

R2: *io Hymen Hymenaeae io*,
io Hymen Hymenaeae
 (117–118, 137–138, 142–143, 147–148, 152–153,
 157–158, 162–163, 167–168, 172–173, 177–178,
 182–183)

117-118-116 V || 118 = 143 = 148 = 153 = 158 = 163 = 168 = 173 = 178 =
 183 *io Hymen Hymenaeae io* V || 118 *om.* O || 138 *om.* V || 143 *om.* O ||
 148 *om.* OG || 153 *om.* O || 158 *om.* O || 163 *om.* O

The chaos of manuscripts leaves much uncertainty about the way these lines should be reconstructed. Mynors's text creates a surprising discrepancy between the two refrains (henceforth, R1 and R2). Indeed, it maintains three occurrences of *io* in R2, in spite of the fact that all other Greek or Latin examples of such exclamations combine Ὑμήν/*Hymen* or Ὑμέναιε/*Hymenaeae* with ὦ/o.⁴ But this decision can be justified on prosodic grounds: except at 141 (*licent*), the verse that precedes R2 ends in a vowel (116: *modum*; 136: *abstine*; 161: *forem*; 166: *tibi*; 176: *uiri*; 181: *puellulam*) or a short vowel followed by one consonant (146: *eat*; 151: *seruiat*; 156: *annuit*; 171: *magis*); monosyllabic *io* thus eliminates an unwelcome hiatus or metrical lengthening before R2.⁵

Yet, this approach has problems of its own.

Quite unexpectedly in such a learned poet as Catullus, the monosyllabic scansion of *io* proves incompatible with the Greek origin of the interjection (ἰώ). Indeed, Greek verse prosody does not license non-syllabic variants of *i* or *u* at word-initial position; the rare exceptions are uncertain (e.g. Ἰόλαε in P. Oxy. XLII 3010)⁶, due to borrowing from Hebrew (e.g. Ἰουδαίων, Ἰορδάνου at Or. Sibyll. 5.249, 6.5) or produced by metrically incompetent

4) On the evidence available, see P. Maas, Ὑμήν ὑμήν, *Philologus* 66, 1907, 590–596, reprinted in: W. Buchwald (ed.), *Kleine Schriften*, Munich 1973, 221–228; J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*, Oxford 1996, 60; A. Agnesini, *Il Carne 62 di Catullo. Edizione critica e commento*, Cesena 2007, 179–180.

5) R. Dawes, *Miscellanea critica*, Cambridge 1745, 32; K. Pleitner, *Des Qu. Valerius Catullus Hochzeitgesänge kritisch behandelt*, Dillingen an der Donau 1858, 32–33; H. A. J. Munro, *Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus*, Cambridge 1878, 134–140; E. Baehrens, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, Leipzig 1885, II, 309; G. Friedrich, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, Leipzig / Berlin 1908, 262.

6) See P. Parsons, *A Greek Satyricon?*, *BICS* 18, 1971, 53–68, at 57; M. Bettini, *A proposito dei versi sotadei, greci e romani: con alcuni capitoli di 'analisi metrica lineare'*, *MD* 9, 1982, 59–105, at 65, 90–91.

poets (e. g. Ἰόσσων at Paus. 5.18.3; compare with *Iasonis et nati crimina morte luunt* at Anth. Lat. 102.2 [Riese], most probably a corruption of *nati et Iasonii crimina morte luunt*).

In Latin, metrical evidence shows that *io* is an iamb that can reduce to a pyrrhic by virtue of iambic shortening.⁷ The predominant scansion is already attested at Pl. Ps. 702, and it becomes frequent in (post-)classical verse (Verg. A. 7.400; Hor. Epod. 9.21–23; Tib. 2.4.6; Ov. Ars 2.1, etc.); see Maur. 6.341.532 [Keil] (*sic 'io matres Latinae', sic 'Iulum' dicimus*), which alludes to the prosodic contrast between *Iulius* and *Iulus* (Verg. A. 1.288: *Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo*). In Plautus, the shortened variant occurs just after the iambic one:⁸

magnufi-|ce hominem | compel-|labo. ||
– quōia | uox re-|sonat? – i-|o
ĩō, te | te, tu-|ranne, | te ro-|go qui im-|peritas |
Pseudo-|lo (Pl. Ps. 702–703)

The second archaic example of the pyrrhic scansion belongs to an iambic septenarius of Aprissius (?) quoted by Varro:⁹

ĩō buc-|co! – quis | me in-|bilat? || – uici-|nus tuus |
anti-|quus (Var. L. 6.68)

It follows that, in Catullus, the prosody of verse-final *io* remains dubious: should we scan it as a monosyllable, or as an iamb after elided *Hymenaeae*? For reasons that will appear below, Statius, Lachmann, Fröhlich, Benoist, Riese, Merrill, Müller, Fedeli and Trappes-Lomax favor the iambic scansion.¹⁰

7) See ThLL s. v.; Wills (above n. 4) 58–60.

8) Manuscripts waver between *ifē e/ġo* and *te rogo* (F. Leo, *Plauti Comodiae*, Berlin 1896, II, 278). I assume *te rogo* to be closer to the authentic version than *te te ego* (Leo's correction). Indeed, the line will exhibit the standard central diaeresis of trochaic septenarii if we edit *ĩō, te te, turanne, rōgō te, tu qui imperitas Pseudolo*, while *ēgō te* would be unmetrical.

9) One could posit a verse-end instead of a central diaeresis, so as to obtain two incomplete senarii; but the second line would not exhibit the standard penthemimeral caesura.

10) Statius (1566) in: J. G. Graevius, *Catullus Tibullus & Propertius*, Utrecht 1680, II, 210; K. Lachmann, *Horatiana*, *Zeitschrift für die Alterthumswissenschaft* 3, 1845, 61/481–486 – 62/489–93, at 61/484, reprinted in: J. Vahlen (ed.), *Kleinere*

One could argue that this putative alternation between monosyllabic *io* and iambic *io* should be put on a par with prosodic variations of the Ἄρεϛ Ἄρεϛ type (Hom. Il. 5.31), which bear on syllabic weight ('quantity') produced by vowel quantity or syllable division.¹¹ But, as far as I can see, there does not exist any example of a variation between syllabic and non-syllabic *i* or *u* that would involve two occurrences of the same lexical word (at Verg. A. 1.288, quoted above, *Iulius* and *Iulo* remain lexically distinct). The monosyllabic scansion of words like *diu* (Pl. Poen. 21), *suīs* (Pl. Poen. 1339), etc. in archaic versification does not aim at variation, and it is doubtful whether it involves the non-syllabic variant of the first vowel in contact (*dīu*, *suīs*) rather than iambic shortening (*dīŭ*, *suīs*), contraction (*dīu*) or elision (see *sis* at Lucr. 3.1025).

The only attestation, except in Catullus, that apparently supports the hypothesis of a monosyllabic *io* appears in Martial:

clamant ecce mei 'io Saturnalia' uersus

(Mart. 11.2.5)

Schriften zur Classischen Philologie, Berlin 1876, II, 84–96, at 88; J. v. G. Fröhlich, Critical notes on K. Lachmann's 1829 edition of Catullus, Abhandlungen der I. Classe der königlichen Akademien der Wissenschaften in München 5, 1849, 233–275, at 247; E. Benoist, Les poésies de Catulle, and Commentaire des poèmes I–LXIII, Paris 1882, II, 514–516; A. Riese, Die Gedichte des Catullus, Leipzig 1884, 122; E. T. Merrill, Catullus, Boston, etc. 1893, 104–109; L. Müller, De re metrica poetarum latinorum praeter Plautum et Terentium libri septem, Leipzig ²1894, 369; P. Fedeli, Catullus' Carmen 61, translated by M. Nardella, Amsterdam 1983, 91–92; J. M. Trappes-Lomax, Catullus: A Textual Reappraisal, Swansea 2007, 147–148.

11) One such variation applies to *ιὼ* if, by postulating *correptio epica* in the reduplication *ιὼ ιὼ*, we analyze it as the beginning of a dochmiac (⊃ ⊃ ⊃ –) at Aesch. Ag. 1136–1146 (*ιὼ ιὼ ταλαίνας κακόποτοι τύχαι* ~ *ιὼ ιὼ λιγείας μόρον ἀηδόνας* = one dochmiac followed by two cretics), Sept. 78/87 (*ιὼ ιὼ θρέομαι φοβερὰ μεγάλ' ἄχη* [*ιὼ ιὼ addidit Bergk*] / *ιὼ ιὼ θεοὶ θεαί τ', ὀρόμενον* = two dochmiacs), and Prom. 576 (*ιὼ ιὼ, πόποι*). See Th. Bergk, Kritische Analekten, Philologus 16, 1860, 577–647, at 604–613; P. Maas, Textkritisches zu Aeschylus II, Sokrates 69, 1915, 312–313, reprinted in: Buchwald (above n. 4) 39–41; E. Fraenkel, Agamemnon, Oxford 1950, II, 509, ad 1125; M. L. West, Greek Metre, Oxford 1982, 111 and his Teubner edition (Stuttgart ²1998), XXXIII, 68, 246–247, 433, 467, 489, 507. But other solutions are available: at Ag. 1136–1146, we can posit hiatus without shortening (a regular phenomenon with interjections) so as to obtain an iambic dimeter with catalexis, followed by a dochmiac; at Sept. 78/87, the same scansion provides two iambic meters followed by a cretic, viz. a variant of the lyric iambic trimeter; at Prom. 576, where the *paradosis* is seriously corrupt, I suggest editing *ιὼ μοι, πόποι*.

