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](#)

Notes on Catullus and on the Agricola of Tacitus

Elmer Truesdell Merrill

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 07 / October 1898, pp 354 - 355

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00033114, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00033114

How to cite this article:

Elmer Truesdell Merrill (1898). Notes on Catullus and on the Agricola of Tacitus. The Classical Review, 12, pp 354-355 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00033114

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

absta or *adsta* was pronounced *asta* except when there was a special reinforcement due to the etymological consciousness. I do not doubt that the impr. *a(b)sta* occurs elsewhere in Plautus in the sense 'stand off, back,' Grk. ἀπόστηθι (Aristophanes) and ἀπόστα (Menander). The difficulty of *illic astate* (Rud. 836, cf. Bach in Studemund's Studien ii. p. 268) will be greatly relieved if we may translate *astate* by 'stand back.'

Our passage will then lend itself to the following rendering, reading *illic* and not *istic*.

'These whom you see standing here, these captives twain,
—I should like you to witness that I'm speaking truth,
Those of you standing-back yonder—why they both stand and sit not down.'

With this interpretation the passage does not seem to me to lose in point. Indeed, the 'gag' seems to me very good. In

none of the other prologues is the audience directly charged to look upon the actors already 'made up' for exhibition. Here after pointing out the two captives the prologizer solemnly tells the audience that he is going to tell them the truth. We may imagine him to proceed solemnly and the audience to fall agape till the prologizer comes out with the ponderous truism 'they are both standing, not sitting.' There may further be an adroit fling at the late-comers standing at the rear, first if the prologizer pointed them out far away (*illic*), and second when the actors are shown to be standing ready when the curtain rises while the spectators are not yet all seated.

That a broad 'gag' of some sort should come at the very introduction of the prologue need not surprise us. I cite Men. 1-3.

salutem primum iam a principio propitiam
mihi atque uobis, spectatores, nuntio.
apporto uobis Plautum—lingua, non manu.

EDWIN W. FAY.

NOTES ON CATULLUS AND ON THE AGRICOLA OF TACITUS.

CATULLUS 39, 11 *parcus Vmber codd.*

It is worth while noticing with regard to the much contested epithet that the MS. of Catullus which Petrarch had, or at least read, apparently gave *parcus*, thus removing the reading at least one generation further back toward the archetype than our existing MSS. can carry it. See the gloss in Petrarch's hand on his MS. of Vergil ('the Ambrosian Vergil'), fol. 29, *Geor.* ii. 192 (*Aut parcus Vmber, aut obesus Etruscus*) as mentioned by De Nolhac in his *Pétrarque et l'Humanisme*, p. 140. I have not seen attention called to this point.

Cat. 63, 77 *lenumque (leuumque G?) pectoris hostem GO.*

The reading in *O* is perfectly clear. In Clédât's facsimile of *G* the reading appears to be the same, but as if corrected from *leuumque*. Yet all the editors so far as I know, who have examined the original, give *leuumque*. The MS. will evidently repay a new glance at this verse. The old emendation of *pectoris* to *pecoris*, found even in at least two minor MSS., seems certain. But *laeuum* has never appealed to me as satisfactory. The augural explanations offered for it are too far-fetched. I have myself tried to explain it as a bit of realistic speci-

fication, but without much conviction of success. More recently I have wondered whether Catullus did not write *lentumque*. To the fierce resentment of the goddess even the natural ferocity of the *pecoris hostis* seems too slow and hesitating. So her hurrying words of eager urgency to rage flow on even while she is yet loosing the yoke from his neck, and she sends him off in a tumult of madness.

Cat. 64, 309 *roseo niuee codd. roseae niueo Guarinus et al.*

The emendation of Guarinus can hardly be supported by citing the reading of *O* in 64, 31 as an instance of precisely similar confusion in the MSS., for in this case *optato finitae* is very probably what Catullus wrote, as Professor Ellis pointed out. The MS. reading in 64, 309 should, I think, also be retained, as some few critics, though for varying reasons, have from time to time claimed. It may perhaps find some support in the verses given in *Augustin. de Mus.* iii. 2 (Baehrens *Fragm. P. R.* p. 403, no. 175) *ite igitur, Camenae | . . . quae lauitis capillum | purpureum Hippocrenae | fonte*, etc. Here the roseate tresses of the Muses are not, I think, characteristic of their youthful beauty (for it is not the *hair* of youth that is

proverbially rosy), but of the rosy effulgence of that divine nature, which they, like the Fates, shared. So *Venus auertens rosea ceruice refulsit*, when she revealed herself as *uera dea* (Verg. *Aen.* i. 402). In Catullus the rosy locks of the Fates are specified to afford the familiar colour-contrast with the white fillets that matched the rest of their clothing. The crimson *instita* is mentioned to mark the dignity of their garb.

