reluctant subject. In each case, the subject is forced to compromise himself, and as a result turns to desperate measures. The similarity of situation, along with the deliberate ambiguity of the phrase μέγα ἔργον, could easily have led a reader or listener to expect an attempt by Combabus to do away with the king before the king could do away with him. In the event, this turns out to be a false narrative path: and so the sudden reference to castration immediately after Combabus' monologue comes with greatly accentuated shock value.

The two interpretations offered by Lightfoot and by me need not, of course, exclude each other. Lightfoot herself has offered a sensitive analysis of Lucian's polyvalent use of the ἔργ- root in this narrative (p. 398), and so it is not surprising that this phrase here can carry more than one meaning. Both need to be appreciated for Lucian's artistry to be fully understood.

All Souls College, Oxford P. J. FINGLASS
patrick.finglass@all-souls.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi062

PLAUTUS AND ENNIUS: A NOTE ON PLAUTUS, *BACCHIDES* 962–5[1]

At *Bacchides* 925–77 the clever slave Chrysalus recites a *canticum* in order to celebrate his success as a cheat to the detriment of his master Nicobulus, whom he has defrauded of the money necessary for his young master's love-affair: he carries out a hyperbolic comparison between his action and the triumph of the Greeks with the wooden horse in the war of Troy.[2] However, the *lamentatio* (so called at v. 932, *libet lamentari*) becomes larger and goes on to display a wider part of that legend, interpreted in a form of parody: there is a sort of review of personages and episodes from the Trojan myth (Priam, Alexander, Helen, Agamemnon, Menelaus, Ulysses, and others), compared to the characters and the intrigues performed in the comedy with a comic effect of contrast.[3] At vv. 962–5 in particular Chrysalus recalls a risk that he has run and hardly averted; he compares it to a peculiar episode concerning Ulysses:

> ibi uix me exsolui: id periclum adsimilo, Vlixem ut praedicant
> cognitum ab Helena esse proditum Hecubae; sed ut olim ille se
> blanditiis exemit et persuasit se ut amitteret,
> item ego dolis me illo extuli e periclo et decepi senem.

These verses are considered interpolated by many editors, beginning with Friedrich Leo, because of their content, which seems to be out of place at that point and cannot be found in the works of other ancient authors (except Euripides and probably

[1] The *Bacchides* is included in the volume *Plaute* 2, texte établi et traduit par A. Ernout, (Paris, 1933); it is commented by Ernout himself (Paris, 1935), is edited with an ample introduction by C. Questa (Firenze, 1975[2]), and has an English translation and commentary by J. Barsby (Warminster, 1986).

[2] As regards the content, the structure and the many textual problems of this *canticum* cf. E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin, 1922), 61–72; Questa, ibid., 46–68.

[3] The parody of the mythical matter (or rather of the tragedy, which treats that matter) is a device frequently employed by Plautus; on this theme cf. H. Haffter, *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache* (Berlin, 1934), 76–85; A. Thierfelder, 'Plautus und die römische Tragödie', *Hermes* 74 (1939), 155–66; G. Manuwald, 'Tragödienelemente in Plautus' Amphitruo. Zeichen von Tragödienparodie oder Tragi-komödie?', in Th. Baier (ed.), *Studien zu Plautus' Amphitruo* (Tübingen, 1999), 177–202.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not only him, as will be discussed below).[4] This study is intended to demonstrate that these verses are not necessarily interpolated: indeed, they can provide new evidence for the dating of the comedy and, more generally, can reveal something about the relationship between Plautus and Ennius, viewed in terms of intertextual dialogue.[5]

In these verses Chrysalus compares himself to Ulysses, when he went to Troy on a secret mission to spy on the enemy and there, 'as people say' (*ut praedicant*, v. 962; the matter being presented like a *comunis opinio*), he was 'recognized by Helen and delivered to Hecuba', but he 'found a way out with his lies and persuaded her to let him go'; in the same way Chrysalus too deceives his master and averts the risk. Ulysses' mission at Troy is largely recounted in the literary and mythographic sources, starting with the Homeric epos. Talking to Telemachus, who has come to Menelaus in Lacedaemon looking for his father, Helen narrates the recognition of the hero and her secret plot with him (*Od.* 4. 244–58):

