

CRITICAL NOTES ON CATULLUS (POEMS 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 21, 22)

Abstract: The following emendations are proposed: *nam, ni turpe putes nihil tacere, / cur non tu latera ecfututa pandas / nec tu quid facias ineptiarum?* (6.12–14); *uocare* corrected to *admouere* (6.17); *fratresque unanimos sinumque matris* (9.4); *est grauis* is corrected to *ex seruitiis* (10.30); *utatur bene cum mihi pararim!* (10.32); *horribilisque uultus / osque Britanni* (11.11–12); *di(s)sertus* corrected to *haud expers* (12.9); *quod, si ut suspicor, hoc inane per te / munus dat mihi Sulla litterator* (14.8–9); *quare desine, dum licet, pudice, / ne finem faciam irrumatione* (21.12–13); *derecta plumbo et pagina omnis aequata* (22.8).

Keywords: Catullus, Poems 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 21, 22; textual criticism

In the following, I will propose new emendations for a set of passages in Catullus' poems 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 21 and 22. In each case, I will print the version I suggest adopting with a reduced apparatus that only records those manuscript readings, and those conjectures, that prove directly relevant to my hypothesis.¹ The ensuing discussion will summarize the state of the question. I will also try to show that the correction suggested conforms to the constraints of meter and language, and (in some cases at least) sheds some light on the symbolic or intertextual dimension of the poem at hand. In addition, I will provide an account of the corruption process that presumably operated, with the aim of establishing the palaeographical verisimilitude of my proposal.

1) For the sake of brevity, I will refer to the readings transmitted by *recensiores* or humanistic marginalia by means of the usual cover letter ζ and, when necessary, I will provide in my discussion the detailed information that can be found in the invaluable website *Catullus Online* <[http://www.catullusonline.org/Catullus Online/](http://www.catullusonline.org/CatullusOnline/)>, built up under the leadership of Dániel Kiss (henceforth “Kiss, CO”).

Poem 6

*Flavi, delicias tuas Catullo,
 ni sint inlepidae atque inelegantes,
 uelles dicere nec tacere posses.
 uerum nescioquid febriculosi
 scorti diligis: hoc pudet fateri. 5
 nam te non uiduas iacere noctes
 nequiquam tacitum cubile clamat
 sertis ac Syrio fragrans oliuo,
 puluinusque peraeque et hic et illic
 attritus, tremulique quassa lecti 10
 argutatio inambulatioque.
 nam, ni turpe putes nihil tacere,
 cur non tu latera ecfututa pandas
 nec tu quid facias ineptiarum?
 quare, quidquid habes boni malique, 15
 dic nobis: uolo te ac tuos amores
 ad caelum lepido admouere uersu.*

12 ni turpe putes *scripsi* : ni est turpe uolens *Statius* : inista preualet O :
 ni ista preualet GR || 13 tu *scripsi* (ς?) : tam OGR | ecfututa *Lachmann* :
 exfututa ς : et futura OGR | pandas ς : panda OGR || 17 admouere
scripsi : uocare OGR

In v. 12, the collocation *praeualet ... tacere* of the paradosis violates grammar; see, for later language, ThLL 10.2.1083.52–1084.33. Thomson prints Haupt's *nam nil stupra ualet, nihil, tacere*, an adaptation of Scaliger's unidiomatic *nam, ni stupra, ualet nihil tacere*.² The missegmentation *ni(l)stu praeualet* elegantly accounts for the corruption. But the negatively oriented term *stupra* proves inadequate in Haupt's version, since it cannot apply to sexual intercourse

2) See D. F. S. Thomson, *Catullus*. Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary, Toronto / Buffalo / London 21997, 103; M. Haupt, *Catullus. Tibullus. Propertius*, Leipzig 1853, 7; I. Scaliger, *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii nova editio*, Paris 1577, 4, *Castigationes in Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium*, Paris 1577, 9; J. H. Gaisser, *Catullus and His Renaissance Readers*, Oxford 1993, 376. K. M. Kokoszkiwicz, *Et futura panda* sive de Catulli carmine sexto corrigendo, *Hermes* 132, 2004, 125–128, at 126 erroneously writes that “Hauptius ... uocem *nam* praeposuit, ut metrum integrum esset”.

with a *scortum* and conveys an ethical blame that conflicts with the jocular tone of the poem.³ Goold prefers Skutsch's *nil perstare ualet, nihil tacere*, which improves on *nam nil stare ualet, nihil tacere* (Ellis);⁴ but *perstare* and *tacere* are mutually redundant, and the shift from *nil perstare ualet* to *nam inista / ni ista pr(a)eualeat* requires a complex palaeographical explanation. The second objection also holds for M^cKie's *nimirum ista nihil ualet tacere*.⁵

Editors and commentators interpret *cur* (v. 13) as a question (supposedly put by Flavius and echoed by the speaker) that receives, in the remaining text of vv. 13–14 with transmitted *nec* corrected to *ni* (A. Guarinus 1521; see Kiss, CO), a hypothetical answer where the subjunctive verbs have an potential value ('You ask why? You / It [*pandas / pandat*; see below] would not ... if you did not ...'); for similar examples, see e. g. 72.7–8, 85; Enn. var. 18 [Vahlen] = Cic. Tusc. 1.34; Versus populares 11b [FLP Courtney, 477]; CLE 932. Opting for *cum* = 'since' (Bondam, Riese *dubitanter*, Camps, Lee) only increases the syntactic complexity of the passage; symptomatically enough, Lee does not translate this connective.⁶

3) See M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis, *Il libro di Catullo Veronese*, Turin 1928, 15; W. Kroll, *C. Valerius Catullus*, Leipzig / Berlin ²1929, 14; P. J. Enk, review of R. A. B. Mynors, *Catulli Veronensis carmina*, Oxford 1958, *Mnemosyne* 14, 1961, 177–179; H. Fuchs, *Zu Catulls Gedicht an Flavius* (c.6), *MH* 25, 1968, 54–56; A. Allen, *Love Awry in Catullus*, *Maia* 34, 1982, 225–226; H. P. Syndikus, *Catull. Eine Interpretation. 1: Die kleinen Gedichte*, Darmstadt 1984, 97 n. 6; J. M. Trappes-Lomax, *Catullus: A Textual Reappraisal*, Swansea 2007, 47–48; D. S. M^cKie, *Essays on the Interpretation of Roman Poetry*, Cambridge 2009, 2–5; C. Deroux, *Le c. VI de Catulle ou: quand un poète promet la berne à un ami*, *Latomus* 76, 2017, 496–501. Trappes-Lomax deletes v. 12. Like *nam instans praua ualet nihil tacere*, proposed by P. Oksala, *Adnotationes criticae ad Catulli carmina*, Helsinki 1965, 16–17, Allen's conjecture (*nam in praua ista ualet nihil tacere*), not recorded in Kiss, CO, is no real improvement in this respect.

4) R. Ellis, *Catulli Veronensis liber*, Oxford 1867, 13 *olim*; O. Skutsch, *Zur Überlieferung und zum Text Catulls*, *Acta Philologica Aenipontana* 3, 1976, 68–69; G. P. Goold, *Catullus*, London 1983, 38, 227.

5) M^cKie (n. 3 above). In his review of M^cKie's book, *ExClass* 15, 2011, 257–271, at 260, D. Kiss writes that "*nimirum* 'of course' would be out of tone with the vigour with which Catullus is criticizing Flavius in this passage. *cur?* in the following line confirms that whatever once stood here, it was not obvious or uncontroversial"; but *nimirum* and *cur?* could reflect the respective viewpoints of the speaker and Flavius (see below).

6) P. Bondam, *Variarum lectionum libri duo*, Zutphen 1759, 130; A. Riese, *Die Gedichte des Catullus*, Leipzig 1884, 15; W. A. Camps, conjecture mentioned in: [A.] G. Lee, *The Poems of Catullus*, Oxford 1990, 6, 186.

In v. 13, the corruption of *ecfututa* to *et futura* led some scribe to read adjectival *panda* ('crooked'; see e. g. Vit. 2.9.12: *non minus est admirandum de cupresso et pinu, quod eae habentes umoris abundantiam aequamque ceterorum mixtionem, propter umoris satietatem in operibus solent esse pandae*) instead of a verb form generally assumed to be *pandas*. Kokoskiewicz⁷ prefers *pandat* (perhaps already envisaged by some humanist; see Kiss, CO), which he construes with the implicit grammatical subject *lectus*, itself contextually inferred from verses 7–11: due to the incessant to-and-fro motion of the lovers, the bed would now offer the sight of its broken or smashed side rungs. Kokoskiewicz claims that his hypothesis is supported both by the use of transitive *effutuisti* in the *uersus triumphales* quoted by Suet. Iul. 51 [FLP Courtney, 483] (*Vrbani, seruante uxores; moechum caluum adducimus. / aurum in Gallia effutuisti, hic sumpsisti mutuum*) and by the occurrence of *tu* in verse 14; but these arguments do not withstand closer scrutiny.

Whatever the precise reality *aurum ... effutuisti* refers to, Caesar did not break or smash the 'gold' in question; by virtue of the metaphor that assimilates money (spending) to semen (ejaculation) or conversely, he spread it, i. e. 'spilled' it 'out'.⁸ The sexual implications of *effutuisti* account for the coherence of the two lines: *caluum* modifying the abusive word *moechum* alludes to an erect phallus with a retracted foreskin; compare with Mart. 2.33 and Catullus' poem 53, where Licinius *Caluus* is described as a penis (*saluputum*).⁹ In addition, the metaphor at work underlies

7) Kokoskiewicz (n. 2 above).

8) See J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London 1982, 119 and Courtney, FLP, Oxford 2003, 483–484, who, relying on Suetonius' comment (*ne prouincialibus matrimoniiis quidem abstinuisse apparet iactato aequae a militibus per Gallicum triumphum*), interpret the collocation as 'exhaust, squander money ... scortando' or *futuendo effudisti*; but it could refer to Caesar's bribery of Gallic elites.

