

Wir kaufen ständig zurückliegende komplette Jahrgänge von

## PHILOLOGUS

**BURSIAN**, Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte  
der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft

und weitere Bücher und Zeitschriften

Zentralantiquariat der DDR - 701 Leipzig — Talstraße 29

Fernruf: 293641 — 43

## Columella

Über Landwirtschaft

Ein Lehr- und Handbuch der gesamten Acker- und Viehwirtschaft  
aus dem 1. Jahrhundert u. Z.

Aus dem Lateinischen übersetzt, eingeführt und erläutert  
von **KARL AHRENS**

2., *berichtigte Auflage 1976*. 466 Seiten — 2 Abb. — gr. 8° — Halbleinen 48,— M  
Bestell-Nr. 751 986 2 (2143/4)

Alles, was die römische Landwirtschaft betrifft, hat Columella in seinem Werk  
zusammengefaßt. Auf Grund der theoretischen und praktischen Beherrschung  
seines Fachgebietes ist sein Lehrbuch das Standardwerk über römische Landwirt-  
schaft. Darüber hinaus gibt es uns von der römischen Sklaverei ein so lehrreiches  
Bild, wie wir es sonst nirgends finden. In keiner anderen antiken Quelle werden  
die Lebens- und Arbeitsbedingungen der Landsklaven und das Verhältnis Sklaven-  
halter—Sklave so ausführlich und gründlich wie bei Columella behandelt.

*Bestellungen durch eine Buchhandlung erbeten*

**AKADEMIE-VERLAG**  
DDR-108 Berlin, Leipziger Str. 3—4



AKADEMIE-VERLAG · BERLIN

EVP 18,— M

32912

# PHILOLOGUS

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR KLASSISCHE PHILOLOGIE

Herausgegeben vom

Zentralinstitut für Alte Geschichte und Archäologie  
der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR

Heft 2

1977

Band 121

RECEIVED  
SERIALS DIVISION  
AUG 01 1978  
PROPERTY OF  
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

ROBERT A. KASTER

## A NOTE ON CATULLUS, c. 71. 4

*si cui iure bono sacer alarum obstitit hircus,  
aut si quem merito turba podagra secat,  
aemulus iste tuus, qui uestrum exercet amorem,  
mirifice est, f a te nactus utrumque malum.  
nam quotiens fuit, lotiens ulciscitur ambos:  
illam affligit odore, ipse perit podagra.*

Among the fifteen passages obelized by Mynors in his text of Catullus, c. 71. 4 is the only one (save for c. 68. 157, which is distinguished by the note, "locus conclamatus") where the editor fails to note at least one proposed emendation in his apparatus criticus. The editor, alone with Kroll (among critics of this century) in applying the obelus, is surely correct in his rejection of *a te*: that reading can be retained only at the cost of offering an interpretation which ventures so far into fancy as to impinge upon the absurd (and so stand in opposition to the logical precision which informs the poem)<sup>1</sup>, or with the sense that the paradox is kept *faute de mieux*<sup>2</sup>. Indeed, the stony silence of the Oxford apparatus may reflect a refreshing candor: the majority of the corrections (well over a dozen) suggested for this passage have been mediocre or worse, most not even meriting discussion, much less a place in a limited apparatus<sup>3</sup>. Yet there are two conjectures which deserve serious consideration, insofar as they respond intelligently to the problem of sense presented by the impossible *mirifice est a te* of the manu-

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, E. T. Merrill, Catullus (Cambridge, Mass. 1951) ad loc.: "*a te nactus*: i.e., in succeeding to your place he has also succeeded to your diseases... In the character of the consolation administered there seems to be a back-handed slap for the person addressed..." On the expectations raised by the structure of the poem, see further below.

<sup>2</sup> See most recently K. Quinn, Catullus. The Poems (London 1970) ad loc., and compare the remarks of A. F. Housman, Vester = Tuus, CQ 3 (1909) 245f. (= Classical Papers, vol. II [Cambridge 1972] 791).

