

CATULLUS



A Textual Reappraisal



John M.
Trappes-Lomax

CATULLUS

A TEXTUAL REAPPRAISAL

John M. Trappes-Lomax



The Classical Press of Wales

First published in 2007 by
The Classical Press of Wales
15 Rosehill Terrace, Swansea SA1 6JN
Tel: +44 (0)1792 458397
Fax: +44 (0)1792 464067
www.classicalpressofwales.co.uk

Distributed in the United States by:
ISD, LLC
70 Enterprise Dr., Suite 2
Bristol, CT 06010
Tel: +1 (860) 584-6549
www.isdistribution.com

© 2007 The author

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

ISBN: 978-1-910589-50-2

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Typeset by Ernest and Andrew Buckley, Clunton, Shropshire
Printed and bound in the UK by Gomer Press, Llandysul, Ceredigion, Wales

The Classical Press of Wales, an independent venture, was founded in 1993, initially to support the work of classicists and ancient historians in Wales and their collaborators from further afield. More recently it has published work initiated by scholars internationally. While retaining a special loyalty to Wales and the Celtic countries, the Press welcomes scholarly contributions from all parts of the world.

The symbol of the Press is the Red Kite. This bird, once widespread in Britain, was reduced by 1905 to some five individuals confined to a small area known as 'The Desert of Wales' – the upper Tywi valley. Geneticists report that the stock was saved from terminal inbreeding by the arrival of one stray female bird from Germany. After much careful protection, the Red Kite now thrives – in Wales and beyond.

CONTENTS

	Page
<u>Preface</u>	vii
<u>Editions</u>	ix
<u>Abbreviations, manuscripts</u>	xi
<u>Introduction</u>	1
<u>The textual commentary</u>	33
<u>Bibliography</u>	303

PREFACE

It is a pleasing duty to record indebtedness. I am deeply grateful to Dr David McKie of Robinson College, Cambridge and to Professor Stephen Harrison of Corpus Christi College, Oxford for reading a draft of this work and making very many valuable suggestions and corrections; the latter has also kindly provided me with copies of his Seminar notes on the text of Catullus and has examined Pocchus' *adversaria* in the Bodleian Library; cf. on 107.7–8. Professor Robin Nisbet demonstrated his generous zeal for Catullan scholarship by providing me with many pages of comment; he has led me to modify, augment or delete my suggestions in well over sixty places. I here make special mention of Stephen Harrison's suggested transposition in poem 54, and of hitherto unpublished emendations offered by Robin Nisbet at 64.288, 64.372, 110.3. The unstinting assistance offered by these distinguished students of Catullus is of course not to be taken as evidence of their agreement with any particular suggestion. Dr Anton Powell of the Classical Press of Wales has read the text with minute exactitude; he is responsible for many improvements of style and content. The remaining errors and infelicities are all my own.

EDITIONS

The following editions and commentaries are cited by author's name only.

- Aldine *Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius*, edited by H. Avantius, Venice, 1502.
- Aldine 1515 The second edition of the above.
- Avantius Avantius' third edition, Venice, c. 1534; its readings are recorded in Ellis^a lxix–lxxv.
- Baehrens Baehrens E., 1876 and 1885, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, text and commentary, Leipzig.
- Bardon Bardon H., 1973, *Catulli Veronensis Carmina*², Stuttgart.
- Ellis^a Ellis R., 1878, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*², Oxford.
- Ellis^b Ellis R., 1889, *A Commentary on Catullus*², Oxford.
- Ellis^c Ellis R., 1904, *Catulli Carmina*, Oxford.
- Fordyce Fordyce C.J., 1973, *Catullus*, corrected reprint, Oxford.
- Goold Goold G.P., 1989, *Catullus*², London.
- Green Green P., 2005, *The Poems of Catullus*, Berkeley.
- Lee Lee A.G., 1990, *Catullus: The Complete Poems*, Oxford.
- Kroll Kroll W., 1968, *C. Valerius Catullus*⁵, Stuttgart.
- Mynors Mynors R.A.B., 1960, *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*, corrected reprint, Oxford.
- Quinn Quinn K., 1973, *Catullus: The Poems*², London.
- Syndikus Syndikus H.P., 2001, *Catull: eine Interpretation*³, 3 vols., Darmstadt.
- Thomson Thomson D.F.S., 1998, *Catullus Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary*, corrected reprint, Toronto.
- Vega and Ramirez Vega A.P. and Ramirez de Verger A., 2005, *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*, Huelva.

A full bibliography can be found at the end of this work.

ABBREVIATIONS

- CIL* *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.*
K-S Stegmann C. and Kühner R., *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*⁴, 2 vols. Munich, 1962.
LIMC *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, 17 vols., Zurich and Munich, 1981–99.
LSJ H.G. Liddell, R. Scott and H.S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon.*
NJbb *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik.*
OLD *Oxford Latin Dictionary.*
TLL *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae.*

MANUSCRIPTS

- T Parisinus lat. 8071 (contains poem 62 only).
O Oxoniensis Canonicianus class. lat. 30.
G Parisinus lat. 14137.
R Vaticanus Ottobonianus lat. 1829.
X the agreement of GR.
V the agreement of OGR.
- ω one or more of the MSS not listed above; citations of ω are taken at second hand, especially from Schwabe and Ellis, and are not guaranteed.

On occasion the following is cited separately:

- a BL add. 11915.

INTRODUCTION

The Catullan problem and the scope of this work

The problem that has faced every reader of Catullus from the fourteenth century to the present day is simply that one of the greatest of poets was transmitted to us via a single MS, which was so bad that in the case of a decently preserved author it would be accounted little better than waste paper. As a result it is universally admitted that emendation is often necessary in Catullus; cf. Goold 1958, 93: 'No modern edition, however conservative, is likely to appear with less than five or six hundred conjectural emendations of the text.' But what criterion should we use in order to decide which readings we accept and which we reject? There is only one possible criterion: *si melius est, Catullianum est*. This criterion will often lead us to reject the authority of the MSS in particular cases, but it is none the less imposed by the authority of the MSS. The MSS, corrupt though they are, suffice to prove that Catullus is a great poet; having proved that, they deprive themselves of any authority to persuade us that he wrote anything manifestly inferior. The tools for determining what is the better reading can only be an appreciation of the practice of Latin poets in general and a knowledge of the practice of Catullus in particular; many students of Catullus are of course as well or better qualified to form such judgments, but even they may derive some benefit or interest from evaluating possible alternatives to their own preferred readings. It may be said that the mere fact that a reading is better does not prove that it is the best and that therefore there is no guarantee that it is what Catullus actually wrote. That is true, and all that can be asserted is that choosing the better reading should at least lead us nearer to the truth. There is always a theoretical possibility that any conjecture may be false; the same is true of any MS reading.

This work may find readers who are primarily interested not in textual criticism but in other and very likely more important parts of classical scholarship. Such readers may ask what method is followed by textual critics; the only truthful answer is that there is no method (cf. Housman 1937, 1, liii–liv). Textual corruption can arise from similarity of letters, similarity of sound, similarity of meaning; from the tendency of the human brain to anagrammatize the words that it is trying to reproduce; from assimilation of the word that the scribe is attempting to write to other earlier or later words

that the scribe has in mind; from our habit of writing once what should be written twice and twice what should be written once; from omission of words because of the proximity of other similar words; from the deliberate attempts of scribes to correct and supplement what they believe to be corruptions or omissions in their exemplar. No single method can possibly resolve such disparate problems. However, the following analogies may be helpful. A musicologist could not write a Beethoven quartet, but he will be able to fill up the gap if presented with a MS from which a few bars have been cut out. An art restorer could not paint a Rembrandt self-portrait, but he will be able to put right a small area from which the paint has been lost. A textual critic could not write a poem of Catullus, but with his knowledge of Catullus' style and content and metre he should be capable of detecting corruption and sometimes at least of performing the requisite restoration. The number of Latin words is finite; if poetry is the best words in the best order, there will be only one correct way of using them. The task of the textual critic (of poetry in particular) is to find that one correct way. It follows from this obligation to recover the best arrangement of words that resemblance to the letters preserved in the MSS is the last and least important of a textual critic's concerns; cf. Housman 1937, 5, xxxiv–xxxv.

This work deals only with those places where there seems to its author to be a fair probability that the Oxford Text of R.A.B. Mynors can be improved – even if only by obelization (as at 36.12; 63.88; 64.35; 64.288; 64.300). There are other passages which would elicit no more than a vague expression of dissatisfaction or doubt, and that would be a waste of the reader's time. In the same way many of the conjectures with which the author disagrees are passed over in silence; to deal with them all would take up a vast amount of space without any commensurate advantage.

The Oxford text of R.A.B. Mynors

Mynors' edition has been selected as the reference text primarily because it is regarded as the standard text in the English-speaking world. It has the further advantages of presenting significant MS readings in an accurate and lucid manner and of providing the best text of Catullus then available. In a work such as this it is inevitable that the reference text will normally be quoted by way of disagreement, but that should not be taken as indicating any lack of respect or gratitude for Mynors' work. Further and valuable comment on Mynors' text will be found in Goold 1958, and Harrison 2000; if there are legitimate criticisms, they are that Mynors sometimes prints a text which he himself recognizes to be dubious and that he sometimes fails to mention good conjectures which at least deserve a place in his apparatus.