Here, we should dismiss Heraeus's hypothesis, adopted by Fraenkel and Syndikus, that *io* might be scanned as a pyrrhic after *mei*.¹² Indeed, there is every reason to rule out the possibility of any hiatus before *io* or another interjection. Ov. Met. 5.625 (*et bis 'io Arethusa, io Arethusa' uocauit*), conserved by many editors, most probably derives from *et bis 'io Arethusa' et 'io Arethusa' uocauit* (compare with Ars 2.1: *dicite 'io Paeon' et 'io' bis dicite 'Paeon'*); the elision after the penthemimeral caesura imitates Greek meter.¹³ Fedeli's defense of the transmitted text at Prop. 2.15.1 (*o me felicem! o nox mihi candida! et o tu*) does not gain support from Verg. A. 12.883 (*te sine, frater, erit? o quae satis ima dehiscat*) or Ov. Met. 14.832 (*o et de Latia, o et de gente Sabina!*).¹⁴ Firstly, metrical lengthening, as in Virgil's example, is much less constrained than hiatus (see below). Secondly, an easy correction is again available for Ovid's line (*o et de Latia gente et de gente Sabina!*); compare with Hor. Carm. 1.1.2 (*o et praesidium et dulce decus meum*).

At Prop. 2.15.1, Housman and Heyworth edit *io me felicem! io nox mihi candida! io tu*.¹⁵ Heyworth argues that the humanistic emendation *nox o* introduces an implausible postposition of *o* in an anaphoric sequence, and that *candida et* would be the only Propertian elision of *-ā* at this point of the line; for the second claim, he relies on Platnauer.¹⁶ But this rationale does not withstand closer scrutiny. On the one hand, postpositions of *o* alternate with the unmarked word order in the following anaphoras: Verg. A. 2.281 (*o*

12) W. Heraeus / J. Borovskij, *V. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton libri*, Leipzig 1976, LVI; W. Heraeus / D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *V. Valerii Martialis Epigrammata*, Stuttgart 1990, 357; E. Fraenkel, *Review of the 1st edition (1961) of Fordyce (below n. 35), Gnomon 34, 1962, 253–263, at 255; H. P. Syndikus, Catull. Eine Interpretation. Zweiter Teil: Die großen Gedichte (61–68), Darmstadt 1990, 33 n. 163.*

13) M. Dominicy, *L'adaptation des modèles grecs dans la versification latine. Les indices d'une conscience métrique (Catulle 62; Horace, Carm. 2.18), Interférences (Ars Scribendi) 6, 2012 [online: <http://interferences.revues.org/439>]; M. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse: A Study of the Metrical Usages of Tibullus, Propertius & Ovid*, Cambridge 1951, 84; J. Soubiran, *L'élosion dans la poésie latine*, Paris 1966, 279–281, 318–319, 528–533.*

14) P. Fedeli, *Propertio. Elegie. Libro II*, Cambridge 2005, 442–443.

15) A. E. Housman, *Emendationes Propertianae*, *The Journal of Philology* 16, 1888, 1–35, at 5–6, reprinted in: J. Diggle / F. R. D. Goodyear (eds), *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*, Cambridge 1972, I, 29–54, at 32; S. J. Heyworth, *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius*, Oxford 2007, 173–174; see also W. R. Smyth, *Thesaurus criticus ad Sexti Propertii textum*, Leiden 1970, 51.

16) Platnauer (above n. 13) 85.

lux Dardaniae, spes o fidissima Teucrum); Sen. Phaed. 1271, Tro. 766–768 (*o dulce pignus, o decus lapsae domus / summumque Troiae funus, o Danaum timor, / genitricis o spes uana!*); [Sen.] Her. O. 1176–1777; Luc. 7.588; V. Fl. 4.327–329 (*salue, uera Iouis, uera o Iouis' undique 'proles' / ingeminant 'o magnanimis memoranda palaestris / Taygeta ...!*); Sil. 6.339–340. On the other hand, elision on the second short of the fifth foot, though especially frequent with *-ē*, also takes place with *-ā*.¹⁷ Moreover, contrary to what is reported by Platnauer, the Propertian corpus contains another instance of this pattern at 1.1.23–24: *tunc ego crediderim uobis et sidera et amnis / posse ... ducere carminibus*; the parallelism between *sidera et amnis* and *candida et o tu*, plus the fact that short monosyllables are clearly preferred as second members of such elisions, suggest that the paradosis should be kept in both passages.¹⁸ Paradoxically enough, Heyworth himself adds another putative attestation when needlessly advocating J. D. Morgan's *Nile, tuus tibicen erat, crotalistris Orontes* at Prop. 4.8.39.¹⁹

17) See E. Norden, P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis Buch VI, Stuttgart⁵ 1970, 455–456; Platnauer (above n. 13) 85; Soubiran (above n. 13) 551–552.

18) See again Soubiran (above n. 13) 551–552. Some scholars (e.g. G. P. Goold, Propertius: Elegies, Cambridge, Mass. / London 1990, 44; id., Paripomena Propertiana, HSPH 94, 1992, 287–320, at 288–289, and Heyworth [above n. 15]) 9) feel impressed by Housman's ([above n. 15] 27–30 = I, 48–50) assertion that "*amnes ducere ...* is one of the commonest operations of Italian agriculture: Virgil's graceful picture of the process is familiar to everyone. A man would no more dream of invoking incantations to *amnes ducere* than to shave his chin or cook his dinner; and when this every-day work of the farmer is coupled with the 'sidera ducere' of the magician, the absurdity is doubled". But Housman's interpretation of *amnes ducere* is obviously wrong; see Dirae 67–70: *flectite currentes lymphas, uaga flumina, retro / flectite et aduersis rursum diffundite campis. / incurrant amnes passim rimantibus undis, / nec nostros seruare sinant erroribus agros* (I prefer *seruare ... erroribus* to the nonsensical *seruire ... erroribus* of the paradosis, or the awkward *seruire ... erroribus* of the vulgate: 'and let them, by their meanderings, not permit our people to preserve their lands').

19) Heyworth (above n. 15) 478–479. G. Hutchinson (Propertius: Elegies. Book IV, Cambridge 2006, 49, 197) prefers *Hibera*. But the line makes perfect sense if we keep the paradosis except for the replacement of *erat* with *eram*: *Nile, tuus tibicen eram, crotalistris Phyllis [erat]*; during preliminaries, Ego and Phyllis metaphorically play instruments that correspond to their respectively most salient body parts. On similar musical metaphors, see J. N. Adams, The Latin Sexual Vocabulary, Baltimore 1982, 25; for the topical association between *crotala* playing and arousingly moving buttocks, see Copa 1–4 and Priap. 27.

At Mart. 11.2.5, iambic shortening becomes acceptable if we edit *ecce mei clamant 'io Saturnalia' uersus*. Two arguments support this word transposition. Firstly, iambic *io* frequently follows a trochaically-ending form of *clamo*: *clamat* (Verg. A. 7.400; Ov. Met. 3.728, 4.513; Sil. 4.779), *clamet* (Hor. Ars 460; Tib. 1.1.24; Ov. Am. 1.7.38), *clamabat* (Ov. Fast. 4.447). Secondly, Mart. 11.2.5 with *ecce mei* occurring after the first foot, and with line-initial spondaic *clamant* accepting transposition, is totally hapactic. The “Musis Deoque” database of Latin poetry²⁰ contains 45 hexameters with *ecce* followed by unelided *mei / mihi / tui / tibi / sui / sibi* or an unelided iambic form of *meus / tuus / suus*, and occurring at the first or second strong position, i.e. at line-initial position (25 examples) or after the first foot (20 examples). Among the 20 examples where *ecce mei*, etc. follow the first foot, 17 begin with a dactyl and meter rules out any possibility of transposing the material of the first foot after *ecce mei*, etc. (e.g. Mart. 9.36.3: *quod tuus ecce suo Caesar permisit ephebo*). In the remaining three examples, the spondaic first foot consists of two words that cannot be transposed after *ecce mei*, etc. for metrical and/or syntactic reasons: *et nunc ecce tuas irritat callidus iras* (Stat. Theb. 11.716), *atque haec ecce tuis tellus habitabilis umbris* (Stat. Theb. 11.753), *et nunc ecce meo rediniuum in corpore portans* (Paul. Nol. Carm. 31.183).