9) See C. Deroux, *De la calvitie de Domitien à la chevelure d'Alexandre: propositions sur Juvénal, Sat., IV, 37–38*, in: J.-M. Croisille (ed.), *Neronia IV*, Brussels 1990, 277–288, at 282–283; id., *A Fresh Look at the Joke in Catullus' Poem LIII*, in: C. Deroux (ed.), *SLLRH 13*, Brussels 2006, 77–86; id., *Petite histoire d'un mot coquin: saluputum, -ii*, in: E. Danblon et al. (eds), *Linguista sum*, Paris 2008, 133–146. Compare with the French expression 'le chauve au col roulé', 'the bald guy with a polo neck'. Licinius Calvus himself composed an epigram that assimilates Pompey's head to a glans: *Magnus, quem metuunt homines, digito caput uno / scalpit: quid credas hunc sibi uelle? uirum* [FLP Courtney, 210]; for this use of *caput*,

Danae's legend, where Jupiter sends down a shower of gold into the girl's lap; see e. g. Ter. Eu. 584–585 (*Iouem / quo pacto Danaae misisse aiunt quondam in gremium imbrem aureum*); Ov. Met. 4.611, 5.11–12, 6.111–113, 11.116–117; Aetna 90; [Sen.] Oct. 771–772; Tiberianus 3.7–8 [FLP Courtney, 437]; Drac. Romul. 2.22. As reconstructed by Dangel, Naev. Danae V [Ribbeck] (... *auri niueo fonte lauere me memini manum*), which probably inspired Ov. Met. 11.116–117 (*ille [Midas] etiam liquidis palmas ubi lauerat undis, / unda fluens palmis Danaen eludere posset*), evokes snow rather than rain for describing the abundance and whiteness of the god's semen.¹⁰ This variant of the metaphor explains why Horace used an obscene and abusive language when imitating or recalling verses of Furius Bibaculus' *Annales Belli Gallici* [FLP Courtney, 197]: compare Furius' *Iuppiter hibernas cana niue conspuet Alpes* with the two Horatian passages: *seu pingui tentus omaso / Furius hibernas cana niue conspuet Alpis* (S. 2.5.40–41), *turgidus*

see Adams (n. 8 above) 72; *magnus* recalls the obscene meaning of Greek μέγας / μέγιστος, see J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, New Haven / London 1975, 115–116. On the epigram and its intertextual link with Prop. 4.8.41–42, see C. Deroux, *Le poème CV de Catulle ou: De l'obscénité comme moyen d'expression littéraire*, Latomus 65, 2006, 612–627 and É. Coutelle, *Properce, Élégies, livre IV. Texte établi, traduit et commenté*, Brussels 2015, 839–840.

10) The correction of transmitted *iubeo* to *niueo* goes back to O. Ribbeck, *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik*, Leipzig 1875, 55, who eventually preferred *rubeo*. See J. Dangel, *Une métrique stylistique au service du texte perdu: Naevius et les fragments de Danaé*, in: ead. (ed.), *Le poète architecte. Arts métriques et art poétique latins*, Paris / Louvain / Sterling 2001, 157–184, at 160–161, 166–180; ead., *Membra disiecti poetae. Éditer les poètes républicains latins en fragments*, in: M. Dominicy / D. Gullentops (eds), *Genèse et constitution du texte* (= Degrés, n° 121–122), Brussels 2005, b1–b28, at b10–b13. See also M. Dominicy, *Properce et le mythe de Danaé*, Latomus 67, 2008, 102–113, on Prop. 3.13.51–54 and 4.1.81–82. According to W. Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity*, London³ 1953, 162, a Seventeenth-Century English poem of uncertain authorship (William Strode?; see A. Quiller-Couch [ed.], *The Oxford Book of English Verse 1250–1900*, Oxford 1924, 459) conveys an obscene allusion to Jupiter's phallus by strangely attributing to the god the 'tower' where Danae is shut up in the standard version of the legend (see e. g. Hor. Carm. 3.16.1; Ov. Am. 2.19.27, Ars 3.415–416): "I saw fair Chloris walk alone / When feather'd rain came softly down, / As Jove descending from his Tower / To court her in a silver shower: / The wanton snow flew to her breast", etc.; notice that, while "feathered rain" evokes Leda's swan, "silver shower" may refer to rain / snow or money. Fans of popular culture will also remember Johnny Burke's and Arthur Johnston's "Pennies From Heaven".

Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona dumque / diffingit Rheni luteum caput (S. 1.10.36–37), where *tentus* (80.6; Priap. 6.5, 20.6, 27.6, 33.2, 63.14, 68.16, 68.33, 73.2, 79.1; Mart. 6.71.3, 11.58.1, 11.60.3, 11.73.3) and *turgidus* (Lucr. 4.1034 [1047]; Mart. 9.27.12) allude to erection, *caput* to the glans (see note 9) and *conspuit* to ejaculation (compare with Petr. 23: *immundissimo me basio conspuit*), while both *pingui* and *luteum* sound abusive in such contexts.¹¹

Kokoskiewicz claims that the use of (supposedly unemphatic¹²) *tu* in v. 14 results from its contrast with the third-person grammatical subject of the preceding sentence (viz. implicit *lectus*). But the pronoun may occur immediately after predications with a coreferential second-person argument; see 15.9–11, 76.1–12, and the whole poem 23. In my view, the use of *tu* cannot be dissociated from the syntactic and semantic problem raised by *tam* (v. 13). In the examples where an adjective or participle is separated from *tam* by the noun it modifies (and possibly other material), *tam* and the adjective / participle prove indispensable to the completeness and contextual relevance of the construction: 7.7–10 (... *quam sidera multa, cum tacet nox, / furtiuos hominum uident amores, / tam te basia multa basiare / uesano satis et super Catullo est* → **quam sidera multa uident amores, te basia basiare satis et super Catullo est*); 60.3 (*tam mente dura procreauit ac taetra* → **mente procreauit*); Pl. As. 944–945 (*nec quisquam est tam ingenio duro nec tam firmo pectore / quin ubi quidque occasionis sit sibi faciat bene* → **nec quisquam est ingenio quin ...*); Pl. St. 295–296 (*tantum a portu adporto bonum, tam gaudium grande adfero, / uix ipsa domina hoc, nisi sciat, exoptare ab dis audeat* → **... gaudium adfero, uix ...*); Ter. Hec. 567–568 (*nam ut*

11) The two Horatian passages are echoed in Carm. 4.12.3–4: *nec fluuuī strepunt / hiberna niue turgidi*. On the sexual reading of S. 2.5.40–41, see H. White, Notes on Horace's Satires, *Veleia* 26, 2009, 331–337, at 335–336. P. Kruschwitz, Gallic War Songs: Furius Bibaculus' *Annales Belli Gallici*, *Philologus* 154, 2010, 285–305 argues against identifying Horace's 'Furius' or 'Alpinus' with Furius Bibaculus; this issue has no bearing on my point here. On *tentus* and *turgidus*, see Adams (n. 8 above) 21, 46, 103; A. Montañés, *Sexo*, in: R. Moreno Soldevila (ed.), *Diccionario de motivos amorios en la Literatura Latina (Siglos III a. C. – II d. C.)*, Huelva 2011, 383–392. On *luteus*, see Adams (n. 8 above) 79, 172, 240, 248.

12) Kroll (n. 3 above) 14; Thomson (n. 2 above) 233. For a more general approach, see J. N. Adams, *Nominative Personal Pronouns and Some Patterns of Speech in Republican and Augustan Poetry*, in: J. N. Adams / R. G. Mayer (eds), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, Oxford 1999, 97–133.

hic laturus hoc sit, si ipsam rem ut siet rescuerit, / non edepol clam me est, quom hoc quod leuiust tam animo irato tulit → *... quom hoc quod leuiust animo tulit); Lucil. 174–175 [Marx] (... *si nulla potest mulier tam corpore duro / esse* → **si nulla potest mulier corpore esse*); Cic. Cael. 16 (*numquam enim tam Caelius amens fuisset, ut, si se isto infinito ambitu commaculasset, ambitus alterum accusaret ...* → **numquam enim Caelius fuisset, ut ...*); Ciris 122–125 (*et roseus medio surgebat uertice crinis, / cuius quam seruata diu natura fuisset, / tam patriam incolumem Nisi regnumque futurum / concordēs stabili firmarunt numine Parcae* → **quam seruata diu natura fuisset, patriam Nisi regnumque futurum firmarunt Parcae*); Ov. Tr. 1.2.84 (*quodque sit a patria tam fuga tarda, queror* → **quodque sit a patria fuga, queror*). But here *latera pandas / pandat* alone makes perfect sense. I thus suggest replacing *tam* with *tu* (perhaps already envisaged by some humanist; see Kiss, CO); confusion between *tu* and *tum / tam* is easy (see e. g. Verg. Ecl. 4.53, 8.6, A. 2.589, 4.50, 10.445; Sil. 16.137). This correction makes it possible for the anaphora *tu ... pandas – tu ... facias* to contrast with vv. 6–11, where the third-person arguments *cubile* and *argutatio inambulatioque lecti* are foregrounded. In addition, such an analysis accounts for initial *nam* in v. 12, which the anaphoric repetition of *tu* allows interpreting as a marker of discourse transition, as in 68.33 ('As for you, ...').¹³ The parallelism between vv. 6 and 12 then subtly combines with a pragmatic difference between the two occurrences of the connective, which conveys its ordinary causal meaning in v. 6.

In line with what precedes, I opt for *nam, ni turpe putes nihil tacere, / cur non tu ... ineptiarum?* ('As for you, unless you thought it shameful not to remain silent about anything, why wouldn't you expose your fucked-out flanks and the follies you're indulging in?'), which simplifies the syntax and vindicates the manuscript reading *nec*; Statius already proposed *nam ni est turpe, uolens nihil tacere*.¹⁴ The parallelisms created by the repeated occurrence of (*-tu(-)*) or *-ut-* underline the speaker's focus on Flavius' bodily and

13) On 68.33, see M^cKie (n. 3 above) 220–223; C. Deroux, Quelques remarques grammaticales et autres sur le poème 68 de Catulle, in: M. Baratin et al. (eds), *Stylus: la parole dans ses formes. Mélanges en l'honneur du professeur Jacqueline Dangel*, Paris 2010, 95–110, at 104–107. Both provide additional references on this use of *nam*.

