλιάδαο, Ποσειδάωνι δὲ κούρη	136
πρίν ποτ' Ἀμυμώνη Δαναὶς τέκεν εὐνηθεῖσα	137

Out of context there is nothing unusual about this equivalence: both *sed* and *δὲ* can be adversative connectives with varying degrees of strength. In the passage from Apollonius, however, *δέ* quite clearly has continuative rather than adversative force. Varro's *sed*, in contrast, only has adversative force.[224] In this passage, I can see no logical sense in such a translation choice. Neither Apollonius nor Varro breaks from the reverse geneaology at this point in the text, even though *sed* suggests a change in topic or approach. Nor does *sed* act as a recall device to bring the reader from the digressive

[224] It could be argued that this instance of *sed* holds something of an emphatic or elaborative force, as some have noted in, among other places, Juvenal *Saturae* 5.146-147, whose echoes with Varro's fragment are entirely coincidental: *vilibus ancipites fungi ponentur amicis, / boletus domino, sed quales Claudius edit.* However, this seems unlikely, as most comparable examples use the conjunction to elaborate and emphasize a word just stated; cf. Plautus *Rudens* 799, Martial 1.117.7, and Juvenal *Saturae* 4.27.

frame structure back into the narrative, since this return does not occur until the final *Danai*. It seems that Varro has simply misread Apollonius and supplied an adversative conjunction where a continuative conjunction like *et* or *nam* would have been more appropriate.

Varro may make a similar misstep in fr.11 in his use of *tum* for Apollonius's *ἔνθα*:

> tum te flagranti deiectum fulmine Phaethon

As in the case of the correspondence between *sed* and *δὲ* in fr.3, Varro's choice of *tum* is not altogether unjustifiable. The adverb *ἔνθα* contains both locational and temporal senses, and *tum* logically corresponds very closely to the latter. The passage at Apollonius 4.595-600 describes the approach of the Argo to the river Eridanus:

> *ἡ δ' ἔσσυτο πολλὸν ἐπιπρὸ* 595
> *λαίφεσιν, ἐς δ' ἔβαλον μύχατον ῥόον Ἠριδανοῖο·*
> *ἔνθα ποτ' αἰθαλόεντι τυπεὶς πρὸς στέρνα κεραυνῷ*
> *ἡμιδαὴς Φαέθων πέσεν ἅρματος Ἠελίοιο*
> *λίμνης ἐς προχοὰς πολυβενθέος· ἡ δ' ἔτι νῦν περ*
> *τραύματος αἰθομένοιο βαρὺν ἀνακηκίει ἀτμόν.*[225] 600

Certainly Apollonius's *ποτ'* seems to find a closer parallel in Varro's temporal *tum*, but these do not quite correspond closely enough to say that Varro draws on it rather than on *ἔνθα*. Apollonius's *ποτ'* would require *olim* for a precise parallel, since *tum* must refer to a specific point in the past and does not reproduce the generalized sense in the original. Unfortunately, because the surrounding text is lost, we cannot know for sure whether Varro had included this word. It seems more likely that Varro has taken the two together and rendered *ἔνθα ποτ'* with the singular temporal *tum*, ignoring the locational aspect altogether.

[225] "And far on sped the Argo under sail, and entered deep into the stream of Eridanus; where once, smitten on the breast by the blazing bolt, Phaethon half-consumed fell from the chariot of Helios into the opening of that deep lake; and even now it belcheth up heavy steam clouds from the smouldering wound" trans. Seaton (1912).

As other scholars have noted,[226] Varro makes another error in reading Apollonius in fr.3 with *Clytio*, since the original has *Κλυτονήου*. It is impossible to judge from what source this mistake arises, but it is sufficient to point out that Varro obviously slips here in a passage in which he is otherwise careful about names and relationships.[227] Varro's intention is unclear, but this may demonstrate another instance of erroneous reading caused by overly faithful translation. If Fränkel is correct in suggesting that *Κλυτίου τοῦ* existed in Varro's version of Apollonius, it may be reasonable to assume that Varro simply took his text as face value and relied more on it than on the traditional geneaology or on personal judgment and correction of a textual error.[228] In this case, Varro appears to hide his own poetic authority and defers completely to the text of Apollonius as he has it.

---

[226] See Courtney (1995, 239)

[227] I do not find convincing Courtney's (1995, 239) suggestion that there was an intervening source that Varro incorporated into his translation. Courtney argues that Varro must have confused Iphitus the son of Naubolus (Apollonius 1.207) with Iphitus the brother of Clytius and son of Eurytus (Apollonius 1.86). I do not think that Varro would have so mixed up these relationships, especially as Apollonius explicitly states that Oechalian Clytius and Iphitus are the sons of Eurytus (*Εὐρύτου υἷες*, Apollonius 1.87), that Phocian Iphitus is the son of Naubolus the son of Ornytus (*Ἴφιτος Ὀρνυτίδαο / Ναυβόλου*, Apollonius 1.207-208), and that Danaid Naubolus is the son of Lernum (Apollonius 1.135). The rest of the names in this passage, and throughout the other fragments of Varro, are carefully retained and I see no reason that Varro would in this one place substitute Apollonius with another text, accidentally or otherwise. Fränkel's suggestion (Courtney 1993, 239) of Varro reading the text as *Κλυτίου τοῦ* seems more reasonable, but without further evidence any theory is no more than bare conjecture.

[228] The tradition of Latin poets reworking errors and related infelicities in their sources is already well-attested by Varro's time. Ennius in the opening lines of his *Medea* alters the arrangement of the nurse's speech in Euripides's play, correcting the order so that the chronology is correct. See Jocelyn (1967, 351) for a brief discussion of this passage. Terence likewise complains at *Eunuchus* 10-13 that Luscius Lanuvinus in his *Thesaurus* had transplanted errors from Menander into his play by translating too literally and not correcting his source:

atque in Thesauro scripsit causam dicere
prius unde petitur aurum qua re sit suom
quam illic qui petit unde is sit thesaurus sibi
aut unde in patrium monumentum pervenerit.

"...and in his "Treasure" represented the defendant as putting his case for the possession of the gold before the plaintiff explained how the treasure belonged to him and how it came to be in his father's tomb" trans. Barsby (2001).

In addition to the points of close translation in fr.3, there are also several departures from the original. For example, Varro adds *ecce* where there is no equivalent in the source.[229] Here, Varro's authorial voice intrudes into the text where Apollonius' does not. This sort of intrusion occurs elsewhere in Varro's translation, though usually Varro draws from other sources in Apollonius when inserting an authorial statement. Another example occurs in fr.7, which renders Apollonius 2.711-712, Varro describes the nymphs celebrating Apollo as the slayer of the Python:

> te nunc Coryciae tendentem spicula nymphae
> hortantes 'o Phoebe' et 'ieie' conclamarunt
>
> *πολλὰ δὲ Κωρύκιαι νύμφαι, Πλείστοιο θύγατρες* 711
> *θαρσύνεσκον ἔπεσσιν, "ἴη ἴε" κεκληγυῖαι*[230] 712

Varro's *te* does not exist in the original, but as Courtney points out[231] the address comes from a vocative only a few lines earlier at Apollonius 2.708 when the poet speaks to Apollo: *αἰεί τοι, ἄναξ, ἄτμητοι ἔθειραι, / αἰὲν ἀδήλητοι* ("Ever, O king, be thy locks unshorn, ever unravaged").[232] Varro uses the same type of authorial address in fr.11, though nowhere in Apollonius's text is there a corresponding vocative in this passage:

> tum te flagranti deiectum fulmine Phaethon
>
> *ἔνθα ποτ' αἰθαλόεντι τυπεὶς πρὸς στέρνα κεραυνῷ* 597
> *ἡμιδαὴς Φαέθων πέσεν ἅρματος Ἠελίοιο* 598

[229] Varro may be drawing on *δή* here, but it is unclear and, at any rate, the Latin *ecce* is far stronger than the Greek particle.

[230] Varro: "Now the Corycian nymphs urging you holding a dart shout 'Phoebus, ieie!'; Apollonius: "And often the Corycian nymphs, daughters of Pleistus, took up the sheering strain crying 'Healer'" trans. Seaton (1912).

[231] Courtney (1993, 241).

[232] Trans. Seaton (1912).

Again, Varro adds *te* where it does not exist in the original. As Courtney points out,[233] this apostrophic insertion is characteristic of Neoteric style. It is impossible to say whether or not such vocative intrusions were commonplace in the rest of Varro's translation, but the relative abundance of such brief addresses in the extant fragments suggests the possibility that this is one of the handful of ways in which Varro actively inserts his voice into the poem and colors the translation with his own unique Neoteric character.

Varro's third fragment, then, generally demonstrates a remarkable tendency to remain faithful to Apollonius while providing mild variation to epic formulae. Varro displays in many of his other short fragments similar tendencies that I will treat only briefly here to avoid repetition of a simple point. First, let us pick up again on fr.11 and Phaethon's fall from Helios's chariot. With the exception of the possible error in mechanically translating *ἔνθα* as *tum* and the introduction of the Neoteric apostrophic *te*, both of which we have already examined, the rest of the fragment stays remarkably close to the original. Varro's *flagranti...fulmine* is identical to Apollonius's *αἰθαλόεντι κεραυνῷ*, and the participle *deiectum* ("cast down"), though not identical in meaning to Apollonius's participle *τυπείς* ("struck"), nevertheless maintains the syntax of the original while integrating Apollonius's main verb *πέσεν* ("he fell").[234]

[233] Courtney (1993): "In the style of the 'new' poets Varro here, as in 7, introduces an apostrophe absent from the Greek" (243).

[234] It is possible that Varro modified his main verb, perhaps to match the meaning of *τυπεὶς* and provide a clever reversal of Apollonius's passive striking in *τυπεὶς* and active falling in *πέσεν* with the passive falling of *deiectum* and an active striking main verb. This possibility is strengthened by the change of Phaethon from subject in Apollonius to direct object in Varro, but without more of Varro's passage this is only conjecture.

Varro's fifth fragment, which describes the creation of the Dactyls by Anchiale, corrresponds to Apollonius 1.1129-1131 and displays similar fidelity with mild innovation:[235]

> quos magno Anchiale partus adducta dolore
> et geminis cupiens tellurem O<e>axida palmis
> scindere Dicta<–⏑⏑ –⏑⏑–⏑⏑ –⏑>[236]
>
> *Δάκτυλοι Ἰδαῖοι Κρηταιέες, οὕς ποτε νύμφη*
> *Ἀγχιάλη Δικταῖον ἀνὰ σπέος, ἀμφοτέρῃσιν*
> *δραξαμένη γαίης Οἰαξίδος, ἐβλάστησε.*[237]

The loss of most of the final line of this passage is troubling and hinders a full understanding of how Varro approaches his translation here, but we can infer something from what is extant. First, some of Varro's vocabulary is particularly close to Apollonius's. Varro's phrase *tellurem O<e>axida* is essentially identical to *γαίης Οἰαξίδος*, in meaning as well as in the transliterated patronymic and word order. Likewise, Varro retains the relative clause which introduces this passage. Second, Varro displays some originality and Neoteric experimentation in his choice of *geminis...palmis* for Apollonius's *ἀμφοτέρῃσιν*. He expands Apollonius's word into two parts which frame the entire line, like Anchiale's hands tearing apart the earth.

There is, however, a remarkable amount of invention in Varro's fragment that seems at first to be uncharacteristically intrusive. Apollonius simply describes the

---

[235] Servius's quotation of this passage ends abruptly after *Dicta*. Traglia (1974) suggests that the final line reads *Dicta<eo dicta est olim peperisse sub antro>* ("...was said once to have given birth down in the Dictaean cave"), while Courtney (1993) follows Thilo in Tandoi (1984, ix) by offering *Dicta<eo quondam est enixa sub antro>* ("once gave birth down in the Dictaean cave"). Neither reading should be used in analyzing Varro, for the same reasons I have cited above regarding Varro fr.3 in n.204.

[236] "...whom Anchiale while giving birth, induced by great pain
and desiring to split the land of Oeaxus with her twin palms..."

[237] "...the Idaean Dactyls of Crete, whom once the nymph Anchiale, as she grasped with both hands the land of Oaxus, bare in the Dictaean cave" trans. Seaton (1912).

production of the Dactyls, but Varro calls attention to Anchiale's pain in giving birth: *magno...partus adducta dolore* and *cupiens...scindere* have no real precedent in the source text. As Courtney points out,[238] scholiasts provide two interpretations of the birth of Apollonius's Dactyls, one equating their creation with Pyrrha's rock-throwing, the other making Anchiale their biological mother. Varro seems to have favored the latter and adjusted his translation accordingly in order to make the description more explicit. As we will see later in fr.7, Varro sometimes makes additions to Apollonius in order to clarify the source for his audience, though usually he simply expands on detail rather than inserts changes wholesale like his predecessors.

In addition to close rendering, Varro also demonstrates a finely tuned sense of Neoteric style and the ability to manipulate his translation through complex intertextual references. Some of his most innovative and clever reworkings of Apollonius are also the shortest extant fragments. First, in fr.4, the start of which we have already discussed, Varro describes the election of Tiphys as helmsman of the Argo:

Tiphyn aurigam celeris fecere carinae

ἐπὶ δ' ἔτρεπον αἰνήσαντες 400
Τῖφυν ἐυστείρης οἰήμια νηὸς ἔρυσθαι. 401

As is the case with most translation fragments, the lack of a complete passage hinders a full understanding of Varro's technique. Nevertheless, we can see close fidelity in translating: Varro retains *Tiphyn* in the first position, keeps the genitive *νηὸς* in *carinae*, and adds the modifying adjective *celeris* to correspond to Apollonius's *ἐυστείρης*.

[238] Courtney (1993): "As one set of scholia explains, this means that Anchiale (like Pyrrha) threw clods of earth which turned into the Dactyls. Another set of scholia understands Anchiale to have grasped the earth in her birth-pangs, and Varro took it in the same way, which has been assumed to show that he used these scholia; but the error is not hard to commit, and Varro did not need a scholiast to mislead him" (240-241). I do not think that we must necessarily agree with Courtney's argument that Varro's choice is a mistake, since this could just as well be a purposeful personal interpretation.

There are two noteworthy innovations typical of Varro's style. First, Varro avoids recreating Apollonius's compound adjective *ἐυστείρης* exactly, choosing instead to draw a logical conclusion from the Greek into his rendering. As we will see shortly in the case of fr.12, Varro dislikes experimenting with Latin compound adjectives and avoids them wherever possible. In this aversion he follows the tradition of most of his predecessors and contemporaries,[239] eschewing this Neoteric preference which is so prevalent in Catullus.[240] Varro's solution, however, is a clever one: a well-keeled ship is necessarily a swift ship,[241] and hence *celeris...carinae* is essentially identical in thought to *ἐυστείρης…νηός*. It is also noteworthy, especially regarding fr.12, that Varro uses *carinae* to replace *νηός*. In addition to reworking the compound adjective through logical derivation, Varro also maintains the *στείρη* ("keel") in Apollonius's word by replacing the prosaic *νηός* with the metonymous poetic *carinae* ("keel" for "ship").

---

[239] Ross (1969) remarks that Latin poets generally avoid such compounds, with the exception of Ennius and tragedy: "Livius Andronicus had made no attempt (as far as we can see) to introduce Greek compounds to a language natively hostile, and Naevius did little more. It was Ennius who, with the introduction of the hexameter, made a place for compounds in epic and led the dramatists to increase their number. Plautus uses compounds mostly *tragice*, and Terence has very few, limiting them largely to prologues – an interesting indication of how they were viewed by a purist. Their later history in poetry is summed up succinctly by Norden [1957]: 'Mit der freien Wortkomposition sind die augusteischen Dichter, da die sprachschöpferischen Versuche früherer Dichter (zuletzt der Neoteriker), die lateinische Sprache nach dem Muster der griechischen zu bereichern, durch das Verdikt der Analogisten, speziell Caesars, gebrandmarkt waren, äusserst zurückhaltend; erst die zweite neoterische Schule, seit Hadrian, wird wieder freier'" (18-19).

[240] Ross (1969) demonstrates 51 instances of compound adjectives in Catullus, of which 50 lie in the more Neoteric and experimental polymetrics and longer poems.

[241] A number of parallels which demonstrate this point are readily available in Homer. In a description of the approach of Achaean ships to the shore at *Iliad* 1.480-483, the poet mentions the keel with special reference to the swift motion of the boat through the waves:

οἱ δ' ἱστὸν στήσαντ' ἀνά θ' ἱστία λευκὰ πέτασσαν,
ἐν δ' ἄνεμος πρῆσεν μέσον ἱστίον, ἀμφὶ δὲ κῦμα
στείρῃ πορφύρεον μεγάλ' ἴαχε νηὸς ἰούσης·
ἡ δ' ἔθεεν κατὰ κῦμα διαπρήσσουσα κέλευθον.

"...and they set up the mast and spread the white sail. So the wind filled the belly of the sail, and the dark wave sang loudly about the stem of the ship as it went, and it sped over the waves, accomplishing its way" trans. Murray (1999).

Varro's second innovation in this fragment, and the one to which we will give extended attention to in the following pages, lies in *aurigam*, which lacks a direct parallel in Apollonius but which comes from the word ἔρυσθαι. A relatively rare word, *auriga* appears elsewhere in both prose and poetry.[242] Varro's usage here, however, is unique; in fact, it is for this irregularity that the fragment is preserved.[243] Varro uses the term *auriga* to mean "helmsman" in place of the usual "charioteer," and this fragment is the first attested instance of this metaphor.[244] The metaphor is not found in Apollonius, and it appears to be a symptom of Varro's occasional Neoteric variation combined with an intertextual moment with a Neoteric predecessor. Catullus treats the first voyage of the Argo with a similar metaphor in the opening of his epyllion:

> diva quibus retinens in summis urbibus arces 8
> ipsa levi fecit volitantem flamine currum,
> pinea coniungens inflexae texta carinae.[245] 10

The similarities between Varro's line and Catullus's are unmistakable. Every word Varro uses, with the exception of *Tiphyn*, has a direct correspondence to this passage of Catullus. Varro's *fecere* and *carinae* offer precise lexical parallels in Catullus's *fecit* and *carinae*. Likewise, *celeris* invokes the emphasis that Catullus places on the speed of the

[242] See *OLD* s.v. *auriga* 1.

[243] Charisius remarks: *metaphora est dictio translata a propria significatione ad non propriam similitudinem decoris aut necessitatis aut cultus gratia...sicut 'Tiphyn aurigam celeris fecere carinae;' ab agitatore ad gubernatorem transtulit* ("Metaphor is a saying translated from a specific meaning to a non-specific analogy for the sake of ornament or necessity or style...just as 'they made Tiphys the charioteer of the swift ship;' he translated from 'charioteer' to 'helmsman'" (*Ars Grammatica* K 272).

[244] See *TLL* s.v. *auriga* 2

[245] "The goddess who keeps her strongholds on the cities' heights
herself made the chariot flying with a light breeze,
joining woven pine to curved keel."

Argo throughout the opening lines of the poem. Thomas[246] comments on passages from Diodorus Siculus[247] and Hyginus[248] describing an alternate etymology for the Argo's name from the Greek word *ἀργός* ("swift"). The latter of these two authors suggests that Callimachus likewise played with the etymology of the Argo. Thomas argues that Catullus employs *cita decurrere* (64.6), *verrentes* (64.7), *levi...volitantem...currum* (64.11), and *tortaque...spumis incanuit* (64.13) so that he can emphasize the ship's swiftness and bolster the etymological connection between *ἀργός* and *Ἀργώ*. Thus, Varro's *celeris* is informed by Catullus's treatment of the ship.

Varro's final debt to Catullus in this fragment fully explains the reason for Varro's choice of *auriga* and demonstrates clearly both brilliant intertextual remodelling and the application of Neoteric allusion and style to his translation. Catullus calls the Argo a *currus*, a metaphor well-attested elsewhere both in Greek and Latin.[249] As with

---

[246] Thomas (1982, 151-152).

[247] Diodorus Siculus 4.41.3: *τὴν δὲ ναῦν Ἀργὼ προσαγορευθῆναι κατὰ μέν τινας τῶν μυθογράφων ἀπὸ τὸ σκάφος ἀρχιτεκτονήσαντος Ἄργου καὶ συμπλεύσαντος...ὡς δ' ἔνιοι λέγουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ τὸ τάχος ὑπερβολῆς, ὡς ἂν τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀργὸν τὸ ταχὺ προσαγορευόντων* ("The vessel was called Argo after Argus, as some writers of myths record, who was the master-builder of the ship and went along on the voyage...but, as some say, after its exceeding great swiftness, since the ancients called what is swift *argos*" trans. Oldfather, 1935).

[248] Hyginus *Astronomica* 2.37: *nonnulli propter celeritatem graece dixerunt Argo appellatum. 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* ("Some said that it was called 'Argo' in Greek because of its swiftness [*ἀργός* = "swift"]. Pindar says that it was made in a town in Magnesia whose name is Demetrias, but Callimachus says that it was made in the same borders near the temple of Apollo of the Shore, which the Argonauts are thought to have founded as they were setting out in that place which is called Pagasae because the Argo is said to have been *built* in that place, because in Greek *παγᾶσαι* is 'to build'").

[249] Davis (1966, 3) notes appearances of the ship-as-chariot metaphor as early as Homer (*Odyssey* 4.707-709: *οὐδέ τί μιν χρεὼ / νηῶν ὠκυπόρων ἐπιβαινέμεν, αἵ θ' ἁλὸς ἵπποι / ἀνδράσι γίγνονται*, "He had no need to go on board swift-faring ships, which serve men as horses of the deep" trans. Murray, 1998) and Plautus (*Rudens* vv.268-269: *nempe equo ligneo per vias caerulas / estis vectae?*, "Brought by 'wooden steed across the azure main,' I suppose?" trans. Nixon, 1932), as well as the direct metaphor in Aeschylus *Septem Contra Thebas* vv.206-207 and Valerius Flaccus *Argonautica* 8.139. Courtney (1993, 240) notes similar comparanda.

the rest of the fragment, Varro's model is Catullus: Varro draws *auriga* as a term for the helmsman of the Argo directly from Catullus's unique use of *currus* to describe the Argo itself. As with his reinterpretation of Apollonius's compound *ἐνστείρης*, Varro makes a logical connection and infers that the ship, which is a chariot in Catullus's version, should have a charioteer at its helm. His choice to retain Catullus's chariot metaphor also seems motivated by the position of this passage in Apollonius and by Catullus's variation on the Argo's chronology. The selection of Tiphys as helmsman occurs immediately after the maiden launching of the ship at Apollonius 1.383-390:

τοὶ δὲ παρᾶσσον 383
ᾧ κράτει βρίσαντες ἰῇ στυφέλιξαν ἐρωῇ
νειόθεν ἐξ ἕδρης, ἐπὶ δ' ἐρρώσαντο πόδεσσιν 385
προπροβιαζόμενοι· ἡ δ' ἔσπετο Πηλιὰς Ἀργὼ
ῥίμφα μάλ'· οἱ δ' ἑκάτερθεν ἐπίαχον ἀίσσοντες.
αἱ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὸ τρόπιδι στιβαρῇ στενάχοντο φάλλαγγες
τριβόμεναι· περὶ δέ σφιν ἀιδνὴ κήκιε λιγνὺς
βριθοσύνῃ, κατόλισθε δ' ἔσω ἁλός.[250] 390

Catullus's opening to the epyllion at *c.*64.4-15 likewise describes the initial journey:

cum lecti iuvenes, Argivae robora pubis, 4
auratam optantes Colchis avertere pellem 5
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. 10
illa rudem cursu prima imbuit Amphitriten;
quae simul ac rostro ventosum proscidit aequor
tortaque remigio spumis incanuit unda,
emersere feri candenti e gurgite vultus
aequoreae monstrum Nereides admirantes.[251] 15

[250] "...and they at once, leaning with all their strength, with one push started the ship from her place, and strained with their feet, forcing her onward; and Pelian Argo followed swiftly; and they on each side shouted as they rushed on. And then the rollers groaned under the sturdy keel as they were chafed, and round them rose up a dark smoke owing to the weight, and she glided into the sea..." trans. Seaton (1912).

[251] "When the chosen youths, strength of the Argive men,
wanting to take the golden fleece from Colchis
dared to run down on the salty shoals with their swift ship,

Catullus pulls some of his details from Apollonius's version of the Argo's first launch: *robora* v.4 seems to come from *κράτει* v.384, though the connection is not grammatically strong, and *cita...puppi* v.6 draws on *Ἀργὼ ῥίμφα* vv.386-387. The most important correspondences, however, are *decurrere* v.6, which invokes *κατόλισθε* v.390 both in form and meaning,[252] and *vada salsa* v.6, which provides a modified rendering of *ἁλός* v.390.[253] The Argo is launched into the sea for the first time in both Apollonius's passage and in *c*.64, and Catullus maintains the sense of this initial launch in his precise lexical choices. The *vada salsa* are the shallows immediately off shore,[254] and Catullus invents this usage in order to cover every step of the Argo's journey from construction to sailing, including the initial touching of the ship to the water on the beach, in these few lines.

---

sweeping the blue sea with fir paddles.
The goddess who keeps her strongholds on the cities's heights
herself made the chariot flying with a light breeze,
joining woven pine to curved keel.
That ship first dipped in pure Amphitrite in its course;
as soon as it ploughed the windy plain
and the churned, spraying wave whitened with the oars,
wild faces emerged from the bubbling eddy,
the Nymphs of the sea plain wondering at this oddity."

[252] Thomas (1982) remarks: "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, where the Argo put in to take on drinking water: *Ἀργὼ 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?" (153-154). Although I cede that Thomas may be correct, I think the likelier source for Catullus's unique usage comes instead from the same passage in Apollonius of which other echoes appear.

[253] Fordyce (1961) calls Catullus's use of *vada salsa* an "epic phrase" (278), and Thomson (1997) notes that "C. is the first to use the poetic word *vada* for 'sea'" (394), but neither note the strong connection between Apollonius's launching of the Argo and Catullus's passage. The phrase *vada salsa* is neither simply an epic conceit nor *ars gratia artis variae*, but a conscious and purposeful invocation of Catullus's source.

