

APPENDIX: HORACE *EPISTLES* 2.1.94–95

With line 94, Horace begins a new topic by describing his external inconsistencies at which he imagines Maecenas to laugh. The first inconsistency is the appearance of an unfortunate haircut (94–95):

Si curatus inaequali tonsore capillos  
occurri, rides.

You laugh if I show up with hair tended by an uneven barber.

On the word *curatus* (“tended”) in line 94, the most recent commentator<sup>19</sup> remarks (ad loc.), “*curatus*: used of barbering only here in literature (*TLL* 4.1504.81–82).” The unusual use of the word may therefore warrant a search for a secondary meaning, and in light of the series of puns in the *Aulularia* on *cura* (“care”) and κουρά (“cropping, shearing”) discussed above, I am inclined to regard Horace’s *curatus* here also as a pun on κουρά. Like *tondere*, the verb κείρειν primarily denotes not just “cutting” in a general sense, but “cropping” the hair, and the same word is used for “shearing” an animal: thus Horace’s *curatus* puns as though it were \*κουρά-tus (“shorn”—utterly or carelessly, like a sheep), securing, incidentally, an exact coincidence in the Greek and Latin elements of vowel length and word accent. The Greek use of the accusative *capillos*, though not rare in Latin poetry, may support my contention, and if the assonance in *curatus* and *occurri* is deliberate, with -*cur*- recurring in the same *sedes* in lines 94 and 95, it can only serve to underline the pun.

I note finally that elsewhere in the *Epistles*, Horace alludes to a Greek word by means of a Latin one: in *Epistle* 1.13, addressed to the courier Vinnius Asina, the word *onus* (“load”) in line 12 (“sic positum servabis onus” [“guard your burden, placed so”]) puns on ὄνος (“ass”)<sup>20</sup>—regarded as nominative in apposition to the subject—in order to allude to Asina’s cognomen. I would suggest too that in line 23 (“Sirenum uoces et Circae pocula nosti” [“you know the Sirens’ voices and Circe’s cups”]) of *Epistle* 1.12, the theme of which is the Homeric *Odyssey*, the syncopated verb *nosti* (“you know”) alludes to the post-Homeric νόστοι (“homecomings”), hinting at the word *reditum* in line 21 two lines previously (“[Vlixes] dum sibi, dum sociis reditum parat” [“in the process of getting a homecoming for himself and for his comrades”]).

19. R. Mayer, ed., *Horace, “Epistles” Book 1* (Cambridge, 1994).

20. Cf. M. Putnam “Horace *epi.* 1.13: Compliments to Augustus,” in *Gestures: Essays in Ancient History, Literature, and Philosophy presented to Alan L. Boegehold*, ed. G. Bakewell and J. Sickinger (Oxford, 2003), 107–8.

## A BINDING SONG: THE SIMILES OF CATULLUS 61

In Catullus 61, the marriage song for Junia<sup>1</sup> and Manlius, the bride is the focus of figuration. She is like Venus, like myrtle, like a daisy. Whereas previous commentators have pointed to Catullus’ use and revision of the typical vegetal imagery of a marriage song, I suggest that Catullus constructs these similes in a ring format

1. I follow Fordyce (1961, 237) in reading *Junia* for the name of the bride. Thomson, the most recent editor of Catullus, considers *Vibia* a possible reading, but ultimately settles on *Iunia* as well (1998, 348).

in order to chart a shift in Junia's relationship to the wedding images.<sup>2</sup> There are three sets of similes in this poem, and I will examine them as chiastically arranged pairs. The following diagram lays out the pairing of the similes; our attention will focus on the words in parentheses:

A. Junia and Manlius as Venus and Paris (16–20)

B. Junia compared to myrtle (*floridis* . . . *enitens*, 21–25)

C. The god Hymen's love like ivy (*implicat*, 33–35)

{Junia compared to a hyacinth flower (87–89)}

c. Junia like a vine (*implicat* . . . *implicabitur*, 102–5)

b. Junia compared to a daisy or poppy (*floridulo* . . . *nitens*, 186–88)

a. Junia and Torquatus *parvulus*, the notional son of the couple, as Penelope and Telemachus (219–23)

I will deal with the simile at line 87 on its own.