14) A. Statius, *Catullus cum commentario*, Venetiis 1566, 33–34.

mental states. For such a use of *puto* with predicative *turpe* and a subordinate infinitive, see Hor. Ep. 2.1.84–85; Ov. Am. 2.17.1, Ars 1.733–734; Sen. Ep. 81.32, 98.16; Juv. 6.390–391, 7.5–6. For *pando* taking as its object the juxtaposition or coordination of a noun phrase and an indirect interrogative clause, see e.g. Lucr. 1.55–57; Verg. G. 4.283–285 (*tempus et Arcadii memoranda inuenta magistri / pandere, quoque modo caesis iam saepe iuuencis / insincerus apes tulerit cruor*); Ov. Met. 4.680–681 (*pande requirenti nomen terraeque tuumque / et cur uincla geras*); Sen. Her. f. 647–649; Stat. Theb. 5.46–47; Anth. 719a.58–59 (*doceas iter et sacra ostia pandas, / quidue sequens tantos possim superare labores*). For *cur non ... nec*, see Hor. Ep. 1.1.70–72 (*quodsi me populus Romanus forte roget, cur / non ut porticibus sic iudiciis fruar isdem, / nec sequar aut fugiam quae diligit ipse uel odit*). For *cur non* with the present subjunctive in direct questions, see 115.3–6; Pl. Cas. 701, Mil. 317; Ov. Am. 1.8.25, Met. 4.430–431, Fast. 3.447–448; Mart. 7.87.9–10. For its rhetorical use in expressing directive or commissive speech acts (exhortations, promises, etc.) with the present subjunctive, see V. Fl. 7.280–281, 7.439; Stat. Ach. 1.949–950.¹⁵ For the position of the pronoun, see Pl. Cas. 701; Ov. Fast. 3.447–448 (*uis ea si uerbi est, cur non ego Veiovis aedem / aedem non magni suspicer esse Iouis?*); Stat. Ach. 1.949–950.

The corruption of v. 12 can be reconstructed as follows. First, *nisi* substituted for *ni*, and *putes* was confused with *potes(t)*.¹⁶ At a second stage, the missegmentation *nisi tu rpe* shifted to *in()ista / ni ista pr(a)e*.¹⁷ As in Tac. Hist. 5.8.2, where *praepotuer* should be corrected to *praepolluere* (Halm), analogy with *praepotens* and *praepotentia* accounts for scribal acceptance of the nonexistent verb form *pr(a)epotest*; meter allowed for it to be subsequently replaced

15) See, more generally, E. Kraggerud, *Vergiliana: Critical studies on the texts of Publius Vergilius Maro*, London / New York 2017, 23–25.

16) J. K. Newman, *Roman Catullus and the Modification of the Alexandrian Sensibility*, Hildesheim 1990, 280 suggested printing *nam nil ista potest, nihil, tacere*.

17) On metathesis involving *r* in the Catullan tradition, see M^cKie (n. 3 above) 17–18 n. 68 and below, on 10.32. More generally, A. E. Housman, *M. Manili Astronomicon. Liber primus*, London 1903, liv–lix, and J. Diggle / F. R. D. Good-year (eds), *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman*, Cambridge 1972, 50–51, 108, 147–148, 150, 158–160, 167, 170, 382, 435, 441, 711–712, 911; J. Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism*, Urbana / Chicago / London 1972, 81–84.

with its idiomatic synonym *pr(a)eualeat*. For alternations between *ni* and *nisi* in manuscripts, see Verg. A. 5.49, 11.112; Aetna 128; Man. 1.173; Maur. 933; Anth. 481.282. For confusions between *puto* and *pot-* forms of *possum*, see ThLL 10.2.2760.20–22; Mart. 5.50.3; Anth. 132.6. For alternations between *ualeo* / *uolo* and *possum*, see Mart. 5.50.3; Maxim. Eleg. 1.124, 3.24.

Deroux has put forth the attractive hypothesis that v. 17 might ironically allude to blanketing, i. e. tossing someone in the air on a blanket (French ‘berner’ = ‘donner la berne à quelqu’un’, German ‘prellen’, Spanish ‘mantear’, etc.).¹⁸ This leads us to suspect not only the transmitted reading *uocare*, but also M^cKie’s *sonare* and Watt’s *uolare*, since we then expect the infinitive to refer both to an upward-oriented movement and to an act of the speaker. Notice that *uocare* and *sonare* should be dismissed on independent grounds: “Catullus cannot ‘call’ anybody to the sky unless he is already there himself” (Nisbet); “there are no parallels for *sonare aliquem in* [or *ad M. D.*] *aliquem locum*” (Kiss).¹⁹ At first sight, Nisbet’s *leuare* (adopted by Syndikus and Trappes-Lomax) fares better. But its use with *ad* / *in caelum* or equivalent expressions only occurs in later (Christian) language: see ThLL 7.2.1233.72–1235.13 and e. g. Tert. Patient. 13 (*continentia carnis ... uoluntarium spadonem ad regna caeli leuat*); Hier. In Os. 1.1.5 (*cur Socratem ad caelum leuent*). Examples like V. Max. 3.1.2 (*tunc Poppedius in excelsam aedium partem leuatum* [Catonem] *abiecturum inde se, nisi precibus obtemperaret, minatus est*), Sen. Ag. 716 (*nunc leuat* [Cassandra] *in auras*

18) Deroux (n. 3 above).

19) M^cKie (n. 3 above) 5; W. S. Watt, Notes on Catullus, ZPE 131, 2000, 65–68; R. G. M. Nisbet, Notes on the Text of Catullus, PCPhS n. s. 24, 1978, 92–115 (reprinted in: S. J. Harrison [ed.], Collected Papers on Latin Literature, Oxford 1995, 76–100), at 77–78; Syndikus (n. 3 above) 99 n. 19; Trappes-Lomax (n. 3 above) 48; Kiss (n. 5 above) 263. In his review of Trappes-Lomax’s book, BMCRev 2008.09.32, S. J. Heyworth claims that Nisbet’s “statement about the use of *uocare* is simply not true: cf. Mucianus speaking to Vespasian at Tacitus, Hist. 2.76.2 *ego te, Vespasiane, ad imperium uoco*. According to Nisbet’s rule, only an emperor could say this”; but Tacitus describes Licinius Mucianus as *comitate adrogantia ... mixtus* (Hist. 1.10.2) and there is no reason for the speaker to adopt such an attitude here. The Ciceronian passages quoted by B. Krostenko, Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance, Chicago 2001, 250–251 to defend *uocare* are irrelevant because they never attribute the act of ‘calling’ to the speaker (e. g. Att. 2.19.4: *id erat uocari in locum mortui*) and sometimes conform to ‘Nisbet’s rule’ (Att. 3.7.2: *me ad uitam uocas*).

altior solito caput), Ep. 15.4 (*saltus uel ille qui corpus in altum leuat uel ille qui in longum mittit*), or Stat. Theb. 10.916–917 (*uictam supera ad conuexa leuari / Inarimen Aetnamue putes*), are different in that they either involve a self-moving agent (Cassandra or the jumper in Seneca) or do not imply any spatial separation between the moved object and the physical entity it is in contact with at the initial point of the movement (Poppedius in Valerius Maximus, the earth’s surface in Statius). I thus prefer *admouere*, whose collocation with an *ad/in*-complement or a directional dative is well-attested (in Catullus, 14b.2–3: *manusque uestras / non horrebitis admouere nobis*). For similar passages, see Ov. Ep. 11.19–20 (*quid iuuat admotam per auorum nomina caelo / inter cognatos posse referre Iouem?*); Curt. 6.9.22 (*patrem in idem fastigium, in quo me ipsi posuistis, admouei*); Sil. 8.293–294 (*sed genus admotum superis summumque per altos / attingebat auos caelum*). The fact that *admoueo* is frequently used “de promotione hominum ad dignitates, magistratus, familiaritatem potentium” (ThLL 1.0.774.83–775.17) increases the irony of the poem’s conclusion, while the parallelisms *t(e) ac... -d(o) ad-* (at the same position), *ad... ad-* and *-ue-... ue-* (under word stress and ictus) contribute to its verbal sophistication. The corruption to *uocare* probably involved the following steps: loss of the prefix, made metrically possible by the elision; confusion between palaeographically close *mouere* and *uouere* under the influence of 36.10 (*iocose lepide uouere diuis*), with *lepido... uersu* interpreted as a dative; replacement of *uouere* with the palaeographically close *uocare* by a copyist who understood that *lepido... uersu* is an ablative.

Poem 9, vv. 3–4

*uenistine domum ad tuos penates
fratresque unanimos sinumque matris?*

4 unanimos ζ : uno animo OGR | sinumque *scripsi* : sanamque O :
suamque GR : al. sanam G^1R^2 | matris *scripsi* : matrem OGR

The readings *tuamque* (ζ) – which eliminates a trivial solecism (‘your brothers and their mother’) –, *senemque* (Avancius 1495²⁰)

20) See J. G. Graevius (ed.), *Catullus Tibullus et Propertius*, Utrecht 1680, 2.622.

and *anumque* (Faernus²¹) provide plausible inputs for the corruption process (the loss of *-s* in *unanimos* stemming either from haplography before *suamque*, *sanamque* or *senemque*, or from missegmentation if followed by *anumque*). Yet, such solutions make the ternary enumeration conclude with an awkwardly flaccid or irrelevant term. Trappes-Lomax recommends Hoeffft's and Palmer's *bonam*, which can have yielded *suonam* due, again, to missegmentation and to the usual confusion between *b* and *u*.²² But I think it preferable to print *fratresque unanimos sinumque matris*. For *sinus* in Catullus, see 2.2, 37.11, 44.14, 55.11, 61.53, 63.43;²³ for examples of the collocation *sinus matris* designating the maternal womb or bosom, see Cic. Clu. 186; Ov. Met. 4.516, 13.450; Col. 10.206. Statius most probably imitated the Catullan line at Theb. 4.88–89 (Polynices is yearning for his kingdom, his mother's embrace, and his faithful sisters): *iam regnum matrisque sinus fidasque sorores / spe uotisque tenet*.²⁴ In both passages, the text progresses from the public to the intimate space with, as an intermediate step in Catullus, the vivid tableau of the brothers affectively joined together when greeting Veranius; for similar uses of *unanimus*, see 30.1 and 66.80.²⁵ For the corruption of *sinum*, see *sonos* for *sinus* or *suos* at Sen. Tro. 172 and Laus Pis. 189; *suos* for *sinus* at Prop. 4.3.34;²⁶ *suus* / *sinus* for *suos* at Epic. Drusi 134; *siuos* for *suos* at Avien. Orb. terr. 559. *Matris* was replaced with *matrem* for repairing grammar.

21) See Statius (n. 14 above) 40.

22) J. H. Hoeffft, *Pericula critica, ab auctore recognita*, Breda 1807–1808, 5–6; A. Palmer, *Catulliana*, CR 5, 1891, 7–8; Trappes-Lomax (n. 3 above) 52; see e. g. *conturbauimus* for *conturbabimus* at 5.11, *uerum uera* from *ueruera* for *uerbera* at 63.81.

23) On 55.11 and 61.53, see M. Dominicy, *Catulliana*, CQ n.s. 65, 2015, 628–654, at 646–647.

24) See J. J. L. Smolenaars, Statius, *Thebaide* 1.72: Is Jocasta dead or alive? The tradition of Jocasta's suicide in Greek and Roman drama and in Statius' *Thebaid*, in: J. J. L. Smolenaars / H.-J. van Dam / R. R. Nauta (eds), *The Poetry of Statius*, Leiden / Boston 2008, 215–237, at 236.

