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](#)

Catullus.—Carm. XXIX

William Everett

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 07 / July 1889, pp 291 - 293

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00195368, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00195368

How to cite this article:

William Everett (1889). Catullus.—Carm. XXIX. The Classical Review, 3, pp 291-293
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00195368

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Classical Review

JULY 1889.

CATULLUS.—CARM. XXIX.

IN a recent number of the *American Journal of Philology* (vol. viii. p. 473) I proposed a new reading of Catull. xxix. 8. An absurd slip of my own pen was perpetuated in the types; and though the learned editor kindly inserted a correction in the next number, I suppose that the emendation, consigned to obscurity by the long primer error, will not be resuscitated by a nonpareil correction.

It is my wish here to review the whole poem, as far as the lines allowed to be corrupt are concerned, and with some reference to Munro's striking article on it, contributed to the *Journal of Philology*, ii. 2—34, and reprinted in *Criticisms and Emendations of Catullus* (1878), 68—113. This article exhibits the amazing extent, although not the most interesting side, of Mr. Munro's scholarship and genius. One feels after reading it that he knew Catullus as Nepos or Varro might have known him in life, as Scaliger and Lachmann knew him afterwards. In fact, when one criticises any such essay of Munro's, one feels like handling Addison at Macaulay's breakfast-table, or the Upanishad in Prof. Whitney's study. Visions of the Combination-room in Trinity College crowd on one's memory, when some youthful graduate, a visitor, ventured to have an opinion on something which Munro *knew*, and felt it his painful duty to let the bold youth know that he *knew*,—and then! *La main la plus ferrée, sous le gant on ne peut plus velouté*, descended—and Dares was dragged to the ships.

No classical scholar in our day has combined more knowledge with more acuteness—more hard common sense with more

appreciative genius. If Munro's Lucretius is compared with Lachmann's, and his suggestions on Catullus with Ribbeck's on Virgil, the meaning of this antithetic praise will be fully seen. Hence it is on all accounts most arduous to criticise him: for one dares not feel that Munro is not in possession of some treasure and some key to it beyond one's utmost store and powers. And yet it must be said:—a man who has less knowledge and less subtlety may by that very deficiency prove a better emender and interpreter. Every word recalled to Munro such a flood of passages, that he sometimes sank his author under parallels that did not apply; and his subtlety was so infinite that it read into the lines what was never there. He was not a Scotchman for nothing; thoroughly metaphysical and dogmatic, though never offensively so. In an article on Lucretius in the *Journal of Philology* when he renounced Lachmann's emendation *decellere* on ii. 219, which he had enthusiastically defended in his own second edition, he says 'One lives and learns.' This was very true; he often learned—by his own study—to abandon his own most cherished suggestions; see his successive emendations of Lucretius v. 312. But it was much oftener learning than being taught; if he had not convinced himself that he was wrong, few others could do it. It is satisfactory to Americans to think that one whom he accepted as having really taught him was their countryman, N. P. Howard of Virginia.

In his elaborate, learned and acute essay on the satirical poem which I have taken as my title he has offered emendations on four passages which are unquestionably corrupt.

The metrical difficulties are insuperable as the verses stand and positively compel us to resort to emendation. It will be most convenient to give the poem nearly at length. Some unattractive lines may be omitted without touching the argument here presented.

- Quis hoc potest videre, quis potest pati,
Nisi impudicus et vorax et aleo,
Mamurram habere quod comata Gallia*
4 *Habebat cum te et ultima Britannia ?
Et ille nunc superbus et superfluens
Perambulat omnium cubilia,*
8 *Ut albulus columbus aut ydoneus ?
Eone nomine imperator unice
Fuiſti in ultima occidentis insula ?
Parum expatrat an parum helluatus
est ?
Paterna prima lancinata sunt bona :
Secunda praeda Pontica : inde tertia
Hibera quam scit amnis aurifer Tagus.*
20 *Hunc Galliae timet et Britanniae ?
Quid hunc malum fovetis ? Aut quid hic
potest
Nisi uncta devorare patrimonium ?*
23 *Eone nomine urbis opulentissime
socer generque perdidistis omnia ?*

