

CATULLIANA

In the following, I will propose and/or defend new or previous emendations for a set of passages in Catullus, most of which are deemed corrupt or even beyond repair by many, if not all, philologists.¹ For the sake of simplicity, I will first quote Mynors's OCT text, except for possible changes in punctuation that will be justified, either implicitly or in their own terms, in the ensuing discussion. Those sections I consider incorrect I will put between obeli (which, on several occasions, are also Mynors's ones). In addition, I will reproduce the relevant manuscript readings recorded in Mynors's apparatus, checked against Thomson's more complete collations. In each case, I will begin with summarizing the state of the question; nevertheless, owing to the vast amount of corrections or conjectures to be examined for many passages, I will concentrate on the most significant proposals.² Next, I will try to show that the correction suggested conforms to the constraints of metre and language, and (in some cases at least) sheds some light on the symbolic or intertextual dimension of the poem at hand. Finally, I will provide an account of the corruption process that presumably operated, with the aim of establishing the palaeographical verisimilitude of my proposal.

¹ In order not to multiply footnotes, I will adopt the following bibliographical policy. Editions of Catullus (with or without commentary), and easily accessible editions of other ancient writings, will be referred to by the name(s) of their author(s) only, with the mention ad loc. left implicit. When necessary, dates will be added; page numbers and other details will only be mentioned when the passage at hand is difficult to locate. The same convention will apply to the following works: R. Ellis, *A Commentary on Catullus* (Oxford, 1876¹, 1889²); C.J. Fordyce, *Catullus: A Commentary* (Oxford, 1961¹, 1973²); J.v.G. Froehlich, critical notes on Lachmann's 1829 text, *Abhandlungen der I. Classe der königlichen Akademien der Wissenschaften in München* 5 (1849), 233–75; J.H. Gaisser, *Catullus and His Renaissance Readers* (Oxford, 1993); S.J. Harrison and S.J. Heyworth, 'Notes on the text and interpretation of Catullus', *PCPhS* 44 (1998), 85–109 (each note is written by one of the two contributors); L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (Paris, 1911); A.E. Housman, *Classical Papers*, edd. J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear (Cambridge, 1972), 3 vols.; D. Kiss, review of McKie (see below), *ExClass* 15 (2011), 257–71; W.M. Lindsay, *An Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation Based on the Text of Plautus* (London, 1896); V.P. McCarren, *A Critical Concordance to Catullus* (Leiden, 1977); D.S. McKie, *Essays on the Interpretation of Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 2009); H.A.J. Munro, *Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus* (Cambridge, 1878); R.G.M. Nisbet, 'Notes on the text of Catullus', *PCPhS* 24 (1978), 92–115, reprinted in *Collected Papers on Latin Literature*, ed. S.J. Harrison (Oxford, 1995), 76–100; P. Oksala, *Adnotationes criticae ad Catulli carmina* (Helsinki, 1965); M.B. Skinner (ed.), *A Companion to Catullus* (Oxford, 2007); H.P. Syndikus, *Catull. Eine Interpretation* (Darmstadt, 1984–90), 3 vols.; J.M. Trappes-Lomax, *Catullus: A Textual Reappraisal* (Swansea, 2007); W.S. Watt, 'Notes on Catullus', *ZPE* 131 (2000), 65–8; J. Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism* (Urbana, Chicago and London, 1972); M. Zicari, *Scritti catulliani*, ed. P. Parroni (Urbino, 1978).

² The reader interested in the detail may consult the invaluable *Catullus Online* website (<http://catullusonline.woodpecker.hu/CatullusOnline/>), built up under the leadership of Dániel Kiss, where precise information can also be found on the readings transmitted by *recentiores* (referred to here by means of the usual cover letter ζ).

10.5–13 huc ut uenimus, incidere nobis
 sermones uarii, in quibus, quid esset
 iam Bithynia, quo modo se haberet,
 et quonam mihi profuisset aere.
 respondi, id quod erat, nihil neque ipsis
 †nec† praetoribus esse nec cohorti
 cur quisquam caput unctius referret,
 praesertim quibus esset irrumator
 praetor, nec faceret pili cohortem.

9 neque nec in ipsis *V*

The triple negative connection *neque ... nec ... nec* requires *ipsis* to convey, as a pronoun, either a metonymical anaphora pointing back to *Bithynia* or a deictic reference, in indirect discourse and in the plural, to the (singular) speaker of the poem.³ As argued by Trappes-Lomax, '*ipsis* meaning "the natives" is a strange expression and all the stranger in that Catullus was hardly concerned with their well-being'.⁴ On the other hand, the equation *ipsis = nobis = mihi* is linguistically awkward; different corrections—*nec/neque ipsi* (Avancius⁵), *mihi nec/neque ipsi* (Stadius; see Gaisser, 415), *mihi ipsi* (Pleitner,⁶ Heyworth)—may solve this problem, but it has frequently been noticed that any distinction between Catullus and the other members of the *cohors* will prove inconsistent with the content of vv. 12–13.⁷ In order to salvage the emendation *mihi ipsi*, Heyworth replaces *praetoribus* with *quaestoribus*;⁸ but, as pointed out by Friedrich and Syndikus, the topical association between *praetoribus* and *cohorti* seems to be echoed in Tib. 1.3.1–2: *ibitis Aegaeas sine me, Messala, per undas, | o utinam memores ipse cohorsque mei!*; the same objection, as noted by Kiss, applies to McKie's *ipsis | exactoribus*. The only solution left consists in making *ipsis* modify *praetoribus* (see *ipse* at Tib. 1.3.2, quoted above). This can be obtained by substituting *hi(n)c* or *nunc* for the first *nec* of v. 10,⁹ but *hi(n)c* creates an odd deictic anchoring (Catullus and his addressees are in Rome) and *nunc* increases the incongruity of *esse*, which 'is in the wrong tense as Catullus is recounting his own past experience' (Trappes-Lomax).

Trappes-Lomax assumes v. 10 to have been fabricated by an interpolator who consequently had to replace *fuisse* in v. 9 with *neque* (or *nec*) *ipsis* in order to restore the syntax. Fortunately, one can easily dispense with this radical move if, elaborating on Westphal's intuition, one prints *ipsis | iam praetoribus*. This emendation was suggested by Schmidt, who convincingly traced back the corruption of vv. 9–10 to the trivial confusion between *iā = iam* and *in/iu*.¹⁰ In addition, Lucretius provides two attestations of

³ The first solution, which goes back to J.F. Gronovius, *De Sestertiis* (Amsterdam, 1656), 551, is advocated by Ellis, Merrill, Fordyce, Quinn, Thomson; the second, by H. Magnus (quoted, without further reference, by Friedrich), Lenchantin de Gubernatis, Pighi, Bardon.

⁴ See also F. Bellandi, Lepos e Patos. *Studi su Catullo* (Bologna, 2007), 403–14; Kroll; Lenchantin de Gubernatis; Syndikus, 1.117 n. 12.

⁵ H. Avancius, *Emendationes* (Venice, 1495), 2v.

⁶ K. Pleitner, *Studien zu Catullus* (Dillingen an der Donau, 1876), 104.

⁷ A point made by Bellandi (n. 4), Friedrich, McKie, Syndikus, 1.117 n. 12, Trappes-Lomax.

⁸ This proposal, which goes back to Muretus (*dubitanter*), was defended by Housman, 2.624, 3.1091.

⁹ Froehlich proposed *hinc*; G. Giri, *De locis qui sunt aut habentur corrupti in Catulli carminibus* (Turin, 1894), 74–6 proposed *hic* (adopted by Bellandi); Ellis (*dubitanter*) and R. Westphal, *Catulls Gedichten in ihrem geschichtlichen Zusammenhange* (Breslau, 1867) [²1870], 184 proposed *nunc*.

¹⁰ See †*immortalibus*† for *iam mortalibus* at Lucr. 5.53 and, in Sen. (Viainsino), †*iam*† for *in* at *Herc. F.* 161 and *Tro.* 188, *iam* omitted before *iudicium* at *Dial.* 5.12.4, *iam* or *in* alone for *iam in* at *Dial.* 5.18.2, †*immortalitas*† for *iam mortalitas* at *Dial.* 5.43.5.

the same syntactic and metrical configuration (5.52–3: *cum bene praesertim multa ac diuinitus ipsis | iam mortalibus e diuis dare dicta suerit* [†*immortalibus*†, see n. 10]; 6.1015–16: *quod facit et sequitur, donec peruenit ad ipsum | iam lapidem*). Goold¹¹ and Trappes-Lomax claim that *nihil ... esse ... cur* should mean ‘there is no cause/reason why’—which, if true, would rule out the datives (of interest rather than possession) *ipsis ... praetoribus* and *cohorti*. But *cur* may be construed with a *ni(hi)l* antecedent whose potential referents do not reduce to indeterminate causes or reasons; see Ov. *Am.* 2.19.56 *nil facies cur te iure perisse uelim?*, which can be compared with 14.4–5 *nam quid feci ego quidue sum locutus, | cur me tot male perderes poetis?*, and Apul. *Fl.* 6 *qui nihil habet adferre cur prandeat, impransus ad opus foras extruditur*.

Since *iam* combines with *neque ... nec*, v. 10 alludes to the fact that war and Roman looting have exhausted Bithynia’s wealth (Schmidt), and contextually implies that this annihilating process was already at work when Catullus first arrived in that country. Thus, while the situation referred to by *esse* remains in force at the moment of the poem’s utterance by the speaker, its consequences for Catullus were triggered in the past. Notice the formal parallelism between *iam Bithynia* (v. 7) et *iam praetoribus* (v. 10): the first occurrence of the adverb may seem enigmatic (Bellandi) but the repetition elegantly suggests temporal continuity (Schmidt). Given that the destructive consequences of Roman policy are likely to persist, the plural *praetoribus* acquires a generic value by applying not only to Catullus’ own *praetor*, but also to all *praetores* in Bithynia, present or to come (see Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.131 *pupillos et pupillas certissimam praedam esse praetoribus*). Accordingly, the singular *cohorti* should be assigned a distributive reading: for each such *praetor*, there will exist one and only one *cohors* (Bellandi). Finally, one can reasonably envisage that Bithynia’s condition is, and will be, constantly worsening, so that Catullus’ own *praetor*, contrary to his present or future successors, still had the opportunity to fiddle some cash or goods without sharing them, obviously, with the men of his *cohors*. This crude picture of greed reminds us of other poems, notably 29, which has in line 22 (see below) a similar usage of *unctus* that also appears at Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.54.

10.24–32 hic illa, ut decuit cinaediorum,
 ‘quaeso’, inquit mihi, ‘mi Catulle, paulum
 †istos† commoda: nam uolo ad Serapim
 deferri’. †‘mane’, inquit† puellae,
 ‘istud quod modo dixeram me habere –
 fugit me ratio: meus sodalis –
 Cinna est Gaius, – is sibi parauit.

27 mane me inquit V

In v. 26, *commoda* is ordinarily analysed (scanning the final syllable as short) as the dactylic variant of the imperative *commodā*.¹² Such shortenings of cretic words occur in anapaestic lines of Old Comedy,¹³ but in (pre-)classical verse they only apply to first-person verb forms, or proper names, ending in *-ō* (see, for instance, 85.2: *nesciō*,

¹¹ G.P. Goold, ‘A new text of Catullus’, *Phoenix* 12 (1958), 93–116, at 103.

¹² O. Skutsch, ‘Notes on Catullus’, *BICS* 23 (1976), 18–22, at 19; H.D. Jocelyn, ‘The arrangement and the language of Catullus’ so-called *polymetra* with special reference to the sequence 10–11–12’, in J.N. Adams and R.G. Mayer (edd.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 1999), 335–75, at 361–2.

¹³ W.M. Lindsay, *Early Latin Verse* (Oxford, 1922), 40–4; C. Questa, *La metrica di Plauto e di Terenzio* (Urbino, 2007), 99–100; J. Soubiran, *Prosodie et métrique du Miles gloriosus de Plaute. Introduction et commentaire* (Louvain and Paris, 1995), 18–19.

along with the frozen *nescio quid*!-s at 2.6, 6.4, 53.1, 80.5; Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.42, 1.10.85, *Carm.* 2.1.14 *Polliō*; Maecenas 3.2 [Courtney, *FLP*] *diligō*). In addition, it is highly implausible for such a process to affect a word-final *-ā* in a corpus that does not contain comparable examples with the weaker vowels *-ē*, *-ī*, *-ū*. Scaliger's *commodo nam uolo ad Serapim* | *deferri* runs against the same objections, while Friedrich's hypothesis of an adverbial *commoda* does not rest on any evidence. Burmannus' *commodā enim* and Hand's *commodum enim* ..., which aim at improving on Scaliger's solution, imply unacceptable elisions.¹⁴ In Catullus, all elisions, before a short syllable, of a cretic-final word ending in a nasal vowel (a graphic *-m*) belong to dactylic lines (64.211, 64.359, 64.366, 66.27, 67.31, 68.3, 68.4, 68.90, 73.6, 90.2, 91.9). Except for 97.6 (*ploxeni habet*), which features a very rare word (*TLL* s.v.), comparable examples with oral vowels involve words ending in *-ō* (6.11 *argutatio inambulatique*; 85.2 *sentio*; 91.2 *perdito amore*) or *-ē* (45.3 *perdite amo*; 104.3 *perdite amarem*). This reflects the influence of dactylic verse, where all elided iambic-final words whose penultimate syllable corresponds to the first element of a pyrrhic end either in a nasal vowel or in one of the three vowels *-ī*, *-ē* and (possibly shortened) *-ō*, Lucil. 1071 (Marx) (*delicā aitque*) being certainly corrupt.¹⁵ Moreover, since *argutatio* does not fall within strictly cretic words,¹⁶ and *sentio* most probably had its last vowel shortened like *nesciō* in the same verse (see above), the examples with an oral vowel are three variations of the same stereotypic formula (see below, on 55.4). This also casts serious doubts on the plausibility of *commodo/-e enim*, proposed by Barthius¹⁷ and Mueller respectively.

According to Trappes-Lomax, *commoda* 'may well be an interlinear gloss' that has replaced *crastina*.¹⁸ But, as pointed out by Ellis and Nisbet, a simpler option consists in interpreting *commoda* as the plural neuter substantive attested at 23.24 (in the same metrical position), 68.21 and 84.1; see also *incommoda* at 14.23 and 68.11. Since *commoda* then substitutes, like *commodum/-o/-e* or *crastina*, for a fully expressed verbal predicate the absence of which would definitely blur the syntax (as also happens with Statius' *nam uolo commode ad Serapim*), Nisbet corrects *quaeso* into *quaero*, and *istos* into *istaec* (see 67.37) rather than *ista* so as to avoid a trochaic base.¹⁹ Yet, *quaero* sounds far less natural than *quaeso* at the beginning of the girl's turn at speech.²⁰

By proposing to substitute *da modo* for *commoda* or *da istos* for *istos*, Doering and Agar²¹ have taken a first step toward an alternative solution, viz. *da mi commoda: nam uolo ad Serapim* ('Give me these facilities [that is: lend me your litter-bearers]'). We find the same metrical and syntactic collocation of *da mi* and a dactylic neuter plural

¹⁴ See P. Burmannus Jr., *Miscellaneae* (Amsterdam, 1734), 10, followed by Zicari, 255–6; F. Hand, *Observationum criticarum in Catulli carmina specimen* (Leipzig, 1809), 53–5.