25) See R. Strati, *Itinerari di parole: unanimus*, in: P. Mantovanelli / F. Romana Berno (eds), *Le parole della passione. Studi sul lessico poetico latino*, Bologna 2011, 209–242.

26) See M. Dominicy, *Notes critiques sur l'élégie 4, 3 de Propertius*, MH 72, 2015, 34–48, at 39–44.

Poem 10, vv. 14–34

'at certe tamen' inquiunt 'quod illic
natum dicitur esse, comparasti 15
ad lecticam homines.' ego ut puellae
unum me facerem beatiorem,
'non' inquam 'mihi tam fuit maligne,
ut, prouincia quod mala incidisset,
non possem octo homines parare rectos.' 20
at mi nullus erat nec hic neque illic,
fractum qui ueteris pedem grabati
in collo sibi collocare posset.
hic illa, ut decuit cinaediorem,
'quaeso' inquit mihi 'mi Catulle, paulum 25
da mi commoda: nam uolo ad Serapim
deferri.' 'mane tu' inquit puellae²⁷
'istud quod modo dixeram me habere –
fugit me ratio – meus sodalis,
Cinna, ex seruitiis sibi parauit. 30
uerum utrum illius an mei, quid ad me?
utatur bene cum mihi pararim!
sed tu insulsa male et molesta uiuis,
per quam non licet esse negligentem.'

26 da mi *Dominicy* : istos OGR || 27 mane tu *Dominicy* : mane OGR ||
 30 ex seruitiis *scripsi* : est grauis is OGR || 32 utatur *scripsi* : utor tam
 OGR | cum *scripsi* : quam OGR

In v. 30, *Caius* / *Gaius* for transmitted *grauis* is a unanimously printed conjecture of Puteolanus's *Editio Parmensis* (1473).²⁸ The word order *Cinna* [cognomen] *est Gaius* [praenomen] clearly violates common usage: none of the examples Friedrich quotes for illustrating such an inversion of the two names contains the copula.²⁹

27) For the text and punctuation of vv. 25–27, see *Dominicy* (n. 23 above) 630–633.

28) See Kiss, CO; Gaisser (n. 2 above) 34, 293; G. G. Biondi, *Catullus, Sa-bellico (& Co.) and ... Giorgio Pasquali*, in: D. Kiss (ed.), *What Catullus Wrote: Problems in Textual Criticism, Editing and the Manuscript Tradition*, Swansea 2015, 29–52, at 31–32.

29) G. Friedrich, *Catulli Veronensis liber*, Leipzig / Berlin 1908, 126.

Editors and commentators tend to assume that this deviation, the use of the resumptive pronoun *is* and, more generally, the haphazard syntax of vv. 28–30 in their vulgate version reflect the speaker's embarrassment.³⁰ According to Palmer, "the joke of this passage is that Catullus excuses his slip of memory by the fact that his friend Cinna had the same praenomen as himself. 'It's not Gaius *Catullus* I meant: it's Gaius *Cinna*'". Relying on the same hypothesis, Housman introduced the innovative punctuation *sodalis (Cinna est Gaius is) sibi ...* ('and that Gaius is Cinna'). Butterfield recently defended Housman's (and thus Palmer's) way out in the following terms: "the point [is] that Gaius Helvius Cinna, not Gaius Valerius Catullus, is being referred to. It may be that Catullus, in his attempt to explain himself, regards the shared *praenomen* as a possible source of his confusion; or it may be an irrelevant fact characteristic of his stammering response."³¹ Like Goold, I think this is a "fanciful explanation".³² As far as I can see, *is* never appears in clause-final position,³³ and one may wonder how the girl might happen to know

30) Lenchantin de Gubernatis (n. 3 above) 25; Kroll (n. 3 above) 23; K. Quinn, *Catullus: The Poems*, London 1970, 124; C. J. Fordyce, *Catullus: A Commentary*, Oxford 1973, 122–123; Syndikus (n. 3 above) 120; Thomson (n. 2 above) 234; H. D. Jocelyn, 'The Arrangement and the Language of Catullus' So-Called *Polymetra* with Special Reference to the Sequence 10–11–12, in: Adams / Mayer (n. 12 above) 335–375, at 366.

31) Palmer (n. 22 above); A. E. Housman, *Emendations in the Fifth Book of Manilius*, *The Journal of Philology* 27/54, 1901, 162–165, reprinted in: *The Classical Papers* (n. 17 above) 548–550, at 549; M. Manilii *Astronomicon. Liber quintus*, London 1930, 59; D. Butterfield *Cui Videberis Bella: The Influence of Baehrens and Housman on the Text of Catullus*, in: Kiss (n. 28 above) 107–128, at 120–121.

32) G. P. Goold, *A New Text of Catullus*, Phoenix 12, 1958, 93–116, at 104.

33) See J. Marouzeau, *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine. 1: Les groupes nominaux*, Paris 1922, 149–155. At Man. 5.450–451, Housman's correction (n. 31 above) [1972] 549, [1930] 59: *facit ora seuerae / frontis (is) ac uultus componit pondere mentis*, though accepted by recent editors, strains the syntax: *facit* cannot take *ora* as its direct object in the absence of a predicatively used adjective; see Prop. 2.30.18 (*turpia cum faceret Palladis ora tumor*); Ov. Am. 3.12.26 (*tria uipereo fecimus ora cani*), Ep. 5.142 (*oraeque sunt digitis aspera facta meis*), Met. 8.544–546 (*nobiles Alcmenaenatis in corpore pennis / adleuat et longas per brachia porrigit alas / corneaque ora facit uersasque per aera mittit*); Man. 1.715 (*resupina facit mortalibus ora*); Juv. 15.135–137 (*pupillum ad iura uocantem / circumscriptorem, cuius manantia fletu / ora puellares faciunt incerta capilli*). I suggest printing *facit ora seuera / frontemque ac uultus componit pondere mentis*. As pointed out by S. J. Harrison, *Discordia Taetra: The History of a Hexameter-Ending*, CQ n. s. 41, 1991, 138–149, at 144, Manilius does

that Catullus and Cinna share the same *praenomen*, and why this could induce her to mistake one for the other in such a clear discourse interaction, which does not contain any previous occurrence of the allegedly problematic *praenomen*. Furthermore, Deroux has shown that no indisputable evidence supports the hypothesis that Cinna's *praenomen* was *Caius* / *Gaius*;³⁴ he consequently feels justified in keeping the paradosis, with a hiatus between *Cinna* and *est* that would be made acceptable by the parenthetical status of *est grauis* ('He weighs a lot!'). But, given the prosody of *Cinna* (see 113.1), his approach conflicts with the systematic avoidance of a trochaic base in the phalaeians appearing between poems 2 and 26 (both included).³⁵

In my view, a more radical change is needed. I suggest *Cinna ex seruitiis sibi parauit*; in Catullus, *ex* occurs before *s-* at 17.18 (*ex sua*) while there is no comparable example with *e*. Plural neuter *seruitia* with a collective value was a common term when Catullus was writing (see, for instance, Cic. Catil. 4.4, 4.13; Sal. Cat. 24.4, 44.6). The construction *e(x) seruitiis* / *seruitio* occurs at Liv. 22.57.11 (*octo milia iuuenum ualidorum ex seruitiis*), Tac. Ann. 1.23.1 (*gladiatores qui e seruitio Blaesi erant*) and 3.43.2 (*e seruitiis gladiaturae destinati*). When alluding to the fact that Caesar paid a lot of money for

not avoid locating, after the hephthemimeral caesura or the bucolic diaeresis, a noun followed by an adjective or participle when both forms end with a short *-a*, even with an attributively used adjective or participle, which is not the case here; see also Var. Men. 123 (*tertia Poenarum / Infamia stans nixa in uulgi / pectore, flutanti intonsa coma, / sordida uestitu, ore seuro*). For *-que ac / atque*, see Man. 3.26–28 (*facile est uentis dare uela secundis / fecundumque solum uarias agitare per artes / auroque atque ebori decus addere*), 5.308–309 (*uicit natura periculum / et pariter iuuenem somnoque ac morte leuauit*). Housman finds support in Cic. Orat. 100 (*sed inuentus profecto est ille eloquens quem nunquam uidit Antonius. quis est igitur is? complectar breui, disseram pluribus*), which I am inclined to think corrupt; compare with Phil. 11.26 (*expedito nobis homine et parato, patres conscripti, opus est et eo qui imperium legitimum habeat, qui praeterea auctoritatem, nomen, exercitum, perspectum animum in re publica liberanda. quis igitur is est? aut M. Brutus aut C. Cassius aut uterque*).

34) C. Deroux, C. Helvius Cinna et ses huit porteurs bithyniens (Catulle 10, 29–30: *grauis* et non *Gaius*), Latomus 59, 2000, 850–857; Le *praenomen* du poète (et tribun de la plèbe?) Helvius Cinna: Catulle X, 29–30 et Valère Maxime IX, 9, 1, Latomus 61, 2002, 971–972. See also T. P. Wiseman, Cinna the Poet and Other Roman Essays, Leicester 1974, 46.

35) See O. Skutsch, Metrical Variations and Some Textual Problems in Catullus, BICS 16, 1969, 38–43.

acquiring slaves that would bear his litter, Suetonius, Iul. 47 (*comparasse ... seruitia rectora politioraque inmenso pretio*) most probably took his inspiration in our poem: see vv. 15 (*comparasti*), 20 (*parare rectos*), 30 (*ex seruitiis ... parauit*), 32 (*pararim*). By eliminating *est* and the resumptive pronoun *is*, my correction makes it possible for *istud* and its relative clause (v. 28) to depend on *parauit* without any interruption other than the parenthetical justification *fugit me ratio*.

The corruption process probably started with the missegmentation *ex seruiti is*. Confusions between *e(x)*, *es(t)* and *et* abound in manuscripts.³⁶ As for *seruiti*, it was first read as contextually meaningful, but unmetrical, *seruis*, and subsequently corrected to metrical, but contextually meaningless, *serius* which was replaced with its unmetrical and ambiguous synonym *grauis*; this substitution stemmed either from wordplay or, more plausibly, from the fact that the corruption to *serius* was supposed to have been triggered by a previous misinterpretation of *grauis*.

