CONJECTURES AND OBSERVATIONS ON CATULLUS 63*

ABSTRACT

This article discusses textually problematic passages in Catullus 63, a particularly corrupt poem from a particularly corrupt manuscript tradition. It proposes new conjectures and revives several old ones. Throughout there are notes on punctuation, conjecture attribution and an analysis of the structure of Attis' lament.

Keywords: Catullus; Attis; Cybele; textual criticism; Latin poetry; galliambics

Catullus' textual tradition is notoriously corrupt, so inevitably there is scope for editors to differ in their readings; several articles have advanced our understanding of the text of this poem in recent decades.[1] Here I use Thomson's second edition.[2]

63.1–5

> super alta uectus Attis celeri rate maria,
> Phrygium ut nemus citato cupide pede tetigit
> adiitque opaca siluis redimita loca deae,
> stimulatus ibi furenti rabie, uagus animis,
> deuulsit ili acuto sibi pondera silice.   5

1 uetus *O*   attis *Terentianus, Marius Victorinus*: actis *V*   celeri *testes vett.*, *θ*: celere *V*   2 (*sim.* 20, 71) frigium *V*, phrygium *m*   3 adutque (?) *O* (*desunt apices*)   4 ibi *Puccius*: ubi *V*   animis *α*, animi *Parth.*: amnis *V*   5 deuolsit *Haupt*: deuoluit *V*   ilei *Bergk*: iletas *V*   pondera silice *Av.*: pondere silices *V*

> Attis, carried over the deep seas on his swift ship,
> when he eagerly reached the Phrygian grove on speedy feet,
> and came to the Goddess's shady places surrounded by trees,
> there, goaded by a raging madness, wandering in his mind,
> he tore off the burden of his groin with a sharp flint.

In line 4, *uagus* is usually construed with *animi* or *animis* depending on how the editor corrects *amnis*. White[3] has suggested construing *animi* as a limiting genitive with *furenti*

---

[1] D.J. Butterfield, 'Duae coniecturae Catullianae', *Paideia* 66 (2011), 541–4; J. Diggle, 'On the text of Catullus', *MD* 51 (2006), 85–104; S.J. Harrison and S.J. Heyworth, 'Notes on the text and interpretation of Catullus', *PCPhS* 44 (1998), 85–109; K. Kokoszkiewicz, 'Catullus 63.74: *roseis ut hinc labellis sonitus adiit*', *Mnemosyne* 62 (2009), 108–10; K. Kokoszkiewicz, 'Catullus 63.40 atque obiter Ennius', *Eranos* 106 (2010), 88–9; K. Kokoszkiewicz, 'Catullus 63.5: *devolsit?*', *CQ* 61 (2011), 756–8; J.M. Trappes-Lomax, *Catullus: A Textual Reappraisal* (Swansea, 2007), 159–70; H. White, 'Observations on the text of Catullus', *Veleia* 27 (2010), 339–45.

[2] D.F.S. Thomson, *Catullus: Edited with a Textual and Interpretive Commentary* (Toronto / Buffalo / London, 1997).

[3] White (n. 1), 339.

rabie, citing Cic. *Tusc.* 3.26.63, but this explanation could do with a stronger defence, as it is a novel interpretation. First, when *uagus* describes persons with no suggestion of physical motion it refers to vacillation or fickleness (for example Vell. Pat. 2.76.2; Prop. 1.5.7; Mart. 2.90.1), but for Attis to have crossed the ocean 'eagerly' and castrated himself means that he was of a fixed will, the opposite of what *uagus* should mean here. The phrase *furenti rabie animi* is also more characteristic of Catullus' idiom than *uagus animi/s*. While the limiting genitive or ablative with *uagus* is generally difficult to parallel (commentators usually cite Verg. *Aen.* 8.228 *furens animis*, although Fordyce[4] cites *ferox animi* and similar phrases in favour of *animi*), the pleonastic genitive of sphere with *animi* and its synonyms is particularly common in Catullus. Line 38 of the same poem deserves special attention as the phrase is almost the same (*rabidus furor animi*), but there are eight other instances (2.10, 64.136, 64.147, 64.194, 64.372, 65.4, 68a.26, 102.2). It may be objected that the hyperbaton of *uagus* is unusual, but it can be paralleled with *tua*[5] in line 9, as long as one does not accept Trappes-Lomax's deletion[6], which I do not. This hyperbaton slows down the rhythm, but it could equally be argued that the unusual word order reflects Attis' mental state. The corruption to *animis* (ignoring the miscounting of minims that gave the archetypal *amnis*) would be caused by dittography of final *-s* from *uagus*.

