

# 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](#)



---

## Critical Notes on Catullus

J. P. Postgate

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 06 / July 1899, pp 294 - 296

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00080550, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00080550](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00080550)

### How to cite this article:

J. P. Postgate (1899). Critical Notes on Catullus. The Classical Review, 13, pp 294-296  
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00080550

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

## THE LITERARY RELATIONS OF 'LONGINUS' AND MANILIUS.

Now that Prof. Rhys Roberts's new and excellent translation and edition of the treatise *on the Sublime* has recalled the attention of scholars and critics to this remarkable work, it may seem not unreasonable to point out a double parallelism which occurs in the thirteenth chapter of the treatise to the beginning of the Second Book of Manilius's *Astronomica*.

περὶ ὕψους xiii. 3 (p. 80 Roberts). μόνος Ἡρόδοτος Ὀμηρικώτατος ἐγένετο; Σησίχορος ἐστὶ πρότερον ὃ τε Ἀρχίλοχος, πάντων δὲ τούτων μάλιστα ὁ Πλάτων ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀμητικοῦ κείνου νόματος εἰς αὐτὸν μυρίας ὅσας παρατροπὰς ἀποχευευσάμενος.

Manil. ii. 8-10.

cuiusque (sc. Homeri) ex ore profusus  
Omnis posteritas latices in carmina duxit  
Annemque in tenues ausa est diducere  
ruios.

περὶ ὕψ. xiii. 4 ἔστι δ' οὐ κλοπή τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπὸ καλῶν εἰδῶν ἢ πλασμάτων ἢ δημιουργημάτων ἀποτύπωσις.

Manil. ii. 57, 8.

Nostra loquar, nulli uatum debebimus ora,  
Nec furtum, sed opus ueniet.

This resemblance of *two* passages closely following one another in each of the two writers, can hardly be fortuitous. Which was the original, which the copy? It is difficult to pronounce, but to me the poet's expansion and diffuseness suggest that he was the *borrower*, rather than the original: which would completely accord with the modern view, recently discussed by Prof. Roberts and defended by Prof. Kaibel (*Hermes* 34, 107 *sqq.*), that the *περὶ ὕψους* was really written in the first century of our era. If indeed it preceded Manilius, whose work seems to have been published at the end of Augustus's or beginning of Tiberius's reign, it would be necessary to place the date of the *περὶ ὕψους* either very early in the first century A.D. or even somewhat earlier. I do not know whether any argument of a convincing or cogent kind can be alleged against this: and it is of course possible that the two passages of Manilius were the *fons* from which the writer of the *περὶ ὕψους* drew.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

## CRITICAL NOTES ON CATULLUS.

xxix. 11 *sqq.*

eone nomine, imperator unice,  
fuisti in ultima Occidentis insula,  
ut ista uostra diffututa mentula  
ducenties comesset aut trecenties?  
quid est alit sinistra liberalitas?

The received reading of the last line, if we take *alit* for *alid* (*aliud*), undoubtedly gives a sense. But the question is weak and irrelevant. What Catullus wants to know is why Mamurra should be allowed to batten on the public revenues; cf. l. 19 'quid hunc malum fouetis?' Pohl long ago conjectured 'quid *istum* alit . . . ?' (see Schwabe's critical note); and the conjecture has lately been repeated. But I should think more probable a proposal which I jotted down in the margin of my Baehrens full fifteen years ago: 'quid *istam* alit . . . ?' In '*istā* alit' *ā* fell out before *a*. The feminine '*istam*', i.e. *mentulam*, is more biting than the mascu-

line; and the change of gender ('*helluatus* est') follows better on '*expatrauit*,' after which the reference to *mentula* is dropped.

paterna prima lancinata sunt bona;  
secunda praeda Pontica; inde tertia  
Hibera, quam scit amnis aurifer Tagus.  
20 hunc gallie timetis et britannie?

