

Ariadne's Lament: The Semiotic Impulse of Catullus 64*

HUNTER H. GARDNER

The College of Charleston

SUMMARY: This paper argues that Catullus's characterization of Ariadne in c. 64 plays an important role in shaping the *puellae* of Augustan elegy. In particular, Ariadne's spatial, temporal, and social marginalization, as well as her power to disrupt teleological progress, become defining attributes of the elegiac beloved. Julia Kristeva's configuration of "women's time" and her linking of female subjectivity with the semiotic (as opposed to symbolic) components of language provide theoretical models that offer one explanation for Ariadne's spatio-temporal crisis and allow us to understand better the relationship between the heroine and her successor *puellae*.

THE EXACT NATURE OF CATULLUS'S BEQUEST TO THE AUGUSTAN elegists has remained a productive source of scholarly debate, despite many authoritative studies of the subject. As important distinctions between Catullus and his successors are regularly upheld or disputed, scholars have offered increasingly subtle analyses of the Catullan ego, particularly in poems 68 and 76, and of the relics of that ego detected in the poet-lovers of elegy.¹ This paper joins that effort, taking as its starting point an ostensibly different pair of comparanda. In the following essay, I examine Catullus's Ariadne as a precursor to the elegiac *puella*: she represents a disruptive force, and one that confounds the progress of the traditional narratives that shape the epic genre, a force similar to that which the *amatores* of elegy so often attribute to their *puellae*. Although Lesbia

* I owe sincere thanks to Allen Miller, Jim O'Hara, and the two anonymous *TAPA* referees for their insightful comments on earlier drafts of this article. I am also especially grateful to Sharon James, whose sound advice and patience have played an important role in strengthening and clarifying my argument.

¹ For Catullus's influence on elegy, see Luck 56–69, Ross 1975, Lyne 19–61, and Greene, e.g. 38–42, 59; for a more specific approach to the subject that addresses the relationship between the Catullan poet-lover and his elegiac successors see esp. Rubino and Miller 2004: 31–59.

makes a regular appearance as the beloved in Catullan verse, it is Ariadne who anticipates the *puella*'s marginalized position and thus better identifies the elements of female subjectivity that Catullus hands down to his elegiac successors. While Cynthia, Delia, and Corinna are the most obvious inheritors of the female subject position as expressed through the figure of Ariadne, "female" subjectivity within the elegiac corpus is an inherently unstable position. We will find that the very qualities that link Ariadne to the *puella* are also manifested in the characterization and behavior of the poet-lover.

As Catullus endows his heroine with the power to disrupt one hero's teleology, he creates a paradigm for the elegiac *puella*'s own power to delay her lover and hinder his epic and historical progress (e.g., Prop. 1.6, Tib. 1.3, 2.6, Ov. *Am.* 2.1). Ariadne, however, also functions as a model for the male *amator*, who occasionally wishes to hinder the progress of his mistress (e.g., Prop. 1.8, 11–12, Ov. *Am.* 2.11, 3.7.81–84; cf. Tib. 2.3) or suffers a lamentable socio-cultural isolation not unlike Catullus's depiction of Ariadne's desertion on the shores of Naxos (Tib. 1.3, Prop. 1.17–18; cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.16). As such we find remnants of the archetypal *relicta puella* evident in both primary subject positions of Latin love elegy, namely lover and beloved.

The template for this dynamic of abandonment on the one hand, and for the hindering of linear progress on the other, we may locate within the structure of language itself, and in particular in poetic language as it is described by the French theorist Julia Kristeva. Kristeva develops her theory of language most fully in her doctoral thesis, *La Révolution du langage poétique* (1974),² which argues for a semiotic (*le sémiotique*) component of language, grounded in the speaking subject's biological drives. These semiotic drives (or "pulsions") are associated with a receptacle or space that she terms the *chora* (a concept that originates in Plato's *Timaeus*).³ Kristeva argues that these pulsions are often manifested in poetic language, particularly in the texts of nineteenth-century avant-garde poets. Since the publication of *La Révolution* critics have identified similar qualities of poetic language from a generically and chronologically broader range of literature. I will argue that Catullus and the elegists should be included within this range, in so far as

²Following the initial publication of *La Révolution du langage poétique* in 1974, significant portions of Kristeva's dissertation were translated into English (most notably by M. Waller in 1984) as *Revolution in Poetic Language* (abbreviated RPL in this discussion). Waller's translation has since then appeared in various anthologies of Kristeva's work, including Moi's 1986, the text I make use of in this discussion. All translations are Waller's unless otherwise noted; page numbers refer to Moi's text unless the original French is cited.

³See below, 151–52.

the works of these writers are defined by semiotic pressures that shape and confound the meaning of the text. In the first section of this paper, I offer a general introduction to Kristeva's semiotic,⁴ its association with the *chora*, and the relevance of these two concepts to a gendering of time that links female subjectivity with isolation, repetition, and eternity, and male subjectivity with linear progress and teleological closure.⁵ I will then outline some important distinctions between Lesbia and the elegiac *puella*, in order to suggest that Ariadne more accurately predicts the elegiac beloved's marginalized position. In parts three through five I will discuss the utility of a Kristevan framework for understanding the figure of Ariadne, and conclude with a brief discussion of the heroine's contribution to the elegiac impetus.

I. KRISTEVA, THE *CHORA*, AND WOMEN'S TIME

Before using Kristeva's theoretical framework to clarify the elegiac impulse that drives Ariadne's characterization in c. 64, it is important to locate her work within the larger context of French linguistic and psychoanalytic theory. As a student of Lacan, she is concerned with the relationship between the unconscious mind and the processes of language, or, more generally, with the motivating forces behind the speech act.⁶ Lacan has identified an opposition between Imaginary and Symbolic realms, or between the way in which we see ourselves in the world and the entire realm of signs and signification, including culture in its broadest sense.⁷ Since language always designates a lack (i.e., since signifiers always presuppose the absence of the signified), Lacan introduces a third term into the dyadic opposition between the self and the world of signs: the Real, that "inaccessible realm which is always beyond the reach of signification, always outside the symbolic order" (Eagleton 1996: 145). The Real, then, is on the one hand that which would recreate a state of plenitude, of the fullness or completion that exists before the subject's break with the maternal body and entrance into Symbolic language, a state which

⁴ The Kristevan "semiotic" (*le sémiotique*) should not be confused with "semiotics" (*la sémiotique*), a term used to denote that field of study focused on signifying systems (poems, bird calls, morse code, etc.); see Eagleton 87.

⁵ This discussion is partly indebted to the helpful analyses of Kristeva's works in Lewis, Roudiez 1–10, Moi 1985: 150–173, 1986: 1–22, and Oliver xi–xxix.

⁶ As Oliver xiv succinctly states the question, "Why do we speak?"

⁷ For a useful summary of the relationship between Lacan's Imaginary and Symbolic, as well as its relevance to the development of Roman elegy, see Miller 2004: esp. 5–16. I have followed customary practice in capitalizing Lacan's Real, Imaginary, and Symbolic in order to distinguish this set of terms from Kristeva's own semiotic and symbolic (which are printed without capitals).

language always unsuccessfully attempts to achieve. On the other hand, and more practically speaking, the Real is the world of events and historical circumstance surrounding us but always separate from us after the introduction and mediation of Symbolic language.

Kristeva revises this triadic structure consisting of Real, Symbolic, and Imaginary elements as an opposition between the “semiotic” and “symbolic” aspects of language. For Kristeva, the symbolic is language in its differentiated form, following the split between signifier and signified. The production of symbolic language involves an initial impulse (the subject’s desire) that is transformed into one or more meaningful signs; this procedure requires a break between subject and object that results in the positing of signification. This process of breaking and positioning is what Kristeva terms the “thetic” phase, which marks a “threshold” (*seuil*) between the realms of the semiotic and symbolic. The completion of this phase results in what we might term comprehensible linguistic utterances:

[All enunciation] requires an identification; in other words, the subject must separate from and through his image, from and through his objects. This image and objects must first be posited in a space that becomes symbolic because it connects the two separated positions, recording them or redistributing them in an open combinatorial system. (RPL 98)

The thetic describes a process of positioning, by which the symbolic elements of language become evident as a subject’s initial impulses or desires are separated from their referents and arranged according to the traditional rules of grammar and syntax. Thus Kristeva’s symbolic is equated with the structures by which symbols operate and convey meaning. Without the thetic phase, the subject cannot join the human community, where communication is symbolic rather than physical.

Kristeva’s most revolutionary thinking, however, involves that which she posits on the other side of the thetic threshold, namely the semiotic. Just as Lacan had assigned to the Real all that which escapes signification and thus marks the limits of the Symbolic, Kristeva acknowledges (within the scope of a subject’s desire to communicate) certain semiotic elements—for instance, intonation, gesture, vocal rhythm (RPL 96)⁸—that escape the restrictions of symbolic language. Kristeva’s semiotic aspects of language emerge from drives or pulsions (predominantly oral and anal) originating in the body of

⁸ More precisely, Kristeva 1974: 28 describes voice and gesture as two of “les différents matériaux sémiotisables,” i.e., material aspects of the speech act in which semiotic pulsions are made manifest.

the speaking subject. These pulsions are also prior to the absence of maternal plenitude; they precede the introduction of symbolic language that constitutes the Oedipal phase. Thus, with her study of the semiotic components of language, Kristeva acknowledges the residual effects of the subject's link with the maternal body and redirects the study of signifying practices back towards the subject's own material form. This subject she describes not as a transcendental ego, but instead as a heterogeneous entity in constant flux and fragmentation (*le sujet en procès*, RPL 90–91; cf. Oliver xvii–xviii.). Kristeva's articulation of subjectivity, while not altogether denying individual identity, strikes a delicate balance that weighs the heterogeneous drives characteristic of the human body against the notion of a unified consciousness or ego (Moi 1986: 13–14).⁹

The pulsions born from bodily drives persist after the Oedipal phase, manifested as semiotic qualities of language. They undergo a kind of stasis when checked by biological restraints and social interaction. Kristeva locates these semiotic pulsions in the *chora*, a spatial concept she borrows from Plato's *Timaeus*. In the dialogue, Socrates discusses a third kind of being:

Τρίτον δὲ αὖ γένος ὃν τὸ τῆς χώρας ἀεί, φθορὰν οὐ προσδεχόμενον, ἔδραν δὲ παρέχον ὅσα ἔχει γένεσιν πᾶσιν, αὐτὸ δὲ μετ' ἀναισθησίας ἀπτὸν λογισμῷ τινι νόθῳ, μόγις πιστόν, πρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄνειροπολοῦμεν βλέποντες καὶ φάμεν ἀναγκαῖον εἶναί που τὸ ὃν ἅπαν ἔν τινι τόπῳ καὶ κατέχον χώραν τινά,...

and a third Kind is ever-existing Place, which admits not of destruction; and provides room for all things that have birth, itself being apprehensible by a kind of bastard reasoning by the aid of non-sensation, barely an object of belief; for when we regard this we dimly dream and affirm that it is somehow necessary that all that exists should exist *in* some spot and occupying some *place*. (52a–b, R. G. Bury, trans., italics original)

This “Place” where all things come into existence is one of three kinds of being that constitute the universe; the other two are identified as source (model) and offspring (copy). Plato's *χώρα* precedes the constitution of difference that is integral to the production of forms, while at the same time providing the very receptacle in which such production can occur. Its heterogeneity results in an inherent instability that must be constantly and tenuously repressed, a process Plato describes as an uneven oscillation: “but owing to being filled with potencies that are neither similar nor balanced, in no part of herself

⁹ Thus Kristeva acknowledges the role of the body in language, speech, and communication.

is she [ἡ χώρα] equally balanced, but sways unevenly in every part, and is herself shaken by these forms and shakes them in turn as she is moved (*Tim.* 52d5–e6, R. G. Bury, trans.).¹⁰ While this space lacks forms or intelligible properties, Plato characterizes it as a markedly feminine entity (*Tim.* 50c–d), assigning it a function as “a receptacle and, so to speak, the wet nurse of all becoming” (πάσης εἶναι γενέσεως ὑποδοχὴν αὐτότην, οἷον τιθήνην, 49a). He also refers to the space as a mother figure (50d, 51a), as opposed to the model father and their resulting offspring.

