The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

A discussion of Catullus Ixii, 39—58

Charles Knapp

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 08 / November 1896, pp 365 - 368

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00204721, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00204721

How to cite this article:

Charles Knapp (1896). A discussion of Catullus Ixii, 39—58. The Classical Review, 10, pp 365-368 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00204721

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER 1896.

A DISCUSSION OF CATULLUS LXII., 39—58.

THE purpose of this paper is to show that in vss. 45 and 56 *dum...dum* are correlatives and must be interpreted literally as "the while...the while," that is, as equal to *quam diu...tam diu*. This explanation is by no means new, since it was advocated by no less an authority than Quintilian. It has been adopted in recent times by Riese (1884), Baehrens (1885), Schmalz (1890), and Hale (1894). It is rejected, however, by Ellis (1889), Merrill (1893), and Simpson (1894, reprint of edition of 1879).¹ These three editors agree in denying that the *dum*-clauses are correlative, and in holding that both are dependent on *est*, to be supplied with *sic*. In the fact that I believe this view to be both flat and erroneous is to be found the justification for my paper. Further, though the view I advocate is not new, I think I may say that the particular line of argument used in its support is novel, as well as sound.

There has been some uncertainty as to the text in the two verses named. In 45, according to Prof. Ellis, most MSS. give *tum cara*, whereas in 56 only one shows *tum*. On the other hand we have the positive testimony of Quintilian, ix. 3. 16. The chapter is entitled *De figuris verborum*, and treats of variations from the normal in the use of words. In § 14 Quint. remarks that many *figuræ* spring from a love of antiquity: *Alia commendatio vetustatis, cuius amator unice Vergilius fuit*. Several illustrative passages are then cited from Vergil, and

¹ Munro's *Elucidations* I have not been able to see.

finally in § 16 we read: *Pleni talibus antiqui: . . . Catullus in Epithalamio Dum innupta² manet, dum cara suis est, cum prius dum significet quoad, sequens usque eo*. At the present time editors are practically agreed in reading *dum . . . dum* in both verses. Thus, even Professors Ellis and Merrill accept Quintilian's testimony as to the text, though they refuse to admit his interpretation. The former's note runs: "He (Quint.) explains the line 'as long as she remains unwed, so long is she dear to her kinsmen.' . . . It is not necessary to interpret Catullus so harshly. *Sic* may contain the predicate *optata est*, implied in the protasis of the simile, 'so is the virgin desirable while she remains unprofaned, while she is dear to her kinsmen.'" On this view something will be said presently. Prof. Merrill, after a brief reference to Quintilian's view, writes: "But comparison with v. 56 indicates that Quintilian misunderstood the meaning of Catullus as much as did the less learned emendators of V and T, who changed the second *dum* to *tum*. The two *dum*-clauses are not correlative, but coordinate, both modifying *sic virgo* (*sc. est*), while *sic* is emphatic, referring to v. 42. Thus v. 45 corresponds alone to vv. 39-42, while vv. 46-47 correspond to vv. 43-44." Now I believe that Prof. Merrill has rightly

² No importance can be attached to the fact that Quint. gives *innupta* here, for he was doubtless quoting from memory. See Baehrens ad loc. For similar slips by others, e.g., Aristotle, see Jebb on Soph. *Antig.* 220, and Humphrey's note on same verse in his appendix.

divided the stanza into its balancing parts, but I shall try to show presently that his method of interpretation does not naturally lead to the results which he sets forth. I call especial attention to the sentence beginning 'But comparison with v. 56,' because it embodies a method of interpreting our passage which, it seems to me, is wholly erroneous.¹ To my mind, the sense of v. 56 must be determined from that of v. 45. To interpret 45 from 56 is to me an inversion of the proper process. This declaration leads naturally to the statement of my main point, which is, that more account must be taken of the *form* of the poem than has been done by any of the recent editors. Ellis, Riese and Baehrens all call attention to the amoebean character of the poem, but none of them makes full use of this point in its criticism and interpretation.