[254] See *OLD* s.v. *vada* 1. Especially relevant are Plautus *Rudens* vv.164-171, in which the slave girl Palaestra is tossed out of her boat by waves breaking near shore but quickly stands up and is in the shallows (*in vadost*), Livy *Ab Urbe Condita* 22.19.12 (*in litus passim naves egerunt, atque alii vadis, alii sicco litore excepti...perfugere*, "Everywhere they drove their ships onto the shore, and some taken up in the shoals, others on the dry shore fled"), and Tacitus *Germania* 45.4, in which men walk and gather amber washed up on the shore and still rolling in the shoals.

Likewise, the Argonauts dared "to run the ship down" (*decurrere*) into the shoals, calling attention to the effort of moving the ship off the land and into the sea.

Catullus also modifies Apollonius's description greatly in making the Argo the first ship.[255] Much of the vocabulary that Catullus uses draws attention to the novelty of sailing and the dearth of terms specific to the new means of transportation: *decurrere* v.6, *abiegnis...palmis* v.7, *volitantem...currum* v.9, *proscidit* v.12, and *monstrum* v.15 all mark the Argo's voyage as *sui generis* and indescribable by nautical terms not yet in existence.[256] Catullus applies this unusual metaphor of chariot because there is no such word as "ship" when the first ship sets sail. Thus, he reworks Apollonius's version of events in a distinct way and makes the launching of the Argo his own in *c.*64.

Varro saw Catullus's appropriation of Apollonius in his version of the Argo's launching, but he also noticed the reworking of the myth so that the Argonauts are the first sailors. Varro presumably follows Catullus in making his Argo the first ship,[257] and his *aurigam* performs the same function as Catullus's unique vocabulary: there is no concept of a helmsman, since Tiphys is the first, so Varro instead reuses the metaphor from Catullus 64.9 and reads Apollonius through a Neoteric predecessor who deals with the same scene.

---

[255] For a fuller discussion of Catullus's reworking of the tradition of the Argo's chronology relative to other seafaring vessels, as well as his possible sources and intentions, see Weber (1983). For a good summary of the competing traditions of Argo's primacy before Catullus, see Jackson (1997).

[256] Thomson (1997) notes that each of these words "seeks to suggest the novelty of seafaring by the want of proper words for ships and sailing" (393). Weber (1982, 128) also says that the strange paradox of inanimate objects actively performing unusual actions (i.e., swimming and flying) indicates the overall uniqueness of the Argo as first ship.

[257] As usual, it is impossible to judge what else Varro did in the lost portions of his translation, but nevertheless I believe such purposeful echoing of Catullus suggests at least awareness of this alternate version of the myth and, since he develops Catullus's metaphor further it seems likely that he followed Catullus's chronology elsewhere.

It is important to note that Catullus's usage of *currus* appears nowhere else than in the opening passage to *c* 64.[258] This experimentation with explicit metaphor seems to be a Neoteric trait and is why Varro so eagerly picks up on this stylistic feature in his translation and, like Catullus, provides a virtual *hapax* with *auriga* as *gubernator*.[259] A brief discussion of a comparable treatment of the ship as chariot helps to demonstrate that this approach to metaphor is particularly Neoteric.

At *Aeneid* 5.142-147, Vergil describes the beginning of the regatta at the games in honor of Anchises and compares the ships to chariots rushing from their starting post:

> infindunt pariter sulcos, totumque dehiscit 142
> convulsum remis rostrisque tridentibus aequor.
> non tam praecipites biiugo certamine campum
> corripuere ruuntque effusi carcere currus, 145
> nec sic immissis aurigae undantia lora
> concussere iugis pronique in verbera pendent.[260] 147

Vergil pulls his regatta from Homer's chariot race,[261] and he also draws greatly on Catullus's and Varro's passages,[262] but he is careful to avoid the Neoteric metaphor. The

---

[258] Fordyce (1961, 279) points this out. Thomas (1982) remarks: "*Currum* is striking. Contrary to *ThLL* 4.1520.49, it is the *only* instance of the word meaning 'ship'...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" (152 n.29).

[259] The next time the word appears in this usage is in Ovid's *Tristia* 1.4.1-16, where the poet describes his stormy voyage towards exile. Ovid pulls his usage of this rare word directly from Varro, and the rest of his passage is a complicated display of intertextual fireworks drawing on Catullus and Vergil. For a fuller discussion of why Ovid chooses to use Varro, as well as evidence for Ovid's usage as a direct result of a desire for distinct Neoteric style, see APPENDIX A: OVID'S *NAVITA*, *RECTOR*, AND *AURIGA*, pp.171-172.

[260] "They cleave the furrows abreast, and all the sea gapes open, uptorn by the oars and triple-pointed beaks. Not such the headlong speed when in the two-horse chariot race the cars seize the plain and dart forth from their stalls! Not so wildly over their dashing steeds do the charioteers shake the waving reins, bending forward to the lash!" trans. Fairclough (1935).

[261] Homer's race appears at *Iliad* 23.362-538. For a fuller discussion of Vergil's treatment of the race as it relates to Homer's, see Willcock (1988).

[262] A full elucidation of Vergil's reliance on Catullus and Varro in this passage has, to my knowledge, not yet been attempted, and it is beyond the scope of this study. A few points of connection between Vergil and

ships run with a speed surpassing chariots (*currus* v.145) and are urged on by their helmsmen more quickly than horses by their charioteers (*aurigae* v.146). Note that Vergil pulls his comparison between ships and chariots directly from his Neoteric predecessors, taking *currus* from Catullus and *aurigae* from Varro in order to invoke Homer.[263] Vergil removes the metaphorical sense, replacing it instead with a simile. This approach, then, seems to have been abandoned after the Neoterics and the epic simile becomes more prominent.

Thus, Varro's rendering of Apollonius in fr.4 is largely the result of Neoteric poetics applied to translation technique in order to maintain fidelity to the original while innovating with complex intertextuality. The image of the helmsman as charioteer comes from Catullus's earlier treatment of the launch of the Argo, and the use of metaphor is a Neoteric trait. Varro's development of Apollonius's compound adjective *ἐυστείρης*, however, is the result of logical analysis of etymology in order to follow the Latin tradition of avoiding compound adjectives, so prominent in Catullus's poetry, while still staying as close to the source text as possible.

We can see, therefore, a marked preference in Varro for close translation with some moderate poetic innovation. The geneaology of Nauplius is a fairly simple passage in the *Argonautika* and poses few difficulties for reproduction. The only especially interesting effect that Apollonius creates is the framing of *Δαναοῖο... Δαναίς* with a reverse chronological order of parentage, which Varro deftly recreates. Likewise, fr.11 is

---

Catullus, however, will help demonstrate that Vergil takes a Neoteric passage and renders it in an Augustan style, altering the earlier approaches to metaphor/simile with the same subject matter. Vergil's *adductis* ***spumant*** *freta* ***versa*** *lacertis* 5.141 is strongly reminiscent of Catullus's ***torta****que remigio* ***spumis*** *incanuit unda c*.64.13, *infindunt sulcos* 5.142 is almost identical in sense to *proscidit aequor c*.64.12, and *currus* 5.145 (used literally in Vergil) comes from *currum c*.64.9.

[263] Willcock (1988): "As the boats get under way, in lines 144-147, he cleverly compares them with chariots starting a race, thus alluding to his model" (11).

straightforward and, except for the Neoteric apostrophe drawn from earlier in Apollonius, Varro keeps his translation restrained. His fourth fragment, however, demonstrates remarkable skill and complicated intertextuality, which he demonstrates elsewhere with great effect. There are several passages in which Apollonius innovates cleverly, and Varro's attempts to reproduce such innovation are interesting for understanding his technique and approach to translation.

In fr.12, which corresponds to Apollonius 4.1561, Varro mentions Libya as a land filled with wild beasts:

> feta feris Libye
>
> *Λιβύῃ Θηροτρόφῳ*[264]

Unfortunately, most of the Latin line is lost and only a hemistich remains. However, it is still possible to note a bit of clever wordplay on Varro's part. Varro breaks apart Apollonius's compound adjective, as is usual for Latin authors, but he retains every sense of the word in his translation: *fera* is a straightforward, precise equivalent for *θήρ*, but Varro's innovation lies in his replacement of *τρόφη* ("nourishing") with *feta* ("pregnant"). In addition to having the sense of *gravida* ("currently pregnant"), *feta* can also denote a mother which has just given birth to young and is currently nursing them.[265] In fact, the passage in which Varro's fragment is preserved demonstrates precisely this point, though the commentator misses the subtle difference between *gravida* and *feta*. Comparing Varro's usage with that in Vergil's *Georgics* at 3.176, DServ comments that *feta* frequently takes the place of *gravida*: *antiqui...fetum pro gravido solebant ponere ut Varro Atacinus* ("The ancients used to put 'newly-delivered' in place of 'pregnant,' as

[264] Varro: "in Libya pregnant with beasts"; Apollonius: "in beast-nurturing Libya."

[265] See *OLD* s.v. *fetus* 1.

Varro Atacinus"). Vergil's passage describes the nursing of newborn calves by their mothers and the resulting loss of milk for the farmer's personal use:

> nec tibi fetae 176
> more patrum nivea implebunt mulctraria vaccae,
> sed tota in dulcis consument ubera natos.[266] 178

Immediately before this passage at *Georgics* 3.139-142, Vergil gives a warning concerning these mothers-to-be, urging his audience not to allow them to draw a plow or overly exert themselves when they are pregnant:

> exactis gravidae cum mensibus errant, 139
> non illas gravibus quisquam iuga ducere plaustris 140
> non saltu superare viam sit passus et acri
> carpere prata fuga fluviosque innare rapacis.[267] 142

Vergil makes a clear distinction between the mothers when they are pregnant and when they have recently given birth: the former are *gravidae*, still heavy with their unborn offspring, while the latter are *fetae*, having just birthed and begun nurturing their young.

Varro cleverly utilizes this subtle meaning of *feta* in his reworking of Apollonius. In a looser sense, the word can simply mean "teeming," and this sense is found elsewhere in late Republican authors.[268] However, *feta* also suggests that Libya is in a state of nurturing the beasts that inhabit there, since the word denotes a period immediately after birth proper. Varro thus etymologizes and reproduces both the sense of the phrase and the literal meaning of *Θηροτρόφῳ*.

---

[266] "And not for you will the new mothers,
the heifers, fill snow-white milking pails as they did for our fathers,
but they will use up their whole udders for their sweet young."

[267] "When the burdened cows wander, their months filled out,
let no one allow them to carry the yokes with burdensome carts,
nor to leap across the road and in rough flight
to graze the meadows and swim the rapid streams."

[268] See *OLD* s.v. *fetus* 3b.

Varro plays with etymology in another passage, when he describes the Corycian nymphs cheering on Apollo in fr.7, which corresponds to Apollonius 2.711-712:

> te nunc Coryciae tendentem spicula nymphae
> hortantes 'o Phoebe' et 'ieie' conclamarunt
>
> *πολλὰ δὲ Κωρύκιαι νύμφαι, Πλείστοιο θύγατρες*
> *θαρσύνεσκον ἔπεσσιν, "ἵη ἴε" κεκληγυῖαι*[269]

As Hunter notes,[270] Apollonius's lines provide an aitiology for the cry *ἵη ἴε*. Callimachus offers the most straightforward explanation for the connection between Apollo and the formulaic shout in his Hymn to Apollo in vv. 97-103:

> *ἰὴ ἰὴ παιῆον ἀκούομεν, οὕνεκα τοῦτο* 97
> *Δελφός τοι πρώτιστον ἐφύμνιον εὕρετο λαός,*
> *ἧμος ἐκηβολίην χρυσέων ἐπεδείκνυσο τόξων.*
> *Πυθώ τοι κατιόντι συνήντετο δαιμόνιος θήρ,* 100
> *αἰνὸς ὄφις. τὸν μὲν σὺ κατήναρες ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλῳ*
> *βάλλων ὠκὺν ὀιστόν, ἐπηύτησε δὲ λαός,*
> *"ἰὴ ἰὴ παιῆον, ἴει βέλος."*[271] 103

The nymphs thus shout *ἵη ἴε* because Apollo shot (*ἵημι*) his weapon at the serpent. In the *Argonautika*, however, the only glimpse at the link between Apollo and the explicit Callimachean aitiology of *ἵη ἴε* from *ἵημι* appears several lines earlier in vv.705-706, when Apollonius mentions the slaying of the Delphic serpent with a bow:

---

[269] Varro: "Now the Corycian nymphs urging you holding darts shout "Phoebus, ieie!"; Apollonius: "And often the Corycian nymphs, daughters of Pleistus, took up the sheering strain crying ["*Hië, Hië*!"] trans. Seaton (1912). I have modified Seaton's translation slightly in order to retain the etymological gloss and incorporate the correction of *Ἰήιε* ("healer" in Seaton's text) to *ἵη ἴε* by Fränkel, for which emendation see Hunter (1986, 60).

[270] Hunter (1986, 57-60).

[271] "*Hië hië paiëon* is your refrain:
the Delphians invented it, the day your skill
at shooting the golden bow appeared:
prodigious the beast, fearsome the snake you met
and slew on the road to Pytho, firing arrows
thick and fast, while the people cheered you on:
'*hië hië paiëon*: hurl your shaft!'" trans. Nisetich (2001).

ὥς ποτε πετραίῃ ὑπὸ δειράδι Παρνησσοῖο	705
Δελφύνην τόξοισι πελώριον ἐξενάριζεν[272]	706

The word *τόξοισι* is the only etymological connection in Apollonius between the shooting of the dart and the formulaic shout, but his audience would certainly have been able to understand the implication and recognize an etymology only hinted at in the text.[273]

Varro clearly understood Apollonius's oblique reference, either on his own or through the help of Callimachus,[274] and maintains the etymology in a very Apollonian manner. The phrase *tendentem spicula* ("holding darts") appears nowhere in the Greek and in fact replaces the patronymic phrase *Πλείστοιο θύγατρες* v.711 ("daughters of Pleistus"). Varro's choice of the diminutive *spicula* marks the translation with a distinctive Neoteric feel,[275] but Varro blends his own style with Apollonius's understated allusivity. As O'Hara notes,[276] this addition by Varro provides the etymological

[272] "How once beneath the rocky ridge of Parnassus he slew with his bow the monster Delphyne" trans. Seaton (1912).

[273] Hunter (1986) remarks: "...the link between *ἰέναι* and the ritual cry to Apollo was certainly familiar in the third century. Callimachus makes the derivation completely clear, but in Apollonius we have only *τόξοισι* in v. 706 to help us. This may seem not very significant as all of Apollonius' readers (ancient and modern) know already how Apollo killed the dragon..." (60). Hunter goes on to suggest that Apollonius's roundabout treatment of the aitiology may demonstrate that Callimachus's hymn had been written by time Apollonius finished his work, but rightly adds that the question is far from certain. Whether or not Callimachus's passage was already widely known or even in existence, it is still reasonable to assume that his audience would have been able to understand the reason for the nymphs's shout *ἴη ἴε*.

[274] The influence of Callimachus on Varro is unclear and beyond the scope of this study. Varro may have read Callimachus's Hymn and understood the etymology through it, but there is little trace of the Callimachean lines in Varro's fragment. Varro may have adapted his *tendentem spicula* from some Callimachean phrases (perhaps drawing the participial phrase from *βάλλων ὠκὺν ὀιστόν* v.102, "shooting a swift arrow," and the plural *spicula* from *ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλῳ* v.101, "one after another"), but without more of Varro's text I only offer this suggestion as a remote possibility. Hunter (1986) demonstrates that the etymology was already in the tradition long before the versions of Callimachus or Apollonius, and it may be possible that Varro drew on a lost text or scholiast for his interpretation. I do not suggest, however, that Varro needs to have had an outside source for his innovation.

[275] Lunelli (1991) remarks: "questi moduli formali organizzano poi tessere preziosamente sonore...come il diminutivo disespressizzato e tecnico (se non si tratta di formazione diversa, magari analogica) *spicula*, che presentava una cadenza elegante e 'neoterica'..." (668).

[276] O'Hara (1996, 56).

connection between ἵη ἵε and ἵημι.[277] Whereas Apollonius sets up this etymology only briefly with the word τόξοισι, Varro must include an extended phrase to clarify the reference for his audience. Varro is juggling two of the most difficult problems for a translator aiming at fidelity to sense and word. His audience, whose first language is likely not Greek, might miss the etymological connection inherent in *ieie* since it requires either a preexisting knowledge of the aitiology or a clear understanding of the connection between the pronunciation of the Greek shout, almost completely lost in Varro's transliteration, and that of the verb ἵημι.[278]

Varro also needs to render the wordplay in such a way that he remains a literary translator and does not become a commentator. If he adds too much explanation in an effort to render Apollonius's nuances, he runs the risk of prosaically overburdening the poetry for the sake of clarity. If, however, he simply ignores Apollonius's subtext and the aitiological tradition in his translation, he loses much of his source's cleverness. Varro's solution to this problem is restrained but refined: he does not draw on Callimachus for an explicit explanation, choosing instead a short phrase that calls to mind the etymology in the same way that Apollonius's τόξοισι does. There are no phonetic parallels between ἵη ἵε and either τόξοισι or *tendentem spicula*,[279] and the references in both cases are subtle

[277] "…in *Arg*. Frag. 7 Courtney...Varro reproduces an etymological gloss in his Apollonian model (and in Callimachus): *tendentem spicula* explains *ieie*, as if from ἵημι, 'shoot'" (O'Hara 1996, 56).

[278] Varro makes a quantity and pronunciation change in his rendering of Apollonius's ἵη ἵε. The original consists of a *brevis* and dactyl (∪ / –∪∪), but the Latin transliteration undergoes a synizesis and becomes a spondee with each *i* pronounced as a virtual consonant. It is quite conceivable that the phonetic connection which underlies the etymology, so easily recognizable in the similarity between ἵη ἵε and Callimachus's trisyllabic imperative ἵει, completely escaped the notice of many an ancient reader because of Varro's drastic alteration in pronunciation and the lack of a phonetic equivalent for the word in Latin.

[279] Although there is no Latin parallel for the etymology as it stands in the original, it does not take much imagination to consider possibile alternatives which Varro could have used and which would have presented Apollonius's wordplay more explicitly. Varro could easily have replaced *tendentem* with *iactantem* or another word which would have rendered the sound of his consonantal *ieie*; if we can so

enough to require a bit of searching and individual interpretation on the part of the audience: Varro's choice is thus Apollonian in both content and style. For the audience familiar with the original text, the single phrase *tendentem spicula* calls attention to a purposeful change in the text, but it is as understated a cue as Apollonius's brief aitiological marker ὥς ποτε and single reference to Apollo's bow in τόξοισι.

The *Argonautae* thus displays two consistent translation techniques that Varro favors and that set him apart from his predecessors: first, he remains as faithful as possible to his source while still creating poetry, avoiding mechanical rendering for the most part and aiming at clever ways to transfer both Apollonius's words and sense; second, he colors his translation with a unique Neoteric style, appropriating his source through subtle wordplay and complex intertextuality with his contemporary Catullus.

VARRO ATACINUS'S *EPHEMERIS* AND ARATUS'S *PHAENOMENA*

Varro's *Ephemeris*, of which only two fragments survive, has received some scholarly treatment already,[280] so it will be necessary to mention only a few points as they relate to our discussion of the *Argonautae* and Varro's translation techniques. I will deal briefly with the smaller of these passages, fr.13, in which Varro renders Aratus's comparison of the clouds to wool at *Phaenomena* 938-939:

> *nubes si ut vellera lanae*
> *constabunt.*

---

readily see this option, Varro, as native speaker of some poetic skill, would *a fortiori* have recognized the possibility. The fact that he avoids such overt wordplay is a purposeful choice and one in keeping with Apollonius's own subtle reference.

[280] See especially Williams (1968, 255-260) and Possanza (2004, 44-45).

πολλάκι δ' ἐρχομένων ὑετῶν νέφεα προπάροιθεν	938
οἷα μάλιστα πόκοισιν ἐοικότα ἰνδάλλονται[281]	939

Varro retains the simile, using *ut si* in place of Aratus's *οἷα… ἐοικότα*, and *nubes* matches *νέφεα* precisely. The phrase *vellera lanae* is an expansion of Aratus's simple *πόκοισιν*, and he draws the phrase directly from Lucretius.[282] Again, Varro translates while engaging in intertextuality.

Varro's largest extant fragment, fr.14, translates Aratus *Phaenomena* 942-945 and 954-957, in which he describes the signs of coming rain:[283]

tum liceat pelagi volucres tardaeque paludis	1
cernere inexpletas studio certare lavandi	
et velut insolitum pennis infundere rorem;	
aut arguta lacus circumvolitavit hirundo[284]	

[281] Varro: "The clouds stood still like tufts of wool"; Aratus: "Often before the coming rain fleece-like clouds appear..." trans. Mair (1955).

[282] Courtney (1993, 244) compares Varro with Lucretius *De Rerum Natura* 6.503-505:

concipiunt etiam multum quoque saepe marinum
umorem, veluti pendentia ***vellera lanae****,*
cum supera magnum mare venti nubila portant

"The clouds also often take up a great deal of sea-water besides, like hanging fleeces of wool, when the winds carry clouds above the great sea" trans. Rouse (1992).

[283] Vergil adapts Varro's and Aratus's passages, as well as Cicero's corresponding passage from *Aratea* vv.954-955, in *Georgics* 1.375-376. For further discussion of how Vergil handles all of these authors, as well as a brief comment on the different approaches each poet takes, see Possanza (2004, 42-45) and Thomas (1999, 131).

[284] A brief comment on this line is necessary. Unfortunately, Servius breaks off his quotation halfway through the passage and resumes only once Varro discusses the rain signs of the cow. Consequently, it is impossible to do anything but speculate on how Varro dealt with Aratus *Phaenomena* 944-945, since each topic is dealt with by both authors in distinct sections which fall into two- and three-line groups. Varro elsewhere moves words around to a following line but still remains close to his source. For a similar passage where this is a problem for interpretation, see fr.5 vv.2-3, where Varro seems to almost completely reverse the order of *Argonautika* 1.1130-1131. Williams (1968) remarks: "It looks as if Varro drew selectively from Aratus while preserving his order, because he even omits the participial phrase which Aratus attached to his description of the swallows" (256). I believe Williams is incorrect and Varro likely did have a participial phrase in the next line, but this is only a guess based on the similar circumstance in the problematic fr.5. At any rate, we must consider the possibility that *circumvolitat* is intransitive and that *arguta lacus* is the object of some other verb or participle in the missing next verse.

* * * * *

et bos suspiciens caelum (mirabile visu)	5
naribus aerium patulis decerpsit odorem,	
nec tenuis formica cavis non evehit ova.[285]	7
πολλάκι λιμναῖαι ἢ εἰνάλιαι ὄρνιθες	942
ἄπληστον κλύζονται ἐνιέμεναι ὑδάτεσσιν	
ἢ λίμνην πέρι δηθὰ χελιδόνες ἀίσσονται	
γαστέρι τύπτουσαι αὖτως εἰλυμένον ὕδωρ	945
καὶ βόες ἤδη τοι πάρος ὕδατος ἐνδίοιο	954
οὐρανὸν εἰσανιδόντες ἀπ' αἰθέρος ὠσφρήσαντο·	955
καὶ κοίλης μύρμηκες ὀχῆς ἐξ ὤεα πάντα	
θᾶσσον ἀνηνέγκαντο.[286]	957

As usual, Varro remains faithful to his source: *pelagi volucres* v.1 is remarkably close to *εἰνάλιαι ὄρνιθες* v.942, *hirundo* v.4 matches *χελιδόνες* v.944, *inexpletas* v.2 corresponds to *ἄπληστον* v.943, and *arguta lacus* v.4 is a slight expansion of *εἰλυμένον ὕδωρ* v.944. In the second portion, *et bos suspiciens caelum* v.5 is almost identical to *καὶ βόες…οὐρανὸν εἰσανιδόντες* v.955, *evehit* v.7 corresponds to *ἀνηνέγκαντο* v.957, *formica* v.7 to *μύρμηκες* v.956, *ova* v.7 to *ὤεα* v.956, and *cavis* v.7 is a clever compression of *κοίλης ὀχῆς* v.956.[287] Just as with Varro's choice of mildly Latinizing Greek names in fr.3, many of the compound forms of this passage are simply reworkings with standard Latin prefixes: the

---

[285] "Then you can see the birds of the sea and of the sluggish marsh as, unsated, they struggle with a desire to clean themselves and, they pour dew on their wings as if they had not before; or the swallow flies around the shimmering lake...And the cow looking up at the sky (marvellous to behold!) snatches the airy smell with open nostrils, nor does the tiny ant not carry eggs from the hollows of his home." Note that Varro's *arguta lacus* could easily be the direct object of a participial phrase which would match Aratus's *τύπτουσαι*, in which case the translation would read: "or the swallow flies around, [striking] the shimmering lake..."

[286] "Often the birds of lake or sea insatiably dive and plunge in the water, or around the mere for long the swallows dart, smiting with their breasts the rippling water...And ere now before rain from the sky, the oxen gazing heavenward have been seen to sniff the air, and the ants from their hollow nests bring up in haste all their eggs..." trans. Mair (1955).

[287] There are only two changes that occur in these forms, neither of which appears to be of great significance. First, Varro's adjectival *inexpletas* replaces Aratus's adverbial *ἄπληστον.* Second, all of the animals, with the exception of the *volucres*, are singularized in Varro.

privatives in *inexpletas* and *ἄπληστον*, the *sub*-prefix in *suspiciens* and the *εἰσανα*-prefix of *εἰσανιδόντες*, and the *e*-prefix of *evehit* and the *ἀνα*-prefix of *ἀνηνέγκαντο* are all identical.

One of the more interesting changes that Varro makes is his juxtaposition of Aratus's initial straightforward indicative *κλύζονται* associated with the birds with the periphrastic construction *εἰσανιδόντες…ὠσφρήσαντο* associated with the cows; in Varro's translation, the birds are treated with the periphrastic construction *liceat...cernere* and the cows with the straightforward *decerpsit*. Varro thus inverts Aratus's construction, placing the reference to external viewing in the first position of this passage and then moving into simple description of events. Varro appears to be correcting Aratus's style slightly, beginning with the logical opening of looking at the scenes and then moving completely into the narrative, rather than breaking the flow of the description halfway through by inserting an external audience watching the cows.