Plato’s vaguely situated, generative χώρα becomes, for Kristeva, a useful concept for designating the dynamic and heterogeneous drives that motivate language:

Discrete quantities of energy move through the body of the subject who is not yet constituted as such and, in the course of his development, they are arranged according to the various constraints imposed on this body—always already involved in the semiotic process—by family and social structures. In this way the drives, which are ‘energy’ charges as well as ‘psychical’ marks, articulate what we call the *chora*: a non-expressive totality formed by the drives and their stases in a motility that is as full of movement as it is regulated. (RPL 93)

Like Plato’s χώρα, Kristeva’s *chora* designates an inherently unstable entity that suffers regulation and repetition during the language process.¹¹ Kristeva feminizes both the *chora* and the semiotic component of language issuing from it by echoing Plato’s original stress on its maternal (*maternel*) properties in *La Révolution* (RPL 94) and later, in her essay on women’s time, where she describes it as a nourishing “matrix space” (*espace matriciel*, Kristeva 1979: 7).¹² Her designation of the *chora* as *matriciel*, in fact, plays off the dual meaning of *matrice*, which denotes a “womb” as well as a “matrix.” Furthermore, as noted above, the drives associated with the *chora* originate in a pre-Oedipal stage and, as such, during the subject’s experience of the mother’s body, the original site of a *jouissance* (loosely translated as “pleasure”) that is later transferred, for instance, to the male phallus (RPL 95, 101).

¹⁰ Cf. Spentzou 99–104, who offers a useful account of the link between Plato’s *chora* and Kristeva’s appropriation of the concept.

¹¹ Cf. RPL 94, and see below, 167–68.

¹² The English translation of A. Jardine and H. Blake (“Women’s Time”) included in Moi’s anthology is used in the present discussion; references to the essay consist of the abbreviation WT and a page number from Moi’s text, though I have chosen to cite certain phrases in the original French. It is important to note that the *chora* (though described as “rhythmic space,” RPL 94) is anterior to both temporality and spatiality. Derrida 75 and 106n39 has criticized the ontological essence of Kristeva’s term, though Kristeva (in my opinion) has anticipated his criticism and defended her use of the *chora* in *La Révolution*, n13.

Because the *chora* can never be definitely posited,¹³ it designates a space between the positions that constitute the signifiers of the symbolic order, and becomes a sign of marginality within Kristevan theory. For Kristeva, the semiotic *chora* is responsible for disruptions and discontinuities, what Toril Moi (1985: 162) describes as “pulsional pressure,” in conventional grammar and syntax (e.g., “slippage” of meaning, disturbed relations between signifier and signified), particularly evident in the poetic language of modernist writers.¹⁴ In such works (especially those of Mallarmé) Kristeva discerns a “genotext” (*géo-texte*), a text of disruptions and contradictions woven from the pulsions of the semiotic, alongside a “phenotext” (*phéno-texte*), the symbolic text resulting from syntactical, grammatical, and even social constraints. Since the publication of Kristeva’s thesis, others have made successful attempts to locate the semiotic elements of language in literary enterprises from all periods. As Leon Roudiez remarks (1984: 5–6), often the material aspects of language (e.g., certain sounds, repetitions, or combinations of letters—without regard for meaning) indicate the semiotic genotext. Brenda Fineberg has accordingly examined anaphoric structures in Tibullus 1.4 as evidence of the poem’s semiotic elements, which she views as latent expressions of desire and frustration, amidst more conventional symbolic structures (1999: 421–22). Indeed, as I shall demonstrate further below, the sounds of Ariadne’s lament—the result of, among other poetic figures, alliteration, anaphora, onomatopoeia, and assonance—comprise a genotext in c. 64, and one that simultaneously enhances and undermines the poem’s symbolic meaning.

In addition to addressing the semiotic properties of Catullan language, I am also concerned with the *chora* generating those properties. Kristeva’s *chora*, as a generative space that is a necessary precursor to the linear and syntactical functions of language, bears distinct ideological implications that may help clarify Catullus’s and elegy’s frequently debated reversals and resumptions of gender roles.¹⁵ In her 1979 essay “Le Temps des Femmes,” or “Women’s Time,”

¹³ In other words, it is not yet a position that can function as a sign or signifier, but is responsible for the preliminary drives that initiate signifying positions.

¹⁴ Cf. Lewis’s summary of the poetic subject’s experience of the semiotic: “the poetic subject is a dialectical process in which the structured language of the ego comes into contact with a violent, heterogeneous force which is its ground, with the flow of psychic instincts which Artaud represented as corporeal motility and which Kristeva terms the semiotic *chora*, designating thereby a music, a rhythm, an architecture, a non-verbal articulation of the semiotic process which redistributes the linguistic and grammatical categories of a language to which the *chora* remains unassimilable” (31).

¹⁵ For a brief survey and introduction to the debates regarding gender roles in elegy, see Miller and Platter 405–6; cf. Wyke 155–191.

Kristeva makes apparent the *chora*'s relevance to gender and positions of social marginality. The semiotic *chora*'s association with (and functional identity as) space, and, more specifically, feminine and marginal space, provides a foundation for her argument concerning the temporal modalities defining men and women. She describes a "problematic of space":

...which innumerable religions of matriarchal reappearance attribute to woman, and which Plato, recapitulating in his own system the atomists of antiquity, designated by the aporia of the *chora*, matrix space, nourishing, unnameable, anterior to the One, to God and, consequently defying metaphysics (WT 191).

Traditional conceptual categories have consistently linked women more closely with space.¹⁶ Women's time, according to those same conceptual categories, fails to progress beyond spatial boundaries in the way that linear time does. Women's time is, like the *chora*, marked by repetition, eternity, and confinement (*la répétition et éternité... sans faille et sans fuite* [1979: 7]), and is largely circular in its conformity with the cycles of nature and biological rhythms. As such, it is the antithesis of historical or cursive time, understood as "project, teleology, linear and prospective unfolding: time as departure, progression, and arrival" (*projet, téléologie, déroulement linéaire et prospectif; le temps du départ, du cheminement et de l'arrivée* [1979: 7]). Just as women's time finds its structural analogue in the semiotic *chora*, and operates like the repetitive pulsions of the semiotic, cursive time, "readily labeled masculine" (*qu'on qualifie facilement de masculine* [1979: 8]) is reflected by the linear movement that determines syntax and the operations of symbolic language.

In accordance with this gendering of time, women—as well as the marginalized and repressed groups that "woman" represents in Kristevan theory—have difficulties accessing and participating in the realm of symbolic language and the larger socio-symbolic contract. Because the socio-symbolic contract requires a sacrifice to articulate the difference necessary for communicable meaning, certain groups—traditionally women, though the assumption of a sacrificial, scapegoat position is by no means limited to them—are forced into marginalized positions. In other words, women are relegated beyond the path of cursive time and to some extent excluded from "language as the fundamental social bond" (*langage comme lien social fondamental* [1979: 12]). The difficulty of access faced by women explains their relative silence in the

¹⁶ Kristeva WT 190 cites Joyce's dictum, "Father's time, mother's species," to illustrate woman's role as a generative space forming the human species. Cf. Blake's remark that "Time and Space are real Beings, a Male and a Female. Time is a Man, Space is a woman, & her Masculine Portion is Death" (1972 ed.) 614.

symbolic phenotext of the elegiac project: the *puella* is rarely allowed to speak in elegy, though, when she does speak, she demonstrates quite forcefully her exclusion from the socio-symbolic contract.

In fact, the very marginality associated with female subjectivity makes the women of elegy potent figures of subversion. Partly because of the *chora*'s association with the confinement, repetition and subversive potential of women's time, it has appealed to Effie Spentzou (2003: 101) as a means of explaining the isolated space of the abandoned woman in Ovid's *Heroides*. Remarking on the unpredictable and heterogeneous nature of the *chora*, Spentzou sees this space as suggesting the heroines' potential for resistance, through their own literary efforts, within the confines of "policed living and creation in their repressed enclaves." A similar urgency of expression (whether or not the speakers are granted a receptive audience) may be identified also in various guises of the elegiac *puella* (e.g., Cynthia of 1.3, 4.7, and 4.8, Arethusa of 4.3; cf. Delia of 1.3.29–32) as well as in Catullus's Ariadne.

At the same time, Ariadne's articulation of desire and loss bears a provocative resemblance to the male *amator*'s expression of his own suffering in Catullus's poetry,¹⁷ and paves the way for Ariadne's influence on the lover's self-representation in Augustan elegy. The Catullan *amator*'s identification with Ariadne reminds us that, while the *chora* and the mode of temporality associated with it are clearly described in feminine terms, subjects of both genders experience the semiotic processes of language born from it.¹⁸ As Moi argues (1985: 165), the semiotic's pre-Oedipal origins mark it as also prior to sexual difference: "Any strengthening of the semiotic...must therefore lead to a weakening of traditional gender divisions, and not to a reinforcement of traditional notions of femininity." By identifying the semiotic elements of Catullan poetic discourse in the ecphrasis of c. 64, as well as the ideological structures underwriting such discourse, we can isolate one source of elegy's gender play and doggedly ambiguous political posturing. More specifically, by examining Ariadne's spatio-temporal crisis, her position at odds with historical progress and civic order, we can locate the origins of elegy's stalwart

¹⁷ The process of identifying links between the epyllion and the more subjective love poems begins largely with Putnam; see below, 161.

