# CATULLUS 66.53 AND VIRGIL, *ECLOGUES* 5.5[1]

ἄρτι [ν]εότμητόν με κόμαι ποθέεσκον ἀδε[λφεαί
καὶ πρόκατε γνωτὸς Μέμνονος Αἰθίοπος
ἵετο κυκλώσας βαλιὰ πτερὰ θῆλυς ἀήτης, 53
ἵππο[ς] ἰοζώνου Λοκρίδος Ἀρσινόης
(Callim. fr. 110.51–4)

abiunctae paulo ante comae mea fata sorores
lugebant, cum se Memnonis Aethiopis
unigena impellens nutantibus aera pennis 53
obtulit Arsinoes Locridos ales equos
(Catull. 66.51–4)

tu maior: tibi me est aequum parere, Menalca,
siue sub incertas Zephyris motantibus umbras 5
siue antro potius succedimus.
(Verg. *Ecl.* 5.4–6)[2]

Modern editors of Catullus all agree on the text of line 53.[3] The manuscripts also agree on the line, the only difference being R transmitting *mutantibus*, while O and G transmit *nutantibus*.[4] Nevertheless, a few scholars have in the past questioned the reading of *nutantibus*. As the lines quoted above illustrate, Catullus generally translates Callimachus' poem closely.[5] But neither of the words suggested in the manuscripts seems wholly to describe the rapid and vigorous movement of Callimachus' κυκλώσας βαλιὰ πτερά, 'having whirled its swift wings'. The reading of *nutantibus* is somewhat supported by Apuleius' *pinnarum nutantium* (*Met*. 6.15.5). But there too the nodding, swaying and wavering sense of *nutare* does not seem to illustrate the hurried

[1] I am very grateful to Professor Stephen Harrison for his generous supervision and helpful suggestions on this piece. I am also grateful to *CQ*'s anonymous referee for several interesting observations, e.g. that Catullus' *nutantibus* might be a nod towards Callimachus' θῆλυς ἀήτης, rather than an incorrectly transmitted translation of the action in Callimachus' κυκλώσας βαλιὰ πτερά, as I suggest in this article.

[2] Editions cited: A. Harder, *Callimachus* Aetia *Volume 1: Introduction, Text, and Translation* (Oxford, 2012); R.A.B. Mynors, *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina* (Oxford, 1958); S. Ottaviano and G.B. Conte, *P. Vergilius Maro: Bucolica; Georgica* (Berlin; Boston, 2011).

[3] N. Marinone, *Berenice da Callimaco a Catullo* (Bologna, 1997), 68; D.F.S. Thomson, *Catullus* (Toronto, 1997), 167; J. Godwin, *Catullus. Poems 61–68* (Warminster, 1995), 82; G. Lafaye, *Catulle. Poésies* (Paris, 1992), 71; G. Lee, *The Poems of Catullus* (Oxford, 1990), 108; W. Eisenhut, *Catulli Veronensis Liber* (Leipzig, 1983), 53; G.P. Goold, *Catullus* (London, 1983), 168; H. Bardon, *Catulli Veronensis Liber* (Stuttgart, 1973), 103; W. Kroll, *C. Valerius Catullus* (Stuttgart, 1959[3]), 207; R.A.B. Mynors, *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina* (Oxford, 1958), 77.

[4] O = Oxoniensis Canonicianus class. lat. 30; G = Parisinus lat. 14137; R = Vaticanus Ottobonianus lat. 1829. The reading of R was soon corrected into *nutantibus* by the first owner of the manuscript, Coluccio Salutati. The hand of Salutati is generally referred to as $R^2$.

[5] For a wider discussion of Catullus' translation of Callimachus' poem, see recently I. Du Quesnay, 'Three problems in poem 66', in I. Du Quesnay and T. Woodman (edd.), *Catullus. Poems, Books, Readers* (Cambridge, 2012), 163–4; P. Bing, *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry* (Ann Arbor, 2009), 66–82; J.H. Gaisser, *Catullus* (Oxford, 2009), 147–50.