Editors and commentators generally consider *quam* (v. 32) equivalent to *quam si*, but no credible parallel justifies this claim.³⁷ Instead of postulating an interpolated line with Trappes-Lomax, I suggest printing *utatur bene cum mihi pararim!* ('I hope he [Cinna] will use [my litter-bearers] without further ado when I will have bought ones for me!'). Manuscripts exhibit constant confusions between *cum*, written *quom*, and *quam*;³⁸ owing to metathesis involving *r* (see above, on 6.12) and the confusion between *u* and *a*, *utatur* may have shifted to *utarta*, normalized as *utor tam* under the influence of *quam mihi pararim* (see also 3.7: *ipsam tam bene quam puella matrem*).

Poem 11, vv. 9–12

sive trans altas gradietur Alpes,
Caesaris uisens monimenta magni, 10
Gallicum Rhenum horribilisque uultus
osque Britanni

11–12 horribilisque uultus / osque scripsi : horribilesque uli-/mosque
 OGR

36) Dominicy (n. 23 above) 640 n. 59.

37) Trappes-Lomax (n. 3 above) 57–58.

38) Dominicy (n. 23 above) 638 n. 39.

Vv. 11–12 exhibit a hiatus (*horribilesque*^H *ultimos*) followed by the split of a word (*ulti-/mosque*) between the third hendecasyllable and the adonean. Benediktson³⁹ claims that the hiatus can be justified by parallel examples in Sappho (31.9: ἀλλὰ καὶ μὲν γλῶσσοσ^H ἔαγε, λέπτον) and Gallus (*fata mihi, Caesar, tum^H erunt mea dulcia, quom tu*). But Sappho's hiatus, if not corrupt (as assumed by many scholars), can imitate epic diction (Hes. Op. 534: οὐ τ' ἐπὶ νῶτασ^H ἔαγε (< *fēfāye*), κάρη δ' εἰς οὐδας ὀρᾶται)⁴⁰ and, in Gallus' (metrically archaic) line, *tūm erunt* is a 'prosodic hiatus', with a heavy ('long') monosyllable 'shortened' before an iambic or iambically-beginning word (see, in Catullus, 97.1: *ita me dī ament*).⁴¹ In Sappho, almost all word splits between the hendecasyllable and the adonean are immediately accounted for by 'forward dovetailing', which transfers the word-break after the first vowel (or whole syllable) of the second colon, provided this syllable is heavy ('long'): ὠράνω(α)ἴθε-/ρος (1.11–12); θυμαίμε-/νοι (2.3–4); ὄτ-/τω (16.3–4); νύμ-/φας (30.4–5); φωνεῖ-/σας (31.3–4); Λύδι-/ον (39.2–3).⁴² In the only exception (ἐπιρρόμ-/βεισι, 31.11–12), ἔπι can be separated from its verb (ἐπὶ ρόμ-/βεισι), another imitation of epic diction (with gemination of word-initial ρ) that produces backward dovetailing, that is the transfer of the word-break before the last syllable (or vowel) of the first colon, provided this syllable is heavy ('long').⁴³ This analysis is supported by the fact that, in Horace, word splits between the hendecasyllable and the adonean

39) D. T. Benediktson, *Horribilesque ultimosque Britannos*, *Glotta* 68, 1990, 120–123.

40) See E.-M. Hamm (Voigt), *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*, Berlin ²1958, 23, 38, 146–147, 161, *Sappho et Alcaeus*, Amsterdam 1971, 57–60; P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique. Tome I: Phonétique et morphologie*, Paris ⁵1973, 18, 72, 104, 126, 480; F. Bellandi, *Lepos e Pathos. Studi su Catullo*, Bologna 2007, 212–213.

41) See Dominicy (n. 23 above) 632.

42) On (forward and backward) dovetailing, see P. Maas, *Greek Metre*. Translated by H. Lloyd-Jones, Oxford 1962, 44–45; G. Nagy, *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter*, Cambridge, Mass. 1974, 279–302; L. Lomiento, *Considerazioni sul valore della cesura nei versi "kata stichon" e nei versi lirici della poesia greca arcaica e classica*, in: F. Spaltenstein et al. (eds), *Autour de la césure*, Bern, etc. 2004, 31–45.

43) P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique. Tome II: Syntaxe*, Paris 1963, 82–86. Notice that this approach rules out Bergk's ἐπιρρό-/μεισι = ἐπὶ βρό-/μεισι, adopted by Hamm (Voigt) (n. 40 above) [1958] 19, 140–141, [1971] 57–60; see Bellandi (n. 40 above) 213–214.

involve either backward dovetailing (Carm. 1.2.19–20: *u-/xorius*; 2.16.7–8: *ue-/nale*) or word division after the first element of a morphological compound (Carm. 1.25.11–12: *inter-/lunia*). None of the solutions available apply to *ulti-/mosque*, in particular because the enclitic cannot be separated from its host word.⁴⁴

The coordination of *ultimos* and the descriptive epithet *horribiles* has no parallel; in all comparable examples, the first conjunct conveys a scalar meaning compatible with that of *ultimus*: Liv. 1.28.11 (*primum ultimumque ... supplicium*); Cels. 2.10.52 (*primam ultimamque aetatem*); [Quint.] Decl. 18.11 (*nouissimis ultimisque*); Just. Epit. 24.2.7 (*inauditis ultimisque execrationibus*). The same objection holds for *horribiles uitro ultimosque Britannos* (Della Corte, M^cKie, Lee), where *-que* cannot connect *Britannos* to *Rhenum* (see Lee's translation: "The Gallic Rhine, those horrible woad-painted / And world's-end Britons");⁴⁵ indeed, this would create an unacceptable asyndeton of two epithets,⁴⁶ and coordinating *-que* is always enclitic to the first word of its phrase or clause in Catullus.⁴⁷ Haupt's *horribile aequor ultimosque Britannos*, adopted by Mynors, Thomson and Kiss, produces a more plausible coordination between two noun phrases, but it too fails to eliminate *ulti-/mosque*.⁴⁸

44) A. M. Devine / L. D. Stephens, *The Prosody of Greek Speech*, New York / Oxford 1994, 352–368.

45) F. Della Corte, *Catullo. Le poesie*, Milan 1977, 22, 246; D. S. M^cKie, *The Horrible and Ultimate Britons: Catullus 11.11*, PCPhS n.s. 30, 1984, 74–78; Lee (n. 6 above) 13, 186.

46) On the prohibition of such asyndeta, see D. G. White, *Ovid, Heroides* 16.45–46, HSPH 74, 1970, 187–191.

47) At 57.2 (*Mamurrae pathicoque Caesarique*), the first occurrence of *-que* does not connect its phrase to any preceding conjunct; at 63.73 (*iam iam dolet quod egi, iam iamque paenitet*), *iam iam* is a lexicalized reduplication; at 76.11, the vulgate text (*quin tu animo offirmas atque istinc teque reducis*) should be corrected to *quin tu animo offirmas teque istinc ipse reducis*; see Trappes-Lomax (n. 3 above) 251–252; M^cKie (n. 3 above) 166–168; Dominicy (n. 23 above) 644 n. 82.

48) M. Haupt, *Observationes criticae*, Leipzig 1841, 25–32; Mynors (n. 3 above) 9; Thomson (n. 2 above) 106; Kiss, CO. According to R. Ellis, *A Commentary on Catullus*, Oxford 21889, 42, "*aequor* is not strong enough for *horribile*". R. G. C. Levens, *Catullus*, in: M. Platnauer (ed.), *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship*, Oxford 1954, 284–305, at 304 n. 47 deems Haupt's version "oxymoronic". For Quinn (n. 30 above) 128, it "gives lame sense"; same verdict in: id., *Catullus: An Interpretation*, New York 1973, 162: "it shows acuteness, but no sense". See, however, 64.179 (*truculentum ... aequor*) and 64.205–206 (*horrida ... aequora*).

The only conjectures that avoid the hiatus, the splitting, and the syntactic oddity, are due to Froehlich (*horribilesque Celtas / atque Britannos*), Palmer (*horribilesque uitro / uisu / uultu in / usque Britannos* or *horribilesque uitri / more Britannos*), Maehly (*horribiles in ultimo / orbe Britannos*) and Trappes-Lomax (*Gallias et horribiles Britannos, / ultima rerum*).⁴⁹

In Froehlich's text, the coordination of two nouns that share the same epithet (*Britannos* cannot stand alone) proves all the more clumsy since *atque* appears in verse-initial position.

Palmer's *in / usque* is definitely implausible⁵⁰ and his *uitri more* cannot refer to the Britons' body paintings (compare with Isid. Orig. 16.4.37: *specularis lapis uocatus est quod uitri more transluceat*).

Maehly's *ultimo / orbe* is metrically objectionable. In the Catullan corpus, most elisions of cretic words involve a nasal vowel (a graphic *-m*); see 64.211, 64.359, 64.366, 66.27, 67.31, 68.3, 68.4, 68.90, 73.6, 90.2, 91.9;⁵¹ the same regularity holds for elisions between the hendecasyllable and the adonean: see 11.19–20 (*omnium / ilia*) and Hor. Carm. 3.27.10–11 (*imminentium / oscinem*, where there is no reason for admitting the hiatus *imminentium^H / oscinem*). Except for 97.6 (*ploxeni habet*), which features a very rare lexeme (ThLL 10.1.2447.8–20), comparable examples with oral vowels expectedly involve words ending in *-ō* (85.2: *sentio et*; 91.2: *perdito amore*) or *-ē* (45.3: *perdite amo*; 104.3: *perdite amarem*).⁵²

49) J. von Gott Froehlich, review of K. Lachmann, *Q. Catulli Veronensis Liber*, Berlin 1829, *Abhandlungen der I. Classe der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in München* 5, 1849, 233–275, at 238; A. Palmer, review of R. Ellis, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, Oxford ²1878, *Hermathena* 3, 1879, 293–363, at 315–316, and *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, London 1896, xxix, 7; J. Maehly, *Zu Catullus*, *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 103, 1871, 341–357, at 344; Trappes-Lomax (n. 3 above) 60–61.

50) At 116.4, *mittere in usque caput* (ζ : *mitteremusque* OGR) is a dubious reading; the first attestations of *in usque* occur at Stat. Theb. 1.440 (poetry) and Aur. Vict. Caes. 33.3 (prose).

51) At 66.43, *maximum in oris* (Puccius) is a correction of transmitted *maxima in oris*, but there are good reasons for adopting a quite different text; see M. Dominicy, *Critical Notes on The Lock of Berenice* (Callimachus 110 Pf., Catul- lue 66), *Paideia* 78, 2018, 1563–1587, at 1571–1573.

52) See J. Soubiran, *L'Élision dans la poésie latine*, Paris 1966, 207–222; Dominicy (n. 23 above) 631, *Critical Notes on Catullus' Epigrams* (Poems 74, 84, 95, 100, 115), *ExClass* 23, 2019, 37–64, at 42.

