ἡμίσειαν, > (‘a lambda on its side pointing with its legs to the right indicates “drachma,” like so <; pointing to the left, “half drachma”, like so >’).[14]

We begin, then, with one sort of ‘horns’ in λεπτὴ μὲν … λεπτὴ δὲ … and we are told what we are looking for and where to search for a third and fourth form of ‘horns’ through the repeated punning emphasis on κέρας/κεραία. As with most riddles we cannot initially solve, once a solution is revealed, it appears simple and obvious in retrospect. We should be grateful to Hanses for making Aratus’ acrostic puzzle look so simple and obvious that we can see connections we could not before.

University of New Hampshire STEPHEN M. TRZASKOMA
s.trzaskoma@unh.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000446

CATULLUS 64.291: A TEXTUAL NOTE*

Peneus comes to the wedding celebration of Peleus and Thetis (64.288–91) –

> non uacuus: namque ille tulit radicitus altas
> fagos ac recto proceras stipite laurus,
> non sine nutanti platano lentaque sorore
> flammati Phaethontis et aeria cupressu.

To judge by the nearly universal silence of modern editions and commentaries, the transmitted text of 64.291 has never come under suspicion. Apparently the only exception is the new online repertory of conjectures, which registers two suggestions: *aerias cupressus* by Ramler and *aeria cyparisso* ascribed to Fea.[1] The rationale behind Ramler’s change is obvious, but does not persuade: the return to the initial direct-object construction, after the lengthy *non sine* phrase, seems unmotivated and abrupt. What reasons are there for writing *cyparisso*? Fea gives none[2]—but he was not the first to endorse this reading. His source was evidently Vulpius’ commentary: ‘Aliis placet legere *aeria cyparisso*. Vox Graeca pro Latina. cupressus enim Graecis κυπάρισσος.’[3] The year after Fea’s publication, *cyparisso* is printed in the bilingual edition by Ginguené, who explains his decision thus: ‘Je n’ai trouvé cette leçon, au lieu de *cupressu*, que dans l’édition d’Alexandre Guarino. Je l’ai cependant suivie comme plus élégante et

[14] In the same work (fr. 52 Hultsch) compare ταῖς τοῦ Κ δύο κεραίαις, referring to the two diagonal strokes of the letter kappa (and, in the same passage, the reference to τὴν κάτω κεραίαν of the same letter).

* I should like to thank *CQ*’s anonymous reviewer and *CQ*’s editor for their comments and suggestions.

[1] D. Kiss, *Catullus Online* (http://www.catullusonline.org/CatullusOnline/index.php), last checked on 24 April 2015.

[2] C. Fea, *Quincti Horatii Flacci opera … tomus primus* (Rome, 1811), XI–XIV n. Q, at XIV.

[3] J.A. Vulpius, *C. Valerius Catullus Veronensis et in eum … novus commentarius locupletissimus* (Padua, 1737), 313. Fea’s familiarity with Vulpius’ commentary can be inferred from his use of Vulpius’ readings as a point of comparison for his own.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000513 Published online by Cambridge University Press

plus harmonieuse.'[4] Guarinus, whose edition appears to be the first to propose *cyparisso*, provides no argument at all; he quotes Virgil, *Aen*. 3.680 *aeriae quercus aut coniferae cyparissi*, but only to demonstrate that as a common noun *cyparissus* is feminine.[5] It may be interesting to note in passing that *cyparisso* was also adopted by La Cerda in his commentary on the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*, though again with no explicit justification.[6] The only specific objection against *cupressu* is reported by Pinder: Catullus 64.291 is 'one of the only passages in Latin poetry where the first syllable of *cupressus* is lengthened; hence some would alter into *cyparisso*'.[7]

