incongruous, and not meant to be taken seriously;[28] secondly, the point of the line is in *lepido*, which, in pointed contrast to lines 2 and 14, only goes to prove that Catullus possesses the social grace which Flavius' girl sorely lacks. Thirdly, as others have pointed out,[29] it is Catullus 6 itself that is the 'charming verse' of which Catullus speaks in the last line. Flavius and his lover have indeed been immortalized, but the terms of their immortality are surely not what they would have wished.

Without delving into the mire of biographical criticism, it is nevertheless possible to sketch the shape of the situation constructed by the text. Is Catullus attacking Flavius? Flavius hardly figures here at all; compared to the ostensibly similar Catullus 55, all of the matters which Catullus criticizes can be sourced back to the girl and her corrupting influence. So, then, the target is Flavius' girl. We ought furthermore to reject those who take Catullus at his word and suggest that this girl was actually a low-class whore.[30] Why so forcefully call a spade a spade? The emotive force of the language here (*diligis*, *stupra*, *ecfututa*) suggests something more. Rather, by comparison with poems such as c. 37 and c. 58, in which the high-class Lesbia is abused by being likened to a common prostitute, we see that it is more likely that Catullus is launching an attack on whatever high-class woman Flavius is in love with, but, in an example of the witty indirection and sophistication that characterizes *lepidus versus*, he does so through the 'hackneyed motif' of the man inquiring about a friend's new love.[31]

University of Sydney JAMES UDEN
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi064

TIBULLUS 2.1.45–6 AND 'AMPLIFICATORY PLEONASM'[1]

aurea tum pressos pedibus dedit uua liquores
mixtaque securo est sobria lympha mero.

'Then the golden grape gave liquids trampled under foot, and sober water was mixed with . . . neat wine'. I have omitted *securo* from the translation. Commentators give *securo* an active sense, 'freeing from care', and (like *OLD* 2c) associate this passage with two in which the adjective describes the waters of Lethe (Virg. *Aen.* 6.715 *securos latices*, Ov. *Pont.* 2.4.23 *securae pocula Lethes*).

That wine gives freedom from care is a poetical commonplace (*Cypria* fr. 18 West, Alc. 335, 346.3 LP, Thgn. 883, Pind. fr. 124.5, Eur. *Cyc.* 172, *Bacch.* 280–1, 381, 772, Hor. *Carm.* 1.7.17–19, 1.18.3–4, 2.11.17–18, 3.1.41–4, 3.12.1–2, 3.21.14–17, 4.12.19–20, *Epod.* 9.37–8, 13.17, *Epist.* 1.5.18, 1.15.18–19), reflected in Tib. 1.7.39–40. But wine which gives freedom from care is wine made safely drinkable

[28] For a similarly disingenuous promise of poeticized catasterization, cf. L. Watson, *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes* (Oxford, 2003), 542 and 562–3 on Hor. *Epod.* 17.40ff.

[29] See Morgan (n. 6), 341; Skinner (n. 1), 141; Nielsen (n. 11), 110.

[30] It is unlikely, at this point of the development of the word, that *stupra* (line 12) would have been used of a low-class whore anyway; the word was usually used of more shocking and improper intercourse than merely that between a man and a prostitute. See Fantham (n.20).

[31] I would like to thank Dr Lindsay Watson and Ms Frances Muecke for their helpful criticism and personal encouragement.

[1] I am very grateful to Professor E. J. Kenney and Mr A. G. Lee for helpful discussion.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi065 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by the addition of water. You do not drink *merum*, neat wine, or offer it to another, except for some special purpose: and that, in elegy or epigram, is usually to knock out a rival lover (Tib. 1.6.27, Ov. *Am.* 1.4.51–2) or to knock yourself out when you cannot bear the pains of love (Asclepiades, *Anth. Pal.* 12.50 = Gow-Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams* 880–7, Meleager, *Anth. Pal.* 12.49 = Gow-Page 4598–4601, Tib. 1.2.1–4, 1.5.37–8, Prop. 3.17.3–4, Ov. *Her.* 16.231, Mart. 1.106.9; cf. [Tib.] 3.6.3–4, Ov. *Rem. am.* 809–10).