In this old crux Palmer writes '*habenda* Gallica ultima et Britannica,' and compares 62, 13, where O has *hunc* for *habent*. It is true that *hñt* in abbreviated minuscules is almost indistinguishable from *hñc*. But *hñda* is not so near; though we might suppose *da* to have fallen out before *gallie*. Again, in the present context '*habenda*' is not so appropriate as in 3 and 4, which Palmer would no doubt have appealed to; '*lancinata*' suggests '*destruction*' rather than '*possession*.' Another suggestion, then, may be hazarded: *Eatne*. If this were once

written *Eante*, the rest of the corruption was a matter of course. I am glad that Palmer saw his way to accepting 'ultima et.' Directly it is observed that the tradition has come from Itim(a)et, the barred *l* representing *ul*, it must be acknowledged that besides being the most logical reading, it is also the easiest to arrive at. Whether Palmer's further alterations *Gallica* and *Britannica* are inevitable is obviously a matter on which there may be two opinions.

lxviii. 135 sqq.

quae tamen etsi uno non est contenta  
Catullo,

rara uerecundae furta feremus erae,  
ne nimium simus stultorum more  
molesti.

saepe etiam Iuno, maxima caelicolum,  
coniugis in culpa flagrantem quotidiana,  
140 noscens omniuoli plurima facta<sup>1</sup>  
Iouis.

atqui nec diuis homines componier  
aequomst

(ingratum tremuli tolle parentis  
opus),

nec tamen illa mihi, dextra deducta  
paterna,

flagrantem Assyrio uenit odore  
domum:

sed furtiua dedit mira munuscula  
nocte,

ipsius ex ipso dempta uiri gremio.

I am compelled to print this passage in its full context, because Palmer, who devotes an appendix to it, though accepting my *opus* (for *onus*) in v. 142 does not admit my punctuation, and its interpretation and emendation depend almost entirely upon the view which we take of its connexion with its context.

Palmer observes that "it is curious that two directly opposite senses of 139 seem right to different critics. Baehrens, who proposes *flagrantem concipit iram* (or *contigit*) thus writes: 'saepe Iuno ob laesam fidem coniugalem in iram exardescit si sentit (nouam) mariti perfidiam: haec sententia ut adsit omnia flagitant.' I will not go so far as to say *omnia*: the lines 135 to 137 will suit either view, but 141, 142 are absolutely inconsistent with the ordinary interpretation." Further on he paraphrases as follows: 'My mistress is not content with me alone. What of that? Even Juno has had to complain of Jove's infidelity. But she is a goddess (and has a right to complain), I am only a mortal: therefore away with complaints on thy part, Catullus.'

<sup>1</sup> So Palmer reads with the MSS. and it may stand.

In my text of Catullus I adopted the view which is involved in the emendations of Lachmann ('*flagrantem concoquit iram*'), Santen, Hertzberg and others: but I now believe that of Baehrens and Palmer to be right. Palmer indeed goes too far when he says that "141, 142 are absolutely inconsistent with the ordinary interpretation which is 'sheer nonsense.'" It is not sheer nonsense to make Catullus say: 'I will put up with my mistress's peccadilloes. Even Juno has often done so with Jove's infidelities. And yet [this comparison makes too much of my troubles; for] mortals should not be compared to gods and goddesses.' But this method of interpretation does not face the fact that Catullus is not likely to have fallen into the more artificial thought. If he had desired to draw an argument from Juno swallowing her indignation, he would surely have argued thus: 'Swallow then your wrath, Catullus, as Juno has done. Imitate her. As a mortal, what better example could you have than a goddess?' And if there ever was a female in the world who would not 'swallow' her anger, that female would be Juno, whose furious jealousy is a theme of all the ancient muses.

With this view of the passage Palmer struck into a new path by reading 'coniugis in culpa flagrans est questa Dianae.' The palaeographical ingenuity of the conjecture is great; but its weakness exegetically was, we may well conjecture, apparent to its author himself. "But it will be said, why should Juno complain to Diana? What help could Diana give her? I reply that she could give her consolation and sympathy, and if Juno must have a confidante, who more likely on such an occasion than the goddess of chastity." This is plainly sheer hypothesis, and one might well rejoice: Who less likely than the goddess whose ears she had clouted with her own quiver? Homer, *Il.* 21. 491. It seems only too clear that Palmer's ingenious fancy that Diana lurked in the concluding letters of the line has blinded him to the *ira*, which every previous critic had seen was demanded by *flagrantem*. In considering how we should restore the line we must start with the reading of O, '*flagrantem cotidiana*'; for G's *quotidiana* is obviously a further corruption. *na* is letter for letter the equivalent of *ira*, the *m* of '*flagrantem*' has come from *z*, i.e. *et* (which has come from *ex*)<sup>2</sup> and *cotidia* is not far from *canduit*: for the codices of Catullus