There are two additional points of alteration that follow Varro's usual Neoteric technique of occasionally inserting his authorial voice into the translation by means of short phrases: *velut insolitum* and *mirabile visu*.[288] The former is a clever poetic insertion that, like *ecce* in fr.3, helps to draw the reader into the scene.[289] The latter, though, has been seen as perhaps a bit too overblown for the events described, and it is curious that Varro would so recklessly add an unnecessary phrase. I propose that the source of this

[288] Varro has been especially criticized for these intrusions in this passage. Williams (1968) remarks: "The phrase [*velut insolitum*] is, however, a little clumsy for its purpose and somewhat obscure in its intention. But *mirabile visu* is really weak, an unconvincing and artificial piece of poetic posturing, especially attached, as it is, to a nicely observed description" (256). Courtney (1993, 245) follows the latter of Williams's complaints.

[289] Williams (1968) is, I believe, correct in his evaluation of the effect: "The point of *velut insolitum* ('as if it were new to them') is complex. It is not, as the surrounding phrases are, intended to describe objectively, for the water is certainly not new to the birds, but it nudges the reader into adopting for himself an impression that the poet feels as he watches. The intention is excellent and it is absent from Aratus: the didactic poet here establishes an intimate *rapport* with his reader and asks him to share the sensations which he feels" (256).

insertion may very well be Cicero's own translation of this passage of Aratus, of which only the lines corresponding to *Phaenomena* 954-955 have survived:

> mollipedesque boves, spectantes lumina caeli, 954
> naribus umiferum duxere ex aere sucum.[290] 955

Cicero's cows stand "gazing at the lights of heaven" (*spectantes lumina caeli*), seeming far more philosophically contemplative and enlightened than Aratus's cows "looking up at the sky" (*βόες…οὐρανὸν εἰσανιδόντες*). At first glance, Cicero's elaboration seems nothing more than *decus gratia decoris*.[291] Within the context of a poem that is primarily about constellations and the necessity of examining them, however, Cicero may not altogether have made a poor choice, at least in terms of his own personal poetics. As Emma Gee has rightly pointed out, much of Cicero's *Aratea* reworks Aratus in order to emphasize the role of the divine artificer and to view the *Phaenomena* through a distinctly Stoic lens.[292] At *De Natura Deorum* 2.97, Cicero says that no person could look at the sky and not believe that there is a divine hand which guides the movements of the stars.[293] Thus, the

---

[290] "…and the soft-footed cows, gazing at the lights of heaven,
drew from the air with their nostrils the moisture-bearing liquid."

[291] Williams (1968) remarks: "The poetic diction of *lumina caeli* is out of place here, for the cattle have no visual interest in the light of the sky, while the essential motion of upwards is omitted – the cattle only appear to look upwards, really they are elevating their nostrils to the breezes" (257).

[292] For a full and excellent discussion of the relationship between Cicero's *Aratea* and Stoic philosophy, see Gee (2001). Especially useful are her comments on Cicero's alterations and additions to Aratus which demonstrate an active Stoic program, for which see Gee (2001, 523-537) She succinctly sums up her point: "In the 'narrative economy' of the *D.N.D.* [*De Natura Deorum*] itself, the *Aratea* has an additional function: it is used by the Stoic speaker to illustrate the layout of the heavenly bodies, as evidence of divine Providence" (527).

[293] Gee (2001, 528) cites this entire passage for her argument, and I find it helpful to follow her lead:

quis enim hunc hominem dixerit qui, cum tam certos caeli motus tam ratos astrorum ordines tamque inter se omnia conexa et apta viderit, neget in his ullam inesse rationem, eaque casu fieri dicat quae quanto consilio gerantur nullo consilio adsequi possumus? an, cum machinatione quadam moveri aliquid videmus, ut sphaeram ut horas ut alia permulta, non dubitamus quin illa opera sint rationis, cum autem impetum caeli cum admirabili celeritate moveri vertique videamus constantissime conficientem vicissitudines

cows "gazing at the lights of heaven" seem to fit Cicero's general poetic program: they breathe in the moist air not merely because they sense that a storm is coming, but also because they examine the movement of the heavens and, like humans, prognosticate the weather by the constellations.[294]

Varro's insertion of *mirabile visu* thus seems to be a compromise between Aratus's version and Cicero's: Varro's style is far more in keeping with that of his model, but he still retains Cicero's sense of awe at the uncanny actions of cows before a storm and their apparent interest in the sky. This demonstrates clearly one of the fundamental differences between Varro's purpose and technique as a translator and Cicero's. Whereas Cicero has a definite poetic program and appropriates his source with a particular goal in mind, Varro remains as close as possible to his source while still developing a unique and personalized literary creation.

One final remark must be made about Varro and his integration of Cicero within his translation. Cicero's version of this passage from Aratus displays a flare for Alexandrian wordplay and strong Neoteric style reminiscent of Catullus. [295] Both

---

anniversarias cum summa salute et conservatione rerum omnium, dubitamus quin ea non solum ratione fiant sed etiam excellenti divinaque ratione?

"Who would regard a human being as worthy of the name, if upon observing the fixed movements of heaven, the prescribed disposition of the stars, and the conjunction and interrelation of all of creation, he denied the existence of rationality in all these, and claimed that chance was responsible for works created with a degree of wisdom such as our own wisdom fails totally to comprehend? When we observe that some object – an orrery, say, or a clock, or lots of other such things – is moved by some mechanism, we have no doubt that reason lies behind such devices; so when we note the thrust and remarkable speed with which the heavens revolve, completing with absolute regularity their yearly changes, and preserving the whole of creation in perfect safety, do we hesitate to acknowledge that this is achieved not merely by reason, but by reason which is pre-eminent and divine?" *trans* Gee (2001).

[294] The attribution of such human qualities to cows may appear simply bathetic, and for this reason Cicero's line might be judged poor poetry, but we should keep in mind that it was likely a programmatic choice and not simply a flaw in poetic style.

[295] Cicero's *Aratea* was likely written around 89 BC, at a period early in his youth when he still experimented greatly with the ever-increasing influence of Alexandrian poetics. Although Cicero is

mollipedes and *umiferum* are unusual words not found in Aratus, and it is noteworthy that Varro avoids them completely.[296] As we saw in the case of his rendering of Apollonius's compound adjectives, especially in fr.4 (*ἐυστείρης*) and fr.12 (*Θηροτρόφῳ*), Varro tends to reject the Neoteric experimentation with compound adjectives, preferring instead to translate such words through logical analysis. Since there are no such compounds in Aratus's passage which Varro must handle, it is not surprising that he ignores Cicero on this point. Varro thus displays a finely-tuned sense of style and appropriateness and demonstrates that his intertextual references are highly selective and chosen for specific purposes.

---

frequently viewed as supremely anti-Neoteric, he obviously had both the ability and predilection to employ Neoteric style early in his literary career. For discussions of Cicero's view of Neoteric poets, see Crowther (1970), Tuplin (1979), and Clausen (1986). For Cicero's Neoteric tendencies, see Ewbank (1997, 4) and Gee (2001, 522).

[296] Williams (1968) praises Varro for eschewing Cicero's compounds, which he says are "invented for the occasion, the former [*mollipedes*] to avoid the already-existing *tardipedes* and to add an irrelevant notion to the noun" (257).

CHAPTER III: CATULLUS AND THE INCORPORATION OF TRANSLATION WITHIN A POETIC *CORPUS*

Of all literary translators from antiquity, Catullus is arguably the most well-known. He wrote two poems which translate Greek originals in full: *c*.51, which is modeled on Sappho fr.31, and *c*.66, modeled on Callimachus's *Plokamos Berenikes*, fr.110 at the end of the fourth book of the *Aetia*. These two poems represent the height of Neoteric experimentation with translation. They are also unique in that they are the only two self-contained Roman translations which exist in the context of a full poetic *corpus*. Poets who come before and after Catullus rely heavily upon intertextual references that borrow pieces of varying length from Greek originals, but *c*.51 and *c*.66 alone are full poems refashioned and appropriated to a poetic context larger than the translations themselves. In this chapter we will look at both poems individually, examining them in order to understand Catullus's approach to translation, both in his reliance upon his predecessors and in his innovations, and then see how the poems are related to each other and the rest of the *corpus*.

CATULLUS *C.*51 AND SAPPHO FR.31

It seems the fashion in any work on *c.*51 to begin by lamenting the abundance of scholarship on the poem and the paradoxical obfuscation of understanding caused by said scholarship.[297] Likewise, it is in vogue to continue from that point and quarrel about the text of the poem, specifically the status of the fourth stanza. I will largely abstain from this tradition and simply refer the reader to the relevant arguments of my predecessors.[298] One brief note on the text is sufficient: the *otium* stanza is and has always been part of the text of *c.*51,[299] and the inability of scholars to understand its role in the poem is less an indication of manuscript displacement than of the fact that Catullus is more clever than his readers.

Catullus models *c.*51 on Sappho fr.31, the famous *φαίνεταί μοι* poem. Like all other Roman literary translations, Catullus's poem is an adaptation that refers extensively and repeatedly to the source text, but Catullus appropriates Sappho entirely to a new context, style, and purpose.[300] David Kubiak opens his discussion of Catullus with a

[297] Kubiak (1979) offers a typical example: "No poem of Catullus has been the subject of more scholarly discussion than the famous translation from Sappho. Unfortunately, however, this constant attention has done more to obscure than to clarify the poem's significance, since it stems in large part from long and tenaciously held notions concerning the nature of Catullan love poetry" (119).

[298] For an excellent bibliography of the arguments against and for retaining the *otium* stanza, see Finamore (1984, 11 n.1 and n.2, respectively). See also O'Higgins (1990), Vine (1992), and Greene (1999, 12-15)

[299] For a brief history of the text of *c.*51 and editorial judgements which have subsequently tried to remove the final stanza, see Kidd (1963, 298). Fredricksmeyer's (1965) pointed statement sums up the proper sentiment with which to approach the last stanza and its place in the text: "But in any case, in the face of the manuscript evidence the denial of the quatrain as fourth and final stanza of poem 51 is, at best, a counsel of despair" (155).

[300] "Catullus 51, like all artful Latin translations, is not only Sappho translated, by [sic] Sappho reinterpreted, in this case through the prism of Hellenistic literary culture, to which Catullus was direct heir, and from which he took so much else of his artistic inspiration" (Kubiak 1979, 122).

remark about the need to view *c*.51 from a different angle than has traditionally been used:[301]

> ...the only excuse for adding to the already copious literature [on *c*. 51] is to look at these verses from a different viewpoint – to treat 51 as a translation in the tradition of other Roman translations, and therefore to come to its problems not with the question 'what would a love-sick youth be expected to write', but rather 'what would a poet-translator with some pretense to learning be expected to write?'

In the years since Kubiak's dissertation, there have been some remarkable advances in the appreciation of Catullus's complexity in *c*.51, but although Kubiak and others have done much to further understanding of Catullus's translation there still remains much which needs examination. We will try to recontextualize *c*.51 in light of those translators we have already examined and demonstrate that, rather than simply continuing in the tradition of his predecessors, Catullus both draws on the poets before him and brings a new dimension to Latin literary translation. Because of the exceptional attention that the poem has received by scholars in the past century, many of the paths which we tread in the following section are necessarily well-worn and owe much to the work of others, but they are nevertheless essential to a full understanding of Catullus's translation approach and techniques.

Sappho fr.31 describes the reaction of the speaker to an encounter between an unnamed beloved and a male character known only as "that man":[302]

---

[301] Kubiak (1979, 121).

[302] I have followed the text of Page (1959), with the exception of the problematic thirteenth line, for which I follow Lobel (1925), and the sixteenth verse, for which I follow Campbell (1967). Page (1959) remarks on Lobel's version: "There remains the objection that we have still given no account of *ψυχρός*: and indeed there is no particular reason to suppose that the corruption lies rather in *ψυχρός* than in *κακχέεται*" (25). He goes on to offer a possible order of corruption which led to the current state of the text from *ψῦχρος ἔχει*, but I do not find this to be any more convincing a guess than Lobel's emendation and feel that the papyrus fragment An. Ox. i.208, which reads *ἀδεμ' ἰδρὼς κακὸς χέεται*, cannot be so readily ignored.

φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος ἴσος θέοισιν
ἔμμεν' ὤνηρ, ὄττις ἐνάντιός τοι
ἰσδάνει καὶ πλάσιον ἆδυ φωνεί-
σας ὑπακούει

καὶ γελαίσας ἰμέροεν, τό μ' ἦ μὰν
καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν·
ὠς γὰρ ἔς σ' ἴδω βρόχέ', ὤς με φώναι-
σ' οὐδ' ἒν ἔτ' εἴκει,

ἀλλ' ἄκαν μὲν γλῶσσα ἔαγε,[303] λέπτον
δ' αὔτικα χρῷ πῦρ ὐπαδεδρόμηκεν,
ὀππάτεσσι δ' οὐδ' ἒν ὄρημμ', ἐπιρρόμ-
βεισι δ' ἄκουαι,

κὰδ δέ μ' ἴδρως κακχέεται, τρόμος δὲ
παῖσαν ἄγρει, χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας
ἔμμι, τεθνάκην δ' ὀλίγω 'πιδεύης
†φαίνομ' ἔμ' αὔτ[α†

ἀλλὰ πὰν τόλματον, ἐπεὶ †καὶ πένητα†[304]

[303] Both Page (1959) and Campbell (1967) have placed daggers around *γλῶσσα ἔαγε*, though this seems unnecessary. Campbell (1967) remarks: "...the hiatus would be irregular, and the meaning 'my tongue is broken', unsatisfactory, although Lucretius 3.155 in an echo of the present passage has *infringi linguam*. Cobet suggested *πέπαγε*, 'my tongue is fixed in silence (*ἄκαν*)', which is close to Catullus' *lingua sed torpet*" (272). I think Page's (1959, 24-25) objections are entirely too restrictive and require a Sappho more formulaic than inventive, and Campbell's intertextual reference to Lucretius seems to justify the sense of the phrase as it stands in the manuscript.

[304] "To me he seems like a god
the man who sits facing you
and hears you near as you speak
softly and laugh

in a sweet echo that jolts
the heart in my ribs. For now
as I look at you my voice
is empty and

can say nothing as my tongue
cracks and slender fire is quick
under my skin. My eyes are dead
to light, my ears

pound, and sweat pours over me.
I convulse, greener than grass,
and feel my mind slip as I
go close to death,

yet I must suffer all things,
being poor." trans. Barnstone (1998).

Catullus 51 describes a similar event, though the beloved is explicitly named “Lesbia” and the speaker “Catullus”:[305]

ille mi par esse deo videtur,
ille, si fas est, superare divos,
qui sedens adversus identidem te
spectat et audit

dulce ridentem, misero quod omnis
eripit sensus mihi: nam simul te,
Lesbia, aspexi, nihil est super mi
<–∪∪––>

lingua sed torpet, tenuis sub artus
flamma demanat, sonitu suopte
tintinant aures, gemina teguntur
lumina nocte.

otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est;
otio exsultas nimiumque gestis;
otium et reges prius et beatas
perdidit urbes.[306]

---

[305] I follow Thomson’s text, except for the eighth line, which I have omitted since it was not in manuscript V and Ritter’s emendation *vocis in ore* is, though elegant, an unjustifiable conjecture.

[306] “That man seems to me like a god –
that man seems, if it may be said, to pass the gods,
who sits across from you and again and again
watches and hears

you sweetly laughing, which from me all my
senses rips: for as soon as I have seen you,
Lesbia, nothing is left for me
* * * * *

but my tongue goes numb, a thin flame drips
under my limbs, my ears buzz with
their own noise, my eyes are covered
by double night.

Ease, Catullus, is distressing to you;
you revel in ease and have it too much;
ease has, both for kings and cities before,
led to their downfall”

As in the case of Livius Andronicus and Lutatius Catulus, whose translations, alone of those we have looked at thus far, retain their extant opening lines, the first line of *c*.51 is highly programmatic. It establishes many of the expectations that Catullus wants his audience to have as it goes through the remainder of the poem. And, as most scholars have noticed, Catullus's opening line is about as close to a verbatim translation as possible. Every word of Sappho's line is represented by Catullus's: *φαίνεται* by *videtur*, *μοι* by *mi*, *κῆνος* by *ille*, *ἴσος* by *par*, and *θέοισιν* by *deo*. The rhythm of the lines is retained almost exactly as well.[307] Catullus thus makes his source readily apparent to his audience, and he does so more fully than Catulus, Germanicus, or Ovid.[308]

There are two mild changes that affect the fidelity of the translation very little, but have important implications for the following lines. Both create an audience expectation of a literal translation and then allow Catullus to undercut that expectation and place his poem in a competitive position with Sappho's original. First, the word order is shifted slightly. Sappho's *κῆνος* comes at a non-emphatic middle position, but Catullus's *ille* is placed in the most emphatic opening position. This sort of rearrangement for emphasis is not unusual for Roman translators[309] and does not draw special attention to itself. The change, however, does more than simply shift the audience's attention away from the

---

[307] "Compare not only the close approximation of thought in Catullus' translation of Sappho 31.1 in poem 51.1, but also the almost identical word patterns:

Sappho – ∪ – | x | – ∪ | ∪ – | ∪ – x
Catullus – ∪ | – | x | – ∪ | ∪ – | ∪ – x" (Loomis 1972, 23 n.2).

[308] See above, pp.32-35.

[309] Kubiak (1979) notes: "Rearrangement of this sort had been done already by Cicero, who like Catullus felt that the first place of the line was to be a place reserved, and so often changes his Greek in order to bring an important pronoun into that position" (127). For comparanda, see Kubiak (1979, 127-128) on Cicero's use of this technique.

female beloved and onto the male rival.[310] It hints subtly at a vital statement of poetics, which we will discuss shortly, that Catullus makes in the next line in his repetition of *ille*, again in the emphatic opening position. Because *ille* is essentially identical to κῆνος and the rearrangement of demonstrative order has precedent in Latin translators before Catullus, it is difficult for even the attentive audience to notice any significance in the change, and this deceptive subtlety makes the effect of the second verse and the repetition of *ille* all the more striking.

Related to the delayed impact of the relocation of *ille* is Catullus's singular *deo* which represents Sappho's plural θέοισιν. There are two reasons for this change. Catullus, like Catulus before him with the combination of Callimachus's two half-souls into one *animus*,[311] makes the poem less abstract and focuses on singular events and characters. In addition, and more importantly for the rest of the poem, the change in number of θέοισιν/*deo* achieves the same effect as the displacement of κῆνος/*ille*. Catullus sets up the expectation of a literal translation and then positions himself with respect to his model by echoing both the singular *deo* and Sappho's plural θέοισιν in the second line with *divos*.

The first verse shows, therefore, Catullus's active attempt to make his source text as apparent as possible and to suggest to his audience that what will follow is not only a close translation, but rather an almost literal rendering. The verse declares that the poem is not without art, but certainly offers little of novelty. The second verse (*ille, si fas est,*

[310] Greene (1999) argues that "the figure of 'that man' (*ille*) dominates the first stanza of the poem, whereas in Sappho's original, the man serves primarily to point up the contrast between the impassivity *he* exhibits and the speaker's highly charged emotional responses to the woman...This [Catullus's repetition of *ille*] not only changes the emphasis from the perceiver to the object of the speaker's looking, but, more importantly, suggests that the speaker's main focus of attention is not the object of desire, the woman, but the presence of another man" (4). I do not necessarily disagree with Greene's assertion, but this shift of focus does not seem to be the primary purpose of the repeated *ille* and the emphatic repositioning.

[311] See above, pp.36-39.

superare divos) completely undercuts this expectation, as it represents nothing found in Sappho's poem and is wholly Catullus's invention. Within the two opening lines Catullus builds up the expectation of a literal translation and removes it, calling into question the actual goal behind the use of Sappho.[312]

The second verse reveals much about how Catullus views his translation and its relationship to the source text. First, let us deal with the effect raised by Catullus's subtle change of *deo* and repositioning of *ille* in the first line. In v.2, Catullus finally gives the audience the equivalent of Sappho's plural θέοισιν in *divos*. Catullus sets up the singular *deo* in the initial verse specifically so that he can expand it later.[313] It is significant, however, that in its new delayed context the emphasis is no longer on equality (ἴσος, *par*)[314] but on superiority (*superare*). Catullus's unnamed godlike man, who is in roughly the same situation as Sappho's man in her first line, reappears and surpasses the gods. The pluralization of *divos* calls the audience's attention to Sappho's plural θέοισιν, but the twice-mentioned *ille* achieves more than Sappho's κῆνος. Catullus engages in an intertextual dialogue with Sappho, essentially saying: "Yes, Sappho, your κῆνος and my *ille* start out in the same place, but look as I point mine out again to show how he one-ups yours and outdoes your multiple gods." Catullus's line illustrates Russell's point that an

[312] "Line 2 of Catullus has no equivalent in Sappho and this divergence does have some significance. Not only is the correction by strengthening of Sappho's expression a hint to the reader that Catullus' poem is not simply a translation of Sappho but, more important, the exaggeration is suited to the difference in tone between Catullus and Sappho..." (Kinsey 1974, 374).

[313] "The rhetorical function of Catullus' singular *deo* is, however, plain: the use of the singular allows Catullus his calculated use of the plural in the crescendo of line 2. When the plural noun does occur it is the solemn *divos*...Since the two forms are juxtaposed we must suppose that Catullus wishes to draw attention to the more imposing sonority of the former noun" (Kubiak 1979, 130).

[314] The question of whether *par* should be taken to be equal in happiness or in strength has long bothered scholars, and I do not propose to offer a solution here. For discussion of this point, see Khan (1966, 454-455), Wills (1967, 174-182), Kinsey (1974, 374-375), and O'Higgins (1990, 158).

author engaging in *mimesis* is in competition with his source,[315] and it likewise offers an excellent example of Thomas's corrective intertextual reference.[316]

Catullus's statement is not a flippant dismissal of Sappho as inferior. On the contrary, his use of Sappho demonstrates a clear respect for Sappho's language and sentiment.[317] This approach to translation through rivalry with the source text may seem unusual, but we have already seen a precedent in Catulus's polemic appropriation of Callimachus in anti-Callimachean terms.[318] The second line places Catullus's poem within a tradition and declares that the translation not only relies upon Sappho, but takes her poem further and in a different direction.[319] The limiting phrase *si fas est* helps to define the purpose of the second line. In addition to providing a distinctively Roman context for the translation,[320] it also restrains the tone of competition in Catullus's *superare divos*. Catullus's poem is equal to Sappho's, and perhaps even develops it further, if it is not an affront to Sappho to make such a statement.

---

[315] See Russell's (1979) fifth point above, n.74.

[316] "Perhaps the quintessentially Alexandrian type of reference is what I would call **correction**, Giangrande's *oppositio in imitando*. This type, more than any other, demonstrates the scholarly aspect of the poet and reveals the polemical attitudes that lie close beneath the surface of much of the best poetry of Rome. The process is quite straightforward, at least in its working principles: the poet provides unmistakable indications of his source, then proceeds to offer detail that contradicts or alters that source" (Thomas 1999, 127).

[317] See Russell's (1979) first point above, n.74

[318] See above, pp.51-57.

[319] Again, we come back to an important point about *mimesis* that Russell (1979) makes: "The novelty which the 'last comer' can seek lies not in the subject, nor even in the words, but in the mysterious 'arrangement' (*σύνθεσις*, composition) which for many ancient critics was the most decisive, and most difficult to analyse, of the elements of literature" (5).

[320] "The solemn Roman associations of the line are reinforced by *si fas est*...Catullus intends religious overtones to pervade this line, for his intention is to give the poem a Roman patina by the introduction of concepts that are only understandable in a Roman cultural context" (Kubiak 1979, 131). For a discussion of this distinctively Roman solemnity in Catulus fr.2, the Roscius epigram, see Kubiak (1979, 129-130).

In the third and fourth verses Catullus comes back to translating, although his personalized appropriations become more visible hereafter. This return to a middle road between the verbatim translation of v.1 and complete invention of v.2 marks the first portion of the poem that is truly programmatic for the rest of the translation. The initial two lines create audience expectations only to destroy them, essentially forcing the audience to remember that this poem is a *literary* translation and therefore subject to full appropriation for new purposes, but the third and fourth line set the tone for everything that is to follow. Catullus keeps fairly close, but he does make a few alterations by amplifying Sappho's poem. Catullus's *identidem* is a new addition, as is *spectat* in the adonic. The latter is, in fact, a clever reworking of Sappho through Sappho. As Pardini notes,[321] Catullus expands the singular action of Sappho's speaker, namely listening (*ὐπακούει*), into two simultaneous actions, listening and watching (*spectat et audit*). Catullus also compresses the actions of the Sappho's female beloved, speaking and laughing (*φωνείσας καὶ γελαίσας*), into only laughter (*ridentem*).

