Sallusts Interesse und Kritik gilt vor allem der römischen Herrschaft und ihrer Entartung. Die Voraussetzung, von der er dabei ausgeht, nämlich daß der Reichtum des weltbeherrschenden Rom zuerst zu pecuniae cupidó oder avaritia führte, der Prozeß der Entartung dagegen in erster Linie durch ambitio oder imperi cupidó ausgelöst wurde, dürfte dem damaligen gebildeten Leser eine so geläufige Vorstellung gewesen sein, daß ihm die knappen Bemerkungen, die Sallust dazu gemacht hat, genügten.

Kiel

Konrad Heldmann

CATULLUS 76.21: UT TORPOR IN ARTUS

The increasing critical attention devoted in recent years to poem 76 of Catullus has served to underscore the importance of this poem for understanding what Carl Rubino has called the poet’s “erotic world”! Despite differences in approach and emphasis (and apart from the well-known “elegy vs. epigram” debate), one notices, in particular, a striking consensus as to the tone of the poem, and especially the emotional impact of the poet’s

concluding prayer to the gods (76.17 ff.)². In general, however, the diction of this remarkable passage has attracted very little attention, beyond enumerations of familiar features of prayer language³. Here I wish to point out a hitherto unsuspected Homeric resonance behind line 21, which may help inform our interpretation of this prayer’s phraseology.

At the climax of his appeal to the gods, Catullus begs them to remove the destructive disease, quae mihi subrepens imos ut torpor in artus / expulit ex omni pectore laetitias (76.21–2)⁴. It has not, to my knowledge, been noticed before that Ovid also describes a paralysis (here the quite physical one of Daphne) via the same collocation of torpor and (line-final) artus:

Vix prece finita, torpor gravis occupat artus  
(Met. 1.548)

This correspondence need not be significant of itself: if one is to describe “paralysis” – whether psychological or physical – independent recourse to the words torpor and artus can hardly be ruled out. What is more important, however, is that the phrase torpor gravis occupat artus is in fact a variant of an Ovidian pattern involving line-final artus (by far the most common position for the word in Ovid). This pattern can be traced back from Ovid directly to Virgil, and from thence to Homer, as the following brief survey will show.

With Ovid’s . . . torpor gravis occupat artus (just mentioned), compare the following:

... attonitus subitos tremor occupat artus  
(Met. 3.40)⁵
occupat obsessos sudor mihi frigidus artus  
(Met. 5.632)
... et metuit, pressos veniat ne livor in artus  
(Met. 10.258)

The frequency of nouns in -or, in such patterns, is striking⁶. Note also the following, which extend over two lines:

---

2) On the question of the relationship of Catullus (in a biographical or autobiographical sense) with the persona depicted in the poem, see especially Dyson (above, n. 1) passim and Rubino (above, n. 1) 298.
3) The most notable exception is Skinner’s (above, n. 1) recent analysis of disease imagery in the prayer, and its meaning for the poem as a whole; see especially 231–232 on the implications of disease imagery as a cliché of political rhetoric.
4) The generally accepted quae (for the impossible sen of V, at the beginning of line 21) is open to some question; note, for example, Leeman’s (above, n. 1) seic (i.e. sic), 248, accepted by Pietquin (above, n. 1). This question, however, has no direct bearing on the following discussion, and is therefore left aside.
5) ... occupat artus also Met. 14.757 and 15.166.
6) Similarly Ib. 605: ut cruor Herculeos abiuët diffusus in artus.
In Virgil, the form artus is again typically line-final, as in
frigida mors anima seduxerit artus (A. 4.385) or quies laxaverat
artus (A. 5.857) \(^7\). The pattern with noun in -or, moreover, is well-
represented (both with and without occupat), including the phrase
subitus tremor occupat artus just seen in Ovid:

\[ \ldots \text{subitus tremor occupat artus} \quad (A. 7.446) \]
\[ \ldots \text{cur ante tubam tremor occupat artus} \quad (A. 11.424) \]
\[ \ldots \text{sopor fessus complectitur artus} \quad (A. 2.253) \]
\[ \ldots \text{fessos sopor inrigat artus} \quad (A. 3.511) \]
\[ \ldots \text{fessosque sopor suus occupat artus} \quad (G. 4.190) \]

With Ovid’s sudor \ldots artus (cited above), compare also the follow-
ing (here in the enjambed pattern):

\[ \ldots \text{salsusque per artus} \]

\[ \text{sudor iit} \ldots \quad (A. 2.173-4) \]
\[ \ldots \text{ossaque et artus} \]

\[ \text{perfundit toto proruptus corpore sudor} \quad (A. 7.458-9) \(^8\) \]