¹⁸ Kristeva, as a somewhat controversial anti-essentialist, has refused to define woman as other than "that which cannot be represented, that which is not spoken, that which remains outside naming and ideologies," citation in Moi 1985: 163, taken from "La Femme, ce n'est jamais ça," *Tel Quel* 59 (1974): 19–24. Her view that woman's struggle is identical to that of other oppressed social classes ("it is the same struggle, and never one without the other," 24), though subject to some criticism, reminds us that the *chora*'s feminine properties mark it as simply that which is marginal to the dominant symbolic order, rather than as the property of either gender. See Moi 1985: 163–64.

oppositionality,¹⁹ a drama writ miniature in the poet-lover's repeated cycles of engagement with the elegiac *puella*.

II. AMOR AS A SYMBOLIC CONTRACT: CATULLUS'S LESBIA

Before discussing the semiotic and temporal ties that bind Ariadne to her successors in elegy, we must address the nature of the *puella*'s more obvious predecessor in Catullus's poetry, Lesbia. Closer comparison of Lesbia with her elegiac counterparts, however, suggests that very little hides beneath a surface reflection. Certainly, as Carl Rubino remarks (1975: 291), the beloved as she is drawn in Catullus 76 is, like the *puella* of elegy, construed as a "locus and repository of uncertainty and unpredictability."²⁰ And yet, for Rubino, these qualities issue largely from the beloved's status as a married woman: it is precisely Lesbia's violation of the *foedus* with her "real-life" husband that injects Catullus's poetry with its unique dynamics of despair. Lesbia's status as a married woman is made especially apparent in poem 68, where Allius provides her and her lover a place far from the watchful eye of her husband:

is clausum lato patefecit limite campum,
isque domum nobis isque dedit dominam,
ad quam communes exerceamus amores (68.67–69; cf. 145–46)

He laid open a fenced field with a broad path,
and he gave us a house and a chatelaine,²¹
among which we might enjoy the love we shared.

This need simply does not arise for the *puella* of elegy, who is most often assigned a space of residence in which she may or may not choose to entertain visitors. As Sharon James has argued, though elegy regularly employs the lexicon of marriage, such words are used in specifically, and thus often ironically, non-marital contexts.²² While Lesbia is endowed implicitly with the rights and

¹⁹ For Kristeva's understanding of feminine repression in terms of position rather than essence, see Moi 1985: 166.

²⁰ Cf. Lyne 20–21 on the importance of Catullus's Lesbia poems to subsequent elegy.

²¹ All translations are mine unless otherwise noted. For the translation of line 67, cf. Fordyce, *ad loc.* The text used throughout most of this discussion is that of R. A. B. Mynors. In line 68, I read *dominam* rather than Froehlich's conjecture *dominae*, so that Allius not only provides the couple with a house, but also with a "discrete chatelaine" to assist in their affair. I am persuaded by the argument of Wilkinson 1970, who (extending the arguments of Fordyce, et al.) does not consider Catullus the originator of the term *domina* (so commonly used of the elegiac mistress) in reference to a beloved. Wilkinson rightly notes that this poem's *domina* (also mentioned at line 156) must refer to someone other than the beloved, who is named *era* at 136 and *mea lux* in lines 132 and 160.

²² See James 2003: 41–52, who cites Prop. 3.20 and Ov. *Am.* 3.11 as clear instances where the vocabulary of legal matrimony is used in reference to unmarried women.

status of a *matrona*, the elegists more often describe their *puellae* (explicitly lacking the *stola* and *vitta* of a matron, and regularly under the tutelage of a procuress, or *lena*) as socially marginalized courtesans.²³

Catullus insinuates that Lesbia's sexuality is a tool with which she stakes her claim in the symbolic order, rather than a barrier removing her from it, whether she is pleasuring the descendents of Remus (58.5, *magnanimi Remi nepotes*) or engaging in incest with her high-profile brother "Lesbius" (77).²⁴ She, unlike the quasi-courtesan of elegy, whose doorway the *exclusus amator* longs to cross, is not spatially or temporally relegated to a *chora*-like enclosure. In c. 11, which older biographical criticism once described as the last comment on his affair with Lesbia, and which certainly concludes one sequence of meditations on the affair,²⁵ the lover may threaten to leave her behind, but it is he who will suffer isolation (*in extremos...Indos*, 11.2), while his beloved remains socially engaged (11.17–20). Regarding Lesbia's participation in symbolic language, it is perhaps worth noting that, while she shares with her elegiac successors the power to criticize both her lover and his poetry, she is never subject to the constant flatteries and persuasive speech, *blanditiae* or *blanda verba*, that the elegiac poets use to gain access to their *puella*'s bedroom. By the same token, Lesbia herself never needs to use the courtesan-*puella*'s *blanda verba* to persuade her poet-lover that he reward her financially for sexual favors.²⁶ Within the Catullan corpus, the only use of language described as *blanda* is significantly that of Theseus, who has,

²³ Delia lacks the *stola* and *vitta* of a respectable (and marriageable) woman at Tib. 1.6.67–68, just as Ovid's female addressees should lack *vittae tenues* at *Ars* 1.31–34. A *lena* counsels the elegiac *puella* at *Ov. Am.* 1.8, *Prop.* 4.5, and (implicitly) Tib. 1.5.48–56. For the *puella* as a courtesan-figure, inspired by women of an emerging demi-monde in Roman society, see Lyne 8–18, though Wyke esp. 11–45 provides a necessary critique of any attempts to correlate the elegiac mistresses, as literary constructs, with identifiable women from Roman society. James 2003, following Wyke's caveats, argues for the *puella*'s identity as a courtesan based largely on her literary portrayal as decidedly mercenary (from the *amator*'s perspective) and necessarily unmarriageable.

²⁴ Such an impression is strengthened by the general tendency to equate Lesbia with Clodia Metelli, sister of Cicero's foe Clodius. I hesitate to base any part of my argument on this sort of biographical speculation, however, and have tried to heed the warnings issued by Dixon 133–156. Cf. Skinner 277 for an evaluation of Clodia's character based on ancient testimony relatively uninfluenced by the "sinister and obviously exaggerated political role assigned to her in the *pro Caelio*."

²⁵ See Quinn 1972: 93; cf. Miller 1994: 61–62.

²⁶ For the elegiac poet-lover's use of *blanditiae* (and persuasive speech more generally), see James 2003: 13–20; for the *puella*'s use of *blanditiae* and *blanda verba*, reported through indirect speech (as, e.g., *Prop.* 1.5.42, 1.9.30, *Ov. Am.* 3.11.31–32, Tib. 1.2.21–22), see James (forthcoming).

according to Ariadne, made promises “in a flattering (or persuasive) voice” (*blanda...voce*, 64.139).

In light of the characteristics that clearly differentiate Lesbia’s status from that of the elegiac *puella*, it is not surprising that Catullus speaks of his relationship with Lesbia in political terms and likens their love, described as *amicitia*, to alliances shared between Rome’s leading male citizens (109.6). A good deal of critical discussion has surrounded the peculiar nuances of *amicitia* in Catullus’s poetry.²⁷ What seems well-established is that Catullus borrows the term (like others, cf. *foedus*, 87.3) from the political sphere as part of a larger process of divesting Republican terms of their original meaning during a critical period of transition within the Roman state. Fitzgerald (1995: 120) has argued that Catullus’s use of “the language of aristocratic obligation” is essentially powerless because the poet uses it in a void, i.e., outside “the shifting network of obligations and reciprocities within which it would have efficacy” (cf. Krostenko 240). Still, the poet may deploy such language in an attempt to elevate the status of his bond with Lesbia and thereby incorporate the pair within the aristocratic social network, rather than to relegate the lovers outside of the symbolic sphere in which such language has potency.²⁸ Such would seem to be the case in poem 72, where the speaker pointedly denies comparison of his love for Lesbia with that which the common crowd might feel for an *amica*, and compares his love instead to that a father would feel for his male successors (both biological and those implicated through marriage alliance), *gnatos et generos*, 72.4.²⁹ Moreover, any process that divests a specific terminology of one set of meanings in order to endow it with a new set is never complete, as political terms applied to personal, erotic experience retain something of their former meanings.³⁰

²⁷ For the most recent bibliography on the subject, see Miller 2004: 28, 242n68. I am especially persuaded by the argument of Ross 1969; see below n32.

²⁸ Cf. Lyne 18, 23–42, on Catullus’s use of *foedus* and *amicitia* as a means of preserving aristocratic obligations and standards, rather than debasing them.

²⁹ Ross 1969: 89 sees the comparison as an extension of the *amicitia* topos. See also Fordyce *ad loc.*, who notes that *generos* is not likely to include daughters-in-law; thus the reference invokes “a traditional attitude which puts the sons-in-law within the head of the family’s protective concern.”

³⁰ Cf. Rubino 291–93, Kennedy 46–63, and Miller 2004: 28. See also Platter 224, who remarks, regarding *officium* in Catullus, that his poetry “cannot speak the city’s language without at the same time importing and acknowledging the city’s authority.” Selden 497 makes some astute comments regarding the impact of Catullus’s self-representation on the prevailing contemporary discourse: “If character portrayal is not only a matter of literary interest, but an unavoidable political concern, this is due, he shows us, to the fact that, regardless of its validity, ethical description introduces irreversible effects. A testimonial

Significant for our purposes of contrasting Lesbia's status in Catullan verse with the *puella* of later elegy are the arguments of Sylvie Laigneau (1999: 285), who, following Hellegouarc'h (1963), argues for notions of eternal, or at least lifelong, commitment implied in *amicitia*, especially as the term is used in Cicero's *De Amicitia* (e.g., 10.32–33). In fact, in c. 109 Lesbia has the authority to propose a lasting bond of "sacred friendship" (*sanctae...amicitiae*) between Catullus and herself, invoking the political nuances of an "everlasting oath" (*foedus aeternum*):³¹

Lucundum, mea vita, mihi proponis amorem
hunc nostrum inter nos perpetuumque fore.
Di Magni, facite ut vere promittere possit,
atque id sincere dicat et ex animo,
ut liceat nobis tota perducere vita
aeternum hoc sanctae foedus amicitiae.

You suggest to me, my life, that this love of ours
will be sweet and everlasting between us.
Great gods, make it that she can promise this truly
and speak it sincerely and from the heart,
so that throughout our whole lives we may continue
this eternal oath of sacred friendship.