¹⁵ J. Soubiran, *L'élision dans la poésie latine* (Paris, 1966), 207–21. On Lucil. 1071 (Marx), see Non. 277.21 (Lindsay) and Housman, 2.693–4.

¹⁶ On the metrical and lexical singularity of 6.11, see S.V. Tracy, 'Argutatiinambulatique (Catullus 6.11)', *CPh* 64 (1969), 234–5.

¹⁷ C. Barthius, *Observationes*, ed. F. Fiedler (Wesel, 1827), 118.

¹⁸ This account echoes, in some way, the absurd hypothesis, put forward by Schulze, Lenchantin de Gubernatis and the *TLL* (3.1924.15–19), that *commoda* might be a fem. adjective qualifying the girl; see Housman, 1.307 and Skutsch (n. 12), 19.

¹⁹ O. Skutsch, 'Metrical variations and some textual problems in Catullus', *BICS* 16 (1969), 38–43 has shown that, provided one prints *illuc* at 3.12 (what most editors do), no phalaccian appearing between poems 2 and 26 (both included) has a trochaic base; though very unfrequent, iambic bases are attested (2.4, 3.17, 7.2).

²⁰ A point made by J.M. Trappes-Lomax, 'Three suggestions in Latin poetry', *CQ* (2002), 609–12, at 610 n. 3.

²¹ T.L. Agar, 'Emendationes Catulli', *Mnemosyne* 53 (1925), 171–6, 273–82, at 275–6.

noun at 5.7: *da mi basia mille, deinde centum*. The introduction of dative *mi* requires *mihi* to be construed with *inquit* in v. 25—a punctuation that, *pace* Mynors and Nisbet, seems preferable on independent grounds.²² The collocation *da ... commoda* is a clear imitation of Plautine diction: at *As.* 445, *si uelis, da commoda homini amico!* should be translated as ‘if the fancy takes you, give facilities [that is, lend something] to a man who is your friend!’ (see 444: *scyphos ... utendos dedi*).²³ This parallel confirms that, in our verse, *commoda* means ‘loan’ (as assumed by Ellis; see *Cic. Verr.* 2.4.6) and not ‘perquisites’ (as assumed by Nisbet). Moreover, both Plautus and Terence use *da mi*: *da mi, optuma femina, manum* (*Aul.* 135; perhaps *mihi*); *da mi operam parumper* (*Aul.* 199); *da mi igitur operam* (*Cur.* 259); *sed obsecro, da mi operam* (*Truc.* 722); *tum tu igitur paululum da mi operae* (*Eu.* 281); *mi gnate, da mi hanc ueniam* (*Hec.* 605 [Bentley]). The comic intertext thus accounts for *quaeso* (see *obsecro* in *Truc.* 722), for *paulum* (see *parumper* in *Aul.* 199 and *paululum* in *Eu.* 281) and for the polyptoton *mihi ... mi ... mi* (see *Hec.* 605, if Bentley was right) that aptly mimics the seductive behaviour and talk of the wench. The corruption of the line stems from a mistake triggered by the repetition of *mi* or (-)da: a scribe wrote either †*mi Catulle paulum* | *mi Catulle (paulum) commoda*† or †*commoda (mi) commoda*†; the unmetrical line opening †*mi Catulle (paulum)*† or †*commoda (mi)*† was subsequently eliminated and the gap filled with a pronominal form derived from *istud* (v. 28).²⁴

In v. 27, pyrrhic *manē* can be accounted for by iambic shortening or by prosodic hiatus; this uncertainty makes the text suspect. If we leave aside the corrupt sequences †*tē in*† and †*modo ipse*† of 55.4 and 114.2 (see below), the only prosodic hiatus that can be assigned with certainty to the Catullan corpus (97.1: *ita me dī ament*) belongs to a frozen expression inherited from comic diction (for instance, *Pl. Am.* 597; *Ter. Ph.* 883), and thus exhibits the usual shortening of a monosyllable before an iambic word.²⁵ Trappes-Lomax argues in favour of *minime!* ‘no way!’ (ς), but such an abrupt rebuttal does not fit in with the speaker’s otherwise dilatory reply; as for Bergk’s *mi anime*,²⁶ it sounds too (ironically) affectionate in this context. Furthermore, we may retain iambic shortening in *mane* by supplementing this imperative with *tu* (*mane tum* ς, *me ne tu* ς); see *Pl. Mos.* 885a: *manē tu at-|que adsis-| te ili-|co* (lecythium, again with iambic shortening in *mane* and elision of *tu*).²⁷ Catullus quite frequently elides *te* or *tu* before prepositional or prefixal *in(-)*: *te incolumem* (9.6), *te inepte* (12.4), *te in* (31.6), *te in Circo ... te in templo* (55.4–5, see below), *te in* (64.149), *tum te indomitam* (68.118, dubious; *tunc te* ς, *tum te Riese*, *indomitam* Statius); in our poem, *tu insulsa* (v. 33).²⁸ Once *inquii*

²² Skutsch (n. 12), 19; Goold; Thomson; Jocelyn (n. 12), 366; Trappes-Lomax.

²³ The imperative mood conveys the same ironic overtones as e.g. at 28.13 *pete nobiles amicos!* or *Ov. Am.* 3.9.37–9.

²⁴ For other examples of pronouns functioning as stop-gaps, see *Ov. Tr.* 1.10.21 and *Juv.* 13.49 (Housman, 3.966, 3.1016–17, 3.1258), both mentioned by S.J. Heyworth, *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius* (Oxford, 2007), 122.

²⁵ See H. Drexler, *Plautinische Akzentstudien* (Breslau, 1932), 2.292–342; Lindsay (n. 13), 226–9, 331–4; Questa (n. 13), 185–93; Soubiran (n. 13), 25; id. (n. 15), 329–85; id., *Essai sur la versification dramatique des Romains. Sénaière iambique et septénaire trochaïque* (Paris, 1988), 113, 115, 148–9, 182–3, 229.

²⁶ T. Bergk, ‘Philologische thesen’, *Philologus* 12 (1857), 578–81, at 581, reprinted in *Kleine philologische Schriften*, ed. R. Peppmüller (Halle, 1886), 2.730.

²⁷ See Questa (n. 13), 359.

²⁸ *Pace* J. Schrader, *Liber emendationum* (Leeuwarden, 1776), 14–15, Pighi and Trappes-Lomax, *insulsa* should not be corrected into *salsa*. Firstly, †*insulsa*† (*X*) for *insulsa* is paralleled by †*insulissimus*† or †*insulississimus*† (*X*) for *insulissimus* at 17.12 and †*insulata*† (*V*) for *inurata* at 25.11 (see

had given rise to †*inquit*†, *tu* was replaced with †*mi*†, eventually misread as †*me*†; *mi* for *me* occurs at 16.3, and *me* for *mi* at 21.11 and 37.11 (see below, on 55.10).

14.12–15 di magni, horribilem et sacrum libellum!
 quem tu scilicet ad tuum Catullum
 misti, continuo ut †*die*† periret
 Saturnalibus, optimo dierum!

All editors and commentators point out the difficulty created by *die* in v. 14. Friedrich quotes Pl. *Capt.* 333 (*optumusque hominum est homo*) and claims that *Saturnalibus* is an inserted apposition; but this grammatical figure does not occur in Latin poetry before Virgil²⁹ and *periret* oddly separates *die* from *optimo dierum*. Watt's *misti, hoc continuo ut die* maintains the inelegant sequence *die ... optimo dierum*; McKie's *diu* requires *continuo* to be construed with *misti* (as also assumed by Heyworth) and conveys a notion of graduality that proves inconsistent with the overall meaning of the passage (Kiss); Heyworth's *ut periret ipsis*, advocated by Trappes-Lomax, is palaeographically implausible. I propose to replace *die* with *tibi*: other examples of such ethical-possessive datives occur in Catullus (see below, on 55.10); the use of *tibi* after *tuum Catullum* (v. 13) recalls Cic. *Fam.* 9.2.1 (*Caninius tuus ... at tibi repente paucis post diebus, cum minime expectarem, uenit ad me Caninius mane*); datives for the person(s) responsible or beneficiary are found with *pereo*, for instance at Sen. *Ag.* 524–5 *quid hoc simul perire nobiscum iuuat | quibus perimus?* and *Phoen.* 170–1 *membratim tibi | uolui perire* (*TLL* 10.1.1340.66–70). Haplography produced †*ut ibi*† (see †*ut ibi*† *G* for *ut tibi* at 66.24); under the influence of v. 15, metre was restored by substituting †*die*† (wrongly construed with *continuo*) for the temporal adverb.

17.1–3 o colonia, quae cupis ponte ludere longo,
 et salire paratum habes, sed ueris inepta
 crura ponticuli †*axulis*† stantis in rediuiuis

3 ac sulcis *V*

Among the possible substitutes for †*ac sulcis*† or Schwabe's hapactic *axulis*, one should rule out Palmer's *aesculis* ('oak piles'), given that there is no parallel example for such a use of *aesculus* and that, in its two attestations (Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.147: *nullo lapide rediuiuo*; Vit. 7.1.3), adjectival *rediuiuis* ('made of material recycled from demolished buildings') qualifies (free)stones. McKie and Kiss adopt *assulis* (Stadius), which they interpret as designating marble chips (see Vit. 7.6.1 *caementa marmorea, siue assulae dicuntur, quae marmorarii ex operibus deiciunt, pilis ferreis contunduntur cribrisque excernuntur*); this hypothesis makes *rediuiuis* oddly pleonastic. Lafaye's referentially inadequate *arcul(esi)s* can be improved on by editing *arcubus* ('arches'; *TLL* 2.479.67–74). Nisbet proposed replacing *rediuiuis* by *recidiuis* ('back-sliding'), but there

below); *insulsissima* was also altered into †*insulissima*† at *Priap.* 10.1 (Clairmont). Secondly, even if the girl proved astute, the speaker's anger will naturally lead him to call her stupid (Syndikus, 1.116).

²⁹ See J.B. Solodow, 'Raucae, tua cura, palumbes: study of a poetic word order', *HSPH* 90 (1986), 129–53, at 136, who dismisses 64.184 *praeterea nullo litus, sola insula, tecto* by adopting *colitur* (A. Palmer, review of Ellis's 1878 edition, *Hermathena* 3 [1879], 293–363, at 344–5); for a defence of this correction against Trappes-Lomax's objections, see M. Dominicy, 'De Catulle 113 à Propercé IV, 11, 65–66', *Latomus* 71 (2012), 392–403, at 396–7 n. 18.

is otherwise no parallel for *recidiuus* in this sense. Both McKie and Trappes-Lomax (who prefers *insulis*, ‘artificial islands’, without any parallel use attested) claim that *crura* makes any further mention of props, piles or arches superfluous. But, as shown by Rudd,³⁰ the decrepitude of the bridge matches that of the man the speaker wants to humiliate; in such a context, the co-occurrence of *crura* and *arcubus* helps the reader to access the symbolism at work.³¹ The corruption process probably started with the solecism †*arcibus*† (*TLL* 2.475.76–9); double metathesis (†*acrubis*†, which created a rhyme between the two subverses) and the usual confusion between *b* and *li* yielded †*acrullis*†, normalized as †*ac sulcis*†.³²

22.5–8 ... nec sic ut fit in palimpseston
relata: cartae regiae, †noui libri†,
noui umbilici, lora rubra membranae,
derecta plumbo et pumice omnia aequata.

6 noue *V*

If a nominative, *noui libri* (v. 6) should normally come before *cartae regiae* in that it refers to the whole books, and not to any specific part of them; if a genitive, it deprives the enumeration of most of its rhetorical force (Kroll; Syndikus, 1.157 n. 12). Vindicating the manuscript reading *nou(a)e*, Nisbet proposed reading *nouae bibli* (adopted by Goold and Syndikus, 1.157), taken as a genitive (‘of new papyrus’) rather than a nominative (‘new papyri’), and parallel to the genitive *membranae*. In favour of his correction, Nisbet pointed out that v. 6 with *libri* is the only Catullan scazon where the penultimate position is filled by a syllable that, given the presence of an obstruent + liquid group, may remain short in other metrical environments, while ‘*bl*’ lengths automatically at its rare occurrences in classical Latin, as it normally does in Greek.³³ But scazon-final *lābris* (Mat. 11.2 [Courtney, *FLP*]; mentioned by Nisbet) and *fēbris* ([Verg.] *Cat.* 2.3), as well as several comparable examples in Martial (1.96.13, 6.39.8

³⁰ N. Rudd, ‘Colonia and her bridge. A note on the structure of Catullus 17’, *TAPhA* 90 (1959), 238–42, reprinted with the same pagination in K. Quinn (ed.), *Approaches to Catullus* (Cambridge and New York, 1972). See also B. Arkins, *Sexuality in Catullus* (Hildesheim, Zurich and New York, 1982), 4–6.

³¹ In Aristotelian terms (*Poet.* 1457b), we would say that the arches (made of ill-adapted recycled freestones) are to the bridge what the *inepta crura* are to *x* (the provisionally unknown value of the equation). A. Henry, *Métaphore et métonymie* (Brussels, 1983²), 123–7 provides several examples of such configurations, e.g. *Aux mâchoires de feu de l’âtre qui se creuse* (Victor Hugo), where the flames are to the hollow hearth what the jaws are to *x* (implicitly, a human or non-human animal that aims at filling his/her/its stomach).

³² On metathesis involving *r* in the Catullan tradition, see McKie, 17–18 n. 68, and below, on 25.11 and 36.12. More generally, A.E. Housman, *M. Manilii Astronomicon Liber Primus* (Cambridge, 1937²), liv–lix; Housman, 1.50–1, 1.108, 1.147–8, 1.150, 1.158–60, 1.167, 1.170, 1.382, 2.435, 2.441, 2.711–2, 3.911; Willis, 81–4. On corruptions produced by the search for rhymes (esp. between hemistichs or subverses), see Willis, 102–8 and below, on 68.158. On *b* and *li*, see Havet, 156.582, 162–3.633, and e.g. †*getalia sternaeque*† for *Geta Basternaeque* at Avien. *Orb. terr.* 442 (van de Woestijne). Housman’s (3.991–2) plausible emendation *arcubus* for †*auribus/aureis*† at Mart. 10.24.9 is quite similar to what I am proposing here.

