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Summary: This article presents a new critical edition of Catullus’ Carmen 66 along with an introduction, a translation and a textual commentary. The text, based on fresh collations of the manuscripts O and G, deviates from the Oxford text by R.A.B. Mynors in 27 cases. Furthermore, it is the first edition to consider the conventional first two lines of Catullus 67 as the last two lines of Catullus 66, an idea independently conjectured by Alex Agnesini in 2011 and Ian Du Quesnay in 2012.¹

1. INTRODUCTION

This article presents a new critical edition of Catullus’ Carmen 66 with an introduction, a translation and a textual commentary. The introduction is divided into five sections. The first section gives a brief survey of the textual transmission of Catullus from the fourteenth to the twentieth century. The second section provides more detailed information on the three principal manuscripts of Catullus, O, G and R. In the third section I describe my editorial principles. The fourth section presents a stemma, a description of sigla codicum and a bibliography of the works mentioned

¹ This article is a slightly revised version of a paper I wrote in 2016 at Corpus Christi College, University of Oxford. I am immensely grateful to my supervisor, Professor Stephen Harrison, for his generous help and supervision.

in my *apparatus criticus*. Finally, in the fifth section I list my 27 deviations from R.A.B. Mynors’ Oxford edition (corrected reprint, 1960) which I take to be the standard edition of Catullus in the English-speaking world. The translation is meant to express my understanding of the sense of the poem as closely as possible. I have therefore chosen to translate the poem into prose rather than within the metrical restrictions of verse. In the textual commentary I explain the reasons behind my choice of a broad selection of readings. All translations from Latin and Greek into English are my own.

1.1 THE TEXTUAL TRANSMISSION OF CATULLUS

The textual transmission of Catullus’ poetry is almost uniquely sparse and famously corrupt.² From late Antiquity until the fourteenth century Catullus has not left many traces.³ One of the few and very significant traces is the Carolingian manuscript T (*Codex Thuanus* after its sixteenth-century owner Jacques-Auguste de Thou), a late ninth-century *florilegium* which includes 66 lines of poem 62. T is the oldest direct witness we possess to Catullus’ poetry; but since the manuscript does not contain Catullus 66 I do not make use of it in this paper.

Shortly after 1300 an extant manuscript of Catullus was discovered in Verona; but by the end of the century it had disappeared again, a fate shared by numerous codices in that period.⁴ This manuscript, commonly referred to as V (*Codex Veronensis* from its place of discovery), is consid-

---

² Propertius seems to be the only other major Latin poet with an equally sparse and corrupt transmission. For convenient surveys see Tarrant 1983a: 43-45 (on Catullus) and 1983b: 324-26 (on Propertius).


⁴ Cf. Reynolds & Wilson 2013: 141: “the humanists also had a capacity for losing manuscripts. Once they had carefully copied a text, they were liable to have little interest in the manuscript which had preserved it.”
ered the pre-archetype of all the preserved extant manuscripts of Catullus. Its rediscovery is famously described in an enigmatic epigram probably written between 1303 and 1307 by the Vincentine notary Benvenuto dei Campesani (1250-1323).

Before the disappearance of V, the equally lost A was presumably copied directly from it. A is considered the archetype of the manuscripts O (Codex Oxoniensis from its current location), undated but from approximately 1360, and X, now also lost. By the end of the fourteenth century the manuscripts G (Codex Sangermanensis after its former location), dated to 1375, and R (Codex Romanus of the Vatican Library), c. 1390, were copied from X. R was copied for the influential Florentine chancellor Coluccio Salutati, whose hand, identified as R², has added 133 variant readings to the manuscript. In comparison, G contains 93 variant readings (G¹, the hand of the scribe, and G², a later hand), while O does not contain any. The three late fourteenth-century manuscripts OGR, all written in Northern Italy, constitute our principal extant witnesses to the text of Catullus. I will describe these manuscripts in further detail in section two of this introduction.

5 D.S. McKie was the first to suggest the existence of a manuscript between V and OX in his doctoral dissertation (Cambridge 1977). McKie’s unpublished dissertation has not been available to me, but his view of V as the pre-archetype and A as the archetypal archetype of OX is widely accepted. See recently Kiss 2015a: xviii and Trappes-Lomax 2007: 16.

6 The epigram, preserved in the fourteenth-century manuscripts G and R, runs as follows (the codex is the narrator): Ad patriam uenio longis a finibus exul. / Causa mei reditu s compatriota fuit, / scilicet a calamis tribuit cui Francia nomen, / quique notat turbe preterite unts iter. / Quo licet ingenio uestrum celebrate Catullum, / cuius sub modio clausa papirus erat; ‘As an exile I arrive to my fatherland from distant borders. / The cause of my return has been a fellow-citizen, / that is, a man to whom France has given her name on account of his writing, / and who notes the journey of the crowd that passes by. / Thanks to his intelligence you may celebrate your Catullus, / whose papyrus has been shut beneath a bushel.’ See Kiss 2015b: 2-6 for a recent discussion of the epigram.

7 Ullman 1960: 1040: “The ownership is attested by Coluccio’s peculiar pressmark on fol. 1: “71 carte 39”, the word carte standing for chartae, leaves or folios, the number before it being the number in Coluccio’s library, apparently. This same type of entry appears in most of Coluccio’s books, of which I have seen well over one hundred.”
Catullus’ poetry might have been rediscovered in the fourteenth century; but his poems were in a very poor condition. The corrupt state of the manuscript tradition was a source of frustration for its earliest scribes. Thus, the scribe of $G$ wrote an apology to the reader on the last page of his edition (folio 36r). Whether the scribe formulated the complaint himself or copied it from $X$ is not entirely clear; but it certainly bears witness to just how poorly preserved Catullus’ poetry was in the century of its rediscovery:


During the fifteenth century a considerable amount of manuscripts were copied from $R$, a few were copied from $G$, while none were copied from $O$. The fertility of $R$ is probably explained by Coluccio Salutati’s influential position in the Italian cultural classes. Of these manuscripts, commonly known as the *codices recentiores*, more than 120 are identified.

---

8 Thomson 1997: 32 argues with reference to McKie’s unpublished dissertation (Cambridge 1977) somewhat convincingly that the unscholarly scribe of $G$ can hardly be the author of the complaint.