Presentation of MS readings

An apparatus criticus resembles the grounds at the bottom of a cup of Turkish coffee; we know that it must be there but we have no wish to ingest it. This is a sound instinct because the time and effort spent in examining every detail in every apparatus would be ill repaid; thus in the first 13 lines of poem 12 Mynors' apparatus of Catullus shows the MSS readings listed below together with the text as printed:

MSS	Mynors
1. matrucine	Marrucine
2. ioco/loco	ioco
4. salsum/falsum	salsum
7. frater/fratri	fratri
8. voluit/velit	velit
9. dissertus/disertus	differtus
13. nemo est sinum/nemo sinum	mnemosynum

All Mynors' readings are certain (except that we should write *mnemosynon*) and the information, though an essential tool of textual criticism, tells the ordinary reader nothing that he needs to know. The disadvantage of ignoring the apparatus is that we overlook important and controversial issues as readily as trivial or obvious ones, and it is generally the case that good readings relegated to the apparatus might as well not exist; perhaps editors should adorn their margins with warning triangles whenever a textual point arises which readers would bypass at their peril. In this work significant MS readings are not banished to the conventional obscurity of small print but are presented as an integral part of the narrative.

The consequences for Catullus

Catullus is a poet of lucidity, elegance and balance. In common, I suppose, with all those engaged in learning Latin I used to encounter passages of Catullus that seemed to me harsh, crabbed and obscure; at that time I attributed those difficulties to my own inadequate comprehension. Many of these passages would still seem harsh, crabbed and obscure, but the fault lies neither in Catullus nor in his readers but rather in the corrupt transmission of his text. I hope that the pages that follow will provide sufficient evidence for this assertion, cf. (for example) poems 10, 11, 68B, 84, 101, 102, 107. Readers will observe a marked reduction in awkward consonant clusters at word junctions (cf. p. 15), and in abnormal elision and the use of oblique cases of *is* (cf. p. 10). Hiatus never occurs (cf. pp. 9f.), except after the interjection *o*.

Catullus will also emerge as a Republican poet rather than as an Augustan poet born prematurely. The evidence for this has been obscured by a scribal

campaign against ecthipsis of final *s* and against Catullus' consequent use of forms such as *tempust* for *tempus est*; cf. pp. 6 ff. Catullus has also been deliberately deprived of the indeclinable future infinitive in *-urum*; cf. 36.7; 42.4. Instrumental *qui* was also viewed with disfavour (cf. p. 9).

Finally, the text of Catullus was enlarged by around 70 interpolated lines; cf. pp. 10 ff. These lines are at best superfluous and at worst unintelligible; many of them, like much of the deliberate modernization referred to above, very likely go back to antiquity, rather than to the activities of medieval scribes. Their removal greatly improves many poems and passages of Catullus.

Corruptions

Some corruptions are so blatant in their violation of sense or grammar or metre that even conservative critics cannot attempt their defence. Some corruptions are so well concealed that they will only be cured, if they are cured at all, by some moment of inspiration; cf. 34.22, where *Romulique* had never given rise to the slightest suspicion until Don Fowler discovered the cure and the disease simultaneously by suggesting *Romulamque*. This improvement was found although it was not being looked for, and we must attribute it to the workings of a Latinist's subconscious. It is impossible to say how many as yet unnoticed corruptions there are in Catullus; but if chance or Herculaneum should ever produce a good MS it will contain many surprises.

However there are numerous corruptions whose presence can be confirmed by the very nature of the arguments deployed in their favour. It is the function of scholarship to explain and illustrate the text; when, by way of contrast, scholars attempt to justify and defend the text, we may be sure that something is wrong. The formula runs something like this: 'Such and such a conjecture by Mr X is attractive, but the received text has been defended by Mr Y.' This defence implies a comparative judgment; i.e. that when we look at the received text and at the conjecture we are inclined to prefer the latter. If the received text is by Catullus, this means that Mr X, who is probably not a poet and certainly not a native speaker of Latin, said what needed saying better than Catullus did; and the probability of that is too remote to be worth considering. Thus 27.2. *inger mi calices amariores* is an excellent example of the corruption which scans and makes some sort of sense; as usual with such corruptions it can be detected by the acres of defence that it has elicited – nearly two pages in Thomson for example. The true reading is *meraciores*; it is a manifest improvement; it was discovered centuries ago by Sabellicus; a few lines, as will be seen, suffice to provide it with all the explanation and illustration that it needs.

Proposals and their classes

A schedule of the proposals brought forward in this supplement can be found at pp. 21 ff.; there are some 450 of them. Excluding minor points of orthography and punctuation, they fall into five classes:

(i) Proposals which have been published comparatively recently or else are at least recorded in standard modern editions. Obviously no great originality or research is required to gather these, but to have them collected in one place may be of some utility to readers of Catullus.

(ii) Proposals that, so far as I know, have not been mentioned since the editions of Ellis (1873 and 1904):

4.15 (Klotz), 10.14 (Turnebus), 13.14 (Fruterius), 16.13 (Avantius), 37.5 (Hand), 42.13 (Status), 50.2 (Sabellicus), 51.10 (Status), 61.122 (Schwabe), 61.149 (Vicenza edition of 1481), 61.217 (Baehrens), 63.79 (B. Guarinus), 64.60 (Heinsius), 64.143 (Froehlich), 64.168 (Heinsius), 64.187 (Orelli), 64.217 (Avantius), 64.275 (Lennep, Baehrens), 64.283 (Heinsius), 65.4 (Heinsius), 66.71 (Palmer), 67.7 (Aldine), 67.27 (Rossbach), 67.33–4 (Maffei), 68B.75 (Avantius), 68B.145 (Graevius), 96.3 (Peiper), 96.4 (Avantius), 102.3 (Avantius), 115.7 (Brunér).

Not every reader of Catullus will have Ellis' editions immediately to hand or the leisure to search them if they have; there may be some advantage in having a selection of attractive readings dredged from his apparatus.

(iii) Proposals that, so far as I know, have been entirely forgotten:

9.4 (Palmer), 15.19 (Maehly), 17.23 (Palmer), 26.4 (Gronovius), 29.19 (van Jever), 40.1 (Froehlich), 42.4 (Putschius?), 42.17 (Maehly), 44.13 (Bergk), 46.11 (Status), 58B.7 (Maehly), 61.25 (Postgate), 61.46–7 (Leyser), 61.53 (Maehly), 61.109 (Maehly), 61.129 (Vasis), 62.54 (Heinsius), 62.56 (Pleitner), 63.31 (Froehlich), 63.50 (B. Guarinus), 64.35 (Lennep), 64.52 (Maehly), 64.55 (Froehlich), 64.94 (Markland), 64.103 (Fea), 64.106 (Fea), 64.263 (Dousa filius), 64.350 (Garrod), 64.357 (Heinsius), 66.28 (Owen), 66.54 (Bosscha), 66.59 (Avantius), 68A.37 (Status), 68B.65 (Peiper), 68B.91 (Huschke), 68B.148 (Baehrens), 68B.153 (Gryphius, Maehly), 69.10 (Froehlich), 84.2 (Froehlich), 87.4 (Baehrens), 107.2 (Status), 107.3 (Maehly), 108.1 (Froehlich), 115.1 (Palmer).

(iv) Proposals that seem to be previously unpublished; as with classes (ii) and (iii) it is impossible to guarantee this; cf. p. 20. These alterations are often trivial and most are fresh assaults on admitted difficulties; in some cases they are no more than mere tinkering with previous suggestions; many are in places where corruption is manifest and the only question is which emendation to choose. A number of deletions have also been recommended; cf. pp. 10 ff.

(v) On occasion readings of V are restored in whole or part:

3.9, 3.12 (O not X), 22.5, 31.13, 42.4, 44.13 and 19, 61.161, 61.164, 62.63,

63.60 (O not X), 64.14, 64.89, 64.383, 64.391, 64.395, 66.7, 66.59, 67.6, 67.32, 68B.63, 68B.68, 74.4, 90.5, 111.2.

In view of the fallibility of human judgment and the impossibility of reading everything that might be relevant, it is inevitable that I will have omitted proposals that deserve to be included and included proposals that deserve to be omitted; *tantis in tenebris tantillum degimus aeuum*. The only way to avoid the former failing is to compile a Repertory of Conjectures, though that could never be complete; the only way to avoid the latter failing is never to put forward any proposals at all, and that will be of no service to the author. This is not an edition, and its readers are free to select and reject; it is asked only that they should not allow their familiarity with the standard texts of Catullus to debar them from impartial consideration of proposed changes.

Textual proposals are discrete, and the goodness and badness of one does not depend on the goodness or badness of another. However, we can detect certain patterns both of usage and of error; to investigate these patterns is to acquire an insight into the practices both of Catullus and of his scribes, and that insight may provide some confirmation that conjectures herein recommended either accord with Catullus' usage or remedy one of the typical accidents that befell his text or both.