We may thus feel justified in eliminating monosyllabic *io* from Catullus’ text. But we still have to choose between four alternative versions for R2:

R2a: *o Hymen Hymenaeae io,*
o Hymen Hymenaeae

R2b: *o Hymen Hymenaeae Hymen,*
o Hymen Hymenaeae

R2c: *Hymen o Hymenaeae io,*
Hymen o Hymenaeae

R2d: *Hymen o Hymenaeae Hymen,*
Hymen o Hymenaeae

20) <http://mqdq.cab.unipd.it/mqdq/>.

R2a was preferred by Lachmann, Fröhlich, Benoist, Merrill and Müller;²¹ R2b by the *editio Aldina* of 1502 (see the “Catullus Online” website for more details); R2c by Statius, Riese, Fedeli and Trappes-Lomax.²²

Whatever solution we opt for, R1 must be edited accordingly, i. e. either as in Mynors’s text:

R1b: – ∪ *o Hymenaeae Hymen,*
o Hymen Hymenaeae

or as proposed by the *editio Aldina* of 1515 (see the “Catullus Online” website for more details), Statius, Scaliger, Passerat, Graevius, Heyse, Ellis, Riese, Fedeli and Trappes-Lomax:²³

R1d: – ∪ *o Hymenaeae Hymen,*
Hymen o Hymenaeae

In my view, three reasons support choosing R2b or R2d. Firstly, as mentioned above, Ὑμήν/*Hymen* and Ὑμέναιε/*Hymenaeae* never combine with ἰώ/*io*. Secondly, this hypothesis creates a straight analogy between R2b (or R2d) and R1b (or R1d). Thirdly, as pointed out by Kroll, the hexametric refrain of poem 62 (*Hymen o Hymenaeae Hymen, ades o Hymenaeae*) can be reanalyzed as a glyconic (*Hymen o Hymenaeae Hymen*), plus a pherecratean (*ades o Hymenaeae*) where the pyrrhic base imitates Aeolian diction; the gly-

21) Lachmann (above n. 10) 61/484 = II, 88; Fröhlich (above n. 10) 247; Benoist (above n. 10) I, 152–158, II, 514–516; Merrill (above n. 10) 104–109; Müller (above n. 10) 369.

22) Statius (1566) in Graevius (above n. 10) II, 210; Riese (above n. 10) 122; Fedeli (above n. 10) 91–92; Trappes-Lomax (above n. 10) 147–148. At vv. 117–118, Graevius (above n. 10) I, 91 prints a mixture of R2b and R2c-d: *o Hymen Hymenaeae Hymen / Hymen o Hymenaeae*. Th. Heyse (Catull’s Buch der Lieder in deutscher Nachbildung, Berlin 1855, 120–126) opts for *o Hymen Hymenaeae io, / Hymen o, Hymenaeae o*; the “Catullus Online” website erroneously claims that Trappes-Lomax follows him in this respect.

23) Statius (1566) in Graevius (above n. 10) II, 202; J.J. Scaliger, Catulli, Tibulli, Properti noua editio, Paris 1577, 30–31, at vv. 39–40, 49–50, 59–60; J. Passerat, Commentarius in Catullum Tibullum Propertium, Paris 1608, ad loc.; Graevius (above n. 10) I, 84–87; Heyse (above n. 22) 108–114; R. Ellis, Catulli Veronensis Liber, Oxford 1867, 82–85; id., A Commentary on Catullus, Oxford² 1889, 211; Riese (above n. 10) 113; Fedeli (above n. 10) 18 n. 2; Trappes-Lomax (above n. 10) 141.

Secondly, the opening of the poem (hence of the stanza that contains the first occurrence of R1) exhibits the oldest attestation of postposed *o*: *Collis o Heliconii / cultor*.²⁷ It is not unreasonable to surmise that, by combining two inversions of the commoner word order, Catullus aimed at creating a chiasmus between vv. 1 and 5.

Thirdly, Riese's prosodic hypothesis is weakened by serious counter-arguments. In poem 84, Arrius' aspirations do not cause any deviation from normal prosody: *dicere, et insidias Arrius hinsidias* (or, perhaps better, *dicere, et hinsidias Arrius insidias*), *dixerat hinsidias, sed Hionios*. In addition, vv. 62.4, 64.20 and 66.11 imitate Greek hexameter, where the ennehemimeral caesura often precedes a minor Ionic word.²⁸ But the crucial objection stems from the fact that the aspiration of *Hymen* would turn out to license hiatus (vv. 116–117, 136–137, 161–162, 166–167, 176–177, 181–182) more frequently than metrical lengthening (vv. 146–147, 151–152, 156–157, 171–172), in contradiction with the evidence available about these phenomena. This can be shown by an examination of Virgil's meter.²⁹ The Virgilian corpus contains 53 instances of hiatus³⁰ and 54 instances of metrical lengthening. Given that the occurrences of words beginning with an aspirated vowel represent around 9–10% of the occurrences of vowel-initial words, we expect both hiatus and metrical lengthening to occur between 5 and 6 times with an aspirated vowel. But the data do not corroborate this prediction: we find 7 instances of hiatus³¹ versus 14 instances of metrical lengthening,³² which suggests that aspiration favors

27) ThLL IX, 2, 11.42–68.

28) F. Cupaiuolo, *Studi sull'esametro di Catullo*, Naples 1965, 34; L. De Neubourg, *La base métrique de la localisation des mots dans l'hexamètre latin*, Brussels 1986, 69; Fedeli (above n. 10) 92; Norden (above n. 17) 438–441.

29) See R. G. Kent, *A Problem in Latin Prosody*, in: *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à Jules Marouzeau par ses collègues et élèves étrangers*, Paris 1948, 303–308; Soubiran (above n. 13) 98–99.

30) This figure is obtained by eliminating attestations where hiatus is licensed by prosodic correption (Ecl. 3.79, 6.44: *Hylā omne*; G. 1.281: *Peliō Ossam*, 1.437: *Panopeāe et*, 4.461; A. 3.211, 5.261), by the fact that the first word is an interjection (Ecl. 2.58, 3.100; G. 2.486; A. 10.18), or by both factors (Ecl. 2.65: *ō Alexi*).

31) Ecl. 2.53, 6.44 (*Hylā, Hyla*), 7.53 (*castaneae hirsutae*); G. 3.60; A. 1.16, 3.606, 5.735.

32) Ecl. 6.53; G. 1.138, 4.137; A. 1.308, 3.112, 7.174, 7.398, 8.363, 9.610, 10.383, 10.433, 10.720, 11.69, 12.772.

metrical lengthening while remaining irrelevant to hiatus; with forms of *hymenaeus* or *hyacinthus* occurring after the ennehemimeral caesura, we find one hiatus (G. 3.60: *pati hymenaeos*) versus five cases of metrical lengthening (Ecl. 6.53: *fultūs hyacintho*; G. 4.137: *tondebāt hyacinthi*; A. 7.398: *canit hymenaeos*, 10.720: *profugūs hymenaeos*, 11.69: *languentis hyacinthi*). Similar results are obtained for other poets. In Propertius, for example, the only authentic hiatus (3.7.49) is an imitation of Virgil (A. 10.136), whereas four out of the nine acceptable instances of metrical lengthening involve an aspirated vowel.³³

Fourthly, most Aeolic bases are trochaic in poem 61: no iambic base is attested, and among the 202 bases that do not belong to R2 or to the pherecratean of R1, only 15 are spondaic;³⁴ moreover, the spondaic variant does not appear before v. 105. Due to the possibility of scanning *Hymen* as an iamb (see above), the base may be trochaic in R1b and R2a/b, but must be spondaic in R1d and R2c/d. Since refrains normally conform to dominant patterns, R1d and R2c/d should most probably be dismissed on that sole ground.³⁵

Fifthly, the choice of R1d and R2c/d does not provide any simple explanation of the corrupt readings transmitted by the manuscript tradition. For the pherecratean of R1, Trappes-Lomax has to assume that “*o* written over *Hymen* to mark it as vocative could account for the corruption”, and he does not say anything about R2.³⁶ By contrast, R1b and R2b provide plausible inputs for the paleographical drift (leaving aside the most anarchic alterations):

33) 1.10.23, 2.8.8 (with *h-*), 2.15.50, 2.24.4, 2.28.29 (with *h-*), 2.32.13, 3.22.5 (with *h-*), 4.1.7, 4.7.85 (with *h-*). On 2.32.13, 3.22.5 and 4.7.85, see M. Dominicy, *De la métrique verbale à l'établissement du texte. Sur trois vers de Propertius* (IV, 3, 51; IV, 7, 85; IV, 10, 31), LEC 75, 2007, 227–248, at 235–238; *L'épigramme III, 22 de Propertius. Propositions pour une nouvelle édition critique*, AC 79, 2010, 137–162, at 144–146.