The pattern tremor/timor/torpor/sopor/sudor (etc.) (occupat)
artus and its phraseological variants represents, in turn, a relatively
transparent Roman incarnation of Homer’s line-final τούμος ἔλ-
λαβε γυνα (Il. 24.170) and its variants \(^9\). Note specifically that the

---

\(^7\) Note also sitis miseros adduxurat artus (G. 3.483), with an echo in Ovid
(macies adduxerat artus, Her. 11.27); cf. Tibullus’ effice ne macies pallentes occupet
artus, 3.10.5.

\(^8\) The same pattern appears in both the Ciris and the Culex: ei mihi! ne
furor ille tuos invaserit artus (Cir. 237), ἑνεκίς aspiciens timor obcaecaverat artus
(Cul. 199). The frequency of such expressions involving line-final artus in the
Culex is extraordinary, as is the compression of the first five occurrences within
seventy-eight lines of each other (128, 138, 160, 199, 205; a sixth occurrence appears
at 409). As recently observed by Joseph Solodow in another connection (HSCP 90
[1986] 140), this sort of patterning in “clumps” indicates a “diminished conscious-
ness and discrimination” of a stylistic feature.

\(^9\) For the Virgilian passages cited above, see the documentation of Homeric
parallels by Georg Nicolaus Knauer, Die Aeneis und Homer (Göttingen 1964), as
well as his discussion of the similar phrase solvuntur frigore membria (A. 1.92 =
12.951), 320–322.
phrase appears most typically with ὑπὸ: ὑπὸ τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα (II. 14.506 = Od. 18.88), ὑπὸ τε τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα (II. 3.34), cf. (with τρόμος in verbal guise) τρομεῖ δ' ὑπὸ φαίδιμα γυῖα (II. 10.95), ὑπὸ δ' ἐτρέμε τε γυῖα (II. 10.390), τρέμον θ' ὑπὸ γυῖα ἐκάστου (Od. 11.527), comparable to e.g. Virgil's ... tremerent sub dentibus artus (A. 3.627). The same feature is also prominent with the other main variant of the formula, which makes use of forms of λύω, as ἵνα λύθειν δ' ὑπὸ φαίδιμα γυῖα (II. 16.805), λύθειν δ' ὑπὸ γυῖα ἐκάστης (II. 18.31 = Od. 18.341), ὑπέλυσε δὲ γυῖα (II. 15.581 = 23.726), ὑπέλυσε μένος καὶ φαίδιμα γυῖα (II. 6.27), etc. (cf. Ovid's formosos perluit artus, Met. 4.310)\(^{10}\). As far as the Latin hexameter is concerned, a two-syllable vowel-initial form like artus would naturally occur most frequently in final position, so that the overwhelming frequency of line-final artus in Virgil and Ovid does not of itself justify direct comparison with Homeric γυῖα\(^{11}\). But the convenient line-final patterning of artus was a happy coincidence the Roman poets exploited to the full, in their working out of the imitation tremor occupat artus (and its variants) = τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα.

To return to Catullus: part of the interest of poem 76 lies in its pervasive verbal echoing of other poems in the Catullan corpus\(^{12}\); and it is this feature which provides a final indication of the Homeric background here suggested. Quinn and others have pointed out certain extensive correspondences between lines 19–21 of poem 76 (one of the last poems in the Lesbia sequence) and lines 5–9 of poem 51 (among the first – if not the first – of the poems addressed to Lesbia)\(^{13}\):

\[me miserum aspicite et, si vitam puriter egi, eripite hanc pestem perniciemque mihi,\]

\(^{10}\) On the complex transformations of similar Homeric formulae in Ennius and Virgil, see Walter Moskalew, Formular Language and Poetic Design in the Aeneid (Leiden 1982) 91–93.

\(^{11}\) I am indebted to my colleague George Goold for this observation.

\(^{12}\) On this point see especially Rubin (above, n. 1), largely based on the treatment by Quinn (above, n. 1).

