Yet the rich thematic possibilities of the Catullan allusion (upon which a psychologized reading rests) are far from explicit, and the stichometric correspondence can still be treated as a formal or visual phenomenon. Downplaying the allusive sensibilities of the *Culex* poet and his readership opens up the intriguing possibility of a method of allusion not inspired by thematic relevance. The overlap of only one syllable between the unrelated words ***de****serto* and ***De****mophoon* (and between the final syllables of *ar****is*** and *mult****is***) is purely auditory or visual, with no real semantic import, implying that the author of the *Culex* engaged with the source text in a meticulous but localized manner. One possibility is that frequent recitation of the source text led to subconscious echoes in composition. Another is that the *Culex* author kept Catullus 64 physically present during the act of composition, drawing not only upon its content and stylistic properties but also upon its visual layout.[19] In both cases we would expect more extensive imitation of the model, though the preceding and following lines show no further similarities, and a smattering of other potential parallels are far less convincing.[20] As technology provides us with new ways to process and analyse text, further examples of stichometric allusion like the one in the *Culex* – whose thematic dimension is subtle and indirect – will come to light, and our understanding of ancient reading practices may consequently change.

University of Kent DUNSTAN LOWE
d.m.lowe@kent.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S000983881400024X

[19] Using what we know of how classical Latin poems were presented in written form, D. O'Rourke, 'Paratext and intertext in the Propertian poetry book', in L. Jansen (ed.), *The Roman Paratext: Frame, Text, Readers* (Cambridge, 2014), suggests that the placing of text, e.g. in adjacent columns, formed the basis for intratextual and paratextual allusions.

[20] There are superficial visual or aural resemblances between words in the same *sedes*, especially at line endings: *aequor*/*auctor* (12), *tuetur*/*petuntur* (53), *fluctibus in*/*talibus in* (98), *labello*/*capellae* (104), *pectus*/*per artus* (138), *femina*/*cacumina* (143), *tauro*/*torvo* (173). The only exact verbal parallel is the unremarkable *quis* at the start of lines 145. On two occasions the same word appears in different positions in the line: *sensus* (189) and *mente*/*mentem* (200). These effects seem coincidental.

APULEIUS, *METAMORPHOSES* 10.25.1

nec iuvenis sororis suae mortem tam miseram et quae minime par erat inlatam aequo tolerare quivit animo, sed … exin flagrantissimis febribus ardebat, ut ipsi quoque iam medela videretur esse necessaria.

This is the text of the passage describing the reaction of the young man at the news that his beloved sister has been murdered *flagris* and *titione candenti inter media femina detruso* as it is transmitted by the Florentine MS (F).[1] With the few exceptions which

[1] I am transcribing the text directly from a photographic reproduction of F, the eleventh-century MS now at Florence (Laurentianus pl. 68.2) upon which our knowledge of the *Metamorphoses* ultimately depends. I also refer to the *editio princeps* by G.A. Bussi (Rome, 1469); to the *editiones variorum* by F. Oudendorp (Leiden, 1786) and G.F. Hildebrand (Leipzig, 1842); to the critical editions by D.S. Robertson (Paris, 1945) and M. Zimmerman (Oxford, 2012); and to the text, with Italian translation, by L. Nicolini (Milan, 2005).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I discuss below, the vast majority of editors accept the text of F, betraying resignation before a paradosis that can hardly seem genuine, since it can be maintained only by forcing both word order and syntax. Editors either refer *quae* to *mortem*, assuming an ellipsis of *ei* (i.e. *sorori*) in the relative clause and taking *par* as 'fitting',[2] or refer *quae* to *soror*, assuming an ellipsis of *in eam* (i.e. *et in eam ... inlatam*) and taking *par* as equivalent to *digna*.[3]

Attempts to restore the text, which date as far back as the fifteenth century, have focused mostly on emending the problematic *quae* and have more persuasively taken the phrase *par erat* to mean 'it was fair'.[4] Of the many suggestions listed by Oudendorp (1.726), only *qua*, found in the *recentiores* and adopted by Robertson, is worth mentioning. In our context, *qua* should be interpreted *qua ratione* (Hildebrand), although it lends itself to misinterpretation (*quo loco*, as Oudendorp prefers). The arrangement *et quae <ut> minime par erat inlata[m] <est>*, printed by Bussi in the *editio princeps* and adopted by Zimmerman in the latest edition of the *Metamorphoses*, would make good sense (*ut ... erat* is a clause of manner), but is questionable from both a methodological and a syntactic point of view, as it requires too many interventions and involves the addition of a perfect tense (*inlata est*) which is difficult in the context. Therefore, the safest way to print the sentence would seem to demand the obelizing of *quae*, as in Nicolini's recent text.[5]

I now put forward a new proposal which would restore an excellent meaning through a barely perceptible change. I suggest reading *utque* instead of *et quae* and thus translating the sentence: '… a death so pitiful and inflicted in a way that was the most unfair'. Such a position of *que*, which joins *miseram* and *inlatam*, is quite common: compare, for example, Apuleius *Met.* 1.23.1: *et cum dicto iubet uxorem decedere utque in eius locum adsidam iubet*; and 5.2.1: *Psyche ... altrinsecus aedium horrea sublimi fabrica perfecta magnisque congesta gazis conspicit*. The well-known similarity between *ut* and *et*, and between *quae* and *que*, in manuscripts allows me to pass over palaeographical matters.

Università per Stranieri di Perugia G. VANNINI
giulio.vannini@unistrapg.it
doi:10.1017/S0009838814000469

[2] E.g. M. Zimmerman, *GCA* 10 (2000), 316: 'the … death, which did not befit her in the last'.
[3] Thus G. Augello, *Studi apuleiani* (Palermo, 1977), 218.
[4] Cf. 5.19.1: *ut par erat*, and *OLD* s.v. 14.
[5] See her perceptive note at Nicolini (n. 1), 672, n. 16.

CLAUDIAN, *DE RAPTU PROSERPINAE* 1.82 AND *GEORGICS* 3.68*

That Claudian imitates Virgil's *Georgics* in the *De raptu Proserpinae* is well known. Most of his allusions are restricted to Golden Age or Underworld imagery, largely

* I am grateful to Michael Dewar, Catherine Ware, and the anonymous reader for *CQ* for their comments on an earlier version of this note.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838814000469 Published online by Cambridge University Press