³³ See W.S. Allen, *Accent and Rhythm. Prosodic Features of Latin and Greek: A Study in Theory and Reconstruction* (Cambridge, 1973), 210–13, 217–18. Exceptions in Greek: Pind. *Nem.* 8.7; Aesch. *Cho.* 589 (West), *Supp.* 761 βύβλου; Soph. *El.* 440, *OC* 533, *OT* 717, *Phil.* 1311; *Delph. Or.* 2.2 (Parke-Wormell); Lycoph. 577. In Latin, where this principle does not hold for words in contact (see e.g. *mixtaquē blanditiis* at Ov. *Met.* 6.626), the only (post-classical) counter-examples I am aware of occur at *Anth. Lat.* 196.7 (Riese) *tāblastis* and Drepanius Florus (Migne, *PL* 61.1089) *tāblis*.

lābris; 3.93.12 *mācrae*; 7.7.10 *Tigris*; 8.61.4 *cēdro*; 10.100.2 *libro*, mentioned by Nisbet; 12.65.4 *libram*), seriously weaken this argument.³⁴ I suggest printing *notae cedri*, which designates the traces, stains or fragrances left by the cedar oil used for preserving books (Vitr. 2.9.13). Poets frequently evoke the *cedrus*: Hor. *Ars P.* 332; Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.7, 3.1.13; Pers. 1.42–3; Mart. 3.2.7, 5.6.14, 8.61.4 (where *cēdro* occurs in scazon-final position). For this use of plural nominative *notae*, see Lucr. 6.220–1 *inusta uaporis | signa notaeque graues halantis sulphuris auras* and Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.7 *nec titulus minio, nec cedro carta notetur*; see also *nota* and *noto* at 68.28, 68.148, 80.8, 107.6. Owing to the confusion between capital *D* and *B*³⁵ and to the context, *cedri* was read as †*libri*†; *not(a)e* shifted to †*nou(a)e*† under the influence of following *noui* and, perhaps, 1.1 *nouum libellum*; see †*nouo*† for *notat* at *Culex* 71 (Salvatore), with Housman, 2.781.

25.10–13 ne laneum latusculum manusque mollicellas
 †inusta turpiter tibi flagella conscribillent†,
 et insolenter aestues, uelut minuta magno
 deprensa nauis in mari, uesaniēte uento.

11 insula *V* | conscribillent *V*

The first *i* of *conscribillent* was undoubtedly long (Kroll). Pighi and Goold follow Turnebus³⁶ in printing *conscribillent flagella*, but nothing, in the evidence available (*TLL* 4.473.71–6), allows us to envisage that, if the orthography with a simple *l* corresponds to phonetic reality, the second *i* did not undergo compensatory lengthening consecutive to the loss of the geminate consonant. Among the verb forms that have been proposed as substitutes for *conscribil(l)ent*, Trappes-Lomax's *contribulent* (before *flagella*) is the only one that may seem plausible, but the first attestations of this word occur in Christian texts (*TLL* s.v.). In addition, *inusta* (Calphurnius) should inspire suspicion, since this epithet always applies to the individual whipped or to the marks left by the whipping (*TLL* 7.2.270.10–12). In my view, we need a more radical solution: *inurat acriter tibi, cum sibilet, flagellum*. The adverb *acriter* regularly features in descriptions of burning, torture and similar (physical or mental) states or actions (Lucr. 3.289; Cic. *Div.* 1.66; Sall. *Hist. frg. dub. uel fals.* 4 [Maurenbrecher]; Livy 27.3.5, 39.43.2; Vitr. 2.3.2; Ov. *Am.* 2.19.3, *Her.* 19.15, *Ars am.* 2.354; Tac. *Ann.* 4.40.3, 15.57.1); see also Verg. *Aen.* 9.718 *et stimulos acres sub pectore uertit* and Tac. *Germ.* 6 *ferro ... acri*. The subordinate clause *cum sibilet* (an improvement on *consibillent*, *ς*) aptly evokes the whistling sound of the whip: see 4.12 *loquente saepe sibillum edidit coma*; Pac. 334–5 (Ribbeck, *TRF*) *flictus nauium | strepitus fremitus, clamor tonitruum et rudentum sibilus*; Luc. 2.698 *nec quatiunt ualidos, ne sibilet aura, rudentes*; Sil. 17.256–7 *stridorque inmīte rudentum | sibilat*. Given that *sibilo* is very naturally predicated of (objects shaken or tossed by) winds or tempests (4.12; Pac. 334–5; Sil. 17.256–7; [Quint.] *Decl.* 12.16 *scissis rudentibus tempestas sibilat*), a perceptual continuity relates our line to vv. 12–13, and thus to v. 4 *Thalle, turbida rapacior procella*, Thallus' announced misfortune being conceived of in the same metaphorical terms as his thefts. A missegmentation, coupled with the confusion between *p* and *c*,³⁷ with metathesis involving

³⁴ Contrary to what is suggested by Housman (3.1245), *lābra* occurs at Pl. *Am.* 444 and *Cas.* 452.

³⁵ Havet, 159.600; Lindsay, 84; see †*bauilla/baiula(s)*† for *Daulias* at 65.14.

³⁶ A. Turnebus, *Adversariorum tomus tertius* (Paris, 1573), 26.

³⁷ On capital *P* and *c/G* (hence *e*, *i*, etc.), see Friedrich, 331; Havet, 160.607; Housman 1.149; Housman *ad* Luc. 7.419; M. Dominicy, 'L'élégie III, 22 de Properce. Propositions pour une nouvelle

r (see above, on 17.3) and the *a/u* alternation, yielded †*inura turpiter*†, †*inura*† being aberrantly normalized as †*insula*† (see n. 28 on 10.33). The search for grammatical agreement, favoured by the constant analogy between whipping and burning, led to †*inura ... flagella*†. As usual, *s(e)i-* shifted to †*sci-*†, hence †*sci*† = †*scri*†.³⁸ Once *cum sibilet* had been altered into †*conscribil(l)e(n)t*†, a rhythmical imperative triggered the permutation: in this poem, no word of more than two syllables has its stress falling on the weak position of a foot; consequently, the accentual anomaly of †*conscribil(l)e(n)t flagellum/-a*† was eliminated by writing †*flagellum/-a conscribil(l)e(n)t*†.

29.1–4 quis hoc potest uidere, quis potest pati,
nisi impudicus et uorax et aleo,
Mamurram habere quod Comata Gallia
habebat †uncti† et ultima Britannia?

4 cum te *V*

Modern editions waver between the two plausible emendations *ante* (Stadius) and *uncti* (G. Faernus, quoted by Stadius; *uncta* ζ, *unctum* Scaliger; see Gaisser, 376). Yet *ante* lacks relevance, in that it simply makes explicit a time reference already implied by the context, while *uncti* is a negatively oriented word that would aptly apply to Mamurra himself (see 10.11) or his possessions (see v. 22), but not to Gaul or Britain at the time they were still preserved from his destructive greed. I choose to read *umquam* so as to provide the free relative clause with an emphatically universal value; see, for instance, Pl. *Poen.* 449–50 *di illum infelicent omnes qui post hunc diem | leno ullam Veneri umquam immolarit hostiam*; Verg. *Aen.* 2.331 *milia aut magnis umquam uenere Mycenis*; Livy 4.6.9 *quicumque aliquid seditiose dixerat quot fecerat umquam*. This construction occurs in a mutilated distich that relates to poems 10 and 29: *Bithynia quicquid | et pedicator Caesaris umquam habuit* (Calv. 17 [Courtney, *FLP*] = Suet. *Jul.* 49.2); one may wonder who the imitator is. Imperfect *habebat* expresses habitualness (‘whatever long-haired Gaul and farthest Britain used to own’); compare with a similar use of the present tense at Ov. *Met.* 583–4 *intumui quantusque, feror cum plurimus umquam, | tantus eram* (‘and I was as great as I am whenever my flood is at its fullest’). This suggests, again, that Roman looting is a systemic process that does not take place in one fell swoop. I assume that *umquam* first shifted to its near-synonym †*cumque*† correlated with *quod*: dittography (†*habebat tum-*†) produced †*cum-*† and the common confusion between *quom*, (-)*quam* and *-que* took place. Then †*cumque*†, written †*cumce*†, evolved to †*cum te*†.³⁹

édition critique’, *AC* 79 (2010), 137–62, at 154, and id., ‘Notes critiques sur l’*élégie* 4, 3 de Propere’, *MH* 72 (2015), 34–48, at 46–7. To the examples quoted in those works, add †*apsi*† *T* for †*ac si*† = *at si V* at 62.54, †*tuignare*† *T* = †*cu(i)gnare*† for *pugnare V* at 62.64 and, in Sen. (Viainsino), *insulam* for *pusulam* (*Dial.* 5.43.4), *ipsumque* for *l(a)esumque* (*Phaed.* 187), *expulit* for *excuit* (*Tro.* 457).

³⁸ See †*scis*† *X* for *sis* at 34.21 and 78b.4; also Lindsay, 77. On the corruption of graphic *sei(-)*, see F. Buecheler, ‘Zur Kritik der Ciceronischen Briefe’, *RhM* 11 (1857), 509–35, at 515, reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, ed. O. Hense and E. Lommatzsch (Leipzig–Berlin, 1915), 1.59.

³⁹ On confusions between *cum/quom*, (-)*quam* and *-que*, or between *-que* and *-ce*, see Buecheler (n. 38), 518 = 1.61; Havet, 180.747–9, 181.756–60, 190.808, 215–6.914–18, 252.1060; Housman *ad Luc.* 9.591; below, on 29.20, 36.12, 107.1. One finds †*-que*† for *cum* at Propertius 2.3.22 and 4.1.18 (see M. Dominicy, ‘Notes critiques sur l’*élégie* 4, 1 de Propere’, *MH* 71 [2014], 85–99), †*cum/-que*† for *quam* at *Ciris* 123 (Knecht), †*feraque*† for *fera quam* at [Sen.] *Oct.* 87 (Viainsino), and *quinte* for *q(u)umce/cumce = cumque* at Cic. *Div.* 2.149 (Giomini).

29.6–8 et ille nunc superbus et superfluens
perambulabit omnium cubilia,
ut albulus columbus aut †Adoneus†?

8 ydoneus *V* (idoneus *R*)

Such a learned poet as Catullus could not resort to *Adoneus/-ius*,⁴⁰ a native adaptation (attested at Pl. *Men.* 144) of the original Greek proper name.⁴¹ Among the corrections proposed, *Dioneus/-ius* (Calphurnius et al.), *Sidonius*,⁴² *Thyoneus/-ius* (Ellis [n. 40]) and *Cydonius* (Oksala) do not make sense (see Zicàri, 265 on *Cydonius*); *Dodoneus* (Herrmann) does not scan (Zicàri, 244); *Aphrodisius* (with elimination of *aut*; Trappes-Lomax) and *ciconius/-eus* (McKie) are unjustifiable hapaxes (see Kiss on *ciconius*). In addition, all those emendations create an awkward disjunction or asyndetic collision between *albulus* and the following epithet. I suggest editing *ut albulus columbus aut olor nitens*; *olor* probably occurs in Lucilius (268 [Marx] = Non. 200.20 [Lindsay])⁴³ and *nitens* is a Catullan word (see 2.5, 61.186; also *enitens* at 61.21, *nitor* at 66.3). Doves and swans belong to Venus' attributes (for swans, see Hor. *Carm.* 3.28.15, 4.1.10; Sil. 7.441; Stat. *Silv.* 3.4.22), but the disjunctive structure of the noun phrase and the erotic overtones of the passage rather favour a reference to Leda's legend (Ov. *Met.* 6.109 *fecit olorinis Ledam recubare sub alis*; Man. 1.339–40 *cum deus in niueum descendit uersus olorem | tergaque fidenti subiecit plumea Leda*; Mart. 1.53.8 *inter Ledaeos ridetur coruus olores*; Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.142 *Amyclaeos ... olores*, *Theb.* 10.504–5 *lubrica ripa Lacaenae | uirginis et falso gurges cantatus olori*;⁴⁴ [Sen.] *Oct.* 204–5 *dominus caeli diuumque pater | ... pennas sumpsit oloris*); the same association between Venus' doves and Leda's swan occurs at Mart. 8.28.13 *Spartanus tibi cedit olor Paphiaequae columbae*. For *nitens* meaning 'brilliantly white', see Verg. *Aen.* 3.20–1, 6.895; Hor. *Carm.* 1.14.19–20, 2.5.18; Ov. *Met.* 1.610; *Ciris* 524–5; Sen. *Tro.* 184;⁴⁵ at Germ. *Arat.* 278, the collocation *Cycnum ... nitentem* designates the constellation, also called *Olor* (*TLL* 9.2.572.29–43). An intricate network of metrical and sound parallelisms relates *columbus aut olor nitens* to *superbus et superfluens*—repeated (-)ol- discretely echoing the wordplay on *super-*. Quite expectedly, *olor* was mixed up with †odor†,⁴⁶ while *nitēs* mechanically shifted to †neus† (see †uenus† for *ueniens* at Germ. *Arat.* 588; Housman, 2.514); the normalization of †odo(r)neus† as †idoneus† recalls that of †idcoeos† (from *Idaeos*) as †idoneos† at 64.178 (Friedrich, 360; see below, on 55.9).

29.15–24 quid †est alid† sinistra liberalitas?
parum expatrauit an parum elluatus est?
paterna prima lancinata sunt bona,

⁴⁰ Statius (see Gaisser, 414–5); R. Ellis, 'Adversaria', *Journal of Philology* 17 (1888), 128–41, at 132–3.

⁴¹ See F. Thomas, 'Autour d'un passage de Plaute: *Mén.* 141 sqq.', *Hommages à Léon Herrmann* (Brussels, 1960), 705–14.

⁴² J.v.G. Froehlich, 'Ueber Catullus' *Carmen* XXIX', *Gelehrte Anzeigen [München]* 23 (1846), 131.23–133.36, at 133.34 (*dubitanter*).

⁴³ See H. Quellet, *Les dérivés latins en -or. Étude lexicographique, statistique et sémantique* (Paris, 1969), 29–30. But serious objections have been formulated by Housman, 2.667 and Soubiran (n. 15), 210, 217–8.

⁴⁴ See R.D. Williams, *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos Liber Decimus* (Leiden, 1972), 92–3.

⁴⁵ See J. Clarke, *Imagery of Colour & Shining in Catullus, Propertius, & Horace* (New York, 2003), 18–19, 106–12.