<sup>3</sup> For the sake of synopsis, I simply list the corrections proposed for this passage prior to the appearance of the Oxford text:

- 1) Baehrens *mirifica est poena*
- 2) Castiglioni *ad te*
- 3) ed. Aldina an. 1515 *ac tu*
- 4) Friedrich *antebac*
- 5) Hand *adeo*
- 6) Haupt *Ate* (i.e., "A7")
- 7) G. Hermann *mirifico est fato*
- 8) L. Herrmann *apte* (sic; see Schoell)
- 9) Heyse *Ate*
- 10) Kroll *Alli*
- 11) Muretus *astu*
- 12) Peiper *certe*
- 13) Phillimore *Cornifici, est alter*
- 14) Postgate *a se*
- 15) Schoell *apte* (sic; see below)
- 16) Turnebus *tactu*
- 17) "uir doctus in exempl. Marc. (4021) Ald. 1515"  
(Cazzaniga teste) *Acti*

A new emendation has more recently been placed in the text by G. P. Goold (Catulli Carmina [Groton, Mass. 1973]): *mirifice est, Quinti*.

scripts. One of these, Gottfried Hermann's *mirifico est fato*<sup>4</sup>, has in fact been printed in the text by a number of editors<sup>5</sup>; the other, *mirifice est apte*, has been neglected by most recent critics of Catullus. The merits of each of these corrections will be our subject. The purpose of this note, however, is not primarily therapeutic; that is, we shall not be concerned with urging the certainty of a specific emendation. Rather, the aim will be one of diagnosis: to inquire into the demands of the style and Latinity of this troubled epigram, and to suggest that, on the basis of the information supplied by the archetype<sup>6</sup>, *apte* is the correction which best satisfies those needs.

As has long been recognized<sup>7</sup>, the key to understanding c. 71 itself and thus determining, in a rudimentary way, the likelihood of any given conjecture is the pointed balance which gives form to Catullus' thought. This basic technique is, of course, important in other epigrams; in our poem, it is the predominant technique, from the first two lines, in which Catullus has modified the usual, prosaic expression for "deservedly", *iure ac merito*<sup>8</sup>, by distributing the two elements of the phrase between the two members of the protasis, to the last line, in which the perfectly balanced clauses are joined by the emphatic elision at the diaeresis of the pentameter. Thus, for the sake of style, to say nothing of logic, we would expect in the apodosis of lines 3-4 some expression answering to the *iure bono* and *merito* of lines 1 and 2. As the text stands, however, there is no thought in line 4 which provides the essential balance: we may assume that the required word is hidden in the corrupt *ate* of the Veronensis<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Offered in Hermann's review of M. Haupt's *Quaestiones Catullianae*, Neue Jahrb. 22 (1838) 313 as an improvement upon Haupt's *Ate* (see above, n. 3; Haupt later withdrew his conjecture in favor of Hermann's suggestion, see below, n. 5).

<sup>5</sup> Hermann's suggestion was adopted by L. Mueller (Leipzig 1910), M. Haupt (Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii carmina rec. M. Haupt, sept. ed. cur. I. Vahlen et ed. R. Helm [Leipzig 1912]) and V. Poeschl (Heidelberg 1960); Schuster, in his Teubner edition, reads *mirifice est fato*, in which he has been followed by R. Helm (Catull. Gedichte<sup>2</sup> [Berlin and Darmstadt 1971] = *Schriften und Quellen der Alten Welt*, Bd. 12).

<sup>6</sup> See below, n. 9.

<sup>7</sup> See M. Haupt, *Quaestiones Catullianae* (Leipzig 1837) 91ff. = *Opuscula* ed. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (Leipzig 1875-76, repr. Hildesheim 1967) 66ff.

<sup>8</sup> *iure* (*uiro* V) is the reading found in Palladius' printed commentary of 1496, and is reported by B. L. Ullman (*The Identification of the MSS of Catullus Cited in Statius' Edition of 1566* [Diss. Univ. of Chicago 1908] 58) as the reading of Paris. lat. 8458 and as a variant in Bonon. 2621 (an. 1412) and Paris. lat. 7989 (an. 1423). For *iure ac merito*, see especially in Cicero's works: Cat. 3. 14 *merito ac iure laudantur*; dom. 2 *iure ac merito laudare*; Marcell. 4 *merito atque optimo iure conligit*; cf. *Verr. II. 5. 172 et recte ac merito ... miseria commouebamur*; *Phil. 5. 37 merito uereque laudetur*.

<sup>9</sup> This assumption, the apparent basis of all emendations save that of Baehrens (above, n. 3), may be unsound: it is possible that *ate* (i.e., *a te*) began as a confused reader's interlinear note on *nactus*, and from there descended into the text, displacing the true reading. For an example of such a corruption, compare c. 65. 12 *canam*, where V had *tegam*, which appears beyond doubt to be derived from a misreading of an interlinear gloss, *tegam*. Since it is impossible to determine the cause of corruption at c. 71. 4, we must recognize the difficulty of prescribing a certain cure.

