placement. Furthermore, there is an unequivocal indication that this clause is correctly placed in Theophrastus' life: the presence of the continuative δ' after διεδέξατο. No other life in Diogenes' work begins with a continuative particle of this sort. The probative value of the absence of the particle elsewhere at the beginning of a life is compelling; its presence here signals the inclusion of the clause as an integral part of Theophrastus' life. Moreover, once this correction is made, the beginning of Strato's life assumes the typical pattern found in the majority of lives in Diogenes' work: name plus patronymic plus ethnic or toponymic.[6]

In dividing the text as they have, editors have produced a correction that cannot be justified paleographically or philologically.[7] Future editors of the lives of Theophrastus and Strato should respect the manuscript tradition and print the following:[8]

Ἀκοῦσαι δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἐρασίστρατον τὸν ἰατρὸν εἰσὶ δ' οἳ λέγουσι· καὶ εἰκός. διεδέξατο δ' αὐτοῦ τὴν σχολὴν Στράτων.

ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝ

Στράτων Ἀρκεσιλάου Λαμψακηνός, οὗ καὶ ἐν ταῖς διαθήκαις ἐμνημόνευσεν· ἀνὴρ ἐλλογιμώτατος κτλ.

---

1 εἰσὶ δ' οἳ λέγουσι Co P Q T V W: εἰσὶν οἳ λέγουσι F D G S: εἰσὶ δ' οἱ λέγοντες B 2 διεδέξατο—Στράτων d: διεδέξατο δ' αὐτοῦ (αὐτὸν B P Q V W) τὴν σχολὴν (om. Στράτων) a V W (haec verba post ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝ [v. 3] perperam transp. edd.) 3 ΣΤΡΑΤΩΝ Co d F^{mg} Q^{mg} V: om. B P W (in W spat. ca. 12 litt. relictum)[9]

MICHAEL G. SOLLENBERGER
Washington University

6. Forty-four of the eighty-two lives begin with this series. Of the thirty-eight that do not, twenty-two nevertheless begin with name plus ethnic or toponymic, omitting only the patronymic. Two more—the lives of Myson (1. 106) and Socrates (2. 18)—start with only name plus patronymic; but the toponymic or ethnic is close by, separated from the series by some brief parenthetical remarks.

7. In my own edition of the *Vita Theophrasti* ("Diogenes Laertius 5. 36–57"), I erred in following the editorial rather than the manuscript tradition and ended the life with καὶ εἰκός. It is noteworthy that Ambrosius Traversarius Camaldulensis, who first translated Diogenes' work into Latin (ca. 1432; first published at Rome in 1472, and at several different times and places in the following years), ended the life of Theophrastus as follows: "Sunt qui dicant Erasistratum medicum eius fuisse auditorem et fieri potest. Successit autem illius scholae Strato." Traversarius, at any rate, obviously adhered to his manuscripts.

8. The apparatus criticus following the text has been compiled from my own reading of photographs of the manuscripts. I have recorded variant readings from eleven manuscripts only: B Co F P and Q (the five major manuscripts; their consensus = a); V and W (the principal representatives of the *vulgata*); and D G S and T (consensus = d; see n. 4, above).

9. I am grateful to Kevin Herbert of Washington University and to the two referees of *CP*, whose valuable comments and suggestions helped this paper achieve its final form.

DISEASE IMAGERY IN CATULLUS 76. 17–26

o di, si vestrum est misereri, aut si quibus umquam
  extremam iam ipsa in morte tulistis opem,
me miserum aspicite et, si vitam puriter egi,
  eripite hanc pestem perniciemque mihi, 20

quae mihi subrepens imos ut torpor in artus
expulit ex omni pectore laetitias.
non iam illud quaero, contra me ut diligat illa,
aut, quod non potis est, esse pudica velit:
ipse valere opto et taetrum hunc deponere morbum. 25
o di, reddite mi hoc pro pietate mea.

Earlier generations considered the elegy *Siqua recordanti* the most morosely introspective of Catullus' erotic poems. Many modern critics, however, treat its opening conditional statement as an ethical pronouncement, arguing that the morally charged expressions *benefacta* (1), *pius* (2), *fides* and *foedus* (3), and *ingratus* (6, 9) assimilate the speaker's protest of fidelity in love to Roman notions of right conduct between associates.[1] D. O. Ross, Jr., in an important study, has now broadened this line of interpretation by suggesting that Catullus' novel fusion of *amor* and *pietas* serves as a metaphor for contemporary political and social conditions: as he invokes a vocabulary of mutual obligation commonly applied to relations between political *amici,* Catullus here and elsewhere in his elegiacs transforms the failed affair with Lesbia into a paradigm of widespread social malaise characterized by the disintegration of traditional moral values.[2] Ross' reading of the opening lines unquestionably expands and deepens the implications of this compelling poem. At its conclusion, I believe, that provocative symbolic association between Catullan *amor* and just political and social conduct may be reiterated and reinforced through the use of florid, seemingly hyperbolic images of mortal illness.