Ecthlipsis of final -s

This is a good place to start our consideration of the patterns of corruption as it is one where scribal ignorance of the metrical practice of Republican Rome has led to the corruption of Catullus' text in about half a dozen places. Fortunately the scribes allowed a single example of ecthlipsis to survive their well-meant meddling – presumably because they could find no way of removing it – and at 116.8 we read: *at fixus nostris tu dabis supplicium*, which of course only scans if we ignore the final *s* of *dabis*. The supposition that Catullus employed ecthlipsis once and once only and that he did so in the last half-line of the last poem in his works as we have them is most implausible; however editors and others prefer to treat 116.8 as aberrant and to fortify their position with a reference to Cicero *Orat.* 161: *Quin etiam, quod iam subrusticum videtur, olim autem politius, eorum verborum, quorum eadem erant postremae duae litterae, quae sunt in 'optimus', postremam litteram detrahebant, nisi vocalis insequebatur. Ita non erat ea offensio in verbis, quam nunc fugiunt poetae novi*; cf. Skutsch 1985, 56: 'The neoterics banished it, and its appearance in the last line of Catullus is a puzzling and intriguing freak'. We might reply that, if Catullus regarded ecthlipsis as poetically unacceptable, he would not have used it at all, and

that, if he regarded it as poetically acceptable, there is no reason why he should have only used it once.

However, Cicero wrote his *Orator* in 46 BC, and the expression *poetae novi* can have nothing to do with Catullus who probably died in 54 and who would have been middle-aged by 46 even if he had been alive; cf. Bickel 1949, 9–11; Courtney 2003, 189. Likewise *Att.* 7.2.1 was written in 50 BC so the νεώτεροι there referred to must be the emergent poets of the new generation rather than the established poets of Cicero's generation; the reference to *cantores Euphorionis* at *Tusc.* 3.45 is even later than the other two and equally irrelevant. It might be best to avoid labels such as 'neoterics', but, if we must use them, it could at any rate be marginally less deceptive to refer to Catullus and his contemporaries as 'palaeoterics'. Cicero himself used ecthipsis 7 or 8 times in his youthful *Aratea*, i.e. about once every 70 lines. Of his later verse we have a 75-line fragment of *De Consulatu Suo* and about thirty other lines. It is true that at the rate of one ecthipsis in 70 lines we might expect one example in the long fragment but that is no proof that Cicero had entirely abandoned the practice. Indeed if a change in practice in his own verses could have been used to exemplify a development from *subrusticum* to *politius*, he would not have been inhibited by any false modesty from telling us so. Therefore at the least we are not entitled to assert as a certainty that Cicero changed his practice. We also know that Catullus' older contemporaries Lucretius and Varro (*Men.* 9, 36, 71, 289, 356, 417) made regular use of ecthipsis. The same is true of other near contemporaries such as Egnatius, Loreius Tiburtinus and Sueius; cf. Courtney 2003, 70, 79, 112, 128, 147. Catullus must have been learning to write poetry around 70–65 BC and there is no reason to suppose that anybody at that time was avoiding ecthipsis; cf. Bickel 1949, 9–10: 'ab hac igitur arte [that of the Sullan epigrammatists] cum Catullus nutrimenta puerascens acceperit'.

It is to be expected therefore that Catullus made regular if not frequent use of ecthipsis, and readers are referred to 27.7 (Pleitner); 44.17 (Muretus); 54.4; 66.9; 66.15; 66.85; 67.6 (Froehlich); 84.2 (Froehlich); 115.7 (Brunér); 116.7 where ecthipsis can be more or less plausibly restored; there may well be other instances which the scribes have been more successful in concealing, just as they tried to do in Lucretius; cf. Housman 1972, 1, 436–7: 'In Lucretius' MSS few errors are commoner than this.' For examples of such scribal emendation in Lucretius, cf. e.g. 2.18; 3.194; 5.970; 5.1410; 6.488; 6.958; 6.971; 6.1139 (where *finibus Cecropiis* was simply 'emended' to the lamentable *finibus in Cecropis*). The same phenomenon in the exceptionally corrupt MS tradition of Catullus should occasion no surprise; indeed such 'emendation' is as old as Quintilian 9.4.39 who includes ecthipsis among the phenomena *quae in ueteribus libris reperta mutare imperiti solent; et, dum*

librariorum insectari uolunt inscitiam, suam confitentur. It is of course possible that Catullus' use of ecthlipsis diminished in the course of his poetic career and that the list of examples above may indicate that poem 66 is an early work like Cicero's translation of Aratus; perhaps aspiring poets gained experience by translation just as student artists used to be set to copy Old Masters. The apparent absence of examples of ecthlipsis from poems 61, 62, 63, 64 may be a function of the skill with which the scribes concealed them; alternatively it may be that Catullus came to regard ecthlipsis as better fitted to shorter and less formal works.

Prodelision; *amatust* etc.

We know that Catullus employed prodelision of *est* and *es*; cf. Mueller 1894, 364–6; and this has left clear traces in the MS tradition, so he wrote *malest* not *male est* and *adeptas* not *adapta es*, though to avoid possible confusion it is best for us to write *adapta's*. Ecthlipsis of final *s* coupled with this prodelision would produce forms like *amatu's* and *amatust* which are common in Plautus but unpopular with his copyists; cf. Lindsay 1904, 1, ix–x: 'scribam nescioquem Palatinae recensionis solitum esse formas *amatust amatast* ita mutare ut uerborum ordo saepenumero sit turbatus'; Studemund 1889, 505; Lindsay 1922, 358 'the scribes' inveterate habit of substituting *est* for *'st* and *es* for *'s*'; Lindsay 1922, 74–6. We can expect the same in Catullus in consequence of his own use of ecthlipsis, and such forms are possible at 22.13 (where idiom requires *est*); 23.27 (Bergk); 39.9, 62.3, 64.186, 78.3, 78.5, 97.4. As late as Marius Victorinus *GLK* 6, 22, it was doctrine that *audiendus est* and the like should be pronounced in this fashion: *primam uocem integram relinquetis, ex nouissima autem e et s detrahetis*. In general the restoration of parts of *sum* agrees with Republican practice; cf. Mueller 1894, 514 who shows that omission of *sum* before the Augustans usually occurred with *pote* (cf. 17.24, 45.5, 67.11, 98.1) and certain fixed expressions like *nec mirum* (cf. 23.7, 57.3).

Forms of the *amatust* type should also be expected in Lucretius. Bailey gives 4.961 as *et diuisior inter se et distractior intust*; a verb is certainly required. Likewise he gives *necessust* at 2.710, 2.725, 4.1006. At 2.710 Bailey writes: 'Lucretius appears to write *necessest*, *necessumst*, and *necessust* indifferently.' We may think it more likely that Lucretius used the archaic form regularly if he used it at all, and that the later *nesesse* and *necessum* were introduced by the scribes. That *necessus* is original is guaranteed by its anomalous form and by *CIL* 1.581.4 *SEI QUES ESENT QUEI SIBEI DEICERENT NECESUS ESE BACANAL HABERE*. The MSS of Catullus have *nesesse est* at 12.16, 16.6, 61.81, 62.61; I would not venture to write *necessust*, but Catullus may well have done so. Note also Fulvio Orsini's *uisust* for *uisus* (mentioned by

Ellis^b at 23.7) in Catullus 2.4 (Courtney 2003, 77) *mortalis uisus pulchrior esse deo*, where the ellipse of the finite verb would be distinctly awkward.

ec- and *ecf-*

Lachmann restored the classical spelling *ecfututa* at 6.13 where V had *et futura*. If Catullus wrote *ecfututa*, it is reasonable to assume that he wrote *ecf-* elsewhere, so we should print it wherever the MSS give *eff-*; thus we should write e.g. *ecfossos* not *effossos* at 108.5. More importantly Housman 1972, 1, 179–80, shows how *ecf-* in classical texts was either modernized to *eff-*, which did little harm, or else corrupted to *et f-* as in 6.13; this destroyed the sense and the superfluous *et* was often expelled by the scribes, which might lead to further corruption if metre had to be restored. It will be suggested that corruptions of this sort have occurred at 29.21, 30.12, 68B.46, 102.4. Note also the corruption of *ecqu-* to *et qu-* at 10.8, 28.6, 88.4.

It is worth observing that *ec-* was also employed in compounds when followed by letters other than *f*; cf. Ribbeck 1866, 418 for the copious evidence offered by the capital MSS of Vergil, and Housman 1937, 5, 110 for that offered by the MSS of Manilius. To take one example only, it is clear that Vergil (cf. *A.* 8.610) and Manilius (cf. 5.131) wrote *ecgelidus* rather than *egelidus*; otherwise why is there MS evidence for *et gelid-* in contexts where *et* is quite meaningless? It is therefore to be assumed that Catullus wrote *ecgelidos* at 46.1 and other forms with *ec-* elsewhere, but in this work *ec-* is not restored except when it is followed by *f*.

h-

The scribes dropped initial *h* without compunction (except when they altered it to *b*); cf. *endecasyllabi* (42.1); *iacinthinus* (61.89); 61.1 where *heliconii* appears variously as *bellicon iei* and *eliconei*; so the MSS have no authority to persuade us of *Ortalus* (65.2 and 15); *Arpocrates* (102.4); *aruspicium* (90.2); however *elleborum* (99.14) is probably a legitimate form.