In the second stanza Catullus begins reworking Sappho more extensively and displays many of the same translation techniques that Catulus and Varro Atacinus use. First, he identifies the beloved by adding the vocative *Lesbia*. Catullus also changes Sappho's construction *ὡς γὰρ ἔς σ' ἴδω βρόχέ'* ("for whenever I look at you briefly"), indefinite with the present subjunctive *ἴδω,* into a single event in the past: *nam simul te...aspexi* ("for as soon as I have seen you"). We saw Catulus take a similar approach to rendering Callimachus: he adds *Theotimum...devenit* vv.1-2, specifically naming the

[321] "In line 4, the perception of the man is expressed by two verbs, *spectat et audit*, instead of one as in Sappho (31.4 *ὐπακούει*). On the contrary the two actions of the woman (Sappho 31.4-5 *ἄδυ φωνείσας … καὶ γελαίσας ἰμέρoεν*) are condensed into one phrase (line 5 *dulce ridentem*), blending the internal accusative of the first action with the verb of the second one" (Pardini 2001, 111).

beloved and placing the action in the past, and he mentions only one boy whom he commanded only one time not to take in his soul (*quid si non interdixem ne illunc fugitivum / mitteret ad se intro, sed magis eiceret?*). In his appropriation Catullus redefines the poem as exclusively about one incident that occurs between the *Catulle* of v.13 and the *Lesbia* of v.7, taking Sappho's potentially generic model and making it his own, specific interpretation. The added vocative, which reappears in the final stanza with *Catulle*, is also an aspect of Neoteric translation that we sawVarro use several times.[322]

The effect of Catullus's compression and summary of Sappho in adding *quod omnis / eripit sensus mihi* is similar to that created by *Lesbia, aspexi*. The indefinite *quod* represents Sappho's equally undefined *τό,* but in Sappho whatever this relative refers to sets off a trembling in her chest (*μ' ἦ μὰν / καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν*). This trembling, in turn, leads to the slow disintegration of the rest of Sappho's body and senses, as well as her passive loss of self-control, which culminates in her eventual feeling of near-death in vv.15-16.[323] It is this effect for which Longinus prizes Sappho's poem, and the reason the fragment is preserved. In Catullus's poem, there is no gradual breakdown and no separation of the speaker's body and senses from himself.[324] The retention of a single

[322] For discussion of Varro's use of the vocative, see pp.85-86. Concerning the vocative in *c*.51, Kubiak (1979) remarks: "*pace* Wilamowitz, who says in his *Reden und Vorträge* I (Berlin 1925) 226, *n.* 1 that the two vocatives of lines 6 and 13 take the poem out of the realm of translation. No, they rather give evidence of neoteric experimentation with translation" (174 n.23).

[323] "While the Catullan speaker says that his wretched condition leads to *all* his senses being stolen from him, Sappho's speaker refers only to her separate body parts. 'Is it not wonderful,' Longinus says in his commentary on the poem, 'how she summons at the same time soul, body, hearing, tongue, sight, colour, all as though they had wandered off apart from herself?' (*On the Sublime* 10.3). The Sapphic speaker describes herself as an agglomeration of fragmented, disparate parts that have 'wandered off from herself.' In narrating her loss of voice and sight, the humming in her ears, the sweat that holds her, and the shaking that grips her, the speaker uses impersonal syntactical constructions that suggest a lack of personal agency" (Greene 1999, 7-8).

[324] "The Catullan speaker compresses all sensation into a totality of effect...Although the speaker appears to imitate Sappho's description of emotional and bodily disintegration, the use of 'all' and 'nothing' in

identity in place of Sappho's shattered persona recalls Catulus's use of a single *animus* in place of Callimachus's double half-souls. In both cases the persona creates a single identity out of the disparate parts of the original's persona, focusing on a singular event rather than on the multiple abstract ideas of the source text. Whether or not Catullus draws on this approach from Catulus, it appears to be a consistent technique for Roman translators of nugatory poetry.

Catullus's inclusion of *Lesbia* at v.7 also allows at the same time both a strengthening of the connection of his translation to the rest of his *corpus* and a clever intertextual reassertion of his source text. By referring to Lesbia in a poem adapted from the most famous poet of Lesbos, Catullus creates an allusive Alexandrian *double entendre*. As Kubiak has already noted,[325] the only two vocatives in the poem are *Lesbia* and *Catulle*, and these references essentially mark the translation as being the shared property of the Lesbian poet and Catullus himself. This identification of the lineage of the poem is unique among the Roman translators and appears to be Catullus's own innovation. In addition, the location of the two vocatives within the poem is important for identifying the role of the final stanza. *Lesbia* appears in the middle of everything that Catullus takes from Sappho, whereas *Catulle* appears only in the section which is wholly Catullus's creation. This pointed placement of vocatives is one way in which Catullus

---

Catullus' version seems rather to suggest the persistence of an integral identity. In Sappho's poem, on the other hand, the self is systematically disfigured as it is broken down into its component parts" (Greene 1999, 9).

[325] "In 51, then, Catullus is, as it were, 'signing' the piece with the name of its Greek authoress, as he signs it with his own name in the last stanza. Since the poem was no doubt originally conceived to become part of a 'Lesbia cycle', the interpolation of the proper name served the double purpose of fitting Sappho's ode into that projected collection, and giving a literary reference that could satisfy every requirement for Alexandrian preciosity" (Kubiak 1979, 138).

denotes his final *otium* stanza as a *sphragis*, which idea we will return to once we finish looking at *c*.51.

One small addition by Catullus, *misero*, also helps to connect *c*.51 to the rest of his *corpus*. A brief glance through Wetmore's concordance to Catullus[326] reveals that *miser* is one of the commonest words in Catullus's poetry and appears 31 times, more than any adjective except those most fundamentally common to Latin.[327] The addition of *misero* thus helps to appropriate Sappho's poem further into Catullus's other poetry by applying typically Catullan vocabulary to the translation.[328] Especially in the opposition between *Lesbia* and *mihi* to which *misero* is connected, as well as the final stanza's vocative *Catulle* which is presumably the same person as *mihi*, Catullus seems to be particularly concerned with recalling *miser Catulle* from *c*.8 and the earlier exhortation to stop wasting himself for the sake of a *puella*.[329] We will come back to this issue at the end of our discussion of *c*.51.

The third stanza is the most complex for Catullus's translation, as is it here that he incorporates the remainder of Sappho's original. A number of scholars have argued that

[326] Wetmore (1961).

[327] Only *bonus*, *Hymenaeus*, *magnus*, *malus*, *multus*, *nullus*, and *omnis* appear more than *miser* in Catullus, and *Hymenaeus* can be discounted for its extraordinary repetition in the hymnal *c*.61.

[328] "In the second stanza *misero* has been attacked as a stopgap supplement. But this is frequently a deeply emotive word in Catullus' erotic vocabulary (as in 8 *miser Catulle desinas ineptire*)..." (Wormell 1966, 192).

[329] Kidd (1963) remarks: "The use of *miser* to describe the unhappy lover is too frequent in comedy and love-elegy to require illustration, and in Catullus we find it as the leading word of Poem 8, and twice in Poem 76 (lines 12 and 19)." (301). Catullus's pointed application of the word to *mihi*, and by association to the vocative *Catulle*, seems more than typical elegiac cliche and recalls specific moments in Catullus's poetry.

Catullus completely ignores Sappho's fourth stanza,[330] but Vine has rightly noted that Catullus compresses Sappho's third and fourth stanza into his third stanza.[331]

The phrase *lingua sed torpet* retains the basic meaning of Sappho's *ἀλλ' ἄκαν μὲν γλῶσσα ἔαγε*, but the imagery is slightly different: in both cases the speaker's tongue no longer functions properly, but Catullus's linguistic impotence is caused by *torpor*, whereas Sappho's is caused by a breaking. Catullus chooses the image of a stunned but whole tongue to begin his list of all the senses that the sight of Lesbia has taken from him (*omnis* / *eripit sensus mihi* vv.5-6), preserving the unity of his persona and shifting away from Sappho's emphasis on disintegration. Nevertheless, Catullus appropriates one aspect of the exceptional artistry in the original, namely Sappho's striking hiatus.[332] The difficult pause between *γλῶσσα ἔαγε* represents the breaking of the speaker's tongue. Catullus's tongue, however, does not break but is only frozen and sluggish, and so the same hiatus would be inappropriate for his image. In its place he uses a chain of pointed alveolar plosives which force a striking slowness: *se**d** **t**orpe**t**, **t**enuis*. It is significant that nowhere else in Catullus's poem do such awkward transitions between words appear, just as *γλῶσσα ἔαγε* is the only instance of hiatus in the source text. Catullus thus retains Sappho's effect while varying its form. Similarly, Catullus translates the final phrase of

[330] See Vine (1992, 253-254) for a discussion of scholarly arguments for the suppression of Sappho's fourth stanza in Catullus's translation. Wormell's (1966) statement, Vine says, is the *communis opinio*: "...Catullus' main problem was to transpose the poem from the feminine to the masculine mode, and to transplant it in time and space from remote Lesbos to contemporary Rome. This is no doubt the reason why he omits the fourth stanza of the Greek – it is essentially feminine" (192). Though perhaps this is only a matter of opinion, I find nothing particularly feminine about sweat, trembling, a pale green complexion, or death.

[331] "But I suggest that Sappho's 'missing' fourth stanza has not been suppressed at all: rather, we can better understand Catullus' third stanza as a partial *compression* of Sappho's third stanza together with certain elements of her fourth stanza..." (Vine 1992, 254).

[332] For the effect of Sappho's hiatus, see Greene (1999, 9 n.18).

Sappho's third stanza, *ἐπιρρόμ- / βεισι δ' ἄκουαι*, quite closely with *sonitu suopte / tintinant aures*. Kubiak notes that Catullus even keeps the unusual word choice and form of the verb, maintaining Sapphic style.[333]

Catullus renders Sappho's *λέπτον / δ' αὔτικα χρῷ πῦρ ὐπαδεδρόμηκεν* as *tenuis sub artus / flamma demanat*. Although Catullus removes Sappho's *αὔτικα* and changes her generalized *χρῷ* to the more specific *artus*, the translation is fairly close. Kubiak points out that Catullus's equivalence of *tenuis* for *λέπτον* is especially important for Catullus's appropriation of Sappho with Neoteric poetics, since Catullus's term holds the same programmatic significance for the Neoterics as *λεπτός* does for Alexandrian poets and Callimachus.[334]

Kubiak also remarks that Catullus's *sub*, combined with the compound *demanat*, renders the full sense of *ὐπαδεδρόμηκεν*.[335] Catullus's apparently repetitive emphasis on Sappho's *ὑπό-* prefix, however, is more complex than mere equivalence with Sappho's *ὐπαδεδρόμηκεν*. Vine points out that each of Catullus's words here serves double duty, *demanat* representing both the form of *ὐπαδεδρόμηκεν* and the meaning of *κὰδ δέ μ' ἴδρως κακχέεται* from Sappho's fourth stanza, and *sub* evoking the entirety of *ὐπαδεδρόμηκεν* while making a Homeric reference. Since the heat caused by fire under the skin (*πῦρ*/*flamma*) logically causes perspiration (*ἴδρως*), the verb *demanat* evokes at the same

[333] "The onomatopoetic verb *tintinant* – a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* – must have been chosen on the basis of its formal resemblance to the Greek *ἐπιρρόμβεισι*, intensified by its prefix *ἐπί* (as *tintinant* is by its onomatopoesis, and also a *ἅπαξ* in Greek...Catullus attempts to match the diction of the original with appropriate Latin equivalents" (Kubiak 1979, 141).

[334] "A further Alexandrian reference may be present here as well. It was a happy accident that Sappho's poem contained the adjective *λεπτός*, a word that was to acquire for the Alexandrian poets a very specific meaning, and which became a part of the vocabulary of the Callimachean literary programme...When Catullus found the word in Sappho he translated it with a Latin equivalent which was to have equal significance for the neoteric poets and their successors" (Kubiak 1979, 139-140).

[335] Kubiak (1979, 140).

time the flame running beneath the speaker's flesh and the resulting sweat dripping down the speaker's body.[336] There are two complex translation techniques at work in this rendering: a rewriting of Sappho using Sapphic terms, which we saw in the case of Livius Andronicus and Gnaeus Matius, and the use of terminology that develops the logical connections implicit in the source text, as in Varro's avoidance of compound adjectives through etymological analysis of the original.[337]

Catullus's *sub* represents a sophisticated approach to translation, although through intertextual rather than intratextual references. Vine argues that the phrase *sub artus* certainly evokes *ὑπαδεδρόμηκεν*, but also calls to mind Sappho's *τρόμος δὲ παῖσαν ἄγρει* from the fourth stanza via the Homeric phrase *ὑπὸ τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα*.[338] In addition to creating the same compression of the third and fourth stanzas of Sappho's poem that comes from *demanat*, this intertextual moment also prepares the way for another complex syncopation, this time of Sappho's third stanza *ὀππάτεσσι δ' οὐδ' ἒν ὄρημμ'* and her fourth stanza *τεθνάκην δ' ὀλίγω 'πιδεύης* / †*φαίνομαι*† by means of a Homeric stock phrase.

Pardini notes that the final symptom of Catullus's list, *gemina teguntur / lumina nocte*, is a far cry from Sappho's much simpler *ὀππάτεσσι δ' οὐδ' ἒν ὄρημμ'* and Lucretius's

[336] "The verb *demanat* 'drips down'...is, I propose, an almost literal rendering of Sappho's *κακχέεται* 'pours down' in line 13 of her *fourth* stanza...Thus *demanat* suggests simultaneously not only the heat 'emanating' from the *tenuis flamma* (Sappho's *λέπτον πῦρ*), but also its resulting physical manifestation in the form of sweat (*ἴδρως*) – literally expressed in Sappho's *κακχέεται*, but merely latent in *demanat*" (Vine 1992, 255).

[337] For Varro, see pp.89 and 97-99.

[338] "...the phrase [*sub artus*] is readily suggested by Sappho's *τρόμος δὲ / παῖσαν ἄγρει* (lines 13-14 of her fourth stanza), a variant of the Homeric cliché *ὑπὸ τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα* (*Il.* 14.506)...Note, incidentally, that according to this interpretation, Catullus' *sub* may be justified not only as a rendering of the prefix of *ὑπαδεδρόμηκεν* (as has often been noted), but perhaps also as a reflection of the *ὑπό* in *ὑπὸ…γυῖα*" (Vine 1992, 254).

close *caligare oculos*.[339] He offers a Homeric phrase which appears to be Catullus's model: *ἀμφὶ δὲ ὄσσε κελαινὴ νὺξ ἐκάλυψε* ("A dark night on both sides covered both eyes)."[340] Homer's phrase is used of individuals who are on the verge of death, and so Catullus's reference consequently suggests more than simple blindness.[341] Catullus's intertextual reference, therefore, encompasses both the blindness of Sappho's third stanza and the appearance of death from her fourth stanza.[342] Though this compression is similar to those discovered by Vine, there is a key difference, namely in Catullus's approach to translation by means of intertextual allusion. It may be that Varro's similar use of another author, specifically Catullus, in translating Apollonius comes directly from Catullus's own practice here.[343]

These two intertextual moments bring up a vital question: why Homer? As we saw in chapter 2, there are several reasons for Varro's choice of Catullus as a model in

---

[339] "A verbal analysis also shows how freely Catullus translated Sappho here: *sonitu suopte tintinant aures* (lines 10-11) amplifies Sappho's *ἐπιῤῥόμβεισι δ' ἄκουαι* (31.11-12), but above all *ὀππάτεσσι δ' οὐδ' ἒν ὄρημμ(ι)* (31.11) is far from being translated literally by Catullus' very elaborate sentence" (Pardini 2001, 111). Pardini also notes: "This contrasts with the succinct rendering at Lucretius 3.156 *caligare oculos*" (111 *n*.13). Catullus could certainly have maintained the same simple phrase, as did Lucretius, but purposefully chose to avoid it.

[340] "The formula [*ἀμφὶ δὲ ὄσσε κελαινὴ νὺξ ἐκάλυψε* 'A dark night on both sides covered both eyes' = *Iliad* 5.310] has been translated by Catullus as exactly as the opening of Sappho's fragment. Evidently an indeterminate epicism did not satisfy Catullus' taste, and he wanted his model to be clearly recognizable among other similar formulas" (Pardini 2001, 112).

[341] "Here, however, the reference to Homer is much more than merely decorative and determines the meaning of *c*. 51.11-12. If we consider Catullus' words without any intertextual reference, 'my eyes are covered by a twofold night' can hardly equal a simple 'I cannot see any more.' This restrictive meaning is usually accepted only because Catullus' sentence is believed to translate Sappho's *ὀππάτεσσι δ' οὐδ' ἒν ὄρημμ(ι)*. We can now see that a further literary model is echoed here and its interference frees us from this bias. Catullus seems to speak of blindness, like Sappho, and actually uses a euphemism for death, like Homer" (Pardini 2001, 114).

[342] "So, alluding to different lines of Sappho (31.11-12 and 15-16) with one intentionally ambiguous sentence, the poet implicitly summarizes all they contain. In other words, he has entirely rendered, by translation or by allusion, Sappho's list" (Pardini 2001, 114).

[343] For Varro's intertextual use of Catullus, see pp.90-96 on fr.4, as well as Courtney (1993, 242) on fr.9, which we have only briefly commented on below, n.345.

his translation of Apollonius. The most apparent of these reasons is the similarity of their subject matter and tone. In fr.4, Varro renders Apollonius's election of Tiphys as helmsman immediately after the initial launch of the Argo. This specific scene certainly justifies Varro's use of the opening to Catullus's *c*.64, which also describes the ship's first launch. Likewise, the apparent connection between Varro fr.9 and Catullus *c*.64.119 and 64.70-71[344] lies in the image of a distraught woman suffering as the result of a sea voyage, Medea in Varro and Ariadne in Catullus. The reason behind Catullus's choice appears to be similar. Catullus recognized, as other scholars have, that behind each of Sappho's symptoms there is a clear Homeric model and that, ultimately, Sappho is describing the experiences suffered by Homeric warriors in battle or near death.[345] Catullus chooses Homer as an intertextual model to compress Sappho's symptoms because these symptoms ultimately are Homeric, both in their vocabulary and relationship to struggling and death. Catullus thus makes what Richard Thomas, Jeffrey Wills, and James McKeown have termed a "window reference," "double reference," and "double allusion," respectively.[346] Thomas's definition provides the clearest explanation:

> Related in nature to this type of correction [see above, n.316] (although more complex) is a feature that I would call 'window reference.' It consists of the very close adaptation of a model, noticeably interrupted in order to allow reference back to the source of that model: the intermediate model thus serves as a sort of window onto the ultimate source, whose version is otherwise not visible. In the process the immediate, or chief, model is in some fashion 'corrected.'

[344] See Courtney (1993, 242) for the text of each passage and the portion of Apollonius to which the fragment corresponds. We have not treated this passage in this study, but Courtney's brief note is sufficient for recognizing the intertextual moment.

[345] "*Τρόμος αἶνος ὑπήλυθε γυῖα* is Homer's memorable description of the fear that upsets a warrior in battle [*Iliad* 20.44]; *ἴδρως* is an unromantic secretion, common and unavoidable in Homer [Edwards compares *Iliad* 16.109 with Sappho fr.31.13], but raising a suspicion of extravagance by this rare appearance in amatory verse. The speaker invokes the virtues of the *πολύτλας Ὀδυσσέυς* [sic] when she states her determination to endure all" (Edwards 1989, 593). For further discussion of the Homeric references which appear in Sappho 31, see Wills (1967, 173).

[346] See Thomas (1999, 130), Wills (1998, 284), and McKeown (1987[1], 36).

This type of reference is a particularly Alexandrian, and therefore Neoteric, technique. In adapting Sappho by means of Homer, Catullus thus nods in the direction of Sappho's source, further develops the poem's lineage which he is concerned with showing elsewhere, and appropriates Sappho by using Sappho's own means of poetic production.

We have seen, then, a number of different techniques that Catullus applies to his translation of Sappho, as well as how they relate to those of the literary translators who precede and follow him. The last stanza, however, is especially problematic, as it is part of the poem but represents nothing of the source text. The fundamental question with which most scholarship on *c*.51 is concerned is what to make of this final *otium* stanza, which seems to defy every notion about translation that applies to the rest of the poem. In the following pages I argue that this stanza is not part of the translation *per se*, but that it is nevertheless a vital part of the poem. The final stanza serves three important purposes: (1) to stand as a poetic *sphragis* that fully identifies the translation as Catullus's personalized appropriation; (2) to comment on the material within Sappho's poem and Catullus's translation from an external frame; and (3) to contextualize the translation firmly within the *corpus* and relate the generalized sentiment of Sappho's poem, modified and personalized in Catullus's translation, to the rest of Catullus's poetry.

We have already seen that there are aspects of the *otium* stanza which serve to signal Catullus's active involvement in making Sappho's thoughts his own. The vocative *Catulle* marks this section of the poem as uniquely Catullan. The earlier vocative *Lesbia* crosses the boundaries of the text, referring at the same time to Catullus's own mistress, to Sappho the poet of the source text, and potentially to a generalized woman from Lesbos who could be equated with Sappho's unnamed addressee. There are hints of

appropriation and mild changes throughout the translation, but it is only in the final stanza that the poem becomes fully distinguished as Catullus's own work.[347] Much of the diction of the *otium* stanza is also typically Catullan, a fact which we will return to when we examine the relationship between *c*.51 and the rest of the *corpus*.

Only a partial line of Sappho's final stanza is preserved in Longinus, but scholars have already noted that there is a change in the speaker's tone which moves from the frantic description of the third and fourth stanzas to a calm, controlled self-exhortation.[348] Catullus follows Sappho's shift of tone, breaking abruptly from the symptoms of his experiences and taking up a discussion of *otium*.[349] Whatever else was in the lost portion of Sappho's poem, however, is abandoned completely by Catullus as he alters the focus of the stanza from Sappho's emphasis on endurance, which seems fundamentally connected to the rest of the fragment, to a far more nebulous commentary on the destructive power of *otium*.[350] One key mistake that many scholars make when discussing Catullus's final stanza is to argue that the speaker is chiding himself and

---

[347] Fredericksmeyer (1965) has already expressed this opinion: "...and there are, furthermore, sufficient minor differences to show that Catullus meant his poem to be modeled on that of Sappho, but also to stand as his own creation, an autonomous structure, the expression of his own concern and his own experience. And it is the last stanza which fully achieves this" (155).

[348] "She [the Sapphic speaker] contemplates from a position of historical distance her own reactions to the presence of the beloved. The speaker's increased emotional control culminates in her ability not only to see herself but also to address herself in a voice of confident self-assertion...The Sapphic speaker then appears not only to have achieved some sort of recovery, but also to have reconstituted herself out of he experience of erotic disintegration" (Greene 1999, 8-9).

[349] "Many have noticed that the poems agree in the way they depart from the list of symptoms with a strong push towards moral resolution – Sappho with a turn from description of lost control to a statement that control is possible, Catullus with the self-exhortation of his little sermon on *otium*" (Wills 1967, 197). Will's basic statement is right, though the term "sermon" and the suggestion that the final stanza is necessarily self-hortatory seem incorrect.

[350] Clack (1976) offers a provocative suggestion for the radically different tone of Catullus's last stanza: "Rather interestingly, I cannot recall any suggestion that Sappho 2 may have been fragmentary in Catullus' day as it seems to have been in 'Longinus'' time and so may have invited an interpolation such as Catullus has made" (51). Though his idea is interesting, it is purely speculative and need not have been the case for Catullus to have created his final stanza.

urging a cessation of *otium*. Whereas Sappho's speaker urges herself to bear everything and seems to suggest that there is something that she can do to fix the situation, Catullus's speaker does not in fact indicate either that there is a solution to his problem or that he should avoid leisure, poetic or amatory. He steps back from the translation and remarks that *otium* troubles him, that he indulges in it too much, and that it has destroyed others before him. One scholar rightly points out that Catullus's problem is unavoidable: "The significant word here is *est* – '*is* your ruin' not 'will be' or 'could be your ruin'. The present indicative reveals that for Catullus the point of no return is already past" (Kinsey 1974, 378). Thus, the final stanza is not an exhortation to abandon *otium*, but rather a contemplation of the inevitably destructive power of *otium*.[351]

This departure from the idea of endurance to that of passive suffering is the key to understanding the role of *c*.51, both alone and in relation to the rest of the *corpus*. Ultimately, to Catullus *otium* offers erotic and literary pleasure with one hand and ruinous loss with the other, and all of *c*.51 is concerned with these two facets of *otium*. This fact is readily apparent in the shifts that we have seen Catullus make in his appropriation of Sappho. The speaker of the source text experiences slow disintegration, but she recovers and regains enough control to endure. Catullus's speaker experiences no such disintegration. The central moment of Catullus's translation, both structurally and thematically, is the rape of the speaker's senses: *eripit sensus mihi* v.6. Before this point, the speaker can see and hear and recognizes in *ille* a sort of divinity conferred by Lesbia's presence, but afterwards he emphasizes only the numbness of his self that occurs as the

[351] "But there is the suggestion as well that Catullus' calamity is very much to be expected. When *reges* and *beatae urbes* succumb to *otium*, it is to expect too much of a poor mortal that he should be able to withstand it" (Khan 1972, 162). Cf. *c*.66.47: *quid facient crines, cum ferro talia cedant?* ("What can hairs do, when such things [mountains] yield to iron?"). The sentiment is similar, and purposefully so, as we will see in our discussion of *c*.66.

result of his viewing Lesbia. This dichotomy, between the creative and destructive potential of the *otium* that allows Catullus to experience and write about Lesbia, is fundamental to much of Catullus's poetry, especially in two poems: *c*.50, the introduction to Catullus's translation of Sappho, and *c*.68, which comes only a short while after Catullus's other translation.

Finamore has already extensively discussed the connections between *c*.50 and *c*.51, so only a few points specifically concerning the *otium* stanza need to be touched upon here.[352] First, Catullus opens *c*.50 with a reference to *otium*: *hesterno, Licini, die otiosi / multum lusimus in meis tabellis* v.1. Catullus's speaker emphasizes the great pleasure that he drew from being at leisure (*otiosus*) with his friend, but at the central point of the poem he experiences a sudden change once he is no longer in the presence of Licinius. This shift caused by the loss of access to Licinius prospectively alludes to the central shift in *c*.51 and foreshadows the final symptom of the speaker: *ut nec me miserum cibus iuvaret / nec somnus tegeret quiete ocellos* vv.9-10. Note especially *me miserum* (50.9), echoed by *misero...mihi* (51.5-6),[353] and *tegeret...ocellos* (50.10), echoed by *teguntur / lumina* (51.11-12).

[352] Finamore (1984). In direct contrast to Finamore, Clausen (1976, 40) argues that *c*.50 marks the end of Catullus's *libellus* and that *c*.51-*c*.60 are essentially leftovers appended by a later editor. This notion is, at best, absurd, especially considering the sophisticated poetics we have just seen at play in *c*.51.