⁴⁶ See *TLL* 9.2.468.21–6 and 41–3; Quellet (n. 43), 29–30, 41, 60–1.

secunda praeda Pontica, inde tertia
 Hibera, quam †scit† amnis aurifer Tagus,
 †nunc Galliae timetur et Britanniae†.
 quid hunc malum fouetis? aut quid hic potest
 nisi uncta deuorare patrimonia?
 eone nomine, †urbis opulentissime†,
 socer generque, perdidistis omnia?

15 alit V || 20 hunc V | timet V

Among the editors of Catullus, only Bardon and Della Corte follow Deroux in printing *quid est? alit ...* in v. 15.⁴⁷ In favour of this conservative reading, Deroux mentions the pun it creates on *est* ('What is happening?' or 'What does he eat?') and a similar collocation: *pu]eri et puellae qui ex liberalitate eius [Imperatoris] aluntur*.⁴⁸ But, as shown by the translations in Bardon ('Eh bien! c'est une largesse de voleur qui l'alimente') and Della Corte ('Come no? Lo mantiene la prodigalità dei ladrocinii'), the statement obtained abruptly interrupts a sequence of interrogative lines (vv. 14 and 16) expressing indignation (Zicàri, 270); more importantly, it entails that Caesar's (and Pompey's) connivance with fraud and looting is 'feeding up' Mamurra, whereas the overall content of the poem precisely points to the impossibility of putting an end to his greed.⁴⁹ Yet, *alid* = *aliud* (Stadius; Gaisser, 414) does not yield better sense, nor even correct syntax (Syndikus, 1.180 n. 21): in all parallel examples, the grammatical subject that directly combines with the collocation *quid est aliud...?* is an infinitival clause (Cic. *Div.* 2.78, *Off.* 2.83, *Phil.* 1.22, 2.7, 3.21, 5.5, 10.5, 12.13, *Pis.* 47, *S. Rosc.* 54, *Verr.* 2.1.128, 2.3.71; Livy 6.40.8; Ov. *Her.* 18.181–2) or an equivalent relative clause with a subjunctive verb (Cic. *Cael.* 32). Faernus' *quid abstulit...?* (reported by Stadius), though failing to solve our problem, suggests the most attractive emendation *quid extulit...?* Such uses of *effero* meaning 'generate, produce' are well-documented (TLL 5.2.143.46–81); see, for instance, Cic. *Sen.* 9 *artes exercitationes uirtutum, quae ... mirificos efferunt fructus*, Verg. *G.* 2.167–9 *haec [that is Italia] genus acre uirum ... extulit*, Petr. 120.98–9 *horrida tellus | extulit in lucem nutritas sanguine fruges*. Moreover, Phaed. 2.9.15–16 *sin autem rabulis doctus occurrit labor, | sinistra quos in lucem natura extulit* may well imitate Catullus. The morphophonological parallelism between *extulit* and *expatruit* (v. 16) favours the word-play relating the second form to *paterna* (v. 17) and *patrimonia* (for the semantic affinity between [h]elluor and *patrimonium*, see Cic. *Sest.* 111, [Verg.] *Cat.* 13.11, Gell. *NA* 2.24.11). A mis-segmentation †*ext ulit*† was spontaneously read as †*est alit*† (see, for instance, †*testa*† *X* for *texta* at 64.10) under the influence of the context.

In v. 19, *scit* hardly makes sense. The comparable corrections proposed by Ezra de Clercq van Jever (*qua nitescit*)⁵⁰ and McKie (*qua tumescit*) require the elimination of

⁴⁷ C. Deroux, 'Catulle, 29, 15', *Latomus* 28 (1969), 486–7; the *Catullus Online* website attributes this proposal to R. Verdière, who borrowed it from Deroux in 1976. A more elaborate defence can be found in C. Deroux, 'Encore sur la sinistra liberalitas des Triumvirs (Catulle XXIX, 15)', *Latomus* 72 (2013), 221–3. T. Birt, *Commentariolus Catullianus tertius* (Marburg, 1895), xiii already proposed *quid istum alit* (erroneously quoted as 'Birt 1894' in the apparatus of the *Catullus Online* website).

⁴⁸ See G. Paci, 'Una nuova dedica dei pueri alimentari di Cupra Montana', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Corolla Epigraphica. Hommages au professeur Yves Burnand* (Brussels, 2011), 2.589–601.

⁴⁹ See D. Konstan ('The contemporary political context') and W.J. Tatum ('Social commentary and political invective'), in Skinner, 73–8, 339–43.

⁵⁰ E. de Clercq van Jever, *Selectarum observationum in M. Annaei Lucani Pharsaliam specimen alterum* (Leiden, 1772), 68.

amnis. Wiman's⁵¹ *unxit* proves unsatisfactory, in that 'the verb *ung(u)ere* (as opposed to its past participle *unctus* – cf. 29.22) is never used for the idea of metaphorically anointing or oiling, i.e. enriching, and seems inappropriate for the more liquid action of a river' (so Harrison, who opts for *auxit*, already proposed by Marcilius⁵²). I think *egit* is definitely preferable, given the frequency of the collocation *praedam ago* in military contexts (*TLL* 1.1368.81–1369.7, 10.2.528.33–6); in Livy, one can find 31 examples of it (for instance, 25.31.13 *praedamque omnis generis retro ad naues egit*), even without taking prefixed derivatives from *ago* into account. This technical expression immediately makes sense in a poem dealing with Caesar's campaigns and with Mamurra's constant looting; by combining it with *aurifer* (*ago* and *fero* are synonymous in this context), Catullus makes Tagus appear both as another Pactolus and as a soldier who brings booty to his commander. Owing to the confusion between capital *G* and *C*,⁵³ *egit* shifted to †*ecit*†, subsequently normalized as †*scit*†; see †*ecit*† for *sciet* at *Priap.* 52.12 (Clairmont).

In order to filter out implausible candidates among the innumerable emendations that have been proposed for v. 20, I will adopt three general criteria. First, we should dismiss the hypothesis put forth by Minyard and Deroux that the first foot might be spondaic owing to the presence of line-initial *nunc* or another prosodically equivalent word;⁵⁴ the deviation with respect to a pure iambic metre that occurs in v. 3 is licensed by the proper name *Māmurram* (for similar phenomena, see trisyllabic *Camērijum* at 55.10, *Au- | runculeia* at 61.82–3 and perhaps the syncopated or hypermetric *Rauide* at 40.1). Secondly, any correction that posits interrogative *-ne* at the third (short) position produces an utterance that lacks the rhetorical force needed in the context at hand, since non-focussing 'yes-no' questions with *-ne* have an argumentative orientation that assimilates them to weaker variants of the corresponding negative statements.⁵⁵ Thirdly, all reconstructions that maintain some form of *timeo* run against the definitive objection that neither Gaul nor Britain had anything left to fear about, that nobody could feel fear for them anymore, and that the whole poem deals with Mamurra's past and actual plunder, not with his future actions (Syndikus, 1.180–1 n. 22). Two interesting conclusions emerge from this systematic examination. At the third (short) position, enclitic *-ce* or *-que* are good substitutes for *-ne*.⁵⁶ Instead of ... *timet*, one may envisage

⁵¹ G. Wiman, 'Ad Catulli textum critica', *Eranos* 62 (1963), 29–37, at 30.

⁵² T. Marcilius, *In C. Valerium Catullum asterismi* (Paris, 1604), 7.

⁵³ Havet, 159.598–9; Lindsay, 84; †*totam*† from †*tocam*† for *togam* at Macr. 1.6.14 (Willis, 7); see below, on 73.4.

⁵⁴ J.-D. Minyard, 'Critical notes on Catullus 29', *CPh* 66 (1971), 174–81; C. Deroux, 'Un nouveau personnage catullien: de la philologie à l'histoire', *RBPh* 55 (1977), 56–78.

⁵⁵ See 9.3, 28.4, 63.58, 64.28–9, 64.178, 66.15. To capture this point intuitively, consider the following acceptability contrast in English: *Does chemotherapy work against cancer stem cells? This would be contrary to all we know* (OK), *Chemotherapy does not work against cancer stem cells. This would be contrary to all we know* (OK), *Chemotherapy does work against cancer stem cells. This would be contrary to all we know* (NONSENSE). For a theoretical approach to such data, see J.-C. Anscombe and O. Ducrot, *L'argumentation dans la langue* (Brussels–Liège, 1983), 8, 115–37. In vv. 11 and 23, the question focusses on *eo nomine*; see Goold's and Lee's translations: 'Was is for this/on this account ...?'

⁵⁶ Various solutions have been proposed: *hunce* (L. Spengel, 'Specimen lectionum in C. Valerii Catulli carmina', *Neues Archiv für Philologie und Pädagogik* (Hannover) 3 [1828], 93–127, at 114); *eunce* (Heyse); *huice* (E. Baehrens, *Analecta catulliana* [Jena, 1874], 43); *timentque* (Avancius); *fiuntque* (A. Tartara, *Animadversiones in locos nonnullos Valeri Catulli et Titi Livi* [Rome, 1881], 29–31; *dubitanter*); *sciuntque* (Birt [n. 47], xiv); *eumque* (G.B. Pighi, 'Emendazioni catulliane', *RFIC* 30 [1952], 38–48, at 39); *fluuntque* (Goold, in his 1973 edition).

(*et*) *ultima(m)* (*et*) or *ultimae*,⁵⁷ which provide a good parallelism with v. 4; notice, however, that the correction *ultima et* would exclude the possibility of construing *ultima* with *Britannia*, since Catullus never postposes *et* (Housman, 2.626). Given that the only conjecture that meets all the conditions formulated (*sciuntque Galliae ultimam* [praedam] *et Britanniae*; Birt [n. 56]) loses all plausibility after the elimination of *scit* from v. 19, I suggest *caduntque Gallia ultimae et Britannia*, which resorts to the same military lexicon as [praedam] *egit*; for a similar collocation, see 11.22–3 *cecidit uehul prati | ultimi flos*⁵⁸ and Sen. *Tro.* 243 *tum saeua Amazon ultimus cecidit timor*. The corruption of the line involved different processes. First, a mis-segmentation †*Gallia ul tima e et*† produced †*Gallia ut tima et et*†; confusions between *e(x)*, *es(t)* and *et* abound in manuscripts.⁵⁹ Secondly, †*ut*† shifted to †*et*†, as constantly happens, and †*tima et*† to †*timet*†.⁶⁰ Thirdly, under the influence of v. 21, *caduntque* was replaced by †*quid hun(c)que*† = †*quid hun(c)ce*†.⁶¹ At that stage, the line read as follows: †*quid hun(c)ce Gallia et timet et Britannia*† (metrical, except for the resolution on †*timet*†). Fourthly, the rare form †*hun(c)ce*†, only (possibly) attested at Laber. 21 and Apul. *Apol.* 99, reduced to †*hunc*† and †*Gallia et*† shifted to †*Galliae*†.⁶² This triggered the adaptation to †*Britanniae*†, perhaps on the model of 45.22 *Syrias Britanniasque* or Plin. *HN* 17.42–3 *alia est ratio, quam Britanniae et Galliae inueniunt ... Gallias Britanniasque*. Finally, the unmetrical line-opening †*quid hunc Galliae*...† was improved on by eliminating †*quid*†.

In v. 23, the resolution and the spondaic foot of *opulentissime/-i* cannot be maintained (again *pace* Minyard and Deroux [n. 54]). The less implausible emendation compatible with *urbis* (*o potissimi*, Mueller) runs against palaeographical objections, and one may reasonably hesitate between the referentially adequate but useless *urbis* and Haupt's hyperbolic *orbis*.⁶³ Trappes-Lomax advocates *eone nomine, imperator unice* (Scaliger), but this repeated insult (see v. 11) does not lead naturally to the vocative that follows. We will obtain an excellent text if we successively adopt Maude Thompson's *o bis* and Giri's *optimi uiri: eone nomine, o bis optimi uiri, | socer generaque, perdidistis omnia*?⁶⁴ For *bis* meaning 'both, doubly' and not 'twice (at different times)', see *Eleg. Maec.* 2.29 = 173 *et tibi succrescant iuuenes bis Caesare digni*,

⁵⁷ T. Bergk, *Lectiones Catullianae* (Halle, 1863), iii–iv; Housman's handwritten notes in a copy of Schwabe's 1886 edition (see the *Catullus Online* website); Ellis; Birt (n. 56).

⁵⁸ According to M.C.J. Putnam, 'Catullus 11: the ironies of integrity', *Ramus* 3 (1974), 70–86, reprinted in *Essays on Latin Lyric, Elegy, and Epic* (Princeton, 1982), 13–29, at 28 n. 11, '[i]t is ... possible that Catullus means *flos ultimus*, by hypallage, or even a series of meadows, one spoiled after another'; these lethal overtones are made explicit at Verg. *Aen.* 9.433–7.

⁵⁹ See Friedrich, 211–2; Havet, 177.726; Lindsay, 74, 85; McCarren, s.v. *e(x)-es(t)-et*; below, on 107.7. Some additional examples: Prop. 1.5.6 and 2.5.5 (Heyworth [n. 24], 129 n. 24); *Ciris* 175 (Knecht); Sen. (Viansino), *Phaed.* 890, *Dial.* 3.1.4 (†*et aestuante*† for *exaestuante*); Luc. 9.649 (Housman).

⁶⁰ On the alternation between *ut* and *et*, see Lindsay, 74; McCarren, s.v. *et/ut*; for the reduction of *ae* to *e*, see e.g. *aestu radiatorum* corrupted into †*est cura deorum*† at Avien. *Orb. terr.* 70 (van de Woestijne) and below, on 107.8.

⁶¹ See above, on 29.4; *hosque* and *hosce* alternate at Cic. *Arat.* 33.285 (Soubiran).

⁶² Laber. 21 in Ribbeck, *CRF*; but C. Panayotakis, *Decimus Laberius* (Cambridge, 2010), 169, 175–6 prefers *hunc*; see also Non. 122.11 (Lindsay). For the corruption of *-a et* to †*ae*†, see e.g. †*poenae*† for *poena et* at Prop. 3.6.20 (Heyworth), †*percussaque*† or †*percussa e(s)t*† for *percussae* at Luc. 3.564 and †*locuta est*† for *locutae* at Luc. 5.210 (Housman); also see below, n. 82.

⁶³ M. Haupt, *Quaestiones Catullianae* (Leipzig, 1837), 20–1.