This objection is hardly decisive, but the lengthening of the first syllable in *cupressu* may indeed be anomalous, even if not in the way meant by Pinder. As is well known, facultative prosodic lengthening before mute and liquid was not practised in Latin poetry from the very beginning. Completely avoided in early drama, it was first introduced under Greek influence by Ennius in the *Annals* (but not in the plays), where it was restricted to Greek words and words that otherwise could not fit the metre; only later it began being commonly used in Latin words even without metrical necessity.[8] Evidently, scansion with lengthening was somewhat artificial—though likely to varying degrees in different periods. It is therefore tempting to speculate that such an artificially lengthened syllable may not have felt 'solid' enough for a fifth-foot spondee. Naturally, this hypothesis cannot be tested in any direct way, but it seems significant that there are no other cases of such a line-ending produced by a Latin word.[9] The only parallel for a fifth-foot spondee produced by a trisyllabic word with its first syllable lengthened by mute and liquid involves a Greek proper name (Ov. *Fast.* 5.83): *hinc sata Pleione cum caelifero Atlante*.[10] In contrast to Latin, in Greek prosodic lengthening before mute and liquid is quite normal.[11] It appears likely that *Atlante* retained, to an extent, its Greek pronunciation and as a consequence the lengthening of its first syllable felt

[4] M.P.L. Ginguené, *Les noces de Thétis et de Pélée, poème de Catulle* (Paris, 1812), 194.

[5] A. Guarinus, *In C.V. Catullum Veronensem per Baptistam patrem emendatum expositiones* (Venice, 1521), LXXVII(r).

[6] I.L. de la Cerda, *P. Virgilii Maronis Bucolica et Georgica* (Lyon, 1619[2]), 184.

[7] N. Pinder, *Selections from the Less Known Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1869), 23. Cf. C.J. Fordyce, *Catullus* (Oxford, 1961), 313: 'the lengthening of the first syllable in this word is found only here: cf. 151 *sūpremo*', and similarly W. Kroll, *C. Valerius Catullus* (Leipzig, 1923), 182.

[8] Cf. recently R. Sen, 'Vowel-weakening before *muta cum liquidā* sequences in Latin: a problem of syllabification?', *Oxford Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology & Phonetics* 11 (2006), 143–61, at 147.

[9] As has been observed by R.I. Sbĭera, *Die prosodischen Functionen inlautender muta cum liquida bei Vergil* (Chernowitz, 1898), 38, in Virgil words with prosodic scheme ⏑́ – × are invariably interpreted as ⏑̆ – × at hexameter end (and this holds true for other authors, with the only exception of *Atlante* at Ov. *Fast*. 5.83). Sbĭera assumed that Virgil's practice was solely motivated by the avoidance of spondaic endings, but there are sufficient examples of a fifth-foot spondee produced by trisyllabic Latin words both in Virgil (*Ecl*. 7.53 *hirsutae; G*. 3.276 *conuallis; Aen*. 7.634 *argento*, 12.863 *desertis*) and in other poets (most relevantly, Catullus: 64.44 *argento*, 96 *frondosum*, 297 *praeruptis*, 65.23 *decursu*). Of course, since the overall number of spondaic hexameter-endings in Latin poetry, especially those produced by trisyllabic words, is not high, the lack of parallels for *cupressu* producing a fifth-foot spondee (i.e. ⏑́ – × interpreted as – – × at hexameter end) may be due to chance.

[10] A fifth-foot spondee can also be produced by quadrisyllabic Greek words with prosodic lengthening before mute and liquid, e.g. Catull. 64.11 *Amphitriten* (ultimately modelled on *Od*. 3.91 Ἀμφιτρίτης, etc.), *Ciris* 239 *Adrastea* (cf. Callim. *Hymn* 2 47 Ἀδρήστεια), and of course Ov. *Fast*. 3.105 *Atlanteas* (no Greek precedent survives). But, again, there are no comparable examples with Latin words.

[11] In particular, it can be noted that in Homer (*Od*. 1.52, 7.245) and Hesiod (*Th*. 509, 517) forms of Ἄτλας invariably have a long first syllable. And so in Virgil (note especially *Aen*. 6.796 *caelifer Atlas*), whereas in Ovid the first syllable can also be short.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000513 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more natural.[12] Moreover, the line's irregular metrical and prosodic pattern (note also the 'Greek' hiatus) is clearly intended to illustrate with its unsteady rhythm the content: Atlas balancing the entire universe on his shoulders. It might perhaps be argued that a similar effect is not out of place at Catull. 64.291,[13] but the fact remains that for Latin words prosodic lengthening in this metrical position is unparalleled.[14]