> Marring his own body with cruel blows, and flinging a wretched garment about his shoulders, in the fashion of a slave he entered the broad-wayed city of the foe, and he hid himself under the likeness of another, a beggar, he who was in no wise such a one at the ships of the Achaeans. In this likeness he entered the city of the Trojans, and all of them were but as babes. I alone recognized him in this disguise, and questioned him, but he in his cunning sought to avoid me. Howbeit when I was bathing him and anointing him with oil, and had put on him raiment, and sworn a mighty oath not to make him known among the Trojans as Odysseus before that he reached the swift ships and the huts, then at length he told me all the purpose of the Achaeans. And when he had slain many of the Trojans with the long sword, he returned to the company of the Argives and brought back plentiful tidings. Then the other Trojan women wailed aloud, but my soul was glad, for already my heart was turned to go back to my home, and I groaned for the blindness that Aphrodite gave me, when she led me thither from my dear native land, forsaking my child and my bridal chamber, and my husband, a man who lacked nothing, whether in wisdom or in comeliness.[6]

There is not even a hint about Ulysses 'delivered from Helen to Hecuba', as Plautus writes at v. 963. In fact, Helen says she regrets having left her family in Lacedaemon (because of Aphrodite, like Homer really knows) and she is waiting anxiously for the conquest of Troy,[7] while, in the *lamentatio* of the *Bacchides* she seems to remain faithful to the host people, especially when she denounces the hero to the queen.

The same episode written in the Homeric way also occurred in the Epic Cycle—to be precise, in the lost poem entitled *Ilias parua* and ascribed to Lesches from Lesbos, whose summary has been written by Proclus (the fifth-century Neoplatonist?) in his *Chrestomathy* (204–36 Severyns).[8] Once again, in this poem, as soon as Ulysses is identified by Helen, he begins to conspire with her against the Trojan people: as explained in the summary, the hero 'disfigures himself and enters Ilion

[4] Cf. *Plauti Comoediae* 1, recensuit et emendauit F. Leo (Berlin, 1895), ad loc.; L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (Paris, 1911), 405; Questa (n. 1) 56, 66.

[5] Cf. A. Grilli, *Studi enniani* (Brescia, 1965), 155–9 (also about the parody of the Ennian tragedy in the *Bacchides*); O. Skutsch, *Studia Enniana* (London, 1968), 174–81, 190–1.

[6] This passage comes from *Homer. The Odyssey* 1, with an English translation by A. T. Murray (Cambridge, MA and London, 1919). For the Greek text cf. *Homeri Opera* 3, recognouit Th. W. Allen (Oxford, 1917[3]).

[7] About Helen in the Homeric epic cf. G. J. Ryan, "Helen in Homer", *CJ* 61 (1965), 115–17; F. J. Groten Jr, 'Homer's Helen', *G&R* 15 (1968), 33–9; O. Lendle, 'Paris, Helena und Aphrodite. Zur Interpretation der III Gesanges der Ilias', *A&A* 14 (1968), 63–71; H. Homeyer, *Die spartanische Helena und der trojanische Krieg* (Wiesbaden, 1977), 1–13.

[8] The text has been edited by A. Severyns, *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclos* 4 (Paris, 1963), 89–90; *Poetarum epicorum Graecorum testimonia et fragmenta* 1, edidit A. Bernabé (Leipzig, 1987), 74–5; *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, edidit M. Davies (Göttingen, 1988), 52–3.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to reconnoitre. He is recognized by Helen, and comes to an agreement with her about the taking of the city. After killing some Trojans, he gets back to the ships' (224).[9] Furthermore the episode was included in the *Library*, wrongly ascribed to Apollodorus, whose section concerning the Trojan legend is lost; but a review of the matter has been preserved in the so-called *Vatican Epitome*.[10] Here Ulysses' mission is reported as in the summary of Lesches' poem, except that the hero in the same expedition also accomplishes the stealing of the Palladion together with Diomedes (5.13 Wagner). The *Chrestomathy* derives strictly from the cyclic poems, while the *Library* reproduces heterogeneous material, coming from many sources, datable chiefly from the Hellenistic period.[11] The Ulysses episode is exposed in the two texts in a very similar way, agreeing approximately with the tale of Homer, which must have been the model or starting-point for all the other writers. Where, therefore, does the 'variation' testified in the *Bacchides* come from? Why should Plautus have chosen to follow a marginal and uncommon mythical trend?