[353] Wray (2001) remarks: "...Poem 50's speaker begins the enumeration of symptoms, the revelation of his illness, by calling himself *miserum* ('wretched,' 50.9). Poem 51's speaker describes himself with the same word (*misero*, 51.5), and the epithet there is a purely Catullan addition to the poem, reflecting nothing in Sappho's original. The announcement that he is 'miserable' thus stands in each poem as the first indication of its speaker's erotic suffering" (98). For the connection of the two poems as a collective missive and the equation of Catullus's *hoc...poema* (*c*.50.16) with *c*.51, see Lavency (1965) and Wray (2001, 97-99); we will return to this issue when we come to the role of *c*.65 in relation to *c*.66.

A further connection between the two poems lies in a series of Homeric allusions in *c*.50. Both Kroll and Scott[354] have demonstrated that the symptoms of the speaker's separation described in 50.9-12 mirror those of Achilles after the loss of Patroclus.[355] It is important to note that Catullus chooses Sappho fr.31 as the *poema* to demonstrate his *dolor*, since, as we have seen, both the source text and Catullus's translation rely extensively upon Homeric allusion to describe the pain experienced by the speaker of each poem. The framing of *c*.50 in these terms is a purposeful development of the Homeric "window reference" in *c*.51. Catullus draws on, and adds to, Sappho's references to Homer in *c*.51, but he also colors *c*.50 with a different reference to Sappho's Homeric source text. He thus establishes an equivalence between the suffering of the speaker in both poems and thereby appropriates more fully Sappho's poem into the surrounding *corpus*.

Ultimately, *otium* is the cause of suffering in both *c*.50 and *c*.51: literary *otium* in the latter, and amatory *otium* in the former. Catullus signals this suffering by his use of *otiosi* (*c*.50.1) and *otium*/*otio* (51.13-15). Charles Segal's excellent observation on the

---

[354] Kroll (1959, 90) and Scott (1969, 171).

[355] "The second allusion [in lines 7-13] is to the final book of the *Iliad* where Achilles seeks to assuage his grief for the fallen Patroclus. He rolls and rosses in sleeplessness, and he cannot eat. By describing his actions in the same terms, Catullus implies that he values Calvus as much as Achilles valued Patroclus; and, now that Calvus is no longer with him and is only remembered, he rolls and tosses the same way that Achilles did in sorrow for his friend" (Scott 1969, 171). Kroll (1959, 90) connects c.50.9-10 with *Iliad* 24.128-130 (*τέκνον ἐμόν, τέο μέχρις ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχεύων / σὴν ἔδεαι κραδίην, μεμνημένος οὔτε τι σίτου / οὔτ' εὐνῆς*, "My child, how long will you devour your heart with weeping and sorrowing, and take no thought of food or of the bed?" trans. Murray, 1999) and c.50.11-12 with 24.4-6 (*αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς / κλαῖε φίλου ἑτάρου μεμνημένος, οὐδέ μιν ὕπνος / ἥρει πανδαμάτωρ, ἀλλ' ἐστρέφετ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα*, "but Achilles wept, ever remembering his dear comrade, nor did sleep, that subdues all, lay hold of him, but he turned ever this way and that…" trans. Murray, 1999) and 24.9-11 (*τῶν μιμνησκόμενος θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυον εἶβεν, / ἄλλοτ' ἐπὶ πλευρὰς κατακείμενος, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε / ὕπτιος, ἄλλοτε δὲ πρηνής*, "Thinking on these things he would shed large tears, lying now on his side, now on his back, and now on his face" trans. Murray, 1999).

connection between the two poems, though largely and regrettably ignored by later scholarship, hits nearest the mark:[356]

> Both 50 and 51, then, present the dangers of *otium*, but from different points of view...In 51 the irony and humour are gone; but Catullus does not, for that reason, suggest that the cost of *otium* is too high. The superb first three stanzas illustrate what his *otium* can produce; and the last stanza, along with poems like 8, shows what can emerge from his struggle with *otium*. The transition from the first three stanzas to the self-address of lines 13-16 (contrast *mihi*, 6, with *Catulle, tibi* 13) is undoubtedly harsh. But 50 helps us to understand that harshness: in poetry as in love, pain and joy are commingled, and the poet suffers from the very intensity of his involvement in an experience which has brought him such delight. Even the literary pleasures described in 50 have a *dolor* (line 17) which is not altogether playful; and the dominant mood of that poem is restlessness rather than unalloyed joy and contentment.

The double reference to Homeric pain and grief, of Achilles in *c*.50 and of heroic death in *c*.51, binds together the inevitable outcome of leisure. The final stanza, then, stands as a *sphragis* which, rather than chiding the speaker for overindulgence, contemplates the nature of *otium* in both poems and points out its destructive quality without recanting its pleasurable aspects.

If we look beyond this single pair of poems, it is easy to find points of intersection between Catullus's translation and the rest of the *corpus*. One such nexus which offers a particularly high concentration of connections is *c*.68a and *c*.68b, in which the poet writes to Manlius and Allius and laments the pain caused by the death of his brother.[357] Let us begin with a few general thematic comments and then move on to more specific intertextual moments.

---

[356] Segal (1970, 30-31).

[357] The fragmentary nature and extensive manuscript problems of this poem make it particularly tricky to handle, but it also provides a wealth of intertextual references which are vital for a full understanding of the role of *c*.51 in the *corpus*. For a discussion about whether *c*.68 is one or two poems and relevant bibliography, see Thomson (2003, 472-474). For our purposes, and since the themes of the two poems are so similar, we will not make any great distinction between the two parts.

The opening of *c*.68a is a *recusatio* to a request by Manlius for aid, both literary and amatory. After describing the condition in which Manlius is when he sends his request, the speaker complains in vv.5-10 that he is abandoned by both Venus and the Muses:

> quem neque sancta Venus molli requiescere somno
> desertum in lecto caelibe perpetitur,
> nec veterum dulci scriptorum carmine Musae
> oblectant, cum mens anxia pervigilat:
> id gratum est mihi, me quoniam tibi dicis amicum,
> muneraque et Musarum hinc petis et Veneris.[358]

The cause of Catullus's pain, the death of his brother, is significantly different from those causes of grief in *c*.50 and *c*.51, but the two aspects that the speaker deals with are essentially those with which these two poems are most concerned. Deprivation of the Muses, which is equivalent to Catullus's loss of Licinius in *c*.50, leads to the removal of the initial *otium* of *c*.50 and causes the speaker pain, while deprivation of Venus, via the loss of contact with the beloved caused by her association with *ille*, eventually leads to the speaker's near-death experience in *c*.51. Note, however, that there is a slight reversal in *c*.68: Venus, and amatory loss, leave the speaker deserted in his bed (*requiescere somno / desertum in lecto caelibe perpetitur*, *c*.68a.6-7), while literary loss framed in amatory terms in *c*.50 creates the same effect (*nec somnus tegeret quiete ocellos, / sed toto indomitus furore lecto / versarer*, *c*.50.10-12). The resulting wakefulness deprives the speaker of the literary Muses and sweet song (*nec veterum dulci scriptorum carmine*

[358] "I, whom neither sacred Venus allows to rest in gentle sleep,
deserted in my bed bereft of company,
nor do the Muses delight me with the sweet song of those old writers
when my anxious mind lays awake.
This is pleasant to me: you say that I'm your friend,
and you ask from me the duties of the Muses and of Venus."

Musae / oblectant, *c*.68.7-8), whereas the result of the speaker's insomnia in *c*.50 is the production of poetry which laments amatory loss.

Only a few verses later in vv.15-20 Catullus describes the descent from previous happiness which existed while his brother was alive:

> tempore quo primum vestis mihi tradita pura est,
> iucundum cum aetas florida ver ageret,
> multa satis lusi: non est dea nescia nostri,
> quae dulcem curis miscet amaritiem.
> sed totum hoc studium luctu fraterna mihi mors
> abstulit.[359]

There are several especially important echoes of *c*.50 in this passage. The speaker once played much when he led a pleasant life (*iucundum*, *c*.68.16; ***multa*** *satis* ***lusi***, *c*.68.17), which statement evokes the earliest joy that the speaker of *c*.50 experienced when he was writing poetry with Calvus (*hesterno, Licini, die otiosi /* ***multum lusimus*** *in meis tabellis*, *c*.50.1-2; note also the placement of the vocative *iucunde*, *c*.50.16, in the same second position as *Licini*, *c*.50.1). When his brother dies, the speaker says that all his pursuit of this leisure was taken away (***sed totum*** *hoc studium*, *c*.68.19); this line echoes the language used at the beginning of the pain that the speaker feels at the loss of Calvus: ***sed toto*** *indomitus furore lecto*, *c*.50.11.[360]

For Catullus, loss is one of the fundamental themes of his poetry and of his relationships with others. In *c*.50, *c*.51, and *c*.68, the speaker loses the presence of Calvus, of Lesbia, and of his own brother, albeit presumably only temporarily in the case

[359] "At that time when first the white clothes were given to me,
when my blossoming youth enjoyed a pleasant springtime,
I toyed enough with many things: not unknown to us is that goddess,
Who mixes sweet bittterness with cares.
But my brother's death took away from me through grief all of these pursuits"

[360] It may also be possible that Catullus evokes *c*.51 in both these passages from *c*.68 in his repetition of "sweet" (*dulci...carmine*, *c*.68.7; *dulcem*, *c*.68.18; *dulce ridentem*, *c*.51.5), though admittedly the connection is weak.

of the first two. The result of this loss of a close companion is an experience which the speaker equates with death (*membra postquam / semimortua lectulo iacebant*, *c*.50.14-15; *gemina teguntur / lumina nocte*, *c*.51.11-12 with the connotations of the Homeric reference which we have already discussed; *tecum una tota est nostra sepulta domus; / omnia tecum una perierunt gaudia nostra*, *c*.68.22-23).

Another connection between *c*.50, *c*.51, and *c*.68 lies in *c*.68b.91-96 and 101-107, directly after the speaker mourns the loss of his brother again and echoes exactly the lament of *c*.68a:

> quae nunc et nostro letum miserabile fratri
> attulit. ei misero frater adempte mihi,
> ei misero fratri iucundum lumen ademptum,
> tecum una tota est nostra sepulta domus;
> omnia tecum una perierunt gaudia nostra
> quae tuus in vita dulcis alebat amor.
> ...
> ad quam tum properans fertur lecta undique pubes
> Graeca penetralis deseruisse focos,
> ne Paris abducta gavisus libera moecha
> otia pacato degeret in thalamo.
> quo tibi tum casu, pulcerrima Laodamia,
> ereptum est vita dulcius atque anima
> coniugium.[361]

Besides a number of minor lexical echoes (*iucundum*, *c*.68b.93, *iucundum*, *c*.68a.16, *iucunde c*.50.6; *lumen*, *c*.68b.93, *lumina*, *c*.51.12), there are two important intertextual

[361] "Which now also the wretched death of our brother
has taken. Ah, brother taken from wretched me,
ah, pleasant light taken from my wretched brother,
all our house has been buried along with you;
along with you have died all our joys,
which your sweet love nourished in life.
…
Then hastening to this place the young chosen from everywhere in Greece are
are said to have deserted their most sacred hearths,
so that Paris, rejoicing in his stolen adulteress, might not
squander his free ease in a peaceful bed.
Then by this misfortune, fairest Laodamia, from you
was snatched your husband, sweeter than life and soul."

connections. First, the speaker says that he is wretched because his brother is taken from him (***misero*** *frater adempte* ***mihi***, *c*.68b.92 and *c*.68a.20), which echoes the speaker of *c*.51 when he complains about how he is wretched from the loss of his senses (***misero*** *quod omnis / eripit sensus* ***mihi***, *c*.51.5-6). Note that this section from *c*.51 is one of those which are almost completely Catullus's own invention and depend very little on the source text.

Second, Catullus mentions that it is the Trojan war and, more specifically, the *otium* of Paris that caused Laodamia to lose her husband Protesilaus (*ne Paris abducta gavisus libera moecha / otia pacato degeret in thalamo*, *c*.68b.103-104). This instance of *otium* is a vital link between Catullus's translation of Sappho and the larger *corpus*. Much has been made of Catullus's general concern with *otium*, but the word itself appears very infrequently throughout Catullus's poetry: *otium* appears in *c*.51 three times (51.13, 14, 15), once at *c*.44.15, and once at *c*.68.104, while *otiosus* appears only once in *c*.50.1 and once in *c*.10.2. We have already seen why *otium* is so important in *c*.50 and *c*.51, and the singular appearances of the adjective *otiosus* in the openings of two poems directly preceding the only two poems in Sapphics makes a strong connection between *c*.10 and *c*.50 seem likely.[362] When *otium* appears in Catullus, it is especially significant and resonates with the other instances of the word. The appearance of *otia* at *c*.68b.104 purposefully recalls *c*.51 and the final *otium* stanza particularly, and this self-reference

[362] To the best of my knowledge, no one has explored this connection between the two poems, though frequently *c*.51 has been viewed as a counterpart to *c*.11, the former signalling the start of Catullus's relationship with Lesbia and the latter marking its end. For this idea, see Woodman (1978) and Fredericksmeyer (1983). I have not yet had the opportunity to see what Russell (1986) says in her dissertation about the relationship between *c*.11 and *c*.51. The connection between *c*.10 and *c*.50 is unfortunately beyond the scope of this study, and so we will simply leave the unusual appearance of *otiosus* in their positions immediately before the two Sapphic poems as a potential suggestion.

demonstrates clearly the connection between *otium*, loss, and suffering which we saw between *c*.50 and *c*.51.

The final two lines of the *otium* stanza veer abruptly away from the effects of *otium* on Catullus and expand its destructive power beyond the personal sphere and into the world of epic: *otium et reges prius et beatas / perdidit urbes* (*c*.51.14-15). As some scholars have pointed out,[363] this is a fine *a fortiori* argument. To borrow and appropriate one of Catullus's own phrases, *quid facient viri, cum otio talia cedant*? The reference to kings and cities, however, has implications beyond a rhetorical analysis of *otium*. Other scholars have noticed that *c*.68b.103-104 offers a concrete example of Catullus's general statement in *c*.50.14-15.[364] Priam and Troy are examples *par excellence* of a *rex* and *urbs beata* which have been destroyed, and in *c*.68b.104 Catullus places the blame of their destruction squarely on the shoulders of Paris and *libera otia*. In addition to being the destroyer of kings and cities, *otium* is also the *casus* which causes Laodamia to lose Protesilaus. Without the *otium* of Paris, Protesilaus would never have had cause to leave Laodamia for war in Troy. Thus, *otium* is ultimately responsible for the pain caused by the loss of a beloved companion, both in Laodamia's loss of her husband and Catullus's loss of Calvus in *c*.50 and Lesbia in *c*.51.

One final echo of *c*.51 appears at *c*.68b.129-137, where Catullus takes up again the theme of his beloved with whom he compares Laodamia:

sed tu horum magnos vicisti sola furores, 129
ut semel es flavo conciliata viro. 130

[363] Fredericksmeyer (1965, 162).

[364] Kidd (1963, 306) makes no argument for why Catullus engages in self-reference in these passages beyond simply stating that there is a connection between *otium* and love. Edwards (1989, 597) says that Catullus uses *c*.68b to intensify the contrast between lovers and warriors and to discourage the speaker from "pretensions to greatness." Neither suggestion is convincing.

aut nihil aut paulo cui tum concedere digna
    lux mea se nostrum contulit in gremium,
quam circumcursans hinc illinc saepe Cupido
    fulgebat crocina candidus in tunica.
quae tamen etsi uno non est contenta Catullo,
    rara verecundae furta feremus erae
ne nimium simus stultorum more molesti[365]

Catullus says that Laodamia's love for Protesilaus alone surpassed the love of a grandchild for their grandparent or a dove for its mate, and that his Lesbia was just the same way. Laodamia, however, is doomed to experience the pain caused by *otium* and to lose her husband despite her surpassing love for him (*quod scibant Parcae non longo tempore abesse, / si miles muros isset ad Iliacos*, *c*.68b.85-86), and so this comparison between her and Lesbia likewise casts back on *c*.51 the pain of amatory loss that Catullus experiences as the result of *otium*.

One of the key resonances in this passage is the word "troublesome" (*molesti*, *c*.68b.137): Catullus claims that he can endure the occasional tryst so that he does not become troublesome to Lesbia, but this endurance of contemplation on Lesbia's dalliance with *ille* is precisely what leads Catullus to call *otium* itself troublesome to him (*otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est, c*.51.13). The speaker's acceptance in *c*.51 of the loss of his beloved to another man,[366] his passive reflection on this scene in the final stanza of *c*.51,

[365] "But you alone have conquered the great passions of these,
    when you were united with your golden-haired husband.
Then she was worthy to equal you, or almost equal,
    my light who brought herself to our embrace.
around her Cupid, ofte flitting here and there,
    shone bright in his saffron tunic.
Even if she is not content with Catullus alone,
    we will bear the occasional tryst of our modest mistress,
so that we are not too troublesome in the way of foolish people."

[366] Though this is impossible to prove because of the fragmentary nature of Sappho's text, I suspect that Catullus's emphasis on endurance at the end of *c*.68b (*rara verecundae furta feremus erae*, *c*.68b.136) may be related to Sappho's own abrupt regrouping and concern with endurance in her final stanza (*ἀλλὰ πὰν*

and the *otium* that allows for these things all become troublesome to him in the same way that *otium* eventually leads to Laodamia's own suffering at the loss of her husband.

We can see, then, that Catullus's adaptation of Sappho engages in a number of allusive techniques, many of which make use of complex intertextuality with Sappho, her source, and the rest of Catullus's poems. Catullus uses a number of translation techniques which come from his predecessors, but he also innovates extensively and uses approaches which translators and poets after him apply to their own work. Though his translation of Sappho is remarkably nuanced, Catullus's translation of Callimachus's *Plokamos Berenikes* is a far more ambitious and arguably the most sophisticated translation from antiquity. We will now examine *c*.66 in detail, calling attention to those techniques which Catullus reuses from his translation of Sappho as well as bringing to light his other innovations in appropriating this Alexandrian masterpiece.

CATULLUS *C*.66 AND CALLIMACHUS *AETIA* FR.110

Callimachus's *Plokamos Berenikes* has survived only in scattered fragments, primarily from two badly mutilated papyri, [367] and therefore our understanding of Catullus's translation technique is necessarily limited to those passages that have extant

---

τόλματον, Sappho fr.31.17) and that *c*.51 may reflect a sort of collapse point for such long endurance of loss.

[367] PSI 1092 preserves about 20 lines (vv.44-64), of which the first 11 are almost all complete. POxy 2258 C preserves three scattered sections (vv.43-55, 65-78, and 89-94), though it has suffered much damage and frequently verges on illegibility. One of the finest aspects of Marinone's (1997) commentary is a set of complete facsimiles of all the papyrus fragments, as well as of *c*.66 from codices O and G of Catullus. In addition, there are 4 lines (vv.1, 7-8, and 40) preserved as citations in scholia and other sources.

equivalents in the source text.[368] Before we can begin to see how Catullus adapts Callimachus, however, it is necessary to clear away three notions that have persistently detracted from a full appreciation of *c*.66: 1) that Catullus purposefully translates as literally as possible; 2) that *c*.66, and ancient translation in general, can offer little insight for critics of Roman poetry; and 3) that Catullus was writing in response to a real request from Hortensius Hortalus, but that he was unable to fulfill his promise of original poetry because he was stricken with grief at his brother's death and therefore could only offer a lesser work, a translation.

The charge of verbatim translation has been levelled against *c*.66 in much scholarship on the poem.[369] Wormell begins his work on the poem by describing the general quality of Catullus's translation:[370]

> Catullus of set purpose imposes on himself the severest possible discipline, choosing to make his version a line for line, almost at times a word for word rendering, and following of course the metre of the original, though elegy is not yet fully acclimatised in Latin poetry.

Comparison of Catullus's poem with Callimachus's demonstrates that this idea is false or, at best, misleading. In the following pages we will see clearly that, as in the case of all the translators we have examined thus far, and most importantly in the case of Catullus himself in *c*.51, *c*.66 is a careful adaptation and personalized appropriation of a Greek source text.

---

[368] Bing (1997), whom we have already cited a number of times, rightly cautions against restoring fragmentary texts based on their Latin translations. Accordingly, I have chosen to follow Pfeiffer's (1987) text of Callimachus, but have been fairly conservative in accepting the proposed restorations of later editors. As in the case of Varro's fragments, I have abandoned any conjecture made *ex nihilo* and simply represented lacunae with the necessary metrical lengths.

[369] The only notable exceptions are Putnam (1960) and Kubiak (1979). Even those authors who believe that the so-called *ritus nuptualis* in lines 79-88 is wholly Catullus's invention, despite their willingness to accept this final part as original, generally follow the assumption that the rest of the poem is a literal translation.

[370] Wormell (1966, 196).

Yet Wormell may perhaps be forgiven his sentiment in light of the forty years of scholarship and considerable advancement of Translation Studies, in Classics and elsewhere, whose benefit he did not have when he published his pioneering work. Even in the past few years scholars writing on *c*.66, who have certainly had the benefits that Wormell lacked, have retained this opinion as a fundamental part of scholarship on Catullus's translations. Thomson's remarks are representative of this persistent view:[371]

> The fact that it [*c*.66] is a translation implies, inter alia, that it is of only very limited value for the criticism of Catullus as a poet; even the language (together with the poem's structure and rhythms...) is often carefully adapted to that of Callimachus. Until not so many decades ago, only a few short scraps of the Greek original survived; but groups of complete lines, about 30 in all, were published from papyrus discoveries...The result of these discoveries was to show that the translation was as close as could possibly be expected from a poet of strong original genius.

Thomson's statement brings us to the next idea in need of correction, namely that literary translations and poetry are unrelated and the former does not help us to understand the latter. We have already seen in this chapter that *c*.51 takes part in complex intratextual references with other portions of Catullus's *corpus*, and so this statement is also clearly false in at least one case, and we will see that this is likewise so in *c*.66.

The final assumption that scholars have frequently made regarding *c*.66 is that the poem represents an actual response to a request made by Hortensius Hortalus, and that Catullus sends a mere translation because the grief of his brother's death prevents him from writing original poetry.[372] This belief is representative of a larger tendency within

[371] Thomson (2003, 447).

[372] Wormell (1966) remarks: "It may be that he [Catullus] hoped the excitement of answering a taxing challenge would help him momentarily forget his grief" (196). Almost two decades later, Itzkowitz (1983) commenting on *c*.51 makes the same biographical assumption, though for completely different ends: "The brooding notion of *otium*, brooding the more because it evokes a mood rather than a specific definition, does indeed concern his love interest. It is the malaise of his preoccupation which has prevented him from completing his task: translation in the manner of 66" (133). Ironically, Itzkowitz accepts the biographical

Catullan scholarship to read Catullus's poetry biographically[373] that, until very recently, has remained unshaken since Apuleius's time.[374] Although there is a growing willingness to read the Catullan *persona* and Lesbia as poetic constructs,[375] still there persists the notion that Catullus's frequent references to his brother's death are somehow more real than those incidents with Lesbia and Iuventius that the poet describes throughout his *corpus*. Whether or not the historical Catullus had a brother who died in the Troad, we must keep in mind that the Catullan *persona* is a poetic construct, as is the entirety of Catullus's work, and that Catullus presents his grief for his brother in a highly artificial framework. None of the poems that explicitly refer to Catullus's brother's death is a spontaneous outpouring of emotion, nor should we take Catullus's assertions about his grief and poetic impotence at face value.

The source of all three pitfalls is not entirely scholarly oversimplification, though, as Catullus himself invites such a reading and is knowingly complicit,[376] so to speak, in

---

view that Catullus's disturbed emotions prevent him from translating well but ignores the emotional difficulty, seemingly much greater than his erotic troubles, that the death of Catullus's brother brings.

[373] Holzberg (2000) provides an excellent summary of this critical standpoint: "...few scholars persist in attempting to compile Catullus's biography by determining the chronology of his poems and squeezing the prosopographical utmost out of all the characters named therein. Not that the novel-like tale of Catullus's life which emerges from such interpretations – young poet from the provinces goes to the big city, falls into the clutches of a dissolute married older woman, is overwhelmed by his intense, but unrequited love for her, dies an untimely death – no longer haunts us...And yet even scholars who apply the most modern of literary theories to Catullus' work continue to read Lesbia as a pseudonym for Clodia, and will insist on identifying the *puella* with whom Catullus's *persona* is in love as a real, live person, and on including this historical *puella* in their interpretations" (28-29).

[374] In his defense against the charge of magic, Apuleius sarcastically lists the authors whose works would incriminate them and identifies Lesbia with Clodia: *Eadem igitur opera accusent C. Catullum, quod Lesbia pro Clodia nominarit* ("Therefore these same works would bring a charge against C. Catullus, because he used 'Lesbia' as a pseudonym for 'Clodia'"), *Apologia* 10.3.

[375] See Holzberg (2000), especially his brief note on recent scholarship that moves away from biographical readings (28 n.4).

[376] I do not mean here to cast blame on Catullus, but only to say that the poet often demonstrates exceptional cleverness and demands the utmost caution in taking what he writes at face value. See, for

this misinterpretation of *c*.66. Just as Catullus crafts *c*.50 as a *billet d'envoi* to *c*.51,[377] so too does he use *c*.65 to set up a number of expectations for *c*.66,[378] including all three of the assumptions we have just examined. Let us momentarily suspend this idea and deal with the opening section of the translation first, as it is necessary to grasp some of the changes that Catullus makes to Callimachus before we can see how *c*.65 functions in relation to *c*.66.

Like all other translations whose opening lines are extant, the beginning of *c*.66 is highly programmatic and establishes for the audience a number of expectations for the entire poem. Callimachus's and Catullus's first lines describe the activities of Conon, Berenice's court astronomer:

πάντα τὸν ἐν γραμμαῖσιν ἰδὼν ὅρον ἥ τε φέρονται	1
omnia qui magni dispexit lumina mundi	1
qui stellarum ortus comperit atque obitus[379]	2

The first two words of Catullus's opening line echo Callimachus's: *omnia* corresponds to *πάντα*, and the relative *qui* evokes *τόν*.[380] Likewise, *dispexit* reproduces some of the sense

---

instance, the discussion above, pp.114-116, on the clever deception and revelation in the first two lines of *c*.51. I would venture to say that Catullus wrote much of his poetry, especially *c*.65 and *c*.66 with a sheepish grin and impish delight at the prospect of pulling the wool over his audience's eyes, were I not opposed to such biographical assumption.