What, on the other hand, can be said for *cyparisso*? To begin with, it is a Greek word: Catullus' neoteric preoccupation with Grecisms requires no demonstration.[15] Quite a few Greek words appear to have been used by Catullus for the first time in Latin poetry[16]—Catullus would be the first to use *cyparissus* too. Although it is true that many Grecisms first attested in Catullus are colloquialisms or technical terms (such as 12.13 *mnemosynum*, 22.5 *palimpsestum*, 25.7 *catagraphus*, 68.2 *epistolium*), some clearly belong to the elevated poetic register. A good example is *thalamus* (61.185, 66.17, 68.104), which in one context (68.103–4 *ne Paris abducta gauisus libera moecha | otia pacato degeret in thalamo*) is pointedly used to allude to Homer's account of 'the meeting of Helen with Paris in the θαλάμῳ καὶ δινωτοῖσι λέχεσσι of the latter' (*Il.* 3.391).[17] A special attraction for Catullus would be the fact that κυπάρισσος is a Homeric hapax (*Od.* 5.64), that is, it belongs to a category of words that evoked much interest among both Hellenistic scholars and poets.[18] In Latin poetry such rare and marked Greek words were especially handy when employed as a 'figure of allusion' directing the reader to a Greek intertext.[19] For instance, *calathiscus*, otherwise unattested in Latin poetry, is used by Catullus to signal an allusion to an epigram by Antipater of Sidon (Catull. 64.319 *uellera uirgati custodibant calathisci*, *Anth. Pal.* 6.160.5–6 καὶ πήνας καὶ τόνδε φιληλάκατον καλαθίσκον, | στάμονος ἀσκητοῦ καὶ

[12] The pronunciation of Greek words, especially proper names, in Latin is a complex topic: cf. recently F.J. Barnett, 'The second Appendix to Probus', *CQ* 56 (2006), 257–78, at 268–71. The important point is that Greek words could sometimes retain not only morphological (declension) but also phonological features (such as accentuation and presumably syllabification) alien to Latin. Of particular interest is an anecdote told by Quintilian concerning two different pronunciations of a Greek name, aptly discussed by J.N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003), 108: 'It may be deduced from Quint. 12.10.57 that names of Greek origin might sometimes be pronounced with Greek prosody even if Latinised morphologically: the name *Amphionem* pronounced in the Greek manner (but apparently with a Latin inflection) had to be repeated in Latinised form (with an unaspirated stop and a short *i*) by the speaker because a "rustic" witness had at first not understood.' Ovid's *Atlante* is presumably a parallel case: it is in the ablative (a case not available in Greek), but retains its Greek syllabification and possibly accent.

[13] Note the fifth-foot spondee, though of a more regular type, in the parallel passage 64.108 *radicitus exturbata* (both contexts speak of trees being uprooted; *radicitus* is repeated at 64.288).

[14] Despite its apparent Greek origin that would be obvious to any educated speaker of Latin, the word *cupressus* was firmly rooted in the Latin phonological and morphological systems (it can regularly take forms of the fourth declension), and had long been established in Latin poetry (note Enn. *Ann*. 223 *longique cupressi*, 511 *rectosque cupressos*, both at hexameter end). Moreover, its Greek counterpart κυπάρισσος has no prosodic lengthening effected by mute and liquid which could serve as a model.

[15] See especially T. Oksala, 'Zum Gebrauch der griechischen Lehnwörter bei Catull', *Arctos* 16 (1982), 99–119. Cf. also G.A. Sheets, 'Elements of style in Catullus', in M.B. Skinner (ed.), *A Companion to Catullus* (Malden, MA, 2007), 190–211, at 197–8.

[16] Oksala (n. 15), 100–4 has a list of Greek words used by Catullus with an indication of their first occurrence in Latin.

[17] R. Ellis, *A Commentary on Catullus* (Oxford, 1889^2), 420.

[18] See e.g. P. Kyriakou, *Homeric Hapax Legomena in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius: A Literary Study* (Stuttgart, 1995).