Tibullus welcomes the invention of wine because its effects are beneficial. Among these beneficial effects is freedom from care. The adjective *securus* conveys this notion, and Tibullus, had he wished, might have applied it to the product of *merum* mixed with water. To *merum* itself he cannot have applied it. He is not here concerned with the knock-out effects of neat wine.

The noun *lympha* has an epithet which is to the point: water introduces a measure of sobriety to a drink which, taken neat, induces stupor or blind drunkenness. And *mero* must have an epithet no less pointed: an epithet which will complement *sobria* by bringing out that property of *merum* which puts it in need of *sobria lympha*. The epithet which does so is *sincero*. 'A thing is . . . *sincerum* when no foreign substance has been added to it' (Housman, *Classical Papers* 788; cf. *OLD* 'sincerus' 3a, Isid. *Orig.* 20.3.3 *merum dicimus cum uinum purum significamus; nam merum dicimus quidquid purum atque sincerum est*).

The expression *sincero . . . mero* is of a common type, in which the epithet duplicates or draws attention to the sense which is fundamental to the noun: what W. Bömer (on Ov. *Met.* 6.66) magniloquently labels 'Hypercharakterisierung durch Synonymie' and Professor Kenney suggests that we might call by the more manageable name of 'amplificatory pleonasm'. Here are some examples: Enn. *Ann.* 298 Skutsch (300 Vahlen) *ualidae uires* (also Lucr. 1.287, et al., Cic. *Arat.* 67, 195, Virg. *Aen.* 2.50, et al.), Plaut. *Bacch.* 384 *lutulentum caenum*, Ter. *Haut.* 295 *inmunda inluuies*, Lucr. 1.300 *calidi aestus*, 2.3 *iucunda uoluptas*, 4.583 *taciturna silentia* (also Ov. *Ars am.* 2.505), Cic. *Arat.* 58 *gelidum frigus* (also [Tib.] 3.7.153, Ov. *Fast.* 2.754, *Her.* 15.112, Sil. 2.136, Mart. 8.68.4),Catull. 64.217 *extrema finis*, [Tib.] 3.7.20 *curuus orbis*, Hor. *Epod.* 7.15 *albus pallor*, 8.3–4 *uetus senectus*, Virg. *Aen.* 9.756 *trepida formido*, 11.38 *maestus luctus*, Ov. *Met.* 4.433, 7.184, 10.53 *muta silentia* (also [Tib.] 3.7.129, Stat. *Theb.* 10.91–2), Sen. *Ag.* 916, *HF* 163 *trepidi metus*, *HF* 160, *Tro.* 994–5 *tranquilla quies* (also Luc. 1.250), *Oed.* 981, *Thy.* 921 *sollicitae curae*, *Tro.* 523 *astus callidi*, 624 *frigidum gelu*. Further examples may be found in Kühner-Stegmann 2.571 (beware of the canard *laetā gaudia* from Catull. 64.236), W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart, 1924), 278, E. S. McCartney, 'Modifiers that reflect the etymology of the word modified, with special reference to Lucretius', *ClPh* 22 (1927), 184–200, H. Hagendahl, *Eranos* 22 (1924), 202–7, and Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965), 794.

The following Tibullan expressions are comparable: 1.3.16 *tardas . . . moras* (also Catull. 63.19, Ov. *Ars am.* 2.718, et al.), 1.4.5 *hibernae . . . brumae* (also Prop. 1.8.9), 1.4.13 *fortis . . . audacia*, 1.5.76, 1.9.12, 50 *liquida(e) . . . aqua(e)* (also Ov. *Met.* 4.354, et al.), 1.8.50 *ueteres . . . senes*, 1.10.18 *ueteris . . . aui* (also Virg. *Aen.* 7.177, Ov. *Fast.* 6.657).

Queens' College, Cambridge JAMES DIGGLE
jd10000@cam.ac.uk
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi065

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi065 Published online by Cambridge University Press