34) Verses 105, 120, 122, 126, 127, 129, 135, 169, 171, 175, 198, 201, 202, 209, 228. I differ from O. Skutsch (*Metrical Variations and Some Textual Problems in Catullus*, BICS 16, 1969, 38–43, at 38–40) in definitely dismissing future *dicēris* at 134 (see below) and the correction *solī* (for *solā*) at 140 (see Fedeli [above n. 10] 95–96 n. 39), and in editing *intimā* / *flammā* at 170–171 (see below).

35) C. J. Fordyce, *Catullus: A Commentary*, Oxford 1973, 239; Thomson (above n. 2) 350.

36) Trappes-Lomax (above n. 10) 141.

(i) In R1b, *Hymen* was first added to the pherecratean under the influence of the glyconic:

R1b: – ∪ *o Hymenaeae Hymen,*
 o Hymen Hymenaeae Hymen (49–50)

Then, again under the influence of the glyconic, the first occurrence of *Hymen* in the pherecratean was either eliminated:

R1b: – ∪ *o Hymenaeae Hymen,*
 o Hymenaeae Hymen (4–5 G)

or replaced with *Hymenaeae*:

R1b: – ∪ *o Hymenaeae Hymen,*
 o Hymenaeae Hymenaeae Hymen (39–40)

In mss. *OR*, an additional missegmentation took place at vv. 4–5:

R1b: – ∪ *o Hymenaeae,*
 Hymen o Hymenaeae Hymen (4–5 *OR*)

(ii) In R2b, *o* first substituted for verse-final *Hymen* due to anticipation of the following interjection, and to the existence of the sequence *o, o* in Late and Medieval Latin:³⁷

R2b: *o Hymen Hymenaeae o,*
 o Hymen Hymenaeae

Then, again under the influence of the glyconic, *o* was added at the end of the pherecratean:

R2b: *o Hymen Hymenaeae o,*
 o Hymen Hymenaeae o

37) See ThLL IX, 2, 12.10–18 and Brepols’ “Cross Database Searchtool” (<http://www.brepolis.net/>).

Subsequently *Hymenaeae o*, written *Hymeneee o*, was missegmented as *Hymenee eo* that yielded *Hymenee io* (orthography of the manuscripts):

R2b: *o Hymen Hymenee io,*
o Hymen Hymenee io

Finally, *io* replaced *o* at the remaining positions:

R2b: *io Hymen Hymenee io,*
io Hymen Hymenee io

2. *The left context of the second refrain*

Though supported by cogent reasons, my choice of R2b obviously does not solve the prosodic problem raised by most stanzas. The only way out left consists in correcting the preceding context so as to restore meter. In the following, I will try to show that this option can be independently justified and that, in some cases, it contributes to eliminating other oddities of the manuscript tradition and/or Mynors's version. Indeed, the paradosis is corrupt at vv.151, 155, 170–171 and 181, while some philologists, at least, have felt uneasiness about vv.144–146 and 164–166. In the remaining four stanzas, the emendation proposed concerns inflection only (vv.116, 136, 161) or involves a slight change in the text (v.176).

2.1. *Verse 116*

ite concinite in modum

An anonymous humanist wrote *modos* in an exemplar of the *editio Aldina* of 1502 (see the “Catullus Online” website for more details). This correction proves all the more plausible since plural forms of *modus* frequently occur in passages dealing with poetry and/or music:³⁸ see e.g. Verg. A. 7.698–701; Hor. Carm. 2.9.9;

38) ThLL VIII, 1255.39–1257.9.

Prop. 2.22.6; Ov. Met. 10.145–147. For the collocation with *conci-no*, see Cic. Tusc. 1.106 (*haec cum pressis et flebilibus modis, qui totis theatris maestitiam inferant, concinuntur*). For *modos/-is* used in such contexts without any epithet, see e.g. Hor. Carm. 2.1.37–40, Ep. 1.19.27, Ars 211; Ov. Am. 1.1.2, Tr. 4.10.23–26. For *modos* introduced by *ad/in* with the meaning at hand, see e.g. Hor. Carm. 3.30.12–14; Tib. 1.4.70, 1.7.37–38; Ov. Fast. 3.387–388, 6.692, Ib. 451–452; Mart. 3.63.5–6.³⁹ Propertius seems to imitate our passage at 4.4.59–61: *nuptae, / uos medium palla foedus inite mea. / adde, Hymenaeae, modos; tubicen, fera murmura conde*.⁴⁰ Some scribe substituted *modum* for *modos* under the influence of vv.38–40: *agite in modum / dicite, o Hymenaeae Hymen, / o Hymen Hymenaeae*. Though prosodically motivated, the alternation between *modum* and *modos* may reflect a technical distinction between spoken (*dicite*) and sung verse (*concinite*); for this use of the singular, see e.g. Cic. Orat. 147, 198, 203.

39) Contrary to R. G. M. Nisbet / N. Rudd, A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III, Oxford 2004, 375–376, I assume that *deduxisse* metaphorically refers to poetic composition at Hor. Carm. 3.30.13–14 (... *Aeolium carmen ad Italos / deduxisse modos*), so that *ad Italos ... modos* is no directional complement; see W. Eisenhut, *Deducere carmen. Ein Beitrag zum Problem der litterarischen Beziehungen zwischen Horaz und Properz*, in: G. Radke (ed.), *Gedenkschrift für Georg Rohde*, Tübingen 1961, 91–104, reprinted in: W. Eisenhut (ed.), *Properz*, Darmstadt 1975, 247–263. As pointed out by C. D. Gilbert, *Ovid, Met. 1.4*, CQ 26, 1976, 111–112, and A. Cameron, *Callimachus and His Critics*, Princeton 1995, 359–361, Ovid alludes to this technical acceptance while using *deduco* with its literal meaning at Met. 1.4 (*ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen*) and Tr. 2.560 (*in tua deduxi tempora, Caesar, opus*). In Mart. 3.63.5–6 (... *in uarios ... modos*), one cannot rule out the possibility that *in* might be corrupt for *ad* or illustrate later usage; but the similar alternation between *in numerum* (Lucr. 2.631; Verg. Ecl. 6.27–28; Man. 1.19) and *ad numerum* (Cic. Brut. 33, Orat. 59; Ov. Met. 14.520) supports the hypothesis of a free variation.

40) This parallel supports the traditional hypothesis that *nuptae* is a vocative (compare with 61.91, 96, 106, 113, 61.144, 62.6, 66.87) – pace O. L. Richmond, *Sexti Propertii quae supersunt opera*, Cambridge 1928, 349; H. E. Butler / E. A. Barber, *The Elegies of Propertius*, Oxford 1933, 348; D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana*, Cambridge 1956, 238; Hutchinson (above n. 19) 130. The ablative *palla ... mea* possibly echoes Verg. A. 8.702 (*et scissa gaudens uadit Discordia palla*); see Prop. 4.4.72: *absciso ... sinu*.

2.2. Verses 134–136

*diceris male te a tuis
 unguentate glabris marite
 abstinere, sed abstine.*

Present *diceris*, which provides an unmarked trochaic base (see n. 34), should be preferred over future *dicēris* because the logic of gossips normally favors reference to present states of affairs (here, the actual bridegroom's reluctance to refrain from homosexual intercourse with his *glabri*). This choice allows editing *abstines* if we assume that *male* meaning 'with difficulty' modifies *te ... abstinere*.⁴¹ 'People say that you find it hard to refrain, but you are refraining.' The joke emphasizes the gap between the bridegroom's mental or bodily states and the way he is immediately constrained to behave (*abstines*; compare with Tib. 1.4.74). Fescennine verses are sung by unmarried boys who have no reasons for refraining from homosexual intercourse and thus can jocularly contrast their sex life with the newly endorsed behavior of the bridegroom. It is usual that in 'bachelor' or 'stag' parties (German 'Junggesellenabschied'), the male companions of the bridegroom will evoke the sexual freedom they still enjoy, contrary to him.

2.3. Verses 144–146

*nupta, tu quoque quae tuus
 uir petet, caue ne neges,
 ni petitum aliunde eat.*

Here, a simple verse transposition (146-144-145) will prove sufficient; *neget* (v. 121) occurs at the same position within its stanza. This change increases the contrast between the complement clause *ne neges*, which depends on *caue* by virtue of the valence of this verb, and the adjunct (adverbial) clause introduced by *ni* (meaning 'so that ... not'), which lies outside its valence domain.⁴² Like many

41) Fordyce (above n. 35) 249; Thomson (above n. 2) 358.