The first question finds an answer in the light of the *Hecuba* of Euripides.[12] In this tragedy the old queen of Troy, fallen into the condition of a wretched slave after the conquest of the city, tries in vain to save the life of her daughter Polyxena, whom the Greeks have decided to immolate at Achilles' tomb (as required by the ghost of the hero). The decree of the army is strongly supported by Ulysses, who goes himself to take the girl from the tents of the prisoners. Hecuba makes a vain attempt to persuade him to spare her daughter's life; she reminds him of the time when she had saved him, when he had come to Troy and, being recognized by Helen, was delivered to her, the queen of the city: yet she had set him free and let him return to the Greek camp. This emerges within a dialogue between the old woman and the hero (vv. 239–48):

ΕΚ. οἶσθ' ἡνίκ' ἦλθες Ἴλίου κατάσκοπος,
δυσχλαινίᾳ τ' ἄμορφος, ὀμμάτων τ' ἄπο
φόνου σταλαγμοὶ σὴν κατέσταζον γένυν;
ΟΔ. οἶδ'· οὐ γὰρ ἄκρας καρδίας ἔψαυσέ μου.
ΕΚ. ἔγνω δέ σ' Ἑλένη καὶ μόνῃ κατεῖπ' ἐμοί;
ΟΔ. μεμνήμεθ' ἐς κίνδυνον ἐλθόντες μέγαν.
ΕΚ. ἧψω δὲ γονάτων τῶν ἐμῶν ταπεινὸς ὤν;
ΟΔ. ὥστ' ἐνθανεῖν γε σοῖς πέπλοισι χεῖρ' ἐμήν.
ΕΚ. ἔσωσα δῆτά σ' ἐξέπεμψά τε χθονός;
ΟΔ. ὥστ' εἰσορᾶν γε φέγγος ἡλίου τόδε.

Hec. Do you know when you came to spy on Ilium, disguised in rags and tatters, while down your cheek ran drops of blood ? **Od.** I do; for it was no slight impression it made upon my heart. **Hec.** Did Helen recognize you and tell me only? **Od.** I well remember the great risk I ran. **Hec.** Did you embrace my knees in all humility? **Od.** Yes, so that my hand grew dead and cold upon

[9] This passage comes from *Greek Epic Fragments from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*, edited and translated by M. L. West (Cambridge, MA and London, 2003), 64–171.

[10] The Greek text has been published in *Epitoma Vaticana ex Apollodori Bibliotheca*, edidit R. Wagner (Lipsiae, 1891); afterwards it has been included in *Mythography Graeci* 1, edidit idem (Lipsiae, 1926[2]). See also *Apollodorus. The Library*, edited and translated by J. G. Frazer (Cambridge, MA and London, 1921).

[11] A comparison between the mythical contents and the working methods of Proclus and Apollodorus is developed by M. Davies, *The Greek Epic Cycle* (Bristol, 2001[2]), 6–8.

[12] This play is edited by S. G. Daitz (Leipzig, 1990[2]) and by J. Diggle (Oxford, 1984), commented by C. Collard (Warminster, 1991) and by J. Gregory (Atlanta, 1999), translated by D. Kovacs (Cambridge, Ma and London, 1995).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

your robe. **Hec.** Was it I that saved you forth again? **Od.** You did, and so I still behold the light of day. **Hec.** What did you say then, when in my power? **Od.** Doubtless I found plenty to say, to save my life.[13]

It is not difficult to recognize the same mythical narration followed by Plautus (if he is the writer of *Bacch.* 962–5). It cannot be excluded, however, that Euripides might have drawn this tale from a more ancient poem that we do not know, such as the *Iliupersis* of Stesichorus.[14] Nevertheless, it seems more probable that Euripides worked out the myth *suo Marte*, according to his own innovation, changing the episode in order to increase the negative portrayal of Ulysses' character, who in his lack of gratefulness and generosity towards his deliverer appears even more disloyal and cynical.[15] Now, the second question must be reformulated: what made Plautus decide to follow Euripides' original and unusual rendering of the myth? Can we be sure that he took it from the Athenian dramatist and not another intermediate model, who in his turn had imitated Euripides?