In what is our last glimpse of Catullus's affair in the collection, the poet (following shortly after a celebrated reconciliation with Lesbia in c. 107) leaves the fate of their love to the symbolic authority of his mistress. As Martial later remarked: *Lesbia dictavit, docte Catulle, tibi* (8.73.8).

Catullus's successors will diverge significantly in so far as they conclude their collections with a bitter attempted departure from their *puellae* and elegy. Perhaps more importantly, Augustan elegy most often allows the poet-lover to voice (and therefore control) promises of eternal affection. The political language of lasting oaths between lovers is virtually absent from (or signifi-

is not simply or even necessarily a record of personal achievement, but introduces a kind of imposition or writing on the real, a dynamic force which literally makes history in ways that no citizen can ever fully appreciate or entirely control."

³¹ For the political nuances of the *foedus aeternum*, see Newman 336–37. Though Lesbia is not named in the poem, most commentators assume her identity and Miller 1994: 57–59, following Wiseman 174–75, makes a case for internal correspondences between c. 107 (in which Lesbia is named) and 109. Cf. Thomson's text and interpretation of poem 109: *Lucundum, mea vita, mihi proponis: amorem / hunc nostrum inter nos perpetuum usque fore*. His reading of the poem separates the awkward coupling of *iucundum* and *perpetuum* and puts greater stress on the temporal endurance (*usque*) of the love affair.

cantly watered down in) the poetry of Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid (Ross 1969: 92ff).³² When Ovid's *praeceptor* suggests that his pupils use *amicitia* as a means to an erotic end in *Ars* 1 (*intret amicitiae nomine tectus amor*, 720–22; cf. 579–80), he measures the difference between Catullus's *amicitia*, in its capacity to convey the notion of a lasting commitment that transcends the mundanely erotic and its rather practical form in later elegy.³³ Catullus's particular collocation of technical terms like those in c. 109, drawn from the political sphere, was never to be reproduced. Such an absence suggests that, despite the debt of these poets to Catullus, their construction of the beloved is based on fundamentally different premises.

III. ARIADNE AND THE CATULLAN SEMIOTIC

Still, it is possible to identify in Catullus's poetry those same qualities that shape subjectivity within Augustan elegy. When the poet turns away from his elegiac and polymetric compositions to epic verse, traditionally reserved for more objective narratives, he evokes, primarily in the figure of Ariadne, the elegiac beloved's marginal status and tendency to disturb the symbolic order, i.e., precisely those semiotic properties that Kristeva associates with woman as a symbolic category. Though the heroine initially appears vulnerable within the socio-symbolic contract, she eventually reacts against it and disturbs the heroic progress of Theseus and the paternal order he supports; these are the very 'deeds of men,' *facta virum* (64.192), she curses. Lawrence

³² *Amicitia* is used only once in Propertius (of a male friend) and is absent from Tibullus and Ovid's *Amores*. Ross speaks of a "clearly intentional avoidance of the word [*amicitia*] and the metaphor" in Augustan poets. He also notes, with regard to *foedus*, that Catullus, "by associating the word with other specific terms of political alliance, made it more exact and technical," (93) than did his successors. Rubino remarks that Catullus distinguishes himself from his successors through his "dogged insistence that the structure of the elegiac world be translated into terms of the real world with which it is at odds" (295). For Lyne *amicitia* in Catullus is effectively replaced by *servitium amoris* in elegy, 80–1. Cf. Laigneau 276ff., who argues that the Augustan elegists follow Catullus closely in their use of *foedus* (and the closely related *fides*), though she does remark on the more physical connotations of *foedus* in Tibullus. Laigneau also sees the elegists as directly influenced by Catullus's use of *amicitia*, despite its virtual absence from the elegiac corpus. She suggests that the sense of the word is evoked in related terms used by elegists (e.g., *discidium*, *fides*), many of them found in Cicero's *De amicitia*. Most recently, see James 2003: 44–48, who argues that elegy's *foedus* evokes the language of orthodox marital relations, but debases the term through its frequent collocation with *lecti* (and the sexual connotations implied therein).

³³ Cf. Konstan 1997: 146, who cites the passage as an illustration of the term's use in describing a non-sexual relationship between the sexes.

Lipking (25), in his analysis of the abandoned woman, for whom he uses Ariadne as a prototype, discusses this same potential for subversion of poetic form in a manner that echoes Kristeva's concept of the *chora*'s potential to disrupt the symbolic order:³⁴

Moreover, [the abandoned woman] spends her life exposing, like a deconstructionist critic, the inner contradictions of every attempt to subjugate language and achieve an unequivocal harmonious whole. An abandoned woman knows better; the plot could always be told in a different way. Ariadne interrupts the wedding...

The relationship between c. 64 and the rest of Catullus's work has received a great deal of scholarly attention.³⁵ For Michael Putnam (1961: 167), both Ariadne and Aegeus, forgotten by the careless (*immemor*) Theseus, suggest, in the guise of representative, rather than subjective, verse, Catullus's own treatment at the hands of Lesbia.³⁶ Critical discussion since Putnam's seminal publication has continued to identify verbal and thematic links binding Catullus's mythological poems with his poems concerning Lesbia. Most recently, Paul Allen Miller has analyzed the split subject position of the Catullan speaker, and deems this Catullus's most significant contribution to the elegiac genre.³⁷ For Miller (2004: 33), who uses a Lacanian approach to the text, such a split in the subject position is the result of:

a profound dissociation of the Imaginary and the Symbolic, that is to say, [of] a fundamental conflict between the subject's baseline self-identification in the

³⁴ Gold 87, focusing her discussion on Propertius's Cynthia and applying A. Jardine's "gynesis" to her reading of Roman love elegy, also makes an important contribution to understanding woman as a "process that disrupts symbolic structures." "Gynesis" involves looking for the hidden or muted aspects of ostensibly "fixed identities assigned to female characters" and thus problematizing traditional assumptions about "the feminine" or "woman." Gold's conclusions about the destabilization of gender roles that results from Propertius's construction of Cynthia, though formulated within a different theoretical framework, have provided some impetus for the present discussion.

³⁵ Most notably, see Putnam 165–205; see also Forsyth 555–66, and Pavlock 116–117 for a review of secondary literature on the subject. Miller 1994: 107–118 discusses the relationship between 64 and other *carmina* in the lyric collection, especially the epithalamia. Fitzgerald 142–144 and 273n6 offers a critique of different approaches linking c. 64 with the more subjective love poems in the collection.

³⁶ Cf. Forsyth, who argues against Putnam's identification of Theseus with both Catullus's deceased brother and Lesbia in the Aegeus episode. Forsyth sees Aegeus's love for Theseus as representing the more spiritual aspects of Catullus' love for Lesbia.

³⁷ See Miller 2004: 32–33, who draws on the work of Rubino in arguing for the "schizoid" subject position of the elegiac speaker.

world of Imaginary reflection and its recognition *as a subject* in the world of codified, signifying practices. The result of this conflict is a split subject whose own discourse is recognizably double, and whose position vis-à-vis communal, ideological norms is therefore profoundly ambivalent.

According to Miller, it is this deeply fractured subject position that Catullus bequeaths to the elegists, but that position is detected more often in mythological narratives that present a subject both isolated and divided than in the articulation of emotional reciprocity between two desiring subjects. Thus Miller begins his discussion of the Catullan split subject in c. 68 with a passing glance at Ariadne's abandonment, a "shearing of the self" so evident in Augustan elegy (2004: 33).

My analysis here in many ways extends a dialectic initiated by Miller, though I have chosen to use a Kristevan (rather than a Lacanian) approach to the problem of the relationship between the speaking subject and the symbolic realm. Kristeva's semiotic and its association with the *chora* allows, I feel, a fuller articulation of Ariadne's distinctly marginalized experience. We may, as noted above, usefully draw a parallel between Kristeva's semiotic, as "pulsional pressure" on language, and Lacan's Real, that extra-linguistic realm of historical change, which tends to become apparent in moments when symbolic language is most obviously inadequate. Both terms, after all, are meant to account for the failings of symbolic language, the inherently unstable relations between signifiers and signifieds. Still, I would argue that the Kristevan *chora* and its spatio-temporal properties provide a more comprehensive terminology for describing Ariadne's plight and the path by which she finds her way into Augustan elegy.

Ariadne's lament is a structural inset of the (so-called) epyllion describing the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. The heroine is presented as a work of art, one tableau of an embroidered tapestry (*haec vestis priscis hominum variata figuris*, 50), meant to illustrate the "virtues of heroes" (*virtutes heroum*, 51). As such, her presence on the tapestry is jarringly ironic³⁸—how can Ariadne's abandonment demonstrate heroism?—and thus forces Catullus's reader to

³⁸ This jarring effect is intensified by the chronological inconsistency one encounters when finding Theseus's ship (among the *priscæ figurae*) depicted, in spite of the fact that the narrator describes the tapestry as viewed by those who have themselves sailed on the first ship (*prima*, 11), the Argo. On the confused temporal relationship between the narrative frame and the tapestry, see Gaisser, and more recently O'Hara; see also below 170–71.

question the very meaning of *virtus*.³⁹ By pointing to an initial discrepancy between traditional notions of *virtus* and its meaning conveyed in the poem, Catullus introduces the possibility of disturbances between signifiers and signifieds. Any doubts regarding the ironic force of the introduction must be dispelled by the line of vision we follow, from the abandoned heroine (*prospectans*, 52) to Theseus, in his easy alliance with an armory of ships, back to lonely Ariadne, who barely contains the "wild rages" (*indomitos furores*, 54) inside her.⁴⁰ As Theseus casually tosses promises to the gusty wind (*ventosae procellae*, 59), we are reminded of the original recipient of those promises, Ariadne herself. Because the agreement made with her has already been violated she is initially presented as someone for whom symbolic language offers no guarantees. Yet an implied comparison between the heroine and the buffeting winds suggests that she is empowered nonetheless.

In spite of the irrepressible motion conveyed by the adjectives *indomitus* and *ventosus*, however, Ariadne's existence is uncomfortably restricted. She is presented above all as a two-dimensional image contrasted with the movement and rejoicing of the guests around her, and is also relatively static when compared with the swift movement of Theseus's fleet. As Andrew Laird has argued (1993: 20), the ecphrasis of Catullus 64 is unique in so far as it is characterized by sound, movement, and temporality, elements usually absent from visual media and suppressed in ecphrasis. Such properties as they emerge in the text do not prevent us as readers from attempting to envision a frozen image. The fact that the tapestry comes to life so vibrantly generates a tension between the anticipated image of a static portrait and the unfolding of a moving narrative that, I would argue, is aptly described by the barely contained pulsions of the *chora*.

The simile likening Ariadne to the statue of a bacchant offers further commentary on this dynamic:

saxea ut effigies bacchantis, prospicit, eheu
prospicit et magnis curarum fluctuat undis (61–62).