The first and last similes of the poem make up the larger frame. First, Junia is compared to Venus, coming to the beauty contest judged by Paris (16–20):

namque Iunia Manlio  
qualis Idalium colens  
venit ad Phrygium Venus  
iudicem, bona cum bona  
nubet alite virgo.<sup>3</sup>

For Junia will marry Manlius,  
as beautiful as Venus, dwelling in Idalium,  
when she came before the Phrygian judge,  
just so will she marry Manlius a good maiden  
with a good omen.

Fedeli asserts that “[t]he comparison between the bride and Venus belongs to the traditional motifs of wedding songs.”<sup>4</sup> Comparisons were certainly a part of epithalamia: Sappho compares the bridegroom to Ares and to a slender tree (frags. 111 and 115 LP, respectively). Yet, our few extant epithalamia contain no traces of such a comparison of the bride to Venus.<sup>5</sup> Let us reexamine this moment.

Commentators stress that the comparison highlights Junia's beauty.<sup>6</sup> To be sure, we are meant to imagine Manlius looking upon a bride as beautiful and sexually desirable as the goddess of love, but this comparison is not simply about Junia's good looks. The emphasis on *bona* in line 19 serves as a kind of proviso: Junia is not only alluring but also morally sound. This use of *bona* in the context of a comparison involving Venus fits comfortably with references to Venus elsewhere in the poem.<sup>7</sup> At two other points, Catullus returns to this adjective when speaking of Venus as a productive force in a marriage. Thus, Hymen (44–45) is called upon in his capacity as

2. Fedeli (1983) in particular has documented the similes' Homeric, Sapphic, Callimachean, and Theocritean echoes and learned Alexandrian allusions.

3. All quotations are from Mynors 1958. All translations are mine.

4. Fedeli 1983, 34.

5. For a brief listing of extant epithalamia and parodies of epithalamia, see Fordyce 1961, 235–36.

6. See Quinn 1970, ad loc.; and Fordyce 1961, ad loc.

7. At first glance, the initial *bona* might be thought to modify *Venus*.

dux bonae Veneris, boni  
coniugator amoris.

leader of good Venus,  
joiner of good love.

Here, Venus stands metonymically for a mutually enjoyed and mutually beneficial sex life that contributes to *concordia* between husband and wife.<sup>8</sup> A bit later (61–64) we learn that

nil potest sine te Venus,  
fama quod bona comprobet,  
commodi capere, at potest  
te volente.

Without you [Hymen] Venus is not able  
to take any pleasure  
of the sort which good report approves,  
but if you are willing, she is able.

Marriage allows a couple to enjoy a socially sanctioned sex life. In a wedding song, we should expect references to these “good” components of the goddess, and the first simile can evoke such thoughts.

Yet, the specific moment celebrated in Catullus’ first comparison, Venus’ appearance before Paris, heralds the adulterous disruption of a legitimate marriage. While Venus can stand for many things, this particular reference conjures her associations with adultery and temporary flings. Aphrodite’s own affair with Ares is recorded in detail in the *Odyssey*. In the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, Zeus becomes so enraged with the goddess’s prompting him to fall in love with mortal women and forget about Hera (40) that he compels Aphrodite to fall in love with Anchises. Is there, then, something dangerously deviant in this comparison to Venus? Is Junia, a virgin bride, granted a sexual power she ought not have? Catullus could easily have picked a less troublesome setting for the assertion of Venus’ good looks. Similarly, Manlius, for his part, is cast as the Paris figure, the dallying adulterer par excellence. In this context, the pejorative connotations of *Phrygium* might have come to the fore.<sup>9</sup> The poet offers us a disturbing image at the start of the poem, prompting us to ask what sort of marriage is about to be consummated.

The final simile’s inversion of the first strengthens this reading. This last image (a) expresses the hope that the child of Junia and Manlius, Torquatus *parvulus* (209), will have as much honor from his mother as Telemachus received by virtue of being the chaste Penelope’s child (219–23):

talis illius a bona  
matre laus genus approbet,  
qualis unica ab optima  
matre Telemacho manet  
fama Penelopeo.