[377] The term *billet d'envoi* is Lavency's (1965).

[378] Clausen (1970) rightly remarks on the need to read *c*.65 and *c*.66 together: "Neither poem has been sufficiently appreciated, in my opinion: 66 because it has been ready primarily as a translation, and 65 because it has been read primarily as if 66 did not exist" (85).

[379] Callimachus: "He who conned the sky mapped out / from end to end on charts, the wheeling / courses of the stars" trans. Nisetich (2001); Catullus: "He who gazed at all the lights of great heaven, who learned the risings and settings of the stars."

[380] I do not mean to suggest that the audience versed in Callimachus's poem would assume that there is an exact correspondence between *qui* and *τὸν*, since they would have been sensitive to the differences in gender and case between the two words and would also readily have recognized that *omnia* and *qui* cannot agree with each other as *πάντα* and *τὸν* do, but only that there is a temporary ambiguity caused by the early placement of *qui* in the same location as *τὸν*.

of *ἰδὼν*. None of Catullus's words except for *omnia*, however, provides even a close parallel to those of Callimachus: *ἐν γραμμαῖσιν* disappears completely,[381] the compound verb *dispexit* changes slightly the sense of Callimachus's plain participle *ἰδών*, Catullus expands the simple word *ὅρον* into the grander phrase *lumina mundi*,[382] and he creates a distinctive break by moving the second clause (*ἢ τε φέρονται*) into the pentameter. Although most of the original's second clause is lost, Catullus seems to have amplified the diction and continued to alter Callimachus drastically, replacing the straightforward *ἢ…φέρονται* with the elevated merism of *ortus...atque obitus* and echoing his first clause with the distinctively Catullan epanalepsis in the relative *qui*.[383] If not for the subject matter, the audience would likely not even recognize Callimachus through the rather thick lens of Catullus. It may be helpful here to recall Catullus's earlier rendering of Sappho's first line in *c*.51:

---

[381] Barrett (1982) argues for the manuscript reading *despexit* instead of the emendation *dispexit* on the grounds that *ἐν γραμμαῖσιν* means that Conon is looking down on charts of the sky rather than up at the stars. I am not altogether convinced that this reading is correct, though I do not reject the possibility. Thomson (2003) states that "it is hard to believe that C.'s readers would easily take the point" (450) of such an oblique allusion, though Catullus shows elsewhere a penchant for playful obscurity of this sort. If *despexit* is correct, then Catullus cleverly compresses and retains *ἐν γραμμαῖσιν*. At any rate, regardless of whether Catullus evokes Callimachus's equally vague description or not, the point still stands that Catullus engages in radical alteration of this opening line.

[382] A possible, though not necessary, source of this phrase may be Cicero's *Aratea*, in which the combination noun + *caeli* appears five times as a strong break at the end of a line (fr.2.2, frs.33.47, 113, 230, 405 Soubiran). Cf. also the so-called *De Duodecim Signis* of Cicero's brother Quintus, where the only other instance of *lumina mundi* in Classical Latin appears at the end of line 13; Possanza (1992) argues that Quintus's poem was likely written between 46 and 43 BC, which date would, of course, rule out any possibility that Catullus was referring to this piece. Courtney (1993) notes that nothing is known about the context or composition date of Quintus's fragment except that it is influenced by Cicero's *Aratea* and therefore later than 89, which Soubiran (2002, 9-11) sets as the publication of at least the first edition of the poem. It is also quite possible that *lumina mundi* is Catullus's own invention independent of Cicero's work.

[383] Clausen (1970, 91-93) cites three examples of Catullus's unusual repetition in *c*.66 and one in *c*.65: 66.39-40, 75-76, 87-88; 65.11-12. He also notes that Catullus breaks from the typical usage, which usually involves repetition of a noun modified by some other word, and instead twice repeats *semper* (65.11-12, 66.87-88), once repeats the unmodified adjective *invita* (66.39-40), and once the infinitive *afore* (66.75-76). Of special importance is the example of epanalepsis in *c*.66.75-76, which can be compared to the Callimachean original and shown to be wholly Catullus's invention.

φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος ἴσος θέοισιν

ille mi par esse deo videtur

As we saw above, every word of Sappho is represented almost exactly in Catullus's line, except for the unexceptional addition of *esse* and the purposeful but subtle singularization of *θέοισιν* in *deo*. Why, then, does Catullus appear to change his approach to translation in the first line of *c*.66 so radically? The answer to this question is, as in the case of *c*.51, to develop audience expectations and then to undercut them.[384] Unfortunately, it is impossible to say how Catullus translated in the next few lines, but a chance scholion preserves the fourth couplet, which allows for both a close comparison and a clarification of Catullus's approach in the first line.

In the next extant fragment of Callimachus's poem, the poet finally names the person who is the subject of the initial *ἰδὼν*, Conon:

ἦ με Κόνων ἔβλεψεν ἐν ἠέρι τὸν Βερενίκης 7
βόστρυχον ὃν κείνη πᾶσιν ἔθηκε θεοῖς[385] 8

Catullus's corresponding section spans two couplets:

idem me ille Conon caelesti <in> lumine vidit 7
e Bereniceo vertice caesariem,
fulgentem clare, quam multis illa dearum
levia protendens brachia pollicita est[386] 10

[384] Pardini (2001) remarks: "Although, as Vergil shows (*Ecl.* 3.41 *descripsit radio totum qui gentibus orbem* 'who with a rod described all the sky to mankind'), a close translation was easy to obtain, Catullus translates Callimachus' opening quite loosely – an unconventional choice. Nevertheless, *c*. 66.1 is immediately recognizable as a rendering of the Callimachean line, even before comparing their respective meanings, since the first words, *omnia* and *πάντα*, match each other. This correspondence now seems to be greater than it actually is. *Omnia* indeed translates *πάντα* and both adjectives have the same prominent position at the beginning of the line. However, they differ in gender and number – but this difference is skillfully disguised and can escape the reader at first glance" (113).

[385] "Conon, noticed me in the heavens, / Berenike's lock, that she had dedicated / to all the gods" trans. Nisetich (2001).

[386] "That same famous Conon saw me in the heaven's light,
hair from the Berenicean head,
shining brightly, which she dedicated to many of the goddesses,

Catullus stays much closer to his source text in this passage: *me* matches *με* in the second position, *Conon* and *Κόνων* stand before the caesura, the perfect *vidit* corresponds to the aorist *ἔβλεψεν*, and *quam...illa...pollicita est* is essentially identical to *ὃν κείνη...ἔθηκε*. Even Catullus's changes are relatively minor, many reflecting the sense rather than the word of the original. The word *idem* appears at first glance to be redundant inflation, but it reflects the force of Callimachus's affirmative *ἦ*. Likewise, *caesariem* is an unusual word, properly of the entire head of hair,[387] but it also reflects the uncommon *βόστρυχον*, which is a Callimachean *hapax*.[388]

One interesting addition which Catullus makes helps to distance his translation from Callimachus's original and demonstrate a subtle acknowledgement of the literary tradition. As with *idem*, *ille* seems to be an unnecessary word and there is no precedent for it in the source text, but it marks Conon as a historical figure both well-known and more distant from Catullus's audience than he was to Callimachus.[389] This distancing technique is particularly Alexandrian and similar to other conventions typical of Neoteric poets.[390]

There are two further points of departure that are minor for understanding the degree to which Catullus alters Callimachus, but that we will mention here since they will be vital for our contextualization of *c*.66 within the rest of the *corpus* at the end of our

---

stretching out her light arms.

[387] Fordyce (1961, 330).

[388] Marinone (1997, 89).

[389] See Gildersleeve (1965, 193 n.307).

[390] See, for instance, Kubiak (1981) on the typically Neoteric use of verbs of reporting and indefinite temporal words to mark stories as legendary and distant.

discussion of the poem. The adjectivalization of Berenike's name in *Bereniceo vertice* offers an odd alternative to the simple possessive *τὸν Βερενίκης*, but this grammatical shifting of names is part of Catullus's Neoteric linguistic experimentation and we will see it appear elsewhere in the poem with greater effect. Also, it is noteworthy that *vertex* in Catullus appears only in the *carmina maiora*.[391] Likewise, *caelesti <in> lumine* is a rather grand expansion of the more prosaic *ἐν ἠέρι*. Kubiak has noted that Catullus places great emphasis on light throughout the poem,[392] and again this point will be important for contextualizing the poem within the rest of the *corpus*.

Since only the single couplet in this section survives and, as we have seen, Roman translators have a tendency to shift word position across several lines in a thematically coherent passage,[393] it is impossible to judge how innovative Catullus's *fulgentem clare* and *levia protendens brachia* are. Nevertheless, from what remains of Callimachus we can see that Catullus returns from his strong reworking in the opening line to a middle road of translation more in keeping with the style that he picks up in *c*.51.3-12. Now that we have seen this shift from rewriting to subtle appropriation we can return to the question of the role of *c*.65 in understanding *c*.66.

There are two particularly programmatic elements in *c*.65: the statement that Catullus is sending to Hortensius Hortalus a translation, since his brother's death has robbed him of his poetic ability, and the simile at the end of the poem that recalls the Acontius and Cydippe episode. The first of these sets up an expectation of literal

---

[391] Wetmore (1912, 110) notes instances of *vertex* at: *c*.63.244, 278, 309, 350, 390; 64.1, 297; 66.8, 39, 62, 76; 68.57, 107.

[392] Kubiak (1979, 163-166). Kubiak lists a total of 11 instances throughout the poem which emphasize light (163-164).

[393] See above on Varro Atacinus fr.5, pp.87-88.

translation and inferior poetics, while the latter hints at the deceptiveness of such an expectation.

Catullus begins his address to Hortalus by elaborating on his wretched state and loss of poetic inspiration:

> etsi me assiduo defectum cura dolore 1
> sevocat a doctis, Hortale, virginibus,
> nec potis est dulcis Musarum expromere fetus
> mens animi, tantis fluctuat ipsa malis[394] 4

At first glance, Catullus's statement seems genuinely heartfelt, but it must not be forgotten that *c*.65 is itself an offspring of the Muses (*Musarum...fetus*). Had Catullus actually wanted to communicate with Hortalus and apologize for the lapse in his poetic abilities, he would not have chosen to do so by employing those very abilities in an elaborate elegiac poem.[395] Again, the opening of the poem is highly programmatic: little of what the poet says hereafter can be taken at face value, especially regarding his own poetics and the effect of his brother's death upon his literary production.

After a brief discursus on the grief of his brother's death, Catullus returns abruptly to his addressee again and says that he can offer only a translation of Callimachus to Hortalus:

> sed tamen in tantis maeroribus, Hortale, mitto
> haec expressa tibi carmina Battiadae,
> ne tua dicta vagis nequiquam credita ventis
> effluxisse meo forte putes animo[396]

---

[394] "Although care separates me, wasted with constant grief,
from the learned maidens, Hortalus,
and the thought of my soul is not able to bear the sweet
offspring of the Muses, since it is tossed by such evils."

[395] "*Carmen* 65 explains that Catullus no longer can write the same verse, but shows by its imagery and even existence that his poetry has revived" (Block 50).

[396] "But nevertheless in such gloom, Hortalus, I send
these poems of Battus's child to you, rendered verbatim,

The key word here is *expressa*, properly "to squeeze" or "to press out,"[397] and of translations often used to suggest verbatim fidelity.[398] Taken alone, as most scholars writing on *c*.65 and *c*.66 have taken it, the term is unproblematic. The poem that follows will be a literal rendering, squeezed from another poet's talent with little innovation. The full context of *c*.65, however, argues against such a reading. Even within the first couplet the poet tries to mislead the audience into believing his ability to write original poetry is gone, and this use of *exprimere* is no less deceptive. Note also that Catullus echoes his first deceptive statement in this new declaration of poetics for *c*.66 by recalling *expromere* v.3 with *expressa* v.16.[399] Catullus says that the following poem will be a literal translation, but the observant audience will notice that everything he has said thus far in the poem is tongue in cheek and will realize that, far from being some mechanical work, *c*.66 will demonstrate the same kind of originality that *c*.65 does.

The simile at the end of the poem has been problematic for scholars,[400] and although it is impossible to address the issue fully here we can nevertheless examine how this seemingly bizarre comparison between Catullus's supposed promise to Hortalus and the fallen apple of an embarassed girl relates to *c*.66 and the creation of audience expectations in *c*.65. The connection between this simile and the Acontius and Cydippe

---

so that you not think your words, entrusted to the wandering breezes,
have flown by chance out of my mind."

[397] See *OLD* s.v. *exprimo* 1, 2, 5, and 6.

[398] See above, n.56, on Cicero's use of the term in *Academica* 1.10.

[399] Block (1984) states: "The reality of renewed poetic vigor is explained both in the repeated verb (*expromere/expressa*), and in the way the poet has knit together the poem as a whole with a single progressive sentence" (49). Although clearly she confuses the two separate verbs *expromere* ("to bring forth") and *exprimere* ("to press out"), the connection she makes is nevertheless valid.

[400] See Block (1984) and Hunter (1993).

episode has long been noted, and recently Richard Hunter has persuasively revived the argument that Catullus refers specifically to Callimachus's version of the story in *Aetia* 3.[401] Hunter also notes that, while Catullus seems to model his own simile on Callimachus, there are a number of points of departure which demonstrate a clear reworking of tradition: in the *Aetia*, Cydippe's father discovers the affair through an oracle, and the apple appears only in the initial deception and does not betray the girl later.[402] Catullus, then, adjusts the story, shifting the discovery to the girl's mother (*matris*, 65.22) and making the apple rather than Apollo the exposer of the secret.

How, then, does the fact that Catullus seems to have freely appropriated Callimachus to his own uses affect our reading of *c*.65 and, by extension, *c*.66? The simile is, in fact, a subtle statement of Catullus's poetics of appropriation. No less than *c*.66, *c*.65 is a gift presented to Hortalus in payment of an almost-forgotten promise. As Hunter and others before him have pointed out, *c*.65 is a poem of Callimachus, a *carmen Battiadae* (65.22), and stands in place of an original poem as the fruit (*fetus*, *c*.65.3) of Catullus's labors.[403] The originality of Catullus's version of the Acontius and Cydippe story, adapted and personalized as it is from Callimachus, belies the assumption of poetic

[401] Callimachus's version of the story is extremely fragmentary, spanning frs.67-75 Pfeiffer and containing only a little over 100 mostly complete lines. Hunter's (1993) argument necessarily relies upon some speculation and is not altogether certain, but his main point nevertheless seems valid.

[402] Hunter (1993, 179).

[403] "Both Catullus 65 and 66 are pledges of the poet's affection for Hortalus and therefore 'apples'. Moreover, on at least one reading of the concluding verses of Poem 65, Poem 66 is in fact announced by the simile as an 'apple', and, on any reading, the resonance of v. 3 in which poetry is described as *dulcis Musarum...fetus* allows the 'poem as apple' assimilation to be felt clearly. Not only are both Poems 65 and 66 'apples', they are also both *carmina Battiadae*" (Hunter 1993, 180). For the work of earlier scholars who have noticed similar connections, see Hunter (1993, 180 n.3).

impotence which Catullus has his reader make. Hunter sums up the effect of this contradictory representation well:[404]

> The very distance of the apple simile from its Callimachean "model" is in fact crucial to its significance. The related, but contrasting, forms of re-writing represented by the two juxtaposed poems raise serious questions about the nature of *imitatio*, the use of literary models, and the role of the individual poet within a poetics such as that practiced by both Catullus and (perhaps) Hortalus.

Catullus's personalized reworking of Callimachus in a poem that is presented as unoriginal and lacking inspiration calls into question how seriously the audience should take the term *expressa carmina...Battiadae* (65.16). His reworking of the Acontius and Cydippe episode also undercuts the suggestion that the accompanying *c*.65, also a reworking of Callimachus, is also merely dashed together and not a poem completely appropriated to Catullus's purposes.

One final point about the Acontius and Cydippe simile, namely about the role of forgetfulness, is relevant here. In Callimachus's version, the apple is only the means by which Acontius tricks Cydippe, but in Catullus's version it also exposes the deception to Cydippe's mother. It is important that Catullus's addition of this function to the apple, which appears to have been tossed away by Cydippe early on in Callimachus,[405] is one of the two key differences between these two versions of the story and seems to be completely Catullus's own invention. In *c*.65, Catullus draws a connection between the apple and the promised gifts which he is now giving to Hortalus, and as the apple reveals the deception in the simile, so too do these "poems as apples"[406] reveal the deception in Catullus's statement of poetics in this poem. Catullus reveals that the phrase *expressa*

[404] Hunter (1993, 182).

[405] See Hunter (1993, 179 n.2).

[406] Hunter (1993, 180), quoted above, n.403.

carmina...Battiadae (65.22) is completely disingenuous as soon as the loosely-adapted version of Callimachus's Acontius and Cydippe rolls out of the poem's folds in the simile at the end of the poem.

Further solidifying the connection between *c*.65 and *c*.66 is the syntactical connection between the last line of the simile and the first line of the translation. Wendell Clausen has noted that there is a distinct relationship between the interlocking word order of *c*.65.24 and *c*.66.1 that seems further to connect Catullus's translation with the rest of his *corpus* and distance it slightly from Callimachus's poem. A comparison of the first line of Catullus's version with both the opening line of Callimachus's *Plokamos* and the last line of *c*.65 is useful:[407]

πάντα τὸν ἐν γραμμαῖσιν ἰδὼν ὅρον ἥ τε φέρονται	
a a B A	Callimachus *Plokamos* 1
omnia qui magni dispexit lumina mundi	
a b A B	Catullus *c*.66.1
huic manat tristi conscius ore rubor	
a b A B	Catullus *c*.65.24

Clausen points out that there is interlocking word order in both of Catullus's lines, but no such order in Callimachus's line.[408] It is also interesting that, of the 11 examples of abAB word order which appear in Catullus's longer poems,[409] two appear in such close proximity to each other. This pattern suggests, I believe, purposeful reworking of the word order precisely to connect *c*.65 and *c*.66 more closely. Another syntactical

[407] In the following diagram I follow Ross's (1969, 133-137) use of symbols, in which lowercase letters indicate the attributive words and uppercase letters the substantive.

[408] Clausen (1970): "The word order of the last verse of 65 and the first verse of 66 is interlocking, a stylistic detail that helps to join 65 to 66. The first verse of Callimachus' poem survives...The word order is not interlocking" (93-94).

[409] For the statistics of Catullan word order, see Ross (1969, 133-137).

connection between the poems lies in the length of the opening sentence of *c*.66, which runs for a full fourteen verses. Clausen's remarks on this point are exactly correct:[410]

> ...the period with which 66 begins consists of seven couplets. This cannot be Callimachean; for there are no such periods in Callimachus. In fact this is the longest elegiac period in Catullus, with one exception: 65 itself. Again we see Catullus at pains to make 65 a suitable introduction to 66...

Although it is impossible to say for certain what Callimachus did syntactically in the 11 corresponding lines of the opening which have been lost, Clausen's assumption seems probable. Clausen also notes a number of verbal and stylistic echoes between the two poems which help to connect them more strongly to each other.[411] Thus, Catullus binds *c*.66 with *c*.65, using the latter to create an expectation of literal fidelity in the translation while dropping subtle hints that such an expectation is entirely deceptive. Catullus uses the same purposeful undercutting of the apparently programmatic opening line that he applies in *c*.51, although in *c*.65 and *c*.66 he develops it much more fully and sets up a strong tension between the surface program and the actual underlying poetics. Catullus thus forces the audience to examine more carefully how he translates Callimachus and what the variations on the original mean for the rest of the *corpus*.

Now that we have thoroughly examined the opening of the poem and the playful creation and removal of audience expectatations, we can move on to the remainder of the translation and see how Catullus reinterprets Callimachus and adapts the *Aetia* to his own purposes. Catullus takes a distinctly middle-of-the-road approach to translation, staying relatively close to the original while adjusting details. The effect of this moderation, as we will see throughout the poem, is to heighten the impact of those changes that he does

---

[410] Clausen (1970, 93-94).

[411] See Clausen (1970, 93) for the use of epanadiplosis in 65.11-12 (*semper...semper*), which seems to correspond to three very similar repetitions in 66.39-40 (*invita...invita*), 66.75-76 (*afore...afore*), and 66.87-88 (*semper...semper*), as well as for the repetition of *casto...e gremio* in 65.20 and 66.56.

make, emphasizing the importance of his subtle shifts. Rather than changing wholesale large sections of the poem, as Catulus does in his epigram, or staying faithful to the sense and style of the original, as Varro does with Apollonius, Catullus gently bends Callimachus's original in a new direction.

The next extant section of Callimachus's original describes Xerxes's building of a canal through Mt. Athos as an example of the overwhelming strength of iron tools:[412]

βουπόρος Ἀρσινόης μητρὸς σέο, καὶ διὰ μέ[σσου 45
Μηδείων ὁλοαὶ νῆες ἔβησαν Ἄθω.[413] 46

Catullus's corresponding couplet runs thus:

cum Medi peperere novum mare, cumque iuventus 45
per medium classi barbara navit Athon.[414] 46

Catullus follows Callimachus's text literally in some details: *per medium...Athon* corresponds exactly to *διὰ μέ[σσου / … Ἄθω* and, although Catullus moves the phrase *per medium* to the beginning of the pentameter, he retains the hyperbaton between the substantive and its attributive which Callimachus uses to represent the violent cleaving of the mountain.

There are also some alterations in this section which, although at first glance they appear unimportant, are pointed redirections of the sense of the couplet. Catullus's verb *navit* stands in the same position as *ἔβησαν* and serves to exaggerate the strangeness of the

[412] Pfeiffer (1987, 114), Marinone (1997, 66), and most other editors of Callimachus retain Pfeiffer's reconstruction of v.44, but this conjecture seems to me unsupported by the evidence, since the line is completely obliterated in *PSI* 1092 and *Poxy* 2258 preserves, at best, only 9 disjointed and badly damaged internal letters of the line. Despite the extreme temptation to comment on this line and the possible clever invention by Catullus of *supervehitur* for Pfeiffer's conjecture *ὑ]περφέ[ρ]ετ[αι*, we will abstain from including this problematic reconstruction in our discussion.

[413] "…your mother's, Arsionoë's obelisk, and through / the middle of Mount Athos sailed / the murderous ships of the Medes" trans. Nisetich (2001).

[414] "…when the Medes made a new sea, and when the barbarian youth
sailed through the middle of Athos with its fleet."

fleet's voyage through the mountain by employing a nautical term.[415] In Callimachus, the Persian ships go through the mountain by means of a colorless verb which is normally associated with land-based travel. Had Catullus wanted to retain this same sense, a number of options would readily have been at hand: *gradi*, *ire*, and *venire* are all lexically identical or very close to *βαίνειν,* and at least the last two offer perfectly acceptable metrical equivalents for *navit*: *iit* and *venit*. This purposeful avoidance of such a flat verb in favor of one which emphasizes both the unusual voyage and the devastation required for ships to actually sail, rather than just go, through the mountain.

Similarly, the subject of Callimachus's lines is the destructive ships (*ὀλοαὶ νῆες*), inanimate objects that belong to the Medes (*Μηδείων*), but Catullus makes the Medes themselves, both separately (*Medi*) and collectively (*iuventus* /*...barbara*) the performers of the violence. The effect of this change is to make the destruction of Athos all the more forceful: whereas in Callimachus the ships simply go through the middle of the mountain, (*διὰ μέ[σσου /…νῆες ἔβησαν Ἄθω*), in Catullus the gathered host of Persians actively sails through Athos.

One aspect of this passage which has bothered many scholars is Catullus's removal of *βουπόρος Ἀρσινόης μητρὸς σέο* and addition of *peperere novum mare*, for which no sufficient explanation has yet been offered.[416] It is apparent that Catullus did alter at

[415] Catullus here may be echoing *c*.64.2 (*dicuntur liquidas Neptuni nasse per undas*), in which he employs the same verb and hyperbaton to emphasize the strangeness and violence of the Argo's first voyage.

[416] Wormell (1966) remarks: "Catullus remodels lines 45ff. extensively; perhaps the obscurity of the reference to Arsinoe's obelisk baffled him as much as it has modern interpreters. One can readily understand that he preferred a more directly rendering of the sense of the original" (197). Clausen's (1970) sentiment is similar: "We don't know what the phrase *βουπόρος Ἀρσινόης μητρὸς σέο* meant, nor did Catullus: he left it out. Hence he had to expand his version, since he was trying to match couplet for couplet. The result is inferior, in point of rhetoric, to what Callimachus wrote" (89). It seems rather presumptuous to assume that Catullus, allusive and clever as he is, made such a translation choice because he failed to understand Callimachus's reference. I do not think it likely that the scholion on *POxy* 2258 would

least a portion of these lines drastically, but without the preceding couplets of Callimachus it is impossible to say what was the overall reinterpretation of the source text. Even without knowing what verb the nominative *βουπόρος* governs, we can see that Catullus seems to place much more emphasis on the violence of the Persian attack. The subjects of the destruction are duplicated and personalized (*Medi* and *iuventus...barbara* in place of *νῆες*), and Catullus marks the unusual violence of the invasion both by his use of a nautical term in a terrestrial setting (*navit*) and by stating outright that the Persians created a new sea in the middle of the land (*peperere novum mare*). Again, Catullus tints Callimachus's account by emphasizing the force of the Persian destruction.

Following upon the idea of the destructive power of iron, the next couplet presents the lock's famous lament:

τί πλόκαμοι ῥέξωμεν, ὅτ' οὔρεα τοῖα σιδήρῳ 47
εἴκουσιν;[417] 48

Catullus purposefully reworks Callimachus's lines to emphasize the status of the objects which are subject to the power of iron as victims:

quid facient crines, cum ferro talia cedant?[418] 47

Catullus's rendering again is very faithful to the original: the lines both begin with interrogatives (*τί, quid*), the main verbs are in the future tense (*ῥέξωμεν, facient*), the subjects are lexically identical (*πλόκαμοι, crines*), the main clause stands wholly before the caesura, the subordinating particles are identical (*ὅτ', cum*), the subordinate verbs are

---

understand that *βουπόρος* is *ὁ ὀβελίσκος* but that Catullus would not be able to find some source to identify the reference if he did not recognize it himself.

