PROBLEMS IN TWO TRANSLATIONS

I. CICERO AND ARATUS.

242   ἀμφοτέρων δέ σφεων ἀποτείνεται ἠΰτε δεσμὰ
οὐραίων ἑκάτερθεν ἐπισχερὼ εἰς ἓν ἰόντων.

(ἰόντα Voss).

14   *atque horum e caudis duplices velut esse catenae*
dices quae diu diversae per lumina serpunt
atque una tamen in stella communiter haerent.

horum = Piscium. What I have presented above is undoubtedly the manu-
script tradition in Cicero, though the corrector in H has tried to obscure it.
No emendation worth mention has been made; I propose

<div align="center">

catenas
dispicies, quae diversae...

</div>

diu is just a dittography; *catenas* has already been suggested by Puteanus
(C. Dupuy) and Maybaum.

338   αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' αἰεὶ
Σείριος ἐξόπιθεν φέρεται μετιόντι ἐοικώς,
καί οἱ ἐπαντέλλει, καί μιν κατιόντα δοκεύει.

123   *nam Canis infesto sequitur vestigia cursu,*
praecipitantem agitans, oriens iam denique paulo.

praecipitantem sc. *Leporem.* The latter half of 124 is obviously corrupt, but
it seems clear to me that *oriens*, which corresponds perfectly to
ἐπαντέλλει, should not be altered. Baehrens changes *paulo* to *ponto*, but
this leaves *iam denique* senseless. Soubiran suggests that we read *paulo /
<instat post Leporem, velox qui cedere pergit>*, but *iam denique* is still not
in place, and Cicero would not have reversed the natural order, as in Ara-
tus, of rising and setting (an order which permits the image of the Dog
chasing the Hare across the sky) in such a way as to present these as two
successive events. And what about this *iam denique*? It seems to be a very
poorly-attested combination: *TLL* 7.1, 112.58 quotes only this passage and
two from Apuleius, *ibid.* 123.77 as a matter of conscience adduces Cic. *De
lege agr.* 2.68, where the two words stand beside each other but function
independently. This seems to me to be the seat of the problem, and what is
needed is to change it to something which will give sense to *paulo*. That
something, I suggest (taking a hint from Soubiran), is *post denique*; the
Dog, rising as it does after (*denique*) and just a little behind (*post*) the Hare,
follows it with hostile intent, chasing it in its headlong course. Having been

led to this conclusion by reason (at least I hope it was reason), I will admit
that I do not see why *post* should have become *iam*, unless perhaps the lat-
ter was a mistaken variant for *nam* in 123.

II. CATULLUS AND CALLIMACHUS.

66.15   *estne novis nuptis odio Venus? anne parentum*
                  frustrantur falsis gaudia lacrimulis,
             ubertim thalami quas intra limina fundunt?
                  non, ita me divi, vera gemunt, iverint.

(*anne* Itali: *atque* V)

As this passage stands, it can only be interpreted on the assumption that
thalami means the girl's bedroom before her marriage, and this can be sup-
ported by Claudian, *Epithalamium Palladio* 116 (the subject is Venus and
Cupid)

              ut thalami tetigere fores...
              adgreditur Cytherea nurum flentemque pudico
              detraxit matris gremio

(this is quoted by Friedrich); the situation would be much as in Catullus
61.81 = 85. In [Ovid] *Her.* 21.160 too *thalami limen* means the bedroom of
Cydippe about to be married. If however *thalami* means the honeymoon
suite, then *parentum* and *intra* are incompatible; and that it does mean this
is suggested by 61.185 = 192 *uxor in thalamo tibi est*, by the reference to
the husband's *gaudia* at 61.109 = 116 and by the preceding *novis nuptis*
here. So attempts have been made to alter either *intra* (*citra* Nisbet, *iuxta*
Goold) or *parentum* (I do not see why Goold would want to alter both). Of
these two words it seems to me that the vulnerable one is the latter. If this
wére changed to a word meaning 'husbands', there would be much more
point in *falsis*. For why would the girls put on an act before their parents?
On the other hand coquetry or the urge to instil a sense of guilt would direct
such complaints at the husbands; note that at 62.36 the young men, who
align themselves with the bridgegroom, remark that the girls, who stand in
the same relation to the bride, complain at the arrival of Hesperus *ficto
questu*. This also harmonises with the reference to rough play in the bed-
room in 13-14. And in fact the mention of parents, though it is put as a
generality, is out of place in this poem, in which Callimachus brilliantly
manages to joke with the king and queen about their sex life without giving
offence; any mention of parents blurs the focus. So what can we restore to
mean 'husbands'? Not Munro's *an quod aventum*; *quod* has no function
here (whereas it has in 31). Much better is O.L. Richmond's *pr<em>entum*
("CQ" 13, 1919, 137); this, like its compound *comprimo*, is a reasonably
polite word (see the instances in *OLD* s.v. 2b and J.N. Adams, *Latin Sexual*

Vocabulary (1982) 182) which fits the general tone well. The implicit reference to the act of intercourse, which is the immediate cause of the tears and groans, is also in place; see parallels quoted by O. Thomsen, *Ritual and Desire* (loc. 1992) 246-7, though I cannot accept his idea that the parents are conceived as standing outside the *thalamus* hearing the bride's weeping (212 n. 233), which would enable us to keep both *parentum* and *intra*. Thomsen seems to me overall much too ready to reconstruct details of wedding ritual from uncertain interpretations and poetic licence.