Like a stone image of a bacchant, she looks out, alas
she looks out and is tossed about on great waves of cares.

³⁹ On the poem as an ironic indictment of the heroic age, see, e.g., Curran and Konstan 1977; see also O'Connell: 754–55, who remarks specifically on the ironic force of *heroum virtutes*, and sees it as part of a larger schema of the poem that underscores the complexity of human situations and the tendency of *fas* and *nefas* to remain tragically entangled.

⁴⁰ Quinn 1973 notes, *ad loc.*, that the force of *classe* opposes Theseus's accompanied condition to Ariadne's solitary state.

The plastic image of a bacchant, a figure so often (as at the conclusion of the ecphrasis) portrayed in restless ululation, becomes an ideal figure through which the poet can express Ariadne's intrinsic motion, in spite of her containment. Laird notes (1993: 21) that the participial form *bacchantis* (from *bacchari*), though often translated as "of a bacchant," literally means "of one raving, or ranting," and thus conveys the notion of a lifeless sculpture quite unexpectedly making a sound. Moreover, the identification between Ariadne and a bacchant makes the heroine's exposed isolation on an empty shoreline all the more striking, since *bacchantes* are traditionally found in large groups and often hidden by mountainside foliage.⁴¹ The raving and ululating bacchant, more than any other figure of Greco-Roman mythology, symbolizes the pre-linguistic impulses of human nature controlled or even denied and ostracized by the social order.⁴² As we shall observe below, Catullus has taken pains to emphasize Ariadne's social isolation, denying her any links with the paternal order she once relied on for both identity and access to symbolic categories.

And yet some force, again aptly described by the pulsions emanating from the Kristevan *chora*, drives Ariadne still, as the poet identifies her suffering with the rising and falling of the ocean that surrounds her (*magnis curarum fluctuat*

⁴¹ For the most obvious instances of bacchantes on a mountainside, see Eur. *Bacc.* 32–54, 135–69, 677ff., and passim. Tatham 64 argues that the poet's reference to the heroine's headdress as a *mitra*, a Greek term often used to describe the cap worn by Dionysius and his followers, further reinforces the Bacchic imagery of the poem.

Such an instructive paradox as the frigid Ariadne's identification with a bacchant did not escape the notice of Ovid, who, in writing his *Heroides*, borrows and analyses the comparison: *aut ego diffusus erravi sola capillis, / qualis ab Ogygio concita Baccha deo; / aut mare prospiciens in saxo frigida sedi, / quamque lapis sedes, tam lapis ipsa fui* (47–50).

In the preceding lines of *Heroides* 10, Ovid corrects his predecessor by abbreviating Ariadne's speech as it is found in Catullus 64. Ovid's Ariadne admits the failing of her own voice, and instead describes the rhythmic pulsions more characteristic of a *relicta puella*: *quod voci deerat, plangore replebam* (37). Moreover, her designation as a *concita Baccha* confirms Catullus's use of the bacchant to represent someone who has been relegated beyond language and the socio-symbolic contract. And yet Ovid's Ariadne questions the bacchant's static and lifeless portrayal in Catullus, thus splitting the "stone image of a bacchant" (*saxea ut effigies bacchantis*) into two separate images (*aut...aut*): either Ariadne is a raving bacchant or she is frozen with despair. This reading of the epyllion asks us (as Ovid's readers) to reconsider the sort of restraint forced upon the stirred up (*concita*) wandering (*erravi*) that is so characteristic of Catullus's Ariadne (cf. *excita*, 56) and her successor *puellae* in elegy. See Pavlock 113–46 for a thorough comparison of *Heroides* 10 and Catullus 64.

⁴² For an analysis of evidence for bacchantes within Greek culture and the threat they may have posed to order in the Greek community, see Dodds 270–82 and Keuls 357–79.

undis, 62). As Putnam notes (1961: 171), the very first adjective describing the physical context of Ariadne's plight, "fluid sounding" (*fluentis* *sono litore*, 52),⁴³ connotes the idea of both wave-like motion and constant resounding that will be expressed throughout the account of the heroine's abandonment. The language and very sounds of undulation will be echoed repeatedly in the following lines as the waves (*fluctus*, 67) play at Ariadne's feet, her garment floats upon the water (*fluitantis amictus*, 68), and her heart is besieged by constant grief (*assiduus...luctibus*, 71). By echoing the repetition of *fluctus* from lines 60–70 with the assonance of *luctus* in line 71, the poet elides the identification of Ariadne's grief (*luctus*) with the metaphorical and literal waves (*fluctus*) that link her to her material surroundings.

Having established a vocabulary that merges Ariadne with her fluid physical context, the poet invokes that vocabulary later in his narrative when he describes the heroine's emotional reaction to Theseus's arrival on Crete, *qualibus incensam iactastis mente puellam / fluctibus* (97–98). The poet's indictment of Cupid and Venus for tossing the inflamed *puella* "upon such great waves," after he has described the physical context of Ariadne's abandonment, can only result in ironic reminiscence (cf. Putnam 172). Within the same account of the first encounter between Theseus and Ariadne, a simile likens the odors of the maiden's chaste bed to those odors of sweet smelling myrtles brought forth from the rivers of Eurotas:

hunc simul ac cupido conspexit lumine virgo
regia, quam suavis exspirans castus odores
lectulus in molli complexu matris alebat,
quales Eurotae praecingunt flumina myrtus
aurave distinctos educit verna colores,
non prius ex illo flagrantia declinavit
lumina, quam cuncto concepit corpore flammam
funditus atque imis exarsit tota medullis (86–93).

The royal maiden, as soon as she spied with desirous eye Theseus, she whom a chaste bed breathing out sweet odors still nurtured in the gentle embrace of her mother, like the myrtles that encircle the streams of Eurotas, or the varied colors that the spring breeze draws out, she did not avert her burning gaze from him sooner than she conceived deep down in her whole body a flame and burned up altogether in her deepest marrow.

⁴³ The word is only attested here and is most likely a Catullan coinage.

The simile is remarkable in its power to convey “the freshness of youth” without explicitly describing it.⁴⁴ And yet an ominous note is also struck in the “rivers” (*flumina*) of Eurotas, since the term looks back to the *fluctus* characterizing the abandoned Ariadne and perhaps even forward (again through assonance) to the language of flames (*flagrantia*, 91, *flamma*, 92) dominating the subsequent description of the heroine’s passion. In line 86, the act of watching also links this passage with the opening tableau, and reminds us of the physical distance (evoked through the word order of the line) between Ariadne and the hero. So too the apparently benign “spring breeze” (*aura verna*) conjures those destructive winds to which Theseus will soon relinquish his promises (59; cf. 142). Thus through the sounds of the language—the material qualities of Catullan poetics—and a subtle pattern of imagery linking Ariadne with forces of nature beyond the scope of human manipulation, an evocative Kristevan genotext is woven.⁴⁵

The cumulative effect of such assonance and verbal recall, throughout the poet’s narrative shift away from Ariadne on the shoreline and back to her first glimpse of Theseus, is one of a remarkable force bound up and repressed within a single abandoned woman. And yet, we are forced to watch the heroine’s unraveling before our very mind’s eye, as the poet’s anaphora (*non...non...non*, 63–64) strips Ariadne of the garments just barely covering her.⁴⁶ The participle *lactentis* (65), which commentators often take as a reference to shape or color, but which more precisely means “full of milk,” suggests that Ariadne is literally almost overflowing.⁴⁷ Moreover, as Quinn notes, *ad loc.*, her likeness to a bacchant statue, mentioned above, finds a precedent in

⁴⁴ See Quinn 1973, *ad loc.*, who notes that the exact terms of comparison (the *odores* of Ariadne’s bed are compared first with those emanating from the myrtle trees, and then with the brilliant colors brought forth from a spring breeze) are suppressed, as often in Latin similes.

⁴⁵ For the detection of the genotext, see Kristeva RPL 120: “Designating the genotext in a text requires pointing out the transfers of drive energy that can be detected in phonematic devices (such as the accumulation and repetition of phonemes or rhyme) and melodic devices (such as intonation or rhythm), in the way semantic and categorical fields are set out in syntactic and logical features, or in the economy of mimesis (fantasy, the deferment of denotation, narrative, etc.).”

⁴⁶ Cf. Miller 2004: 34, who points to the passage as an illustration of the “alienation of the self” and violation of the subject’s integrity.

⁴⁷ Thomson takes the participle as a reference to shape; cf. Watt, who cites Petr. *Sat.* 86.5 as a parallel for “milk-white” and Lee, “milky.” The connotations of a lactating woman may be pressed further in light of a mythical variant that described a pregnant heroine left behind on Naxos. The variant is mentioned in Plut. *Thes.* 20 and cited in Konstan 1977: 45, 53n103.

Euripides' *Hecuba*, where the form of Polyxena, about to be unclothed from the waist up and sacrificed, is compared to the statue of a goddess:

Κἀπεὶ τόδ' εἰσήκουσε δεσποτῶν ἔπος,
λαβοῦσα πέπλους ἐξ ἄκρας ἐπωμίδος
ἔρρηξε λαγόνας ἐς μέσας παρ' ὀμφαλόν,
μαστούς τ' ἔδειξε στέρνα θ' ὡς ἀγάλματος
κάλλιστα,... (Eur. *Hec.* 557–561).

When she heard the order of her masters, seizing her robe, she tore it from the shoulders to the middle of her waist, by the navel, and revealed her breasts, lovely as a goddess's statue...

Euripides also lingers over the exposed physical form of his heroine, though he emphasizes the decorum with which she covers herself in death: “she took great care to fall in seemly fashion (εὐσχήμων) to the ground, concealing (κρύπτουσ') from male eyes what should be concealed,” (568–70). Catullus, in what is perhaps a deliberate contrast, allows Ariadne no such comfortable return to the niceties of social custom and instead leaves her exposed on the stage for our viewing pleasure.⁴⁸ In fact what becomes increasingly apparent in Catullus's description of Ariadne is how the strictures imposed by the symbolic order must constantly yield to the pressures of the semiotic, to those subversive forces that compel words to say something other than what they “mean” and remind us, in the manner of Lipking's heroine, that the plot may be told in a different way.

IV. STARTING OVER (AGAIN): ARIADNE'S LAMENT

Following a narrative flashback that enacts Theseus's heroic slaying of the Minotaur against the background of Ariadne's ever-watchful and desirous eye (91–115), the poet returns to his heroine on the shore. By means of an ingenious *praeteritio* he condenses events surrounding the couple's departure from Crete and refocuses his and our gaze upon Ariadne, though leaving her culturally isolated in the process and stressing the familial bonds that she sacrificed to accompany Theseus: ...*ut linquens genitoris filia vultum, / ut consanguineae complexum, ut denique matris* (117–18). When (where) Ariadne appears once again on the tapestry, she is full of activity—Quinn refers to lines 124ff. as an “action tableau”—but her actions are without progress or consequence; in short, they are like the repetitive movements of Kristeva's pulsions, etching out a *chora* that is both regulated and disruptive:

⁴⁸ Cf. Miller 2004: 34 on the “specularization” of Ariadne's undoing.