The *canticum* of Chrysalus comprises a wide and various material regarding the Trojan myth; thus, it cannot be brought back to one specific *auctor* (Euripides or another): there is a *summa*, a sort of review, of the legend of the conquest of Troy in the key of a parody. In every episode, every single passage refers to a different model, or to more than one. Indeed, it is probable that Plautus chiefly followed the coeval Roman writers, Naevius and Ennius, whose plays were well known by the theatre audience. In the archaic period it is probable that Greek classic tragedies, such as the *Hecuba* of Euripides, were still performed, at least from time to time, in some cities of *Magna Graecia*, while it is certain that Hellenistic plays, which drew their plots and themes from the classic ones, were performed in the region. Plautus knew these works and most likely did not disdain to take ideas and images from them to put in his parodies. However, his favourite models, for this aim, were the tragic Latin poets, well known by the rough and uncultured Roman public, who were equally ignorant of the Greek language and of Hellenistic drama. In a comedy addressed to this audience, an allusion referring to the *Hecuba* of Euripides would not have been easily understood and would most likely have passed completely unnoticed, while the comic effect, pursued by Plautus, implies the acknowledgement of the parodied work: consequently it must have been a play written in the Latin language and performed in the Roman theatre, one known and remembered by a large public.

But from which tragedy precisely did Plautus draw the episode narrated in those verses? It must be a play analogous or similar to the *Hecuba* of Euripides, which was its model. It took not only the main storyline from the Greek original, but also single scenes and expressions, such as the one at issue. It is not a work of Livius Andronicus or Naevius, who, although they translated and imitated many of Euripides' plays, did not attempt the *Hecuba*.[16] The only Roman tragedy strictly

[13] This passage comes from *Euripides. The Complete Greek Drama*, edited by W. J. Oates and E. O'Neill Jr, Volume 1, *Hecuba*, translated by E. P. Coleridge (New York, 1938).

[14] Cf. C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford, 1961^2), 101–6. For fragments and evidence, see *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 1, edidit M. Davies (Oxford, 1991), 183–205; *Greek Lyric* 3, edited and translated by D. A. Campbell (Cambridge, MA and London, 1991), 100–121.

[15] About the increasingly worsening development of the character of Ulysses in the Greek drama cf. W. B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme* (Ann Arbor, 1968^2), 128–37.

[16] Cf. *Tragicorum Fragmenta*, edidit A. Klotz (Munich, 1953), 19–43; *Remains of Old Latin*, newly edited and translated by E. H. Warmington (Cambridge, MA and London, 1967), 2–20, 110–35; U. Carratello, *Livio Andronico* (Rome, 1979), 57–72, 77–90.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

related to that model is, as far as we know, the homonymous one written by Ennius.[17] This play no longer exists but, from what we can infer from the fragments, it seems to have been a free and artistic translation, not lacking in originality in regard to the style and not devoid of some reference to the Roman usage.[18] The close (but not literal and servile) agreement of this tragedy with its Greek original is also testified by Gellius (9.4.2–3).[19] Thus, it can be suggested that Plautus drew the episode narrated at *Bacch.* 962–5 from the *Hecuba* of Ennius, who in turn had taken it from Euripides. We can be sure that Plautus knew Ennius' play, because we find an imitation and parody of it within *Pers.* 753–6:

> Hostibus uictis, ciuibus saluis, re placida, pacibus perfectis,
> bello exstincto, re bene gesta, integro exercitu et praesidiis,
> cum bene nos, Iuppiter, iuuisti, dique alii omnes caelipotentes,
> eas uobis habeo grates atque ago, quia probe sum ultus meum inimicum.

This is a solemn and unusual thanksgiving to the gods for having obtained a special favour, that is to say a vengeance upon an enemy! It seems modelled (in spite of the more extensive circumlocution) on v. 176 Jocelyn, that comes from the *Hecuba*:

> Iuppiter tibi summe tandem male re gesta gratulor.[20]

Therefore, not only does Plautus know this play of Ennius, he also does not refrain from changing it to parody. Besides, in the *canticum* of Chrysalus, there are also some other allusions to the drama of the same poet and in particular to the *Andromacha*, to which belongs the highly pathetic exclamation at v.87 Jocelyn:

> o pater, o patria, o Priami domus!