Passing over (4) for the moment, I wish on (8) to renew the suggestion made in the *American Journal of Philology*, *Ut albulus columbus aut aedonis* i.e. ἀδωνίς, 'a pet nightingale.' Greek words invariably get tortured out of all semblance of right in our MSS. The pet names in Lucretius iv. 1160-1169 afford an excellent instance. In Cat. xii. 10 μνημόσυνον has become *nemo sinum*, the effect being to make a string of letters unintelligible to the scribe—*Graecum est, legi non potest*—into good plain Roman. Hence ἀδωνίς, = *Aedonis*, would become in an incredibly short time *Adonis*—*Adonius*—*Adoneus*—*Idoneus*—*Ydoneus*. The attempt to turn *Aut Ydoneus* into *Haut Idoneus* with any satisfactory meaning seems to me very far fetched; and *Adoneus*, which is Avancius' reading, and doubtless was actually written by some copyists, is curiously inappropriate. *Adonis* may have been an indefinite favourite of women in Rome, as he was in Alexandria; but surely not as a *perambulator cubilium*.

In line 20, there can be no doubt that an amphibrach to precede *Galliae* must be extracted from *Hunc*; and I entirely accept Munro's argument that, even allowing the plural *Galliae*, we cannot stand *Britanniae*; that probably both names are singular. But his version *Et huicne Gallia et metet Britannia ?* impresses me forcibly as one of those instances where a less degree of erudition

would have saved him from an inadmissible proposal. He proposes this emendation, relying on certain passages in Plautus where *meto* is used with the dative of a personal pronoun. One who has the *Mercator* and the *Epidicus* at his tongue's end will always know enough to frighten humbler scholars; but he will not make such a proposed emendation seem any the less extraordinary. I propose

Eumne Gallia et timet Britannia ?

Eumne being strongly hinted by the *eone* which occurs twice in our poem; and moreover a collocation of letters that might become almost anything, and *h* is a notoriously suspicious intruder in all MSS. of the age of G and O.

In line 23 the impossible *urbis opulentissime* has been very variously corrected. But Lachmann and Haupt it seems to me have got the real key to the situation: a superlative in the vocative plural preceded by *O* is needed. Haupt's *orbis, O piissime* has several objections, neatly and convincingly marshalled by Munro, who disposes of Ellis's *urbis O pudet meae* in the shortest order possible, although it is surely much nearer to the MSS. than his own remarkable suggestion *Urbis ob luem issimae*, i.e. *ipsimae*, 'for this plague-sore of our mistress-town,' to give his own translation. Of which amazing manipulation I can only say *ne Catullo quidem affirmanti crediderim*, and I should have delighted to see how Munro would have disposed of any one else who should have suggested it.

I venture to suggest *urbis O potissimi*, 'O ye choicest of the city—ye who have the preference in everything.' (It makes little difference whether we write *potissimi* or *potissime*—either spelling would slip into *e* in the uncials of 400-800 A.D.). *Potissimi* avoids the serious objection to *piissimi* of being an unaccredited word, and this use of *potissimi* seems to me to suit the tone of the whole poem peculiarly well. Moreover it gives an easy explanation of the MSS. reading. An annotator would be almost sure to misunderstand its force, and to gloss it by *O potentissimi* or *O pollentissimi*, either of which would soon run into *opulentissime*.

To return now to (4), *habebat cum te et ultima Britannia*. *Cum te* is impossible, and *uncti* is generally agreed upon; Munro justly objects to it, and accepts the old *ante* of Statius, as favoured by Lachmann, Haupt, and Mommsen. This seems weak, considering the terse style of the whole. I am

strongly disposed to suggest *auri*. The almost invariable transposition of *i* and *e* in our MSS. of Catullus, and the almost equally frequent confusion of *r* and *t* make this change far less unnatural than it at first seems. But another view has occurred to me founded on the fact that *habet* is found in some MSS. and that the whole strain of the poem seems to protest against the *present* transfer of the wealth of Gaul and Britain. May not *Habet comati* be the real text? The long-haired slaves were for a long time a chief export from Gaul and almost the only one from Britain, and would be specially prized whether to retain or to sell by the Mamurras of 53 B.C. The turn of words *quod Comata Gallia Habet comati* seems to me not alien from our poet's style.