9 ‘You, the reader into whose hands this little book has come, please excuse the scribe, if the book will seem corrupt to you. For he has transcribed it from a highly corrupt exemplar. There did not exist anything else, from which he could have had the opportunity to copy this book. And in order to take anything out of this rough exemplar he decided that it was better to have it in a corrupt condition than to lack it altogether, in the hope that another copy might emerge from which he could correct it. Farewell, if you will not curse him.’

10 Kiss 2015b: 14. Kiss further suggests that $O$ “may have seemed a hopelessly corrupt manuscript of Catullus rather than one of the best ones available, so there seems to have been no reason to copy it.”

11 For a recent study of the *codices recentiores* see Kiss 2015b and 2015c, where the manuscripts are numbered and listed.
Due to the corrupt state of the manuscript tradition the scribes usually compared and added readings from other manuscripts, which resulted in a high degree of contamination. Accordingly, the codices recentiores do not seem to contribute significant information on Catullus’ textual transmission. Their chief and very significant contribution lies in their conjectures and emendations, to which the apparatus criticus of every modern edition of Catullus bears solid witness.

The great age of Catullan conjectures, however, arose in the subsequent centuries. After the publication of the Venice editio princeps in 1472 manuscripts quickly stopped being copied. Instead, humanist scholars began producing commentaries and emending the corrupt text.\textsuperscript{12} The vigorous activities of these Renaissance humanists can hardly be overestimated.\textsuperscript{13} Numerous conjectures of theirs are today accepted readings; and even when they are wrong, their conjectures can be of great help in showing the modern reader and editor where the paradosis might be corrupt.\textsuperscript{14}

As in many other fields of classical philology, Catullan studies flourished in the nineteenth century, and another great age of Catullan conjectures arose.\textsuperscript{15} My present edition of Catullus 66 has benefited greatly from conjectures by scholars such as Emil Baehrens (1848-1888), Theodor Heyse (1803-1884) and Karl Lachmann (1793-1851). The nineteenth century also saw the revival of the principal manuscripts OGR and the first employment of O and G in critical editions. Ludwig Schwabe (1866) was the first editor to base his text on G, while O was rediscovered in the Bodleian Library and presented by Robinson Ellis (1867), who famously failed to acknowledge its importance. Emil Baehrens (1876) was the first editor to make full use of the manuscript in his edition. Finally, R was rediscovered in the Vatican Library by William Gardner Hale in 1896.\textsuperscript{16} But it was

\textsuperscript{12} Gaisser 1992: 207-16.
\textsuperscript{13} Cf. Reynolds & Wilson 2013: 142 on the fifteenth-century humanists: “A glance at the apparatus criticus of many classical texts – Catullus is a good example – will show how frequently scholars of this period were able to correct errors in the tradition.”
\textsuperscript{14} This principle applies to conjectures in general. Cf. Nisbet 1991: 70, 75.
\textsuperscript{15} Goold 1983: 12 counts 147 corrections to the text made in the nineteenth century compared to 37 in the seventeenth and 16 in the eighteenth.
\textsuperscript{16} Hale 1896.
not until the middle of the twentieth century that the relationship between OGR was fully realised and utilised in a critical edition, namely R.A.B. Mynors’ edition from 1958.\textsuperscript{17}

The twentieth century has seen ten critical editions of Catullus’ opera,\textsuperscript{18} and several editions devoted to single poems.\textsuperscript{19} Additionally, Robin Nisbet’s seminal article “Notes on the Text and Interpretation of Catullus” (1978) has inspired a new wave of conjectures and revivals of forgotten conjectures on Catullus. This conjectural activity has in recent years been greatly helped by Dániel Kiss’ online repertory of conjectures on Catullus, which has also made high resolution digital images of O and G available to its readers.\textsuperscript{20} However, two important tasks on the text of Catullus still need to be done. First, there is a need for a new critical edition of Catullus, which employs more conjectural solutions than usual in the text and apparatus criticus.\textsuperscript{21} Secondly, the codices recentiores need to be further identified, analysed and put into a stemma. Dániel Kiss is currently working on the codices recentiores; and I hope that with this edition of Catullus 66 I may be able to demonstrate, however modestly, some of the editorial principles from which a future edition of Catullus might benefit.

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. the review of Goold 1958: 95. Ellis 1902 and Kroll 1928 use OGR in their editions but do not recognize the importance of R. See also description of the sigla codicum in Cazzaniga 1941: xv [unnumbered page], who does not recognize R as a descendant of V.

\textsuperscript{18} Thomson 1978 (revised 1997); Goold 1983; Eisenhut 1958 (new edition 1983); Bardon 1970 (revised 1973); Mynors 1958 (revised 1960); Schuster 1949; Cazzaniga 1941; Kroll 1923; Lafaye 1922; Ellis 1904.

\textsuperscript{19} For instance Harrison 2004, a text and translation of Catullus 63; Marinone 1997, a double edition of Catullus 66 and Callimachus fr. 110. In addition, Gail Trimble has an edition of Catullus 64 coming through the Cambridge University Press.

\textsuperscript{20} Kiss 2013.

\textsuperscript{21} Further elaboration and documentation in section 1.3 of this paper.
1.2. THE PRINCIPAL MANUSCRIPTS OF CATULLUS 66 (OGR):

- **O** (*Oxoniensis Canonicianus* class. lat. 30 in the Bodleian Library)

The *Codex Oxoniensis* is the oldest of the three principal manuscripts. It was probably written in Venice in 1360. The manuscript is written on parchment in Italian Gothic minuscule, also known as *Rotunda*. Its unknown scribe is considered to have been a competent copyist but a poor Latinist.\(^{22}\) The scribe appears to have focused more on the layout of his codex than on the text itself.\(^{23}\) As a result O does not contain any of the variant readings assumed to have been present in V.\(^{24}\)

O is not known to have left any descendants. The manuscript was re-discovered at the Bodleian Library in 1867 by Robinson Ellis, who did not recognize the importance of his discovery. In 1876 Emil Baehrens acknowledged the importance of O, which he used as the foundation of his text alongside the manuscript G.

- **G** (*Parisinus* lat. 14137 in the Bibliothèque National de France)

The *Codex Sangermanensis* is the second oldest of the principal manuscripts. It was written in 1375, most likely in Verona.\(^{25}\) Its scribe has been identified as Antonio da Legnago, who wrote the manuscript on parchment in Italian Gothic minuscule and added a few titles and marginal readings to the text, which he otherwise left unfinished. The other variant readings in G are by a later scribe, commonly referred to as G\(^2\), who

\(^{22}\) Cf. Mynors 1958: v: (O), optime scriptus ab homine uix satis docto, sedulo tamen ac modo
to, et qui saepe quod non intellexisset describere mallet quam textum coniecturis sollicitare (’(O),
written perfectly well by a scarcely learned, though diligent and moderate man, who
often prefers to copy what he does not understand, rather than disturbing his text
with conjectures’).