Viewed in terms of this basic requirement of structure, Herrmann's *mirifrice* est *fato* was an excellent attempt to provide what was needed. Yet, I believe, there is perhaps equally good reason to doubt that it is what Catullus wrote. As in the other lampoons written in elegiac couplets, the art of c. 71 — one might believe the sole reason it was written — involves the tension between the unadorned grossness of subject and language on the one hand, and the elegance of form on the other. *fato*, however, intrudes into the poem a tone too elevated for what is, simply, a coarse and silly matter, handled in a closely-knit, rhetorically structured form, in language that conforms to the confined, i.e. unpoetic diction of the epigrams; specifically, *fato* jars, following as it does upon the flat, pedestrian *iure bono* ... *merito*. Indeed, with regard to the diction peculiar to the epigrams, the impropriety of *fato* here seems especially instructive. Catullus uses *fatum* only in the elaborately poetic contexts of cc. 64, 65 and 66<sup>10</sup>, and in c. 15. 17, where the poem is being brought to a close through the use of highly colored, (mock-) solemn diction in the poet's threat against Aurelius<sup>11</sup>. The use of *fatum* in the neoteric diction of c. 15 is appropriate to the context and, together with the other neoteric plays found in the last lines of the poem, contributory to the effect sought by the poet. In c. 71, the effect of *fato* is quite otherwise: the tone of *fato* is neither anticipated in the first three lines nor developed in the last three lines of the epigram. Yet the tone of *fato*, the "destiny" of the *aemulus*, is related to a more concrete question of sense as well: specifically, the sense of *nancisci*, which often conveys a connotation of the fortuitous, never, to my knowledge, the fated. The operation of *nancisci* in the realm of chance, with the sense of the English "hit upon" or "stumble upon", can be seen clearly, for example, at Cic. n.d. 3. 87 *si aliat quispiam nacti sumus fortuivi boni aut depulimus mali, tum dis gratias agimus*, and is the underlying idea in a context such as, e.g., Ter.

<sup>10</sup> See cc. 64. 245, 321, 326; 66. 51. In c. 65. 14, Catullus applies the word to the fate of Ixylus and, thus obliquely, to his brother's death; in c. 101, where the same topic is handled directly and *prisco* ... *more parentum*, the word used is *fortuna* (line 5), not *fatum*. The two notions, of course, are not interchangeable; it is therefore interesting to compare that most strange and difficult of the poems, c. 68, where the same distinction is maintained in an interesting way: Catullus, in the epistolary introduction, speaks of himself, in relation to his brother's death, as *fortuna casaque oppressus acerba* (line 1, cf. line 13 *fortunae fluctibus*), while in the mythological center of the poem, it is the Parcae who appear in connection with Protesilaus, then the morbid symbol of Troy, and so once more the poet's brother.

<sup>11</sup> c. 15. 14—19:

*quod si te mala mens furororque uecors  
in tantam impulerit, scelestae, culpam,  
ut nostrum insidiis caput lacessas,  
a, tum te miserum matique fati!  
quem attractis pedibus patente porta  
percurrant raphanique mugilisque.*

For a recent discussion of the neoteric devices used to modulate the tone of the poem's conclusion, see D. Ross, *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, Mass. 1969) 51 ff. (on the interjection *a!*) and 64 f. (on the use of *-que* ... *-que*).

Hec. 825 *unde anulum istum nactus es?*<sup>12</sup> *nancisci*, it is certainly true, does not always possess the notion of chance: yet, in view of what I believe to be a complete absence in Latin of the connection of the idea of *fatum* with that verb (and in view of the remarks on the question of tone, above), I would suggest that Catullus here is more likely than commenting on a chance occurrence which has turned out rather neatly than celebrating an ordered universe wherein the rival was "fated" to be afflicted with the stench of a goat and the torture of gout. Herrmann's conjecture, I think, must ultimately be rejected.