It is probably echoed, with the comic effect aroused by the strident contrast between the tragic style and the low situation, at *Bacch.* 933:

> o Troia, o patria, o Pergamum! o Priami, periisti, senex!

So it is clear that Plautus in the *canticum* of Chrysalus parodies also, if not especially, Ennius: it is more than probable that the Ulysses episode, recalled at vv. 962–5, is drawn from the *Hecuba* of this poet and not from that of Euripides.

Now it is necessary to take a step backwards and return to the textual problem: if the passage at issue is authentic or interpolated, as many critics believe. One of the two reasons often cited is that the hint to the Ulysses venture is out of place at this point in the *canticum*; but the impediment could be easily removed by changing the position of the passage and placing it in a more appropriate context. One suggestion would be to insert it after vv. 949–52, in which the same hero and precisely his secret mission at Troy are mentioned, but in generic and vague terms, without touching on Helena and Hecuba:

[17] For (the remains of) the text cf. *The Tragedies of Ennius*, the Fragments edited with an Introduction and Commentary of H. D. Jocelyn (Cambridge, 1969), 104–6, 303–18.

[18] Cf. A. Della Casa, 'Ennio di fronte all'*Ecuba* di Euripide', *Dioniso* 36 (1962), 63–76; but expecially A. Traina, *Vortit barbare. Le traduzioni poetiche da Livio Andronico a Cicerone* (Rome, 1970), 125–44.

[19] As regards fr. 84 Jocelyn, belonging to this tragedy and modelled on Euripides, *Hec.* 293–5, Gellius states that Ennius, *cum eam tragoediam uerteret, non sane incommode aemulatus est.*

[20] The speaking character must be Hecuba, who thanks Jupiter for having allowed her to take a bloody vengeance upon Polymestor, the murderer of her son Polydorus. Cf. Traina (n. 18), 136–7.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nam illi itidem Vlixem audiui, ut ego sum, fuisse et audacem et malum
<in> dolis ego prensus sum, ille mendicans paene inuentus interiit,
dum ibi exquirit fata Iliorum; adsimiliter mi hodie optigit.
uinctus sum, sed dolis me exemi: item se ille seruauit dolis.

Nevertheless, on a closer reading of all the passage from v. 949 up to 965, a continuity can be identified in the matter, in the apparently free and capricious sequence of the thoughts exposed; there is indeed a sort of ring-structure, starting and closing with the character of Ulysses, used and abused by Chrysalus as his worthy model, his term of comparison. This is the pattern:

1. Comparison with Ulysses (v. 949: *nam illi itidem Vlixem audiui, ut ego sum, fusisse et audacem et malum*), anticipated at v. 946 and earlier at v. 940 (if not interpolated, as Ernout states); first generic mention of the mission at Troy, compared with Chrysalus' misadventure and his skill and astuteness in averting the risk (vv. 950–2).
2. Short exposition of the *tria fata*, alias the three tasks that the Greek had to accomplish to conquest Troy, still in comparison with the cheats carried out by the slave (vv. 953–6).
3. Reference to the first two of the *tria fata* (i.e. the stealing of the Palladion and the murder of Troilus), compared with the deceptions performed by Chrysalus (vv. 957–61).
4. Second and more distinct mention of the secret mission realized by Ulysses ('recognized by Helen and delivered to Hecuba', etc.), to which the slave compares his hazardous adventure, recalled at vv. 960–1 and coupled with the murder of Troilus (vv. 962–5).

The other, more important reason is the peculiar content of the episode, its agreement with the *Hecuba* of Euripides or, better, with the Latin one written by Ennius: the imitation of this work seemed to some critics so improbable as to imply the expulsion of the passage. But why so improbable? Why should Plautus not have parodied an Ennian tragedy, that he surely knew and elsewhere imitated?

The allusion to the Latin *Hecuba* seems to me more credible than the supposed interpolation, that has not been demonstrated and is not demonstrable by linguistic or stylistic evidence (e.g. inconsistency with the archaic language or incoherence with the *usus scribendi* of Plautus). There is no valid reason for the expulsion.

Thus, the passage at issue has not to be deemed interpolated. Furthermore, the presence of these verses in the *Bacchides* implies two consequences, regarding the chronology of this comedy and of the parodied tragedy.