<sup>2</sup> For the confusion of *et* and *m* see Prop. 4, 11, 21, cited in *Silvia Maniliana* p. 21. The confusion of *et*, *ex* and *e* is discussed *ib.* pp. 63 sqq.

often confuse *a* and *o* (e.g. 63-43, 81; 64, 328) as well as *u* and *a* (14, 19; 29, 17). We thus get 'flagrant<sup>1</sup> excaudit ira'; incanduit would indeed be somewhat nearer to the MSS., but it is doubtful whether in the age of Catullus it would have been employed in a metaphorical sense. The word, if used at all by him (for at 64, 13 *incanuit*, the correction in *O*, may be right) is quite differently used, whereas for 'excaudit' compare Cic. *Tusc.* 4, 43 'nisi ira exca-

<sup>1</sup> Some may prefer *flagrant<sup>2</sup>*, and there is exactly the same doubt at Prop. 4, 7, 48, 'ardente (or ardent<sup>2</sup>, MSS. ardent<sup>2</sup>)e nostro dotem habitura rogo.'

duerit fortitudo' and, of slighted women, Juvenal 10, 327 'nec Sthenoboea minus quam Cressa excaudit.' The connexion of the whole passage is then as follows: 'I must make allowances for the occasional lapses of a usually faithful mistress. Juno herself has to put up with infidelities which make her blaze with indignation. And yet (unlike me) she is no mere mortal (nec 141) and (unlike me) she is after all said and done (tamen) not bound (nec 143) to Jupiter by unsanctioned ties.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

## NOTES ON SILIUS ITALICUS.

### I.-IV.

THERE are a few points in connection with the textual criticism of Silius Italicus which I hope will be borne in mind by those who may read these notes. The first is that our poet wrote, if not with *ingenium*, at least with *cura*, so that slovenliness that is pardonable enough in more inspired writers is in the case of Silius's text more likely to be due to corruption. Secondly, of the four MSS. LFOV, LF occupy an entirely superior position, and where OV offer a better reading I believe it has generally been arrived at by conjecture. This is a point I hope to examine at some other time. Again the whole question of the importance of the readings of the lost Cologne manuscript is extremely difficult. Our chief authorities are Modius and Heinsius. The difficulties attending the use of Modius's statements for this purpose have been clearly shown by Blass (*Textesquellen*, pp. 189 sqq.) and Thilo (*Jahrbücher für cl. Phil.* 1891, pp. 591 sqq.), and an example may be found in my note on ii. 614. Heinsius's statements, though definite, are also liable at times to grave suspicion (Blass, *l. c.* pp. 205 sqq., Thilo, *l. c.* pp. 595 sqq.): of the various causes for this I wish two specially noticed. In the same edition in which H. entered his collation of this MS., he also entered notes from two other MSS. and some old editions (e.g. Parma and Aldine) and emendations of other scholars and himself: it is extremely probable, as Thilo shows, *l. c.*, that he sometimes confused the reading of an edition with that of C. In the second place, Drakenborch no doubt edited Heinsius's critical notes—as he cer-

tainly has his extracts from Modius. Perhaps the best example to show how doubtful we must be as regards assuming a reading of C is iv. 4. Here S have wrongly *iactatur fama*, the right reading being undoubtedly *iactantem facta*. Heinsius's note in Drakenborch runs 'scribe *iactantem facta* ex Coloniensi libro.' But, as Bauer notes, since Blass pointed out the fact that *iactantem facta* was a conjecture made by Livincius, it is generally assumed that either Heinsius or his editor made a mistake in the matter. But apart from the uncertainty as regards C's readings, even where we feel confident of having a reading of that MS., both Blass (*l. c.* p. 249) and Thilo (*l. c.* p. 612) agree that if it differs from that of S it must be judged by its intrinsic merits. This is too generally forgotten. Bauer certainly pays too much respect to the lost MS. In iv. 773, for example, he has excluded from the text the reading of S which Blass rightly preferred to that of C.

### 322 sqq.

aut hydro imbutas, bis noxia tela, sagittas  
contendit neruo, atque insultat fraude  
pharetrae,  
Dacus ut armiferis Geticae telluris in oris  
spicula, quae patrio gaudens acuisse ueneno  
fundit, etc.

Bauer adopts Heinsius's conjecture 'qui' for 'quae' in 325. I think it is unnecessary, if we put a comma after 'neruo' and take 'atque'—'pharetrae' as parenthetical and so equivalent to 'insultans fr. ph.': 'spicula' is then the object of 'contendit.' Silius is