⁶⁴ E. Maude Thompson, 'Catulliana', *AJPh* 21 (1900), 78–9; Giri (n. 9), 132–5. Similar wordplays between *optimus* and *omnis* occur at 49.5–7 and 75.3–4; see M. Dominicy, 'Une analyse poétique de Catulle 75', in P. Defosse (ed.), *Hommages à Carl Deroux I – Poésie* (Brussels, 2002), 171–82.

about Gaius and Lucius Caesar (Schoonhoven ad loc.) and Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.64–6 *nec enim temeraria uirtus | illa magis, summae gelidum quae Pelion Ossae | iunxit anhelantemque iugis bis pressit Olympum* (Vollmer ad loc.).⁶⁵ The shift from †*obis*† to †*ōbis*† = †*orbis*† is palaeographically trivial, and manuscripts systematically waver between †*orbis*† and †*urbis*†. Owing to repeated mistakes on a series of minims, *optimiuri* was read as †*oplitissimi*† = †*oplētissime*†, expectedly normalized as *opulentissime*; this was favoured by the semantic affinity of *optimus* and *opulentus* (see Enn. *scen.* 259 [Vahlen] = Cic. *Fam.* 7.6.1 *matronae opulentaе optimates*).

36.11–17 nunc o caeruleo creata ponto,
 quae sanctum Idalium †*Vriosque* apertos†
 quaeque Ancona Cnidumque harundinosam
 colis quaeque Amathunta quaeque Golgos
 quaeque Durrachium Hadriae tabernam,
 acceptum face redditumque uotum,
 si non inlepidum neque inuenustum est.

12 utriusque *al. uriosque G* || 14 colisque Amathunta *V*

Commentators have shown anxious to associate with Venus all the place-names occurring in this passage. Ancona's and Durrachium's cult and temple of Venus⁶⁶ can perhaps be put on a par with the legendary Cnidus, Amathus and Golgoe (on this form, see below); but the enigmatic *Vrios*, approximately identifiable with the name of one or another obscure port or town,⁶⁷ definitely looks like a non-existent word produced by textual corruption.

Since there is no reason for assuming v. 15 to be interpolated (see n. 66), one should envisage that, by evoking the Adriatic and some of its ports, Catullus aimed not only at establishing a loose symbolic link to sea-born Venus, but also at alluding to some referentially relevant detail. Williams (n. 66), Wiseman (n. 67) and Goold think of Catullus' route home from the East in 56. But Volus(i)us lived in, was native from, or related to some place in the delta of the Po (see below, on 68.157–8) and he may have been a Picene, so that it would have been quite natural for him to situate an episode of his annals in the Adriatic space.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ G. Liberman, *Stace Silves* (Paris, 2010), 272 objects to Vollmer's analysis ('die Zweieit ist zum Prädicat gezogen') that *bis* means 'd'abord sous le poids de l'Ossa, puis sous celui du Pélion, lui-même posé sur l'Ossa'; but what matters in such examples is the fact that two individuals or objects exhibit the same moral or physical property (of excellence, dignity, or weight), so that their simultaneous presence at some spatio-temporal point results in a 'doubling' of that quality or quantity.

⁶⁶ See Juv. 4.40 on Ancona. Catullan scholarship traditionally emphasized the lack of any corresponding evidence concerning Durrachium – which led Fordyce to add this unexpected remark (inspired from Baehrens, Kroll, or Lenchantin de Gubernatis) in his notoriously prudish commentary: 'the cult of Venus, which is mentioned only here, is not surprising in a large seaport'; see also G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), 222–3. In his 2007 book, Trappes-Lomax deleted v. 15, but he changed his mind after discovering that archaeological testimony supports the hypothesis that 'Durrachium did have a major shrine of Venus'; see his 'Further thoughts in Catullus', *Paideia* 67 (2012), 633–45, at 637.

⁶⁷ For the evidence available, see T.P. Wiseman, *Catullan Questions* (Leicester, 1969), 42–5; *Cinna the Poet and Other Roman Essays* (Leicester, 1974), 50; and his contribution in Skinner, 58; Thomson's edition ad loc.

⁶⁸ See Wiseman, *Catullan Questions* (n. 67), 41 n. 3. This would militate in favour of the substitution of *Hadriaticus* for *Hortensius* at 95.3 (for the scansion, see Avien. *Orb. terr.* 139, 561); but other solutions are available (see J.B. Solodow, 'On Catullus 95', *CPh* 82 [1987], 92–5).

Few attempts have been made to emend *Vriosque apertos: Vriosque portus* (Heinsius, *dubitanter*)⁶⁹ does not solve the problem, but interestingly suggests that the participle form might be corrupt too; *Chytrosque apertos* (Bergk),⁷⁰ from Gk. Χύτροι designating a town in Cyprus (see, for instance, Xenagoras, fr. 10, *FHG* 4.527), makes good sense, but remains devoid of any mythical overtones; Trappes-Lomax, after considering the palaeographically implausible *Paphonque celsam*, prefers to obelize the manuscript reading. I propose to print *quae sanctum Idalium, quae Hydrunta portum*. Feminine *Hydrus, Hydruntis* is the ancient name of Otranto, the nearest Italian port to the Epirean coast and thus a natural stopping place for people who crossed the Adriatic (Cic. *Att.* 15.21.3, 16.5.3, *Fam.* 16.9.1; Livy 36.21.5; Plin. *HN.* 3.100–1; Mart. Cap. 6.650). Though other Latin writers only use the accusative *Hydruntem* (Cic., Livy) or, in later times, *Hydruntum* (Mart. Cap., Paul.-Nol. *Carm.* 17.85),⁷¹ *Hydrunta* here imitates Gk. Ὑδροῦντα (Str. 6.3.5). Similarly, Catullus resorts to *Ancona* instead of *Anconem* (Cic. *Att.* 7.11.1) or *Anconam* (Caes. *BCiv.* 1.11.4; Cic. *Fam.* 16.12.2, *Phil.* 12.23; Livy 41.1.2; Mela 2.64; Plin. *HN* 6.218; Tac. *Ann.* 3.9.1), and to the exceptional *Amathunta*, never found elsewhere, except at Ov. *Met.* 10.220, 10.531. In addition, *Golgos* does not belong to the Latin declension of an otherwise unattested *Golgi*, but adapts the Dorian accusative Γολγός (nominative Γολγοί; see *Golgoe* at Plin. *HN* 5.130) used by Theocritus, *Id.* 15.100–1 Δέσποιν', ἃ Γολγός τε καὶ Ἰδάλιον ἐφίλησας | αἰπεινάν τ' Ἔρυκα, χρυσῶ παίζοις Ἄφροδίτα. Since 64.96 *quaeque regis Golgos quaeque Idalium frondosum* confirms that Theocritus' verses are one of the main sources of our passage, we can conjecture that the accusative Ἔρυκα (with lengthening of the final vowel by the following obstruent + liquid group) induced Catullus to accumulate comparable forms in his verses. In view of the fact that words beginning in *hydr-* always have an initial long syllable in Latin poetry (see, for instance, *Hydrochoi* at 66.94 and spondaic *Hydrus* at Luc. 5.375),⁷² the amphibrachic scansion of *Hydrunta* may seem unacceptable. But this exception takes its roots in Greek prosody, where words beginning in ὕδρ- and etymologically linked to ὕδωρ frequently tolerate Attic corruption (see Appendix A); moreover, *Hýdrunta* may find an echo in *Hādriaticus* (see n. 68). The postposition of *portum* obeys to the norms of topographical language (see, for instance, Mela 3.11 *Eborā portum*; Plin. *HN* 3.34 *Citharista portus*). The presence of *Hydrunta portum* increases the density of sound effects triggered by the parallelism *Hydrunta-harundinosam-Amathunta* and by the repetition of the nasal vowel *-um* (ten occurrences with *portum*); notice the strict phonological, metrical and even orthographical correspondance between *-dalium quae Hydrunta* and *-na Cnidumque harundi-*. This might allude to some characteristic feature of Volus(i)us' diction.

⁶⁹ N. Heinsius, *Adversariorum libri IV*, ed. P. Burmannus Jr. (Harlingen, 1742), 642; see J.A. Bellido Díaz, 'Las notas a Catulo de A. Petreius y N. Heinsius', *ExClas* 15 (2011), 123–200, at 148.

⁷⁰ T. Bergk, 'Philologische Thesen', *Philologus* 30 (1870), 677–82, at 682, reprinted in *Kleine philologische Schriften* (n. 26), 2.756.

⁷¹ *Hydruntum* is a (fem. or masc.) nominative at Plin. *HN* 3.100; on fem. geographical names ending in *-um*, see M. Dominicy, 'Propertius, 4.5.19–21', *RhM* 153 (2010), 144–87, at 172.

⁷² At Luc. 5.374–7 *Brundisium decumis iubet hanc attingere castris | et cunctas reuocare rates quas auisus Hydrus | antiquusque Taras ... | ... recipit*, we should substitute a fem. epithet for the ungrammatical, oddly prosaic and referentially inadequate †*auisus*†, retained by Housman and Shackleton Bailey; *nobilis* will do the job (see below, on 55.9).

A mis-segmentation †*Hydrunt aportun*† gave rise to †*apertum*†. The relative *quae* was read as †-*que*†⁷³ and moved after †*Hydrunt*†. †*Hydrunt*†, written †*idrūt*†, shifted to †*utrus*†, †*utrios*† that reduced to †*urios*†; a similar confusion between *it* and *d* occurs at Ov. *Met.* 8.806 where, owing to metathesis involving *r* (see above, on 17.3 and 25.11), †*ordīe*† = †*ordine*† stems from *crate* read as †*oride*† (Housman, 1.133). Finally, grammatical agreement yielded †*apertos*†.

55.3–5 te Campo quaesiuius minore,
 te in Circo te †in† omnibus †libellis†,
 te in templo summi Iouis sacrato.

3 te Campo quaesiuius in *V*

Contrary to what is claimed by Trappes-Lomax (57), the prosodic hiatus *tē in* (v. 4) does not conform to any well-established constraint of archaic or (pre-)classical metre. In archaic (essentially comic) diction, monosyllables shortened by prosodic hiatus normally precede an iambic word (see above, on 10.27). In the far less frequent configuration where the second word itself is a short monosyllable (as happens here),⁷⁴ the first word either (i) is the accusative pronoun *me* placed as an enclitic just after its verb and before a syntactic boundary, or (ii), more commonly, belongs to a closed set of grammatical words (relative / interrogative pronouns, subordinating conjunctions, non-lexical adverbs); case (ii) is also attested in dactylic verse (see Appendix B). Neither can *tē in* gain plausibility from a parallel with Verg. *Aen.* 6.507 *nomen et arma locum seruant*; *tē, amice, nequii*. Firstly, Virgil's example belongs to a corpus where prosodic hiatuses often testify to a Greek influence (see *Ecl.* 2.65, 3.79, 6.44; *G.* 1.281, 1.437, 4.461; *Aen.* 3.211, 5.261). Secondly, the etymology that links *amicus* to *amo*⁷⁵ entails that *amice* should be put on a par with the trisyllabic forms of either word that license shortenings like *oscu-|lum ... sat est| oscu-|li mihi| uostri*. | *quī ama-|bo, pa-|ter?* (tro⁷, Pl. *St.* 91) or *quīn tuos | inimi-|cos poti-|us quā a-|micos | uocas?* (ia⁶, Pl. *Ps.* 880) by virtue of an analogy with *ita me dī ament* (see above, on 10.27), *quī amat* (Pl. *Trin.* 242a), *tē amo* (Ter. *Ad.* 680), etc. (Drexler [n. 25], 2.310; Lindsay [n. 13], 247); see also, in dactylic verse, *quī amant* (Verg. *Ecl.* 8.109) and *mē amas* (Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.38). The anomalous elisions *perdito amore, perditte amo, perditte amarem* (see above, on 10.26) and *Pollio amat* (Verg. *Ecl.* 3.84, 3.88) illustrate this peculiar status of *amo* too (Soubiran [n. 15], 207–18), while *at contra quāe amara atque aspera cumque uidentur* (Lucr. 2.404) originates from the wordplay relating love to bitterness.⁷⁶ Thirdly, the shortening in *tē amice* is made transparent by a parallel elision at *Aen.* 6.509 *ad quae Priamides: 'nihil o tibi, amice, relictum'*,⁷⁷ whereas the two indisputable occurrences of *te in* of

⁷³ See Lindsay, 77; McCarren, s.v. *qu(a)e*. In particular, one finds †*colisque*† for *colis quaeque* in v. 14, †-*que*† for *quae* at 61.111–12, †-*que*† for *quicquam* at 107.1 (see below). See also above, on 29.4.

⁷⁴ At Pl. *As.* 731 *satis iam | delu-|sum cen-|seo*; | *nunc rēm ut | est e-|loqua-|mur*, ia⁷, *ut est* should be analysed, phonetically, as an iambic word; see Drexler (n. 25), 2.331; Lindsay (n. 13), 331.

⁷⁵ See R. Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds, 1991), 30; A. Michalopoulos, *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Commented Lexicon* (Leeds, 2001), 23–4.

⁷⁶ Lucr. 4.1133–4 *medio de fonte leporum | surgit amari aliquid*. For examples of the wordplay in question, see J.J. O'Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor, 1996), 247–8, 251, who quotes Pl. *Cist.* 68, *Trin.* 260; Verg. *Ecl.* 3.109–10, 10.4–6; *Rhet. Her.* 4.21; Quint. *Inst.* 9.3.69–70.

⁷⁷ On the exceptional patterning of elision and word boundaries in the last three feet of this verse, see E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis Buch VI* (Stuttgart, 1970⁵), 266; Soubiran (n. 15), 549–50.

poem 55 (4 *te in Circo*; 5 *te in templo*), as well as those at 31.6 (*te in tuto*) and at 64.149 (*te in medio*), have a metrical value that conflicts with the pyrrhic scansion required by the prosodic hiatus. Such a disharmony proves all the more implausible since, in poems 55 and 58b (both about the elusive Camerius), Catullus takes the experimental liberty of freely contracting the pyrrhic section of the standard phalaecian line.⁷⁸ Notice, to conclude on this technical point, that 58b.8 *defessus tamen omnibus medullis*, while recalling 55.4, conforms to classical norms and that, at 58b.10 *essem te mihi, amice, quaeritando*, Catullus resorts to the same prosodic trick as Virgil at *Aen.* 6.509.⁷⁹

In v. 4, *libellis* should be corrected into *tabernis* (ς, probably under the influence of Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.71); contrary to what is assumed by Hand⁸⁰ and Trappes-Lomax, this word does not refer here to bookshops or inns, but to stalls in the Circus (see Oksala, who quotes Cic. *Mur.* 73 *quid statuent in uiros primarios qui in Circo totas tabernas tribulium causa compararunt?*). It thus turns out that Catullus enumerates three places, one of which should be described by means of a conjoined phrase.⁸¹ I propose to edit *teque omnibus* (which improves on the unmetrical *te que in omnibus*, ς). At the same time, I retain Mynors's text in v. 3 (where many editors, following Sillig, insert *V's in* after *te*), so as to create a regular alternation between the absence and presence of the preposition; notice that, in v. 14, *in* is superfluous and unidiomatic before *fastu* (Schuster, Heyworth, Trappes-Lomax). As frequently happens, *te et* substituted for *teque*; next, the second *et* was read *te* and dropped accordingly.⁸² This gave rise to a metrical anomaly; someone added a marginal *in* that was subsequently introduced at two different places in vv. 3–4, and perhaps also, contagiously, in v. 14. Trappes-Lomax writes that '*libellis* might be no more than a metrical filler'; but *tabernis* was more probably altered into †*tabellis*†, subsequently replaced with †*libellis*†.