Moreover, since *sentio* most probably had its last vowel shortened like *nesciō* in the same verse (*nesciō, sed fieri sentiō et excrucior*), the examples with an oral vowel are three variations of the same stereotypic formula; compare with *Polliō amat* at Verg. Ecl. 3.84, 3.88.⁵³ At both 6.11 (*argutatio inambulatioque*, a highly anomalous line) and 39.17 (*Celtiberia in terra*), a word with the prosodic template – ∪ – ∪ – (thus with a cretic ending) elides before monosyllabic *in(-)*.⁵⁴ None of these examples contain, like Maehly's text, an elision between vowels that only differ in length.

Trappes-Lomax's reconstruction creates another metrical problem, by eliminating any conceivable caesura in the sapphic line. His argument numbered (10), according to which "[t]he rhythm is precisely that of *seu Sa[g]as sagittiferosue Parthos*" (v. 6), does not withstand closer scrutiny. Vv. 6, 7 and 23 exhibit a standard feminine (v. 6: *sagitti-ferosue*; v. 23: *praeter-eunte*) or masculine (v. 7: *septem-geminus*) caesura after the first element of a compound;⁵⁵ notice the similar treatment of *Sagittifer* at Anth. 623.5 (*Scorpius atque Sagittifer aequoreique Capri frons*) and *Sagittari* at Man. 1.691 (*extremamque Sagittari laeuam atque Sagittam*) and the wordplay at Ov. Met. 1.468 (*eque sagittifera prompsit duo tela pharetra*) that etymologically motivates *pharetra* through the morphological division of *sagittifera*.⁵⁶ As for the paradosis of v. 11, it contains what French metrist Jean Soubiran calls a "césure avant élision faite", that is a metrical prodelision that can be analyzed (not phonetically, but

53) Recall that *amo(r)* and related words (like *amicus* or *amarus*) also favor 'prosodic hiatus', as in *ita me dī ament* (97.1, see above), *quī amant* (Verg. Ecl. 8.108), *mē amas* (Hor. S. 1.9.38), *nomen et arma locum seruant; tē, amice, nequīui* (Verg. A. 6.507), *at contra quāe amara atque aspera cumque uidentur* (Lucr. 2.404); see Dominicy (n. 23 above) 643–644.

54) On the use of monosyllabic prefixes in such metrical configurations, see Dominicy (n. 23 above) 650. Notice that both Soubiran and Dominicy overlooked 39.17; see again n. 52.

55) See F. A. Todd, *Passages of Catullus, Martial, and Plautus*, CR 55, 1941, 70–74, and above, on Sapph. 31.11–12 and Hor. Carm. 1.25.11–12.

56) On Man. 1.191, see M. Dominicy, *Propertius*, 4.5.19–21, RhM 153, 2010, 144–187, at 152–153. On Ovid's wordplay, see R. Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Leeds 1991, 470; J. J. O'Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, Ann Arbor 1996, 124–125; A. Michalopoulos, *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Commented Lexicon*, Leeds 2001, 144–145.

schematically) as the erasure of the second vowel in contact (*Rhenum horri-* → *Rhenum + Ørri-*).⁵⁷ Compare with Cic. Tusc. 2.8.20 = 34.10 [Blänsdorf]: *sic corpus clade horribili absumptum extabuit* (ia⁶), where one may waver between a penthemimeral caesura produced by prodelision (*clade + Ørri-*) or a hephthemimeral caesura with prodelision (*horribili + Øbump-*) or with elision and a break after the monosyllabic prefix (*horribilØ + ab-*).

Relying partly on two of Palmer's proposals (*uultu / ...* and *... / usque*), I suggest printing *Gallicum Rhenum horribilisque uultus / osque Britanni*.

As shown by Bettini,⁵⁸ both *uultus* and *os* designate the human face, but the first word describes it as expressing (real or faked) emotions through external aspects accessible to sight, while the second is primarily associated with speech and, more generally, with auditory manifestations of mental states. In particular, *uultus* frequently occurs in contexts where the emotions expressed cause the face to look frightening; see Verg. A. 8.265–267 (*nequeunt expleri corda tuendo / terribilis oculos, uultum uillosaque saetis / pectora semiferi atque extinctos faucibus ignis*); Hor. Epod. 5.3–4 (*quid omnium / uultus in unum me truces?*); Ov. Ep. 4.73 (*quemque uocant aliae uultum rigidumque trucemque*), Met. 1.265 (*terribilem picea tectus caligine uultum*), 7.111–112 (*uertere truces uenientis ad ora / terribiles uultus praefixaque cornua ferro*), Tr. 4.2.23–24 (*et cernet uultus aliis pro tempore uersos, / terribiles aliis inmemo-*

57) This is a feature of comic diction; see J. Soubiran, *Essai sur la versification dramatique des Romains. Sénairé iambique et septénaire trochaïque*, Paris 1988, 155–157, *Prosodie et métrique du Miles gloriosus* de Plaute. Introduction et commentaire, Louvain / Paris 1995, 31, 38, 45. In Greek, most prodelisions seem to be phonetically grounded; see M. Platnauer, *Prodelision in Greek Drama*, CQ n. s. 10, 1960, 140–144; Devine / Stephens (n. 44 above) 269–270. But the examples where prodelision would create a necessary hephthemimeral caesura in the iambic trimeter may well illustrate the purely metrical trick identified by Soubiran. For an overview of this question, see J. Descroix, *Le trimètre iambique des iambographes à la comédie nouvelle*, Mâcon 1931, 255–257; W. S. Allen, *Accent and Rhythm. Prosodic Features of Latin and Greek: A Study in Theory and Reconstruction*, Cambridge 1973, 121–122; M. L. West, *Three Topics in Greek Metre*, CQ n. s. 32, 1982, 281–297, at 296; M. van Raalte, *Rhythm and Metre: Towards a Systematic Description of Greek Stichic Verse*, Assen / Maastricht / Wolfenboro 1986, 195–201.

58) M. Bettini, *The Ears of Hermes: Communication, Images, and Identity in the Classical World*. Translated by W. M. Short, Columbus 2011, 134–151.

resque sui), 5.7a.17 (*trux uultus*); Sen. Her. F. 371 (*quid truci uultu siles?*); Luc. 2.509 (*uultu ... minaci*); Suet. Cal. 50.1 (*uultum uero natura horridum ac taetrum etiam ex industria efferebat componens ad speculum in omnem terrorem ac formidinem*). In metonymic uses, *uultus* may focus on the gaze and eyes; see Ov. Ep. 6.149–150 (*paelicis ipsa meos implessem sanguine uultus, / quosque ueneficius abstulit illa suis*); Sen. Her. F. 595–596 (*da, Phoebe, ueniam, si quid illicitum tui / uidere uultus*), 640–641 (*flebilem ex oculis fuga, / regina, uultum*); [Sen.] Her. O. 1707–1709 (*nube discussa diem / pande, ut deorum uultus ardentem Herculem / spectet*), 1978–1979 (*fallor an uultus putat / uidisse natum?*).⁵⁹ It may also designate the whole appearance of the body, provided the face remains the most salient part of it (Ov. Met. 1.610–611: *inque nitentem / Inachidos uultus mutauerat ille iuuenecam*, 1.738–739: *uultus capit illa priores / fitque quod ante fuit*), and thus may be synonymous here with Caesar's *aspectus*: *omnes uero se Britanni uitro inficiunt, quod caeruleum efficit colorem, atque hoc horribiliores sunt in pugna aspectu* (Gal. 5.14.2); see also Acc. Trag. 80–80a [Ribbeck] (*o dirumque hostificumque diem, o / uim toruam aspecti atque horribilem!*). Owing to the changing nature of emotions, *uultus* “can be used both in the singular and plural to refer to an individual's face”;⁶⁰ see Ov. Am. 3.4.43–44 (*si sapis, indulge dominae uultusque seueros / exue*), Ars 3.506 (*ut uidit uultus Pallas in amne suos*), Met. 2.92–93 (*adspice uultus / ecce meos*); [Sen.] Her. O. 228–230 (*felix quisquis nouit famulum / regemque pati / uultusque suos uariare potest*); CLE 430.5–6 (*namque ego te semper, mea alumna Asiatica, quaeram / assidueque tuos uultus fingam mihi maerens*). Collocations of a form of *uultus* and a form of *os* abound in Latin prose and poetry; see e. g. Cic. Catil. 1.1, Deiot. 5, de Orat. 2.251, Fin. 3.56, 5.47; Verg. A. 3.173–174, 9.251, 10.821; Liv. 2.5.8, 5.41.8, 26.41.24; Ov. Met. 97–98, Met. 5.234, 12.348,

59) Heinsius corrected *uultus* to *coetus* at [Sen.] Her. O. 1708 (M. Billerbeck / M. Somazzi, Repertorium der Konjekturen in den Seneca-Tragödien. Unter der Mitarbeit von H. Kaufmann und S. Marchitelli, Leiden / Boston 2009, 206). A. Hudson-Williams, Notes on Some Passages in Seneca's Tragedies: II, CQ n. s. 41, 1991, 427–437, at 436 and J. G. Fitch, Annaeana Tragica: Notes on the Text of Seneca's Tragedies, Leiden 2004, 227 convincingly argue against this emendation.

60) So Bettini (n. 58) 141, who quotes Quint. Inst. 8.6.28: *cum dico uultus hominis pro uultu, dico pluraliter quod singulare est*.