\(^{25}\) Parisinus lat. 14137 (= G), fol. 36r: 1375 mensis octobris 19 (‘19 October 1375’).
took the readings from the manuscript \( m \), an early copy of \( R \). A seven of the 93 variants are on poem 66.

\( G \) is held to have been copied from the lost manuscript \( X \), a brother of \( O \). C.I. Sillig (1830) was the first modern editor to make use of \( G \), but the manuscript was not used properly until Schwabe’s edition in 1866.

- \( R \) (Otto bonianus lat. 1829 in the Vatican Library)

The Codex Romanus is the brother of \( G \), copied for the Florentine chancellor Coluccio Salutati, probably in 1390. Like its brother, \( R \) was copied from the lost codex \( X \), the brother of \( O \), and like \( O \) and \( G \) the manuscript is written on parchment in Italian Gothic minuscule. The hand of Coluccio Salutati, commonly referred to as \( R^2 \), has added 133 variant readings to the manuscript. 17 of these variants are on poem 66.

\( R \) was dramatically rediscovered by William Gardner Hale in 1896 when he realized that the Vatican Library had miscatalogued the manuscript. Hale never managed to publish a full collation of \( R \), which was instead published by D.F.S. Thomson in 1970. The first editor to make use of \( R \) was Ellis in 1902, but the importance of \( R \) was not acknowledged properly until Mynors’ edition in 1958.

### 1.3. EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES

In 2000 Stephen Harrison published an article on the need for a new text of Catullus. In Harrison’s view the existing editions of Catullus are too reluctant to emend the text and present too few alternative readings in
their apparatus.  

Harrison argued that, since the textual transmission of Catullus is considerably flawed, there is a greater need than usual for conjectures in the text and for alternative readings in the apparatus. The only edition of Catullus that meets the demands for emending the text, Goold’s text from 1983, does not supply an apparatus. Accordingly, the ideal text should combine the conjectural boldness of Goold with an extensive and conjecturally informative apparatus. Harrison summarised his views by suggesting three editorial principles:

1. The text should have an *apparatus criticus* which is free of minor orthographical variants. Since the apparatus will already be more than usually extensive due to the mentioning of variant readings, recordings of orthographical variants without any bearing on the meaning should be avoided.

2. The apparatus should cite the three main manuscripts OGR singly rather than using the sigla *V, X* or *A* to indicate accordance between the manuscripts. OGR vary sufficiently at crucial points to make this a significant help to the reader.

3. Due to the poor transmission of Catullus’ poetry the text and the apparatus should contain more conjectural solutions than usual. Numerous conjectures worth mentioning have been made in the past; and there are still many unsolved problems and good conjectures to be made.

I find these editorial principles convincing and I have strived to use them throughout my text.  

In addition, I have applied Dániel Kiss’ practice of

---

29 Harrison 2000: 66-70. The need for a new edition of Catullus has recently been repeated by Tarrant 2016: 147.

30 Harrison 2000: 69-70. Tarrant 2016: 145 might be said to express these principles in general terms: “A minimal definition of a satisfactory edition might be one that accurately reports the essential manuscript evidence and reflects the current state of thinking about a text well enough to provide a basis for further study.”

31 In contrast to Thomson 1997 I do not record minor orthographical variants and mis-spellings such as *himeneo* (O, line 11), *assirios* (OGR, line 12) and *dissidium* (GR, line 22). My employment of the two other editorial principles should be evident throughout my text and apparatus. My apparatus is positive rather than negative; for the distinction between these two styles see Tarrant 2016: 162-63.
citing the *codices recentiores* individually rather than using collective *sigla* like Mynors and Thomson.\(^\text{32}\) Since Kiss has identified and listed some 129 of the *codices recentiores*,\(^\text{33}\) I believe that citing the manuscripts individually will be of great help to the reader who wishes to check the references given in the apparatus. I cite the manuscripts in accordance with Kiss’ identification of them, and I list them in section 1.4.2 of this introduction. Finally, neither of the manuscripts O, G and R is considered decisively superior to the others in establishing the text of Catullus. When the manuscript readings differ, I therefore choose to print whichever reading (or conjecture) I find is of greatest merit.\(^\text{34}\)

The present edition is based on my own transcription and collation of the manuscripts O (fols. 28r-29v) and G (fols. 26v-27v) which are accessible in high resolution digital images on Dániel Kiss’ *Catullus Online. An Online Repertory of Conjectures on Catullus*.\(^\text{35}\) The manuscript R, located in the Vatican Library, has not been available to me. When referring to R I primarily rely on D.F.S. Thomson’s collation of the manuscript; where I suspect that Thomson has collated incorrectly (for instance in lines 17, 18, 35, 82) I rely on the information given in Kiss’ *apparatus criticus*.\(^\text{36}\)

---

\(^{32}\) Kiss 2013; Thomson 1997; Mynors 1958.

\(^{33}\) Kiss 2015c.

\(^{34}\) Cf. Tarrant 2016: 57 on the manuscripts: “when G and R agree against O, the two readings have equal stemmatic value, and the reading of the archetype can only be ascertained by weighing the relative merits of the readings.” See also Trappes-Lomax 2007: 1: “There is only one criterion: *si melius est, Catullianum est.*”

\(^{35}\) Kiss 2013.