55.9–12 †*faelte*†, sic ipse flagitabam,
 'Camerium mihi, pessimae puellae?'
 quaedam inquit, †*nudum* reduc ... †,
 'en hic in roseis latet papillis'.

⁷⁸ Soubiran (n. 15), 374–80 assumes *tē i-* to be equivalent to a long vowel, so that v. 4 would fall within the exceptional ten-syllable phalaecians of poems 55 and 58b. But his analysis rests on the erroneous hypothesis that prosodic shortening of monosyllables always produced a falling diphthong: though this treatment may seem plausible in our case (*teῖ-nom* being paralleled by e.g. bisyllabic *deῖn(-de)* at 5.7–10 and 103.2), basic phonetic principles rule out any such diphthongization in *dī ament, quēm ad, mē amas*, etc.

⁷⁹ I wonder what reason Trappes-Lomax (n. 20), 610 n. 2 may have for claiming that *te, mi amice* (Scaliger) 'runs more smoothly than *te mihi, amice*'. Nisbet seems to be right when construing *mihi* with *quaeritando*; similarly, we find *quos iunctos, Cameri, mihi dicares* (58b.7), comparable with *Camerium mihi, pessimae puellae* (55.10, see below).

⁸⁰ F. Hand, *Q. Valerii Catulli Carmen LV in antiquam formam restituere conatus est F.H.* (Jena, 1848), 9–10.

⁸¹ For a similar phenomenon, see Dominicy (n. 37 [2010]), 143.

⁸² On the alternation between *et* and *-que*, see Havet, 323–4.1319. On the confusion between *et* and *te*, see Housman's *Manilius* I (n. 32), lv; Housman, 1.147. To Housman's examples, add Prop. 2.1.35 (Heyworth) and 4.3.51 (see M. Dominicy, 'De la métrique verbale à l'établissement du texte', *LEC* 75 [2007], 227–48, at 227–30), Avien. *Orb. terr.* 691 (van de Woestijne). In Catullus, see 107.7 (to be discussed below), 64.253 and 80.8, where *ilia et emulso* was altered into †*illa et et mulso*† (Friedrich, 211, 544), then into †*illa et te mulso*†, and finally into †*ill(a)e te mulso*† owing to the reduction of *-a et* to *-(a)e* (see above, on 29.20). At 76.11 *quin tu animo offirmas atque istinc teque reducis*, the correction *teque istinc ipse reducis* (advocated by Trappes-Lomax and McKie) can be justified by an analogous process of corruption: *teque* was altered into †*etque/atque*†; the correct reading *teque*, written in the margin, took the place of *ipse*.

Among the solutions proposed for making sense out of v. 9, one should first reject *ah uel te* (ζ) and all similar corrections that postulate an otherwise unattested use of *flagito* with an accusative designating the person looked for; at Cic. *Clu.* 83 *cur ... Staienum ... non requirebant? Oppianicus querebatur; Quinctius flagitabat*, the implicit objects of *querebatur* and *flagitabat* do not refer to Staienus himself, but to his absence from, and presence at the court, respectively. Like *ah uel te*, etc. or *at certe*,⁸³ Thomson's *audite en* (*audite*, ζ) does not provide vv. 9–10 with an explicit verbal predicate; moreover, like Harrison's *efferte en*, it creates an unwelcome repeated use of the interjection in contiguous turns at speech. Camps's *a, cete huc* avoids both objections, but one can reasonably doubt whether Catullus would use such an archaism.⁸⁴ Third-person *auellent* (Ellis) does not fit in with the dialogical structure of the passage; *auelli sinite ipse* (Avancius [n. 5]) fares better, but the expression is unnatural and the reduction of *sinite* to *sic* palaeographically problematic. Foster's *reddatis*,⁸⁵ while sounding spontaneous, requires *uultu* (v. 8) to have played a crucial (and rather implausible) role in the corruption process. Goold's *aufertis* is in the wrong tense (Harrison); *auertistis, saepe* (Riese) proves definitely preferable in this respect, but *saepe* is pleonastic (in contrast with *ipse*, which underlines the fact that, contrary to the norms of Old Comedy, the speaker personally takes in charge a task he should have entrusted to a slave). I thus propose *nouistis, sic ipse flagitabam, | Camerium mihi, pessimae puellae?* (see Pl. *Poen.* 591–2 *hunc uos lenonem Lycum | nouistis?*), which here conveys obvious sexual overtones.⁸⁶ Similar uses of a dative substituting for an unmetrical possessive adjective occur at 21.10–11 and 37.11–14.⁸⁷ Haplography produced *nouisti*, which gave †*auelte*† owing to the confusion between *io-*, with one minim lost, and *a-*⁸⁸ and the usual shifts from *i* to *e*, and *s* to *l*.

⁸³ Proposed by S.-Y. Li, 'Ancora su Catullo 55, 9', *Latomus* 69 (2010), 1105–6 (not recorded in the *Catullus Online* website).

⁸⁴ W.A. Camps, 'Critical and exegetical notes', *AJPh* 94 (1973), 131–46, at 131–3. The use of *cete* is deliberately archaic at *CLE* 2151.5; see E. Courtney, *Musa Lapidaria* (Atlanta, 1995), ad loc. (151.5).

⁸⁵ J. Foster, 'Catullus, 55.9–12', *CQ* 21 (1971), 186–7.

⁸⁶ See 61.187, 72.1; Turp. 42 (Ribbeck, *CRF*) = Non. 483.30 (Lindsay); Prop. 2.29.33; Ov. *Her.* 6.43, 6.133, *Fast.* 5.525–6; Col. 6.37.9; Tac. *Hist.* 4.44; *TLL* 3.1503.82–1504.36; J.N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (Baltimore, 1982), 190; P. Fedeli, *Catullus' Carmen 61* (Amsterdam, 1983), 119. At 89.3–4, the sexual promiscuity of Gellius' family life is underlined by the phrase *puellis | cognatis* that punningly points to *puellis cognitis*; for the topical association between *natus* and *notus*, see Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.156, 2.5.167; Ov. *Her.* 8.97–100, *Pont.* 4.5.23–4; Plin. *HN* 8.88. This makes unnecessary any correction of the passage – pace S.J. Harrison, 'Halls full of girls? Catullus 89.3', *CQ* 51 (2001), 304–5, Watt and McKie; see also Kiss.

⁸⁷ See above, on 10.27 and 14.14. At 21.10–11, I would opt for *nunc ipsum id doleo, quod esurire | meus mi puer et sitire discet* (I. Meleager *dubitanter*, in I. Gebhardus, *In Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium animaduersiones* [Hannover, 1618], 20). As pointed out above (n. 19), an iambic base is acceptable in a phalacian appearing between poems 2 and 26, notably with possessives (3.17 *tuā*; 7.2 *tuae*), while the collocation of a possessive and a dative with an ethical-possessive value imitates spoken language (see G. Liberman, 'Remarques sur le premier livre des Élégies de Propertius', *RPh* 76 [2002], 49–100, at 68, on Pl. *Truc.* 698 and Prop. 1.6.9); for a convincing rebuttal of McKie's *insane puer*, see Kiss. At 37.11–14 *puella nam mi, quae meo sinu fugit, | ... | consedit istic*, S.J. Harrison, 'The need for a new text of Catullus', in C. Reitz (ed.), *Von Text zu Buch* (St Katherine, 2000), 63–79, at 70–1 and Watt object to *mi* (M. Marulić [ζ], see the *Catullus Online* website for more details; N. Heinsius, marginalia, see Bellido-Díaz [n. 69], 148) that the ethical-possessive dative should be closely connected to the main verb (relying on a similar argument, Trappes-Lomax deletes v. 12); but see Lucr. 2.500–3; Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.213 (quoted by Trappes-Lomax), *Fam.* 9.2.1 *at tibi repente paucis post diebus, cum minime expectarem, uenit ad me Caninius mane*.

⁸⁸ See e.g. the well-known †*alcos*† for *golgos*/†*colcos*† at 36.14, †*inde corsater*† for *uidear satur* at 48.4, †*moenico*† for *moenia* at 64.212, †*concillis/conciliis*† for *ancillis* at 67.42 (Friedrich, 168, 360; McKie, 133); also †*aiuis*† for *nobilis* at Lucr. 5.375 (see n. 72).

When he conjectured *nudum sinum reducens* in v. 11, Avancius (in *ed. Ald.* 1502) took a first step towards what I think is the right solution. But, by maintaining *nudum*, he also led future critics on a wrong track. In spite of the fact that, in its anatomical acceptation, *sinus* always refers to the woman's womb, a major trend in Catullus scholarship, influenced by v. 12 and by the meaning of the Italian or French reflexes of the word, enduringly entertained the absurd notion that the girl might uncover her breast (an intolerably provocative gesture in Roman society).⁸⁹ Since *reducens* did not make sense under such an interpretation, it was replaced with the palaeographically close *recludens* (Riese).⁹⁰ Almost simultaneously, *pectus* (Ellis) was substituted for *sinum*; this semantically sound move did not leave any metrical slot for *reducens/recludens*: *nudum reducta/reduce pectus* (Ellis, Lenchantin de Gubernatis) restored metre by turning back to previous nonsense (*pace* Housman, 2.623); *nudum reclusa/reclude pectus* (Riese *dubitanter*, Friedrich) produced new nonsense in that elsewhere *pectus recludere* means 'open the breast' (Fordyce).⁹¹ If we opt for the referentially more plausible hypothesis that the girl shows her cleavage, *niueum resecta pectus* (Harrison) looks like the best choice (see Prop. 2.22.8: *candida non tecto pectore si qua sedet*). But a simpler solution consists in assuming that *sinum* designates the girl's dress (as in 61.52–3, see n. 89): by tying her girdle (*reducens*) or having it tied (*reducta*) under her bosom, she makes the dress cling to her breast (an erotic but socially more tolerable posture that also motivates *latet* in v. 12). As a consequence, we have to emend (away) *nudum*. Some of the corrections available saturate the text with occurrences of the same interjection: 'en', *inquit quaedam, sinu/-um reducto/-ens* (Goold), *quaedam 'en, en' inquit sinum reducens* (Kokoszkiwicz⁹²). Froehlich's *tunicae sinum* and Hermes' (*dubitanter*) *dextram ad sinum*⁹³ do not run into this objection, but can account for the paradox only with difficulty. I suggest reading *nodo sinum reducta*. In conformity with attested usage (see, for instance, Verg. *Aen.* 6.301, 11.775–6 *tum croceam chlamydemque sinusque crepantes | carbaseos fuluo in nodum collegerat auro*; Curt. 6.5.27; Sen. *Herc. F.* 766–7; Stat. *Theb.* 4.266), *nodo* refers to the knot that fastens the girdle.⁹⁴ My preference for *reducta* against the equally acceptable *reducens* stems from the fact that Catullus has the same use of a past participle with an accusative and an ablative at 64.64–5 *non contacta leui uelatum pectus*

⁸⁹ See, for instance, Lafaye and Arkins (n. 30), 23–4, who still render Avancius's text as 'découvrant son sein nu' or 'bar[ing] her bosom'. Similarly, Lafaye translates 61.52–3 *tibi uirgines | zonula soluunt sinus* as 'c'est pour toi que les vierges dénouent la ceinture de leur sein'. As pointed out by Housman (1.289), the same mistake was made about Prop. 4.4.71–2 *illa ruit, qualis celerem prope Thermodonta | Strymonis abscis(s)io fertur aperta sinu*; see e.g. J.K. Newman, *Augustan Propertius: The Recapitulation of a Genre* (Hildesheim–Zürich–New York, 1997), 365–6, as well as D. Paganelli's and S. Viarre's absurd translations in their Budé editions: 'le sein nu et déchiré', 'montrant son sein mutilé à travers son vêtement déchiré'. Most editors correct *fertur* into *pectus* (Hertzberg) but *fertur aperta* is an attractive solution (M. Dominicy, 'Notes critiques sur les élégies IV, 4 et IV, 5 de Propertius', *AC* [forthcoming]).

⁹⁰ A. Riese, review of L. Schwabe, *Coniecturae catullianae* (Dorpat = Tartu, 1864), *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 91 (1865), 295–304, at 298.

⁹¹ Quinn's and Della Corte's hypotheses of a pun on *pectus* ('breast' and 'heart', i.e. 'thoughts') or of a parody of tragic diction should be ruled out.

⁹² K.M. Kokoszkiwicz, 'Catullus 14B, 16, 41, 43, 55, 58B: Adnotationes criticae', *Mnemosyne* 62 (2007), 608–27, at 620.

⁹³ H. Hermes, *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Catull* (Frankfurt an der Oder, 1888), 17–19.

⁹⁴ See A. Rich, *A Dictionary of Roman and Greek Antiquities* (London, 1893⁶), s.v. *nodus*; C. Daremberg and E. Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines* (Paris, 1877–1919), s.v. *cingula*.

amictu, | *non tereti strophio lactentes uincta papillas*, 64.122 *deuinctam lumina somno* and 64.296 *restrictus membra catena*; at *Aen.* 1.320 *nuda genu nodoque sinus collecta fluentes*, Virgil probably imitates our line as well as Laev. 12a *et reuocet uolucres in pectore balteus sinus* (see Courtney, *FLP* ad loc.). At the first stage of the corruption process, someone jumped from *nod-* to *-um*, all the more easily since the mistake involved two bisyllabic words and the resulting text remained meaningful ('with the knot tied'); next, †*nodum*† was altered into †*nudum*† (see †*nudus*† for *nodus* at Prop. 2.29.10 [Heyworth]); finally, a scribe stopped writing after *reduc-* because he did not understand the construction anymore.