42) For similar adjuncts introduced by *ni*, see Lucr. 3.286; Prop. 2.7.3; E. Diehl, *Altlateinische Inschriften*, Berlin ⁵1964, 87 (801²); CLE 1542.10. In other examples mentioned by Fedeli (above n. 10) 104 and Norden (above n. 17) 232, the

modern readers,⁴³ some scribe failed to capture the difference and accordingly moved verse 146 after *caue*. Since the point of the stanza is that the bride should allow her husband to have anal sex with her,⁴⁴ the boys' address to her is represented as emerging incidentally. This contributes to the jocular tone of the whole passage, while accounting for the postponement of vocative *nupta* and the use of the *tu quoque* apposition.

2.4. Verses 149–151

*en tibi domus (ut potens
et beata!) uiri tui,
quae tibi sine seruiat*

151 seruit V

As a collective noun, *domus* may trigger plural agreement in a relative clause introduced by *qui*, all the more so since the singular and plural forms are distant from each other: *qui tibi sine seruiant*;⁴⁵ see Sall. Iug. 14.5–6 (*familia nostra ... quorum progeniem*) and, with a very similar meaning for the collective noun, Var. R. 1.13.1 (*familia ubi uersetur prouidendum, si fessi opere aut frigore aut calore, ubi commodissime possint se quiete recipere*) or Apul. Fl. 23 (*totum eius seruitium hilares sunt atque epulantur*). My emendation also provides support for *sine*. Heyworth⁴⁶ suspects this verb form on the ground that, in contrast with e. g. Verg. A. 5.163 (*litus ama et laeua stringat sine palmula cautes*), the accompanying subjunctive should be optative; he claims that, if *sine seruiat* were given a jussive reading, “the continuation in the next stanza ...

ni-clause is a complement (Verg. A. 3.684–686 after *iussa monent*, 6.352–354 after *timorem*; CLE 1533.7 after *metuo*).

43) E. g. K. Quinn, *Catullus: The Poems*, London / New York 1970, 272; Fordyce (above n. 35) 249–250; Trappes-Lomax (above n. 10) 150.

44) Fedeli (above n. 10) 102 n. 66.

45) R. Kühner / C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, Hanover ²1912–14, II/1, 22–25, 29–31; M. Leumann / J. B. Hofmann / A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik*, Munich ⁵1977, II, 436–437.

46) In S. J. Harrison / S. J. Heyworth, *Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Catullus*, PCPhS 44, 1998, 85–109, at 103. See also Trappes-Lomax (above n. 10) 151; id., *Further Thoughts in Catullus*, *Paideia* 67, 2012, 633–645, at 639.

would place an improbable limitation on the instruction: ‘*may* the house serve you till you get old’ makes far better sense than ‘*let* the house serve you till you get old’”. But the jussive (or better, ‘permissive’) makes perfect sense if the relative clause reproduces, in a free indirect way, the obsequious speech of slaves and servants (‘Permit us to serve you all the time till you get old’).⁴⁷ Grammatical hypercorrection produced the corrupt line.

2.5. Verses 154–156

*usque dum tremulum mouens
cana tempus anilitas
omnia omnibus annuit*

155 anilis etas V

Both the unmetrical paradosis (if read *anilis aetas*) and *anilitas* (ς) make sense. But *anilitas* only occurs at Isid. Etym. 11.2.28 (*sicut autem a sene senectus, ita ab anu anilitas nominata est*), where it may be a term formed by analogy. In addition, the use of this abstract substantive involves either an abrupt metonymy (‘your white-haired old age’ for ‘you, white-haired and old’) or an unexpected transition, after *tibi... seruiant* (v. 151), to a general and sententious statement. I suggest editing *anile eas / omnia omnibus annuens*. Like involuntary nodding of the head, aimless wandering (*eas*) is a typical symptom of senility. For temporal (*usque dum* (‘all the time till’) with present subjunctive, possibly depending on an imperative or subjunctive form, see ThLL V, 1, 2226.51–2229.19; in particular: *illunc] | eu[in]cant, [uincant], usq[ue dum animam | eiu]s eripiant* (Diehl [above n. 42]); *incipere cantare ... usque dum coeant* (Cato, Agr. 160); *utinam strepitantibus aduolet alis / flauaque coniugio uincola portet Amor, / uincola quae maneant semper dum tarda senectus / inducat rugas inficiatque comas* (Tib. 2.2.17–20).⁴⁸ For the use of present participles with *eo* and other verbs of movement, see 61.17–19, 63.31 (with a comparable accumulation of epithets: *furibunda simul anhelans uaga uadit animam*

47) See Merrill (above n. 10) 107: “for you come to be *domina*, and the house offers its lasting allegiance for your acceptance.”

48) ThLL V, 1, 2226.51–2227.81; Diehl (above n. 42) 87 (801²).

agens), 63.42, 64.251–253, 66.52–55; Verg. A. 11.89–90 (*it lacrimans*); Stat. Theb. 4.82–83 (*ne rara mouens inglorius iret / agmina*). Cicero uses *anilis* at Div. 1.7, 2.19, 2.125; Dom. 105; N.D. 2.70, 3.12, and Tusc. 1.93; Ovid probably imitates our passage at Ep. 19.45–46 (*annuit illa fere; non nostra quod oscula curet, / sed mouet obrepens somnus anile caput*), where *anile caput* echoes *tempus anile*. In the missegmentation *anil eeas*, the first letter group was interpreted as an abbreviation of *anilis*;⁴⁹ the shifts from *eeas* to (*a*)*etas*, and from *annuēs* = *annuens* to *annuit* agreeing with (*a*)*etas*, are paleographically trivial.

2.6. Verse 161

rasilemque subi forem.

Change to *rasiles . . . fores* will suffice; for similar accumulations of sibilants, see vv. 28 (*rupis Aonios specus*), 46 (discussed below), 51 (*te suis tremulus parens*), 136 (discussed above), 179 (*uos, bonae senibus uiris*), 214 (*sit suo similis patri*).

2.7. Verses 164–166

*aspice intus ut accubans
uir tuus Tyrrio in toro
totus immineat tibi.*

164 unus V

At v. 164, both *unus* ('alone') and *intus* (Statius)⁵⁰ prove irrelevant; the scholars who envisage assigning a richer signification to the first item waver on the precise meaning that would be conveyed.⁵¹ I suggest editing *unus . . . tibi uni*, so that elision will take place between the third and the fourth line of the stanza. For elisions be-

49) See W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae: An Account of Abbreviation in Latin Mss. of the Early Minuscule Period (c. 700–850)*, Cambridge 1915, 336–339.

50) Statius (1566) in Graevius (above n. 10) II, 213.

51) Ellis (above n. 23, 1889) 232–233; Fedeli (above n. 10) 110 n. 91; Fordyce (above n. 35) 251; P. Oksala, *Adnotationes criticae ad Catulli carmina*, Helsinki 1965, 63; Passerat (above n. 23) 20; Trappes-Lomax (above n. 10) 151–152.

tween adjacent lines, see vv. 115–116, 135–136, 140–141 (with an elided long vowel), 184–185, 227–228 (with an elided long vowel); for verse-internal elisions before R1b, see vv. 4 (with an elided long vowel), 39, 49 (with an elided long vowel). The collocation *tibi (...) uni* occurs at e.g. Pl. St. 617; Pub. Sent. App. 369; Cic. Catil. 1.18, Ver. 5.105; Ov. Am. 1.6.15, Ars 3.561, Ep. 20.25, Met. 13.856; Luc. 2.255–256; *uni (...) tibi* at e.g. Cic. Fam. 15.4.15; Hor. S. 2.2.106; Liv. 2.12.11; Luc. 9.1045–1046; Mart. 9.90.7. The fact that *tibi uni* tends to become a frozen expression makes it similar to the bacchiac or amphibrachic words involved in the other interlinear elisions (see also below, on vv. 176 and 181). The redundancy *unus ... uni* emphasizes the notion that each lover will be unique to his/her partner, and belong to him/her only;⁵² I have proposed a similar correction at 107.7–8: *quis me uno uiuit felicior, aut magis ac te / optandam esse unam dicere quis poterit?*⁵³ For comparable examples, see e.g. 45.21–24 (*unam ... uno*); Ter. Eun. 367 (*una ... unis*); Rut. Ruf. hist. 15 HRR [Peter] (*uni una*); Lucr. 6.914 (*unus ... uno*); Cic. Red. Pop. 16 (*unus uni*), Leg. 1.29 (*unum uni*); Sen. Cl. 1.1.5 (*unus ... uni*), Dial. 7.20.3 (*unum ... uni*). Scribal tolerance for verse-final *tibi* before a vowel also explains *V*'s *thalamo est tibi / ore* instead of ... *tibi est ...* at vv. 185–186.