It is well known that the law of Amoebean poetry is that the utterances of the second speaker shall correspond in form and contents to those of the leader. See Conington's introductions to the third, seventh and eighth Eclogues of Vergil, and Mr. Page's prefatory note to Horace, *Carmina* iii. 9. I need hardly remind the reader how finely this law is obeyed by Horace. In Eclogue iii. the dialogue covers 48 verses, each competitor delivering twelve strains of two verses each; in Eclogue vii. we have again 48 verses, divided into twelve strains of four verses each. How far did Catullus obey this rule in the poem before us? The hymn falls into three parts. Vss. 1-18 are introductory; 20-59 form the *carmen amoebaeum* proper; 60-66 constitute a sort of epilogue, spoken either by the youths or by the poet himself. In the introduction there was evidently no striving after symmetry of form. Vss. 1-4, spoken by the *pueri*, are imperfectly balanced by 7 and 8, uttered by the *puellae*. The *pueri* require eight verses (11-18) to make the statements which the *puellae* set forth in two (8 and 9). Turning to the second part (20-59), or *carmen amoebaeum* proper, we note that it consisted, as it came from the poet's hand, of three pairs of stanzas.² The second of these is mutilated

beyond recovery; only the six verses, 32-37, remain. We may therefore throw this portion entirely out of the discussion. The first strophe and antistrophe (20-31) contain each, besides the refrain, five verses, with no trace of incompleteness; it seems likely, also, that the third pair of stanzas (39-58) contained each ten verses,³ besides the refrain. We may conjecture, therefore, with great probability, though we cannot clearly prove that in the matter of form this *carmen amoebaeum* fulfilled the first law of such compositions.

Leaving now the question of form and glancing at the language, we note at once very striking resemblances. In vv. 20-25 the girls say 'How cruel thou art, Hesperus, to tear the maiden from her mother.' The lads reply 'How kind thou art, Hesperus, to give the maiden to her lover.' Cf. here again what Mr. Page has said in his preface to Hor. C. iii. 9. Each of these utterances consists of three sentences: a question in one v., a relative clause in three vv., and a second question in the concluding v. The final questions, *Quid faciunt hostes capta crudelius urbe* and *Quid datur a divinis felici optatus hora* are clearly cases of amoebean "tit for tat." In our passage (39-58) we have in the strophe (39-47) practically a single sentence, composed of two clauses correlated by *ut* and *sic*. Each of these falls into two parts, with adversative asyndeton at the joints, i. e., at vv. 43 and 46. In the antistrophe (49-58) we have the same arrangement, except that at v. 54 the conjunction is expressed. This evident resemblance in the language, on which I need not dwell at greater length, strengthens the hypothesis accepted above that in external form there was originally complete correspondence between the parts of this amoebean song.⁴

I have dwelt at such length upon the amoebean character of the poem because on that my special line of argument depends. The points of this argument are: (1) We have here a fair specimen of the *carmen amoebaeum*; (2) the law of such *carmina* is that the leader sets the pace, so to speak, to which the other must conform; (3) that here the girls lead; and hence (4) their utterances should in each case be perfectly clear and intelligible, when taken by themselves. To put the matter concretely, it became the duty of the lads at v. 49 to reply to the statements just made by the

¹ Prof. Ellis makes what I conceive to be essentially the same mistake, for in speaking of the text in 45 he says (p. 248, footnote): 'More decisive (sc. than MSS. evidence or Quintilian's statement) is the parallel verse 56 . . . as K. P. Schulze observes: for here *dum inculta* is given by all MSS except Thuan.' I hold it an error to attempt to extract from v. 56 any evidence as to the text or meaning of 45.

² Riese (p. 132) conjectures, though without supplying proof, that the first strophe and antistrophe contained six verses each, the second eight each, and the third ten each.

³ See Riese and Baehrens on v. 41.

⁴ On the structure of this poem see further Carl Ziwsa, *Die Eurhythmische Technik des Catullus*, II. Theil, pp. 11, 12. (Wien, 1883).

girls. They must do this in ten verses, and the form of their deliverance must be as like as possible to that of the girls. It is self-evident that to fulfill this task acceptably, indeed, to accomplish it at all, it was necessary for them to understand in every detail what the girls had said. Hence, in reading the poem, we must put ourselves in the position of the lads by interpreting vv. 39-47 wholly by themselves, and then we must apply the same line of interpretation to 49-58. In other words we must take a course the very opposite of that followed by Ellis and Merrill.