68.157–8 *et qui principio nobis terram dedit †aufert†,*
a quo †sunt primo† omnia nata bona

158 bono *V*

Verse 157 has been corrected in multifarious ways (see the *Catullus Online* website for more details). One reason for this emendatory abundance lies in the fact that the line exhibits a rare metrical profile, with an unelided polysyllable ending at the ennehemimeral position before an unelided pyrrhic word.⁹⁵ Catullus elsewhere has two such hexameters, at 64.58 and 98.3 (notice also the pyrrhic words *datur*, *Themis* and *tua* at the same position in 68.147/153/155); Ennius in *Ann.* (Vahlen) ten or eleven, at 14, 20, 32, 40, 52, 110, 385, 517, 518, 529 (?), 543 (notice *terram* in the same position), with a higher frequency in Book 1 (six cases); Lucretius thirteen, at 1.69, 1.155, 1.184, 1.250, 2.184, 2.305, 2.592, 3.874, 4.267, 4.1255, 5.293, 5.1339, 6.1131; Cicero nine, at *Arat.* 33.174, 33.187, 33.309, 33.325, 33.343, 33.376, 33.454, 33.468 and *Homer.* 9.1 (Soubiran); Virgil sixteen, at *G.* 1.80, 2.153, 4.251, *Aen.* 3.695, 5.731, 8.382, 10.302, 10.400, 10.440, 10.442, 10.471, 10.772, 10.849, 11.143, 11.170, 11.562 (the concentration in the last books of the *Aeneid* confirming the Ennian archaism of this pattern). The distribution of dactyls and spondees increases the exceptionality of v. 157; but similar examples are found at Lucil. (Marx) 1372 *quare da te homini: complectetur, mihi crede*; Lucr. 4.1255 *uxores parere, inuentast illis quoque compar* and 5.1339 *ut nunc saepe boues Lucae ferro male mactae*; Cic. *Arat.* 33.309 *sed tantum supera terras semper tenet ille and Homer.* 9.1 *tales sunt hominum mentes, quali pater ipse*; Verg. *Aen.* 10.302 *omnes innocuae; sed non puppis tua, Tarchon!*; Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.36 *natura aut etiam consuetudo mala namque*.

Though dismissed in passing by Fordyce, *auctor* (ς, Rossbach) for †*aufert*† is a palmary correction. Indeed, this substantive can designate the founder of a people or lineage (see, for instance, Verg. *Aen.* 4.365, Stat. *Theb.* 1.224; *TLL* 2.1204.30–66), that is the individual whose natural mission consists in giving a land to his descendants, generally after some tribulations on the sea across different parts of the world; see, for a similar use, Ov. *Tr.* 2.194: *ulterior nulli, quam mihi, terra data est* (Baehrens, Friedrich and Lenchantin de Gubernatis also mention Pl. *Merc.* 195–7; Cic. *Sen.* 71; Ov. *Tr.* 4.5.5, *Pont.* 1.2.60, 1.10.39, 2.8.68, 2.9.9). Once we opt for *auctor*, v. 158 makes perfect sense: for the members of the family, all good things originate from (*a quo*) their first (*primo*) common ancestor; see, for instance, Ov. *Met.* 13.142 *nostris*

⁹⁵ Norden (n. 77), 446–8; L. De Neubourg, *La base métrique de la localisation des mots dans l'hexamètre latin* (Brussels, 1986), 68–71, 77–9; P. Tordeur, *Deux études de métrique verbale* (Brussels, 2007), 231–40; O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford, 1985), 50–1.

quoque sanguinis auctor, Stat. *Theb.* 2.463 *primus sanguinis auctor*. But the hiatus *primo omnia* is an undisputable sign of corruption. Nisbet suggests *plurima* (or *tot mihi*) *nata bona*; Trappes-Lomax, *tanta parata bona* (he assumes that *tāta parata bona* was reduced to *tata bona* owing to the homoeoteleuton; ‘a scribe then altered *tata* to *nata* to provide the necessary participle, and filled up the line with *omnia*’). A simpler solution consists in reading *a quo primo sunt* (ς, Scaliger, Oksala), but *primo* sounds pleonastic after *principio*. I propose *a quo patria sunt omnia nata bona*. The collocation *patria bona* frequently occurs in Republican texts: Ter. *Eu.* 235 *hominem haud impurum, itidem patria qui abligurrierat bona*; Acc. 164 (Ribbeck, *TRF*) = Non. 471.21 (Lindsay) *qui nostra per uim patria populauit bona*; Afran. 50 (Ribbeck, *CRF*) = Non. 475.21 (Lindsay) *cum testamento patria partisset bona*; Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.113 *ut liberis eius bona patria—uoluntate patris, iure, legibus tradita—eriperes*, 2.2.30, 2.2.59, 2.4.37, *S. Rosc.* 145; Sall. *Cat.* 14.2 *quicumque ... bona patria lacerauerat*; see also *paterna ... bona* (29.17), *patriam* (63.49), *patria ... creatrix ... patria ... genetrix* (63.50), *patria* (63.55), *patria, bonis* (63.59), *patriis ... aris* (64.132).

Even if any such hypothesis must remain highly speculative, two reasons induce me to identify Catullus’ *auctor* with Volesus, the mythical founder of the *gens Valeria* whom Silius claims to be of Spartan descent (see Livy 1.58.6, 2.18.6, 2.30.5, 3.25.2; Asc. *Pis.* 12; Sil. 2.8; Juv. 8.182; [Aur. Vict.] *De vir. ill.* 15.1; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.46.3; Plut. *Vit. Num.* 7). First, Ovid was perhaps recalling our distich when he evoked Volesus in a poem addressed to a member of the *gens Valeria*: *quos Volesus patrii cognoscat nominis auctor* (*Pont.* 3.2.105). Secondly, given the equivalence between the etymological *Volesus* and its vernacular variant *Volusus*,⁹⁶ I am inclined to believe that Catullus’ acrimony against *Volusius* (or perhaps *Volusus*, since both forms are compatible with genitive *Volusi*) and his annals (36, 95.7–8) stemmed from the fact that this bad poet—related, in some way, to the north of Italy (95.7 *Paduam ... ad ipsam*, that is somewhere in the delta of the Po)—belonged (or claimed to belong) to the *gens Valeria*⁹⁷ and perhaps endeavoured to celebrate the deeds of that family (see above, on 36.9–17). In Virgil (*Aen.* 11.463), the elided tribrachic vocative *Voluse* occurs just a few lines after two verses that mention the same (or another) branch of the Po and its raucous swans (11.457–8 *piscosoue amne Padusae | dant sonitum rauci per stagna loquacia cyeni*).⁹⁸ In Catullus, the diaeresis *peruoluent* of 95.6 not only creates a wordplay with *Volus(ius)*’ name (Friedrich), but also echoes a famous Ennian line (*var.* 18 [Vahlen] = Cic. *Tusc.* 1.34: *uolito uiuos per ora uirum*) subsequently imitated by Virgil (*G.* 3.9; *Aen.* 10.790, 11.296, 12.235), Propertius (2.1.2, 3.1.24, 3.9.32) and Ovid (*Met.* 15.878–9). This formal and intertextual network underlines the contrast between the talentless annalist and his literary model.

One could find it strange that Catullus might indiscriminately address good wishes to Allius/Manlius, his wife or girlfriend and his house, to Volesus and, in conclusion, to Lesbia herself. But, as shown by the legend of Laodamia and Protesilaus, military expeditions make people abandon, like Catullus’ brother, their home and native land, and thus make them inverse the mythical itinerary of their *auctor*. Similarly, Catullus has

⁹⁶ W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Göttingen, 1904), 104–7.

⁹⁷ Catullus’ attacks on Gellius might well be due to similar reasons; see Wiseman (n. 67 [1974]), 119–29.

⁹⁸ On *Padua*, see Polyb. 2.16.11 (Παδόα); on *Padusa*, see Plin. *HN* 3.119 and Valg. 3 (Courtney, *FLP*), quoted in Serv. *ad Aen.* 11.457. Contrary to Munro, Wiseman (n. 67 [1974]), 49 assumes that the two names refer to the same branch.

left Rome for Verona, and thus inverted the itinerary that led him to literature and love. The chaotic world of poem 68 symbolically reflects the impossibility of any synthesis of those different components: love and poetry will never find a home because experiencing them amounts to constantly alternating between peace and war, or life and death.

The corruption of vv. 157–8 involved two different processes. On the one hand, *auctor* shifted to †*auctor*†, a non-existent but plainly intelligible word that someone glossed with *aufert* in the margin; subsequently, †*aufert*† ousted the graphically similar, but unmetrical, †*auctor*† from the main text.⁹⁹ On the other hand, *p̄ria* = *patria* was altered into †*p̄ria* = *prima*† (see the alternation between †*primos*† and †*patrios*† at *Ciris* 45 [Knecht, lxxxii]), which was moved after *sunt* in order to restore the metre; this produced first the false grammatical agreement †*primā* ... *bona*†, with hemistich-final lengthening (see above, on 17.3), and subsequently †*primo* ... *bono*†, which allowed coreference with *a quo*.

73.3–4 omnia sunt ingrata, nihil fecisse benigne
†<prodest>†: immo etiam taedet obestque magis

4 i. e. t. o. magisque magis *V*

Philologists analyze *nihil* either as the modifier of a verb omitted in the paradosis (*prodest* in Puccius's marginalia, see the *Catullus Online* website for more details; *iuuerit* Baehrens; *iam iuuat* Munro) or as the attribute of a copula sentence with *est* implicit or to be restored (*ed. Ald.* 1502, Friedrich)—which requires a different addition in v. 3: for instance, *immo etiam taedet, taedet obestque magis* (*ed. Ald.* 1502). None of those proposals accounts for the omission of the first foot and for verse-final †*magisque magis*†. I thus prefer to print *nihil fecisse benigne | malis: immo etiam taedet obestque magis* ('You had better not be kind: contrary to what you may expect, it will be tiresome and harmful rather'). For *malo* (attested at 24.4, 45.22, 70.1, 79.1) governing a perfect infinitive, see Livy 42.11.1 *plurium annales, et quibus credidisse malis, ipsum Eumenem uenisse tradunt*; Ov. *Fast.* 6.70–1 *blandior et partes paene rogantis ago | remque mei iuris malim tenuisse precando*; Plin. *HN* 28.179 *aliqui murinorum capitum cinerem miscuisse malunt, 28.203 aliqui et nitrum et aquam adiecisse malunt*. Archaic legal language combined perfect infinitives with *nolo* or negated *uolo* in prohibitions, and poets frequently imitated and extended this use (see, for instance, 69.1–2 *noli admirari quare tibi femina nulla, | Rufe, uelit tenerum supposuisse femur*; Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.28; Prop. 2.19.32; Ov. *Am.* 1.4.38); *nihil*, though to be construed with *fecisse* here, surely favoured the analogy (Kühner-Stegmann, 1.133–5; Hofmann-Leumann-Szantyr, 2.351–3). Moreover, the verse-enclosing pair *malis* ... *magis* creates an easily accessible etymological wordplay (Cic. *Orat.* 154 '*malle*' pro '*magis uelle*' ... *dicimus*). Translators (for instance, Goold, Lee) usually assume that *immo* (*etiam*) requires there to be an opposition between the two sentences it connects; but this particle may introduce an utterance that corroborates a previous speech act when the justification provided contradicts common expectations (see, for instance, Petr. 43.7–8, about a septuagenarian: *et adhuc salax erat. non mehercules illum puto domo canem reliquisse. immo etiam puellarius erat, omnis Mineruae homo*; 'contrary to what you may expect of such an old man'). For the use of *immo* (*uero*) with *magis* meaning

⁹⁹ See *auctam* at 64.132, and the alternation between (possibly correct) *auctus* and (possibly corrupt) *auctus* at 66.11. S.-Y. Li, 'Nota a Catullo 68, 157', *Maia* 62 (2010), 53–6, who advocates *auctam* while also envisaging *augens* and *auctis* (none of those corrections being recorded in the *Catullus Online* website), has to assume that a purely palaeographical drift led to †*aufert*†.

'rather', see Cic. *Mil.* 34 'obstabat in spe consulatus Miloni Clodius'. at eo repugnante fiebat, immo uero eo fiebat magis. Owing to the confusion between capital G and c, hence *l*, initial *malis* was read †*magis*†.¹⁰⁰ Then, a scribe who attempted to restore the metre moved †*magis*† to the end of the line so as to fabricate an additional dactyl; see the manuscript reading †*immo etiam taedet stetque magisque magis*† (ς), probably derived from †*immo etiam taedēt estque magisque magis*† with lengthening in hemistich-final position.

107 si †quicquam cupido optantique† optigit umquam
 insperanti, hoc est gratum animo proprie.
 quare hoc est gratum nobis, †quoque† carius auro,
 quod te restituis, Lesbia, mi cupido,
 restituis cupido atque insperanti, ipsa refers te
 nobis, o lucem candidiore nota!
 quis me uno uiuit felicior, aut magis †hac est
 optandus uita† dicere quis poterit?

1 quid quid *O*: quicquid *X* || 7 me est *X*

In v. 1, the collocation of the adjectival and participial forms creates a hiatus and a pleonasm. By editing *si quoi quid cupido atque optanti contigit umquam* (not recorded in the *Catullus Online* website; *quoi quid* Ribbeck;¹⁰¹ *contigit* Puccius, marginalia, see the *Catullus Online* website for more details), Trappes-Lomax eliminates the hiatus, but not the pleonasm (compare with v. 5); in addition, *optigit* is undoubtedly idiomatic in this use (*TLL* s.v.) and one may want to conserve the enriched alliteration *opt- ... opt ...*. In Froehlich's *si quicquid quoiquam cupide optanti obtigit unquam*, where *quicquam* (ς) should substitute for *quicquid*, the adverb *cupide*, also attested at 63.2 and 64.267, slightly mitigates the pleonasm; but the repetition of *cupido* in vv. 4–5 suggests that this epithet must be maintained here. I propose *si cuiquam cupido optatum quicquam obtigit umquam*. This emendation combines two metrical idiosyncrasies. First, it exhibits, like v. 5, the elision of a polysyllabic word at the ennehemimeral position (Soubiran [n. 15], 536–7). We find sixteen such lines in other poems (62.50, 64.44, 64.56, 64.180, 64.184, 64.248, 64.255, 64.322, 64.363, 68.89, 71.1, 80.1, 81.1, 83.5, 91.5, 99.3); in four cases, the fifth foot begins with a verbal prefix, as happens here (62.50 *educat*, 64.56 *excita*, 64.255 *inflectentes*, 71.1 *obstitit*). Secondly, the lack of a central (penthemimeral or trochaic) caesura is compensated by two breaks at the trihemimeral and heptemimeral position. This pattern occurs at 64.18, 64.128, 64.193, 64.196, 64.248 and 108.1; in all cases except 64.193, metrical prodelision (erasure of the second vowel in contact) and/or morphological division after a (pseudo-)prefix would permit a penthemimeral caesura, as happens here;¹⁰² 64.248 *obtulerat mente immemori, talem ipse recepti* shows the same combination of both features, while the strict parallelism between 107.1 and 108.1 *si, Comini, populi arbitrio tua cana senectus* rules out Trappes-Lomax's hypothesis that 108.1 might be metrically corrupt. Repeated

¹⁰⁰ See above, on 29.19; †*magis*† for *malis* at Lucr. 6.1150 (Martin), *Ciris* 181 (Knecht), [Sen.] *Herc. O.* 1266 (Viansino), Juvenc. 2.695 (Marold); †*malis*† for *magis* at Prop. 3.13.62, Juvenc. 4.563. On the Propertian line, see M. Dominicy, 'Properce, III, 13, 59–62', *Latomus* 66 (2007), 1008–9.

