

the poet describes him in vivid terms which all but make him out to be a fire-breathing creature: "his agitur furiis, totoque ardentis ab ore / scintillae absistunt, oculis micat acribus ignis" (101–2). When the truce is broken and the wounded Aeneas retires from the field, Turnus is suddenly fired with new hope ("subita spe fervidus ardet"), calls for his arms, and plunges madly into another orgy of unnecessary killing. At last, when the final showdown comes, his nobler nature asserts itself. He wrenches himself free from his self-protective illusions and goes to meet Aeneas. When he falls, his few last sad words tell us

15. *Inferno*, Canto 1, 106–8.

that now the volcanic fire within him is all spent: "equidem merui nec deprecor" (931).

Turnus, like Achilles, is surely a memorable artistic creation, whatever one may think of his moral character. Like a volcano in the physical world, he seldom fails to inspire a certain awe in the reader. It is little wonder that Dante, recalling those old, unhappy, far-off days when men battled and died for Italy, writes feelingly: "Di quella . . . Italia . . . per cui morì la vergine Cammilla, Eurialo e Turno e Niso di ferute."¹⁵

FRANCIS A. SULLIVAN, S.J.

LE MOYNE COLLEGE,
SYRACUSE, N.Y.

AGAMEMNON 1446–47

ἄτιμα δ' οὐκ ἐπραξάτην
ὁ μὲν γὰρ οὕτως, ἡ δὲ τοι κύκνου δίκην
τὸν ὕστατον μέλψασα θανάσιμον γόνον
κεῖται φιλήτωρ τοῦδ', ἐμοὶ δ' ἐπήγαγεν
†εὐνῆς† παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς
[Ag. 1443–47, Fraenkel].

1445

It is with these lines that Clytemnestra's final trimeters in the epirrhematic composition of 1407–1576 conclude. In addition to Wecklein's *Appendix* and Dawe's *Repertory of Conjectures on Aeschylus* (Leyden, 1965), the commentaries of Headlam-Thomson, Fraenkel, Denniston-Page, *et al.*, reveal how much energy and ingenuity have been expended in attempts to clarify the text. The two basic problems are the subject of ἐπήγαγεν and the sense of the double genitives εὐνῆς and χλιδῆς. Commentators have been divided on the question whether Agamemnon (e.g., Heath, Campbell, Stanley, Wilamowitz) or Cassandra (e.g., Schütz, Verrall, Headlam, Fraenkel) is the subject of the verb, and, as Denniston-Page comment, "the latter is favoured by the run of the words, the former by the sense." Headlam, adopting Auratus' χλιδῆν, believed that "the phrase εὐνῆς παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς is not accusative and object of ἐπήγαγεν, but nominative and subject of it—or better, perhaps, it is in apposition to the previous nominative ἡ δὲ τοι." Denniston-Page believe the corruption is in παροψώνημα (Casaubon's correction of the παροψόνημα of the MSS.)

and rewrite the line εὐνῆς πάροψον, ὅμμα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς. I concur, however, with Fraenkel's opinion "that παροψώνημα τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς must be taken together, and that the genitive must on no account be altered." The fault lies in εὐνῆς and is one of sense rather than grammar. Fraenkel draws attention to Wilamowitz's excellent discussion of this double genitive construction at Eur. *H.F.* 170 and believes that "εὐνῆς may have crept in as an undiscerning gloss on χλιδῆς and displaced the original word. Perhaps this was an adjectival attribute to παροψώνημα; but a word of some quite different kind is also conceivable." But while the construction of εὐνῆς may be sound, its meaning is not satisfactory, and editors and translators alike have had to resort to elaborate paraphrases to render the passage. The dramatic context, as well as its position at the close of the trimeters, seem to call for a direct statement, however terse, and such is not offered by the present text.