8. See Treggiari 1991, 251–53.

9. Amata laments the marriage of her daughter, Lavinia, to Aeneas, exclaiming, “And did not the Phrygian shepherd thus penetrate into Lacedaemonia, / and convey Leda-born Helen to the Trojan cities?” (Verg. *Aen.* 7.363–64). Phrygia can carry negative connotations in Catullus’ own poetry: the demented Attis castrated himself “when he eagerly touched with speedy foot the Phrygian grove” (63.2).

May such praise from his good  
 mother reveal as good his descent,  
 as great as is the unique fame  
 that remains to Telemachus  
 on account of that best of mothers, Penelope.

The comparison to Penelope is a high and responsibility-laden honor to bestow on a bride. The reference expresses the utmost confidence in Junia's desire and ability to remain faithful to Manlius. Manlius himself is indirectly cast as Odysseus, as one who will forsake even the company of a goddess to return to his wife.

Like the first simile, the last is Homeric in form and content.<sup>10</sup> But, by looking forward to a lengthy union of the newlyweds, this simile cancels the discordant implications of the first simile. No longer need we fear that this marriage will follow the paradigm of Paris' elopement with Helen. We are now literally and figuratively on the opposite end of the Trojan story. Having started with the specter of the young man who initiated the war, we end with the young man who reflects a successful return from the war. We start with a goddess notorious for beguiling the wits of mortals and immortals alike but end with a dignified matron unswerving in her loyalty. The image of Penelope and Telemachus calls to mind stability, continuity, and the comforts of home, all far away from the adulterous activities of Paris' bedroom and the strife-ridden chaos of the Scamander's plain. The suggestion is made that, in the final assessment, Junia is best compared to Penelope, not Venus, and Manlius is more of an Odysseus than a Paris. Catullus closes the poem by displacing the negative connotations of the simile with which he inaugurated it.

Whereas between these framing similes we see a drastic thematic shift, the similes that appear in between all argue the same point: Junia is like some vegetal entity. Still, as we will see, there does occur a linguistic shift within these similes in the direction of metaphor. This shift matters. When a metaphor is applied to the tenor of a simile, a new hierarchy can emerge in the relationship between the tenor and the vehicle of the simile.<sup>11</sup> There is a difference in the tenor's role in "she is like a blooming rose" and "she blooms like a rose." In the first instance, the vehicle alone presents the flower image. By contrast, in the second version, the tenor, "she," is linked through the metaphor "blooms" to flowers and so participates along with the vehicle in the offering of the flower image. Further, both metaphor and simile are comparative acts, but simile maintains the distance between tenor and vehicle, while metaphor collapses that difference and urges a more thorough identification of the two terms. We can chart such changes across the central similes of Catullus 61.

The second pair of similes consists of the second (B) and sixth (b) similes. In the second simile, Catullus turns to a common trope in which a young girl of marriageable age is likened to myrtle (21–25): Junia is

floridis velut enitens  
 myrtus Asia ramulis  
 quos Hamadryades deae  
 ludicrum sibi roscido  
 nutriunt umore.

10. Fedeli 1983, 141.

11. I use I. A. Richards' well-known terms (2001, 64). I borrow this concept of a hierarchy between tenor and vehicle from Addison (2001, 499).

just like Asian myrtle  
 shining with blooming shoots  
 which the Hamadryad goddesses  
 nourish as a plaything for themselves  
 with dewy moisture.

I make two observations. First, the hyperbaton between *floridis* and *ramulis* throws the adjective into relief. Second, with reference to the placement of *enitens* we note that it is not Junia who is said to shine, but rather the Asian myrtle. Presumably, Junia is herself “shining,” but that idea must be extracted from the *velut* clause; the vehicle is in possession of the common source of comparison. The tenor plays no role in the presentation of the image; in fact, Catullus extends the vehicle with a lengthy relative clause.

If we contrast this simile with its mate, the sixth simile (b), a shift in Junia’s role is apparent. Addressing Manlius (186–88), the poet tells him to approach his new bride who is

ore floridulo nitens,  
 alba parthenice velut  
 luteumve papaver.  
 shining with a sweet little blooming face,  
 just like a white daisy  
 or a yellow poppy.