[417] "What are mere locks of hair to do / when mountains like those / yield to iron?" trans. Nisetich (2001).

[418] "What will hairs do, when such as these yield to iron?"

identical (*εἴκουσιν*, *cedant*), *σιδήϊ[ρῳ* and *ferro* are identical,[419] and *talia* brings out the sense of the modifier *τοῖα*. Except for the slight shift of word order in the two clauses, which seems largely unimportant, Catullus makes only two changes: he replaces the first-person *ῥέξωμεν* with the third-person *facient* and removes the noun *οὔρεα*. Both alterations serve to objectify the victims of iron. In Catullus's poem, the lock no longer associates itself with other hair directly and instead uses the third-person verb *facient* to heighten the rift caused by its separation from Berenice's head. Likewise, Catullus generalizes the specific *οὔρεα τοῖα* to the abstract *talia*, making the mountains indistinct victims.

The next three verses contain the lock's curse of the Chalybes, who first discovered iron:

Χαλύβων ὡς ἀπόλοιτο γένος, 48
γειόθεν ἀντέλλοντα, κακὸν φυτόν, οἵ μιν ἔφηναν
πρῶτοι καὶ τυπίδων ἔφρασαν ἐργασίην.[420] 50

As with the preceding lines of the lock's lament about the power of iron, Catullus creates a more violent reading of Callimachus:

Iuppiter, ut Chalybon omne genus pereat, 48
et qui principio sub terra quaerere venas
institit ac ferri stringere duritiem![421] 50

The first pentameter verse corresponds closely to Callimachus: Catullus adds *omne*, but otherwise all lexical and syntactical choices are identical to those of the source text. In

[419] Although the end of *σιδήϊ[ρῳ* is lost in the manuscript, the emendation seems probable judging from the context and the verb *εἴκουσιν*, and so, despite the general danger of recreating the source text from the translation, this assumption seems justifiable in demonstrating the close connection between *σιδήϊ[ρῳ* and *ferro*.

[420] "May they die, / the wicked Chalybes / who first brought steel to light, / an evil flower / sprouting from the earth – die, those / who first invented hammering!" trans. Nisetich (2001).

[421] "Jupiter, would that all the race of Chalybes would die,
and he who first began to seek below the earth those veins
and to draw the harshness of iron."

the next couplet, however, Catullus departs drastically from Callimachus.[422] In Callimachus's text the lock complains that the Chalybes revealed (*ἔφηναν*) iron, an evil plant (*κακὸν φυτόν*) that comes up from the earth on its own (*γειόθεν ἀντέλλοντα*). The image that Callimachus presents is of a spontaneous and perverted shift from the Golden Age to the Iron Age, in which iron replaces earth-born plants as the primary crop. Catullus removes all sense of spontaneity in his version, instead focusing on how iron must be sought (*quaerere venas*). There is also an explicit contrast between Callimachus's *γειόθεν* ("from the earth") and Catullus's *sub terra* ("underneath the earth"). Unlike the evil plant in Callimachus's poem, which comes up of its own accord and is merely revealed by the Chalybes, Catullus's iron must be violently wrenched from the ground. There is no longer a sense of the all-too-common Hesiodic natural decline, but of active and brutal destruction.

Note also the provocative enjambment of the verb *institit*, which stands in the place of Callimachus's *ἔφηναν*. The relative pronoun *qui* initially suggests to the audience a precise correspondence with Callimachus's *οἵ*, but only upon coming to the pentameter does Catullus reveal that the lock is blaming not the Chalybes as a whole, but rather a single man. Catullus thus creates an effect similar to that made by Catulus in fr.1, focusing the translation on specific participants and strengthening the emotional force of the scene. The lock blames not just the abstract collective, but also the individual *auctor* of iron. As with his duplication and specification of the Persians who cut through Mt. Athos, Catullus defines the source of violence in concrete terms.

[422] Clausen (1970) notes this shift and remarks : "About the following two couplets I can be very brief. The first, lines 47-48, is again a remarkably close translation, with the addition of the Latin exclamation *Iuppiter!* The next, lines 49-50, is not: I suppose that Catullus was simply unable to render Callimachus' Greek in any way that would be intelligible in Latin" (89). As with Catullus's replacement of *βουπόρος Ἀρσινόης*, a different reason than a dearth of skill on Catullus's part should be sought.

In the pentameter Catullus continues his reshaping of Callimachus along the same lines. Callimachus's Chalybes are didactic, only showing (*ἔφρασαν*) men the work of hammers (*τυπίδων...ἐργασίην*). Iron is an evil crop, but its uses are left unstated by Callimachus. Certainly the lock has in mind the shears that have separated it from the head of Berenike, but the Golden and Iron Age motifs also call to mind the necessity of iron for the new order that Zeus imposes on the world.[423] The lock complains of the work of hammers, but only because these hammers have produced evil along with good.

Catullus's lock complains not of hammers, but of the hardness of iron (*ferri…duritiem*). On a superficial level, Catullus's alteration seems to strengthen only mildly the lock's complaint that iron is destructive. It is, after all, the strength of iron, not the work of the hammers, which allows for the cleaving of Mt. Athos and of hair. Catullus is doing more, however, and engaging in subtle but clever wordplay by

[423] Compare Vergil, *Georgics* I.147-161:

prima Ceres ferro mortalis vertere terram
instituit, cum iam glandes atque arbuta sacrae
deficerent silvae et victim Dodona negaret.
mox et frumentis labor additus, ut mala culmos
esset robigo segnisque horreret in arvis
carduus; intereunt segetes, subit aspera silva
lappaeque tribolique, interque nitentia culta
infelix lolium et steriles dominantur avenae,
quod nisi et adsiduis herbam insectabere rastris
et sonitu terrebis aves et ruris opaci
falce premes umbram votisque vocaveris imbrem,
heu magnum alterius frustra spectabis acervum
concussaque famem in silvis solabere quercu.
dicendum et quae sint duris agrestibus arma,
quis sine nec potuere seri nec surgere messes.

"Ceres was the first to teach men to turn the earth with iron, when the acorns and arbutes of the sacred wood began to fail, and Dodona denied men food. Soon, too, on the corn fell trouble, the baneful mildew feeding on the stems, and the lazy thistle bristling in the fields; the crops die, and instead springs up a prickly growth, burs and caltrops, and amid the smiling corn the luckless darnel and barren oats hold sway. Therefore, unless your hoe, time and again, assail the weeds, your choice affright the birds, your knife check the shade of the darkened land, and your vows invoke the rain, vainly alas! Will you eye your neighbors big store, and in the woods shake the oak to solace hunger. I must tell, too, of the hardy rustics' weapons, without which the crops could neither be sown nor raised" trans. Fairclough (1935).

reworking Callimachus. Properly, *ferrum* is simply "iron," but by metonymy it is also "sword," an object violent by its very nature, and designed to cut. The shears that cut the lock from Berenice's head are no less a weapon to hair than a sword is to humans, and the ambiguity here heightens the aggressive nature of the lock's severing. Further contributing to this effect is the ambiguity of the verb *stringere*, which has a broad range of meanings, including "to harden," "to unsheathe," and "to strike."[424] Each meaning is appropriate here: the lock curses the man who first decided to harden iron, the man who first decided to unsheathe the hardness of iron for military purposes, or the man who first decided to strike the hardness of iron by hammering it. Catullus plays with the ambiguity here, allowing the audience to pull the first meaning directly from Callimachus's *τυπίδων* while at the same time suggesting the other two meanings by recalling the harsh martial function of iron and swords and the violence necessary for the creation of such weapons.

Of special importance to this passage is Catullus's inclusion of the exclamation *Iuppiter*, which has no parallel in the source text. It could easily be argued that Catullus uses this simply as a vocative, as Varro Atacinus does with the insertion of the second-person *te* in frs.7 and 11. It may likewise be possible that Catullus follows Livius Andronicus, the playwrights of New Comedy, and Catulus in Romanizing his source text by inserting a distinctively Roman word.[425] The more likely, and more subtle answer, I believe, is that Catullus purposefully calls attention to Callimachus's poem and the shift

[424] See *OLD* s.v. *stringo* 1b, 4, and 5, respectively.

[425] Wormell (1966) suggests this possibility: "At 48 *Iuppiter* gives a touch of Roman solemnity to the prayer (though Catullus has, of course, his tongue in his cheek)" (198). Although Wormell does not explain his "tongue in his cheek" comment, I think he simply means that such solemnity is out of place in so bathetic a complaint by so trivial a victim. As we have already seen frequently, and will continue to see, *c*.66 should not be read as mock-dramatic, but as a serious and heartfelt lament about loss and separation. After all, why is a lock of hair's loss any less valid than Ariadne's loss in *c*.64? If you cut it, does it not fall?

between Golden and Iron Age which the source text emphasizes. Of all deities, the lock chooses to call on Jupiter, who, as the one who caused the shift from the Saturnian Golden Age to the Jovian Iron Age, is the indirect source of iron and its destructive power. The scene becomes all the more pitiful, and the lock all the more victimized, because it seeks aid from the god who has caused its separation.

In the next few sections, the lock describes its actual severing, but whereas initially Catullus reworks Callimachus in order to emphasize the contrast between the power of aggressors and the helplessness of victims, now he bends his source text in a different direction and underscores the suffering of the lock as a result of her loss of Berenice. The first line describes the sister locks lamenting the loss of their kin:

ἄρτι [ν]εότμητόν με κόμαι ποθέεσκον ἀδε[λφεαί,	51
abiunctae paulo ante comae mea fata sorores	51
lugebant…[426]	52

Catullus's changes to Callimachus are less drastic, but no less important, than in his previous passages. The word *abiunctae* is ambiguous and has caused some confusion for readers.[427] Catullus seems here to be playing with this ambiguity, forcing the audience to pay closer attention to the line and focus on the most painful moment immediately after the violent separation. By relying on the ambiguity of the word, Catullus thus makes his audience continually relive the moment of loss and separate *abiunctae* from the lock and from its sisters repeatedly. Also, *lugebant* ("they mourned") is a far stronger verb than

[426] Callimachus: "My sister tresses / were mourning me, just then cut off…" trans. Nisetich (2001); Catullus: "My sister hairs mourned the fate of me cut off just a little before."

[427] For a discussion of this ambiguity and the various possible readings, see Levin (1959, 109). The word *abiunctae* can be the genitive singular, modifying *comae*, making the line: "[My] sisters mourned my fate of [me] the separated lock." It can also be nominative plural, modifying *sorores*, making the line: "[My] sisters, separated [from me], mourned my fate of [me] the lock." Finally, it can be genitive singular modifying a genitive understood in the possessive *mea*, making the line: "[My] sister locks mourned my fate of [me] having been separated [from them]."

Callimachus's simple *ποθέεσκον*, which would properly be rendered in Latin by *desiderabant*. Finally, *abiunctae…comae mea fata* elevates and amplifies the sense of Callimachus's *[ν]εότμητον*.[428]

At this point I would like to break with our line-by-line approach, since the *POxy* 2258 manuscript of Callimachus is badly mutilated in vv.56-74 and it is difficult to make any reasonable comparison between Catullus's poem and the source text without having at least nearly complete lines of the original. I would like instead to offer observations on just two more features of *c*.66: first, Catullus's completely innovative addition of v.62, and second the so-called *ritus nuptialis* at the end of the translation.

In vv.64-67, Callimachus describes the actual catasterism of the lock:

–]ιν ἐν πολέεσσιν ἀρίθμιος ἀλλ[ὰ ∪ –– 64
– Βερ]ενίκειος καλὸς ἐγὼ πλόκαμ[ος 65
–∪∪]λουόμενόν με παρ' ἀθα[νάτους ∪∪ ––
–∪∪]ς ἐν ἀρχαίοις ἄστρον [∪ –∪∪ –[429] 67

Catullus's parallel passage:

sed nos quoque fulgeremus 61
devotae flavi verticis exuviae
uvidulam a fluctu cedentem ad templa deum me
sidus in antiquis diva novum posuit[430] 64

Judging from what is extant in Callimachus, Catullus seems to follow the source text reasonably close in the second couplet: *in antiquis* is identical to and placed in the same

[428] "So too *abiunctae comae mea fata* (51) is a deliberate substitution of poetic artificiality for the flatly prosaic *νεότμητόν με*" (Wormell 1966, 198).

[429] "…but that I too, / Berenike's beautiful lock, might join / the lights studding the heavens, / Kypris placed me among them, wet / from my first ocean bath and rising / near the gods, to shine / a new star cluster with the old" trans. Nisetich (2001).

[430] "…but so that we also might shine
as the dedicated spoils of the golden-haired head,
the goddess placed me departing, moist, from the wave
at the temples of the gods as a new star among ancient stars."

position as *ἐν ἀρχαίοις*, and *uvidulam*, *ad*, and *me* all seem to correspond to Callimachus's *λουόμενόν*, *παρ'*, and *με*, respectively. The first couplet, however, contains nothing of the original. An intratextual echo may explain Catullus's insertion at this point. At the beginning of the poem, Catullus describes the erotic wounds that Ptolemy suffers in his initial wedding night with Berenice and which he still bears when he marches off to war immediately afterwards at *c*.66.11:

> qua rex tempestate novo auctus hymenaeo 11
> vastatum finis iverat Assyrios,
> dulcia nocturnae portans vestigia rixae,
> quam de virgineis gesserat exuviis.[431] 14

Note that in the earlier passage Berenice is thoroughly objectified, and her virginity is counted as only the spoils (*exuviis*) of Ptolemy's conquest. Later on, the lock describes itself as the spoils (*exuviae*) that Berenice dedicated to Venus. Ultimately, the marriage of Berenice signifies the objectification and loss of happiness of the victim, although Berenice uses the lock itself to make her loss only temporary. We might infer from this connection that the lock's tone in the later passage is moderately resentful, since in the verses immediately following the earlier passage the lock is quite clearly disdainful of Berenice's marriage. It is unfortunate that the section of Callimachus's text that corresponds to this section is lost, since it is impossible to tell whether or not Catullus's emphasis on *exuviae* is original, but this possibility seems likely.

The final matter which we must address, and arguably the most important for understanding how Catullus's translation functions within his *corpus*, is the puzzling addition of the nuptial rite in vv.79-88, for which there is no space in the *POxy* 2258

[431] "…when the king, bolstered by his new marriage,
had gone to destroy the Assyrian borders,
carring the sweet traces of nocturnal fight,
which he had waged over the spoils of her virginity."

manuscript.[432] Scholars have spilled much ink over this passage, largely arguing either that it was part of a second edition of Callimachus's *Aetia* which has not been preserved or that it is entirely Catullus's own creation.[433] I do not presume to offer here a complete solution to the problem, as one is unlikely to occur without the full and improbable restoration of the *Aetia*. Nevertheless, I do think that Catullus actively chooses to make this addition to Callimachus and I offer a new hypothesis for why he does so, as well as how the rite relates to the translation and its role within Catullus's *corpus*. The nuptial rite is, I argue, a wholly personalized cap to the translation, in the manner of the *otium* strophe in *c*.51, which allows Catullus to appropriate Callimachus completely, to reflect upon the source text from the point of view of Catullus's lock, and to draw thematic connections between *c*.66 and the surrounding poems.

Structurally, there are many similarities between the original sections of Catullus's two translations. In *c*.51 we saw that Catullus frames his translation by two original sections: *c*.50 fronts the same themes of loss and separation which appear in *c*.51, preparing the audience for a variation on these themes, while the *otium* strophe comments remotely on the experience of the material in the translation. Catullus likewise frames his translation of Callimachus: *c*.65 leads into *c*.66 and develops themes of loss

[432] "In the Oxyrynchus papyrus which supplies the latter fragments of Callimachus' poem there is not a place for the αἴτιον which Catullus provides. That is to say, there is no break in the papyrus between what are Catullus' lines 73 and 89" (Kubiak 1979, 162).

[433] Much scholarship concerning *c*.66 focuses on this issue. For relevant bibliography and a discussion of the different hypotheses, see Marinone (1997, 38-51). Pfeiffer (1987) and Jackson (2001) both argue that Callimachus made separate editions of the *Aetia*, and the nuptial rite is a later addition by the poet. Pfeiffer (1987) remarks: "hunc 'ritum nuptialem', cuius αἴτιον in disticho praecedente indicatur, Catullum de suo addidisse veri dissimillimum est; nisi per errorem decem vv. in ℘ omissi sunt, Callimachum eos addidisse suspicor, cum 'Comam' Aetiorum l. iv insereret...et omisisse 'epilogum'" (121). Jackson (2001) argues that the rite is not just a later alteration, but rather a purposeful and occasional revision. Hollis (1992) argues that the rite is the result of *contaminatio* with another, now lost passage of Callimachus. For the view that the rite is purely Catullan, see especially Putnam (1960), Hutchinson (1988, 323 *n*.91), Cameron (1995, 105-106), and Frederick Williams in Jackson (2001, 2 *n*.3). Jackson (2001, 2 *n*.5) also lists extensive bibliography for this view, which seems the predominant opinion currently.

and separation, and the nuptial rite presents the aloof viewpoint of the lock after all the events in *c*.66, accepting its fate but examining its experience at the same time.

There is a clear break in thought between v.77 and v.78, as the lock shifts out of the narrative of its catasterism and into the present (*nunc*). Compare the shift that occurs in *c*.51, which we have already noted above: Catullus says that as soon as he saw Lesbia (*simul te, / Lesbia, aspexi*, *c*.51.6-7) the symptoms rush upon him, but these symptoms are attracted to the past action of the first three stanzas by the perfect *aspexi*. When he begins the *otium* stanza, Catullus shifts out of the narrative frame and into the present: otium *is* troublesome to him now (*otium…molestum est*, *c*.51.13).[434]

The lock also constructs an audience to whom it speaks (*vos* v.79), whereas the rest of the poem is directed at Berenice.[435] The audience of the rite is very specific: the lock speaks to those who have been married just recently and now are about to begin their wedding night (*optato quas iunxit lumine taeda*).[436] Compare Catullus's shift of addressee in *c*.51: the speaker addresses Lesbia twice in the first three stanzas (*te*, *c*.51.3; *te, / Lesbia* (*c*.51.6-7), but then addresses himself (*Catulle, tibi*, *c*.51.13) in the *otium* strophe.

Structurally, then, there seems to be a similarity between the two original sections of Catullus's translations. We have already seen how Catullus's addition to *c*.51 informs

[434] See Kinsey's (1974) note, above, p.129, for the present force of the statement.

[435] There are 10 second person addresses throughout the poem preceding the nuptial rite: *tu* (v.21), *tibi* (v.24), *te* (v.25, assuming Trincavellius's emendation is correct), *oblita es* (v.27), *adepta es* (v.27), *locuta es* (v.29), *te* (v.31), *pollicita es* (v.34), *o regina, tuo de vertice* (v.39), and *teque tuumque caput* (v.40). The lines following the nuptial rite, which are probably part of Callimachus's poem, are also addressed to Berenice.

[436] Here I follow Fordyce's (1961, 339) reading of v.79, which allows both "with its longed-for light" and "on the longed-for day" as the meanings of *optato…lumine* and draws on *c*.64.33 for a similar use of the phrase *optatae…luces* to indicate the wedding day of Peleus and Thetis. Thomson (2003, 461) seems to misread the passage in arguing that the addressees must be "already-married women, not brides."

our reading of the poem and interacts with the rest of the *corpus*, but does the rite in *c*.66 function in this way? Indeed, the lock not only urges faithfulness among her newlywed addressees,[437] it also urges the enjoyment of love and implies, by echoing other verses of Catullus, that separation and loss are inevitable.

Michael Putnam first proposes the connection between the nuptial rite and the themes of loss that run throughout the *carmina maiora*.[438] Putnam, however, takes the connection only so far, concluding that the lock's address is primarily an admonition against infidelity:[439]

> But just as the Roman poet takes the occasion offered by the marriage of Manlius and Vinia in 61 to offer advice to the happy couple and warn them that the felicity of their present state can be maintained only if they preserve their purity and fidelity toward each other, so here, as a kind of moralizing appendage, by the device of the lock he warns Berenice and all happy lovers to preserve their *castitas* and *puritas*. For only thus will they remain united, preserving that *concordia* which, to Catullus, was the basis of all love.

We have already seen how the *otium* strophe of *c*.51 has been read frequently as merely moralizing, and I have demonstrated, I hope, that there is also in Catullus's addition an implication beyond moralizing, namely that *otium* inevitably leads to loss which, though it is painful, is nevertheless a fundamental aspect of Catullus's persona and poetics. Likewise, I would like here to show that, beyond simple moralizing, the nuptial rite comments on the same themes of loss and, though such loss is painful, shows that it is nevertheless worthwhile.

---

[437] Putnam (1960) notes: "The real point of the ten lines in 66 is not so much the description of an *aition* as an exhortation to fidelity (of which the *aition*, if it is one, is only a minor part)" (226).

[438] See especially Putnam (1960, 226-227).

[439] Putnam (1960, 227).

Let me begin with the connection between the rite and the rest of the translation in the quality which the lock demands of its worshippers. The lock requires perfume poured by those who revere the laws of a chaste bed:

> non prius unanimis corpora coniugibus 80
> tradite nudantes reiecta veste papillas
> quam iucunda mihi munera libet onyx
> vester onyx, casto colitis quae iura cubili[440] 84

The lock evokes here verses it has already spoken, as well as verses in which Catullus himself speaks in other poems. In vv.55-56 it requires chastity (*casto*), the same quality that accompanied its catasterism:

> isque per aetherias me tollens avolat umbras
> et Veneris casto collocat in gremio[441]

The single word may seem a weak connection, but it is strengthened by its precise placement in the third position in the line, by the identical metrical opening of a dactyl and spondee, and by verbal echoes before and after the word: *casto* in each line is framed by *vester onyx* and *et Veneris* on one side and *colitis* and *collocat* on the other.[442] Note also that in *c*.66.56, Catullus echoes *c*.65.20: *procurrit casto virginis e gremio*. How do these lines all relate to each other? Simply put, they all connect separation and loss with marriage. In the case of *c*.65.20, the simile recalls Acontius and Cydippe, the latter of which was forced to lose her maidenhood by the deception of the former by means of the apple. The apple rolls out from her chaste lap (*casto…e gremio*), but her chastity is only

[440] "…do not hand over your bodies to joined marriage
revealing your breasts with your clothes cast off
before your perfume jar pour pleasant offerings to me,
your perfume jar, you who perform these rights with a chaste bed"

[441] "…and he, lifting me up, flies through the airy shadows
and places me on the chaste lap of Venus"

[442] Also potentially important is the fact that the adjective *castus* appears predominantly in the *carmina maiora*, in which it is found in eight of the total ten instances in the *corpus*.

temporary since the apple also signifies her unavoidable marriage. Likewise, the lock's placement into the chaste lap of Venus in *c*.66.56 (*casto…in gremio*) connects the separation of the lock from Berenice as a direct result of the latter's very recent marriage to Ptolemy.[443] Chastity, and by association marriage and the wedding night, is thus naturally accompanied by loss.

One other point in the rite is important for contextualizing Catullus's addition, namely the odd repetition in vv.87-88:

> sed magis, o nuptae, semper concordia vestras,
> semper amor sedes incolat assiduus[444]

What is strange is not the lock's admonition, but the structural and verbal echoes that appear between this couplet and both *c*.66.74-75 and *c*.65.11-12. In the former, the lock complains that it will always be separated from Berenice's head:

> non his tam laetor rebus, quam me afore semper
> afore me a dominae vertice discrucior[445]

Putnam has already picked up the importance of the connection between this couplet and the couplet from the rite, as well as how Catullus amplifies Callimachus to emphasize the pain of separation.[446] The pointed use of repetition of this sort occurs only four times in

---

[443] Cf. *c*.66.11 and 66.14, in which Catullus calls attention to the freshness of Berenice's marriage by stating that Ptolemy goes off to war when the marriage was still new (*novo auctus hymenaeo*) and while he still carries the violent signs of his wedding night (*vestigia rixae / quam de virgineis gesserat exuviis*).

[444] "But more, O brides, always let harmony,
always let constant love accompany your homes"

[445] "I do not delight in these things, as much as by being away,
by being away from the head of my mistress I am tortured"

[446] "In spite of Barber, *ἀσχάλλω* is hardly replaced by *discrucior*. The one is a verb more associated with annoyance than tribulation, while *discrucior* registers the almost physical pain the lock undergoes at being separated from her mistress. This is a motif entirely of Catullus' creation, and appears obviously or inherently in most of the changes he makes from his original in the last two of these four lines…In lines 75-78, Callimachus concentrated on the lock's annoyance at being deprived of unguents, whereas Catullus stressed the torture absense from Berenice caused. The lovers will always be united, whereas the lock's

Catullus, and in each case the emphasis is on the pain of separation.[447] The repetition of *semper* within the same couplet in the rite recalls the appearance of *semper* in the couplet in which *afore* is repeated twice in the same couplet, tying the two sections and thoughts together.[448]

The other echo of *c*.66.87-88 in *c*.65.11-12 is much stronger, and it is through this couplet that Catullus connects erotic separation with the loss of death. In the couplet in *c*.65, Catullus remarks that he will always sing sad songs now that his brother is dead:

at certe semper amabo,
semper maesta tua carmina morte canam[449]

Note the emphatic repetition of *semper* at the beginning of both pentameters, as well as the reference to love (*amabo* 65.11, *amor* 66.88). Catullus joins the two poems again and emphasizes the connection between amatory and fraternal love and loss. The lock considers *amor* to be a good worthy of dedicated cultivation, but Catullus, by inserting a framed address within his translation, also underscores the fact that love of a thing allows for its loss to become painful. Thus, love and loss are implicitly bound in Catullus's *corpus*.