Instrumental *qui*

This archaic relic (whether relative or interrogative) puzzled the scribes who were accordingly inclined to alter it to the familiar *quid* or *quod* or *quo*; cf. 24.7 (*qui* X; *quid* O); 67.17 (*quid* V; *qui* Muretus); *qui* is additionally recommended at 42.16, 52.1, 52.4, 62.9, 66.27, 67.37 (Avantius).

Hiatus

There are no genuine examples of hiatus in Catullus (except of course the interjectional hiatus of *o Hymenaeae* in the refrains of poem 61 and poem 62); cf. Goold 1958, 106–11 followed by Trappes-Lomax 2001b. Mynors

retains hiatus at 3.16, 38.2, 66.11, 68.158, 107.1, 114.6 (obelized). These can all be removed with significant ease and usually with positive advantage, thus complying with our criterion that the better reading is Catullan.

Elision

Catullus' avoidance of hiatus is naturally accompanied by freedom of elision, yet Siedow 1911, 10, 22 (Tab. Vi), shows that in hexameters elisions 'in arsis 2, 3, 4, ...uitantur, si uox posterior habet acutum accentum in prima syllaba...disyllaba et trisyllaba in prima syllaba acuta, quae nisi arto uinculo conexas aut in figuris rhetoricis numquam fere audent adhibere poetae'; Norden 1957, Anhang XI provides confirmation. Siedow 71 gives six Catullan examples of abnormal elision (64.11, 64.98*, 64.205*, 64.237, 89.3, 114.3). All but the two asterisked examples succumb on other grounds to emendation or deletion; in both of the surviving examples the elided vowel is short *-e*, which is the sound that most easily disappears at the end of a word; cf. Lindsay 1922, 71–3.

is ea id

Similar statistics apply to the oblique cases of pronominal *is*, which non-comic poets other than Lucretius used as little as possible; cf. Axelson 1945, 72. We have frequent uses of *is* and *id* (whether nominative or accusative); two uses of adjectival *eo* (with *nomine*) at 29.11, 29.23; one of adjectival *eo* (with *tempore* understood) at 35.14. That apart, we have *eius* at 84.5 and *earum* at 63.54, both of which are in interpolated lines; *eum* at 17.23 and 63.43, both of which yield to emendation; *eam* at 64.122, where the tradition is too defective to provide sufficient evidence of an anomaly. The only survivors are *eam* at 42.6 and 42.10.

Interpolation in general

Only one line (64.378, which is actually genuine) is treated as spurious in Mynors although it is universally acknowledged that the text is corrupt in every other respect. Tarrant 1989, 158 in the course of a most valuable discussion of interpolation, writes of Catullus that: 'even a more radical skeptic than I would be hard pressed to scrape together more than the occasional instance of interpolation'. It will be here suggested that interpolations are in fact quite numerous, and that they can be recognized by any or all of superfluity, incongruity, incompetence. There are all sorts of reason for interpolation, one of which has been unduly neglected. Writing Latin verses is an enjoyable challenge, and this is particularly so when the metre is rare and interesting, hence the high proportion of arguably spurious lines in poem 63; cf. also 17.22, 29.20, 61.92–6. Versifiers appear also to have been

attracted by the prospect of inserting or enlarging lists; cf. 22.6–8, 29.20, 36.15, 39.11–12, 58.3–4. Versifiers who are satisfied with their performance will naturally wish to jot down their compositions, and the margin of the poem that inspired them is the natural place. Incorporation into the text is likely to follow at the next copying; we have no witness other than that of V, so that even a late medieval interpolation could have contaminated the whole tradition. If Thomas Seneca had lived a century earlier, his *omnibus in triuuis uulgetur fabula passim* would form an unquestioned part of all our texts at 68B.47. I suspect however that most interpolations in Catullus – especially those involving metres not employed in the Middle Ages – go back to late antiquity; cf. in particular 63.75; those which involve officiously explaining jokes (cf. 36.9–10, 39.16, 44.21, 89.3–4, 90.3–4) may also be late antique and due to a simple-minded editor like the one whose activities in Juvenal are described at Nisbet 1995, 19–28, 227–30, 280–4.

A number of Catullus' short poems are spoiled by superfluous lines; these poems will be written out in full both in their long interpolated versions and in their short Catullan versions; it will be easy to observe which is better and which is worse, and thus to apply our criterion. The alternative is that Catullus weakened his own poems by inserting unnecessary lines and thus spoiling the joke; yet there can be no greater folly than to go out of one's way to make things worse; cf. D.H. *Comp.* 16: *μανίας ἔργον ζητεῖν τὰ χεῖρω*. The longer poems too have been marred by interpolation and at any rate sufficient extracts will be written out to enable the reader to judge which version is the better. The following lines have been athetized; the name of the first proposer follows in brackets where the athetesis is known not to be original:

2.7 (Tartara), 6.12 (Muretus), 8.8, 10.10, 10.32, 17.22, 21.2–3 (Knoche), 21.13, 22.6–8, 29.20 (Scaliger), 32.4, 36.9–10, 36.15, 36.17, 37.5 (Hand), 37.12 (Heyworth), 39.11–12, 39.16, 40.5 (Schmidt), 44.21, 58B.3–4, 61.92–5 (Georg), 63.9, 63.21–22, 63.37, 63.54, 63.67, 63.75 (Muretus), 64.11, 64.18, 64.37, 64.89–90 (Kraffert), 64.119, 64.260, 66.31–2, 67.33–4 (Maffei), 68A.27–30, 68B.59–60, 68B.77–8, 68B.85–6, 68B.93–6 (Froehlich), 84.5–6, 89.3–4, 90.3–4, 95.3 (Stattius), 98.5–6.

No reader will agree with all these deletions, but it is hoped that each suggestion will be considered on its own merits.

Repetitious interpolation

Courtney 1997–8a, 164 writes: 'One stylistic criterion which carries much weight in questions of authenticity... is the unhappy or "inorganic" use of a phrase or idea used happily or "organically" in another context... In the case of disputed authenticity the two passages will purport to be by the same author, and the axiom that an author will not unhappily imitate himself will

demonstrate one passage to be spurious.' There are several places in Catullus where interpolators have either perpetrated incompetent paraphrases or else have borrowed whole lines or at any rate metrically convenient items of vocabulary from genuine passages:

8.8, 10.10, 10.32, 21.2–3, 21.13, 36.9–10, 36.17, 37.12, 40.5, 61.92–5, 63.9, 63.21, 63.37, 63.54, 64.11, 64.18, 64.37, 64.89–90, 64.260, 68B.77–8, 68B.93–6, 89.3–4.

It should be stressed that the mere fact of repetition is not proof of interpolation; the repetition has to be, as Courtney says, 'unhappy'; that is to say it must be a species of unsatisfactory interpolation, for which see below.

Unsatisfactory interpolation

It may also be suggested that failure by scholars over the past 600 years or so to restore disputed lines to something worthy of Catullus is *prima facie* evidence of interpolation. Of course it is not in itself proof, because satisfactory solutions may yet be found, nor should we forget Jackson 1955, 7: 'It is a constant temptation of the medical profession to dispose of an unremunerative patient by killing him.' However it is surely significant that such a large number of much disputed or emended lines can be deleted *without leaving a noticeable lacuna*:

2.7, 6.12, 10.10, 10.32, 21.13, 22.6–8, 29.20, 32.4, 36.9–10, 58B.3–4, 63.75, 64.11, 64.37, 64.119, 67.33–4, 68A.27–30, 68B.59–60, 68B.85, 84.5–6, 98.5–6.

Sometimes the interpolated line has come to us in the form which satisfied the interpolator but which would never have satisfied Catullus; cf. e.g. 21.13 *ne finem facias, sed irrumatus*; sometimes the interpolator's handiwork has suffered corruption and cannot be restored to Catullan excellence for the good reason that it never had it; cf. e.g. 6.12 *†nam inista preualett† nihil tacere*.

Metrical interpolations

Scribes are constantly liable to omit words; usually – but not always – there is a mechanical reason for this, i.e. resemblance to some neighbouring word which caused the copyist to jump from one place to another. Omissions in poetry destroy metre, and subsequent scribes may restore metre by inserting any word that scans and makes some sort of sense. It is suggested that such metrical interpolation occurred in the following places:

8.5, 14.8, 29.19, 31.13, 61.76, 62.22, 63.88, 64.58, 64.103, 64.120, 64.184, 66.74, 66.78, 66.93, 68A.37, 68B.158, 71.4, 101.3, 102.1, 110.2, 114.3, 115.1.