The next step in our discussion will be an analysis of vv. 39-47. In 39-44 the theme is the *flos*. Of this two things are said: (a) that under certain circumstances it is dear to the *pueri et puellae*, and (b) that under certain other circumstances it loses its charm for them. We may paraphrase thus: *Dum flos intactus est, carus est pueris et puellis; sed cum tactus est, non carus est*, etc. When we read *sic* in 45 we naturally expect from our knowledge both of grammar and poetic workmanship, that the correlating clause will itself be broken into two parts, corresponding exactly to those of the *ut*-clause. These we can find without trouble, since *dum intacta (virgo) manet = dum flos intactus est* of our paraphrase, and *dum cara suis est*, if taken as Quint. interprets it, is a complete correlative to *carus est (flos) pueris et puellis*.¹ To continue, v. 46, which = *sed cum virgo tacta est*, corresponds exactly to 43, which = *sed cum flos tactus est*, and v. 47 = *virgo non cara est pueris et puellis*, is correlative to 44, which = *flos non carus est pueris et puellis*. If we interpret this stanza by itself, as I have urged, we shall inevitably, I think, arrange the several parts in this way. By so doing we get a stanza in whose art there is not a single flaw. Catullus matches two things said of the flower by two things said of the girl, and the flow of the thought, the rhythm of the language, and the balance of the structure are perfect.

Contrast the results thus secured with those obtained by Ellis and Merrill. The former says, "*sic* may well contain the predicate *optata est* implied in the protasis of the simile, 'so is the maiden desirable while she remains unprofaned, while she is dear to her kinsmen.'" This I believe to be faulty

both in grammar and in sense. (1) The protasis of the simile contains not merely *optata est*, but *non optata est* also. If, then, we supply *est* at all after *sic*, we must take as its predicate the *whole contents* of the protasis, not a part, as Ellis has done. (2) As regards the sense, To whom, I ask, is the maiden desirable? To *suae*, 'her kinsfolk'? Is it not a very flat truism to say that a girl is dear to her kinsfolk as long as she is dear to them? Or are we to say that she is dear to her lover or husband, so long as she is dear to her kinsfolk? Can we not conceive of a girl as desirable in the lover's eyes quite apart from her relation, whatever it may be, to her kin? Both views are absurd. And yet, if we follow Ellis, we must supply after the words 'so is the maiden desirable,' either 'to her kin' or 'to her lover,' for together her kin and her lover represent to her the whole world, as divided into two classes, the one including all within the circle of her family, the other all the rest of the world.

In what has been said of Prof. Ellis' view has been shown the error, I think, of Merrill's view, that *est* alone is to be supplied with *sic*. In that event, as already urged, the predicate to *est* would naturally be the whole contents of the protasis of the simile, as contained in 39-44. Thus v. 45 will correspond, not, as Merrill would have us believe, to 39-42 alone, but to all the vv. 39-44. Verses 46 and 47 would then be wholly unnecessary and therefore weak, and the complete artistic balance which we obtained before would be wholly destroyed.

Precisely the same interpretation must be applied to vv. 49-58. There is not the slightest trouble in doing this, even at v. 56, for the difficulty which editors have felt there is, I think, entirely of their own creation. The lads say two things about the *vitis*, which takes the place of the *flos* of the preceding stanza. We may paraphrase again: *dum vitis intacta est, non cara est; sed cum tacta est, cara est*. This is balanced by *dum virgo intacta est, non cara est; sed cum tacta est, cara est*. How shall we render v. 56? Simply thus: 'So the maiden, the while she remains *intacta*, the while she grows old uncared for,' a sentiment wholly in keeping with the genuine Roman ideas on the subject of marriage.²

¹ I regard *suis* in 45 as merely a variation for *pueris et puellis* virtually contained in 42, 44, and 47. Both expressions merely = 'acquaintances,' the flower and the girl being dear, or not, as the case may be, to those who are aware of their existence.