CrossMark

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000234 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and rapid action of Jupiter's eagle.[6] Additionally, the wording of the passage is sufficiently disputed to make it possible that *nutantium* is not the correct reading.[7]

Hitherto, scholars questioning the paradosis in Catullus have primarily taken the reading of $OGR^2$ as the basis of their attempts to emend the word. The sixteenth-century philologist and poet Marcus Antonius Muretus, who did not have access to the line in Callimachus' poem,[8] interpreted *Memnonis Aethiopis | unigena* (66.53–4) as Aurora and suggested the reading *natantibus* in connection with Aurora's rising.[9] It is now agreed that the indirect agent of the participle is Zephyrus, the Western Wind, whereby Muretus's conjecture seems to lose its sense.[10] In 1697 Richard Bentley, who did not know the line by Callimachus either, suggested the conjecture *nictantibus*, and offered as parallels Lucretius' *hic ubi nictari nequeunt insistereque alis* (6.836), a line later corrected to *nixari* which is now the accepted reading,[11] and Virgil's *hic primum paribus nitens Cyllenius alis* (*Aen*. 4.252).[12] *nictantibus* was conjectured anew, with due acknowledgement of Bentley's conjecture and with the sense of 'flashing', by J.R.C. Martyn,[13] who offered a further parallel in Lucretius' *semina quae faciunt nictantia fulgura flammae* (6.182).[14]

I think that Bentley and Martyn are right in seeking an intransitive participle. But I am not convinced by their parallels. In Verg. *Aen.* 4.252 *nitens* illustrates that Hermes is borne on his wings, and does not describe any flashing quality nor a swiftness of movement; and in Lucr. 6.182 *nictantia* is not used to describe the wind but the flashes of flame, that is the lightning, which the wind squeezes out of the cloud. I suggest that,

[6] I thank *CQ*'s anonymous referee for the interesting suggestion that *nutare* could be used in Catullus 'for the action of landing, in Apuleius for taking off in haughty disdain; both actions requiring the same sort of hovering action'. However, since the action in Callimachus' κυκλώσας βαλιὰ πτερά seems to be rapid and vigorous rather than hovering, I do think that *nutantibus* is the wrong reading in Catullus. In the case of Apuleius, *CQ*'s referee might indeed be right.

[7] *motantium molibus* would certainly give an attractive alliteration. For *motare* see further down.

[8] Apart from a few ancient testimonia Callimachus' poem was unknown until the publications by G. Vitelli, 'Frammenti della "Chioma di Berenice" di Callimaco in uno papiro della Società Italiana', *SIFC* 7 (1929), 3–12, and E. Lobel, '2258. Callimachus', in E. Lobel, E.P. Wegener and C.H. Roberts (edd.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XX* (London, 1952), 69–107. For a schematic presentation of the transmission of the poem, see P. Hansen and C.G. Tortzen, 'Berenikes plokamos – coma Berenices', *Museum Tusculanum* 20 (1973), 29–54, at 32.

[9] M.A. Muretus, *Catullus, et in eum commentarius* (Venice, 1558), 15: 'Memnonis Aethiopis unigena, id est, Aurora, quæ unum Memnonem ex Tithono genuit, impellente aera natantibus pennis, (ita enim hoc postremum in ueteribus non nullis legitur) id est, exoriente.'

[10] Recently A. Harder, *Callimachus* Aetia *Volume 2: Commentary* (Oxford, 2012), 852: 'For Zephyrus and Memnon as sons of Eos, cf. Hes. *Th.* 378ff. … and 948f.'

[11] Cf. C. Bailey, *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura. Libri Sex. Volume I. Prolegomena, Text and Critical Apparatus. Translation* (Oxford, 1947), 556; J. Martin, *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura* (Leipzig, 1963), 262; C. Buechner, *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura* (Wiesbaden, 1966), 284.

[12] R. Bentley, 'Notae ad elegiam Catulli de coma Berenices', in T.J.G.F. Graevius (ed.), *Callimachi Hymni, Epigrammata, et Fragmenta* (Utrecht, 1697), 437: 'Omnino nutans & languidum est illud epitheton nutantibus: sed a librariis profectum est, non a Catullo; qui sine dubio scripsit. *Unigena impellens NICTANTIBUS aera pennis.* Quid sit *nictari*, vide apud Festum: Lucretius lib. VI. *Cujus ubi e regione loci venere volantes; | Claudicat extemplo pennarum NISUS inanis, | Et conamen utrinque alarum proditur omne: | Hic ubi NICTARI nequeunt, insistereque alis.* Virgilius IV. *Hic primum paribus NITENS Cyllenius alis*.'

[13] J.R.C. Martyn, 'Catullus 66.53', *Eranos* 72 (1974), 193–5, at 195: 'I suggest that Catullus wrote *nictantibus* ("flashing"), thus adding movement to the mock-epic assault, and giving the full force [along with *impellens*] of κυκλώσας.'