Love as a physical affliction is, of course, a recurrent topos in the Greco-Roman literary tradition. Certainly the speaker's agony must owe something to conventional comic depictions of the *amator* as lovesick, with perhaps a side glance at the Stoic condemnation of sexual infatuation as a disorder of the soul.[3] However, other standard contexts for metaphors of disease extend the trope in a quite different direction. In both the public and private spheres, violations of *pietas* are often presented as infallible symptoms of a life-threatening moral sickness, curable only by extreme methods, occasionally past cure. In Ciceronian polemic, for example, such imagery is routinely applied to any public threat

1. I cite Catullus' text from R. A. B. Mynors, ed., *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina* (Oxford, 1958). Studies of the moralistic overtones of 76. 1–10 include R. M. Henry, "*Pietas* and *Fides* in Catullus," *Hermathena* 75 (1950): 63–68 and *Hermathena* 76 (1951): 48–57; P. Oksala,"'Fides' und 'Pietas' bei Catull," *Arctos* 2 (1958): 88–103; H. Akbar Khan, "Catullus 76: The Summing Up," *Athenaeum* 46 (1968): 54–63; M. Dyson, "Catullus 8 and 76," *CQ* 23 (1973): 136–42; C. A. Rubino, "The Erotic World of Catullus," *CW* 68 (1975): 289–98; and M. von Albrecht, *Römische Poesie: Texte und Interpretationen* (Heidelberg, 1977), pp. 82–84.

2. *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), pp. 88–90. Returning to poem 76 in a subsequent discussion (*Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* [Cambridge, 1975], p. 14), he again observes: "Lesbia, who is not named in the poem, has become only a shadow representing the iniquities of the present, and the affair itself is now a moving and affective synonym for betrayal of trust, for a general dissolution of human values."

3. As K. Quinn, ed., *Catullus: The Poems*[2] (London and Basingstoke, 1973), pp. 407, 409, points out, the language of 76. 19–21 closely resembles the description of the lover's physical symptoms at 51. 5–10. Other parallels for the metaphor of love as disease are conveniently listed in J. Svennung, *Catulls Bildersprache,* Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 3 (Uppsala, 1945), pp. 122–27. For the motif in Roman comedy, see E. Fantham, *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery,* Phoenix Supplementary Volume 10 (Toronto, 1972), pp. 88–89. Cic. *Tusc.* 4. 74–76 provides a contemporary explication of the Stoic notion of erotic passion as a psychic disorder.

arising from within the body politic. The citizen who intends violence against the established order is a baneful *rei publicae pestis:* Catiline at *In Catilinam* 1. 11 and 1. 30; Clodius at *De domo sua* 5, 26, and 72, and *Pro Sestio* 83 and 114. Insurrection engendered by such individuals spreads like a *morbus:* the simile receives elaborate development at *In Catilinam* 1. 31. Eaten by its cancer, the state ultimately succumbs (*Att.* 2. 20. 3 *novo quodam morbo civitas moritur*). That disease imagery was a well-worn cliché of political rhetoric is implied by Catullus 44. 12, where Sestius' speech against the candidate Antius is described as *plenam veneni et pestilentiae,* so loaded with expressions of "poison" and "pestilence" that it has given its reader a bad cold. Slyly posing as a compliment to the orator's invective skills, Catullus' remark really intimates that Sestius, in defaming his ambitious opponent, has overworked such phraseology—to the point where even a well-disposed audience must sicken.[4]

These citations from the literature of partisan politics might in themselves suffice to prove social and moral dimensions for the imagery of disease in poem 76. Still more pertinent to our inquiry, however, is the poet's use of the same metaphors of sickness to protest a betrayal of friendship in a passage containing unmistakable cross-references to the lines we are examining.[5] In poem 77, the faithless Rufus is called a *pestis amicitiae* burning within the speaker's vitals. Characterizing the way in which he has crept into Catullus' bosom, the verb *subrepsti* readily recalls the *pestem perniciemque* of 76. 20 insinuating itself, *subrepens imos ut torpor in artus.* Rufus' treachery has snatched away (*eripuisti*) all good things (*omnia nostra bona*) from a man both sick and unhappy (*misero*). Employing similar language in 76. 19–22, Catullus entreats the gods to behold a sick, unhappy man (*miserum*) and snatch from him (*eripite*) the disease that has driven joy from his heart (*expulit ex omni pectore laetitias*). For our purposes, it does not matter which piece was written earlier; these reminiscences, surely conscious and intentional, constitute a poetic interchange in which each piece reciprocally alludes to the other. We must therefore associate the "mortal sickness" of poem 76 with a moral upheaval: the breakdown of the code that controls relationships of friendship and obligation within the larger social order and ultimately sustains the patriotic duty and loyalty required of every Roman citizen.