The lock's admonition is not only an *aition* or an admonition of fidelity, but also a programmatic statement about the nature of love. As with *otium* in *c*.51, which provides

---

parting is eternal (the occurrence of *semper* in l. 75 and then twice in 87-88 adds to the effect)" (Putnam 1960, 224-226).

[447] For a discussion of these passages, which include *c*.65.11-12, *c*.65.39-40, 75-76, and 87-88, see Clausen (1970, 91-93).

[448] It is perhaps also important that *semper* is a relatively rare word in Catullus, occurring only twelve times, of which ten instances are in the *carmina maiora* and are spaced throughout the longer poems almost evenly until the intensification in *c*.66. It appears once each in *c*.61-64: *c*.61.218. *c*.62.33, *c*.63.90, and *c*.64.315. In *c*.65 it appears twice in the same couplet at 65.11-12, and it appears three times in *c*.66 at 66.75, 87, and 87.

[449] "But certainly I will always love you, I will always sing songs sad with your death"

both pleasure at its creation and pain at its subsequent and necessary loss, *amor* in *c*.66 provides both joy and grief, but neither separately. In his translations, Catullus uses these capping insertions to reflect upon his source text, to tie it to the rest of his poetry, and create a unified programmatic statement.

APPENDIX A: OVID'S NAVITA, RECTOR, AND AURIGA

We have already seen that the word *auriga* is rare in the sense of "helmsman," and I would like briefly to discuss the other Classical instance of this usage in Ovid's *Tristia* 1.4:

tinguitur oceano custos Erymanthidos ursae, 1
aequoreasque suo sidere turbat aquas.
nos tamen Ionium non nostra findimus aequor
sponte, sed audaces cogimur esse metu. 4
...
pinea texta sonant pulsu, stridore rudentes, 9
ingemit et nostris ipsa carina malis. 10
navita confessus gelidum pallore timorem,
iam sequitur victus, non regit arte ratem.
utque parum validus non proficientia rector
cervici rigidae frena remittit equi
sic non quo voluit, sed quo rapit impetus undae 15
aurigam video vela dedisse rati.[450]
16

I think it likely that Ovid uses *auriga* for two specific reasons. First, the vocabulary in Ovid's passage recalls both Catullus 64 and Varro fr.4, both of which he undoubtedly knew. Ovid's *pinea texta* appears in Catullus at 64.10, and all three passages use some form of *carina*. In addition to these admittedly weaker verbal echoes that might be expected in any ship scene, there are several odd words which Ovid seems to draw from Catullus: *tinguitur* at *Tristia* 1.4.1 and Catullus's *imbuit* are unusual words for emersion

[450] "The guardian of the Erymanthian bear dips in ocean and with his setting stars makes stormy the waters of the sea. Yet I am cleaving the Ionian waves not of my own will but forced to boldness through fear...The pine planks resound from the battering, the ropes from the shrieking wind, and the very keel groans over my woes. The sailor confessing by his pale face a chilling fear now in defeat humours the craft, no longer skilfully guiding her. As a rider who is not strong enough lets the ineffective reins fall loose upon the stubborn neck of his horse, so not where he wishes but where the billow's power carries him our charioteer, I see, has given the ship her head" trans. Wheeler (1988).

into the sea, *findimus aequor* and *proscidit aequor* are phrases at the same final position in hexameter lines that evoke violent plowing, and *audaces* is strongly reminiscent of *ausi sunt*.

Unfortunately, the fragmentary nature of Varro's line does not allow us to say to what extent Ovid borrows from the *Argonautae* in this passage, but the rarity of the metaphor *auriga* and the fact that both Ovid and Varro draw from the same source suggest that, at the very least, Ovid was writing with Varro in mind. Though he is certainly capable of innovation on his own, Ovid seems to have appropriated the metaphor from Catullus and the unique vocabulary directly from Varro.

Second, Ovid's *auriga* is not an abrupt Neoteric metaphor and follows the Augustan tendency to favor similes over metaphors, for which see above, pp.95-96, on Vergil's similar usage at *Aeneid* 5.142-147. Ovid seems to draw as well from Vergil, who likewise draws from Catullus. Much of Ovid's vocabulary comes from Vergil's description of the start of the regatta: Ovid's *insilit* evokes Vergil's *prosiluere*, *verberat* evokes *verbera*, *findimus* evokes *infindunt*, *frena* evokes *lora*, *remittit* evokes *immissis*, and *aurigam* evokes *aurigae*. Vergil thus stands as an intermediary between Ovid and Catullus/Varro: Vergil's chariot race simile leads Ovid into the metaphor of the Neoterics at the end of Ovid's passage. The term *auriga* is still an unusual metaphorical rendering of *gubernator* in *Tristia* 1.4, but Ovid introduces it first with a straightforward epic simile comparing the helmsman with a charioteer (*rector*). He thus mixes two traditions, one Neoteric and one Augustan, and enters into a complicated intertextual discourse with his sources. Ovid is fond of such stylistic mixes, and the gradual shift from *navita* to *rector*-simile to *auriga* metaphor is a brilliant display of nuanced Ovidian *variatio*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J.N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.

Arkins, B. 1982. "Tradition Reshaped: Language and Style in Euripides' Medea 1-19, Ennius' Medea Exul 1-9 and Catullus 64.1-30," *Ramus* 11, 116-133.

Arnott, W.G., ed. 1997. *Menander*. Vol.1. Cambridge, Mass.

Bain, D. 1979. "*Plautus Vortit Barbare*: Plautus, *Bacchides* 526-61 and Menander, *Dis exapaton* 102-12," in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, edd. D. West and T. Woodman, 17-34. Cambridge.

Baiter, I.G. and C. Halm. 1961. *M Tullii Ciceronis Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia ac Deperditorum Fragmenta*. Vol.4. Amsterdam.

Barnstone, W., trans. 1998. *Sappho. Poems. A New Version*. Los Angeles.

Barsby, J., ed. 1986. *Plautus: Bacchides*. Oak Park.

---, ed. 2001. *Terence. The Woman of Andros, The Self-Tormentor, The Eunuch*. Vol.1. Cambridge, Mass.

Barwick, C., ed. 1964. *Flavii Sosipatri Charisii Artis Grammaticae Libri V*. Leipzig.

Bassnett-McGuire, S. 1991. *Translation Studies*. New York.

Belloc, H. 1931. *On Translation*. Oxford.

Bing, P. 1997. "Reconstructing Berenike's Lock," in *Collecting Fragments – Fragmente Sammeln*, ed. G. Most, 78-94. Göttingen.

Block, E. 1984. "Carmen 65 and the Arrangement of Catullus' Poetry," *Ramus* 13, 48-59.

Brock, S. 1979. "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," *GRBS* 20, 69-87.

Cameron, A. 1993. *The Greek Anthology: from Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford.

Campbell, D.A. 1967. *Greek Lyric Poetry*. New York.

Clack, J. 1976. "Otium tibi Molestum Est – Catullus 50 and 51," *CB* 52, 50-53.

Clark, D. 1957. *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education*. New York.

Clausen, W. 1964. "Callimachus and Latin Poetry," *GRBS* 5: 181-196.

---. 1970. “Catullus and Callimachus,” *HSCP* 74, 85-94.

---. 1976. “Catvlli Veronensis Liber,” *CP* 71, 37-43.

---. 1986. “Cicero and the New Poetry,” *HSCP* 90, 159-170.

Copley, F.O. 1974. “The Structure of Catullus c. 51 and the Problem of the *Otium*-Strophe,” *GB* 2, 25-37.

Courtney, E., ed. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.

Crowther, N.B. 1970. “*OI NEΩTEPOI*, Poetae Novi, and Cantores Euphorionis,” *CQ* 20, 322-327.

---. 1987. “Varro Atacinus: Traditional or Neoteric Poet,” *L’Antiquité Classique* 262-268.

Damen, M. 1995. “‘By the gods, boy, … Stop bothering me! Can’t you tell Menander from Plautus?’ or How *Dis Exapaton* does *not* help us understand *Bacchides*,” *Antichthon* 29, 15-29.

Davis, C.G. Jr. 1966. *The Voyage, the Chariot Race, and the Hunt: Three Motifs in Vergil’s Aeneid*. Diss. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Denniston, J.D. 1954. *The Greek Particles*. Oxford.

Dionisotti, A.C. 1982. “From Ausonius’ Schooldays? A Schoolbook and Its Relatives,” *JRS* 72, 83-125.

Duckworth, G.E. 1952. *The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment*. Princeton.

Elder, J.P. 1966. “The ‘Figure of Grammar’ in Catullus 51,” in *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studiesi in Honor of Harry Caplan*, ed. L. Wallach, 202-209. Ithaca

Edwards, M.J. 1989. “Greek into Latin: A Note on Catullus and Sappho,” *Latomus* 48, 590-600.

Fairclough, H., ed. 1935. *Virgil. Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I-VI*. Cambridge, Mass.

---. 1970., ed. *Horace. Satires, Epistles, and Ars Poetica*. Cambridge, Mass.

Farrell, J. 2001. *Latin Language and Latin Culture*. Cambridge.

Ferry, D., trans. 2001. *The Epistles of Horace*. New York.

Finamore, J. 1984. “Catullus 50 and 51: Friendship, Love, and Otium,” *CW* 78, 11-19.

Fordyce, C.J., ed. 1961. *Catullus*. Oxford.

Fraenkel, E. 1931. “Livius Andronicus,” *RE* Suppl.5, 598-607.

Frank, R.I. 1968. “Catullus 51: Otium versus Virtus,” *TAPA* 99, 233-239.

Fredericksmeyer, E.A. 1965. “On the Unity of Catullus 51,” *TAPA* 96, 153-163.

---. 1983. “The beginning and the end of Catullus’ *longus amor*,” *SO* 58, 63-88.

Frost, K.B. 1988. *Exits and Entrances in Menander*. Oxford.

Gaiser, K. 1970. “Die plautinischen ‘Bacchiden’ und Menanders ‘Dis exapaton’,” *Philologus* 114, 51-87.

Gee, E. 2001. “Cicero’s Astronomy,” *CQ* 51, 520-536.

Gifford, W., ed. 1875. *The Works of Ben Jonson. With Notes Critical and Explanatory and a Biographical Memoir*. London.

Gildersleeve, B. 1965. *Gildersleeve’s Latin Grammar*. New York.

Godwin, J., ed. 1995. *Catullus: Poems 61-68*. Warminster.

Goldberg, S. 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. Oxford.

---. 2005. *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic: Poetry and its Reception*. Cambridge

Gow, A.S.F. and D.L. Page. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. Vol.2. Cambridge.

Greene, E. 1999. “Re-Figuring the Feminine Voice: Catullus Translating Sappho,” *Arethusa* 32, 1-18.

Griffith, R.D. 1995. “Catullus’ *Coma Berenices* and Aeneas’ Farewell to Dido,” *TAPA* 125, 47-59.

Gutzwiller, K. 1992. “Callimachus’ *Lock and Berenice*: Fantasy, Romance, and Propaganda,” *AJP* 113, 359-385.

---. 1993. “Callimachus and Hedylus: A Note on Catullus 66.13-14,” *Mnemosyne* 46, 530-532.

Habinek, T. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton.

Halporn, J., M. Ostwald, and T. Rosenmeyer. 1963. *The Meters of Greek and Latin Poetry*. Suffolk.

Handley, E.W. 1968. *Menander and Plautus: A Study in Comparison*. London.

Harder, M.A. 2002. "Intertextuality in Callimachus' *Aetia*," in *Entretiens sur L'Antiquité Classique: Callimaque* (Tome 48), 189-233. Geneva.

Hermann, G., ed. 1845. *Plauti Bacchides*. Leipzig.

Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.

Hollis, A.S. 1992. "The Nuptial Rite in Catullus 66 and Callimachus' Poetry for Berenice," *Zeitschrift fur Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 91, 21-28.

---. 1997. "A Fragmentary Addiction," in *Collecting Fragments – Fragmente Sammeln*, ed. G. Most, 111-123. Göttingen.

---. 2003. "The *Argonautae* of Varro Atacinus," in *Des géants à Dionysos : mélanges de mythologie et de poésie grecques offerts à Francis Vian*, edd. D. Accorinti and P. Chuvin, 331-341. Alexandria.

Holmes, L. 1992. "Myrrh and Unguents in the *Coma Berenices*," *CP* 87, 47-50.

Holzberg, N. 2000. "Lesbia, the Poet, and the Two Faces of Sappho: 'Womanufacture' in Catullus," *PCPS* 46, 28-44.

Hubbel, H.M., ed. 1960. *Cicero. De Inventione. De Optimo Genere Oratorum. Topica*. Cambridge, Mass.

Hunink, V. ed. 1997. *Apuleius of Madauros: Pro Se De Magia (Apologia)*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam.

Hunter, R. 1986. "Apollo and the Argonauts: Two notes on Ap. Rhod. 2, 669-719," *MH* 43, 50-60.

---. 1993. "Callimachean Echoes in Catullus 65," *Zeitschrift fur Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 96, 179-182.

Hutchinson, G.O. 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford.

Itkowitz, J. 1983. “On the Last Stanza of Catullus 51,” *Latomus* 42, 129-134.

Jackson, S. 1997. “Argo: The First Ship?” *RM* 140, 249-257.

---. 2001. “Callimachus, Coma Berenices. Origins,” *Mnemosyne* 54, 1-9.

Jakobson, R. 1959. “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation,” in *On Translation*, ed. R. Brower, 232-239. Cambridge, Mass.

Jocelyn, H.D., ed. 1967. *The Tragedies of Ennius*. Cambridge.

Jones, D.M. 1959. “Cicero as a Translator,” *BICS* 6, 22-34.

Jones, W.H.S., ed. 1956. *Pliny. Natural History*. Vol. 7. Cambridge, Mass.

Khan, H.A. 1966. “*Color Romanus* in *Catullus* 51,” *Latomus* 25, 448-460.

---. 1972. “Observations on Two Poems of Catullus,” *RM* 114, 159-178.

Kidd, D.A. 1963. “The Unity of Catullus 51,” *AUMLA* 20, 298-308.

---., ed. 1997. *Aratus: Phaenomena. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Cambridge.

Kinsey, T.E. 1974. “Catullus 51,” *Latomus* 33, 372-378.

Korhonen, K. 1996. “On the Composition of the Hermeneumata Language Manuals,” *Arctos* 30, 101-119.

Kroll, W., ed. 1959. *C. Valerius Catullus*. Stuttgart.

Kubiak, D.P. 1979. *Cicero, Catullus, and the Art of Neoteric Translation*. Diss. Harvard University.

---. 1981. “Catullus 64.1-2,” *AJP* 102, 41-42.

Kytzler, B. 1993. “*Fidus Interpres*: The Theory and Practice of Translation in Classical Antiquity,” *Antichthon* 23, 42-50.

Lavency, M. 1965. “L’Ode à Lesbie et son billet d’envoi,” *L’Antiquité Classique* 34, 175-182.

Lefèvre, E. 2001. “Dis Exapaton 6-113 und Plautus *Bacchides* 500-561,” in *ScriptOralia Romana: Die römische Literatur zwischen Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit*, ed. L. Benz, 141-168. Tübingen.

Lehnus, L. 2000. *Nuova Bibliografia Callimachea (1489-1998)*. Alexandria.

Lejnieks, V. 1968. "*Otium Catullianum* Reconsidered," *CJ* 63, 262-264.

Leo, F., ed. 1895. *Plauti Comoediae*. Vol. 1. Berolini.

---. 1913. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur: die archaische Literatur*. Berlin.

Levin, D. 1959. "Ambiguities of Expression in Catullus 66 and 67," *CP* 54, 109-111.

Lobel, E., ed. 1925. *ΣΑΠΦΟΥΣ ΜΕΛΗ: The Fragments of the Lyrical Poems of Sappho*. Oxford.

Loomis, J.W. 1972. *Studies in Catullan Verse: An Analysis of Word Types and Patterns in the Polymetra*. Leiden.

Luck, G. 1976. "Aratea," *AJP* 97, 213-234.

Lunelli, A. 1969. *Aerius: Storia di una Parola Poetica (Varia Neoterica)*. Rome.

---. 1991. "Il grido delle ninfe ortigie: Varrone Atacino e Callimaco (Varro At. *fr*. 5 Büchn. = 5 Mor.)," in *Studi di Filologia Classica in Onore di Giusto Monaco*. Vol. 2. 655-669.

Mair, A.W. and G.R. Mair, ed. 1955. *Callimachus: Hymns and Epigrams, Lycophron, Aratus*. Cambridge, Mass.

Maltby, R. 1997. "The language of early latin epigram," *Sandalion* 20, 43-56.

Mariotii, S. 1952. *Livio Andronico e la Traduzione Artistica*. Milan.

Martin, J., ed. 1998. *Aratos. Phénomènes*. Vol.2. Paris.

Matthews, V. 2004. "From *Coma* to Constellation: Callimachus, Catullus, and Catasterism," *Eranos* 102, 47-57.

May, J. and J. Wisse, trans. 2001. *Cicero: On the Ideal Orator (De Oratore)*. Oxford.

Mazzarino, S. 1982. "L'iscrizione latina nella trilingue di Philae e i carmi di Gallus scoperti a Qasr Ibrîm," *RM* 125, 312-337.

McKeown, J.C., ed. 1987[1]. *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary*. Vol. 1. Leeds.

---., ed. 1987[2]. *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary*. Vol. 2. Leeds.

Melmoth, W., ed. 1963. *Pliny. Letters*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, Mass.

Morel, W. 1926. "Zu Hesiod, Apollonius Rhodius, und Varro Atacinus," *Hermes* 61, 231-235.

Most, G. 1981. "On the Arrangement of Catullus' *Carmina Maiora*," *Philologus* 125, 109-125.

Muckle, J.T. 1942. "Greek Works Translated Directly into Latin Before 1350," *Mediaeval Studies* 4, 33-42.

Meuwese, A.P.M. 1920. *De Rerum Gestarum Divi Augusti Versione Graeca*. Amsterdam.

Müller, H. 1964. *Ciceros Übersetzungen. Beiträge zur Kenntniss der cicronischen Sprache*. Diss. University of Marburg.

Murray, A.T., ed. 1998. *Homer. Odyssey*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.

---., ed. 1999. *Homer. Iliad*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.

Mynors, R.A.B., ed. 1972. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford.

Nisetich, F., trans. 2001. *The Poems of Callimachus*. Oxford.

Nixon, P., ed. 1932. *Plautus*. Vol.4. Cambridge, Mass.

Norden, E., ed. 1957. *Aeneis Buch VI*. Stuttgart.

O'Hara, J. 1994. Rev. of E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. *CP* 89, 384-391.

---. 1996. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor.

O'Higgins, D. 1990. "Sappho's Splintered Tongue: Silence in Sappho 31 and Catullus 51," *AJP* 111, 156-167.

Oldfather, C.H., trans. 1935. *Diodorus of Sicily*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, Mass.

Page, D., ed. 1959. *Sappho and Alcaeus*. Oxford.

Pardini, A. 2001. "A Homeric Formula in Catullus (c.51.11-12 gemina teguntur lumina nocte)," *TAPA* 131, 109-118.

Pascucci, G. 1979. "*Praeneoterica*: Lutazio, Callimaco e Plauto," in *Studi di Poesia Latina in Onore di Antonio Traglia*. Vol. 1. 109-126. Rome.

Perini, G.B. 1997. “Valerio Edituo e gli Altri,” *Sandalion* 20, 15-42.

Perutelli, A. 1990. “Lutazio Catulo Poeta,” *Rivista di Filologia di Istruzione Classica* 118, 257-281.

Pinto, M. 1956. “Il *Circolo Letterario* di Q. Lutazio Catulo,” *Giornale Italiana di Filologia* 9, 210-233.

Pfeiffer, R., ed. 1949. *Callimachus. Volumen II: Hymni et Epigrammata*. Oxford.

---. 1987., ed. *Callimachus. Volumen I: Fragmenta*. Oxford.

Possanza, M. 2004. *Translating the Heavens: Aratus, Germanicus, and the Poetics of Latin Translation*. New York.

Powell, J.G.F. 1995. “Cicero’s Translations from Greek,” in *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*, ed. J.G.F. Powell, 273-300. Oxford.

Prickard, A.O., ed. 1906. *Libellus de Sublimitate Dionysio Longino Fere Adscriptus*. Oxford.

Putnam, M. 1960. “Catullus 66.75-88,” *CP* 55, 223-228.

Questa, C. 1970. “Alcune strutture sceniche di Plauto e Menandro,” in *Menandre*, ed. Turner, 181-228. Geneva.

---. 1975., ed. *Bacchides*. Firenze.

Quinn, K., ed. 1973. *Catullus: The Poems*. London.

Rackham, H., ed. 1931. *Cicero. De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*. Cambridge, Mass.

---., ed. 1961. *Pliny. Natural History*. Vol. 5. Cambridge, Mass.

Richter, H. 1938. *Uebersetzen und Uebersetzungen in der römischen Literature*. Diss. Friedrich-Alexander-Universität zu Erlangen.

Ronconi, A. 1973. *Interpreti Latini di Omero*. Turin.

Ross, D.O. 1969. *Style and Tradition in Catullus*. Cambridge, Mass.

Rouse, W.H.D., ed. 1992. *Lucretius. On the Nature of Things*. Cambridge, Mass.

Russell, D.A. 1979. “De Imitatione,” in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, edd. D. West & T. Woodman, 1-16. Cambridge.

Russell, S. 1986. *Studies in Sappho Fragment 31 L-P and Catullus, Poems 11, 50, and 51*. Diss. New York University.

Scaffai, M., ed. 1997. *Baebii Italici Ilias Latina: Introduzione, Edizione Critica, Traduzione Italiana e Commento*. Bologna.

Scott, W.C. 1969. "Catullus and Calvus (Cat. 50)," *CP* 64, 169-173.

Seaton, R.C., ed. 1912. *Apollonius Rhodius. The Argonautica*. Cambridge, Mass.

Sedley, D. 1999. "Lucretius' Use and Avoidance of Greek," in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, edd. J.N. Adams and R.G. Mayer, 227-246. Oxford.

Seele, A. 1995. *Römische Übersetzer. Nöte Freiheiten Absichten*. Darmstadt.

Segal, C. 1970. "Catullan *Otiosi*: The Lover and the Poet," *G&R* 17, 25-31.

Selden, D.L. 1998. "Alibis," *ClAnt* 17, 289-412.

Shackleton Bailey, D.R., ed. 1999. *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*. Vols.2 and 3. Cambridge, Mass.

Soubiran, J., ed. 2002. *Cicéron: Aratea, Fragments Poétiques*. Paris.

Tandoi, V., ed. 1984. *Disiecti Membra Poetae: Studi di Poesia Latina in Frammenti*. Vol. 1. Foggia.

Thomas, R.F. 1979. "New Comedy, Callimachus, and Roman Poetry," *HSCP* 83, 179-206.

---. 1982. "Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (Poem 64.1-18)," *AJP* 103, 144-164.

---. 1999. "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference," in *Reading Virgil and His Texts*, ed. R. Thomas, 114-141. Ann Arbor.

Thomson, D.F.S., ed. 2003. *Catullus: Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary*. Toronto.

Tompkins, J., ed. 1980. *Reader-Response Criticism. From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*. Baltimore.

Traglia, A. 1971. "Note su Cicerone traduttore di Platone e di Epicuro," in *Studi filologici e storici in onore di Vittorio De Falco*, 137-178. Naples.

---. 1974. *Poetae Novi*. Rome.

Traina, A. 1970. *Vortit Barbare: Le Traduzioni Poetiche da Livio Andronico a Cicerone*. Rome.

---. 1989. "La Traduzioni," in *Lo Spazio Letterario di Roma Antica*, edd. G. Cavallo, P. Fedeli, and A. Giardina, 93-123. Vol. 2. Rome.

Tuplin, C. 1979. "*Cantores Euphorionis* Again," *CQ* 29, 358-380.

Van Sickle, J. 1968. "About Form and Feeling in Catullus 65," *TAPA* 99, 487-508.

---. 1981. "Poetics of Opening and Closure in Meleager, Catullus and Gallus," *CW* 75, 65-75.

---. 1988. "The First Hellenistic Epigrams at Rome," in *Vir Bonus Discendi Peritus: Studies in celebration of Otto Skutsch's eightieth birthday*, ed. N. Horsfall, 143-156. London.

Vine, B. 1992. "On the 'Missing' Fourth Stanza of Catullus 51," *HSCP* 94, 251-258.

Waszink, J.H. 1956. "Camena," *C&M* 17, 139-148.

Weber, C. 1983. "Two Chronological Contradictions in Catullus 64," *TAPA* 113, 263-271.

---. 1996. "Roscius and the Roscida Dea," *CQ* 46, 298-302.

West, D. and T. Woodman., edd. 1979. *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*. Cambridge.

Wetmore, M.N. 1961. *Index Verborum Catullianus*. Hildesheim.

Whallon, W. 1961. "The Homeric Epithets," *YCS* 17, 95-142.

Wheeler, A.L. 1934. *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry*. Berkeley.

---. trans. 1988. *Ovid. Tristia. Ex Ponto*. Cambridge, Mass.

Willcock, M.M. 1988. "Homer's Chariot Race and Virgil's Boat Race," *PVS* 19, 1-13.

Wills, G. 1967. "Sappho 31 and Catullus 51," *GRBS* 8, 167-197.

Wills, J. 1998. "Divided Allusion: Virgil and the *Coma Berenices*," *HSCP* 98, 277-305.

Witgil, D. 1982. “The Translator of the Greek *Res Gestae* of Augustus,” *AJP* 103, 189-194.

Woodman, A.J. 1966. “Some Implications of *otium* in Catullus 51.13-16,” *Latomus* 25, 217-226.

---. 1978. “C.11 and 51,” *LCM* 3, 77-79.

Wormell, D.E.W. 1966. “Catullus as Translator,” in *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studiesi in Honor of Harry Caplan*, ed. L. Wallach, 187-201. Ithaca.

Wray, D. 2001. *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood*. Cambridge.

Wright, B.G. III. 2003. “Access to the Source: Cicero, Ben Sira, The Septuagint and their Audiences,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 34, 1-27.