The reading transmitted in line 5, *deuoluit* ('rolled down'), is too mild for this extremely violent context, and so it is accepted to be corrupt. Haupt's *deuolsit* has won the most approval as it involves the simplest change, but Stephen Harrison has pointed out to me (*viva voce*) that *deuello* is not the *vox propria* for this context, as it describes the act of plucking flowers, hair, feathers and similar inanimate objects (see *OLD* s.v.). The act of slicing off the genitals with a stone cannot be compared very precisely to plucking. Indeed, the *TLL* gives only this passage for extending its meaning to body parts (5.1.849.14–15). I would also add that *deuello* is a rare word. The *PHI* disc gives seven examples, none of them contemporaneous with Catullus. The closest in date are Lucilius (30.1027 Marx) and Statius (*Theb.* 2.604). As *deuolsit* is restored by conjecture, we should question whether the vulgate reading is the best one possible.

The violence suggests *di-* rather than *de-*, whether it be *diuellit* (Aldine edition, 1515) or *diuulsit*.[7] The exchange of *di-* and *de-* is extremely frequent and it produces a word appropriate and common to dismemberment (compare, for instance, 64.257 *pars e diuulso iactabant membra iuuenco*, 'some brandished about limbs torn from a bullock'), and yet I have not found it printed in any edition since 1805.[8] Argument from usage therefore strongly favours *diuellit* over *deuellit*.

The appropriate form of the perfect still needs determining. Kokoszkiewicz[9] advocates Werthes's *deuellit*.[10] He infers from its use in Laberius (*inc.* 137 Bonaria), who used many vulgar forms, and from its rarity in most writers (except Lucan and Seneca) that *-uolsi* is colloquial. However, the form *-uulsi* is attested in Ovid

---

[4] C.J. Fordyce, *Catullus* (Oxford, 1973), 264.
[5] *tua* is an early necessary correction of *tu*.
[6] Trappes-Lomax (n. 1), 159–60.
[7] Catullus would have written *d(e)iuolsit*, which is closer to the archetype, but the modern orthography is *-uu-*.
[8] R. Pastore, *Catullo Tibullo e Properzio d'espurgata lezione*, vol. 1 (Bassano, 1805), 70.
[9] Kokoszkiewicz (n. 1 [2011]).
[10] F.A.C. Werthes, *Ueber den Atys des Katull* (Münster, 1774), 7, 23–4.

(*Met.* 12.300) and Propertius (3.15.13), so this idea appears not to be valid.[11] As the form is unobjectionable and it is slightly closer to the transmitted reading, *diuulsit* is preferable to the second Aldine's *diuellit*.

I accept Currie's[12] arguments in favour of *ipse* over *ili* for the troubled *-iletas*. But my reason for discussing this conjecture is its attribution, which is complex and goes back further than Palmer,[13] to whom Kiss attributes it.[14] Palmer attributed it in turn to Ellis and Passerat, though I can only find it in the latter.[15] Passerat attributed *ipse* to a '*uetus liber*', which seems to be Muretus's edition.[16] Muretus printed *ipse* without comment, so it is possibly not his own conjecture. A similar reading, *iste*, is found in Avantius's 1502 Aldine edition; the 1515 Aldine edition and Avantius' Trincavelli edition read *ille*. Avantius's 1502 was enormously influential,[17] so it seems that it was used as Muretus's base text and that *ipse* was printed by mistake, albeit a fortuitous one.

63.13–16

> simul ite, Dindymenae dominae uaga pecora,
> aliena quae petentes uelut exules loca
> sectam meam exsecutae duce me mihi comites   15
> rabidum salum tulistis truculentaque pelagi,

13 pecora *Av.*: pectora *V*   14 aliena quae *P. Laetus*, *B. Guarinus*: alienaque *V*   loca *B. Guarinus*, *Polit.*: loca celeri *V*   15 execute *V*: excute *R²*

> Come together, wandering herd of Lady Dindymene,
> who making for foreign places like exiles
> followed my path under my leadership as my companions,
> and bore the rabid brine and truculent ocean.

Dindymene is a rare Greek word that makes only two other appearances in Latin, both of them in Greek forms.[18] Catullus' manuscripts are not to be trusted on orthography, and indeed Catullus does use Greek morphology. In the case of first-declension genitives, he uses the Greek genitive for *Cybele* and *Cybebe*, in accordance with all other Classical writers, and there is also *Arsinoes* at 66.54. As it is a rare word, and therefore one unlikely to have been naturalized to a Latin form through common usage, and given Catullus' free use of Graecisms, it is likely that Catullus would have preferred the Greek form *Dindymenes*.