Much of the difficulty comes from the editors' and commentators' assumption that either Agamemnon or Cassandra is the subject of ἐπήγαγεν and can be eliminated if H. Voss's εὐνή is read in place of the troublesome genitive. This conjecture, recorded in Wecklein's *Appendix*, deserves further attention than it has hitherto received and satisfies requirements of both grammar and sense. The particular meaning of the word would be *lectus*

genialis, concubitus (Italie), a sense in which it is used in the play at 1193 and 1626 (see also *Eum.* 217; *Supp.* 141, 151 where the Danaids vehemently deny any intention of marriage; *Sept.* 364 [although the text is corrupt]; and *Pers.* 543 [where it may refer back to the *πόθος φιλόνωρ* of 136, but cf. Broadhead on *Pers.* 541–45]). If this reading is accepted, the sense of the sequence not only is clarified but also becomes much more forceful. Clytemnestra's pattern of thought and expression would be as follows: the pair of them have got what they deserved; Agamemnon in this way, Cassandra *etc.*, "and for me their 'marriage' has brought an added relish to my feast of luxury." Clytemnestra's ironic use of *ἐννή* as "marriage," an irony which is compounded by the fact that the word may also be used for "grave" (cf. *Cho.* 318), would thus echo the force and implication of the dual in 1443, the *κοινόλεκτρος* of 1441, and the *πιστὴ ἔννευος* of 1442. (It might, perhaps, even shed some light on the problematic *ἰστοτρίβης* of 1443 for which Pauw's *ἰστοριβής* has been so frequently substituted.) Beginning with her acid

commentary on Agamemnon's amours before Troy in 1438–39, the sexual innuendo and sarcasm of Clytemnestra's remarks have been obvious. Headlam, commenting on Clytemnestra's use of *φιλήτωρ* to describe Cassandra, suggested that "perhaps by the active word she wishes to imply that the woman was the seducer" (cf. *Sen. Ag.* 1001–3); and the double-entendre of *παροψώνημα*, especially in its collocation with *ἐννή* in whatever case, has long been recognized (cf. *Ar. Frag.* 187, *Eccl.* 225–26). Clearly Clytemnestra has been incensed by the presence of Agamemnon's concubine, and the use of *ἐμοί* and *τῆς ἐμῆς χλιδῆς* in the closing lines indicates her strong personal satisfaction at the present state of affairs. Reading *ἐννή* as the subject of the clause makes the irony of her remarks all the more pointed. The corruption may have occurred because a copyist felt, as so many editors and commentators have felt since, that either Cassandra or Agamemnon was the subject of the verb.

CHARLES FUQUA

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

A NOTE ON CATULLUS' FIRST POEM

Catullus' first poem has received distinguished attention within the last twenty years from two American scholars¹ both of whom have deserved well of students of Catullus. The justification for a third paper is not that these scholars have "misunderstood" the poem in question but that they have said something about the poem which is true—that it is not merely a dedicatory poem but genuinely introductory—without, perhaps, explaining adequately why it is true. It will be my contention that the poem is not only both a dedication and a genuine introduction but that it combines these two functions in such a way that each assists the fulfillment of the other.

Catullus begins with a question: "Cui dono lepidum novum libellum / arida modo pumice expoliturum?" Simple enough, we think, but

containing, in fact, a number of ambiguities. The tone of the question is apparently self-depreciatory; we get a picture of the poet with his nice little book, hot off the press, looking for someone to give it to. The use of the diminutive, at first sight, reinforces this impression, but we ought not to forget that basically the diminutive conveys the idea of smallness. If Catullus does merely want to impress upon us the fact that his book is small, he may possibly be hinting at his Callimachean literary ancestry.²

But *libellus* is ambiguous in another sense too; it has a double reference to the book as an actual concrete object and to the book as a collection of poems. An obvious point but nevertheless important, since, if *libellus* has this double reference, it must follow that the adjectives and the adjectival phrase qualifying

1. F. O. Copley, "Catullus C. 1," *TAPA*, LXXXII (1951), 200–206; and J. P. Elder, "Catullus 1, His Poetic Creed, and Nepos," *HSCP*, LXXI (1966), 143–49.

2. Cf. Elder, *op. cit.*, pp. 145–47.