\(^{36}\) Thomson 1970; Kiss 2013.
1.4. STELLMA, SIGLA CODICUM AND WORKS MENTIONED IN THE APPARATUS CRITICUS

1.4.1 Stemma

1.4.2 Sigla codicum

O = Oxoniensis Bodleianus Canonicanus class. lat. 30 c. 1360
G = Parisinus lat. 14137 1375
G² = a later hand in G
R = Vaticanus Ottobonianus lat. 1829 c. 1390
R² = Coluccio Salutati
MS 4 = Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Diez. B Sant. 37 1463
MS 8 = Bologna, Bibliotheca Universitaria 2621 1412
MS 28 = Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Magl. VII 1158 1460-1470
MS 31 = Florence, Bibliotheca Riccardiana 606 1457
MS 46 = London, British Library Add. 11915 1460
MS 52 = London, British Library Egerton 3027 1467
MS 59 = Milan, Biblioteca Nazionale di Brera AD xii 37 1450

37 I use the traditional sigla of the manuscripts, although they do not indicate that V, A and X are lost (cf. section 1.1).
MS 78 = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 7989 1423
MS 122 = Vicenza, Bibliotheca Civica Bertoliana G 2.8.12 (216) 1460
MS 129a = ‘The Codex Tomacellianus’, in private hands 1448-1458

1.4.3 Works mentioned in the apparatus criticus

Avancius, H. 1535. Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, Gallus restituti per Hieronymum Avancium, Cardinali Farnesio dicantur ... Venetiis.
Calphurnius, J. 1481. [Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii Carmina et Statii Siluae], Vicentiae.
Ed. 1472 = [Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii carmina et Statii Siluae, Venezia] – Catullus’ editio princeps; editor identified as Hieronymus Squarzaficus; printed by Vindelinus de Spira.
Guarinus, A. 1521. Alexandri Guarini Ferrariensis in C. V. Catullum Vernensem per Baptistam Patrem Emendatum Expositiones ... Venetiis.

39 The bibliographical information is derived from Kiss 2013.


Pisanus, B. 1522 [marginal notes in a copy of Calphurnius 1481, now in Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Inc. Magl. A. 3. 39].


Politianus, A. 1472-94 [annotations in his copy of the editio princeps of 1472, now in Rome].


Puccius, F. 1502 [marginalia taken over from Puccius by Pisanus 1522].

Puteolanus, F. 1473. Val. Catulli Veronensis poetae doctissimi liber ad Cornelium ... Parmae.

Rehm, B. 1934. ‘Catull 66, 1 und der neue Kallimachosfund’ Philologus 89, 385-86


Schmidt, B. 1887. C. Valeri Catulli Veronensis Carmina ... Editio Maior. Lipsiae.

## 1.5 Deviations from R.A.B. Mynors’ edition (1960^2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mynors (1960^2)</th>
<th>Larsen (2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. dispexit Calphurnius</td>
<td>despexit OGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. lumina OGR</td>
<td>limina Rehm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Beroniceo OGR</td>
<td>Beroniceo ‘codices omnes’ teste Avancio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. multis OGR</td>
<td>uotis McKie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. dearum OGR</td>
<td>deorum MS 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. nouo OGR</td>
<td>nouis Aldine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. hymenaeo OGR</td>
<td>hymenaeis Aldine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. iuerat ed. 1472</td>
<td>ierat OGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. intra OGR</td>
<td>citra Nisbet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. et OGR</td>
<td>aut Hertzberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. oris OGR</td>
<td>orbe MS 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. facient OGR</td>
<td>faciant Puteolanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. cedant OGR</td>
<td>cedunt Harrison*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. nutantibus OGR^2</td>
<td>motantibus Guarinus in comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. aetherias OGR</td>
<td>aerias Trappes-Lomax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. umbras OGR</td>
<td>undas Zwierlein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. †hi dii uen ibi† OGR</td>
<td>hic liquidi Friedrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. ueri MS 31</td>
<td>imi Nisbet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. dum OGR</td>
<td>iam Harrison*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. fuit omnibus OGR</td>
<td>muliebribus Skutsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. casto OGR</td>
<td>casti Gigli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. cubili OGR</td>
<td>cubilis Gigli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. a OGR</td>
<td>uae Trappes-Lomax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. tuam Ald.</td>
<td>tui Calphurnius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. utinam GR</td>
<td>iterum ut Corradinus de Allio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. fulgeret OGR</td>
<td>fulguret ‘codex antiquus’ teste Avancio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95–96. om.</td>
<td>add. Agnesini</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Valerii Catulli Carmen LXVI
Coma Berenices

Omnia qui magni despexit limina mundi,
qui stellarum ortus comperit atque obitus,
flammus ut rapidi solis nitor obscuretur,
ut cedant certis sidera temporibus,
ut Triuiam furtim sub Latmia saxa relegans

dulcis amor gyro deuocet aerio;
idem me ille Conon caelesti in lumine uidit

e Bereniceo uertice caesariem
fulgentem clare, quam uotis illa deorum
leuia protendens bracchia pollicita est,
qua rex tempestate nouis auctus hymenaeis
uastatum finis ierat Assyrios,
dulcia nocturnae portans uestigia rixae,

estne nouis nuptis odio Venus? anne parentum
frustrantur falsis gaudia lacrimulis,
ubertim thalami quas cita limina fundunt?
non, ita me diui, uera gemunt, iuerint.

1 despexit OGR, dispexit Calpurnius 1481, descripsit McKie 2009
limina Rehm 1934, obitus MS 59 1450, habitus OGR
4 certis GR, ceteris O
sub latmia MS 122 1460, sublatmia O, sublimia GR (al. -lamia uel -limina R²), sublatmia Calphurnius 1481
relegans MS 122 1460, religans OGR
6 gyro ed. 1472, guioclero OGR
7 in lumine Vossius 1684, numine OGR, lumine Canter 1564, limine MS 46 1460
8 e bereniceo ‘codices omnes’ teste Avancio 1495, ebore niceo OGR
9 uotis ... deorum McKie 2009, multis ... deorum OGR, cunctis
... deorum Haupt 1837, templis ... deorum Pohl 1860
11 qua rex Puteolanus 1473, quare ex OGR
nouis auctus hymenaeis Ald. 1502, nouo auctus hymeneo OGR, nouo auctatus hymenaeo Goold 1969
12 uastatum MS 31 1457, uastum OGR
14 ierat OGR, iuerat ed. 1472
15 est ne OGR

16 falsis OGR, salsis Heyse 1855
17 ubertim GR, uberum O citae Nisbet 1978, intra OGR
18 diui MS 78 1423, diu OGR, di ut Statius 1566
id mea me multis docuit regina querelis
inuisente nouo proelia torua uiro.
aut tu non orbum luxti deserta cubile,
sed fratris cari flebile discidium?
quam penitus maestas exedit cura medullas!
ut tibi tunc toto pectore sollicitae
sensibus ereptis mens excidit! at <te> ego certe
cognoram a parua uirgine magnanimam.
anne bonum oblita es facinus, quo regium adepta es
coniugium, quod non fortior ausit alis?
sed tum maesta uirum mittens quae uerba locuta es!
Iuppiter, ut tristi lumina saepe manu!
quit te mutauit tantus deus? an quod amantes
non longe a caro corpore abesse uolunt?
atque ibi me cunctis pro dulci coniuge diuis
non sine taurino sanguine pollicita es,
si reditum tetulisset. is haud in tempore longo
captam Asiam Aegypti finibus addiderat.
quis ego pro factis caelesti reddita coetu
pristina uota nouo munere dissoluo.
inuita, o regina, tuo de uertice cessi,
inuita: adiuro teque tuumque caput,
digna ferat quod si quis inaniter adiurarit!
sed qui se ferro postulet esse parem?