In this case the homoeoteleuton should also be considered, as this conjecture removes it, and it may be considered deliberate. In this poem there is homoeoteleuton in 28 out of 93 lines, so it is common, but 18 of these involve a short *a* and should

---

[11] I owe this observation to the anonymous reviewer.
[12] B. Currie, 'A note on Catullus 63.5', *CQ* 46 (1996), 579–81.
[13] A. Palmer, *Catulli Veronensis liber* (London, 1896), xxxix.
[14] D. Kiss, www.catullusonline.org (2015).
[15] J. Passeratius, *Ioannis Passeratii professoris et interpretis regii Commentarii in C. Val. Catullum, Albium Tibullum, et Sex. Aur. Propertium* (Paris, 1608), 32.
[16] M.A. Muretus, *Catullus et in eum Commentarius M. Antonii Mureti* (Venice, 1554), 78.
[17] Thomson (n. 2), 48.
[18] *-e* Hor. *Carm.* 1.16.5 (guaranteed by metre); *-es* Mart. 8.81.1.

probably be thought of as consequences of the limited ways of producing long sequences of short syllables.[19] Some of the others may be considered deliberate: in lines 59–60 the repeated final long *-o* recalls the exclamation *o*, in line 64 it may emphasize the force of *fui*, in lines 74 and 86 it may be onomatopoeic, and in lines 91–2 it may imitate ritualistic incantation. The effect in this case may be similar to lines 92–3, but I prefer the exoticism of the Greek morphology.

63.29

leue tympanum remugit, caua cymbala recrepant,

the light drum lows, the hollow cymbals clatter

Here Catullus describes the instruments' sounds, but unlike *caua*, which refers to the cymbal's resonance (cf. Lucr. 2.620), *leue* is irrelevant to sound. A far more appropriate word for this context is *graue*, for which we can compare a dramatic fragment describing the same thing: *agite turba Phrygia nunc et quatite grauia tympana* ('Come on now, Phrygian crowd, shake the low-pitched *tympana*', Anon. *apud CGL* 6.144). Both *caua* and *graue* should be taken adverbially, referring to the instrument's low-pitched tone (*OLD* s.v. *grauis* 9a). The collocation *graue mugire* is well attested for both musical instruments and animals, and so this also has the advantage of reinforcing the pervasive animal imagery.[20] The earliest and most interesting parallel is in Lucretius: *tuba depresso grauiter sub murmure mugit | et reboat* ('the horn booms and bellows with a low-pitched tone in a low murmur', 4.543–4 = 4.545–6). These two writers are the first who attest to the verb *reboat*, and one may be imitating the other.[21] This is a polar error motivated by a reminiscence of *leue typanum* from line 8. A parallel is found at Sen. *HF* 1117, where the manuscript A gives *leues* for *graues* because of *leui* in line 1113.

63.52–4

ad Idae tetuli nemora pedem,
ut apud niuem et ferarum gelida stabula forem,
et earum operta adirem furibunda latibula,

52 retuli *GR*   memora *O*   53 apud *ε*: caput *V* (capud *R*)   stabula *R²* (*ita tamen ut a* stabilia *uix distingui possit*), stabilla *mG²*: stabilia *V*   54 opaca *uel* operta *L. Mueller,* amica *Muretus*: omnia *V*

did I set foot on Ida,
so that I could be among the snow and beasts' cold lairs?
and approach their covered dens, raging?

---

[19] As a comparison, Ovid freely admits homoeoteleuton of final short *-a* in metrically identical words in the fourth and fifth feet of a hexameter (*Met.* 1.192; 2.16; 3.123, 251, 638; 7.141, 284; 8.247), but other types are much rarer (2.178, 322; 3.79; 4.760; 6.104). I have taken the first eight books of the *Metamorphoses* as my sample.

[20] G.N. Sandy, 'The imagery of Catullus 63', *TAPhA* 99 (1968), 389–99, at 392–3.

[21] Cf. Plin. *HN* 8.76; Stat. *Theb.* 6.120–1, 6.667, 10.263; Valerius Flaccus 7.591; Apul. *Flor.* 17.

This passage is a *locus conclamatus*. The transmitted text gives a hemistich that lacks anaclasis, which is agreed not to be possible in Catullus' handling of this metre.[22] In poetry *earum* is avoided except in Lucretius and Horace's *Sermones*,[23] and is far too weak to balance *ferarum*. *omnia* has also been suspected. Nisbet asks 'why should Attis tour all the lairs?'[24] But Postgate disputes this, as it can perhaps be taken as a piece of emotional exaggeration.[25] More recently, Diggle and Nisbet have also cast doubt on *furibunda*.[26] It is not an easy epithet to apply to *latibula*, so it is usually taken to be feminine singular, applying to Attis, but the word order makes this awkward. As for the conjectures, the only unobjectionable suggestion is Heyworth's *ut* for *et*,[27] as the temptation to restore anaphora is difficult to resist when it is so frequent, especially in lines 20–5 and 62–72.

Trappes-Lomax cuts the Gordian knot by deleting the line,[28] but this is not very attractive, as these two lines are closely complimented by another pair in lines 70–1,[29] and deleting line 54 will upset this structural balance. The fact that a line is repetitive often argues in favour of interpolation, but repetition of all kinds is such a pervasive device in this poem[30] that it argues just as much in favour of authenticity.