fr. 110.52   γνωτὸς Μέμνονος Αἰθίοπος
66.52-3   *Memnonis Aethiopis*
          unigena

The Etymologicum Gudianum defines γνωτός as ὁ ἅμα τινὶ γεννηθείς, and it is often enough applied to brothers and sisters. But *unigena* is a very striking translation of this. It seems to be modelled rather on ὁμόγνιος, ὁμόγνητος, but the first part of the compound is remarkable. The word seems to be found outside Catullus in classical Latin only at Cic. *Tim.* 12, where it means 'unique' (a sense taken up by Christian writers for the only son of God) and translates μονογενής (Plato 31b); I do not know what J. Godwin (*Catullus, Poems 61-68* (loc. 1995) 164 has in mind when he says "the epithet is often applied to Hecate, the only child of Perseus and Asterie". Now Catullus uses the word elsewhere, at 64.300, where it is applied to Apollo's twin sister Diana. This is an innovation, but a comprehensible one, since the word is perfectly appropriate to twins born on the same occasion. But here Memnon and Zephyr are only half-brothers, since they share the same mother Eos but have different fathers, Tithonus for Memnon and Astraeus for Zephyr. Now Axelson and others, in relation to settling of priorities between authors of whom at least one is undated by external evidence, have established a methodology: when two passages reveal imitation, then that in which the similarity is organically rooted in the context is the imitated, that in which it has no such roots is the imitator. This applies also within authors, and here it seems clear to me that Catullus first introduced this word with a specific nuance in 64, and then used it in a wider sense in 66. From this we can deduce that 66 was composed later than 64; and since 66 is linked with 65, and that refers to the death of Catullus' brother, and that is usually dated before Catullus' visit to Bithynia because of Catullus' visit to his tomb in the Troad (101), it will follow that 64 is not "one of the latest in date" of Catullus' poems (D.F.S. Thomson in his commentary (loc. 1997) 386), but came rather earlier as the statutory 'epyllion' needed to establish Catullus' place among the poets of his generation.

66.66   *Calixto iuxta Licaonia*

So V. Editors usually adopt two thirds of the restoration of Parthenius, who wrote *Callistoe iuncta Lycaoniae*; the third which they do not adopt is *Callistoe*. Fordyce tells us that *Callisto* represents a Greek dative Καλλίστῳ; where did he find such a form? Normal is Καλλιστοῖ; the only support for a dative *Callisto* comes from a late inscription from Larinum (*CIL* 9.747), which has *Fulviae Erato*. See Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre* 1.458.

fr. 110.75   οὐ τάδε μοι τοσσῆνδε φέρει χάριν ὅσσον ἐκείνης
                        ἀσχάλλω κορυφῆς οὐκέτι θιξόμενος,
                     ἧς ἄπο, παρθενίη μὲν ὅτ᾽ ἦν ἔτι, πολλὰ πέπωκα
                        λιτά, γυναικείων δ᾽ οὐκ ἀπέλαυσα μύρων.

66.75   *non his tam laetor rebus quam me afore semper*
                     afore me a dominae vertice discrucior,
                 quicum ego, dum quondam virgo fuit, omnibus expers
                     unguentis †una† vilia multa bibi.

(*vilia* Lobel: *milia* codd.)

We have to start here by establishing the meaning of Callimachus, and a great step was taken to this end by H. Herter (his paper is most conveniently accessible in his *Kl. Schr.* (loc. 1975) 417 and in *Kallimachos*, ed. A. Skiadas (loc. 1975) 186), who showed that we are not intended to understand μύρα with λιτά, but that Callimachus is drawing a contrast between the simple oil once used by his tomboy (25-8) while still unmarried, and the compounded perfumes which married women abitually used, but of which this lock was deprived because it was cut off immediately after the marriage. Herter's central point was unwittingly repeated by Holmes, "CP" 87, 1992, 47. Herter left one point unsettled: does the second couplet mean (a) 'while she was still a virgin I did not enjoy the perfumes of married women, though I absorbed plenty of plain oil' or (b) 'when she was still a virgin I absorbed plenty of plain oil, but when she was married I did not receive, as I might have expected, elaborate perfumes'? Herter himself was worried by the ambiguity, but in the end preferred (b); on the other hand L. Koenen in *Images and Ideologies*, ed. A.W. Bulloch etc. (loc. 1993) 108 supports (a). It seems strange that neither of these eminent Hellenists has taken note of those little words μέν and δέ and their placement, which surely demand interpretation (b); if Callimachus had intended (a), he would have had to say πολλὰ μὲν πέπωκα (unmetrically of course in my rearrangement).

That established, we may turn to the text of Catullus, where an antithesis to *virgo* and a correspondent to γυναικείων is missing. This cannot be found in *omnibus* without very violent alteration, so it has to be found in

una, a totally superfluous word. Accordingly W. Morel changed this to *nuptae*, but I agree with the feeling of many (e.g. Herter in Skiadas 193) that the singular in uncomfortable. *Via prima salutis, quod minimae reris, pandetur* by H. Bardon, who suggests *nu<pt>a*; 'with which [i.e. the head] I drank many cheap oils when she was unmarried, but was deprived of all perfumes when she had been married'. For the one-word ablative absolute see Kühner–Stegmann, *Lat. Gramm., Satzlehre* 1.773, Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lat. Gramm., Syntax* 141. With this reading one will place a comma after *nupta*, whereas one is usually placed after *unguentis*.

University of Virginia   E. COURTNEY