On the one hand, the allusion to the *Hecuba* confirms the late dating of the *Bacchides*. In fact, scholars have already cited the complexity of the plot, the careful construction of the structure, the refined profile of the slave, the wideness and the richness of the *cantica*, the stylistic and metrical variety, the true or supposed hints at contemporary historical events and uses, as evidence that the play belongs to the last period of Plautus' production.[21] Therefore, the first performance of the *Bacchides* must be dated (about two or three years) earlier than 190 B.C.

On the other hand, the *Hecuba* of Ennius must have been staged before this date and consequently it belongs to the earlier period of his dramatic production (a few

[21] The various arguments for the late dating of this comedy are discussed by K. H. E. Schutter, *Quibus annis comoediae Plautinae primum actae sint quaeritur* (Leiden, 1952), XVII–XX, 31, 38; other proofs are added by Questa (n. 1), 1–8.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

years after his arrival in Rome, at the end of the third century B.C.). Indeed, this dating seems to be confirmed by the profile of the play, which is commonly believed to have closely followed the Greek model. Finally, the parody-allusion testifies the wide success of this tragedy among the coeval public, proving it was well known and appreciated by the theatre audience. That is why Plautus chose to imitate this work, drawing such a peculiar element from it.

Naples GIAMPIERO SCAFOGLIO
scafogli@unina.it
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi063

SCORTUM DILIGIS: A READING OF CATULLUS 6

The canonical interpretation of Catullus 6 characterizes the poem as a 'playful', [1] 'occasional'[2] piece between friends—gossipy Catullus (some commentators compare c. 67) tries to extract details of his friend Flavius' latest affair. Ferguson's comments are typical: to him, this piece is '. . . clever, friendly, not to be taken too seriously . . .'.[3] But more careful attention to the wording of the poem will not allow so light-hearted an interpretation. Rather, Catullus 6 is an attack on a woman whose details are lost to us, but presumably known to Catullus and his readers. The insults are, it is true, encapsulated within the playfully indirect form of a 'hackneyed genre'[4]—the sympathetic, or nosey, outsider inquiring into a friend's love life—but the poem's true intentions lie in the startling directness of the insults, which force our attention away from the surrounding frame and onto the woman herself.

At its beginning, Catullus 6 is tactfully indirect. Apparently coy, Catullus suggests in lines 1–3 that Flavius would be talking about his latest amour to him were she not 'gauche and inelegant' (*illepidae atque inelegantes* in line 2). But in lines 4–5, Catullus abandons this indirection and appears to be telling Flavius directly what kind of woman Flavius is in love with; note the emphatic *verum* beginning line 4 ('the truth is . . .').[5] She is *nescioquid febriculosi/scorti*—'some kind of fever-ridden slut'. The strength of this phrase ought to be noted. Morgan pointed out that the only known occurrence of *febriculosus* before this is in Plautus' *Cistellaria* at 406 to describe common whores (as to its literal meaning, Morgan supports an earlier view that it refers to someone who has malaria).[6] Morgan does acknowledge that this word is 'much harsher than customarily admitted' but counter-intuitively suggests that its shock value 'rivets the reader's attention on the lines which immediately follow', referring to the witty bedroom scene at

[1] Cf. M. Skinner, 'Semiotics and poetics in Catullus 6', *LCM* 8 (1983), 141–2, at 141: 'Certainly the piece is playful in tone . . .'.

[2] D. Thomson, *Catullus* (Toronto, 1997), 221: '. . . this occasional piece removes us temporarily from all deeper and more personal feeling'.

[3] J. Ferguson, *Catullus* (Lawrence, KA, 1985), 25.

[4] M. Skinner (n. 1), 141. On the ubiquity of the topos, she cites Catullus 55, Propertius 1.9, Horace *Odes* 1.27 and 2.4, and in Greek, *A.P.* 12.71 and 134 [Callimachus] and 135 [Asclepius]. See also A. Wheeler, *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry* (Berkeley, 1934), 227.

[5] *Verum* often connotes a strong turnaround or change in tone in Catullus; cf. 10.31, 15.9, 26.4, 76.14, 99.3.

[6] M. Morgan, '*Nescio quid febriculosi scorti:* A Note on Catullus 6', *CQ* 27 (1977), 338–41, at 339.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi063 Published online by Cambridge University Press