The most frequent type of conjecture in recent discussions has been to look for a genitive plural behind *earum* to describe *latibula* in some way and balance *ferarum*. The combination *Phrygiae … Idae* in the corresponding passage at lines 70–1 supports this. Diggle's *erae leonum* introduces Cybele's lions too early, and gives an awkward double-genitive construction. Heyworth's *aprorum opaca*[31] is better in some ways, but it is unlike Catullus to balance a general word for beast with a specific species. He groups together terms more similar in meaning than *ferarum* and *aprorum*, such as *domum Cybebes* and *nemora deae* in line 20, *mei creatrix* and *mea genetrix* in line 50, and *Idae* and *Phrygiae* in lines 70–1. Mueller's *opaca* is attractive in sense, as the cold is then complemented by the dark, but palaeographically it is rather unlikely. A more general word for 'beast' would be more convincing, but none has yet been suggested.

More approaches need to be tested, so I will offer some here in the hope that it will stimulate fresh debate. The first way is to reassign the dens to inhabitants other than animals, and the best alternative is the Maenads.[32] The only suggestion with any palaeographic plausibility that I can offer is *ut Maenadum animo*[33] *adirem*. There are

---

[22] This variation is not to be found in Terentianus Maurus' analysis (second century C.E., lines 2885–900). His analysis holds good except that the opening pyrrhic in the second hemistich may be contracted (lines 18, 22, 34, 73, 83, 86).

[23] B. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Lund, 1945), 70–3.

[24] R.G.M. Nisbet, 'Notes on the text of Catullus', *PCPhS* 204 (1978), 92–115, at 100.

[25] J.P. Postgate, 'Addendum to Catulliana', *JPh* 18 (1889), 145–9, at 145.

[26] Diggle (n. 1), 100–2; Nisbet (n. 24), 100.

[27] Harrison and Heyworth (n. 1), 104.

[28] J.M. Trappes-Lomax, 'Seven suggestions in Catullus', *Mnemosyne* 55 (2002), 73–82, at 76.

[29] Especially so if my analysis of the speech's structure in the next note is accepted.

[30] The most in-depth analysis of the repetition is C. Kroon, 'The effect of the echo. A text linguistic approach to Catullus carmen 63', in R.R. Nauta and A. Harder (edd.), *Catullus' Poem on Attis: Texts and Contexts* (Leiden, 2005), 121–42.

[31] Harrison and Heyworth (n. 1), 104.

[32] Others would be fish (impossible), birds (Catullus shows no interest in birdlife in this poem) or Cybele (the genitive on its own would be rather vague).

[33] *animo* is not the only way to will the metre (e.g. *ipsa*), but is the least otiose. See my note on line 5 for the pleonastic *animo* (here ablative rather than genitive, for which cf. 64.70 and 63.85, where however the early conjecture *animum* is preferable).

two potential paths of error. *Saut du même au même* may have produced the arrant nonsense *ut m[a]en adirem, omīa* would have been a reasonable guess for *maen* in Gothic script, where *e* and *o* are often confused, and *earum* would be a metrical filler. Otherwise, *m[a]enadum*, although it was only lightly corrupt in line 23 and transmitted correctly in line 69, may have been corrupted to *earum* because of its unfamiliarity,[34] and *animo* is simply an anagram of *omnia*. *animo* has the considerable advantage of easing the difficulty of *furibunda*. The idea of line 53 is inspired by epigrams in which a Gallus shelters in a cave and meets a lion ([Simon.] *Anth. Pal.* 6.217 = 918–27 *FGE* = [116] Sider; Antipater of Sidon 6.219 = 608–31 *HE*; Dioscorides 6.220 = 1539–54). This would be a novel development of that idea.[35]

The second option is a word that can complement *ferarum* without combining the general with the specific as all previous efforts have done. My best effort is *beluarum*, in which *furibunda* can again be taken as a transferred epithet. The combination is attested elsewhere in prose and verse,[36] so the sense is not objectionable, but it may be felt that there is not enough distinction in meaning to justify the repetitiveness. The corruption is explicable but involves several stages, so it will not convince everyone. *beluarum* would have been corrupted to *ueluarum* by betacism (for which we can compare *uerum uera* for *uerbera* in line 81) and rationalized as *uel earum*. *uel* would then be deleted as nonsensical and *omnia* interpolated to fill the metre.

The third approach is to use a different kind of genitive altogether, one that defines where the *latibula* are rather than whose they are. This is attested with *latibulum*, but not in elevated verse.[37] As an example I suggest *ut nemorum opaca adirem*. In epigrams by Alcaeus of Messene and Antistius, a Gallus meets a lion in the woods rather than in a cave (*Anth. Pal.* 6.218 = 134–43 *HE*, 6.237 = 1101–8 *GP*), which could have inspired the variation. However, this does not alleviate the awkwardness of *furibunda*, and the repetition of *nemorum* after *nemora* two lines above has no point. This option seems the least attractive.