[14] According to D. Kiss, *Catullus Online. An Online Repertory of Conjectures on Catullus* (http://www.catullusonline.org/CatullusOnline/index.php?dir=poems&w_apparatus=1) (2013, apparatus criticus on Catull. 66.53, consulted 14 November 2016) Johannes Schrader suggested *nitentibus* 'ante 1784'. Unfortunately, Schrader's handwritten notes on Catullus have not been available to me.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000234 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in emending the word, we look closer at R's *mutantibus* rather than at OGR$^2$'s *nutantibus*, and at the indirect agent of the participle, Zephyrus.

In 1521 Alexander Guarinus put *nutantibus* in his text, but mentioned *motantibus* as an alternative in his commentary.[15] I agree with Guarinus that *motantibus* is a very attractive reading. R's *mutantibus* could easily be a corrupted form of *motantibus*, produced by a scribe through an act of normalization. Although *motare* is very rare,[16] Virgil, who echoes Catullus 66 in the *Aeneid*[17] as well as Catullus 62 and 64 in *Eclogues* 4 and 6,[18] uses the word in the same form and with Zephyrus as its agent in *Ecl.* 5.4–6:

> tu maior: tibi me est aequum parere, Menalca,
> siue sub incertas Zephyris motantibus umbras
> siue antro potius succedimus.

In order for the parallel to be effective, Virgil ought to use *motantibus* in an intransitive sense, as Catullus almost certainly does in 66.53. Traditionally, commentators on the passage have read the word as transitive in sense.[19] But I think that there are persuasive arguments in favour of Virgil using *motantibus* intransitively.[20] First, although *OLD* does not give an intransitive sense of *moto*,[21] Lewis and Short seem to suggest that Virgil uses *motantibus* intransitively in *Ecl.* 5.5,[22] and *TLL* states that Virgil uses

[15] A. Guarinus, *Alexandri Guarini Ferrariensis in C.V. Catullum Veronensem per Baptistam Patrem Emendatum Expositiones …* (Venice, 1521), LXXXVIII: 'ales unigena memnonis æthiopis impellens aera pennis motantibus uel nutantibus obtulit se'; and further down on the same page: 'impellens aera, uolans pennis motantibus frequenter aera ipsum mouentibus uel pennis mutantibus.'

[16] Manuscripts transmit forms of *motare* in Verg. *Ecl.* 5.5, *Ecl.* 6.28 and Gell. *NA* 11.3.1. Merkel suggested *motasse* for *mutasse* in Ov. *Met.* 4.46, which is accepted by R.J. Tarrant, *P. Ouidi Nasonis Metamorphoses* (Oxford, 2004), 95, and A. Barchiesi, *Ovidio. Metamorfosi. Volume II (Libri III-IV)* (Florence, 2007), 66; cf. G. Rosati, 'Commento. Libro quarto', in Barchiesi (this note), 254: '*motasse* è correzione palmare di Merkel per il *mutasse* dei mss., erroneamente indotto dal contesto metamorfico'. Further, Gronovius suggested *motatque* for *mouet atque* in Ov. *Met.* 11.674, rejected by Tarrant (this note), 339 but accepted by J.D. Reed, *Ovidio. Metamorfosi. Volume V (Libri X-XII)* (Florence, 2013), 106 (see argumentation on p. 367). Finally, Forbergerus emended *motat* for *mouet*/*mouit* in *Priapea* 19.3, accepted by E. Baehrens, *Poetae Latini Minores. Volumen I* (Leipzig, 1879), 64 and most recently by L. Callebat, *Priapées* (Paris, 2012), 9.

[17] Catull. 66.39–40: *inuita, o regina, tuo de uertice cessi,* | *inuita: adiuro teque tuumque caput*; Verg. *Aen*. 6.460: *inuitus, o regina, tuo de litore cessi; Aen.* 6.492–3: *testor, cara, deos et te, germana, tuumque* | *dulce caput*.

[18] The song of the Fates (Catull. 64.326–81) is echoed in Verg. *Ecl.* 4.46–7, while *Vesper Olympo* (Catull. 62.1) seems to be echoed in Verg. *Ecl.* 6.86.

[19] Servius (= G. Thilo [ed.], *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica* [Leipzig, 1878], 54); J.L. de la Cerda, *P. Virgilii Maronis Bucolica et Georgica. Argumentis, Explicationibus, et Notis illustrata* (Toledo, 1608), 89; A. Forbiger, *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera*, (Leipzig, 1852), 83. C.G. Heyne, *Publius Virgilius Maro. Varietate Lectionis et Perpetua Adnotatione illustratus …* (London, 1830), 149–50 suggests that we read *motantibus* transitively, but offers a reflective sense as well: 'Mode recte accipias *Zephyris motantibus* scil. eas umbras. Nisi alteram malis *motantibus* esse *mouentibus se*.'