52) See Merrill (above n. 10) 108: “the bridegroom is the one object upon which her eyes rest, while he in turn has eyes for her alone.” Prop. 2.1.47–48 (*laus in amore mori; laus altera si datur uno / posse frui, fruar o solus amore meo!*) expresses a similar reciprocity with *solus* replacing *unus*; see M. Hubbard, Propertius, London 1974, 101–102 and Heyworth (above n. 15) 110, pace G. Williams, Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry, Oxford 1968, 485. At Prop. 2.20.27 (*cum te tam multi peterent, tu me una petisti*) and Ov. Met. 13.750–752 (*Acis ... / magna quidem patrisque sui matrisque uoluptas, / nostra tamen maior; nam me sibi iunxerat uni*), one occurrence of *unus* is left implicit. Friedrich (above n. 5) 236 paraphrases the first example as ... *tu me unum petisti*, and the second one as ... *me sibi iunxerat unam*; but the real implications are, respectively, *ego te unam peti(u)i* and *ego illum mihi iunxeram uni*; see CLE 652.4–5 (*ante meos thalamos me dignum sola petisti / contemptisque aliis me dicto iure secuta es*), quoted by Shackleton Bailey (above n. 40) 104, where *sola petisti* does not imply *me solum petisti* (expressed by the following line), but *ego te solam peti(u)i*.

53) M. Dominicy, Catulliana, CQ, forthcoming.

2.8. Verses 169–171

*illi non minus ac tibi
pectore writur intimo
flamma, sed penite magis.*

Goold's *pectore writ in intimo* hardly improves on the ungrammatical paradosis.⁵⁴ Heyworth tentatively proposed *pectus writur intim / flammā*, noticing however that "[o]ne possible objection is the rarity of initial spondaic words in Catullus's glyconics (there are only two examples: *illi* in 169, and *Iuno* at 34.14)⁵⁵; in my view, the parallelism between *illi* and *flammā*, both before a grammatical monosyllable, rather supports this emendation. At v. 171, the hapactic adverb *penite* has every chance to be corrupt, but neither *penita est magis* (Avancius 1535, see the "Catullus Online" website for more details) nor *perit en magis* (Skutsch)⁵⁶ eliminate the metrical lengthening at the end of the line; yet *penita est* may well constitute an intermediate stage in the corruption process that led to *penite* (see below). Heyworth claims that "no one has made the more obvious suggestion *penitus* (used by Catullus on four other occasions)", viz. 62.14, 66.23–25 (*quam penitus maestas exedit cura medullas! / ut tibi tunc toto pectore sollicitae / sensibus ereptis mens excidit!*), 95.5 and 102.2; but A. Guarinus (1521, see the "Catullus Online" website for more details) already envisaged this option, recently adopted by Trappes-Lomax, who maintains unmetrical *magis*.⁵⁷ I suggest editing *penitus malum est*. For the collocation of adverbial *penitus* and *sum* with the full lexical value of a position verb, see Vitr. 8.6.14 (*sin autem loca dura erunt aut nimium uenae penitus fuerint*) and Aetna 117–118 (*quis enim non credit inanis / esse sinus penitus ...?*); for the topical association of *penitus* and *malum*, see Verg. A. 6.735–738, 7.374–375; Cels. 6.15; Sen. Dial. 9.15.6, Phaed. 637–644, Thy. 258–260; [Sen.] Her. O. 447–452,

54) G.P. Goold, *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*, Groton, Mass. 1973; id. (above n.25, 1983) 118.

55) In Harrison / Heyworth (above n. 46) 103.

56) Skutsch (above n. 34) 40.

57) Trappes-Lomax (above n. 10) 152–153, who could solve this problem by editing *magest*, as he does at 61.46 (see below). But this way out proves linguistically implausible; see McKie (above n.25) 157–159, Dominicy (above n.53) on 107.7.

1224–1227. Written *maluest*, *malum est* shifted to *males/malis*, and was read as *magis* due to the confusion between capital C/L and G; then, someone replaced *penitus* with *penita* agreeing with nominative *flamma* and added *est*; *penita est* yielded *penit(a)e*.⁵⁸

2.9. Verses 174–176

*mitte brachiolum teres,
praetextate, puellulae:
iam cubile adeat uiri.*

I suggest editing *iam uiri illa adeat cubile*, so that elision will take place between the third and the fourth line of the stanza, as in vv. 166–167; for a similar word disposition, see vv. 56–58 (*tu fero iuueni in manus / floridam ipse puellulam / dedis*). The insertion of *illa* creates a welcome contrast between the two agents mentioned. Due to the graphical similarity of *uiriilla* and *cubile*, a scribe began writing *iam cubile* ... and dropped *illa* when completing the line.

2.10. Verse 181

collocate puellulam.

181 puellam V

The emendation *puellulam* (ς) augments the paradosis with a light (‘short’) penultimate syllable. An alternative solution consists in editing *in eo puellam*, so that elision will again take place between the third and the fourth line of the stanza (see vv. 166–167 and 176–177). Pronominal *eo* is coreferent with *cubile* (v. 176); for the use of *colloco* with ablative introduced by *in*, see 10.23, 66.56; Ter. Eun. 593 (*deinde eam in lecto illae conlocarunt*); Ov. Met. 2.525–526 (*cur non et pulsa ducit Iunone meoque / collocat in thalamo socerumque Lycaona sumit?*). Oblique cases of *is* are notoriously rare in poetry; but see *eo* (‘for that purpose’) at 66.57, *quo tempore* ... *ex eo* at

58) On corruptions analogous to the shift from *malum est* to *males*, on the confusion between capital G and C, on the frequent alternations between *magis* and *malis*, and on the reduction of *-a est* to *-(a)e*, see Dominicy (above n. 53) on 29.19–20, 73.4 and 107.8, and below, on v. 46.

35.13–14, *in eo* coreferent with *nemus* or *pomi* at Ov. Ep. 12.67–69, 20.241–242. The prepositional phrase was dropped because of its weak informational import.

3. Verses 21–25

*floridis uelut enitens
myrtus Asia ramulis
quos Hamadryades deae,
ludicrum sibi, roscido
nutriunt umore.*

Nobody has ever managed to justify the metrical deviation in v. 25. But none of the corrections available proves satisfactory (see the “Catullus Online” website for more details); in particular, Postgate’s *roscido ... alimento*, advocated by Trappes-Lomax, is implausible:⁵⁹ except for *alimentum* at Aetna 159, *alimentis* at Lucr. 5.815, *alimentis* at Ter. Hau. 836 and Juv. 15.93, only *alimenta* occurs in poetry (first example at Prop. 3.21.4 with a figurative meaning; then, frequent in Ovid, Manilius, Silius and Statius). I suggest editing *lucidi ... ope roris*. This correction creates, between *ludicrum*, *lucidi* and *nutriunt*, an intricate network of phonological and metrical parallelisms underlined by the distribution of the two pyrrhic words. Catullus uses ablative *ope* at 34.24 and 67.2; moreover, I suggest correcting 114.6 into ... *dum modo ope ipse egeat*.⁶⁰ For the collocation *lucidi ... roris*, see Pervigilium Veneris 15–16: *ipsa roris lucidi, / noctis aura quem relinquit, spargit umentes aquas* – most probably, a direct imitation in a poem where Catullan echoes abound. For the combination of *ope* with the genitive and *nutrio* or a synonymous verb, see Ov. Fast. 6.485–486 (*accipit Ino / te, puer, et summa sedula nutrit ope*), 2.419–420 (*ubera ducunt / nec sibi promissi lactis aluntur ope*) and Met. 9.338–339 (*inque sinu puerum, qui nondum impleuerat annum, / dulce ferebat onus tepidique ope lactis alebat*); Ovidian *ope lactis* is the variation of an archaic collocation (*quem ego nefrendem alui lacteam*

59) J. P. Postgate, *On Catullus*, CPh 7, 1912, 1–16, at 4–5; Trappes-Lomax (above n. 10) 142–143.

60) Dominicy (above n. 53).

immulgens opem, Andr. 38 TRF [Ribbeck] = 23 TrRF). The naïve (and still frequent) belief that dew ‘feeds’ plants and flowers accounts for such an example as Plin. Nat. 18.186 (*fruges nocturno tantum rore nutriens*); this generated the metaphorical equation between dew and milk, attested at Cic. Cons. fr. 42–44 [Soubiran] (*hic siluestris erat Romani nominis altrix, / Martia, quae paruos Mauortis semine natos / uberibus grauidis uitali rore rigabat*) and Culex 76 (*illi sunt gratae rorantes lacte capellae*). In such a context, *lucidi* may allude, even from a formal viewpoint, to the whiteness common to light and milk; see Maltby⁶¹ on *lac(teus)* and e. g. *conlucens Lacteus* at Cic. Arat. Ph. 33.286 [Soubiran]; *luce(n)t/lucem* (...) *lactea* at Verg. A. 8.660, 10.137; Mart. 8.45.2; *lactis ... lucet* at Germ. 457. Due to the confusion between *p* and *u*, *ope roris* shifted to *oueroris* normalized as *umoris*.⁶² At some stage, *roscidi* substituted for the graphically similar *lucidi*, under the influence of either *roris* or the collocation *roscidus ... umor* found at Sen. Nat. 2.26.7; Plin. Nat. 9.38; Anth. Lat. 744.6 [Riese] = [Claud.] Carm. min. uel spur. uel suspect. app. 12.6 [Hall]⁶³. Finally, *roscidi ... umoris* was corrected into *roscido ... umore* on grammatical grounds.