The use of *floridulo* and *nitens* returns us to the shining (*enitens*) myrtle with its blooming (*floridis*) shoots of the second simile (B). But, whereas the second simile operated solely through the vehicle’s presentation of the flower image, this time the tenor plays a vital role. The hapax legomenon *floridulo* (“sweet little blooming”) stands out as a metaphor that identifies Junia with the vegetal world. So too does *nitens* function as a metaphor from the floral realm, since it is used with reference to flowers in its earlier appearance in the second simile. An equation thus established between Junia and flowers, Junia is made to participate in her capacity as tenor in the presentation of this particular image of a daisy and a poppy. Fittingly, now the tenor possesses the relevant participle, “shining,” that specifies in what particular attribute of flowers the comparison lies. The syntax of the simile emphasizes the importance of the tenor to the presentation of this flower image.

Much the same transformation occurs in the third pair of similes (C and c). In the third simile (C), the poet addresses the marriage deity (31–35):

ac domum dominam voca  
 coniugis cupidam novi,  
 mentem amore revinciens,  
 ut tenax hedera huc et huc  
 arborem implicat errans.  
 And call the mistress home,  
 the lady desirous of her new husband,  
 binding her mind with love,  
 just as tenacious ivy here and there  
 wandering clasps a tree.

Junia is envisioned as a tree overtaken by the ivy of love. Ellis notes that this is “a common simile applied in an uncommon way” since the ivy is here love and not a

lover.<sup>12</sup> Most often the woman is the clinging ivy; for example, Horace writes of a woman “clinging with pliant arms more closely than the tall ilex is twined with ivy” (*Epod.* 15.5–6). Here, the emphasis on love as the subject draws attention to Junia as the object of love’s assault.<sup>13</sup> She is to be so filled with desire that she will remain faithful to Manlius.<sup>14</sup> In addition, the vehicle of the simile reworks the central idea of the passage, moving from binding to a more emphatic entwining. As in the poem’s second simile (B), the poet entrusts the presentation of the image entirely to the vehicle.

As the sixth simile (b) revises the second (B), the fifth (c) revises the third (C).<sup>15</sup> The poet tells Junia that her husband will not sleep around behind her back (102–5):

lenta sed velut adsitas  
vitis implicat arbores,  
implicabitur in tuum  
complexum.

but just as a pliant vine  
entwines the trees planted near it,  
he will be entwined<sup>16</sup> in your  
embrace.

It is now Junia’s turn to bind her husband to her so tightly that he will never stray from her grasp. The verb *implicare* is used twice in this simile, and that repetition reminds us of the only other appearance of that word in the poem, in the third simile (C). There, the god Hymen is the source of that which entwines—the ivy of love entwines the tree of Junia. Here, Junia has taken on that role and prompts the comparison to the entwining vehicle; she is the vine that entwines the tree of her husband. She goes from the entwined to the entwiner and takes on a more active role in guaranteeing a state of sexual bliss in her marriage.<sup>17</sup> In keeping with this shift, the repetition of *implicare* in the metaphorical *implicabitur* identifies Junia with the ivy. Through this metaphorical act of identification, Junia, as entwining tenor, plays an essential role in the presentation of the ivy image.

The first movement I wish to point to, then, is the greater importance of the tenor in similes c and b. The second, related shift is the increase in metaphor itself. Here, we can turn to the work of psycholinguists Dan Chiappe and John Kennedy.<sup>18</sup> Two of

12. Ellis 1889, ad loc. Thomsen argues that the tree corresponds to Junia (1992, 108–10), while Fedeli claims that the ivy stands for Junia (1983, 37–38).

13. We might speculate that line 33 evokes the language of erotic binding spells. But one does not seek to bind one’s victim with love. Rather, the purpose of a binding spell is to stop the object of the spell from having sex with someone other than the person issuing the spell. The binding is to cease once the object of affection comes to the desiring party; see Ogden 2002, 231, for two examples, and see Faraone 1999, 14, 34–35, 51–53, 62, and 143–44, for binding as a component of erotic magic. Catullus is clearly not saying that the grip that love has on Junia is to cease once she comes to Manlius.