[19] For the concept in general, see J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion* (Oxford, 1996), and specifically 22, on the use of Homeric *hapax legomena* in Latin poetry.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000513 Published online by Cambridge University Press

τολύπας φύλακα).[20] Similarly, it has long been noted that Catullus 64.290–1 lists 'the same combination of poplar, plane and cypress' as Theocritus 22.41 λεῦκαί τε πλάτανοί τε καὶ ἀκρόκομοι κυπάρισσοι.[21] The allusion would be even more pointed if, in addition to *platanus* matching Theocritus' πλάτανος,[22] Catullus used the Greek form *cyparissus* to render κυπάρισσος.[23] After Catullus, we can see Virgil doing precisely that in the *Georgics*: the only context featuring *cyparissus* (*Idaeis cyparissis*, 2.84) imitates, or rather borrows, nearly half a line from Nicander's *Theriaca* (Ἰδαίης κυπαρίσσου, 585).[24] The only occurrence of *cyparissus* in the *Aeneid* (*aeriae quercus aut coniferae cyparissi*, 3.680)—evidently a hint at the word's being a Homeric hapax[25]—does not seem to have a specific Greek model. Instead, it closely engages with Catullus: while taking one noun and one adjective from 64.291 *aeria cupressu* (*cyparisso*), it derives the other pair from the parallel context, 106 *quercum aut conigeram* (*coniferam*).[26] Although Virgil's allusion can admittedly be interpreted as a 'correction' of Catullus (saying, as it were, that he should have used the Greek form), it seems more natural to take it as an indication that *cyparisso* is what Virgil read in his text of Catullus.

This brings us to our final consideration: the likelihood of the corruption of *cyparisso* to *cupressu* in a textual tradition like Catullus' is so high that the transmitted reading can have little advantage over the conjecture.[27] Thus, while neither the shortcomings of

[20] The parallel is noted e.g. in Kroll (n. 7), 185. The only other occurrence of *calathiscus* in Latin is at Petr. 41.6. In Greek καλαθίσκος is more frequent, but has only one other context in dactylic poetry, at Theoc. 21.9.

[21] Ellis (n. 17), 328, citing Dousa the younger. Strictly speaking, the Heliades were transformed into black poplars (αἴγειρος: see e.g. Ap. Rhod. *Argon*. 4.604) rather than white poplars (λεύκη), which moreover have a different *aition* of their own. The two species are consistently distinguished in Greek (though a Suda entry identifies αἴγειρος as λεύκη), but in Latin *populus* is used for both, which may partly account for Catullus' substitution of one for the other. A further reason may be that thus Catullus comes closer to Theocritus' Homeric model, *Od*. 5.64 κλήθρη τ' αἴγειρός τε καὶ εὐώδης κυπάρισσος, on which see A. Sens, *Theocritus: Dioscuri (Idyll 22)* (Göttingen, 1997), 109. Note that the first narrative part of Theocritus 22 (27–134) treats an episode from the Argonautic expedition, a topic closely related to Catullus 64.

[22] It may be interesting to note that the standard epic form since Homer is πλατάνιστος, while πλάτανος is largely avoided in narrative hexameters. The present context is the only one in Theocritus to use the latter form, whereas the former is attested four times (18.44, 18.46, 22.76, 25.20).

[23] Note also that, especially after the periphrastic reference to the poplar-tree as *sorore flammati Phaethontis*, the Greek form would more readily recall the *aition* of the cypress-tree.

[24] The parallel is noted e.g. in R.A.B. Mynors, *Virgil Georgics* (Oxford, 1990), 112.

[25] By contrast, there are three contexts of *cupressus* in the *Aeneid* (2.714, 3.64, 6.216); likewise in the *Georgics*, in addition to one occurrence of *cyparissus* (2.84), there are two of *cupressus* (1.20, 2.443). Valerius Flaccus, the only other Latin poet to use the Greek form, has one context of each (1.774, 7.405).

[26] J.M. Trappes-Lomax, *Catullus: A Textual Reappraisal* (Swansea, 2007), 181 seems right to argue for *coniferam*, which is also accepted by G. Trimble, 'A commentary on Catullus 64, lines 1–201' (Diss., Oxford, 2010), 184. Kiss (n. 1) names B. Realinus, *In nuptias Pelei et Thetidis Catullianas commentarius* (Bologna, 1551), 21(r) as the first to propose this reading. But it is already found in I. Parrhasius, *Cl. Claudiani Proserpinae raptus* (Milan, 1505), on 1.205 (no pagination), whom Realinus cites, on another topic, at the same page. Also prior to Realinus's commentary, Basilio Zanchi wrote *coniferam pinum aut pulsantem sydera quercum* in a close imitation of the Catullan context (*Panis et Aegis Solis filiae epithalamion*, in L.P. Zanchus, *Poemata varia* [*s.l., ante* 1540], no pagination).