In light of the above, it is interesting to consider *mirifrice* ... *apte*, which was recently printed in the text by L. Herrmann in his idiosyncratic book, *Les deux livres de Catulle*<sup>13</sup>. Herrmann was twice wrong, however, in writing "*apte* coniecti" in his apparatus: *apte* was proposed already by F. Schoell in 1880<sup>14</sup>, and, in fact, was reported by Sillig in his edition of 1823<sup>15</sup> as the corrected reading (*ap'ite*) in his codex Dresdensis<sup>16</sup>. As far as meaning of the words themselves is concerned, we can see that *mirifrice* ... *apte*, "with wonderful propriety", accords quite nicely both with *iure bono* ... *merito*, and with the overtones of the fortuitous which *nactus* may convey ("that rival of yours ... has, with wonderful propriety, hit upon both misfortunes ..."), and has the added benefit of explicitly referring ahead to the final distich, in which the "fitting" punishment visited upon mistress and *aemulus* alike is described<sup>17</sup>. Further, *mirifrice* ... *apte* is consonant with the diction of the poem (especially *iure bono* and *merito*); both words are "un-

<sup>12</sup> Compare Ter. Ad. 420 f. *pisces ex sententia/nactus sum* (of a happy bargain struck) and And. 967 f. *more hominum euenit ut quod sum nactus maliprius rescisceres tu quam ego illud quod tibi euenit boni*.

<sup>13</sup> *Latomus* 29 (1957).

<sup>14</sup> F. Schoell, *Zu Catullus*, Neue Jahrb. 121 (1880) 486 f.; Schoell suggested the construction of *mirifrice* ... *apte* in asyndeton, comparing c. 36. 10 *icose lepide*.

<sup>15</sup> C. Valerii Catulli Carmina rec. C. J. Sillig (Göttingen 1823).

<sup>16</sup> The correction may be assumed to be a Humanist conjecture, with no independent manuscript authority (cf. n. 8, above). The codex Dresdensis is described by Sillig in the following terms (p. xxi): "*scriptus est anno 1479 ... sub finem totius libri (Propertii) duo non inelegantia epigrammata leguntur*." This would seem to accord with the manuscript described in the *Katalog der Handschriften der Königl. Öffentl. Bibliothek zu Dresden* (Leipzig 1882) vol. I p. 319 under the self-mark Dc. 133, save that the latter entry, while agreeing in date, identifies the order of the works contained as *Catullus-Propertius-Tibullus* (cf. W. G. Hale, *The Manuscripts of Catullus*, CP 3 [1908] 233 ff., where K. Öffentl. Bibliothek Dc. 133 is also listed, with *Tibullus* as the final work in the codex, but without date). To my knowledge, no editor subsequent to Sillig (who refers to the Dresdensis in passing in his later contribution in *Jahrb. f. Phil. und Paed.* 13 [1830] 259 ff.; I have not been able to see his 'Epistola critica de C. Valerio Catullo' [Leipzig 1822]) drawn upon the readings of this manuscript.

<sup>17</sup> In connection with the final couplet, it might just be possible (a suggestion I advance with the greatest reservations) to understand a sexual pun involving the literal meaning of *apte*, "fitting snugly together"; so Ovid (the only Augustan poet to use any form of *apte*, below n. 18) Am. 1. 4, 5, describing his mistress and her husband "fitting snugly together" as they recline at table.

poetic<sup>18</sup>, and the former is, as we shall see presently, especially favored in the informal<sup>19</sup> prose of Cicero's epistulae.

The construction *mirifrice* ... *apte* is itself interesting. Although a parallel classical use of *mirifrice* as an adverb of degree modifying another adverb is not to be found<sup>20</sup>, we might compare with some profit Cicero's use of *valde* in the epistulae: ad Att. 1. 14, 3 *valde graniter*; 6. 1, 13 *valde honeste*; 6. 6, 2 *valde famuliter*; 13. 6, 2 *valde bene*. To the foundation with these examples provide we may add the knowledge that Cicero, also in the epistulae, used *mirifrice* often and as little more than an intensification of *valde*<sup>21</sup>. Thus we can suggest, with a degree of security, that the contemporary use of *mirifrice* in such a construction was not impossible. This conclusion becomes more secure if we view this use of *mirifrice*, instead of the common *valde*, as a stylish modification of a usual idiom, as the distribution of *iure bono* ... *merito* in lines 1 and 2 represents a modification of a common, formalized expression meaning "rightly and deservedly", *iure ac merito*. It is important, in view of what was said above regarding *fato*, that Catullus' artfulness in this epigram would thus best be understood as the subtle modification and precise placement of the usual and traditional, as opposed to the more bold and noticeable innovation found in the polymetrics.