One last option is to supply more epithets to complement *furibunda*, which would then relieve some of its awkwardness, though on the other hand a transferred epithet would do this more effectively. An example along these lines is *et ut animam agens adirem*,[38] which would repeat the epithets in line 31. *animam* for *omnia* (*omīa* for *anīā*) and the loss of *ut* after *et* would be simple errors, less so the omission of *agens* before *adirem* and interpolation of *earum*. A point against this is that it leaves *latibula* isolated, which also applies to *ut beluarum adirem*, but perhaps it may be taken as gloss on *stabula*, which is first attested here for the dens of non-domesticated animals.

Of all these options I have a slight preference for *ut Maenadum animo adirem*, but these are intended as diagnostic conjectures only.

---

[34] There are a few examples of Greek words deeply corrupted to Latin in Catullus: *celerum* for *Chalybon* at 66.48 (see Thomson [n. 2], 455–6 for the archetypal readings), *ereptum* for *Erectheum* at 64.211 and *freti* for *Erecthei* at 64.229.

[35] The θαλάμευμα Κουρήτων ('lairs of the Corybantes') in Eur. *Bacch.* 120–1 might also be relevant.

[36] e.g. Pacuvius, *Periboea* fr. 22 *TRF*; Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.109, *Luc.* 108; Sen. *Thy.* 1033.

[37] e.g. Cic. *Flac.* 31; Phaedrus 1.30.9; Apul. *Met.* 8.29.

[38] *et ut* was first proposed by J.C. Scaliger, *Castigationes in Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium* (Paris, 1577), 58.

63.61–2

>   miser a miser, querendum est etiam atque etiam, anime.
>   quod enim genus figurae est, ego non quod obierim?

61 ha *O*: ah *GR*   queri dum *G*, corr. *G¹*   aīe *G*, anime *G²*   62 figurae est *Ald.*, figuraest
Lachmann (figurest *iam ed. Rom.*): figura est *V*   quod obierim *Statius*: quid abierim *V*

>   Ah, my wretched, wretched mind, you must complain again and again:
>   what kind of appearance is there that I haven't passed into?

I start with an analysis of the structure of Attis' speech. As far as I know, it has so far been treated as a single unit,[39] but it should be divided into two halves with a new paragraph starting at line 61.

The change in addressee from the *patria* in line 50 to the *animus* is significant: it marks the difference between addressing the public consequences of his self-imposed exile and the private ones. The two halves broadly run in parallel. First is the apostrophe (49–51a, 61), then a series of anaphoric rhetorical questions focussing on Attis' present situation (51b–5, 62). This is followed by a statement that expands on the rhetorical questions (56–7, 63–7),[40] though in different ways. The fourth element is another set of anaphoric rhetorical questions that speculate on what the future will hold (58–60, 68–72), in both cases dwelling on how Attis can live on Ida. The speech is then rounded off with a short conclusion (173), though the apostrophe to the *animus* contains a similar statement (*querendum est etiam atque etiam*, 61).

The first half focusses on Attis' self-imposed exile, the second on his changed social status. Attis' epithets for the *patria*—*creatrix* and *genetrix*—are pregnant, as they evoke the debt of *pietas* that Attis owes to it, even though he has abandoned it. If we compare a fragment of Varro's *Menippean Satires*, he seems to have even violated it (fr. 236 Cèbe = 235 Astbury):

siqui patriam, id est maiorem parentem, extinguit, in eo est culpa; quod facit pro sua parte is qui se eunuchat aut alioqui liberos <non> producit.

If anyone destroys their fatherland, that is his greater father, he is at fault, and this is what he does for his part if he makes himself a eunuch or in some way does not produce children.

This retrospectively transforms Attis' migration into betrayal. He becomes like a runaway slave, the lowest of the low (51–2), and he will now always be without any of the benefits of having a *patria* (59–60). The second half expands on the material losses of his desertion and the soliloquy becomes much more introspective, as Attis dwells on the status he had in his *patria* (lines 64–6) and what it must become now (68–9).

As for textual matters, in line 62 the manuscript reading *non quid abierim* is impossible. *quid* is nonsensical, and it requires *ab* with *abierim*. *obierim* has stood in most modern editions with the sole exceptions of Baehrens, who tries to defend *abierim*,[41] and

---

[39] D.A. Traill, 'Catullus 63: rings around the sun', *CPh* 76 (1981), 211–14.
[40] I agree with Trappes-Lomax's deletion of line 67 ([n. 1], 167), but that does not affect the structure.
[41] E. Baehrens, *Catulli Veronensis liber, volumen I* (Leipzig, 1876), 351–2.

Palmer,[42] who reads *habuerim*. This goes back to Statius, who read *habu[e]rim* in one of his manuscripts.[43] The best way to understand *obierim* is as 'accept' or 'undertake' (*OLD* s.v. 5), though there is no parallel for its application to physical states, only to something more abstract. The strangeness of *obierim* is apparent from Thomson's gloss, who translates *obierim* more literally as 'passed into <on my way>'.[44]

habuerim must be revived. At the very least it belongs in the apparatus criticus. Palaeographically it is at least as easy as *obierim*, especially after the repeated *abero* (lines 59–60), as it involves little more than the loss of an aspirate.[45] It is also much easier in sense. Unlike *obierim* it is regularly used for physical features (*OLD* s.v. 3), for example *habent figuram litterae V* ('they have the shape of the letter V', Varro, *Ling.* 5.117), so its usage here is unremarkable.