See Housman 1937, 1, lix–lxi for a full account of this phenomenon. Where metrical interpolation has taken place, there need of course be no palaeographic resemblance between the genuine word and the word that stands in the MSS; the genuine word could not influence the scribe, because it had disappeared before the scribe felt obliged to plug the gap that had been left by its disappearance.

Transposition of words

The MSS are frequently convicted by metre of transposing words, e.g. *tibi habe* for *habe tibi* (1.8); *aridum magis* for *magis aridum* (23.13); *excitat orator* for *orator excitat* (39.3); *est ita voce miseriter maiestas* (with variations) for *maestast ita voce miseriter* (63.49); *levis bibat dona* for *dona levis bibat* (66.85). Metre cannot always be expected to reveal this form of delinquency, and changes of word order lead to improvement at 45.8 and 17 (Gratwick), 61.54, 64.181, 64.183, 64.246–7. It is worth noting that Ribbeck 1866, 361–2 gives a list of 32 places where such transpositions are evidenced in the capital MSS of Vergil; e.g. *A. 5.281 plenis subit ostia uelis* (PRV), where M has *uelis...plenis*; 9.674 *iuuenes patriis* (MR), *patriis iuuenes* (P). It is no surprise that the greatly inferior MS tradition of Catullus should have succumbed to this form of corruption when we know that it existed in the text of Vergil in antiquity; *quid facient crines, cum ferro talia cedant?* We should also bear in mind Jackson 1955, 229–31 who gives a long list of scribal transpositions from Attic drama and concludes: ‘neither in trimeters nor lyrics can anything patently abnormal, whether linguistically or metrically, be regarded as established, if it would vanish upon a readjustment of the *ordo verborum*’.

Greek words

Catullus, who among other things translated Sappho and Callimachus, was of course soaked in Greek language and Greek literature. Furthermore metre proves that he used the Greek dative in short *-i* at 64.247 (*Minoidi*); 66.70 (*Tethyi*); and the genitive plural in *-on* at 66.48 (*Chalybon*). On the other hand metre proves that he used the Latin dative singular in long *-i* at 64.21 (*Thetidi*). The question therefore arises as to whether he would have preferred Latin or Greek forms when the metre would permit either. To ask this is to ask which Catullus would have regarded as the more poetical and attractive, and the answer for a poet of his time and taste is surely that he would have generally preferred Greek forms to Latinized forms. Catullus’ MSS generally exhibit Latinized forms, but that is no surprise. Housman 1972, 2, 817–39; 3, 1136–46, discusses the representation of Greek nouns in Roman poetry (apart from the old scenic poetry); he shows that Greek forms were preferred, and that the older and better the MS the more likely

it is to preserve a Greek form; the later and worse the MS the more likely it is to have a Latinized form. However, even good MSS, including the capital MSS of Vergil, often have Latin forms even where metre proves them wrong; Norden 1957, Anhang VI points to the same conclusion. Catullus' MSS are so bad that their use of Latin forms proves nothing, but any trace of a Greek form is significant. Thus at 10.26 the fact that OR give the Latin form *Serapim* is consistent with Catullus having used either the Latin *Serapis* or the Greek *Sarapis*. The fact that G gives *Sarapim* as an alternative is evidence that that is what Catullus wrote, for there would be no reason for such a form to be introduced later. Besides, Greek words are so corrupted that the MSS can hardly be relied on for points of detail. Thus, as we have seen, at 12.13 the MSS offer *nemo sinum/nemo est sinum* for *mnemosynon*, and at 66.48 *celerum/celorum/celitum* for *Chalybon*. To trust them for the endings where they cannot even be trusted for the stem would be a remarkable manifestation of gullibility. Of particular significance is 64.3 where V's *phas(c)idicos* is presumably a relic of the Latinizing *Phasidis* being written by way of correction over the Greek *Phasidos*, which is evidence of a deliberate campaign of Latinization by Greekless scribes who thought Greek forms were simply errors; cf. also 11.5 where G has *Arabaesue*, evidence for *-as* 'corrected' to *-es*; for a list of Greek forms, see Fordyce on 64.3 and p. 414; cf. also Ross 1969, 101–2, and (for Greek forms in Manilius) Housman 1937, 5, 107–9. Where metre permits we will attribute Greek forms to Catullus.

The Greek diphthong εἰ

A particular problem arises with the representation of the common Greek diphthong εἰ. Three possible solutions come into consideration: *i*, *e*, *ei*; and we need expect no help from Catullus' scribes on such a detail. Mynors employs all three spellings: *Piraei* (64.74) *Penios* (64.285) *Thiae* (66.44) *Hydrochoi* (66.94) *Laudamia* (68B. 74, 80, 105); *Aeeteos* (64.3) *Bereniceo* (66.8) *Cycneae* (67.32) *Protesilaeam* (68B.74); *Pelei* (64.382) *Pipleium* (105.1). Housman 1972, 2, 897–902 took it for granted that *-eus* is the proper representation of *-εἰοσ*; Goold 1965, 12 writes: 'the general rule of the transliteration of the diphthong εἰ is that it becomes *i* before a consonant and *e* before a vowel', which is the doctrine of Priscian *GLK* 2.40–1; however Goold 1989 prints *Laodamia* and *Thiae*, perhaps thinking that the forms in *-e-* would look rather strange. He refers to Servius ad *Ecl.* 6.2: *THALIA Musa scilicet, et Graece ait: nam Latine 'Thalea' debuit dicere...sed propter euphoniā contempsit ius regulae et ideo in graecitate permansit*. Servius' scribes are no more to be relied on than Catullus' in distinguishing *i*, *e*, *ei*, and to make sense of his comment we should fall back on the expression *in graecitate permansit*, which implies that Servius supposed that Vergil wrote *Thaleia*. Servius may have been misled by

false readings in his Vergilian MSS, for such errors occurred in antiquity even against metre, as *Minoeia* (*A.* 6.14) and *Agamemnoneiae* (*A.* 6.489), however Priscian loc. cit. also seems to have had reason to believe that Greek $\epsilon\iota$ had in earlier times been represented by Latin *ei*: *ei diphthongo nunc non utimur, sed loco eius in Graecis nominibus e uel i productas ponimus*. I attribute *ei* for $\epsilon\iota$ to Catullus throughout (except in *Nilus* which was presumably naturalized in Latin); this may of course be wrong, but it is at least consistent and thus offers the reader something with which to disagree. Further information may be found in Tolkiehn 1923 and Allen 1974, 69.

Consonant clusters

Poets and artistic writers in general aim at euphony; they therefore tend, where possible and appropriate, to avoid awkward collocations of consonants at word junctions; the Romans were particularly sensitive to *-s s-*; cf. Cic. *De Orat.* 3.172; *Orat.* 150; Quint. 9.4.37; Wilkinson 1963, 13–15. A number of the suggestions made here receive some confirmation from the fact that they avoid or diminish unnecessary consonant clusters:

13.14, 28.2, 30.11, 48.4, 52.1 and 4, 52.2, 62.17, 63.60, 63.82, 64.17, 64.136, 64.357, 64.379, 64.383, 66.71, 68A.2, 102.1.

‘Stands the church clock at ten to three?’ Brooke’s first draft had ‘half past three’. Of course he eliminated the ‘stthr’ consonant cluster.

Sandwiching and grammatical rhyme

Sandwiching can be given the more exalted names of ‘hyperbaton’ and ‘Sperrung’, but it is a highly concrete and visible phenomenon, and there is no harm in naming it accordingly; besides the verb ‘to sandwich’ is a useful one. It consists of inserting as much material as is metrically possible and artistically desirable between noun and adjective in agreement; there is a valuable discussion at Norden 1957, Anhang III, 391–400, and cf. also Patzer 1955; Conrad 1965 and his bibliography; Harrison 1991 ad *A.* 10.133 with further bibliography. Catullus’ fondness for sandwiching is palpable, though less so in the traditional style of the epigrams; cf. Ross 1969, 132–7. It explains for example why at 1.3 he adopted what Pliny *Nat. Pr.* 1 apparently regarded as the harsh word order *meas esse aliquid putare nugas* when he could have written *nugas esse aliquid meas putare*; the former is a whole line sandwich as well as placing a desirable emphasis on *meas*; cf. also Nisbet 1999. It is significant that changes recommended here for other reasons produce new or bigger sandwiches at:

25.11, 31.13, 34.22 (Fowler), 58.5 (ω), 61.217 (Baehrens), 63.31 (Froehlich), 64.14, 64.103 (Fea), 64.107 (Palmer), 64.136–7, 64.149, 64.174 (Gratwick),

Introduction

64.175 (O), 64.181, 64.212 (Pontanus), 64.217 (w), 64.246–7, 64.273 (Lennep), 64.340, 64.357 (Heinsius), 64.379, 64.395 (Nisbet), 66.77–8, 68B.147–8 (Parma edition), 107.7–8, 115.1.

Sometimes there is elaborate interlacing of nouns and epithets; cf. on 64.174.

