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](#)

Palmer's Edition of Catullus, and Menozzi on Catullus *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, edited by Arthur Palmer, Professor of Latin in the University of Dublin. Macmillan. (Parnassus Library.) 3s. 6d. net. *De Catulli Carm. XLIX. et LXXXXV. commentationes duas scripsit Eleutherius Menozzi. Trani. 1895.*

Robinson Ellis

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 06 / July 1896, pp 305 - 307
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00204356, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00204356

How to cite this article:

Robinson Ellis (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 305-307 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00204356

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

and in μ the reading of the first hand is often difficult to read. It appeared to me, however, that in P and μ the reading of the first hand was generally or always the same, and that any alteration which had taken place was also common to both MSS. I have not yet been able to go through my collation, but, if judged by the test of omissions, it would seem that μ is the older, since it has several lines omitted in P,

whereas I found no instance of the contrary occurrence. I attach no importance to M, in which the readings of the second hand in μ are followed, and which is obviously a later MS. It is therefore highly probable that for Valerius Flaccus also we have in μ the earliest representative of the Poggian recension.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

NOTE ON ZOSIMUS, V. 46.

ἔταξε καὶ Γενέριδον τῶν ἐν Δαλματία πάντων ἡγείσθαι, ὄντα στρατηγὸν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων † ὅσαι Παιονίας τε † τὰς ἄνω καὶ Νωρικοὺς καὶ † Ραιτοὺς ἐφύλαττον.

THE first corruption was nearly healed by Mendelssohn who proposed (see *ad loc.*) ἱλῶν, a word used by the author elsewhere, for ἄλλων: only we may keep ἄλλων. The second corruption is not healed either by τὰ ἄνω or by Παιονίαν τε τὴν ἄνω (an example of

the same uncritical method which substitutes ὅσοι for ὅσαι). The following words, Νωρικοὺς καὶ † Ραιτοὺς, show that Παιονίας is a corruption for Παίονας (cp. ii. 33), of which τὰς for τοὺς was the further consequence. The restored passage runs:

ὄντα στρατηγὸν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἱλῶν ὅσαι Παίονας τε τοὺς ἄνω καὶ Νωρικοὺς καὶ † Ραιτοὺς ἐφύλαττον.

J. B. BURY.

PALMER'S EDITION OF CATULLUS, AND MENOZZI ON CATULLUS.

Catulli Veronensis Liber, edited by ARTHUR PALMER, Professor of Latin in the University of Dublin. Macmillan. (Par-nassus Library.) 3s. 6d. net.

De Catulli Carm. XLIX. et LXXXXV. commentationes duas scripsit ELEUTHERIUS MENOZZI. Trani. 1895.

OF the two dissertations by Menozzi the first deals with the short poem to Cicero, *Disertissime Romuli nepotum*. Menozzi considers these lines to Cicero ironical, and the occasion which caused them as follows. Cicero had been defending Vatinius and had used the occasion to attack Calvus who was prosecuting him. In the course of his attack he had used words to this effect '*At hi pessimi poetae qui Vatinium aggrediuntur*,' including in *pessimi poetae* Calvus and his intimate literary friend Catullus. Catullus, incensed at a charge which involved both his friend and himself, could not allow the attack to remain unanswered. The exaggerated tone of the poem from first to

last, *Disertissime... Quot sunt quotque fuere ... Quotque post aliis erunt in annis—Gratias maximas—pessimus omnium poeta—optimus omnium patronus*, is intended to convey, and does convey, an unmistakable sarcasm. The recurrence of the words *pessimus omnium poeta*, *Tanto pessimus omnium poeta*, would be just what we should expect after such a provocation. Catullus has repeated Cicero's words, and dextrously turned them to his own advantage. 'You call us the worst of poets. I acknowledge myself to be the worst of poets, in the same proportion as I acknowledge you to be the best of pleaders,' meaning in Menozzi's words 'neque sum equidem poetarum omnium pessimus, ut me et Calvum praedicas, neque tu, ut putas, optimus omnium orator.' This theory is not new, it is little more than an expansion of B. Schmidt's; but I am not aware that any one before Menozzi has suggested that the actual words *pessimi poetae* were used by Cicero in reference to Calvus and Catullus, and this on a public occasion,

when they would be more insulting and require a more directly allusive reply.