Keeping in mind, then, the uncertainties bequeathed us by the Veronensis, we may conclude that, of the many corrections suggested for this passage, (*mirifrice* ...) *apte* alone responds consistently to the movement and balance of the whole poem and to the demands of style and thought. *apte* approximates, if it does not precisely recapture, the artistic note for which Catullus would have been striving, and so brings us closer to an understanding of the poem and the poet's technique.

University of Chicago

Department of Classics

Chicago, Illinois 60637 / USA

<sup>18</sup> On *mirifrice*, see B. Axelson, Unpoetische Wörter. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache (Lund 1945) 61; *apte* only in Ovid Am. 1. 4, 5; Medic. 81; Met. 2. 733, 9. 611, 14. 685 (comparative degree in Am. 1. 12, 23; 3. 4, 12; Ars 3. 808); not in Hor., Verg., Tibull., Prop.

<sup>19</sup> See J. B. Hofmann, Lateinische Umgangssprache<sup>3</sup> (Heidelberg 1951) 77f.

<sup>20</sup> I do not think we find what we are looking for in Cic. ad Q. fr. 2. 2, 3; in *ea re nos et officio erga Lentulum mirifrice et voluntati Pompei praeclare satis fecimus*, although the use of *mirifrice* here is certainly noteworthy, see below and n. 21.

<sup>21</sup> See especially ad Q. fr. 2. 4, 7 *tuas mirifrice litteras exspecto*; ad Att. 5. 15, 3 *mirifrice sollicitus sum* (likewise ad fam. 2. 11, 1); similarly at ad Att. 2. 19, 1; 5. 15, 2; 5. 17, 2; 5. 21, 6; 6. 2, 2; 9. 11, 1; 12. 34, 2; 13. 20, 2; 16. 16, 14; ad fam. 3. 1, 2; 6. 6, 8; 10. 22, 1.

## GRAHAM ANDERSON

### PATTERNS IN LUCIAN'S PROLALIAE

Lucian's *prolaliae* are brief preambles to humour his audience before an *epivēsis*; and as such they are among the slightest trifles among the vast amount of ephemera produced by the Second Sophistic<sup>1</sup>. Did he adopt any literary form for these pieces? On the one hand there is little need for organisation in such inconsequential performances: they would take only a few minutes to deliver, during which the speaker as well as the audience might be expected to relax before the rigours of the formal display; but Lucian is given to ingenious variation, and once he has found a scheme which works, he tends to stick to it<sup>2</sup>. Scholars have accordingly been divided over his methods here. Ps.-Menander laid down no rule for introductions of this kind (Spengel, Rhet. Gr. III. 392: ἀτακτος ... ἐργασία τῶν λεγόμενων, cf. 390, 401, 441); this 'rule' leads Bompaire to deny that Lucian would organise his own introductions with a formula<sup>3</sup>. But he does not discuss the conclusions of K. Mraz<sup>4</sup>, who analysed these short pieces as two- and three-part compositions, like several of the examples in Apuleius' *Florida*. It is worthwhile to examine the parallelisms in both theme and structure which we might expect from an author as repetitive as Lucian.

#### Zeuxis:

The author is not satisfied with the way  
his audience is complimenting his  
novelties

(1-2)

#### Prometheus es:

(1-2)

An Old Master at work

Zeuxis (3-7)

Prometheus as  
ἀφγυρέκτων (3)

A strange hybrid

The female  
hippocentaur (4)

The two-coloured  
man (4)

A Hellenistic king and his  
frightening exhibit

Antiochus Soter  
uses elephants in  
battle (8-11)

Ptolemy son of Lagus  
uses a black camel  
in his show (4)

The author compares his own work  
to these monstrosities

(5-7)

<sup>1</sup> For the form as a whole see A. Stock, De prolaliarum usu rhetorico, Diss. Königsberg 1911 (on Lucian 11-36).

<sup>2</sup> For Lucian's characteristic techniques of variation, see my monograph 'Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic' (Mnemos. Suppl. 41), Leyden 1976, cc. I, IX, X.

<sup>3</sup> J. Bompaire, Lucien écrivain, imitation et création, Paris 1958, 287. Cf. also B. P. Reardon, Courants littéraires grecs des II<sup>e</sup> et III<sup>e</sup> siècles après J.-C., Paris 1971, 165f., who recognises the variety of rhetorical elements which Lucian has reassembled in the *prolaliae*.

<sup>4</sup> WSt 64 (1949) 71-81; Anzeiger der Oesterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse 86 (1949) 205ff.