14. For the possibility that a woman of high status might not be entirely faithful to her husband, see Treggiari 1991, 304–9; and Dixon 2001, 39–40.

15. Thomsen (1992, 110–14) also explores the connections between the third and fifth similes.

16. For the argument that *implicabitur* is passive, see Thomsen 1992, 110–11.

17. Cf. Thomsen: “The tenacious efforts of enticement belong to Vinia” (1992, 111). She chooses to read Vinia for the bride’s name (on which see p. 33, n. 33 and p. 112).

18. In a recent issue of *Poetics Today*, Richardson and Steen have collected a group of essays that seek to bridge the disciplinary gap between “[l]iterary studies and the cognitive sciences” (2002, 1). See especially their introduction (1–8). In the field of classics, Minchin’s book on the role that memory plays in the

their studies are of particular relevance to my analysis of Catullus 61. In one article (revealingly entitled "Aptness Predicts Preference for Metaphors and Similes, as well as Recall Bias"), they test the hypothesis that a speaker uses a metaphor when the comparison between tenor and vehicle is considered especially apt but a simile when the comparison is judged less apt.<sup>19</sup> "Aptness" is defined in the following fashion: "The comparison that captures the appropriate number of relevant features could be considered especially apt."<sup>20</sup> First, Chiappe and Kennedy show that there is "a significant consensus between subjects on how some comparisons are best expressed."<sup>21</sup> So, for example, 97% of the participants in the study preferred the statement "Life is (like) a journey" as a metaphor, rather than a simile. Conversely, only 20% would choose to express the statement "Billboards are (like) warts" as a metaphor; 80% of the participants thought such a statement best rendered as a simile. Once a consensus is established, one can test for the generating factors behind this consensus.<sup>22</sup> The two go on to demonstrate through a series of three tests that "the higher the aptness of a comparison, the more likely it was that it was preferred as a metaphor rather than as a simile."<sup>23</sup> I suggest that we see Catullus' application of metaphor to Junia as an assertion that the comparison between the bride and the vegetal world has become more apt over the course of the poem.

In a second article ("Are Metaphors Elliptical Similes?"), Chiappe and Kennedy refine the so-called argument from correction, aimed at distinguishing metaphors from similes.<sup>24</sup> According to this model, when a speaker wants to make a simile into a stronger statement, he or she resorts to a metaphor; one might say, "Jill is not like a rock, she is a rock." The metaphor is felt to be stronger since more properties of the vehicle are to be attributed to the tenor.<sup>25</sup> In the first experiment presented in this article, Chiappe and Kennedy conclude that "metaphors involve more properties than similes in corrective contexts, whether the correction is made by the metaphor or the simile."<sup>26</sup> A second experiment builds on these findings: "In corrective contexts metaphors may be used to strengthen comparisons by suggesting that a relatively large number of properties are to be attributed to the tenor and simile may be used

---

performance of Homeric poetry successfully employs such an interdisciplinary approach (2001). See also Bakker's application of modern tools of discourse analysis to the Homeric poems (1997).

19. Chiappe and Kennedy's larger goal in this article is to bypass the debate over whether metaphors are abbreviated similes or similes are lengthened metaphors. They urge that we not prioritize one over the other: "We maintain that similes, like metaphors, are instructions to find relevant common properties between tenors and vehicles. A priori, we see no need to convert one form of the comparison into another prior to engaging in a comparison process" (1999, 675). In Chiappe, Kennedy, and Smykowski 2003, they present a "distinct statements" model that sees metaphor and simile working toward independent goals (88). Chiappe and Kennedy 2001 and Chiappe, Kennedy, and Smykowski 2003 present arguments regarding aptness similar to those in the 1999 article under discussion here. The scholarship on the metaphor vs. simile controversy is vast. For two recent examinations, see Bethlehem 1996 and Bredin 1998.

20. Chiappe and Kennedy 1999, 669.

21. *Ibid.*, 671.

22. We are dealing here with trends: of the thirty sentences used in the experiment, Chiappe and Kennedy were able to establish a clear preference for metaphor or simile in the case of fifteen, since "only consensus levels greater than or equal to .70 [70%] were significant . . ." (*ibid.*, 671).