In his second dissertation Menozzi discusses xcv. *Zmyrna mei Cinnæ* etc. Retaining *Hortensius uno* in 3, he considers the lost pentameter to have contained *uersuum* and *anno*: Hortensius to be the famous orator, born 114 B.C. Hortensius would seem to have published a long and inartistic poem at the same time at which Cinna published his short but nine years elaborated *Zmyrna*; Catullus took the occasion to contrast in a severe epigram, much of which is in all probability lost, the two schools of poetry which then divided the literary world of Rome; the older school, which cared little for finish and rejoiced in long annals or chronicles put into verse, and the newer which, in imitation of the Alexandrian poets, made finish everything and delighted in short bijoux of song. Menozzi thinks the *annals* of Hortensius, to which Velleius Paterculus alludes (ii. 16, 3), may have been in verse (like those of Volusius) and may have been the work spoken of in 3. Velleius however says that Hortensius *dilucide in annalibus suis retulit* an exploit of an ancestor of his own, one Minatius Magius, during the Social War: this can hardly refer to a poem; at least *dilucide* naturally explains itself of a detailed narrative in prose, in which all the circumstances of the episode were fully described.

Professor Palmer's Catullus challenges comparison, as regards externals, with Mr. Postgate's edition; both are elegant, and pleasing to the eye. Postgate however gave us a text and app. crit. alone: Palmer adds some introductory matter, a Life of the poet, remarks on the metres and diction, a section on the MSS., an Excursus on xvii. 1-4, lxviii. 135-142, and an Index.

Some of the emendations have already appeared in *Hermathena*; but there are many that are new, though perhaps none so striking as Palmer's correction of c. 6 *Perspecta est igni tum unica amicitia*. I will mention some of the more interesting. viii. 15 *Scelesta ne tu*, with which Palmer compares Most. 3, 1, 36 *ne ego sum miser, Scelestus, natus dis inimicis omnibus*. xi. 11 *Gallicum Rhenum horribilesque uultu in Usque Britannos*. xxix. 20 *Habenda Gallica ultima et Britannica? sc. praeda*. xxxviii. 2 Palmer allows, with Giri, the MS. reading to stand *Malest mi hercule et laboriose*. xlv. 8 *Hoc ut dixit, Amor manu sinistra Dextram sternuit approbationem*. xlv. 11 *Diverse*

maria et uiae reportant. lvi. 7 *Protelo rigido meo cecidi* (not *rigida mea*). lxi. 151 *Quae tibi bene seruiat*. 179 *Iam bonae senibus uiris Cognitae bene feminae*. lxiii. 78 *fac ut hunc furor abigat*. lxiv. 16 *Illac aequalis uiderunt luce marinas*. 24 *uos ego saepe mero, uos carmine conpellabo*. 109 *Prona cadit late, rameis quasque obuia frangens*. 119 *Quae misera in gremio gnatam deperdita alebat*. 320 *Hae tum clarisona pellentes aethera uoce*. lxx. 9 *Numquam ego te potero posthac audire loquentem*, a verse which might well come from Catullus. lxxvi. 15 *anne maritum for a. parentum*. 59 *Hic donum uario ne solum in lumine caeli*. lxxvii. 12 *Verum istuc populi lingua quieta tacet*. lxxviii. 60 *Per medium ludens transit iter populi*. 157 *Et qui principio nobis te tradidit auspex A quo sunt primo mi omnia nata bona*. lxxvii. 9, 10 *Omniaque* (not *Omnia quae*) *ingratae perierunt credita menti*. *Quare cur tu te iam amplius exerceas?* Palmer compares Prop. i. 3, 25 *Omniaque ingrato*. lxxvii. 6 *Vitae, heu non uerae pectus amicitiae*. This is a very interesting correction. It certainly seems impossible not to feel the force of the combination *pectus amicitiae*, and yet this ill accords with *heu heu nostrae*. Palmer's *heu non uerae* suits the words excellently. lxxxiii. 3, 4 *si nostri oblita taceret Salua esset* 'which is a little nearer to *Sanna* or *Samia* of MSS. than *Sana*.' xcv. 3 *Milia cum interea quingenta Hortensius uno* is thought by Palmer to be spurious. In 7 he supplies *poetae*. cxii. Palmer writes thus *Multus homo es, Naso, nec tecum multus homo cum Descendis: Naso, multus es et pathicus*. None of the poems has received more correction from Palmer than the last, cxvi. He gives it thus:—

Saepe tibi studioso animo uerba ante
requirens
carmina uti possem uertere Battiadae,
qui te lenirem nobis, neu conarere
tela infesta mihi mittere in usque caput,
hunc uideo mihi nunc frustra sumptum esse
laborem,
Gelli, nec nostras hic ualuisse preces.
Caetra nos tela ista tua euitabimus apta:
at fixus nostris tu dabis supplicium.