Cat. 110, 2 accipiunt pretium quae facere instituunt *codd.*

The device of accounting for *quae* by supposing it equivalent to *eorum quae* (neut.) is at best objectionable. The reading in both *G* and *O* is *que* (in *O* in ligature), for which I would suggest *quod*, 'they easily get their regular market price.' *Pretium facere*, 'to set a price,' is supported by Plaut. *Pers.* 586 '*indica; fac pretium.*' '*Tua merx est; tua indicatio est*'; and a similar error of *que* (in ligature) for *quod* is found in both *O* and *G* in 51, 5 *miseroque* (corrected in *G* to *miseroquod*), and in *O* in 66, 41 *feratque* (where, however, *G* has *ferat qd'*). I have before mentioned this suggestion, but so briefly and in so obscure a place that I trust I may be pardoned for repeating it in this connection.

Tac. *Agr.* 28 *mox ad aquam atque ut illa raptis secum plerisque Britannorum codd.*

Halm's *egressi et cum* seems as satisfactory as anything that has yet been proposed in the puzzling coil of *raptis secum*, and Selling's *utilia* for *ut illa* appears to me certain. But *ad aquam atque utilia* needs no further adjustment to fit in with *egressi* directly, as may be seen from such a passage as Liv. v. 20, 10 *ad praedam Veientem . . . proficis-*

cerentur. The only further change necessary is in the word following *utilia*, which I should read as '*raptim* (from *rapti*). The passage would then stand *mox ad aquam atque utilia raptim egressi et cum plerisque Britannorum*, etc. *Raptim* occurs a dozen times in Tacitus, and always with the idea of something like disorderly haste, such as must have characterised these hurried landings of the Usipii.

Tac. *Agr.* 34 *nouissimae res et extremo metu corpora defixere aciem* in his uestigiis *codd.*

One must evidently choose between *corpora* and *aciem*, and *corpora defixere* sounds to me much more true in this setting than *defixere aciem*, though I cannot share the conviction of Wex that, leaving the question of *corpora* aside, *defixere aciem* would be impossible here. But the attempt to heal the difficulty by quietly dropping out *aciem*, with Rhenanus and others down to Wex, appears to me unreasonably arbitrary, nor am I satisfied with the suggestion that *aciem* is merely a gloss upon *corpora*. Perhaps *aciem* is simply an error for *etiam*, in which case the passage would run *nouissimae res extremo metu corpora defixere etiam in his uestigiis*, etc. *Et* may be considered as a gloss of some student who imagined, and wished to point out, that their desperate plight and the extremity of their fear were co-ordinate causes in planting the Britons where Agricola found them. Yet there are other and common ways of accounting for the unauthorised appearance of an *et* in the MSS.

ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL.

Wesleyan University, Middletown, Ct.

THE SEQUENCE AFTER *NE* PROHIBITIVE.

I.

The question as to the sequence after *Ne* Prohibitive in Classical Latin is one of the most interesting that have emerged in recent years, and America has produced in the person of Professor Elmer a Protagonist¹ whose verdicts on the subject command attention and cannot be ignored or overlooked. In the following papers it is intended to present the results of independent

investigation in the same field, results that are found largely confirmatory of his main position, and it is singular that simultaneously with the researches at Cornell University there should have been developed in the North of Scotland a kindred inquiry on kindred lines coming substantially to the same conclusion, viz. the overthrow of the Madvigian canon as absolutely controlling the sequence in question.

The incidents which led to the critical inquiry in Aberdeen were originally local

¹ Professor Elmer's views are found in *American Journal of Philology*, vol. xv. 2 (1894), and in volume of *Cornell Studies in Cl. Philology*, 1898.