PROBLEMS IN TWO TRANSLATIONS

I. CICERO AND ARATUS.

242 ὁμοφωτέρων δὲ σφεών ἀποτείνεται ἦτε δεσμὰ
οὐραίων ἐκάτερθεν ἐπισχέρω εἰς ἐν ἱόντων.

(iόντα 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 manuscript tradition in Cicero, though the corrector in H has tried to obscure it.
No emendation worth mention has been made; I propose catenas

dispicies, quae diversae...

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

338 αὐτὰρ ὁ γα' αἴει
Σείριος ἡξόπιθεν φέρεται μετίόντι ἑοικὸς,
καὶ οἱ ἐπαντέλλει, καὶ μιν κατίόντα δοκεὺει.

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 Aratus, 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 est ne novis nuptis odio Venus? annē 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
Cydispe 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
were 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 bridegroom, 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 avenut; 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 γνωτός Μέμνονος Αιθίοπος
66.52-3 Memnonis Aethiopis
unigena

The Etymologicum Gudianum defines γνωτός as ὁ ἄμα τινὶ γεννηθεῖς, 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 Astere”. 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.
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 Καλλιστός; where did he find such a form? Normal is Καλλιστοί; 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 τοστήνδε φέρει χάριν ὀσσον ἐκείνης ἀσχάλλω κορυφῆς οὐκέτι βιζόμενος, ἤς ἀπο, παρθενίνα μὲν ὄτ’ ἤν 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 discrucrior, quicum ego, dum quondam virgo fuit, omnibus expergumentis tunam 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 μὲν and δὲ 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 *nupta*; ‘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.
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