I add here two suggestions of my own.
vi. 12 *Nam in (ni) ista preualet nihil tacere*.
Possibly in this strangely vitiated line, not *nil supra*, but *nil uerpa*, is concealed: *uerpa* spelt backwards is a preu. How the word came to be so reversed, I would not pronounce: nor how *sta* or *ista* forms part of the corruption. *Verpa* is used by

Catullus xxviii. 12 of a debauchee *cum isto uerpa*. Elsewhere it = *mentula*. This latter would be its meaning in vi. 12.

xxix. 6-8 Et ille nunc superbus et superfluens
Perambulabit omnium cubilia
Ut albulus columbus aut ydoneus?

I have not found any critic who has suggested what, I confess, only lately occurred to me as a possibility, that *idoni*us (not *idoneus*) is the comparative of the adverb *idonee*, and that the verse, with *haut* for *aut*, is only another form of the construction found twice in Horace, *Epod.* v. 59 *Nardo perunctum, quale non perfectius Meae laborarint manus*, S. i. 5, 41 *quales neque candidiores Terra tulit, nec quis me sit devinctior alter*, *ib.* 33 *Antoni non ut magis alter amicus*.

The adverbial comparative *idoni*us is not

found in any writer of authority, but it is an existing form. *Neue-Wagener* cites it from Tertullian *de Pall.* 3 and *idoni*or, which Charisius i. 16 will not allow, is found notwithstanding in the *Digest*, as well as in Tertullian and S. Augustine (*Neue-Wagener* ii. p. 206). It is well known that *idoneus* is often used *amatorie* = well adapted for love, i.e. with bodily capabilities such as the service of Venus requires: Hor. *C.* iii. 26 l *Vixi puellis nuper idoneus Et militari non sine gloria*; and in itself it is exactly the right word to describe Mamurra, as successful with women.

Whether *ut* in such cases is 'that,' here *perambulaverit* 'that no white dove surpass him in fitness for the task,' or 'as' = 'in such a way as no white dove more fitly,' it is difficult to say. Wickham on S. i. 5 leans to the latter view: I rather incline to the former.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

DE MIRMONT ON THE MYTHOLOGY OF APOLLONIUS RHODIUS AND VERGIL.

Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile, La Mythologie et les Dieux dans les Argonautiques et dans l'Énéide. Thèse présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris, par H. de la Ville de Mirmont, Maître de conférences à la Faculté des Lettres de Bordeaux. Paris, 1894. pp. viii. 778. 10 frs.

THE object of this thick volume is to show that the mythology of the *Aeneid* is not what it would have been had the *Argonautica* of Apollonius not existed. As a general statement this is of the nature of a truism, but M. de la Ville de Mirmont with extraordinary assiduity has carefully gone through all that occurs in both works bearing on the many points of resemblance and difference, and has produced a valuable comparative study of mythology. After we have got through the first book, which is devoted to Theogony and Cosmogony and the Hesiodic generations previous to Zeus, we find the gods arranged in pairs, Zeus—Jupiter, Hera—Juno, Athena—Minerva and so on. The conscientious minuteness with which it is all worked out rather causes the book to rank with a dictionary than as one to be read through continuously.

M. de Mirmont often calls attention to the way in which Vergil confuses deities which in early times were distinct, e.g. Apollo is confused with the god of healing and with the Sun-god, Lucina with Diana (in the fourth *Eclogue*), the Harpies with the Furies, while Apollonius is scrupulously exact in his mythological lore. The reason however, as he reminds us, is clear enough. It is that Vergil, in composing a national epic, treats mythology, within certain limits of course, as it suits his purpose, while mythology is of the essence of the purely literary epic of the Alexandrian writer. An 'extensive and peculiar' knowledge of mythology is (like Mr. Sam Weller's knowledge of London) a part of his apparatus, and a special 'note' of Alexandrian learning. We find it reproduced to a great extent in Ovid. I doubt however whether it is pushed by Apollonius quite to the extreme that M. de Mirmont thinks. I doubt, for instance, whether there is really meant to be any distinction between Typhaon and Typhoeus, or between Phorcos and Phorcyas.

The Zeus of Apollonius holds himself aloof from the other gods in a manner far