14.281–282, Fast. 6.579–580; Curt. 4.15.11; Epic. Drusi 86–88, 275–276; Luc. 2.372–373; Tac. Ann. 14.16.2; Plin. Ep. 2.13.6, 5.16.9; Gel. 1.2.5, 14.4.1; Anth. 462.18. Due to its literal meaning, *os* occurring after *uultus* will more specifically apply to the terrifying cries of the Britons; see Lucr. 5.841 (*muta sine ore etiam, sine uoltu caeca reperta*); Cic. Brut. 265 (*quanta seueritas in uoltu, quantum pondus in uerbis, quam nihil non consideratum exhibat ex ore!*); Ov. Ep. 11.95–96 (*interea patrius uoltu maerente satelles / uenit et indignos edidit ore sonos*), Fast. 2.613–614 (*uoltu pro uerbis illa precatur, / et frustra muto nititur ore loqui*), Tr. 3.4.37–38 (*uidi ego te tali uoltu mea fata gementem, / qualem credibile est ore fuisse meo*); Luc. 8.682–683 (*dum uiuunt uoltus atque os in murmura pulsant / singultus animae*); Stat. Theb. 9.898–899 (*nec usquam / tu prope, quae uultus efflantiaque ora teneres*). Plural *uultus* combines with some form of singular *os* at Ov. Met. 1.85–86, 5.292, Fast. 2.773–774, Tr. 3.5.11–12; Luc. 8.682. Verse- or hemistich-initial *osque* occurs at Ov. Ep. 6.70, Met. 13.892, 14.280–282 (*nec iam posse loqui pro uerbis edere raucum / murmur et in terram toto procumbere uultu; / osque meum sensi pando occalescere rostro*), Tr. 3.5.11–12 (*uidi ego confusos uultus uisosque notauit, / osque madens fletu pallidiusque meo*). Ovid probably imitated Catullus in the last two examples, and one may wonder if Horace did not do so too in 3.27.11 (*oscinem coruum prece suscitabo*, see above) since this is the only example of *oscen* in poetry before late Latin and the word was folk-etymologized after *os* + *cano*.⁶¹

For collective singular ethnonyms like *Britanni* before Livy and the Augustan poets, see Enn. Ann. 152, 291 [Skutsch]; Var. R. 1.2.2; Cic. Att. 5.16.14; Rhet. Her. 4.45. Syntax, with genitive *horribilis ... Britanni* enclosing *uultus osque*, conforms to Catullus' diction: compare with 11.7–8 (*septemgeminus ... Nilus*) and 11.23–24 (*praetereunte ... aratro*).⁶² For the use of *-que* with dif-

61) See ThLL 9.2.1100.79–1101.65 and Maltby (n. 56 above) 436.

62) This may justify one in writing *litus ut longe resonante Eoum / tunditur unda*, instead of the paradosis *resonante Eoa* or Statius's *resonans Eoa*, at 11.3–4. See Statius (n. 14 above) 48–49; Fordyce (n. 30 above) 125–126; and the collocation *litus ... Eoum* at Claud. Carm. min. 30.114. For the same reason, I am inclined to maintain *gemina ... nocte* at 51.11–12 and thus to reject the correction *aures geminae*, first attested in J. Schrader's handwritten notes (see Kiss, CO) and defended by G. P. Goold, Problems in Editing Propertius, in: J. N. Grant (ed.), Editing Greek and

ferent functions in adjacent lines, see 9.8–9: *applicansque collum / incundum os oculosque sauiabor*.

The enclitic *-que*, written *q* plus some (possibly neglected) diacritic,⁶³ may have absorbed the initial *u* of *uultus*; *qu ultusosque* was read as *-que ultimosque*; see the reverse corruption of *ultimi* to (*u*)*ultum* at Liv. 9.16.18, and *ultimos* (for *ultimum*) to *uultus* at Priap. 63.11.⁶⁴ This triggered the change of *horribilis* ... *Britanni*, understood as a plural, to *horribiles* ... *Britannos*. The palaeographical drift was surely favored by the influence of 11.22–23 (*qui illius culpa cecidit uelut prati / ultimi flos*) and 29.3–4 (*Mamurram habere quod comata Gallia / habebat umquam et ultima Britannia*).⁶⁵

Poem 12, vv. 6–9

*non credis mihi? crede Pollioni
fratri, qui tua furta uel talento
mutari uelit: est enim leporum
haud expers puer ac facetiarum.*

9 *haud expers scripsi* : *dissertus O* : *disertus GR*

Latin Texts, New York 1989, 97–119, at 98–100. Ovid probably imitated 51.11–12 at Met. 1.720–721 (*Arge, iaces, quodque in tot lumina lumen habebas, / extinctum est, centumque oculos nox occupat una*); but his use of numeral *centum* allowed him to echo 5.6 (*nox est perpetua una dormienda*) at the same time. See also Stat. Theb. 2.30–31 (about Mercury and Cerberus): *ni deus horrentem Lethaeo uimine mulcens / ferrea tergemino domuisset lumina somno*, commented by A. Fusi, *Imitazione e critica del testo. Qualche esempio* (Catullo, 51 11 SG.; Marziale, I 116 2, IX 71 7), in: G. Piras (ed.), *Labor in studiis. Scritti di filologia in onore di Piergiorgio Parroni*, Roma 2014, 23–48, at 24–34.

63) L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins*, Paris 1911, 178.727–728, 181.760; W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae: An Account of Abbreviation in Latin Mss. of the Early Minuscule Period (c. 700–850)*, Cambridge 1915, 228–233.

64) S. P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X. Volume I: Introduction and Book VI*, Oxford 1997, 296 n. 408; R. E. Clairmont, *Carmina Priapea*, Chicago 1983, <https://ecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3177&context=luc_diss>.

65) For my emendation *umquam* at 29.4, see Dominicy (n. 23 above) 636–640, where I also suggest writing *caduntque Gallia ultimae et Britannia* at 29.20.

Though contextually motivated,⁶⁶ *disertus* is an unacceptable reading. Between poems 2 and 26 (both included), three (perhaps four) phalaeicians have an iambic base: *et acris* (2.4), *tuā* (3.17), *tuae* (7.2), *meus mi* (21.11); but each of these verses begins with a grammatical word.⁶⁷ Printing *dissertus* does not solve the problem since no poetic parallel exists for such a prosody. In addition, the two genitives *leporum* and *facietiarum* do not make sense when combining with either *disertus* or *puer*. Passerat's *dif(f)ertus* may seem plausible; yet, in the absence of any comparable example with a genitive (ThLL 5.1.1082.35–44), Fordyce's acute (though cautiously formulated) objection should lead us to dismiss this correction: "The tone of the word in the few places where it occurs is like that of the English 'chock-full' ... If Catullus used it here, it is a colloquial pleasantry – as we might say 'cram-full of' or 'packed with wit'; but one may wonder whether he would have thought that pleasantry appropriate here."⁶⁸ The same point is made by M^cKie, who proposes *est enim leporum / dispectus puero ac facietiarum*. Kiss convincingly argues against M^cKie's conjecture on grammatical and semantic grounds; moreover, *dispectus* attributes intellectual discernment to Pollio instead of endowing him with a practical know-how. Thomson suggests editing *diserte pater* ('quite clearly, the very essence of ...'); *diserte* was already envisaged by Peiper, *pater* by Calphurnius (1481) and by an anonymous humanist.⁶⁹ But several arguments militate against such a solution. Firstly, *dis(s)erte* raises the same

66) Krostenko (n. 19 above) 251 n. 39; Catullus and Elite Republican Social Discourse, in: M. B. Skinner (ed.), *A Companion to Catullus*, Oxford 2007, 212–232, at 219.

67) See Syndikus (n. 3 above) 128 n. 9; M^cKie (n. 3 above) 8–15; Kiss (n. 5 above) 262–263. On 21.11, see Dominicy (n. 23 above) 645 n. 87.

68) J. Passerat, *Commentarii in C. Val. Catullum, Albiu[m] Tibullu[m], et Sex. Aur. Propertiu[m]*, Paris 1608, 2; Fordyce (n. 30 above) 131. See also H. A. J. Munro, *Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus*, Cambridge / London 1878, 41. The counterarguments in favor of *difertus* fail to convince: "Just as in referring to a full auditorium we might say 'a packed house', so too Catullus here uses *difertus* with no more meaning and implication than *plenus*" (Goold [n. 32 above] 93–94); "If Pollio was 'crammed to overflowing with clever pranks', i. e. hardly able to restrain himself, then his condemnation of his brother's napkin-pinching is naturally more impressive" (Quinn [n. 30 above] 131–132).

69) Thomson (n. 2 above) 240–241; R. Peiper, *Q. Valerius Catullus. Beiträge zur Kritik seiner Gedichte*, Breslau 1875, 25; Kiss, CO.

metrical and prosodic problems as *dis(s)ertus* and is syntactically suspect, given that elsewhere this adverb always modifies a verb (see ThLL 5.1.1380.44–1381.3). Secondly, *pater* so used should designate the intellectual or spiritual creator, inventor or leader of/in something good or evil (ThLL 10.1.683.61–684.19); compare with the derisive hyperbole of 21.1–3: *Aureli, pater esuritionum, / non harum modo, sed quot aut fuerunt / aut sunt aut aliis erunt in annis*. Thirdly, the elimination of *puer* inadequately mitigates the blame incurred by the addressee; compare with 17.12–13: *insulsissimus est homo, nec sapit pueri instar / bimuli tremula patris dormientis in ulna*. Fourthly, Thomson's version rules out the possibility that the passage might allude to the verbal talent of young (probably 16–18 years old) C. Asinius Pollio.⁷⁰

Though Pleitner's *expertus*,⁷¹ like *dispectus* or *pater*, cannot apply to a boy, it suggests that *haud experts* is the authentic reading; for examples of *non/haud experts* with the genitive, see Cic. Att. 7.3.2, Orat. 216; Liv. 28.24.10; Verg. A. 10.752. Confusions between *expers* and *expertus* are frequent; see ThLL 5.2.1686.54–86 and e.g. Sil. 8.614; Maxim. Eleg. 1.122. The missegmentation *hau dexpertus* (> *dessertus*) led to *dis(s)ertus* under the influence of 53.5 (*di magni, salaputium disertum!*). *Lepos* was linked by folk-etymology to *lepus* (Pl. Cas. 138, 235; Plin. Nat. 28.260; Mart. 5.29; Lampr. Alex 38), whose obscene meaning made it the occasional synonym of *salaputium* (Pl. Cas. 138; Ov. Ars 3.662; Petr. 131.7; Mart. 3.94).⁷² Catullus' use of *leporum* and *salaputium*, with its allusions to the small size of Asinius Pollio or Licinius Calvus, recalls the anecdote told by Suet. Vit. Hor. 8 [Villeneuve] (*saepe eum inter alios iocos purissimum penem et homuncionem lepidissimum appellat* [Augustus]), and an additional wordplay on *Pollio*, *polleo* and *polluo* should not be ruled out.

70) See Fordyce (n. 30 above) 128–129; C. Deroux, Le frère d'Asinius Pollio. Note de prosopographie catullienne (c. 12 et 54), AC 50, 1981, 209–221.

71) K. Pleitner, Studien zu Catullus, Dillingen an der Donau 1876, 106.

72) On *lepos* and *lepidus* in Catullus, see 1.1, 6.17 and 36.10 (discussed above), 12.8, 16.7, 32.2, 50.7, 78.1–2. On *lepos-lepidus* and *lepus*, see Maltby (n. 56 above) 33; Krostenko (n. 19 above) 267; J. Carcopino, Études romaines. La basilique pythagoricienne de la Porte Majeure, Paris 1927 [1943], 104–105 n. 2. On *lepus* = 'phallus' and *salaputium*, see Adams (n. 8 above) 34; Deroux (n. 9 above [2008]); G. Schmeling, A Commentary on the Satyrca of Petronius. With the collaboration of A. Setaioli, Oxford 2011, 501.