23. *Ibid.*, 672.

24. Chiappe and Kennedy 2000.

25. *Ibid.*, 373–74.

26. *Ibid.*, 381.

to weaken comparisons by suggesting that fewer properties are to be attributed.”<sup>27</sup> A third experiment provides similar evidence for the greater strength of metaphor: “people correcting similes with metaphors express stronger attitudes. The reverse is evident when similes correct metaphors.”<sup>28</sup> We are, I imagine, to understand “attitude” as an index of the speaker’s belief in the aptness of the comparison. Finally, they conclude from a fourth experiment that “correcting a simile with a metaphor suggests that the tenor possesses more of a particular property, while correcting a metaphor with a simile suggests that the tenor possesses less of a particular property.”<sup>29</sup> Chiappe and Kennedy go on to suggest that, whereas metaphors might be stronger than similes in such corrective contexts, that is not the case when similes and metaphors stand alone.<sup>30</sup> They claim that perhaps “there is something about corrective situations, not the relative number of properties [that a metaphor and simile express], that triggers a preference for metaphors rather than similes.”<sup>31</sup>

I suggest that, in Catullus 61, metaphors in the tenors of similes c and b effectively “correct” similes C and B, their counterparts in the poem’s first half. The metaphors *implicabitur*, *floridulo*, and *nitens* imply a more forceful linking of Junia to the vegetal world. That is, in receiving these metaphors, Junia becomes further identified with the traditional wedding imagery: she is one who shines with a little blooming face, and so she is not merely like a shining flower, she is a shining flower.<sup>32</sup>

Through this reworking, Catullus charts Junia’s movement from *virgo* to *matrona*. Initially, Junia is hesitant (79–81):

tardet ingenuus pudor.  
quem tamen magis audiens,  
flet quod ire necesse est.

noble shame holds [her] back.  
Nevertheless, obeying this [her shame] more  
she weeps, because she must go.

By the end of the poem, she is cast as a more active participant in her first coupling with Manlius (174–76):

mitte brachiolum teres,  
praetextate, puellulae:  
iam cubile adeat viri.

27. *Ibid.*, 381.

28. *Ibid.*, 384.

29. *Ibid.*, 386.

30. *Ibid.*, 386–92.

31. *Ibid.*, 392. They suggest that metaphors and similes function in an analogous fashion to literal claims of identity or similarity: “In literal use, saying ‘X is like a Y’ is weaker than saying ‘X is a Y.’ For example, ‘this object is like an apple’ attributes to the object fewer properties of apples than ‘this object is an apple.’ Thus in corrective situations, people may note metaphors are in the form of literal categorization statements [e.g., ‘this object is an apple’], and similes are formed like literal claims of similarity [e.g., ‘this object is like an apple’], cueing that more properties (or fewer) than otherwise are to be attributed to the tenor” (*ibid.*, 393). Kennedy and Chiappe 1999 and Chiappe and Kennedy 2001 also address this issue, but see Gibbs 2001, 326–27 for some reservations about their arguments. For the researchers’ most recent restatement of their views, see Chiappe, Kennedy, and Smykowski 2003.

32. Similarly, Junia is not merely like one entwined, she does entwine her husband. This reworking offers the additional change from passive to active.



Let go of the smooth little arm  
 of the little girl, young boy:  
 let her come to her husband's bed.

(185):

uxor in thalamo tibi est . . .

the wife is in the bed chamber for you [Manlius] . . .

In keeping with her notionally increasing zeal for Manlius, Junia is made to participate vigorously through metaphor in the wedding imagery proper for a young bride. Catullus thus remotivates the conventional imagery for the purpose of emphatically binding Junia to her appropriate figurative role.<sup>33</sup> The first and last similes provide the frame for this linguistic shift. Any questions provoked by the initial comparison are resolved in the final image of marital continuity. The potentially disruptive Venus becomes the productive Penelope. The regression of the similes mirrors the progression from reluctant fiancée to dutiful wife.

Yet, the simile beginning at line 87 presents a moment of hesitation about Junia's transition. The image separates the three pairs of similes and does not have a mate (87–89):

talis in vario solet  
 divitis domini hortulo  
 stare flos hyacinthinus.