A frequent concomitant of sandwiching is grammatical rhyme, that is the rhyme achieved by ending the two halves of a line with adjective and noun of the same declension in agreement. Catullus plainly regarded this as desirable; cf. e.g. 31.7 *o quid solutis est beatius curis* and 66.13–4 *dulcia nocturnae portans uestigia rixae | quam de uirginis gesserat exuuiis*. The sandwiches referred to above produce additional grammatical rhyme at: 31.13, 64.14, 64.217, 64.357, 115.1.

Compound words

Catullus adorned Latin with such forms as *lasserpicifer*, *pinnipes*, *erifuga*, *nemoriuagus*, *siluicultrix*. We need therefore not be reluctant to attribute to him such unremarkable compounds as *contribulo* (25.11); *ecfoueo* (29.21).

The primary MSS

A full account of the textual history of Catullus before the invention of printing is given by Thomson 1998, 22–43, whose work is explicitly based on McKie 1977; cf. also McKie 1989. A summary version may be of interest to readers new to this field; professional scholars will know it all already.

There was little interest in or knowledge of Catullus in late antiquity, but at least one MS survived; it was the ancestor of all our MSS. Its text was gravely corrupt and we may call it [P] for Pessimus (square brackets indicate MSS that no longer exist). Why it was so corrupt is impossible to say, though we do know that there were *corrupta exemplaria* within 200 years of Catullus' death; cf. Gellius 6.20.6.

T is an anthology dating from towards the end of the ninth century; it contains only one poem of Catullus, to wit poem 62. It probably derives from [P]; cf. its sharing with OGR the lacuna after l. 31, though that might be coincidental.

Around 1300 there appeared at Verona a descendant of [P]; it was probably written in France in the late twelfth century to judge by the errors its script induced in its descendants; cf. Goold 1989, 10. This MS, called [V] for Veronensis, was copied before it was lost; the copy, known as [A], is also lost. Around 1360 [A] was copied twice. One of these copies is referred to as O and survives. Its scribe, who was a calligrapher rather than a Latinist, did not trouble himself with variant readings. The other copy is called [X] and is lost; it contained a number of variant readings presumably derived from [V]

by way of [A]. [X] was copied twice. One copy is G, whose scribe soon gave up copying the variants. The other is R, which included the variants, though it is not always certain where [X]'s variants end and where the emendations of R's owner (Coluccio Salutati) begin; cf. McKie 1989, 68; Thomson 34–5; 38–43. However, at 44.11 V had *oratione minantium petitoem*; Achilles Statius made sense of this without changing a letter: *orationem in Antium petitoem*; Coluccio Salutati had seen that an accusative noun was demanded by *plenam* in the next line; however he then altered *petitoem* to *petitorum* to agree with the apparent *minantium*, thus 'correcting' the line to *orationem minantium petitorum* and making it even worse than it was before (cf. Thomson 34–5); in the light of this we may reasonably assume that good R² variants are ancient rather than Coluccian. It is of course possible that they derive from comparison with a significantly better MS (cf. p. 18) which has no direct descendants.

The secondary MSS

There are around 130 other MSS; it is generally agreed that they derive in their entirety from O or G or R, usually the latter, and that they are thus of no independent authority, though they often contain good readings conjectured by Italian humanists. However Mynors, viii, remarks of the *recentiores*: 'omnes a codicibus OGR originem aut duxerunt aut, quod nobis idem ualet, duxisse possunt'. By the cautious second alternative he recognizes that it is impossible to prove with absolute certainty that there was never a now lost brother of GR which could conceivably be the source of one or two good readings in the *recentiores*; cf. Levine 1959, 417.

The only MS that I have looked at is **a**; it has a few interesting readings; cf. 6.8 (corrector); 64.52 (first hand); 112.2–3, where the hand of a corrector other than that at 6.8 completes the couplet with (abbreviations are expanded) *neque tecum multus homo est | descendat Naso multus es et pathicus*, where *descendat* makes no sense so cannot be an emendation but none the less comes closer to the true reading, which is *te scindat* if Schwabe and Mynors are right. It will be observed that these three readings are in three different hands so provide no evidence that **a** was either copied or corrected from a better MS than any that now survive. There is however one other unique reading that deserves consideration; at 109.3 **a** offers *di magni, facite et facite ut uere promittere possit*. The natural explanation would be that the scribe was faced with the alternative readings *facite* and *et facite*, the latter of which would most easily have arisen as a corruption of *efcicite* (cf. p. 9), and if that were the case **a** would have had some access to ancient information not preserved elsewhere. This is much more likely to be a mere freak; none the less I indulge myself on occasion by quoting **a** separately; cf. also 61.217, 64.52.

Agius of Corvey

It is generally assumed that [P] was the only MS of Catullus that survived to the Carolingian era. This is an arbitrary assumption; if one MS survived and has descendants, another may have been in existence but have been lost without being copied. The monastery of Corvey in Westphalia preserved the only MS of the first six books of Tacitus' *Annals* and plainly had an exceptional library. Agius, who was a monk there in the ninth century, appears to have had access to a complete text of Catullus, which we might call [C] for Corbeiensis; cf. Nisbet 1978 (who limits his discussion to poem 68) followed and amplified by Trappes-Lomax 2001b, 307 n. 9 (vii). Note the following:

- (i) parcatis ocellis
 quos nimium flendo perditis omnimodo. (Agius 39–40)
 meae puellae
 flendo turgiduli rubent ocelli. (3.18)
- (ii) vos melius nostis quanto me semper amore
 quantis incolumis foverit officiis. (Agius 73–4)
 non possum reticere, deae, qua me Allius in re
 iuverit aut quantis iuverit [*foverit* Cornelissen] officiis. (68B.41–3)
- (iii) in qua sunt una perdita tanta bona. (Agius 58)
 a quo sunt primo omnia nata [*tanta parata* *] bona. (68B.158)
- (iv) quo desiderio susceperit advenientem (Agius 77)
 quo desiderio veteres renovamus amores (96.3)
- (v) Agius 417 calls women *femellae*, a word whose only other literary occurrence is 55.7, but it is also known from glossaries and Agius might have found it there.

As (ii) and (iii) can be used to emend the text of [V], it is clear that [C] was a significantly better MS than [P]. It is possible that [C] or a MS resembling it was the ultimate source of the good R² variants; cf. p. 17.

The authority of the MSS

OGR and T (in poem 62) are none of them derived from any existing MS and each therefore represents the end of a chain of transmission reaching back to Catullus' autograph. Therefore they constitute *prima facie* evidence that Catullus wrote what they contain. What this authority means in practice can best be seen by selecting a few examples – which could easily be multiplied – of their corruption, and comparing it with the text of Mynors:

V	Mynors
bonum factum male bonus ille passer (3.16)	o factum male! o miselle passer!
cuma est gravis (10.30)	Cinna est Gaius
oculo in aque (17.1)	O Colonia, quae

aliamque pectore expulsus sim (44.7)
 mens uertur (44.8)
 inde corsater (48.4)
 magna amiremini/admiremini (58.5)
 procatur pia (61.99)
 sui tui se (64.55)
 freti (64.229)
 nereus (64.385)
 dulcissimus harum (65.3)
 cotidiana/quotidiana (68B.139)
 nos illa mare (69.3)
 sacrorum/sacratorum (71.1)
 efficit (110.7)
 firmanus saluis (114.1)

malamque pectore expuli tussim
 meus uenter
 uidear satur
 magnanimi Remi
 probra turpia
 uisit uisere
 Erechthei
 heroum, et
 dulces Musarum
 concoquit iram
 non si illam rareae
 sacer alarum
 officiis
 Firmano saltu

It is easy to say that we should feel no great reluctance to stray from the readings of such MSS, when sense or style demands it; cf. Goold (1958) 109 'In real life we do not swallow tall stories from liars convicted of lying a thousand times over.' It is far more important to say that even if Catullus' MSS were as good as Vergil's they would still have no authority to impose upon us any readings that are unmetrical, ungrammatical, nonsensical or otherwise unworthy of the author.

Limitations of the authority of the MSS

Even the *prima facie* authority of the MSS does not extend to areas where the transmission of one reading or another is random. For example the apparatus criticus makes it clear that *u* and *n* were interchangeable as long as the result was still a Latin word. Therefore at 64.80 V's *angusta* is not *prima facie* evidence that Catullus wrote *angusta* rather than *augusta*; it is merely *prima facie* evidence that Catullus wrote either *angusta* or *augusta*, either of which was as likely to be corrupted into the other as to be preserved. Therefore *augusta* (ω, Avantius, Scaliger) is just as compatible with the evidence as V's *angusta*. This is one instance of the rule that any set of minims (e.g. *ni* and *m*) is likely to be confused with any vaguely similar set of minims. Likewise the scribes habitually failed to distinguish between *t* and *c*, *f* and long *s*, *a* and *e*, *e* and *o* etc; cf. also Friedrich 1908, 62. Similarly the virgula over a vowel indicating a following *n* or *m* is so easily lost that, for example, O's *ocio* at 44.15 is just as likely to stand for *ocimo* as for *otio*.