Poem 14, vv. 5–15

cur me tot male perderes poetis? 5
isti di mala multa dent clienti,
qui tantum tibi misit impiorum.
quod, si ut suspicor, hoc inane per te
munus dat mihi Sulla litterator,
non est mi male, sed bene ac beate, 10
quod non dispereunt tui labores.
di magni, horribilem et sacrum libellum
quem tu scilicet ad tuum Catullum
misti, continuo ut tibi periret
Saturnalibus, optimo dierum! 15

8 inane per te *scripsi* : nouum ac repertum OGR || 9 mihi *scripsi* : tibi OGR || 14 tibi *Dominicy* : die OGR

As underlined by Harrison, M^cKie, Trappes-Lomax and Watt, the participial form *repertum* (v. 8) cannot mean ‘recherché’. Watt proposes *his refertum* (*refertum* goes back to Vossius),⁷³ with *his* anaphorically pointing to the bad poets of vv. 5–7; but, as far as I can see, the ablative or genitive that depends on *refertus* never metonymically refers to works or activities through a literal mention of their authors or agents.⁷⁴ Trappes-Lomax tentatively suggests *malis refertum*. Harrison’s *nouum repertum* (already proposed by Puccius 1502; see Kiss, CO), with *repertum* a (non-attested) substantive and *munus* (v. 16) an apposition to it, is unidiomatic, while *peramplum* (M^cKie) requires a complex explanation of the paradosis. In my view, Trappes-Lomax is on the right track when considering *nouum* an interpolation; but the fact that the same word occurs

73) S. J. Harrison / S. J. Heyworth, Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Catullus, PCPhS n. s. 44, 1998, 85–109 (each note is written by one of the two contributors), at 89; M^cKie (n. 3 above) 15–18; Trappes-Lomax (n. 3 above) 65; Watt (n. 19 above) 65–66; I. Vossius, Caius Valerius Catullus et in eum Isaaci Vossii observationes, London 1684, 37–38.

74) Examples with the ablative: Cic. Deiot. 33, Dom. 55, Off. 1.132, Orat. 140, 146, Phil. 2.67, Pis. 11, Planc. 19, Ver. 2.1.137; Liv. 26.10.8, 34.39.7; V. Max. 6.9.1; Sen. Dial. 2.13.4, 4.8.1, 6.10.1, 10.14.4. With the genitive: Cic. Att. 9.1.2, de Orat. 2.154, Font. 11, Man. 31, Planc. 98, Rab. Post. 20.

at 1.1 (*nouum libellum*) and at 22.6–7 (*noui libri*, / *noui umbilici*; see below) should refrain us from reducing it to a mere metrical filler.

I suggest printing *quod, si ut suspicor, hoc inane per te / munus dat mihi*... The passage thus emphasizes the fact that Sulla's gift was indirect, which leads one to surmise that he did not dare to offer the *libellus* personally to Catullus. For this use of *do* with *per* + accusative and a dative of the beneficiary, see Ter. Hau. 468–470 (*ut ne scientem sentiat te id sibi dare / ... / per alium quemuis ut des*); Cic. Fam. 10.15.2 [Plancus] (*per Laterensem internuntium fidem mihi dedit* [Lepidus] *se Antonium, si prohibere prouincia sua non potuisset, bello persecuturum*), Rosc. Am. 74 ('*pretium dedit*'; *cui dedit? per quem dedit?*; imitated by Quint. Inst. 5.7.37, 7.2.54). As in 28.1 (*cohors inanis*) and Nux 97–98 (*iam tamen inuenio qui me iaculentur et ictu / praefestinato munus inane petant*), *inanis* alludes here to some kind of worthlessness; but the collocation of *inanis* and *munus* typically occurs in passages that evoke the last services to the dead and, possibly, the offerings made on such occasions: Verg. A. 6.883–886 (... *manibus date lilia plenis, / purpureos spargam flores animamque nepotis / his saltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani / munere*); Ov. Met. 2.340–341 (*nec minus Heliades lugent et inania morti / munera dant lacrimas*); Sil. 10.535–536 (*funereas tum deinde pyras certamine texunt, / officium infelix et munus inane peremptis*); see also Stat. Theb. 6.168–169 (... *quid dona, duces, quid inania fertis / iusta rogis?*). This symbolic association elegantly combines with the metaphor that assimilates Catullus' reception of the *libellus* to his own death: *me ... perderes* (v. 5); *periret* [Catullus] (v. 14),⁷⁵ contrasting with *non dispereunt tui labores* (v. 11); notice the repetition of (-)per(-) at vv. 5, 8, 11, 14.

The corruption probably results from the missegmentation *in at ieperte* where *in*, interpreted as the negative prefix, was replaced with *non*, and *at* read *ac*. The sequence *non ac ieperte* gave rise to *nouum ac repertum* under the influence of 1.1 and 22.6–7. This allowed *tibi* to substitute for *mihi*.

75) On the correction *tibi* for *die*, see Dominicy (n. 23 above) 633.

Poem 21, vv. 7–13

... *nam insidias mihi instruentem
tangam te prior irrumatione.
atque id si faceres satur, tacerem;
nunc ipsum id doleo, quod esurire
meus mi puer et sitire discet.*⁷⁶ 10
*quare desine, dum licet, pudice,
ne finem faciam irrumatione.*

11 *meus mi Meleager* : me me OGR || 12 *desine* ζ : desinat OGR | *pudice scripsi* : *pudico* OGR || 13 *ne ed. 1472* : nec OGR | *finem faciam Baehrens* : *finem facias* O'GR : *facias finem* O | *irrumatione scripsi* : *sed irrumatus (sum) ζ* : *sed irruminatus sum* OGR

After demonstrating that the vulgate text cannot withstand critical examination, Trappes-Lomax pleads for deleting v. 13; in his view, “the interpolator perhaps thought it necessary to elucidate *dum licet pudico*, which Catullus’ intended readers would not have required”. Both ... *facias sat irrumatus* (Stattius *dubitanter*) and *facias et irrumatus* (Heinsius) conflict with the meaning of *finem facio*, ‘put an end to’ (see ThLL 6.1.796.68–84); *nec finem facies, nisi irrumatus* (A. Guarinus; see Kiss, CO) creates inconsistency with the preceding line. Baehrens’s *ne(i) finem faciam, sed irrumans te* fares better, but coherence would demand *et* (which is ruled out by meter) and such a use of the present participle in the nominative singular is unidiomatic.⁷⁷ Relying partly on his proposal, I suggest printing ... *pudice, / ne finem faciam irrumatione*. The adverb *pudice* is used in a similar context at 15.5 (*conserues puerum mihi pudice*) and the instrumental ablative *irrumatione* echoes v. 8.

The corruption process can be reconstructed as follows. Someone added *irrumatus sum* (from first-person *faciam*) in the margin; *irrumatus sum* replaced *irrumatione*; *desine* shifted to *desinas* de-

76) On the correction *meus mi*, see above, on 12.9.

77) Trappes-Lomax (n. 3 above) 74–75; Stattius (n. 14 above) 69–70; on Heinsius’s emendation, see J. A. Bellido Díaz, *Las notas a Catulo de A. Petreius y N. Heinsius*, *ExClass* 15, 2011, 123–200, at 140; ; E. Baehrens, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, Leipzig 1876–1885, 1.20, 2.155. On Baehrens’s propensity to resort to unidiomatic present participles in the nominative singular, see M. Dominicy, *Notes critiques sur l’élégie 4,1 de Propertius*, MH 71, 2014, 85–99, at 92, about Prop. 4.1.73.

pending on *licet*, and *faciam* to *facias* under the influence of *desinas*; afterwards, the adverb *pudice* was interpreted as *pudico* depending on *licet*, which triggered the change from *desinas* to *desinat*; in v. 13, *et* was added for restoring the syntax and a dittography after *facias* produced *set = sed*.

Poem 22, vv. 4–9

puto esse ego illi milia aut decem aut plura
perscripta, nec sic ut fit in palimpseston 5
relata: cartae regiae, notae cedri,
novi umbilici, lora rubra membranae,⁷⁸
derecta plumbo et pagina omnis aequata.
haec cum legas tu, ...

6 notae cedri *Dominicy* : noue libri *OGR* || 8 pagina omnis *scripsi* : pumice omnia *OGR*

As pointed out by Bellandi, who speaks of “il rimando indispensabile al *liber* come *volumen*”, *omnia* in v. 8 should refer to the components or aspects of the book that have just been enumerated; but the two properties predicated obviously cannot apply to all of them.⁷⁹ On the other hand, construing *omnia* as directly referential, as proposed by Ellis, Benoist / Thomas and Friedrich, or as correlative to *haec* in v. 9, as envisaged by Munro, would be highly unnatural. Trappes-Lomax chooses to delete vv. 6–8 as an addition of an incompetent interpolator;⁸⁰ but the subtlety of *notae cedri* (if this is the authentic text) does not fit in with such a hypothesis. I prefer printing *derecta plumbo et pagina omnis aequata*. In conformity with attested usage, *pagina* designates both the sheets that bear lines marked out with a lead plate and a ruler (ThLL 5.1.1234.45–49) and the book they form together, with its edges and ends smoothed

78) For the text and punctuation of vv. 6–7, see Dominicy (n. 23 above) 634–635.

79) Bellandi (n. 40 above) 30 n. 47; Kroll (n. 3 above) 41–42.

80) Ellis (n. 48 above) 73; E. Benoist / É. Thomas, *Les poésies de Catulle*. Tome II, Paris 1890, 417; Friedrich (n. 29 above) 152; Munro (n. 68 above) 53–54; Trappes-Lomax (n. 3 above) 76–77.

with pumice.⁸¹ Due to the confusion between capital *G* and *C*,⁸² to the usual *a/u* alternation, and to a trivial mistake on the number of minims, *pagina* could shift to *pucine*, normalized as contextually adapted *pumice* on the model of 1.2; the change to *omnia* followed logically.

Brussels

Marc Dominicy

81) On the use of *omnis* meaning ‘with no part left’, see M. Dominicy, *Gallia est omnis divisa in partes tres: Pourquoi omnis et non tota?*, *Ludus Magistralis* 12, 1980, 33–53; Coutelle (n. 9 above) 786, 818, ad Prop. 4.7.56, 4.8.6.

82) W.M. Lindsay, *An Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation Based on the Text of Plautus*, London 1896, 84; Havet (n. 63 above), 159.598–599; Dominicy (n. 23 above) 638–639, 649–650, *Critical Notes on Catullus* 61, *RhM* 158, 2015, 138–166, at 157–158.