<div align="center">63.63–4</div>

<div align="center">
ego puber, ego adolescens, ego ephebus, ego puer,
ego gymnasi fui flos, ego eram decus olei
</div>

63 puber *Scaliger*: muliēs *O*, mulier *GR*   64 gymnasi *γ*, -sei *Voss. 76*, gimnasii *β*: gimnasti *V*   fui *O*, sui *GR*: suus *Nisbet*   oley *V*

<div align="center">
I was a young man, I a youth, I an ephebe, I a boy,
I was the flower of the gymnasium; I was the glory of the oil.
</div>

mulier is dubious grammatically because it requires an ellipsis of *sum* as well as of *fui*.[46] It is also implausible psychologically. In these lines Attis shows a deep regret for his lost youth, whereas in lines 68–9 the tone is one of self-loathing for his present lack of manliness. Here *mulier* weakens this contrast. I prefer Rossberg's *iuuenis*,[47] but recently Thomson and Goold[48] have printed Scaliger's *puber*.

The purpose of this note is to improve on Scaliger's conjecture, even though I reject it. *puber* gives the right sense but is of doubtful Latinity. In surviving literature and in inscriptions only the form *pūbēs*, which does not scan here, is securely attested. According to Priscian (*CGL* 2.249), Caesar's *De analogia*, which is contemporary with this poem, advocated *pūbis pūberis*. Other grammarians attest to the form *pūber* (for example *CGL* 5.418.10; Serv. *Aen.* 5.546), but they are much later in date and quote no examples. This was probably formed by levelling, and the lack of quoted parallels may indicate that it was a spoken form. It is uncertain whether Caesar supported *pūbis pūberis* by analogy or usage,[49] but perhaps the former is more likely, as '*Cerēs Cereris*

---

[42] Palmer (n. 13), xl.

[43] A. Statius, *Catullus cum commentario Achillis Statii Lusitani* (Venice, 1566), 229.

[44] Thomson (n. 2), 382.

[45] For an early example of this, see *Alcestis Barcinonensis* 41, preserved in a late fourth-century half-uncial codex.

[46] Baehrens (n. 41), 352.

[47] K. Rossberg, 'Zu Catullus', *NJPhP* 113 (1876), 549–50, at 549.

[48] G.P. Goold, *Catullus* (London, 1983).

[49] A. Willi, 'Campaigning for *utilitas*: style, grammar and philosophy in C. Iulius Caesar', in E. Dickey and A. Chahoud (edd.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (Cambridge, 2010), 229–42, at 232–4.

is the only parallel for a nominative *pūbēs*'[50]. Against this are *cinis cineris*, *puluis pulueris* and so on. Garcea also cites an apparently unique form *pūbs* (Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 31), but this is long by position before *-que*. It is possible that others used *pūbis pūberis* but that it has been eliminated from the manuscript record by normalization. Whatever the case, the evidence indicates that *pūbis* is more likely to be a Republican form than *puber*, and should therefore be preferred to Scaliger's original conjecture.

The tense variation of *fui* and *eram* has been suspected by Baehrens, Nisbet and Heyworth[51] because of the lack of parallels for such a variation that disregards potential differences in nuance. Heyworth's otherwise neat solution of *eram gyminasii flos* must be rejected because the genitive form *-ii* is not attested until the Augustan period. Thomson[52] says that *fui* carries over from the previous line, but the parallelism between the two phrases in line 64 is too close for such an explanation. In this case it is essential that any parallel should involve the same verb. I offer the following: *Arcesilas tuus, etsi fuit in disserendo pertinacior, tamen noster fuit; erat enim Polemonis* ('Your friend Arcesilaus, although he was rather too obstinate in discussion, was still one of ours, for he was one of Polemon's', Cic. *Fin.* 5.94), *uictor erat quamuis, aequus in hoste fuit* ('although he [Minos] was victorious, he was fair to the enemy', Prop. 3.19.28), and *parua mea sine matre fui; pater arma ferebat; | et duo cum uiuant, orba duobus eram* ('As a small child I was without my mother; my father was under arms, and though the two lived, I was bereft of the two', Ov. *Her.* 8.89–90). The latter two cases are due to metrical constraint,[53] the first to avoid excessively repeating *fuit*.

63.68–9

ego nunc deum ministra et Cybeles famula ferar?
ego Maenas, ego mei pars, ego uir sterilis ero?

68 nunc *Santen*: nec *V*   decum *G*, corr. (c *eras.*) *G¹(G²?)*   ministtra *O*   cibellos *O*, cibeles
GR   ferar (*γ*): ferarum *V*   69 pās *G*, pars *G²*

Will I now be called a servant of the Goddess and a slave of Cybele?
Will I now be a Maenad, I a part of myself, I a sterile man?