\(^{13}\) Kenneth Quinn, Catullus: The Poems (Cambridge 1970; 2nd edition 1973) ad 76.19–21, and Catullus: An Interpretation (New York 1973) 126. See already Steele Commager (HSCP 70 [1965] 97–98), whose analysis is apparently independent of similar observations made by Salvatore Costanza some fifteen years before (Risonanze dell’ode di Saffo Fainetai moî kénos da Pindaro a Catullo e Horazio [Messina-Florence 1950] 84–95). Indeed, the comparison had already been signaled by Friedrich in his commentary (ad 51.9), although no subsequent commentator other than Quinn has seen fit to mention it. More recently, see also Valdis Lejnieks, CJ 63 (1968) 262–263, and Skinner (above, n. 1) 231 n. 3.
Perhaps the most verbally striking among these correspondences consists precisely in the similar collocations sub(repens) ... torpor ... artus (76.21) and torpet, ... sub artus (51.9), even if the syntactic connection is quite different – the material first noted by Friedrich. In a general way, as has often been noted, “Sappho's 'symptoms' are largely drawn from Homeric descriptions of fear”\(^{14}\). More specifically, her phrase τόμος ὑπὸ ... τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλλοβε γυῖα discussed above\(^{15}\). It is no accident, moreover, that Lucretius' well-known description of the physical symptoms of fear (3.152ff.) is generally thought to be modelled (at least in part) on Sappho's poem, and is often adduced in this connection by commentators on Catullus 51 – and here, too, Lucretius refers to the giving way of the limbs in the (line-final) phrase succidere artus (3.156)\(^{16}\).

Thus, for Catullus' invocation to the gods in poem 76 Quinn's pronouncement that in this passage the poet “draws ... upon the high style of the epic-tragic tradition”\(^{17}\) can be interpreted more precisely, as far as line 21 is concerned. In typical neoteric fashion, Catullus' lyric evocation of the Homeric formula is relatively complex (as compared with the relatively straightforward transpositions seen in Virgil and Ovid). For τόμος, we find not tremor ‘trembling' but torpor ‘paralysis’ (used also by the Augustans, as we have seen), which has both physical and psycho-

\(^{14}\) Garry Wills, GRBS 8 (1967) 174 n.18.

\(^{15}\) I intend to show elsewhere that Catullus' third stanza of poem 51 (where torpet, ... sub artus is found) reflects a partial conflation of material from Sappho's third and fourth stanzas.

\(^{16}\) Among commentators on Lucretius, only Merrill takes any note of Homeric phraseology relevant to succidere artus, although his comparison with “Hom. λύτο γοῦναντα” seems less apposite than the patterns with ὑπὸ ... γυῖα discussed above.

\(^{17}\) Kenneth Quinn, The Catullan Revolution (Cambridge 21969) 77.
logical reference\textsuperscript{18}). The somewhat colorless ὑπὸ … ἔλλαβε (cf. occupat in Virgil and Ovid) becomes the highly charged subrepons, whose prefix at the same time expresses the insidious nature of the affliction, and also subtly recalls the pervasive Homeric ὑπό. The artus are given the adjective imos, which has its own intense and partly erotic resonances in Catullus\textsuperscript{19}); and as a final touch, the phrase is couched as a simile (ut torpor), which is not a part of the original epic phraseology\textsuperscript{20}).

There is, then, a perceptible, if subtle, epic reference behind Catullus' description of the disease overtaking his limbs like a creeping paralysis: the association with the seizing of the hero's limbs in extreme states of fear (and the loosening of the limbs in death) serves to reinforce the tone of seriousness and despair (not to mention self-pity) on which so many critics have commented in more general terms. Note, finally, that this interpretation complements Skinner's view of disease imagery in the prayer\textsuperscript{21}): whereas the use of disease imagery itself is primarily related with the external facts of what Skinner calls “political and social conduct” and the “social and moral dimensions” of the poet's amor, Catullus' manipulation of this imagery via the heroic associations outlined above has more to do with his personal conception of his own suffering.

Princeton (NJ)          Brent Vine

\textsuperscript{18} Note further that while tremor and torpor both have potentially pathological overtones (at least in some circumstances), they are also semantically opposite in terms of their physical sphere of reference; at the same time, their phonetic make-ups (including their internal bilabial consonants) are extremely similar.

\textsuperscript{19} Kroll (ad 76.21) compares 64.93 imis exarsit tota medullis and 35.15 ignes interiorem edunt medullam; cf. further 45.16 ignis mollibus ardet in medullis and 66.23 exedit cura medullas.

\textsuperscript{20} The corpore of V cannot seriously be defended (see Leeman [above, n.1] 248 on this point); the preceding discussion lends further support, if any were needed, for the early conjecture torpor.

\textsuperscript{21} See note 3 above.