[20] G. Wakefield, *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera. Volumen Prius* (London, 1796), 277 (unnumbered page) seems to suggest an intransitive use: 'Minimè autèm ineptum videtur affirmare, umbras "variare" ob Zephyrorum "motum".' So do T.E. Page, *P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica et Georgica* (Edinburgh, 1968), 132; R. Coleman, *Vergil Eclogues* (Cambridge, 1977), 155; and R.D. Williams, *Virgil The Eclogues & Georgics* (New York, 1979), 110.

[21] *OLD* s.v. *moto* cites the passage as transitive, but fails to mention the crucial preposition *sub*: 'to set in motion, shaken, stir, etc. *incertas Zephyris ~antibus umbras* Verg. *Ecl.* 5.5'.

[22] Lewis and Short s.v. *moto*: 'to keep moving, move about (poet.): *Zephyris motantibus*, Verg. E. 5, 5'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000234 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*motantibus* in a mediopassive sense.[23] Further, both *OLD* and Lewis and Short give intransitive meanings of *moueo*.[24] When *moueo* can be used intransitively, there should be a strong possibility that *moto*, derived as a frequentative verb from *moueo*, could be used in that sense as well. Second, the preposition *sub* must certainly go with *incertas umbras*. Thus, the western winds do not rapidly and continuously move the uncertain shades. Mopsus suggests that the two of them go beneath the shades, which are uncertain *because* the western winds rapidly and continuously move about.[25]

I suggest that *motantibus ... pennis* describes the rapid, vigorous movement of Zephyrus, as he rushes down to snatch the lock of hair. This reading is in accordance with Callimachus' κυκλώσας βαλιὰ πτερά, it is easily corrupted in the manuscripts into the much more common *mutantibus* and *nutantibus*, it finds support in Virgil's *Zephyris motantibus* and it derives further probability from the Catullan echoes in *Eclogues* 4 and 6. I therefore suggest that Catullus wrote:

unigena impellens motantibus aera pennis 53

*Corpus Christi College, University of Oxford*
*Department of Greek and Latin, University of Copenhagen*
KRISTOFFER MARIBO ENGELL LARSEN
xtb969@alumni.ku.dk
doi:10.1017/S0009838817000234

## IRONY AND THE TEXT OF CAESAR, *BELLVM GALLICVM* 5.31.5

omnia excogitantur, quare nec sine periculo maneatur **nec** languore militum et uigiliis periculum augeatur.

et ω

The sentence that comprises 5.31.5 in Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* has long been felt to be problematic. It was deleted entirely by H. Meusel.[1] A. Klotz posited a lacuna after *quare*.[2] Others sought smaller adjustments.[3] Yet, the defence of the text as transmitted

[23] *TLL* 8.1531.82–3, s.v. *moto*: 'frequenter, vehementer movere (mediopass. …): Verg. ecl. 5, 5 *sub incertas zephyris -antibus umbras*'.
[24] *OLD* s.v. *moueo* 13; Lewis and Short s.v. *moueo* II.
[25] For the sense of swiftness, see Callebat (n. 16), 128: 'le verbe *motare* dénotant un mouvement rapide, répété et/ou violent'.
[1] H. Meusel (ed.), *C. Iuli Caesaris Belli Gallici Libri VII* (Berlin, 1894), 117, following W. Paul.
[2] A. Klotz (ed.), *C. Iuli Caesaris Commentarii, Vol. I: Commentarii Belli Gallici* (Leipzig, 1962[4]), 118. He suggests, on the model of Livy 8.38.8, that *nec cum periculo eatur* has dropped out. He then prints Fleischer's *augetur* in place of the manuscripts' *augeatur*.
[3] See the several suggestions, with bibliography, listed at H. Meusel, *Coniecturae Caesarianae* (Berlin, 1893), 38 (or in the *Tabulae Coniecturarum* at the back of the second volume of H. Meusel, *Lexicon Caesarianum* [Berlin, 1887–1893], 20). The most ingenious emendation is Hartz's *mane eatur* for *maneatur*, which is adopted in L.-A. Constans (ed.), *César: Guerre des Gaules* (Paris, 1926), 2.154.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838817000234 Published online by Cambridge University Press