21 aut Hertzberg 1862, et OGR (al. at G²R²), an Puccius 1502 non GR, uno O 22 fratris
GR, factis O 23 quam Bentley 1697, cum OGR 24 tibi OR, ibi G tunc OGR², nunc GR
sollicitae MS 122 1460, solicitet OGR 25 te add. Avancius 1535 26 magnanima MS 31 1457,
magnanima OGR 27 quo Puccius 1502, quam OGR adepta es Calphurnius 1481, adeptos O,
adeptus GR 28 fortior GR, forciior O, fortius MS 129a 1450 ausit Puccius 1502, aut sit OGR
29 tum GR, cum O 31 tantus OGR, tantum MSS recentiores, iterum coni. Schrader 1776 32
abesse OR, adesse G uolunt OGR, ulalent Baehrens 1876 33 me cunctis Puccius 1502, pro
cunctis OR, pro cuncis G 34 taurino om. O 35 si G²R², sed OGR tetulisset MS 28 1460-70,
te tulisset OGR haud Ald. 1502, aut OGR, haut Statius 1566 41 feret quod GR, feratque O,
feret quod Puccius 1502 adiurarit Ald. 1502, adiuraret OGR
ille quoque euersus mons est, quem maximum in orbe
progenies Thiae clara superuehitur,
cum Medi peperere nouum mare, cumque iuventus
per medium classi barbara nauit Athon.
quit faciant crines, cum ferro talia cedunt?
Iuppiter, ut Chalybon omne genus pereat,
et qui principio sub terra quaeferere uenas
institit ac ferri stringere duritiam!
abiunctae paulo ante comae mea fata sorores
lugebant, cum se Memnonis Aethiopis
unigena impellens motantibus aera pennis
obtulit Arsinoes Locridos ales equus,
isque per aerias me tollens auolat undas,
et Veneris casto collocat in gremio.
ipsa suum Zephyritis eo famulum legarat,
Graia Canopitis incola litoribus.
hic liquidi uario ne solum in lumine caeli
ex Ariadnaeis aurea temporibus 60
fixa corona foret, sed nos quoque fulgeremus,
deouta flaui uerticis exuuiae,
uuidulam a fluctu cedentem ad templa deum me
sidus in antiquis diua nouum posuit.
Virginis et saeui contingens namque Leonis
lumina, Callistoe iuncta Lycaoniae,
uertor in occasum, tardum dux ante Booten,
qui uix sero alto mergitur oceano.
seu quamquam me nocte premunt uestigia diuum,
ux autem canae Thetyi restituit;
(pace tua fari hic liceat, Rhamnusia uirgo,
namque ego non ullo uera timore tegam,
nec si me infestis discerpent sidera dictis,
condita quin imi pectoris euolueam)
on his tam laetor rebus, quam me afore semper,
afore me a dominae uertice discruclior,
quicum ego iam uirgo quondam muliebribus expers
unguentis una uilia multa bibi.
nunc uos, optato quas iunxit lumine taeda,
non prius unanimis corpora coniugibus
tradite nudantes reiecta ueste papillas,
quam iucunda mihi munera libet onyx,
uester onyx, casti colitis quae iura cubilis.
se quae se impuro dedit adulterio,
illius uae! mala dona leuis bibat irrita puluis;
namque ego ab indignis praemia nulla peto.

77 qui cum OGR  iam Harrison*, dum OGR  muliebribus Skutsch 1970, fuit omnibus
78 uilia Lobel 1949, milia OGR  79 quas Calpurnius 1481, quem OGR (al. quam R°) 80
prius Palladius 1494, post OGR  unanimis Marcilius 1604, uno animus OGR  81 reiecta MS
122 1460, reecta OGR  83 casti ... cubilis Gigli 1880, casto ... cubili OGR  colitis que R,
colitisque O, queritis que R 85 dona leuis bibat ed. 1472, leuis bibat dona OGR  uae! mala
Trappes-Lomax 2007, amala OGR  86 indignis (al. indignatis) R°, abindignatis O, ab indigetis
Gr 87 uestras MS 52 1467, nostras OGR  91 unguinis Bentley 1697, sanguinis OGR  siris
Lachmann 1829, uestris OGR  tui Calphurnius 1481, tuum OGR, tuam Ald. 1502 92 affice MS
52 1467, effice OGR  93 corruerint Lachmann 1829, cur iterent OGR, cur retinent Puccius
1502, cursum iterent Lenchantin de Gubernatis 1928  iterum ut Corradinus de Allio 1738,
utinam GR, utina O 94 hydrochoi ed. 1472, id rochoi OR, idrochoi G  fulgetur `codex
antiquus’ teste Avancio 1495, fulgeret OGR, fulgeat Ald. 1502 95-96 [Cat. 67.1-2] add. Agnesini
C. Valerius Catullus: Carmen 66