Just so a hyacinth flower  
 in the variegated little garden of a rich master  
 is accustomed to stand.

The simile is introduced abruptly. The tenor must be supplied from the previous stanza: Junia is the most beautiful girl under the sun, just like the most beautiful flower in a rich man's garden amidst a multitude of rival plants. The simile is another attempt to praise Junia's good looks. But the lack of a specific name for the *dominus* gives one pause; we do not know whether the garden is that of Junia's father or Manlius. In the immediate context, the most relevant *dominus* of a house for Junia would seem to be Manlius; after all, she is soon to be living in his house.<sup>34</sup> But the rich *dominus* could just as well be Junia's father. Let me spell out the consequences of this latter possibility. Just as Junia must ultimately leave her father's house, so the flower that represents Junia must be removed from the garden. The image of a plucked flower is, of course, the operative metaphor for a loss of virginity. Such a subtext to the image of the flower here would parallel the simile at Catullus 62.39–47: the chorus of maidens anxiously compares the defloration of a bride to the plucking of a flower from "fenced gardens" (*saeptis . . . hortis*, 39), presumably those of the father. Our simile raises the specter of a defloration that is all the more obvious for its omission. I submit that the infinitive *stare* (89), signifying a lack of movement, might hint

33. For the political uses of figures, such as simile and metaphor, see McLaughlin 1995.

34. Fedeli believes the *dominus* to be Manlius (1983, 69). Treggiari notes, "In the Principate, we find husbands and wives addressing each other by their titles as master or mistress of the household, as *domine* and *domina*" (1991, 414). Junia is called the mistress of the house (*dominam*) at line 31.

at resistance to this implied transition.<sup>35</sup> Such hesitation would contrast with the image just drawn of Junia's being summoned from her father's house—"Open the bolts of the door. / The maiden is coming" (76–77)—and would help explain the admonition that abruptly ends the simile: "But you delay, the day is moving along" (90). In this central simile, Catullus explores a moment of ambivalence about the impending consummation of the marriage, before he begins the systematic revision of the first three similes of the poem.<sup>36</sup>

JONATHAN L. READY

*University of California, Berkeley*

35. Lucretius consistently uses the verb *stare* in constructing an opposition between that which is in motion and that which is or seems to be stationary: see *De Rerum Natura* 1.1054, 1.1078, 2.310, 2.332, 4.422, and 6.1058.

36. I wish to thank Ellen Oliensis and *CP*'s anonymous reader for helpful advice and suggestions. Those errors that remain are my own.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Addison, C. 2001. "So Stretched Out Huge in Length": Reading the Extended Simile. *Style* 35:498–516.
- Bakker, E. J. 1997. *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*. Ithaca, N.Y.
- Bethlehem, L. 1996. Simile and Figurative Language. *Poetics Today* 17:203–40.
- Bredin, H. 1998. Comparisons and Similes. *Lingua* 105:67–78.
- Chiappe, D. L., and J. M. Kennedy. 1999. Aptness Predicts Preference for Metaphors and Similes, as well as Recall Bias. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 6:668–76.
- . 2000. Are Metaphors Elliptical Similes? *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 29:371–98.
- . 2001. Literal Bases for Metaphor and Simile. *Metaphor and Symbol* 16:249–76.
- Chiappe, D., J. M. Kennedy, and T. Smykowski. 2003. Reversibility, Aptness, and the Conventionality of Metaphors and Similes. *Metaphor and Symbol* 18:85–105.
- Dixon, S. 2001. *Reading Roman Women: Sources, Genres and Real Life*. London.
- Ellis, R. 1889. *A Commentary on Catullus*<sup>2</sup>. Oxford.
- Faraone, C. A. 1999. *Ancient Greek Love Magic*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Fedeli, P. 1983. *Catullus' Carmen 61*. Amsterdam.
- Fordyce, C. J., ed. 1961. *Catullus*. Oxford.
- Gibbs, R., Jr. 2001. Evaluating Contemporary Models of Figurative Language Understanding. *Metaphor and Symbol* 16:317–33.
- Kennedy, J. M., and D. L. Chiappe. 1999. What Makes a Metaphor Stronger Than a Simile? *Metaphor and Symbol* 14:63–69.
- Lobel, E., and D. Page, eds. 1955. *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* (LP). Oxford.
- McLaughlin, T. 1995. Figurative Language. In *Critical Terms for Literary Study*<sup>2</sup>, ed. F. Len-tricchia and T. McLaughlin, 80–90. Chicago.
- Minchin, E. 2001. *Homer and the Resources of Memory: Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the "Iliad" and "Odyssey"*. Oxford.
- Mynors, R. A. B., ed. 1958. *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*. Oxford.
- Ogden, D. 2002. *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A Sourcebook*. Oxford.
- Quinn, K., ed. 1970. *Catullus*. London.
- Richards, I. A. 2001. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, ed. J. Constable. Oxford.