In conjunction with the language of ethical commitment operating in the opening lines of the poem, these concluding images of disease set Catullus' involvement with Lesbia against a background of far more pressing social concerns. The rupture of the *sanctae foedus amicitiae* (109. 6) should not be viewed as an exclusively personal misfortune. Like the speaker's experience with the treacherous Rufus, it reveals how drastically the accepted code of conduct has been debased. As the fever of class agitation and corrupt ambition wastes the body politic, so among private individuals the pursuit of self-gratification at

4. For imagery of infection and poison applied to the content of oratory, cf. Hor. *Serm.* 1. 7. 1 *regis Rupili pus atque venenum.* W. Kroll, ed., *Catull*[5] (Stuttgart, 1968), pp. 81–82, comments upon the underlying literary implications of Catullus' phrase. On poem 44 as an "oblique statement of poetic doctrine," see G. N. Sandy, "Indebtedness, *Scurrilitas,* and Composition in Catullus (Cat. 44, 1, 68)," *Phoenix* 32 (1978): 68–73.

5. For a comprehensive examination of the poetic interplay between poems 76 and 77, see Khan, "Catullus 76," pp. 65–71.

the expense of binding obligations, evinced here in Lesbia's consummate breach of faith, reflects the cheapening of all social values and at last confronts us with a horrifying vision of moral anarchy. Unfortunately, the poem provides no reassuring solution to the ethical dilemma it has implicitly posed. Rather, it allows Catullus' final, tenacious proclamation of his virtue (26 *o di, reddite mi hoc pro pietate mea*) to fade into silence. Only the gods—the last, usually vain, recourse of the doomed suppliant—remain as remote enigmatic guarantors of erotic and social justice.

MARILYN B. SKINNER
Northern Illinois University

WAR, PEACE, AND THE *IUS FETIALE* IN LIVY 1

Although almost all ancient authorities agree that the *ius fetiale* and its guarantors, the fetial priests, originated during the monarchy,[1] they put forth various views on which king was responsible for the institution. Both Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Plutarch ascribe the fetial priesthood to Numa Pompilius as one of that king's many religious foundations (Dion. Hal. 2. 72; Plut. *Numa* 12, *Cam.* 18). According to Dionysius, Numa established the priesthood when he was on the point of making war with Fidenae; through the *fetiales* he averted the war, thus keeping his reign entirely free of foreign conflict (cf. Dion. Hal. 2. 76. 3). Cicero makes the third Roman king, the martial Tullus Hostilius, the originator of the *ius fetiale* (*Rep.* 2. 17 [31]). But my concern here is with Livy's position.

Livy's position is unclear. In his account of the combat of the Horatii and the Curiatii (1. 24), which occurred during the reign of Tullus, both the fetial priesthood and the procedure for making a *foedus* appear as established facts of Roman life. (The *foedus* that figures in this Livian passage is the agreement between Rome and Alba Longa that the outcome of the combat of the Roman Horatii and the Alban Curiatii would determine which people would hold sway over the other.) But Livy does not reveal whether he believes that Tullus himself, or Numa, or, for that matter, Romulus was responsible for the establishment of fetial priests or the procedure for making a *foedus*.[2] Livy first mentions the fetials in 1. 24. He mentions Roman *foedera* as early as the reign of Romulus (1. 13. 4, 14. 3, 19. 4, 23. 7), but without comment on the procedure by which they were made.[3]

1. Servius on Verg. *Aen.* 7. 695 alludes to a tradition that the *iura fetialia* were introduced in Rome during the decemvirate; cf. E. Pais, *Storia critica di Roma durante i primi cinque secoli,* vol. 1 (Rome, 1913), pp. 679–80.

2. *Pace,* e.g., B. O. Foster in his Loeb Livy, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1919), p. 114 (on 1. 32. 5), and J. Heurgon, *T. Livi: "Ab urbe condita," Liber primus*[2] (Paris, 1970), p. 114 (on the same passage), both of whom understand Livy to ascribe the priesthood or the *ius* to Tullus.

3. "It has been noted that 24. 4 *nec ullius vetustior foederis memoria est* contradicts 23. 7," where an earlier *foedus* is mentioned (R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1–5* [Oxford, 1965], p. 106). But one could respond by quoting H. J. Müller, ed., *T. Livi "Ab urbe condita" libri, erklärt von W. Weissenborn*[8], vol. 1.1 (Berlin, 1885), p. 154 (on 1. 24. 4): Livy is here remarking "das erste *foedus, dessen feierliche Abschliessung* man kennt" (my emphasis).