The Lock of Berenice

He who looked down on all the boundaries of the great universe,
Who learnt the risings and settings of the stars,
How the flaming brightness of the rapid sun grows dark,
How the constellations fade at certain times,
How, secretly banishing Selene beneath the rocks of Mount Latmos, 5
Sweet love calls her down from her airy orbit;
That man, Conon, saw me in the heavenly light,
A flowing lock of hair from Berenice’s head,
Shining brightly, whom she promised with vows to the gods,
As she stretched out her smooth arms, 10
At the time when the king, blessed with a new wedding,
Had set out to lay waste the Assyrian borders,
As he carried sweet traces of the nocturnal war,
Which he had waged over virginal spoils.
Is Venus hated by new brides? Or do they deceive 15
The joys of their parents with false tears
Which they shed abundantly on this side of the marriage chamber?
They do not, so may the gods help me, grieve truly.
So my queen taught me with her many laments,
When her new husband had gone off to the grim battles.
Or did you not, abandoned, weep for your deserted bed, 20
But rather the lamentable separation from your dear brother?
How deeply did anguish devour your mournful marrow!
How then, as you were troubled in all your heart,
Was your mind cut off when your senses failed! Yet certainly I
Have known you as courageous since your early maidenhood.
Or have you forgotten that noble deed, by which you obtained a royal 25
Marriage, a deed no stronger man would have dared?
But when you, depressed, sent your husband away, which words did you speak!
By Jupiter, how often did you dry your eyes with your hand! 30
Which mighty god changed you? Or is it because lovers
Do not wish to be far away from the body of their beloved?
And there to all the gods for the sake of your dear husband
Not without blood from bulls you vowed me,
If he should come back. In no time at all
He had added Asia to the borders of Egypt.
For these achievements I, given as due to the heavenly crowd,
Discharge those former vows with a new gift.
Unwillingly, o queen, did I leave your head,
Unwillingly: I swear by you and your head;
May anyone who swears falsely by this get what she deserves!
But who can claim to be equal to iron?
Even that mountain was overthrown, the greatest in the world
Over which Thia’s illustrious descendant is carried,
When the Persians gave birth to a new sea, and when the youth
Of the Orient sailed with the fleet through the middle of Mount Athos.
What can locks of hair do, when such things succumb to iron?
By Jupiter, may the whole race of the mining Chalybes perish,
And he who first began to search for veins underground
And to increase the hardness of iron.
Just after I was severed my sister locks were mourning my fate,
When the brother of Ethiopian Memnon showed himself,
Beating the air with his rapidly moving wings,
The winged horse of the Locrian Arsinoe,
And lifting me through the airy waves he flies away,
And places me in the chaste bosom of Venus.
For this reason Zephyritis herself had chosen him as her messenger,
The Greek inhabitant on the Canopian shores.
Then, so that not only the golden crown from Ariadne’s temples
Should be fixed in the diverse light
Of the clear sky, but that I too should shine,
The devoted spoil of a blond head,
As I came a little wet from the billow to the temples of the gods,
The goddess placed me as a new constellation among the old.
For touching the Virgin’s and the savage Lion’s
Lights, close to Callisto the Bear, daughter of Lycaon,
I move to my setting, as a guide before the slow Bear-keeper,
Who is barely dipped in the deep ocean late at night.
But even though the steps of the gods trample me by night,
The dawn, however, restores me to white-haired Thetys;
(Allow me at this point to speak, virgin Nemesis,
For I will not hide the truth through any fear,
Not even if the constellations rend me with their hostile words;
I will on the contrary express the secrets from the bottom of my heart:)
I am not as happy at this as I am tormented at being absent
Forever absent from my mistress’ head,
With whom I already as a virgin, devoid of matrimonial
Perfumes, once drank many cheap scents.
Now you, whom the marriage torch has united on the longed-for day,
Do not yield your bodies to your loving husbands,
While you bare your breasts with your garment thrown away,
Until the perfume jar pours delightful presents to me,
Your perfume jar, you who honor the laws of the chaste marriage bed.
But she who gives herself to filthy adultery,
That cursed woman, may the light dust drink her wicked,
useless gifts;
For I do not seek any rewards from unworthy persons.
But rather, o brides, may ever harmony inhabit,
May ever continuous love inhabit your homes.
You indeed, my queen, when you, looking at the constellations,
Will propitiate the goddess Venus with festal lights,
Do not allow me to be without your perfume,
But rather present me with plentiful gifts.
May the constellations fall down, so that I again could become a royal lock;
Let Orion the Hunter shine next to Aquarius the Water-bearer!
O queen, delightful to your sweet husband, delightful to your parent,
Farewell, and may Jupiter enrich you with good help!
TEXTUAL COMMENTARY

1. despexit OGR, dispexit Calphurnius 1481, descripts McKie 2009:

Modern editors all adopt Calphurnius’ conjecture dispexit, ‘he discerned’, and with good reason. The key sense of the paradosis despexit is ‘looking down’ which fits awkwardly with the context of looking at the sky; and dispexit in the sense of perceiving heavenly phenomena is indicated in OLD (s.v. 3) and, more importantly, paralleled in Catullus’ contemporary Lucretius:

- Lucr. 2.741-42: nam cum caecigeni, solis qui lumina numquam / dispexere

As in Catullus, the paradosis in Lucretius is despexere which has later been emended into the now universally accepted dispexere. Thus, there is a strong possibility that Calphurnius’ conjecture dispexit is the correct reading in Catullus 66.1 as well.

However, I believe that the first line of Callimachus’ poem, unknown to Calphurnius, is instructive in establishing the right verb in Catullus. Pfeiffer (1949: 112) notes that γραμμαί is an astronomical terminus technicus: “γραμμαί h.l. non solum lineae, quibus caelum in partes dividitur, sed etiam delineationes ‘geometricae’ siderum esse videntur”. Pfeiffer (1949: 112) goes on to suggest that Callimachus in lines 1 and 7 perhaps juxtaposes the act of looking down on an astronomical map and of looking up at the sky. In a note to his translation of the line Trypanis (1958: 81) also suggests that “on the charts of the stars the sky was divided by lines into sections. This is probably the meaning of ἐν γραμμαῖσιν.” Finally, Harder (2012: 802) agrees that Conon “studied the maps of the stars or an astronomical globe and then discovered the shape of

40 Lucr. 2.741-42: ‘For when those born blind, who have never seen the lights of the sun.’

41 Apart from a few ancient testimonia Callimachus’ poem was unknown until the publications by Vitelli 1929 and Lobel 1952. For a schematic presentation of the transmission of the poem see Hansen & Tortzen 1973: 32.

42 Pfeiffer 1949: 112: ‘γραμμαί seem in this place not only to be the lines, by which the sky is divided into parts, but also the ‘geometrical’ sketches of the constellations.’
the new constellation, which was not yet in the maps, in the sky (cf. 7 ἐν ἣσπὶ).”

This sense of juxtaposition between looking down at the maps and then looking up at the sky is perfectly expressed by the paradosis despexit, but it is lost in Calphurnius’ and McKie’s conjectures. Barrett (1982: 136) notes that Latin “has no equivalent to γραμμαί” and concludes that despicere “which usually implies looking down from a height, is a splendid verb to use of an omniscient astronomer who can survey the whole universe by looking down at his charts.” Although Catullus uses despicere in the sense of ‘despise’ in 64.20, which is the only other place in his opera where the verb is transmitted, I agree with Barrett that Catullus, in order to elucidate the sense of looking down in Callimachus’ ἐν γραμμάσιν, might have written despexit in place of the neutral ἴδων, ‘having looked at’, in Callimachus. Therefore, I think that the manuscripts are right in transmitting despexit, although Calphurnius’ conjecture is very elegant indeed.