Diggle[54] has doubted *uir*, since Attis is no longer a man (*euirastis*, 17). He could adduce no parallels for the phrase *uir sterilis*, and the fact that Attis describes himself with feminine forms (54, 58, 68; *Maenas*, 69) shows that he does not consider himself a man anymore. But surely the oxymoron is pointed here, and the tone is bitterly ironic. Diggle's solution is *ui*, and he intends *ui sterilis* to mean 'deprived of sexual potency', but this idea has already been conveyed by *mei pars*, and the meaning he ascribes to the singular *ui* properly belongs to the plural (*OLD* s.v. *uis* B20). The singular could be

[50] A. Garcea, *Caesar's De Analogia: Edition, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford, 2012), 213.
[51] Baehrens (n. 41), 352; Nisbett (n. 24), 100; Harrison and Heyworth (n. 1), 105.
[52] Thomson (n. 2), 383.
[53] In the case of Propertius it would conform more with normal usage if the tenses were reversed, as victory is a single action (perfect tense), and administering justice is a continuous process (imperfect).
[54] Diggle (n. 1), 102.

justified if *procreandi* were understood in ellipsis (*OLD* s.v. *uis* A16), but this usage belongs to philosophical discourse.

There is, in fact, an excellent parallel for *uir sterilis* in Mart. 3.91.5 *hoc steriles sensere uiri* ('when the sterile men sensed this'), which also describes the Galli. As these are the only two places where *sterilis* occurs with *uiri* attributively, Martial has likely taken the phrase from Catullus.

63.74–7

        roseis ut hinc labellis sonitus <citus> abiit,
geminas deorum ad aures noua nuntia referens,   75
ibi iuncta iuga resoluens Cybele leonibus
saeuumque pecoris hostem stimulans ita loquitur.

74 hinc] huic *θ*   citus *add. Bentley*   abiit (*θ*): adiit *V*   75 adauris *O*   76 ibi *ζ*: ubi *V*   cibelle *O*, cibele *GR*   77 saeuumque *Caes.*, *Puccius*, *Ashb. 973* (*primo*, *ut uidetur*): leuumque *V* (lenumque *O*)   pecoris (*η*): pectoris *V*   stimulans *O¹* (-im- *in rasura*), sintmulans *G* (n *priorem exp. G¹, corr. G²*)

        When the quick sound issued here from her rosy lips,
bringing unheard-of news to the twin ears of the gods,
then Cybele, undoing the yoke joined to her lions
and goading the savage enemy of the flock spoke thus.

It is difficult to say what the point of *laeuum* (*lenum* O) is, and there has not been much analysis as to what it might mean. The transmitted text is usually accepted, but here Thomson is a notable exception. Since Cybele is addressing one of a number of lions, Catullus may have wanted some specification of which lion Cybele is addressing. The only possible defence for the paradosis I can conceive of is that Catullus imagines that there are two lions, the mythological figures of Atalanta and Hippomenes (Ov. *Met.* 10.703–4). Ovid's account is the only one which mentions Cybele, but he may have drawn from a lost Hellenistic source, since *aitia* and narratives about localized deities are typically Hellenistic interests. Catullus may be referring to Atalanta because of her speed, but this would be cryptic, and I can see no reason why *laeuum* should denote Atalanta as opposed to Hippomenes, unless this were clarified by the putative Hellenistic source. This is so far the best defence for the text, but it is still far too weak for me to take seriously, and one does not need to be a radical critic to accept Puccius's *saeuum*, a standard epithet well attested with *hostis*. Manuscripts often oscillate between *laeuus* and *saeuus* (*TLL* 7.2.890.64–5), so the error is trivial.

63.78–80

        'agedum', inquit, 'age ferox <i>, fac ut hunc furor <agitet>,
fac uti furoris ictu reditum in nemora ferat,
mea libere nimis qui fugere imperia cupit.   80

78 age dum *V*   inquid *OR* (*corr. R²*)   i *add. Scaliger*   face *ed. Rom.* (*idem* 79, 82) agitet *add. ed. Cantabrig. anni 1702*   79 uti *Lachmann*, ut hunc *ζη*: ut *V*   ictu *α*: ictum *V*

> 'Come on', she said, 'Come wild beast, <go>, make her madness <spur>
>   him <on>,
> make him return to the groves from the maddening shock,
> he who wants to flee my power with excessive freedom.