Though deprived of unity, identity, or deity, the *chora* is nevertheless subject to a regulating process, which is different from that of symbolic law but nevertheless effectuates discontinuities by temporarily articulating them and then starting over, again and again. (RPL 94)

Commentators who attempt to visualize the tapestry point out that it must contain Ariadne in the center flanked by Theseus departing on one side and Bacchus arriving on the other.⁴⁹ And yet the peculiar narrative process of c. 64 disturbs such easy linearity, since the poet insists on returning to the heroine in her moment of abandonment.

Adverbs mark Ariadne's repetitive, almost ritualistic attempts to catch some glimpse of Theseus's departing ship (*saepe...ac tum...tum*, 124–28), words indicating a series of events repeated over and again, in vain.⁵⁰ The emphasis on repeated gesture is in fact multiplied by a recall of the image with which we first confront Ariadne: the poet introduces her as one "looking out" (*prospectans*, 52) at Theseus, and one who, in her statue-like paralysis, finally "sees before [herself]" (*prospicit...prospicit*, 60–61) in despair.⁵¹ In her second appearance in the narrative, Ariadne scales the nearby cliffs "so that she might extend her view (*protenderet aciem*) into the vast swellings of the sea (127)." And, just as at the start of his ecphrasis (cf. 63–70), the poet forsakes Ariadne's line of vision for the spectator's vision of her, reminding us of her exposed and nearly naked condition (*mollia nudatae...tegmina surae*, 129). There is apparently no end to Ariadne's attempts to hold Theseus in her gaze, and similarly no end to the spectacle of her unraveling.

Ariadne's repetitive movements are punctuated by a final lament (*extremis...querellis*, 130), as the heroine is given a clear voice (a moment of symbolic expression, though one without the social context that ensures its validity) with which to articulate her sorrow and condemn the perfidy of her lover. She pours forth (*fudisse*) her complaints in a manner that is paradoxically both "clear sounding" (*clarisonas...voces*, 125) and nearly incomprehensible, as she stutters forth "chill little sobs" (*frigidulos udo singultus ore cientem*, 131), a paradox we may resolve by understanding it as the poet's

⁴⁹ E.g., see Ferguson 198 and Wiseman 174; but cf. Martin 155–56, who compares the narrative depth of the ecphrasis to the innovations in depth and perception characteristic of contemporary Roman painting.

⁵⁰ Quinn 1973, *ad loc.*, notes the shift of the infinitives (*conscendere, procurrere*) in each temporal clause to the historic present, often used to indicate continuous action.

⁵¹ Significant for Catullus's anaphoric artistry, *prospecto* is formed from *prospicio*, though the different senses of the two words (the former "looking out for" and the latter "seeing before one") imply a subtle nuance of progress (forward temporal movement) in the ecphrasis.

double articulation, an attempt to sever symbolic and semiotic registers.⁵² Ariadne's speech allows her to restate the language of abandonment found throughout the poem (especially evident in forms and compounds of *relinquo*: 117, 123, 200, 213), and to articulate in symbolic language her own condition as a *relicta puella*.

At the same time, the poet continues weaving his semiotic tapestry since, as Thomson notes (*ad loc.*), the bitterness that Ariadne conveys through her words is mirrored by the shrill i-sounds that dominate her speech. She indicts the very meaninglessness of words, or rather, the fragile social bonds on which they rely:

at non haec quondam blanda promissa dedisti
voce mihi, non haec miserae sperare iubebas,
sed conubia laeta, sed optatos hymenaeos,
quae cuncta aërii diserpunt irrita venti.
nunc iam nulla viro iuranti femina credat,
nulla viri speret sermones esse fideles (139–44).

These were not the promises you gave me once
in a persuasive voice, not these did you bid wretched me to hope for,
but a joyful union, but a hoped for wedding,
all of which the airy winds have torn up into nothing.
Now let no woman trust in a man swearing,
let no woman hope that a man's words are trustworthy.

Ariadne's reference to her lover's promises (*promissa*, 139) takes us back to the initial image on the tapestry, where she gazes upon Theseus, who has abandoned his promises (*promissa*, 59) to the blustery wind. Here the heroine characterizes those promises as made in a blandishing voice (*blanda...voce*), a phrase that further impugns the sincerity of Theseus and, as noted above, anticipates the very language of sexual persuasion, or *blanditiae*, so characteristic of erotic elegy.⁵³

Ariadne's reference to the *aërii venti* (142) also links Theseus's perfidy with earlier and subsequent images in which the poet uses wind to convey the failings of symbolic language or, rather, its collapse under the "pulsional pressure" of the semiotic. At line 164 Ariadne will point to the futility of her lament by noting that she complains to the "unknowing breezes" (*ignaris...auris*). This failing of symbolic language, however, finds a correlative in the recuperation

⁵² As Putnam 172 notes, *fudisse* recalls the sound of beating waves that characterized Ariadne in her first appearance in the ecphrasis.

⁵³ For *blanda* as "insincere" see OLD s.v. 3; for *blanditiae* in elegy, see above 157n26.

of the semiotic. After Ariadne concludes her lament, the poet demonstrates the efficacy of her curse with a Homeric simile:

haec mandata prius constanti mente tenentem
 Thesea ceu pulsae ventorum flamine nubes
 aereum nivei montis liquere cacumen (238–40).

These commands abandoned Theseus who held them before
 with a steadfast heart, just as clouds, from a blast of wind,
 abandon the airy peak of a snowy mountain.

The symbolic *mandata* of Aegeus are driven from Theseus's consciousness like so many clouds driven from a mountain peak by the blasts of wind. Though she has lost her place within the social contract, Ariadne finds recourse in the divine. Paradoxically, Jupiter, although described as a *rector caelestum*, appears not as that paternal authority preserving the order of things, but instead as a kind of primordial vengeance embodied in forces of nature (*ventorum flamine*) explicitly beyond human control and more characteristic of the Eumenides to whom Ariadne originally appeals (192–95).

V. A GENDERING OF TIME

In her lament, Ariadne emphasizes critical moments within the scheme of linear time, from the point when Theseus's ships first embarked on Cnossian shores to the present circumstances in which she finds herself. As the heroine distinguishes her isolated circumstances from the heroic and progressive course of Theseus, she suggests a convergence of space and time markedly different from that of the hero who has abandoned her. Theseus participates in the linear movement of what Kristeva would describe as "men's time," while Ariadne remains innocently relegated to a single, reenacted moment of abandonment.

From its beginnings the poem is concerned with temporal progress, as well as the deterioration that accompanies time's linear movement, a trope that becomes particularly evident in the final lines of the epyllion (382–408).⁵⁴ As mentioned above, the tapestry is wrought with *priscae figurae*, images suggestive of an age even earlier than that of the gods and mortals who now look upon them. Various critics have remarked on the fragmented and manipulated narrative of c. 64, and emphasized the way that the narrative insets disrupt

⁵⁴ Temporal markers are rife (and not without moral implications) in the first fifty lines of the poem (e.g., *quondam*, 1; *tum...tum...tum*, 19–21; *optato...tempore*, 22; *finito tempore*, 31). On theme of decline from a heroic age, cf. Putnam 192ff, Reckford, and Janan 109–111.

normal temporal sequence. Julia Gaisser's reading of the poem demonstrates how the poet's use of different and competing sources, which would have Theseus's and Ariadne's maritime adventures occur before the first (*prima*, 11) ship has sailed, creates a confused chronology in which time is "circular, reversible, and even elastic" (Gaisser 587).⁵⁵ The narrator's initial and constant attention to the when of things within the narrative frame that outlines the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (1–51) makes us as readers particularly sensitive to time as it unfolds for Theseus and Ariadne: these two characters, as their story is developed by the narrator of c. 64, follow two fundamentally different and ultimately incompatible trajectories.

As she describes her plight, Ariadne juxtaposes what might have been Theseus's final day, the end to his linear narrative, with what have become, thanks to cruel chance, her own final moments:

certe ego te in medio versantem turbine leti
eripui, et potius germanum amittere crevi,
quam tibi fallaci supremo in tempore dessem. (149–151)

Surely I snatched you away as you were spinning about
in death's whirlwind and I decided to lose a brother,
rather than fail treacherous you in a critical moment.

sic nimis insultans extremo tempore saeva
fors etiam nostris invidit questibus auris.
Iuppiter omnipotens, utinam ne tempore primo
Cnosia Cecropiae tetigissent litora puppes. (169–172)

In such a way does cruel Fortune, exulting too much in my last moment,
begrudge even ears for my complaints.
Almighty Jupiter, would that on that first occasion
Cecropian ships had not touched Cnosian shores.

Somewhat ironically, Ariadne's efforts at Crete help straighten out Theseus's dangerously circular course (*in medio versantem turbine leti*) as he flounders

⁵⁵ For a brief bibliography on the chronological contradiction, see Weber 263, who argues that Catullus's chronological inconsistencies are borrowed primarily from Apollonius. Most recently O'Hara has argued that the temporal inconsistency of the poem (the result of the poet's handling of two competing Hellenistic accounts) is a deliberate strategy, aimed at creating a distinction between the narrator of c. 64 and the poet, in order to "undercut the authority of the speaking voice...and to call attention to the fictionality of the work." It is worth noting that *prima* (64.11) has been contested, though (as O'Hara remarks) various other details in c. 64 (e.g. the Argonauts are "bold" [*ausi*] and the sea "inexperienced" [*rudem*]) imply that the ship described in lines 1–15 is the first ship.

in the Minotaur's labyrinth. In return she is reduced to mere *praeda* (153), and forced into a temporally and spatially marginalized position, *extremo tempore*. Though *extremus* is used often enough in temporal expressions (cf. *OLD*, s.v. 3), the primary sense of the adjective refers to remote spatial or geographic orientation (*OLD*, s.v. 1–2), as is evident from the poet's description of his proposed departure to the ends of the earth (*extremos Indos*, c. 11.2) upon bidding farewell to Lesbia.