**limina Rehm 1934, lumina OGR:**

In connection with magni ... mundi (66.1), ‘of the great universe’, Rehm’s conjecture is a natural translation of Callimachus’ astronomical terminus technicus ὅρον, which, according to the parallels to Aristotle’s De generatione et corruptione given in Pfeiffer (1949: 112), means something like ‘the limit of the sky’; cf. Trypanis (1958: 82) who translates πάντα τὸν ἐν γραμμάσιν ἴδων ὅρον as “having examined all the charted (?) sky”, and Nisetich’s (2001: 164) translation: “He who conned the sky mapped out from end to end on charts”. For the erroneous paradosis see Catullus 66.17 where OGR clearly mistake limina for lumina. Since limina is not a terminus technicus in itself the corruption may have been caused through normalisation by a scribe unfamiliar with the Greek technical term or through a confusion of i (one stroke) and u (two strokes).

2. **obitus MS 59, habitus OGR**

The conjecture obitus agrees with the familiar pairing of ortus and obitus. See for instance:
• Cic. *Inv. rhet.* 1.59: *nam et signorum ortus et obitus definitum quendam ordinem servant.*

• Cic. *Fat.* 17: *signorum ortus obitusque perdiscere.*

• Verg. *G.* 1.257: *nec frustra signorum obitus speculamur et ortus.*

For words being corrupted by an initial *h* see Nisbet (1991: 87).

5. **sub Latmia MS 122, sublamina O, sublimia GR:**

MS 122’s conjecture fits nicely with the mentioning of *Triuia*, i.e. Artemis/Selene, and *dulcis amor*, ‘sweet love’, in the next line. The object of Artemis/Selene’s desire, Endymion, is held to have dwelled on Mount Latmos (e.g. Theoc. *Id.* 20.37-39 and Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 4.57-58). The strokes in *-tmi-* could have been read as *-min-*(O) by an inattentive scribe. A later, more attentive scribe could in turn have corrected the nonsensical *sublamina* into *sublimia* (GR), ‘lofty’, in order to make it agree with *saxa*, ‘rocks’.

**relegans MS 122, religans OGR:**

The reading of the manuscripts is unmetrical. The conjecture *relegans*, ‘banishing’, fits well with the context of a goddess’ shameful submission to a mortal. For the strong wording of *relegans* see Callimachus’ contemporary Apollonius Rhodius’ description of the affair between Selene and Endymion in *Argonautica* 4.57 and 4.62-64.

7. **in lumine Vossius 1684, numine OGR, lumine Canter 1556:**

Canter’s conjecture *lumine*, ‘the light’, with Voss’ addition *in* matches Callimachus’ *ἐν ἄει*, ‘in the sky’. The reading of *OGR* might be explained by the corruption *caelesti(i)n(l)umine*.

---

43 Cic. *Inv. rhet.* 1.59: ‘For both the risings and the settings of the constellations keep a certain fixed order.’

44 Cic. *Fat.* 17: ‘To learn thoroughly the risings and the settings of the constellations.’

45 Verg. *G.* 1.257: ‘Nor in vain do we observe the risings and the settings of the constellations.’
9. uotis ... deorum McKie 2009, multis ... dearum OGR, cunctis ... deorum Haupt 1837:
In the context it does not seem clear at all why Berenice would promise the lock of hair to ‘many of the goddesses’ as the para-
dosis reads, especially since the paradosis in 66.33-34 says that she promised the lock cunctis diviis, ‘to all the gods’. This prompted Haupt to suggest cunctis ... deorum, ‘to all of the gods’, which is somewhat supported by Callimachus’ πᾶσιν ... θεοῖς, ‘to all the gods’, unknown to Haupt. The partitive in Haupt’s conjecture is, however, unparalleled in both Greek and Latin. Given the mentioning of pristina uota, ‘the former vows’, in 66.38, which would otherwise stand unexplained, McKie’s conjecture seems to be the best reading, although Haupt’s conjecture does agree with the sense in Callimachus. For a parallel to the genitive in uotis ... deorum, ‘with vows to the gods’, see:
- Livy praef. 13: cum bonis potius ominibus uotisque et precationibus deorum dearumque
Palaeographically uotis is not far from multis, and it could very well have been corrupted by a scribe yet unfamiliar with pristina uota in 66.38. Additionally, dearum and deorum look similar in minuscule manuscripts and can easily be confused.

11. nouis ... hymenaeis Ald. 1502, nouo ... hymeneo OGR:
The paradosis nouo auctus hymenaeo, ‘blessed with a new wed-
ding’, presents a hiatus after nouo which Catullus generally avoids.47 The reading of the Aldine edition is in better accordance with Catullus’ general practice than the paradosis by (i) avoiding the hiatus and (ii) using the plural of hymenaeus. Catullus uses the plural of hymenaeus in two other places, both unanimously trans-
mittted by OGR, in the sense of ‘wedding’, whereas he does not use the word in singular in that sense. Cf.:
- Cat. 64.20: tum Thetis humanos non despexit hymenaeos

46 Livy praef. 13: ‘With good omens, rather, and with vows and prayers to the gods and the goddesses’.
48 Cat. 64.20: ‘Then Thetis did not despise a mortal wedding.’
• Cat. 64.141: *sed conubia laeta, sed optatos hymenaeos*\(^{49}\)

**auctus** _OGR_, **auctatus** _Goold 1969_

Goold’s reading *auctatus*, ‘enlarged by’, avoids the hiatus in the manuscripts; but the transmitted *auctus* is in better accordance with Catullan practice. Catullus uses the participle of *augeo* twice (64.25, 64.165) in the sense of ‘blessed with’ (*OLD* s.v. 6b), transmitted by the manuscripts, but he does not use the participle of *aucto* anywhere else; instead he uses the verb once (67.2), transmitted by the manuscripts as well. Thus, the Aldine reading *nouis auctus hymenaeis* (see previous entry) will be the best way to avoid the hiatus transmitted by the manuscripts.

12. **uastatum** _MS 31, uastum_ _OGR:_

The unmetrical paradosis must have been caused by haplography.

**ierat** _OGR_, **iuerat ed. 1472:_

The paradosis is usually corrected into *iuerat*. But according to Marinone (1997: 96) a long *i* in the perfect sense of *eo* is well-attested in the comic poets: *iēram* (*Plaut. Amph. 401*), *iēro* (*Capt. 194; Stich. 484*), and *iērant* (*Ter. Ad. 27*). The lock generally speaks in an archaic and colloquial manner which fits well with Roman comedy.\(^{50}\) Therefore, I see no need to emend the paradosis here.