² Prof. F. D. Allen has suggested to me what is, so far as I know, wholly novel, namely, that a strong proof of the correctness of the view held in this paper is the very v. 56 which has caused most editors so much trouble. I confess that this view appeals to me with some force when I take into account the practical impossibility of gathering any predicate at

It remains to consider whether *dum...dum* can bear the meaning assigned them in this paper. On this point we have, first of all, Quintilian's testimony, as cited above. The flow of §§ 14-16 of the chapter would seem to indicate that Quint. regarded the use as an archaism, a very natural view, and one which receives confirmation from Plaut. Truc. 232 (cited by all editors of Catull.), as emended to read *Dum habeat, dum amet*. Lambinus was the first to alter the *tum amet* of the MSS., but the conjecture has been 'accepted or repeated by Hand, C. F. W. Müller, Fleckeisen, Haupt, Schwabe, Schöll, and Key, L.D. s.v.' (Ellis, p. 248, footnote.) To this list may be added Haupt (*Opusc.* ii. p. 473), Baehrens and Riese in their editions, Hale (*Anticipatory Subjunctive*, pp. 68, 69), all to *sic virgo* in v. 56 from the protasis of this simile, yet I am very far from admitting that it affects in any particular the correctness of my main argument, as based on the amoebean character of our passage.

and Schmalz in Müller's *Handbuch*, ii. p. 509. See further the critical note in the Goetz-Loewe-Schöll edition of the *Truculentus*. I have not had access to Richardson's treatise on *dum*. Good discussions are those by Haupt, Schmalz, and Hale, as cited above. The construction may be illustrated by certain uses of the Greek: see especially Haupt, *Opusc.* ii. pp. 471-473, and Ellis on v. 45. It may be added finally that both Riese and Baehrens cite Verg. Eclog. viii. 42 *Ut vidi, ut perii*, both referring to Savelsberg, Rhein. Mus. xxvi. (1871), p. 135, the latter adding Corssen, *De pronunt.* ii.² p. 856. But see Conington on the passage. Riese also cites by way of illustration *Il.* xiv. 294 ὥς δ' ἴδεν, ὥς μιν ἔπος πυκνὰς φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν, and Theocr. iii. 42 ὥς ἴδεν, ὥς ἐμάθη, but the appositeness of such citations is questionable.

CHARLES KNAPP.

Barnard College, New York.

MARTIANUS CAPELLA.

THIS author forms so important a link between the old world and the new, that a critical edition with an adequate commentary, noting sources and imitators throughout, would be a great boon to classical as well as mediaeval scholars. Kopp's notes are distinguished by infinite industry, but lack exact scholarship. Eyssenhardt's edition, published thirty years ago in the Teubner series, is handy and has a useful index. His conjectures are not often happy.

Thus in the speech of Iuppiter in praise of bride and bridegroom (§ 92 p. 25 l. 23-25)

nam nostra ille fides sermo benignitas
ac uerus genius fida recursio
interpretsque meae mentis honos sacer,

Eyssenhardt substitutes for the last two words ὁ νοῦς *acer*, referring to p. 37 l. 20, where νοῦς occurs: he might have cited p. 104 l. 8, where we find *sacer νοῦς*. It is the extreme of prudery to reject *honos*, abstract for concrete, in a context teeming with examples of the figure. Within a few lines (i 110 117) Juvenal has *sacro honori* and *summus honos*. Nor is our African author to be saddled with the strange use of the article, or the false quantity in *acer*, without convincing evidence. Martianus, I grant, shortens *omega* (§ 327 p. 98 l. 9 in a pentameter *et scholicum praestruit axioma*) and the final vowel in *frustra* (§ 92 p. 25

l. 25, so Prudentius) and perhaps the *a* in *mortalibus* (in § 125 l. 5 6, the Adonic verses *tuque caducis | mortalibusque*, the latter verse may be a gloss on the former; cf. in Thalia's song § 126 p. 37 l. 16 *reserent caducis astra*). All the more reason that we should not add to his guilt by random guesses, where the ms. reading offends neither against prosody nor sense.

Thanks to Kopp's index many of his author's words have found a place in the lexicons; but the references are (as is the case with two other Africans, Apuleius and Arnobius) very inconsistent, sometimes to Kopp's paragraphs, sometimes to the pages of the boy Grotius. Under *animator* Lewis and Short cite 'Capitolin. i p. 13.' Forcellini has 'Martian. Capell.' Hundreds of similar blunders might have been avoided, if editors of the handy compendiums, which to the great injury of learning have ousted Gesner, Scheller, Forcellini from the desks of our students, had possessed a tolerable acquaintance with literary history, or had condescended to keep an eye on Forcellini as they corrected their proofs. Whoever passed 'Capitolin. i p. 13' for the press can never have seen either Capitolinus or Martianus. If we examine the references to Tertullian in Lewis and Short, we find many like evidences of helpless ignorance.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.