This is a passage that has not been treated in much depth, as Butterfield has said.[55] Indeed, the vulgate text has remained the same for 300 years. However, there is a problem with the Latinity of *agedum age <i> fac*. For *age* I will defend D'Orvill's *<i>*.[56] The variation in hortatory or jussive particles like *agedum age* is unparalleled. The normal idiom can extend an imperative to a maximum of one particle and two paratactic imperatives (the first always either *age* or *i*), and either the particle or the first imperative can be geminated. The closest parallel to the vulgate text is *age age, i puere, duc me ad patrios fines* ('Come on, come on, boy, go and lead me to the country's borders', Caecilius, fr. 100 Ribbeck), where the particle is geminated, but that is not a parallel for the variation *agedum age*. The only way to make the vulgate resemble idiomatic Latin is to print a strong sense pause before *i*, but *age*, even if one accepts that *agedum age* is possible, is meaningless as a main verb without an object, and the pause in this position is not seen elsewhere in this poem. If Bancks and Annesley's *<agitet>* is right, one may argue that the consonance may be deliberate, but it is still an unparalleled expression and should be treated with great suspicion.

All of this makes emendation of *age* necessary to restore good Latin. D'Orvill's *agedum inquit i* is far more idiomatic, and the loss is easy to account for palaeographically. After the long succession of minims in *inquit* the loss of another minim would be simple, and *age* is an inept supplement drawn from *agedum* or *age*.

After *ferox* the transmitted text is a syllable short. Scaliger's *<i>* has stood without challenge in all modern editions, and the gemination of the imperative is attested in poems of a high style.[57] It is more pointed than doubling the hortative particle, as the lion encourages itself (line 85), whereas Cybele (*caede*, 81; *quate*, 83) and the narrator focus on motion (*uadit, fremit, refringit uirgulta pede uago*, 86), which the geminated *i* would develop. Finally, the gemination of *i* is stylistically supported by the gemination of *fac*, so the vulgate reading here is more than adequate.

ferox is usually printed without commas, so it could be taken as adverbial or as a vocative. In line 83 it must be vocative: Cybele does not need to tell her lions how to shake their manes, as it is an intrinsically threatening gesture. In this line I take it in the same sense, so commas would be appropriate in both lines to make this clear. If we take *ferox* as semantically identical in both lines, this would be complemented by *i … i* and *fac ut … fac ut*.

The end of line 78 is also defective, probably owing to its unusual length.[58] Butterfield's *<acuat>* is more pointed than the vulgate *agitet*. His note is brief, and since *<agitet>* has won such unquestioning support it will do no harm to reinforce his arguments. His conjecture produces the correct meaning (*OLD* s.v. 4) whilst adding

---

[55] Butterfield (n. 1), 541.

[56] *apud* L. Santen, *Terentianus Maurus de litteris syllabis pedibus et metris, e recensione et cum notis Laurentii Santenii: opus Santenii morte interruptum absoluit David Iacobus van Lennep* (Utrecht, 1825), 379.

[57] J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion* (Oxford, 1996), 91–3.

[58] This omission also occurs at 8.8 and 112.1.

to the animal imagery seen elsewhere in the poem.[59] Attis is compared to an animal in line 33 and he quite possibly compares himself to wild animals in line 72.[60] The consonance with *fac ut … ictu* is also appealing, more so than the consonance with *agedum* produced by *agitet*, it is entirely in this poem's style, and it would imply an etymological link between *acuo* and *icio*. This is a device Catullus uses elsewhere, for instance in 64.156, where *Scylla rapax* suggests σκύλαξ. *agitet*, which has stood since Lachmann, is not as choice, but it is used with a similar meaning in 63.93 and 64.94 *heu miseros agitans* [dub. Markland; *misere exagitans* V] *immiti corde furores* ['alas stirring up wretched madness with his cruel heart']).

There is yet another syllable missing from the transmitted text in the next line. The most commonly printed emendation is Lachmann's *uti*, which is only securely transmitted in Catull. 116.2. That line is unique in having ecthlipsis and being holospondaic, both of which imitate Ennian practice. In that context *uti* suggests itself as another archaizing form. The manuscripts' *fac ut hunc furor <acuat> fac ut furoris* is strong evidence for a more than usually complex figure of repetition that involves gemination of the imperative[61] varied by a change in subject in the subordinate clause, thus producing polyptoton (*furor … furoris*) straight after the imperative (*fac ut*). The polyptoton of *hunc furor … hic furoris* is more elegant than the prosodic variation *ut … uti.* The second option introduces a new variation without a point, whereas the first reinforces an already existing figure, and the repetition of the pronoun draws attention to Attis' exceptional behaviour (for a Gallus) of regretting his castration. If one follows Goold in believing that Cybele should speak of Attis as a female, the beginning of line 79 should read *ut haec*, whereas Goold prints *uti*.

Plymouth   T.A.J. HOCKINGS
                                                       tajhockings@gmail.com

---

[59] I cite only the most pertinent examples of this imagery below. It is pervasive. See Sandy (n. 20) for a full treatment.

[60] K. Kokoszkiewicz, 'C. Valerii Catulli carmina prolegomenis, apparatu critico commentarioque instructa' (Diss., University of Warsaw, 2018), lxxxii proposes *uti … uti* for *ubi … ubi*. The omission of *est* is indeed awkward, though *ut … ut* may be better.

[61] Wills (n. 57), 91–5.