[27] On the unenviable fate of Greek words in the manuscript tradition of Catullus, cf. Trappes-Lomax (n. 26), 13–14, who even postulates 'a deliberate campaign of Latinization by Greekless scribes who thought Greek forms were simply errors'. Trappes-Lomax's most relevant example is the split of the manuscript tradition between *Serapim* and *Sarapim* at 10.26, which implies

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000513 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cupressu nor the attractions of *cyparisso* may be absolutely compelling, there is simply no positive reason to retain the paradosis other than habit.

University of Leeds BORIS KAYACHEV
boriskayachev@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000513

TWO TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN CICERO'S *PHILOSOPHICA*

(1) deinde ibidem homo acutus, cum illud occurreret, si omnia deorsus e regione ferrentur et, ut dixi, ad lineam, numquam fore ut atomus altera alteram posset attingere †itaque† attulit rem commenticiam: declinare dixit atomum perpaulum …

(*Fin.* 1.19)

The above is Reynolds's text. *itaque* has puzzled editors since Paulus Manutius, there being no preceding main verb to coordinate with *attulit*. Some would posit a lacuna, either before *itaque* (Reid) or after it (Usener). Reynolds cites Simplicius on Aristotle, *Physics* 216a17 (quoted by Reid ad loc.) and Lucretius 2.221-4. But the parallel at *Nat. D.* 1.69 suggests that this is essentially the information Cicero thought appropriate for his argument (and/or found in his doxographical source):

uelut Epicurus cum uideret si atomi ferrentur in locum inferiorem suopte pondere nihil fore in nostra potestate quod esset earum motus certus et necessarius, inuenit quo modo necessitatem effugeret, quod uidelicet Democritum fugerat: ait atomum cum pondere et grauitate directo deorsus feratur declinare paululum.

Vahlen, who cited *Nat. D.* 1.69 in this connection, suggested that our text presents an anacoluthon, Cicero proceeding as if he had written not *deinde ibidem homo acutus, cum illud occurreret* but rather *deinde ibidem homini acuto occurrit*. In this he is followed by Moreschini, who prints the transmitted text with a dash before *itaque*.

that in all likelihood Catullus wrote *Sarapin* (cf. the similar split between *Serapin* and *Sarapin* at Mart. 9.29.6). More generally, A.E. Housman, 'Greek nouns in Latin poetry from Lucretius to Juvenal', *Journal of Philology* 31 (1910), 236–66 provides ample evidence of Greek forms being ousted by Latin ones in the course of transmission. While the majority of Housman's examples concern case endings, the pair *Hecuba – Hecabe* is similar to *cupressus – cyparissus*: as he points out (261), in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Seneca's tragedies and the *Ilias Latina*, the Latin form has systematically replaced the Greek one even when the latter is required by the metre. Housman ([this note], 266) also notes an exception that confirms the rule: at Juv. 7.11 the much rarer Latin word *tripedes* has in most manuscripts given place to the more familiar Greek word *tripodes*. Although in our case the available editions report no variants for forms of *cyparissus* at *G.* 2.84, *Aen*. 3.680 or Val. Fl. 7.405 (the only contexts in classical Latin poetry), such a variation is attested in Vida's *Christiad* at 1.621 *coniferis cyparissis*, where a manuscript predating the first edition, possibly the dedication copy, reads *cupressis* (which, given *Aen.* 3.680 *coniferae cyparissi*, can hardly be the original reading): see J. Hankins, 'Variants of the first redaction', in J. Gardner (ed.), *Marco Girolamo Vida: Christiad* (Cambridge, MA, 2009), 385–90, at 385. Finally, R. Bentley, 'Emendationes Bentleii in Ovidium', *CJ* 19 (1819), 168–77, at 175 may be right in conjecturing *cyparissifero* for *cupressifero* at Ov. *Her*. 9.87 on the basis of *cuperisifero* read by manuscript 598 at Trinity College, Cambridge; if he is right, then also at Ov. *Fast*. 5.87 *cyparissiferae* should be read for *cupressiferae*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000513 Published online by Cambridge University Press