- Richardson, A., and F. Steen. 2002. Literature and the Cognitive Revolution: An Introduction. *Poetics Today* 23:1–8.
- Thomsen, O. 1992. *Ritual and Desire: Catullus 61 and 62 and Other Ancient Documents on Wedding and Marriage*. Aarhus, Denmark.
- Thomson, D. F. S., ed. 1998. *Catullus*. Toronto.
- Treggiari, S. 1991. *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. Oxford.

### AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS 21.6.3: A MISUNDERSTOOD OMEN

Ammianus Marcellinus is our sole source for a curious incident that apparently occurred during the winter of 360/61. The emperor Constantius II had returned to Antioch in Syria following an unsuccessful campaign against the Persians and intended to winter there (20.11.32). A delegation was duly appointed to welcome him as he arrived, but this included one most unwelcome face (21.6.2–3):

Cum igitur a Mesopotamia reversus, Constantius hoc exciperetur officio, Amphilocheius quidam ex tribuno Paphlago, quem dudum sub Constante militantem discordiarum sevisse causas inter priores, fratres, suspiciones contiguae veritati pulsabant, ausus paulo petulantius stare, ut ipse quoque ad parile obsequium admittendus, agnitus est et prohibitus, strepentibusque multis, et intueri lucem ulterius non debere clamantibus, ut perduellem, et obstinatum, Constantius circa haec lenior solito, “Desinite” ait “urgere hominem ut existimo sonem, sed nondum aperte convictum, et mementote quod, si quid admisit huius modi, sub obtutibus meis conscientiae ipsius sententia punietur, quam latere non poterit,” et ita discessum est. Postridie ludis Circensibus idem ex adverso imperatoris (ubi consueverat) spectans, repentino clamore sublato, cum certamen opinatum emitteretur, diffractis cancellis, quibus una cum pluribus incumbibat, cunctis cum eo in vanum excussis laesisque leviter paucis, interna compage disrupta, efflasset spiritum repertus est solus, unde Constantius ut futurorum quoque praescius exsultabat.

Therefore when Constantius, on his return from Mesopotamia, was received with this attention, Amphilocheius, a former tribune from Paphlagonia, who had served long before under Constans and was under well-founded suspicion of having sown the seeds of discord between the deceased brothers, having dared to appear somewhat arrogantly, as if he also ought to be admitted to this service, was recognised and forbidden. And when many raised an outcry and shouted that he ought not to be allowed longer to look upon the light of day, being a stiff-necked traitor, Constantius, milder than usual on this occasion, said: “Cease to trouble a man who is, I believe, guilty, but has not yet been openly convicted; and remember that if he has committed anything of that kind, so long as he is in my sight he will be punished by the judgement of his own conscience, from which he will be unable to hide.” And that was the end of it. On the next day, at the games in the Circus, the same man was looking on from a place opposite the emperor, where he usually sat. And when the expected contest began and a sudden shout was raised, the railing on which with many others he was leaning broke, and he with all the rest fell to the ground; and while a few were slightly injured, he alone was found to have suffered internal injuries and to have given up the ghost, whereat Constantius rejoiced greatly, as if he had a knowledge of future events also.<sup>1</sup>

1. Text and translation from J. C. Rolfe, *Ammianus Marcellinus II*, Loeb Classical Library, 315 (Cambridge, Mass., 1940), 116–19.