On the other hand, the phrase used to describe Theseus's own defining moment, *supremo in tempore*, suggests a crisis, the outcome of which will determine the future course of events.⁵⁶ The narrator has already indicated the two endings the hero's story might assume: Ariadne languishes at the realization that he seeks either death or the rewards of praise (*aut mortem appeteret Theseus aut praemia laudis*, 102). From her perspective, Theseus's narrative assumes a linear course, beginning with his arrival at Knossos (*tempore primo*, 171), culminating in his slaying of the Minotaur (*supremo in tempore*), and ending with his swift departure for Athens. Ariadne's experience of time is different; she can speak of her present, *extremo tempore*, and with much aporia contemplate her own end (177–185), but has no forward progression (i.e., beginning and end) that is not utterly dependent on Theseus: "nec patet egressus pelagi cingentibus undis./ nulla fugae ratio, nulla spes..." (185–86).

At this point, some further comment on Kristeva's articulation of women's time may be helpful. The time she describes as "readily labeled masculine" is cursive, nationalistic, and operates by the same principles that govern symbolic aspects of language. Women's time, on the other hand, transcends national, ethnographic or geographic boundaries and:

would seem to provide a specific measure of time that essentially retains repetition and eternity from among the multiple modalities of time known through the history of civilizations. On the one hand, there are cycles, gestation, the

⁵⁶ Quinn 1973, *ad loc.*, translates "at a moment of crisis" (cf. *OLD*, s.v. 6); Merrill explains "i.e. in extreme danger of life." Both Merrill and Fordyce liken the sense of the phrase to that of *extremo tempore* at 169. In my opinion this comparison overlooks subtle differences regarding the narrative circumstances of each character: Theseus was at a critical point which had to end in one of two ways (death at the hands of the Minotaur or praise), Ariadne is now in *extremo tempore*, in the sense that she can see no likely outcome to her narrative. In the lines that follow (176–187), she will consider a number of different options only to reject each one of them. In the sense of "critical, decisive" *supremus* is most often used to describe military engagements (e.g., Liv. 30.32.1, 30.40.2, Luc. 7.243), the teleological impact of which needs no explanation. When *supremus* refers to spatial orientation the adjective (perhaps significantly) often describes lofty height (e.g., of a mountain, or the heavens; see *OLD* s.v. 1). Thus there may be some moral contrast implied between Theseus, at his loftiest moment, and Ariadne, at her most remote.

eternal recurrence of a biological rhythm which conforms to that of nature and imposes a temporality whose stereotyping may shock, but whose regularity and unison with what is experienced as extra-subjective time, cosmic time, occasion vertiginous visions and unnameable *jouissance*. On the other hand, and perhaps as a consequence, there is the massive presence of a monumental temporality, without cleavage or escape, which has so little to do with linear time (which passes) that the very word 'temporality' hardly fits: all-encompassing and infinite like imaginary space, this temporality reminds one of Kronos in Hesiod's mythology, the incestuous son whose massive presence covered all of Gea in order to separate her from Ouranos, the father. (WT 191)

Kristeva's concept of a time without cleavage or escape, characterized by repetition and bound by nature's rhythms, defines precisely Ariadne's experience of abandonment. Just as women's time (Kronos-like, as Kristeva notes) severs female subjectivity from the paternal authority of Ouranos, Catullus's heroine explicitly links a lack of linear progress (*nulla ratio fugae*) with the severing of all socio-symbolic links, particularly those she had shared with father, brother, and "husband" (180–82). She makes repeated reference to the paternal order in which she no longer participates (*patriis ab aris*, 132; *prisci praecepta parentis*, 159; *patris auxilium*, 180). Her distance from the socio-symbolic contract is made more apparent as she stresses the utter lack of civilization that surrounds her (*praeterea nullo colitur sola insula tecto*, 184), as well as the lack of any outlet or escape into symbolic discourse (*omnia muta*, 186; cf. 164–66). The heroine may attempt to impose a linear framework on her suffering, as she imagines it is her "final hour" (*postrema hora*, 191), but Catullus's narrator, who repeatedly harkens back to a single moment of abandonment on the tapestry and exchanges the closure of death with the hope of divine salvation, stubbornly resists such imposition.

Ariadne's curse creates an effective disturbance of Theseus's linear voyage: marginalized and confined to forever reenact her abandonment, she demonstrates the power of subversion as one of the few options available to those overlooked by the socio-symbolic order.⁵⁷ Under the weight of her semiotic pressure, the "sweet signs for the father" (*dulcia signa parenti*, 210) are forgotten and thus rendered meaningless. After accounting for Theseus's fate and the suicide of Aegeus, who is allowed the very teleological closure in death that Ariadne is denied, the poet returns once more to Ariadne and locates her (again) in the same moment of Theseus's departure where she was introduced. As a grieving Ariadne watches the ship depart, *prospectans*

⁵⁷ For Kristeva 1979: 13, this subversion reaches its modern day apogee in terrorism, "a paranoid type of counter-investment in an initially denied symbolic order" (*un contre-investissement de type paranoïaque d'un ordre symbolique initialement dénié*).

cedentem...carinam (249), it is as if the poem's narrative never progressed beyond our initial impression of her. Where the poet wishes to proceed with his story, the images on the coverlet, explaining Ariadne's plight, work in contrary motion to slow it down. In this final tableau, Bacchus, along with the guests gathered at the home of Peleus and Thetis, gazes at the heroine. In doing so, the god reminds us of the very act of watching and brings us back to the celebration at hand. His gaze also manages to further isolate and retard Ariadne, as we are reminded of her status as the passive object of the spectator's gaze.⁵⁸

And yet Catullus has incorporated into his ecphrasis reminders of the heroine's own active potential for disruption. The god is accompanied by a troop of real Bacchantes to replace the frozen likeness to which the heroine is compared earlier in the poem. The detailed portrait of a raging (*furebant*, 254) and diverse (*pars...pars...pars*, 257–59) mob offers a stark contrast to the lonely and static figure Ariadne resembles. The crowd's heterogeneous nature, however, points to the contradictory impulses that define Ariadne in her anguish, the undulating pulsions that generate a *chora* of containment. In particular, by raising (*ciebant*, 262) with bronze cymbals the onomatopoetic *tenuis tinnitus*, the bacchants recall Ariadne's mournful and incomprehensible sobbing (*cientem*, 131). In both its contexts, the verb *cieo* bears connotations of rousing and provoking, of initiating a forced entry into the symbolic, while at the same time defying symbolic categorization. (Chrono)logically it is with the homecoming of Theseus, and death of Aegeus, that the story should end; yet Ariadne's constant reappearance in the ecphrasis—invoked finally through her Bacchic sisters—ultimately intrudes upon any notions of teleological closure.

In fact, even after the narrator's description of the coverlet has ceased (265) Ariadne's complaints continue to resonate. At the end of the poem, the fates portend the future in a "clear resounding voice" (*clarisona...voce*, 320). This designation, so unlike Theseus's *blanda vox*, recalls and forces us to compare it with Ariadne's own "clear resounding words" (*clarisonas...voces*, 125). The Parcae sing the heroic deeds of Achilles, who will be the only son of Peleus and Thetis. Crowning Achilles' achievements is the sacrifice offered to him in death, Polyxena, daughter of Hecuba, whose presence has already been felt implicitly in the ecphrasis describing Ariadne. Both heroines are offered as *praedae* and both tacitly suggest that which must be given up in the name of progress (whether it be Theseus's journey home, or the return of the Aegeans

⁵⁸ For theories of the gaze as gendered, where the male is spectator and the female a visual object, see Mulvey. For criticism of Mulvey's theory, see, e.g. Kaplan. For applications of theories about the gaze to classical texts, cf. Greene 84–92 and Salzman-Mitchell.

to Greece), the semiotic forces against which the symbolic defines itself.⁵⁹ This tension between symbolic progress and semiotic disturbance, restated in terms of epic movement and elegiac languor, will become one of the defining tropes of elegy. Though Catullus in his role as a lover identifies with both Aegeus and Ariadne as a victim of his beloved's callousness (Putnam 1961: 185–87), it is the *chora*-like containment and resulting temporal crisis of Ariadne (rather than the loss of a son suffered by the father Aegeus) that finds its way more directly into the language and ideology of elegy.

VI. CONCLUSION

Similar temporal and symbolic crises will define, on the one hand, Vergil's melancholy portraits of Gallus (*Ecl.* 10), isolated in a pastoral impossibility, and Dido, abandoned by Aeneas and asking only for a meaningless measure of time (*tempus inane*), a delay that would interrupt Aeneas's teleological progress (*Aen.* 4.428–436). On the other hand, Ariadne's untamed rages will haunt the *puellae* of elegy, who also await their lovers in isolation, as Cynthia does in Propertius's *Monobiblos*, where she is cast specifically as an Ariadne figure,⁶⁰ watching her lover's ship depart (*Thesea...cedente carina*, 1.3.1), and as Delia does, playing Penelope to her Odysseus at the conclusion of Tibullus 1.3, or so her lover imagines. At least for the duration of the elegiac affair, the marginality of these women becomes, for the *amator*, the very basis of their allure. The poet-lover's *recusationes* will constantly juxtapose the mainstream epic projects they refuse with the love of a mistress who metaphorically signals literary as well as political dissent.⁶¹ In fact the elegiac speakers themselves will also assume the guise of the abandoned woman (cf. Prop. 1.8, 11, 12, 18; 2.19; Tib. 2.6), relegated beyond the sphere of the symbolic and momentarily divorced from the well-defined teleologies that marked the age of Augustus.⁶²

⁵⁹ Cf. Konstan 1977: 48, who notes that *praeda* marks Ariadne and Polyxena as victims of heroic *virtus*, and "reveals the breakdown of the concept of *virtus* into a moral and a military or objective aspect."

⁶⁰ Cf. also Aelia Galla of 3.12, Arethusa of 4.3, and Cynthia of 2.29 and 3.6.

⁶¹ Perhaps the most recent works on the political "heterodoxy" or dissent signaled by the poet-lover's service to his *domina* are those of Wyke: esp. 31–45 and James (below, n63). Hallett was among the first to recognize the "counter-culture" sensibility signaled by devotion to a *puella* (rather than to the state, military service, etc.).

⁶² The Romans conceived of life in strictly divided (though not entirely well-defined) stages, such as *puer*, *iuvēnis*, and *senex*; cf. Harlow and Laurence. It is significant for our purpose that Augustus tried to involve a younger segment of the population in state ceremonies and lower age requirements for young patricians entering the *cursus honorum* (cf. Suet. DA 32, 35, 38.3, 43.2, Dio 52.26). For speculation on Augustus's own interest in time and its relevance to Ovid's composition of the *Fasti*, see Wallace-Hadrill.