¹⁰¹ O. Ribbeck, Review of F. Ritschl, *Prooemiorum Bonnensium decas* (Berlin, 1861), *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 85 (1862), 369–86, at 378.

¹⁰² On this phenomenon, see Soubiran (n. 15), 528; De Neubourg (n. 95), 95–6; and Dominicy (n. 71), 152–3. At 64.193 *Eumenides, quibus anguino redimita capillo*, the morphological division *anguino* might play the same role.

scribal confusions between *qu-* words or morphemes (see above, on 29.4 and 36.12) and case contagion in †*optanti*† account for the paradosis.

In v. 3, the lexical meaning of *quoque* conflicts with the unequal force of the two predications (Fordyce); Avancius's *et carius auro* does not really improve on the paradosis. Maehly's *quare hoc est nobis quoque gratum et carius auro*,¹⁰³ not recorded in the *Catullus Online* website and advocated by Trappes-Lomax, solves the problem but confers an oddly syllogistic flavour to vv. 1–4. I suggest editing *quare hoc est gratum nobis, hoc carius auro* (Froehlich); the anaphora allows vv. 3–6 to form one single sentence closed by a climactic exclamation. By writing †*quoque*†, a scribe expressed the semantics of the two occurrences of *hoc* without capturing the rhetorical impact of the structure.

In vv. 7–8, I suggest reading *ac te | optandam esse unam* (*ac me* Schwabe in *apparatu*; *optandam uitam* Puccius, marginalia; see the *Catullus Online* website for more details). For this use of (*prae*)*opto* in an erotic or epithalamic context, see 62.30, 62.42, 62.44, 64.22, 64.31, 64.120, 64.141, 64.328, 64.372, 66.79; Verg. *Aen.* 11.270; Ov. *Her.* 16.36, 16.173, 17.101, 17.111, *Met.* 8.324–5, 10.622, *Fast.* 1.417 (*TLL* 9.2.829.17–41); for the construction of the comparative, see 22.16 and 61.169 *illi non minus ac tibi*. The substitution of *unam* for *uita* not only eliminates a reading that, in my view, has led most scholars on the wrong track (Syndikus, 3.118–19; see the *Catullus Online* website for more details),¹⁰⁴ but also puts both lovers on a par: the speaker's happiness is unique and no woman is so uniquely desirable to any man as Lesbia (see 45.14, 45.21, 45.23, 58.2, 68.135, 68.147). For a similar collocation, see Cic. *Att.* 11.19.1 *est autem unum quod mihi sit optandum, si quid agi de pace possit*, *Fam.* 2.6.4 *qui si ex omnibus unus optandus esset, quem tecum conferre possemus non haberemus*; Stat. *Theb.* 2.689 *huic una fides optanda labori*. In v. 7, *te* was replaced with †*et*†, hence †*est*†; scribes attempted to make sense out of the paradosis by writing †*hac*† or by repeating ablative †*me*†.¹⁰⁵ In v. 8, *optandā esse* reduced to *optandā est* (probably owing to a confusion between the *ē* and *ēe* abbreviations) and thus shifted to †*optandus*†;¹⁰⁶ a trivial mistake on a series of minimis altered *unā* into †*uita*†.

114.5–6 *quare concedo sit diues, dum omnia desint;*
saltum laudemus, dum †modo ipse† egeat.

¹⁰³ J. Maehly, 'Zu Catullus', *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 103 (1871), 341–57, at 357.

¹⁰⁴ We should rule out the linguistically implausible emendations *magis nostra* and *mage uitam* (J.L. Butrica, 'Catullus 107.7–8', *CQ* 52 [2002], 608–9; Trappes-Lomax). For a criticism of Trappes-Lomax's systematic recourse to ecthipsis, see McKie, 157–9. At 116.8, *dabis supplicium* is a parody of Enn. *Ann.* 100 (Vahlen) *hoc nec tu: nam mi calido dabis sanguine poenas*; see e.g. Tatum (n. 49), in Skinner, 350.

¹⁰⁵ On the confusions between *te* and *et*, see above, on 55.4. On the confusions between *et* and *est*, see †*culpa et*† *D* for *culpa est* at 91.10 (Friedrich, 212); Lucr. 3.992 (Martin); Prop. 3.3.29 (see Dominicy [n. 37 (2010)], 154 n. 59), 3.7.25 (†*positaque*† from †*posita et*† for *posita est*), 3.11.64; *Ciris* 53 (Knecht); Sen. *Oed.* 516, [Sen.] *Herc. O.* 1025 (Viansino); above, on 29.20. On †*hac*† for *ac*, see Lindsay, 73, the alternations between †*ha*† (*V*) and *ac* at 22.16 or †*hac*† (*OG*) and *ac* (*R*) at 61.169, †*ad hac me*† (*V*) for *at Acme* at 45.10.

¹⁰⁶ See †*adepus*† or †*adepus*† for *adepus es* at 66.27, Lucr. 3.306 (Martin) (†*sitas*† for *sita est*); Prop. 4.1.36 (†*Fidenas*† for *Fidena est*), 4.1.73 (†*cantas*† for *cantu est*), 4.2.19 (†*noces*† for *nota est*); M. Dominicy, 'Notes critiques sur l'épigramme IV, 2 de Propertius', *Latomus* 68 (2009), 923–32, at 928 and id. (n. 39).

As pointed out by Kroll, the metrical anomaly in v. 6 cannot be justified by iambic shortening or prosodic hiatus operating on an underlying *modō*: this adverbial form does not occur in Catullus (*modo scurra* at 22.12 is no example of it, *pace* Fordyce¹⁰⁷) and *ipse* is no iambic word (see above, on 10.27). Most of the emendations proposed are equally unmetrical (*dum domō/domī/bonō ipse* Lachmann *dubitanter*, Ellis *dubitanter*, Riese), unidiomatic (for instance, *dum tamen, dum modo et c;* *dum modio* Richmond¹⁰⁸), or contextually inadequate (for instance, *dummodo te ipse egeas* Froehlich, *dum domino* Peiper *dubitanter*¹⁰⁹). Trappes-Lomax's *dum omnibus* (not recorded in the *Catullus Online* website) creates a formal redundancy with v. 5 and requires a complex palaeographical drift. I suggest editing *dum modo ope ipse egeat*. Catullus uses ablative *ope* at 34.24 and 67.2; the graphical similarity of *ope* and *ipse* led a scribe to drop the first word.¹¹⁰

Université libre de Bruxelles

MARC DOMINICY

mdomini@ulb.ac.be

APPENDIX A

Attic correction in ὕδρ- words.

(i) Iambic trimeters

λιβάσιν | ὕδρη-|λαῖς παρ-|θένου | πηγῆς | μέτα

(Aesch. *Pers.* 613)

ἔβα-|ψεν ἰ-|οὺς θρέμ-|μα Λερ-|ναίας | ὕδρας

(Soph. *Trach.* 574)

See also *Trach.* 1094 (ὕδραν)

τιμῶσ' | ὕδραῖ-|νεῖν αὐ-|τὸν ὤς | θανού-|μενον

(Eur. *IT* 54)

κρωσσούς | θ' ὕδρη-|λούς. ᾧ | ταλαί-|πῳροι | ξένοι

(Eur. *Cyc.* 89)

See also *Suppl.* 206 (ὕδρηλάς)

στέργειν | θ' ὕδρη-|λοῖς ὤσ-|τε θῆρ | ἀεὶ | ποτοῖς

(*Trag. Adesp.* 546.6 [Nauck, *TrGF*])

δι' ὕδρορ-|ρόας, | βορέαν | ἐπιτη-|ρήσας | μέγαν

(Ar. *Ach.* 922)

See also *Ach.* 1186 (ὕδρορρόαν), *Eccl.* 738 (ὕδριαν ὕδριᾶφόρε), *Vesp.* 926 (ὕδριαν), *Fr.*

Geras 15 (Meineke, *FCG*) (ὕδριαν)

ὕδρία | τις ἦ | χαλκοῦς | ποδανιτ-|τήρ ἦ | λέβης

(Diocles, *Bacchae* 1 [Meineke, *FCG*])

διὰ τῶν | ὕδρορ-|ροῶν. | θορυβῆ-|σω του-|τονί

(Men. *Aspis* 467 [Sandbach])

See also *Dys.* 200 [Sandbach] (conjectural)

¹⁰⁷ See H.M. Hoenigswald, 'A note on Latin prosody: initial *s* impure after short vowel', *TAPhA* 80 (1949), 271–80.

¹⁰⁸ O.L. Richmond, manuscript notes quoted in Cornish's 1913 edition.

¹⁰⁹ R. Peiper, *Q. Valerius Catullus. Beiträge zur Kritik seiner Gedichte* (Breslau, 1875), 61–2.

¹¹⁰ I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer and the Editor, whose insightful comments and suggestions on content and language have considerably enriched this article.

(ii) Anapaestic tetrameters catalectic

πωλῶ | γαῦλον, | κτῶμαι | σμινύην, | καὶ τὰς | ὑδρίας | ἀνορύτ-|τω

(Ar. *Av.* 602)

καὶ τὰς | ὑδρίας, | καὶ ῥα-|ψωδεῖν | ἔσται | τοῖς πα-|δαρίοι-|σιν

(Ar. *Eccl.* 678)

(iii) Lyric metres

λουτρὰ πα-|νύσταθ' ὑ-|δρανάμε-|νον χροῖ

(dactylic tetrameter, Eur. *El.* 157 [Denniston])

τὸν ὑδρό-|εντι | δόνακι | χλωρὸν

(trochaic dimeter, Eur. *Hel.* 349 [Dale])

Λερναῖον ὕδραν ἐναίρει

(hagesichorean X – UU – U – X, Eur. *Ion* 191 [Owen])

δινηθεῖς ὑδροειδῆς

(pherecratean XX – UU – X, Eur. *Rhes.* 353 [Zanetto])

νὺν δὴ γὰρ ἐμ-|πλησασμένη | τὴν ὑδρίαν | κνεφαία

(– – U – | – UU – | – UU – | U – X, Ar. *Lys.* 327 [Henderson])

(iv) Dactylic hexameters

οὐχ' ὕδρος οὐδ' ἐπὶ χέρσον, ὄθ' ὕδατα κάρκινος αἴθει

(Andromachus 21, Heitsch, *Griech. Dichterfr.* 2.62)

νὺν πρῶτον ναῦς ὄπται ὑδρωπικῆ, ἀλλά γε <δεῖδω>

(Anth. *Pal.* 11.332.5)

λυγρὸς ὕδρος, τὸν φασιν ἀναλθέα τε στυγερόν τε

(Quint. *Smyrn.* 9.385)

APPENDIX B

Monosyllables shortened by prosodic hiatus before a short monosyllable.

(i) The first word is the accusative pronoun *me* placed as an enclitic just after its verb and before a syntactic boundary (comic diction):

defo-|dit, *uene*-|rans *mē ut* | *id ser*-|uarem | *sibi*

(ia⁶, Pl. *Aul.* 8)

crucior | *lapidem* | *non ha*-|bere | *mē, ut il*-|li *mas*-|tigi-|ae

(tro⁷, Pl. *Capt.* 600)

pro Iup-|piter, | *tu homo adi*-|gis *mē ad* | *insa*-|niam

(ia⁶, Ter. *Ad.* 111)

(ii) The first word belongs to a closed set of grammatical words (relative/interrogative pronouns, subordinating conjunctions, non-lexical adverbs):

(a) In archaic (essentially comic) diction:

aurum, | *dūm hic est* | *occu*-|patus. | *sed si* | *repper*e-|ro, o *Fi*-|des

(tro⁷, Pl. *Aul.* 621)

lepide her-|cle *animum* | *tuum temp*-|taui: | *iām ut e*-|riperes | *appa*-|rabas

(tro⁸, Pl. *Aul.* 827)

- nām ut in | nauī | uecta es, | credo, | timida es. | – aliquan-|tum, so-|ror*
(tro⁷, Pl. *Bacch.* 106)
- Mnesilo-|chi Pis-|toctle-|rum, quēm ad | epis-|tulam*
(ia⁶, Pl. *Bacch.* 176)
- nām ut in | Ephesum hinc | abii – hoc | factum est | ferme ab-|hinc bi-|enni-|um*
(tro⁷, Pl. *Bacch.* 388)
- quid ille | faciat | nē id ob-|serues, | quo eat, | quid re-|rum ge-|rat?*
(tro⁷, Pl. *Men.* 789)
- quam erus meus | ama-|bat. nām is | illi-|us fi-|liam*
(ia⁶, Pl. *Mil.* 111)
- nam hospes | nullus | tām in a-|mici hos-|pitium | deuo-|ti po-|test*
quin, ubi triduum continuum fuerit, iam odiosus siet
(tro⁷, Pl. *Mil.* 741–2)
- quā ab il-|larum? | nam ita me oc-|cursant | multae; | meminī-|se haud pos-|sum*
(an⁷, Pl. *Mil.* 1047)
- quōm et ip-|sus probe | perdi-|tust et | beneuo-|lentis | perdi-|dit*
(tro⁷, Pl. *Per.* 650)
- omni-|a ego istaec | facile | patior, | dūm hic hinc | a me | senti-|at*
(tro⁷, Pl. *Rud.* 1100)
- adules-|cens qui-|dam est quī in | hisce habi-|tat ae-|dibus*
(ia⁶, Pl. *Trin.* 12)
- uide quam i-|niquos | sis prae | studio: | dūm id ef-|ficias | quod cu-|pis*
(tro⁷, Ter. *An.* 825)
- semper | satis age-|re ut nē in | amo-|re animum oc-|cupes*
(ia⁶, Pac. 72 [Ribbeck, *TRF*] = Non. 355.30 [Lindsay])
- priua-|bit, ig-|ni cūm et | aqua in-|terdi-|xerit*
(ia⁶, Lucil. 787 [Marx])

(b) In dactylic verse:

- uiuam progeniem quī in oras luminis edant*
(Lucr. 2.617)
- nam sī, ut ipsa petit maiestas cognita rerum*
(Lucr. 5.7)
- pectora, terrarum quī in orbi sancta tuetur*
(Lucr. 5.74)
- impello, expungam; nām et est scabiosus et acri*
(Pers. 2.13 [Clausen])