4. Verses 46–50

*quis deus magis est amatis
petendus amantibus?
quem colent homines magis
caelitum, o Hymenaeae Hymen,
o Hymen Hymenaeae?*

46/47 amatis / est V

61) R. Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Leeds 1991, 322, 324.

62) See Friedrich (above n. 5) 120 n. 1; Housman (above n. 15, 1972) I, 102, II, 781 (about Culex 118); M. Dominicy, *Propertius 3.1.27*, *Mnemosyne* 62, 2009, 417–431, at 428; id., *Propertius, 4.5.19–21*, *RhM* 153, 2010, 144–187, at 163, 173; *opem* for *umum = humum* at Ov. Am. 3.5.30 [McKeown]; in Luc. [Housman], *umore* for *pudore* at 7.525, *ruinas* for *rapinas* at 9.40.

63) See also Egn. 2 FLP [Courtney]: *roscida noctiuagis astris labentibus Phoebe / pulsa loco cessit concedens lucibus †altis†*.

Modern editors waver between *est ama- / tis* (Bergk) and *anxiis / est* (Haupt).⁶⁴ The first solution cannot gain any plausibility from *Au- / runculeia* (61.82–83), since proper names notoriously allow for metrical deviations (see *Māmurram* at 29.3, trisyllabic *Camēri-um* at 55.10, and perhaps the syncopated or hypermetric *Rauide* at 40.1). The second runs against the objection that *anxius* (Cic. Att. 2.24.1, Tusc. 4.70) obviously differs from ornamental epithets like *tremulus* (v. 51) et *timens* (v. 54).⁶⁵ In my view, there must be some truth in the humanistic correction *magis ac magis* (A. Guarinus 1521; see the “Catullus Online” website for more details): the confusion between capital G and C, hence *t* (see above, on v. 171), most probably yielded *amatis* from *et/ac magis*, as an anticipation of *amantibus*. But the first or second occurrence of *magis* should be corrected. I suggest editing *maribus magis / te expetendus amantibus*, which makes v. 47 open a long anaphorical sequence of line-initial pronouns: *te* (v. 51), *te* (v. 54), *tu* (v. 56), *te uolente* (vv. 64, 69, 74). The reading *expetendus*, already printed in the *editio Aldina* of 1502 (see the “Catullus Online” website for more details), was adopted by Staius, who proposed *magis a macris*, while Leyser and Trappes-Lomax prefer the linguistically implausible *magis ac* (or *cupidis*) *magest / expetendus* (see above, on v. 171).⁶⁶ One could also envisage ... *te petendus* or ... *te est petendus*; but Catullus has the rarer verb *expeto* at 15.4, and the ThLL records the affinity between *expetendus* and *magis*.⁶⁷ For elisions of line-initial monosyllables, see 11.22, 13.11, 15.18, 37.8, 55.4–5, 64.305, 64.350, 65.22, 67.30, 68.14, 86.6, 89.5;⁶⁸ elision of *te* before a form of *expeto* is a Plautinian feature (see Mil. 620: *te expetere*; Ps. 43: *te expetit*; Rud. 1393: *te expetam*; St. 740: *te expetimus*). Catullus uses *marem* at

64) Bergk (above n.11) 619; M. Haupt, *Quaestiones Catullianae*, Leipzig 1837, 21–24, reprinted in: U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (ed.), *Opuscula*, Leipzig 1875, I, 1–72, at 16–18.

65) Fedeli (above n. 10) 48, 50–51 n. 12.

66) Staius (1566) in Graevius (above n. 10) II, 207; H. Leyser, Review of F. W. Doering’s 1834 edition of Catullus, *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 15, 1835, 35–42, at 37; Trappes-Lomax (above n. 10) 143. Leyser’s contribution is absent from the “Catullus Online” website. L. von Schwabe, *Quaestionum Catullianarum Liber I*, Giessen 1862, 67 quoted it elliptically, so that Trappes-Lomax did not manage to identify it in 2007; see now Trappes-Lomax (above n. 46) 638.

67) ThLL V, 2, 1699.6–13.

68) On 55.4–5, see Dominicy (above n. 53).

16.13; the homoeoteleuton between the two closed (heavy, ‘long’) syllables in *deus maribus*, and the repetition of verse-final *magis* at vv. 46 and 48, conform to his diction: see *alterius lepidus* at 78.2, and the same distribution of *licent ... licent* at 61.139–141. The language of vv. 46–50 exploits the common referential and metaphorical link between the pursuit of intercourse and devotion to a god or goddess: *expetendus* and *colent* convey sexual overtones;⁶⁹ *maribus* is used in a religious and erotic context at Tib. 1.6.22 (*sacra Bonae maribus non adeunda Deae*) and Juv. 2.89 (*solis ara deae maribus patet*); the collocation *maribus ... amantibus ... homines* again recalls Plautus (Poen. 1311: *aut contrectare quod mares homines amant*). For the use of ablative *te* in a comparative construction with *magis*, see Hor. S. 1.3.142 and Ov. Pont. 3.1.71; for the cooccurrence of the dative and the ablative, see Verg. A. 4.31 (*o luce magis dilecta sorori*). Most probably, *maribus magis*, written *marib. magis*, yielded *magis magis*, hence *magis et/ac magis*, due to the confusion between *b* and *s*, and the influence of common expressions like *magis magis* (38.3, 64.274; Verg. G. 4.311), *magis (...)* *atque/ac magis* (68.48; Verg. G. 3.185, A. 2.299, 12.239, 12.406) or *magis et magis* (Cic. Att. 14.18.4); as in other places, *te ex-* was altered into *et est* and thus *est*.⁷⁰

5. Verses 97–101

*non tuus leuis in mala
deditus uir adultera,
probra turpia persequens,
a tuis teneris uolet
secubare papillis*

99 procurat pia V

69) For (*ex*)*peto*, see 15.4, 61.145–146, 68.10, 70.2; ThLL V, 2, 1695.41–63, X, 1, 1959.5–14; Adams (above n. 19) 212 n. 1. For *colo*, see M. Dominicy, *De Catulle 113 à Propertius IV*, 11, 65–66, *Latomus* 71, 2012, 392–403.

70) On the abbreviation of final *-bus* and the corruption of *b* into *s*, see W. M. Lindsay, *An Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation Based on the Text of Plautus*, London 1896, 90; L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins*, Paris 1911, 159.601, 187–188.798; A. Ernout, *Recueil de textes latins archaïques*, Paris 1916, 60. On the confusions between *te*, *e(x)*, *et* and *est*, see Dominicy (above n. 53) on 29.20, 55.4 and 107.7.

The correction *probra turpia* (Calphurnius 1481; see the “Catullus Online” website for more details) entered the vulgate. Nisbet, who considers *turpia* “certain”, rightly claims that *probra* does not produce adequate sense; but alternatives like *facta*, *furta* or *stupra* are paleographically problematic.⁷¹ I suggest editing *praemia impia* (impious pleasures conceived of in terms of a prey or booty, as underlined by *persequens*); see *praemia* referring to a (potential) sexual partner at Ov. Met. 8.92, 8.105, and the erotic overtones of *praemia* at Prop. 1.14.16. Catullus uses *praemia* in a passage with a highly similar lexicon (66.84–86: *sed quae se impuro dedit adulterio, / illius a mala dona leuis bibat irrita puluis: / namque ego ab indignis praemia nulla peto*) where McKie envisages replacing *a mala* with *impia*.⁷² The substitution of unmetrical *impia* for *turba* at Sen. Thy. 19 [Viansino] shows that *impia* could easily shift to the semantically close *turpia*; *pr(a)emia*, written *prēia*, reduced to *preia*; the resulting sequence *preiaturpia* was read *precatur pia*, which would look coherent to a monk.⁷³ The trivial change from *precatur* to *procatur* occurs at Priap. 12.8; see also the alternation between *procamus* and *precamur* at Priap. 37.2 [Clairmont]. It may have been favored here by the context and an analogy with *procax* (61.119), since it is hardly imaginable that the scribe who produced this reading may have thought of *proco*, not to mention the exceptional and disputable deponent form *procari* at Sen. Nat. 4a praef. 5.⁷⁴

71) R. G. M. Nisbet, *Notes on the Text of Catullus*, PCPhS 24, 1978, 92–115, at 98, reprinted in: S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Collected Papers on Latin Literature*, Oxford 1995, 76–100, at 84.