We might say, then, that Ariadne's bequest to the elegists was one of a space divorced from *imperium* and driven by less linear and altogether less predictable forces.⁶³ As Propertius's *amator* watches a triumph's steady progression from the sidelines in the arms of his beloved (3.4), and as Tibullus, hovering about the locked doorway of his mistress, falters in his attempts to sing of martial achievements (2.6.1–12), both hark back to the isolated figure of the heroine whose literally marginal position on the sea-shore metaphorically suggests a failure to participate in the socio-symbolic contract. Yet, where Ariadne and her sister *puellae* suffer uncomfortable restriction in their abandoned condition, the poet-lovers of elegy betray a certain satisfaction with their own marginality, as well as the power to return to the familiar territory of symbolic structures. The Propertian poet-lover can in mock-humiliation accept Apollo's command that he sail close to the shore, avoiding mid-Ocean and the traditionally patriotic subjects associated with it (3.3.23–24). And yet even his Callimachean stylistic affiliations will not prevent him from singing Rome's praises when he wishes: "sed tamen exiguo quodcumque e pectore rivi / fluxerit, hoc patriae serviet omne meae" (4.1.59–60).

Ovid, in his roles as both *amator* and *praeceptor amoris*, will also play with the trope of temporal and symbolic relegation. His meeting with *Elegia* and *Tragoedia* in *Amores* 3.1 leaves him asking only to defer rather than deny his responsibility to sing the deeds of men (*facta virorum*, 3.1.25). Though he bids farewell to subjective love elegy at the end of the same book (3.15), the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris* explain the different temporal modes that govern the men and women of elegy: his didacticism spells out in bathetic detail the narrative closure previous elegy only implied.⁶⁴ Ovid's *praeceptor* uses the abandoned heroines of myth, Ariadne, Dido, Medea, Phyllis, Circe, *et aliae*, to describe and (ostensibly) heal the broken female subjects of elegy.⁶⁵

⁶³ Cf. the comments of James 212–23, who, in discussing the socio-political context of elegy, remarks on the elegiac *puella's* role in providing a space of retreat (esp. from the political pressures commonly experienced by the elite male) for her *amator*.

⁶⁴ Conte 1994 has argued persuasively for Ovid's critique of the elegiac code, especially apparent in his didactic works.

⁶⁵ The story of Phyllis, abandoned *amica* of Demophoön, is a particular favorite in the *Ars* and *Remedia*. The circumstances of her abandonment, defined by repetitive pacing on the shoreline and difficulties participating in symbolic language, are indebted to Catullus's portrayal of Ariadne. As I argue in a forthcoming article, her story is paradigmatic of the role assigned to female addressees throughout Ovid's erotodidactic poetry: the *amica/puella's* movement is restricted to a repetitive and circular course (revolving largely around her boudoir) and most of her efforts involve attracting a lover, rather than enacting any teleological process of her own. For the circular and "natural" course

In doing so he comments on the gendered temporal dynamics that shape the plot of previous elegy, a plot that allows the poet-lover recourse to a world outside of elegy, while the *puella* suffers abandonment and is, in the end, *extremo tempore*, denied access to the symbolic, a denouement that Catullus's Ariadne had predicted long before.

WORKS CITED

- Conte, G. B. 1994. "Love without Elegy: The *Remedia Amoris* and the Logic of a Genre," in *Genres and Readers: Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny's Encyclopedia*, trans. G. W. Most. Baltimore. 35–65.
- Curran, L. 1969. "Catullus 64 and the Heroic Age," *YCS* 21: 171–92.
- Derrida, J. 1981. *Positions*, trans. A. Bass. Chicago.
- Dixon, S. 2001. *Reading Roman Women*. London.
- Dodds, E. R. 1971. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley.
- Downing, E. 1990. "Anti-Pygmalion: The *Praeceptor* in *Ars Amatoria*, Book 3," *Helios* 17: 237–49.
- Eagleton, T. 1996. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. Minneapolis.
- Ferguson, J. 1985. *Catullus*. Lawrence.
- Fineberg, B. 1999. "Repetition and the Poetics of Desire in Tibullus 1.4," *CW* 92.5: 419–28.
- Fitzgerald, W. 1995. *Catullan Provocations: Lyric Poetry and the Drama of Position*. Berkeley.
- Fordeyce, C. J. 1961. *Catullus: A Commentary*. Oxford.
- Forsyth, P. 1976. "Catullus: The Mythic Persona," *Latomus* 35.3: 555–66.
- Gaisser, J. H. 1995. "Threads in the Labyrinth: Competing Views and Voices in Catullus 64," *AJP* 116.4: 579–616.
- Gardner, H. Forthcoming. "Women's Time in the *Remedia Amoris*," in *Elegy and Narrativity*, eds. G. Liveley and P. Salzman-Mitchell. Columbus.
- Greene, E. 1998. *The Erotics of Domination: Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry*. Baltimore.
- Gold, B. K. 1993. "'But Ariadne Was Never There in the First Place': Finding the Female in Roman Poetry," in *Feminist Theory and the Classics*, eds. N. Rabinowitz and A. Richlin. New York. 75–101.
- Hallett, J. P. 1973. "The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism," *Arethusa* 6: 103–24.
- Harlow, M. and R. Laurence. 2002. *Growing Up and Growing Old in Ancient Rome*. London.
- Hellegouarc'h, J. 1963. *Le vocabulaire Latin des relations et des parties politiques sous la République*. Paris.

charted by women (vs. the linear and culturally productive course of men) in the *Ars*, see Levine; cf. also Downing on the stasis and "artefaction" experienced by the fictive female addressees of the *Ars*.

- James, S. 2003. *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy*. Berkeley.
- . Forthcoming. "Women's Speech in Latin Elegy."
- Janan, M. 1994. "When the Lamp is Shattered": *Desire and Narrative in Catullus*. Carbondale.
- Kaplan, E. A. 1983. "Is the Gaze Male?" in *The Powers of Desire: The Politics of Sexuality*, eds. A. Snitow, C. Stansell, and S. Thompson. New York. 309–27.
- Kennedy, D. 1993. *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy*. Cambridge.
- Keuls, E. 1993. *The Reign of the Phallus: Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens*, 2nd ed. New York.
- Keynes, G. 1972. *Blake: the Complete Writings with Variant Readings*. Reprint of 1969 edition. London.
- Konstan, D. 1977. *Catullus' Indictment of Rome: The Meaning of Catullus 64*. Amsterdam.
- . 1997. *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge.
- Kristeva, J. 1974. *La Révolution du langage poétique: l'avant-garde à la fin du XIXe siècle, Lautrémont et Mallarmé*. Paris.
- . 1979. "Le Temps des femmes," *Cahiers de recherche de sciences des textes et documents* 5: 4–19.
- . 1984. *Revolution in Poetic Language*, trans. M. Waller. New York.
- Krostenko, B. A. 2001. *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance*. Chicago.
- Laigneau, S. 1999. *La Femme et amour chez Catulle et les élégiaques augustéens*. Brussels.
- Laird, A. 1993. "Sounding Out Ecphrasis: Art and Text in Catullus 64," *JRS* 83: 18–30.
- Lee, G. 1998. *Catullus: The Complete Poems*. Oxford.
- Levine, M. M. 1981–82. "The Women of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*: Nature or Culture?" *SCI* 6: 30–56.
- Lewis, P. E. 1974. "Revolutionary Semiotics," *Diacritics* 4.3: 28–32.
- Lipking, L. 1988. *Abandoned Women and the Poetic Tradition*. Chicago.
- Luck, G. 1969. *Latin Love Elegy*, 2nd ed. London.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. 1980. *The Latin Love Poets: From Catullus to Horace*. Oxford.
- Martin, C. 1992. *Catullus*. New Haven.
- Merrill, E. T. 1951. *Catullus*. Reprint of 1893 edition. Cambridge.
- Miller, P.A. 1994. *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness: The Birth of a Genre from Archaic Greece to Augustan Rome*. London.
- . 2004. *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*. Princeton.
- Miller, P. A. and C. Platter. 1999. "Introduction" to *Power, Politics, and Discourse in Augustan Elegy*, special issue of *CW* 92: 403–08.
- Moi, T. 1985. *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory*. London.
- , ed. 1986. *The Kristeva Reader*. New York.
- Mulvey, L. 1975. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," *Screen* 16.3: 8–18.
- Mynors, R. 1958. *Valerii Catulli Carmina*. Oxford.
- Newman, J.K. 1990. *Roman Catullus and the Modification of the Alexandrian Sensibility*. Hildesheim.

- O'Connell, M. 1977. "Pictorialism and Meaning in Catullus 64," *Latomus* 36: 746–56.
- O'Hara, J. Forthcoming. *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, and Lucan*. Cambridge.
- Oliver, K, ed. 2002. *The Portable Kristeva. Updated from the 1997 Edition*. New York.
- Pavlock, B. 1990. *Eros, Imitation, and the Epic Tradition*. Ithaca.
- Platter, C. 1995. "Officium in Catullus and Propertius: A Foucauldian Reading," *CP* 90: 211–24.
- Putnam, M. 1961. "The Art of Catullus 64," *HSCP* 65: 165–205.
- Quinn, K. 1972. *Catullus: An Interpretation*. London.
- , ed. 1973. *Catullus: The Poems*. 2nd ed. London.
- . 1999. *The Catullan Revolution*, 2nd ed. London.
- Reckford, K. 1958. "Some Appearances of the Golden Age," *CJ* 54: 79–85.
- Ross, D. O. 1969. *Style and Tradition in Catullus*. Cambridge.
- . 1975. *Background to Augustan Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Roudiez, L. 1984. Introduction to J. Kristeva's *Revolution in Poetic Language*, trans. M. Waller. New York. 1–10.
- Rubino, C. A. 1975. "The Erotic World of Catullus," *CW* 68: 289–98.
- Salzman-Mitchell, P. 2005. *A Web of Fantasies: Gaze, Image, and Gender in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Columbus.
- Selden, D. 1992. "Ceveat Lector: Catullus and the Rhetoric of Social Performance," in *Innovations in Antiquity*, Selden and R. Hexter, eds. New York. 461–512.
- Spentzou, E. 2003. *Readers and Writers in Ovid's Heroides*. Oxford.
- Skinner, M. 1983. "Clodia Metelli," *TAPA* 113: 273–87.
- Tatham, G. 1990. "Ariadne's *Mitra*: A Note on Catullus 64.61–64," *CQ* n. s. 40.2: 560–61.
- Thomson, D. F. S., ed. 1998. *Catullus. Edited with a Textual and Interpretive Commentary*. Toronto.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1987. "Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus and the *Fasti*," in *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, eds. M. Whitby et al. Bristol. 221–30.
- Watt, W. 1984. "Notes on Martial," *LCM* 9: 130–31.
- Weber, C. 1983. "Two Chronological Contradictions in Catullus 64," *TAPA* 113: 263–71.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1985. *Catullus and His World: A Reappraisal*. Cambridge.
- Wyke, M. 2002. *The Roman Mistress: Ancient and Modern Representations*. Oxford.