And in this connection I desire to suggest an emendation in the poem which is so naturally suggested by the one in hand, namely the Sapphic ode numbered xi, where countless suggestions have been made to cure the eleventh line

Gallicum Rhenum horribiles [que] ultimique Britannos.

Haupt's *horribile aequor* has generally met with most favour, perhaps because it tries to preserve some trace of the QV which looks very much like an addition. Munro in 1860 proposed *horribilem salum*, i.e. *horribilē salū*,

supporting the masculine by Ennius's *undantem salum*. Ellis gives *horribilem insulam*, i.e. *horribilē isulā*, of which Munro falls foul 'as doing scant justice to our island,' as if the reference was to the appearance of the island landscape to the invaders. But Caesar's experience of the coast in both his voyages was anything but encouraging. I agree however with Munro and Haupt that the horrors of the passage rather than of the island are specially in question, and suggest *horribilem fretum*, i.e. *horribilē fretū*. Lucretius vi. 364 *seqq.* may be advantageously studied in this connection. On 364 we have the somewhat rare *fretus*, which I introduce here—in 374 the word *freta* has wholly dropped out of the MS., and I believe for the same reasons as here; FR appeared as ET. In Lucretius vi. 385 *extulerit* is written EATulerit in A, and FATulerit in B, and the confusion of R and T in our MSS. of Catullus is constant, hence *horribilētetūl* would easily become almost any of the variations which we have of the line.

I have nothing more to offer on the score of emendation; I ask the kind and candid consideration of those that I have presented on the part of scholars of ten times my experience, assuring them that these are not written in haste, or without study.

WILLIAM EVERETT,
Quincy, Mass.

NOTES ON ARISTOTLE'S *ETHICS*.

Eth. Nic. iii. 11, 8. 1119 a. 16. τῶν τοιούτων οὐθέν. This is Bekker's reading, the MSS. having all οὐθενός. Rassow (*Forsch.* p. 91) favours οὐθενός, making it depend upon ἐπιθυμεί. But although all MSS. seem to exhibit οὐθενός, three—K^b, Ob, and CCC Oxon. read immediately after it not ὅσα but ᾧ, and are accordingly as good evidence for an original οὐθέν. ὅσα as for an original οὐθενός ᾧ. It seems certain that the letters οο are original, and that Susemihl's οὐθέν ᾧ is wrong. Are we then to read οὐθέν ὅσα, or οὐθενός ᾧ, or οὐθενός ὅσα? I am inclined to accept the reading of K^b, Ob, and CCC, punctuating οὐθέν ὅσα, and regarding the phrase οὐδ' ὅλως τῶν τοιούτων οὐθέν as adverbial like οὐδὲ μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ and οὐδ' ὅτε μὴ δεῖ, the whole clause οὐδὲ μᾶλλον . . . τῶν τοιούτων οὐθέν being epexegetic of μετρίως. 'The σῶφρων does not experience the painful longing for certain pleasures which the ἀκό-

λαστος experiences, or only experiences it moderately, i.e. not too strongly, not at improper times—in short not in violation of any of the conditions of moderation.' According to this view, τῶν τοιούτων has the same reference as τὰ τοιαῦτα in *Eth.* ii. 3, 5. 1104. 6. 24, (ἢ ἄς μὴ δεῖ ἢ ὅτε οὐ δεῖ ἢ ὥς οὐ δεῖ ἢ ὅσαχῶς ἄλλως ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου διορίζεται τὰ τοιαῦτα), and the blank adverbial formula or et cetera οὐδ' ὅλως τῶν τοιούτων οὐθέν, added to οὐδὲ μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ, οὐδ' ὅτε μὴ δεῖ, and with it qualifying οὐτ' ἀπόντων λυπεῖται οὐδ' ἐπιθυμεί, is to be filled in ὅσαχῶς ἄλλως ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου διορίζεται τὰ τοιαῦτα—e.g. οὐδ' ὥς μὴ δεῖ would be included in it.

The vulgar οὐθενός ὅσα would easily arise by dittograph of οο, and would be retained by scribes for Rassow's reason that οὐθενός depends on ἐπιθυμεί.

vi. 3, 3. 1139. 6, 29. ἢ μὲν δὴ ἐπαγωγὴ ἀρχὴ ἐστὶ καὶ τοῦ καθόλου. L^b and Ald.