72) McKie (above n. 25) 156–159. In his review of McKie’s book (CR 62, 2012, 493–496, at 494), S. J. Heyworth rightly objects to this emendation that “Catullus nowhere has a hexameter (or pentameter) beginning with two dactylic words”. Since the interjection is altogether suspect (see Trappes-Lomax [above n. 10] 218), the simplest solution consists in editing *ut mala . . . bibat*.

73) For examples of such mistakes, see Friedrich (above n. 5) 339; Havet (above n. 70) 263–264.1093–1097; Lindsay (above n. 70) 81; J. Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism*, Urbana / Chicago / London 1972, 100–102.

74) ThLL X, 2, 1541.55–58.

6. Verses 109–113

*quae tuo ueniunt ero,
 quanta gaudia quae uaga
 nocte quae medio die
 gaudeat! sed abit dies:
 prodeas noua nupta.*

110 gaudiaque V || 111 nocteque V

According to e.g. Statius, Passerat, Benoist and Fordyce, *uaga* can be understood as ‘ranging the sky’.⁷⁵ Indeed, *uagus* is a stock epithet of celestial bodies: 64.271 (*Aurora exoriente uagi sub limina Solis*; also Laev. 32 FLP [Courtney]; [Tib. = Pan. Mess.] 3.7.76); Hor. S. 1.8.21 (*uaga luna*; also Verg. A. 10.215–216; Pacon. FLP [Courtney]; Stat. Silv. 1.4.36–37, 3.3.54–55); Germ. 17 (*sidera uaga*; also Man. 2.742–743, 3.101; Sen. Thy. 834; [Sen.] Oct. 1; Stat. Theb. 10.360); Man. 5.722 (*uagae stellae*; also Man. 3.62–63; Luc. 9.12); [Sen.] Oct. 389 (*astra ... uaga*; also Egn. 2 FLP [Courtney], see n. 63). Similar representations of night as a moving entity are found at Enn. Ann. 414 [Skutsch]; Trag. 96–97 TRF [Ribbeck] = 34–35 TrRF; Verg. A. 5.721, 8.407–408; Tib. 2.1.87–88; [Tib. = Lygdamus] 3.4.17–18. But Stat. Silv. 3.1.42–43 rather supports an erotic interpretation: *qualemque uagae post crimina noctis / Thespius opstupuit, totiens socer*. This parallel also militates against Harrison’s proposal, adopted by Trappes-Lomax and McKie, to replace *uaga* with *caua*, all the more so since, in all comparable attestations, the second epithet acquires sinister overtones: see Verg. A. 2.360, 6.293; Sil. 13.894; Stat. Theb. 4.478, 5.753.⁷⁶ Nisbet convincingly argues against the idea that *medio die* might refer to making love during the siesta, as in poem 32 or Ov. Am. 1.5; but his own correction (*emerito die*), though grounded on attested use, creates a needless redundancy, coupled with an awkward temporal regression, after *uaga / nocte*.⁷⁷ I suggest editing *cum uaga / nocte quae*

75) Statius (1566) in Graevius (above n. 10) II, 207–208; Passerat (above n. 23) 16; Benoist (above n. 10) 527; Fordyce (above n. 35) 247.

76) S.J. Harrison, *Catullus* 61.109–13 (again), PCPhS 31, 1985, 11–12; Trappes-Lomax (above n. 10) 147; McKie (above n. 25) 243. See ThLL III, 718.59–66.

77) Nisbet (above n. 71) 99 = 85. See ThLL V, 2, 470.70–81.

medio die / candeat! For *cum* plus ablative with a comitative-temporal value, the prototypical expressions are *cum (...) luce*, *cum (...) die*, *cum (...) sole*, etc.⁷⁸ but similar collocations applying to the evening are found, e. g. 64.328–329 (*adueniet tibi iam portans optata maritis / Hesperus, adueniet fausto cum sidere coniunx*, where *adueniet* recalls *ueniunt*) and, with *nocte*, Aetna 235b (*sex cum nocte rapi, totidem cum luce referrī*); Apul. Met. 5.5 (*eo simul cum nocte dilapso*). Epithalamic discourse frequently associates, or mixes up, dusk with dawn; see vv. 84–86 and poem 62. This liberty allows substituting *candeat* for *gaudeat*; see 64.13 (*incanduit*, dubious), 64.14 (*candenti*, dubious), 64.45 (*candet*), 64.318 (*candentis*) and *candido* in the last line of the preceding stanza (v. 108). For *candeo* used in astronomical contexts, see e. g. Enn. Trag. 234 TRF [Ribbeck] = 98 TrRF; Lucr. 6.1197; Cic. Arat. Ph. 33.248, Pr. 2 [Soubiran]; Verg. A. 8.720; [Tib. = Pan. Mess.] 3.7.65; Germ. 203, 233; Man. 1.587, 1.703. Catullus' lines may have justified later poets in resorting to *candidus* in order to evoke happy nights or dreams: see Prop. 2.15.1 (already discussed above); Ov. Ep. 15.124; Mart. 8.45.5 and, in particular, Ov. Ep. 16.319–320 (*te mihi meque tibi communia gaudia iungant, / candidior medio nox erit illa die*), which might be an imitation of our passage. The bridegroom's unrealistic wish that night should shine in the middle of the day aptly characterizes his impatience. In such a context, *medius* combines a strictly referential meaning with the fictive notion that the day, by delaying the arrival of the night, acts as an opponent to the bridegroom; this provides *sed* with robust pragmatic relevance.⁷⁹ The corruption of this stanza only involved trivial mistakes.⁸⁰

78) ThLL IV, 1361.40–60.

79) On this use of *medius*, see ThLL VIII, 583.78–584.3, 591.53–64. For similar examples where *sed* introduces new perceptual contents that may defeat current beliefs or feelings, see Verg. A. 10.575–577; Prop. 2.29.7; Ov. Met. 15.653–655.

80) On the confusion between capital G and C, favored here by *gaudia*, see above, on v. 171; one finds *candeat* for *gaudeat* at Prop. 2.4.18 (S.J. Heyworth, *Sexti Properti Elegi*, Oxford 2007, xxii), and A. Riese envisaged correcting *gaudet* into *candet* at Anth. Lat. 477.6 [Petr.]. On the confusions between *quae*, *quam*, *quom/qum/cum* and *-que*, see Dominicy (above n. 53) on 29.4, 36.12, 107.1.

7. Verses 214–218

*sit suo similis patri
Manlio et facile insciis
noscitur ab omnibus,
et pudicitiam suae
matris indicet ore.*

215 insciens V

Unmetrical *omnibus* cannot be maintained in v. 216. As pointed out by West, Dawes's solution, which consists in simply transposing *insciis* and *omnibus*, "is not very felicitous; *insci[ī]s* is better in the predicative position, the desired emphasis being *ab omnibus, etiam insci[ī]s*, not *ab insci[ī]s, et quidem omnibus*".⁸¹ Pleitner's *insciis* / ... *ab obuiis*, adopted by Lee, and its variant *obuiis* / ... *ab insciis* (Thomson), sound intolerably prosaic.⁸² I suggest editing *omnibus* / ... *et insciis* (Fröhlich).⁸³ This correction may seem unjustified in that it introduces the only Catullan use of adverbial *et* between two occurrences of the conjunction.⁸⁴ But a comparable accumulation occurs at Tib. 1.2.71–74 (*ipse boues, mea, si tecum modo, Delia, possim / iungere et in solito pascere monte pecus, / et te dum liceat teneris retinere lacertis, / mollis et inculta sit mihi somnus humo*). The corruption of the passage stems from the fact that someone read *inscieis* as *insciens*, understood as 'without his knowing', that is 'in spite of the lack of any conscious attempt of his to mimic his father'; this interpretation (still adopted by Quinn⁸⁵) was emphasized by permuting the two cretic words ('easily in spite of ...'). Since *et omnibus* did not make sense anymore, *et* was replaced with *ab*.

Brussels

Marc Dominicy

81) Dawes (above n.5) 31–32; M.L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*, Stuttgart 1973, 137; Fedeli (above n. 10) 134–135 n. 3.

82) Pleitner (above n. 5) 4, 48–49; G. Lee, *The Poems of Catullus*, Oxford 1990, 68, 187; Thomson (above n. 2) 142, 362–363; Fedeli (above n. 10) 134 n. 3.

83) Fröhlich (above n. 10) 247.

84) McKie (above n. 25) 126.

85) Quinn (above n. 43) xxv, 41, 274.