Orthography

It is probably neither possible nor desirable to restore every detail of Catullus' orthography. But it is clear that he wrote *quoi* and *quoius* (or *quoius*) not *cui* and *cuius*; that he spelled the conjunction *quom* not *cum*; that he avoided

vocalic *u* following consonantal *u*, so *nouos* rather than *nouus*. Many of these changes would make a real difference to the sound, which is after all at the heart of all poetry. In most words (other than compounds like *desino*) he would have written *ss* not *s* after long vowels and diphthongs; cf. Quint. 1.7.20; Allen 1965, 36; it is therefore not surprising to find MS evidence for *rassilem* at 61.161. Catullus probably used *loed-* rather than *lud-*; cf. on 17.1. Most orthographical points are passed over in silence (but cf. 1.1); however, some Catullan spellings are introduced in passages which are anyhow being discussed. It is worth noting that the old Latin diphthong *ei* had merged with inherited long *i* a century or so before the time of Catullus; cf. Allen 1965, 53–4. Catullus certainly used the spelling *ei* and it accounts for some corruptions; cf. e.g. 17.3, 61.129. However, to use an apparently diphthongal spelling for a monophthong could be misleading, and it is probably best to stick to *i*.

Principles

I have tried to attribute every emendation (unless purely orthographical; see below) to its first proposer; no doubt I have sometimes failed, and I can only apologize to all those living and dead whom I may have deprived of their intellectual property. I know from experience (cf. on 6.12, 91.3, 107.3, 107.7–8) as well as from observation how easy it is to lay claim to the emendations of others; if I have done so in this work, I hope that the aggrieved will accept a plea of guilty to incompetence rather than theft. I have not felt it necessary to acknowledge every borrowing of illustrative passages and the like, particularly from the storehouses of erudition bequeathed to us by Ellis and Kroll; I hope that this general expression of obligation will suffice.

Schedule of suggestions

This schedule should cover all those places (other than silently introduced orthographic changes where readings other than those of Mynors are recommended. Minor points of punctuation and orthography are not necessarily pursued beyond Graevius' edition of 1680, so 'Graevius' may be taken to mean 'at least as old as Graevius'; for example, there seems little point in hunting through the Renaissance editions to see who, if anybody, preceded Graevius in writing *haruspicium* with an *h* at 90.2. The introduction of Greek spellings is signalled merely by a reference to pp. 13 ff. That apart, the first known proposer of any suggestion is mentioned; the present writer is represented by *. Where the reading occurs in a secondary MS, the name of the first proposer is preceded by ω. Orthographical tinkering with the original suggestion is indicated by the addition of '(in effect)'. Where the name of a proposer is bracketed it means that he considered but rejected the recommended reading.

MYNORS	PREFERRED READING	PROPOSER
1.1 cui ...nouom	quoi...nouom	Friedrich
1.2 arida	arido	V
1.9 qualecumque; quod <o> patrona uirgo	qualest cumque, quod <o Thaleia> uirgo	(Garrod) + *
2.3 appetenti	adpetenti	V + Lachmann
2.5 meo	mei	Heyworth
2.5 nitenti	calenti	Pleitner
2.6 carum	gratum	Heyworth
2.7	<i>del.</i>	Tartara
3.9 circumsiliens	circum saliens	V + *
3.10 pipiabat	titiabat	(Birt); *
3.12 illud	illuc	O (v.l.)
3.16 o miselle	quod miselle	Goold
4.1 phaselus	phaselos	pp. 13 ff.
4.5 praeterire	praeter ire	Mueller
4.8 Rhodum	Rhodon	pp. 13 ff.
4.8 Thraciam	Thrascia	J. Thomson + Oliver
4.15 phaselus: ultima ex origine	phaselos ultima ex origine;	Klotz (in effect)
4.23 cum ueniret a mari	praeter hoc nouissimum	* (cf. Verg. <i>Cat.</i> 10.20)
4.24	<i>obelis inclusit</i>	*
5.23 sciat	sciet	Buecheler (cf. <i>Priap.</i> 52.12)
6.8 oliuo	amomo	Ø; Baehrens
6.9 ille	illic	Ø; Vossius
6.12	<i>del.</i>	Muretus (in effect)
6.17 uocare	leuare	Nisbet
7.4 lasarpiciferis	lasserpiciferis	Muretus (in effect)
8.5 nobis	tantum	*; cf. 37.12
8.6 cum	tum	R; Fraenkel
8.8	<i>del.</i>	*
8.15 scelesta, uae te, quae tibi	quae te, scelesta, uae tibi!	Froehlich + *
9.4 anumque	bonamque	Palmer
10.8 et quonam	ecquonam	Stattius
10.9 neque ipsis	<fuisse>	*
10.10	<i>del.</i>	*
10.14 inquit	inquit, 'id	Turnebus
10.15 natum dicitur esse	nasci dicitur, ipse	*
10.25 inquit 'mihi, mi	inquit mihi, 'mi	Skutsch
10.26 istos commoda: nam	istos, crastina nam	*
10.26 Serapim	Sarapin	G(v.l.) + Graevius
10.27 mane	minime	V + Pontanus
10.32	<i>del.</i>	*
10.33 insulsa	salsa	Schrader
11.3 resonante	resonans	Stattius
11.6 Sagas	Sacas	1472 ed.
11.7 quae	qua	Ø; Graevius
11.11–12 Gallicum Rhenum	Gallias et horribiles	*
horribile aequor	Britannos ultima	
ultimosque Britannos	rerum	

Introduction

MYNORS	PREFERRED READING	PROPOSER
11.14 quaecumque	quocumque	Ellis
11.23 praetereunte	praeter eunte	Mueller
12.13 mnemosynum	mnemosynon	Calphurnius (in effect)
13.13–14 rogabis, totum	rogabis totum	Vossius
13.14 ut	<i>om.</i>	Fruterius
14.8 nouum ac repertum	malis refertum	Watt + *
14.14 die periret	periret ipsis	Heyworth
14.16 false	salse	G (v.l.)
15.2 pudentem	pudenter	Maehly
15.19 percurrent	pertudent	Maehly
16.13 putatis	putastis	Avantius
17.1 ludere	loedere	V + Scaliger
17.3 axulis	insulis	*
17.8 meum	tuum	*
17.21 meus	merus	Passerat
17.22	<i>del.</i>	*
17.23 nunc eum	hunc uelis	O + Palmer
21.1 esuritionum	essuritionum	Bergk
21.2–3	<i>del.</i>	Knoche
21.6 haerens	haeres	Muretus
21.7 instruentem	struentem	Ribbeck
21.9 atque	atqui	Aldine
21.10 esurire	essurire	Bergk
21.11 me met†	iam iam mi	*
21.13	<i>del.</i>	*
22.5 palimpseston	palimpsesto	V (in effect)
22.6–8	<i>del.</i>	*
22.9 tu	tum	⊖; Muretus
22.12 putemus	putamus	Fordyce
22.13 scitius	scitius	*
23.21 lapillis	lupinis	Gulielmius + Hotomannus
23.23 posses	possis	⊖; Froehlich
23.27 sat es beatus	satis beatus	V + Bergk
25.2 oricilla	auricilla	Lachmann
25.5 diua †mulier ariest†	<lychnus ostiarios>	*
25.10 manus	natis	Scaliger
25.11 flagella conscribillent	contribulent flagella	Turnebus + de Allio + *
26.1 uestra	nostra	X
26.3 Apheliotae	Apeliotae	Graevius
26.4 ducentos	ducenta	⊖; Gronovius
27.2 amariore	meraciore	Sabellicus
27.7 est	sit	Pleitner
28.2 aptis...expeditis	apti...expediti	⊖; Wakefield
28.11 pari	pari in	Friedrich
29.4 uncti	ante	Status
29.5 haec	hoc	Baehrens
inter 29.5–6 es impudicus et uorax et aleo	<i>add.</i>	Aldine

MYNORS	PREFERRED READING	PROPOSER
29.8 aut Adoneus	Aphrodisius	*
29.9 haec	hoc	Baehrens
29.19 quam scit amnis	qua nitescit	van Jever
29.20	<i>del.</i>	Scaliger
29.21 malum fouetis	male ecfouetis	*
29.23 †urbis opulentissime†	imperator unice	Scaliger
29.24 socer generque	gener socerque	Baehrens; cf. Verg. <i>Cat.</i> 6.6
30.4 nec	num	Schwabe
30.4 caelicolis placet	caelicolas latet	*
30.5 quae	quos	B. Guarinus
30.6 eheu	heu heu	Lyne
30.6 dic	dice	Ellis
30.11 meminerunt	meminere, at	Muretus
30.12 faciet	ecficiet	*
31.12 o	<i>om.</i>	Goold
31.13 gaudente, uosque, o Lydiae	gaudete, <crebrae> limpidi	V + Avantius + Goold + *
31.14 ridete quidquid	ridete, quidquid	Lachmann
32.1 Ipsitilla	Ipsimilla	Baehrens
32.4	<i>del.</i>	*
34.22 Romulique	Romulamque	Fowler
34.23 antique	antehac	*
34.23 solita es	solita's	cf. 66.27–9
35.6 meique	tuique	Nisbet
35.13 nam quo	nam ex quo	*
36.7 daturam	daturum	*
36.9–10	<i>del.</i>	*
36.12 Vrios apertos	<i>obelis inc.</i>	*
36.13 Cnidum	Cnidon	pp. 13 ff.
36.15	<i>del.</i>	*
36.17	<i>del.</i>	*
37.5	<i>del.</i>	Hand
37.8 una	unum	Pleitner
37.12	<i>del.</i>	Heyworth
38.2 et laboriose	et est laboriose	Sillig
38.6 meos	tuos	Baehrens
38.7–8	<i>seiunxit</i>	*
39.9 monendum est <te>	monendu's <tu>	Calphurnius + *
39.10 urbanus	Albanus	Froehner
39.11–12	<i>del.</i>	*
39.16	<i>del.</i>	*
39.19 defricare	pumicare	Junius; cf. Apul. <i>Apol.</i> 6
40.1 Rauide	Auite	Froehlich
40.5	<i>del.</i>	Schmidt
41.1 Ameana	Anneiana	Schwabe (in effect)
42.4 nostra	uestra	V
42.4 reddituram	redditurum	Putschius
42.9 ridentem	ringentem	*
42.13 facis	facit	Halbertsma

Introduction

MYNORS

42.13 lupanar
 42.14 perditius
 42.14 potes
 42.16 quod si non
 42.17 ore
 42.16–17
 42.23 siquid
 44.2 laedere
 44.13 grauedo
 44.13 hic
 44.15 orio
 44.17 ulta
 44.19 grauedinem
 44.21
 45.6 Indiaue
 45.8 and 17 Amor sinistra ut ante
 45.12 suauyata
 46.11 diuersae uariae
 48.4 nec numquam
 48.5 aridis
 49.7 omnium
 50.2 in meis
 50.5 ludebat
 post 50.17
 50.19 despuas
 51.8
 51.10 demanat
 51.11 gemina
 51.13–16
 52.1 and 4 quid moraris
 52.2 Nonius
 54.2 †et erit rustice
 54.2–3
 54.4 omnia
 54.5 Sufficio
 54.6–7
 55.2 tenebrae
 55.3 te in Campo
 55.4 libellis
 55.11 reduc...
 55.11–12
 55.14 in
 55.17 nunc
 56.5 pupulum
 56.5 puellae
 56.6 trusantem;
 56.7 protelo
 58.5 magnanimi

PREFERRED READING

o lupanar
 putidius
 potest
 qui si nil
 ori
post v. 23 pos.
 si quid
 loedere
 grauido
 hinc
 ocimo
 ultus
 grauidinem
del.
 Indiaue
 ut ante Amor sinistra
 sauiata
 diuersos uariae
 nec umquam
 Africis
 omnium's
 in uicem
 loedebat
lacunam stat.
 respuas
 <uocis in ore>
 dimanat
 gelida
seiunx.
 qui moraris
 non homo
 et, mi Rustice,
transp.
 omnibus
 Fufidio
seiunx.
 latebrae
 te in Campo
 tabernis
 retect<ta pectus>
transp.
om.
 num
 Pupulum
 in puella
 : crisantem
 pro telo
 magnanimos

PROPOSER

Stadius
 *
 Ø; Halbertsma
 *
 Maehly
 Westphal
 Graevius
 Heyworth (in effect)
 V
 Bergk
 Ø; Barbarus
 Muretus
 V
 *
 Stadius
 Gratwick
 V (in effect)
 Stadius
 Stadius + Baehrens
 Markland
 R (in effect)
 Sabellicus (in effect)
 R² (in effect)
 Heyworth
 *
 Ritter
 Stadius
 Baehrens
 Stadius
 *
 *
 Stadius + Thomson
 Harrison
 *
 Bickel
 Rossbach
 Palladius
 Sillig
 Aldine
 Ellis + Harrison
 Heyworth
 Schuster
 Ø; Graevius
 (Ellis) + *
 Schwabe
 Ø + *
 G
 Ø; Calphurnius

MYNORS	PREFERRED READING	PROPOSER
58B	<i>post 55.13 pos.</i>	1475 ed.
58B.3–4	<i>del. et lacunam stat.</i>	*
58B.7 iunctos	cunctos	ω; Schrader
58B.7 dicares	ut dicares	Maehly
58B.10 mihi, amice	mi amice	Scaliger
60.5 a	heu	Kershaw
61.5, 40, 50, 60 o Hymen Hymenaeae	Hymen o Hymenaeae	Graevius
61.8 cape laetus, huc	cape, laetus huc	Bachrens
61.25 umore	alimento	Postgate
61.46–7 magis est amatis petendus	<cupidis> magest expetendus	Leyser + *
61.54 timens cupida nouos	nouos cupida timens	*
61.76 ianuae	<uirgines>	Richards + *
61.92–5	<i>del.</i>	Georg
61.97–8 in mala...adultera	aut malae...adulterae	Harrison
61.102 sed	qui	X + Aldine
61.109 ueniunt	obueniunt	Maehly
61.110 uaga	caua	Harrison
61.117–8; 137–8 etc.		
io Hymen Hymenaeae io,	Hymen o Hymenaeae io,	Aldine; Statius
io Hymen Hymenaeae	Hymen o Hymenaeae	
61.122 desertum	defectum	*
61.122 audiens	uidens	Schwabe
61.126 lusisti nucibus	lusisti; nucibus	Owen
61.126 lubet	iuuet	Busche
61.129 uilicae	uilic(e)i	Vasis
61.145 ne neges	deneges	Owen
61.146 ni	ne	Graevius
61.149 ut	et	Bernardus Pisanus
61.151 sine	bene	Palmer
61.161 rassilem	rassilem	X
61.164 intus	unus	V
61.170 pectore uritur intimo	pectore ardet in intimo	Goold + *
61.171 penite	penitus	Heyworth
61.215–6 insciis...omnibus	omnibus...insciis	Dawes
61.218 suae	suo	ω; Baehrens
61.223 Penelopeo	Penelopaeo	Passerat
62.3 tempus	tempust	*
62.9 quod	qui	*
62.17 saltem	tandem	*
62.22 retinentem...natam,	<possis> ...natam	*
62.39 flos in	flos <qui> in	Spengel
post 62.41	<i>lacunam stat.</i>	Spengel
62.54 marito	maritae	Heinsius
62.56 senescit	suis est	Pleitner
62.58b	<i>om.</i>	V
62.59 et	at	Aldine
62.60 cui	quia	*
62.63 patrist	patri	V

Introduction

MYNORS

63.4 animis
 63.5 ili
 63.9
 63.15 exsecutae
 63.16 rapidum
 63.16 pelagi
 63.21–2
 63.30 Idam
 63.31 anhelans
 63.37
 63.43 trepidante eum
 63.50 mei
 63.54
 63.60 gyminasiis
 63.60 et
 63.63 mulier
 63.63 gymnasi fui
 63.67
 63.74 ut
 63.75
 63.76 leonibus
 63.78 and 79 fac
 63.79 uti
 63.82 fac
 63.82 mugienti
 63.85 rapidum
 63.85 animo
 63.88 prope marmora pelagi
 63.91
 64.11
 64.14 freti
 64.14 uoltus
 64.17 oculis
 64.18
 64.23b
 64.28 Nereine
 64.35 deseritur Cieros
 64.35 Tempe
 64.37
 64.38–41
 64.52 fluentisono
 64.55 uisit uisere
 64.58 fugiens pellit uada
 64.60 alga
 64.64 uelatum
 64.75 templa
 64.80 angusta
 64.89–90

PREFERRED READING

animi
 ipse
del.
 secutae
 rabidum
 pelage
del.
 Iden
 anhelam
del.
 tepidante quem
 mea
del.
 guminasiis
om.
 iuuenis
 eram guminasii
del.
 ubi
del.
 quadrupedibus
 face
 ut hic
 face
 rugienti
 rabidum
 animum
 <placida> prope pelage
interpunxit
del.
 feri
 ponti
 oculi
del.
 <saluete bonarum> *suppl.*
 Nerinaon
 †deseritur Siros†*obelis inc.*
 templa
del.
 39, 41, 40, 38
 fluctisono
 cernit cernere
 pellit uada <caerula>
 acta
 nudatum
 tecta
 augusta
del.

PROPOSER

⚬; Parthenius
 Palmer
 *
 Bergk
 Bergk
 Victorius
 *
 pp. 13 ff.
 Froehlich
 *
 Bentley
 B.Guarinus
 *
 Ellis
 Pleitner
 Rossberg
 Heyworth (in effect)
 *
 *
 Muretus
 Pleitner
 ed. 1475
 ⚬; B. Guarinus
 ⚬; ed. 1475
 *
 Schwabe
 ⚬; Graevius
 *
 Thomson
 *
 V
 *
 ⚬; Vulpius
 *
 Peerlkamp
 Allen + *
 *
 Lennep
 *
 Ramler + Bahrens
 ⚬; Maehly
 Froehlich
 *
 Heinsius
 Schwabe
 Parthenius
 ⚬; Avantius
 Kraffert