15. **anne** _MS 52, atque_ _OGR:_

A disjunctive conjunction is needed, since the second question poses an alternative to the first question. The reading *anne* is in accordance with line 27, and it is palaeographically close to the paradosis.

17. **citra Nisbet 1978, intra** _OGR_

Catullus uses neither *intra*, ‘within’, nor *citra*, ‘on this side of’, elsewhere in his poems. Therefore, the choice of reading depends on the tricky sense of *thalami*. According to *LSJ* (s.v.) θάλαμος can

---

\(^{49}\) Cat. 64.141: ‘But a happy marriage, but a long-desired wedding.’

\(^{50}\) Cf. for instance the many contracted forms in the lock’s speech, such as *cognoram* for *cognoveram* (66.25), *alis* for *alius* (66.28) and *tristi* for *trivisti* (66.30). For morphological contraction as a part of colloquial diction in Roman comedy see Karakasis 2014: 568.
mean (i) an inner room or chamber; (ii) a women’s apartment in the house; (iii) a bedroom; (iv) a bride-chamber / bedroom of an unmarried son; (v) the house in general. According to OLD (s.v.) thalamus can mean (i) an inner chamber or apartment, esp. for sleeping; (ii) the bedroom or apartment occupied by a married couple. The noun is attested twice in Callimachus (Ep. 5.9; Hymn 6.112), but never in relation to marriage. In Catullus, the noun is attested in two other places:

- Cat. 61.185: uxor in thalamo tibi est
- Cat. 68.103-4: ne Paris abducta gauisus libera moecha otia pacato degeret in thalamo.

In 61.185 the sense is clearly (ii) ‘marriage-chamber’, whereas the sense in 68.104 is probably (i) ‘bedroom’. However, as Catullus 61.76-106 tell how noua nupta, ‘the new bride’ (cf. 66.15), weeps as she walks out of the doors of her family house to the bridegroom’s cubile, ‘bed’, I find Nisbet’s conjecture attractive. As a possible parallel Nisbet (1978: 101) points to Medea’s return in:

- Ov. Met. 7.238: constitit adueniens citra limenque foresque

The corruption may have occurred through a scribe misreading ci for in or through normalisation, since intra is a commoner preposition than citra.

**limina MS 31, lumina OGR**

In the context lumina, ‘lights’, does not make any sense, while limina, ‘thresholds’, fits well with citra and thalami, marking the boundaries outside of which the brides shed their tears. The noun lumina occurs frequently throughout the poem, but in this place as in 66.1 the manuscripts must have mistaken limina for lumina.

**18. iuerint ed. 1472, iuuerint OGR:**

Fordyce (1961: 332) argues that iuerint “is in origin an s-aorist optative formation” and shows that the form is attested in Plautus,

---

51 Cat. 61.185: ‘Your wife is in the wedding-chamber’.  
52 Cat. 68.103-4: ‘Lest Paris might spend undisturbed leisure in a peaceful chamber after having enjoyed his abducted paramour.’  
53 Ov. Met. 7.238: ‘When she arrived she stopped on this side of the threshold and the doors’.
Terence and Propertius. The parallels to Roman comedy fits well with the lock’s general manner of speech (cf. entry 12 on *ierat*). The change into *iuuerint* has probably occurred through normalisation.

21. **aut Hertzberg 1862, et OGR (al. at G²R²), an Puccius 1502:**
The paradosis does not seem the right way of beginning the line. What is needed is rather a disjunctive conjunction introducing the question. Puccius’ *an* is certainly a possibility. But given *et* and the alternative *at* in the manuscripts, I think that Hertzberg’s conjecture is better. The first letter is separated from the rest of the line in O; and monosyllables at the beginning of a line are in general liable to corruption (Kenney 1958: 65). Sometimes (though rarely) *aut* is abbreviated to *a* in medieval manuscripts (Cappelli 1982: 34). If the first letter was lost in the manuscript, the scribe could easily corrupt *aut* into *et*. For *aut* introducing an alternative question see Catullus 29.21.

23. **quam Bentley 1697, cum OGR:**
Bentley’s *quam* turns the line into an exclamation which fits the context. The corruption may have occurred through a scribe mis-reading *quam* for *quom* and a later scribe correcting *quom* into *cum*. Cf. *quom* in the sense of *cum* in the Gallus fragment (Plate IV in Anderson, Parsons and Nisbet 1979 [unnumbered page]). Trappes-Lomax (2007: 19) even argues that Catullus “spelled the conjunction *quom* not *cum*.”

25. **te add. Avancius**
The addition of *te* is necessary (i) in order to make a long syllable of the naturally short *at* before the two short syllables <*te*> *ego* (with elision) and (ii) as a direct object for *cognoram*. It has probably been lost due to double haplography: *at(te)ego*.

27. **quo Puccius 1502, quam OGR:**
Puccius’ conjecture expresses the instrumental sense of *facinus*, ‘deed’. The medieval abbreviations of *qui* and its oblique forms are liable to be confused.
28. **fortior GR, forci̊r O, fortius MS 129a**

The reading of the manuscripts qualifies Berenice, while the conjecture qualifies *facinus*, ‘deed’. Both of these readings make good sense in the context. I choose to print the paradosis partly because it is the *lectio difficilior* (it is easier to imagine *fortior* being corrupted into *fortius* because of *quod* than the other way around), and partly because the adjective fits well with Berenice’s display of bravery when she had her adulterous first husband, Demetrius the Fair, killed as she caught him in bed with her mother.\(^{54}\)

31. **tantus OGR, tantum MSS recentiores**:

The conjecture *tantum*, ‘so much’, expresses the extent to which Berenice has been changed from her previous brave state of mind (66.27-29) into her present sorrowful condition. The paradosis indirectly expresses the extent to which Berenice has changed by referring to the greatness of the god who has changed her (probably Amor). The reading of the manuscripts could be a corrupted form due to assimilation, agreeing with *quis*, but it is not unparalleled:

- Verg. Aen. 2.281-82: *o lux Dardaniae, spes o fidissima Teucrum, / quae tantae tenuere morae*\(^{55}\)

Since the paradosis is definitely the *lectio difficilior* and attested in Vergil, who famously echoes Catullus 66 elsewhere in the *Aeneid* (Cat. 66.39-40 in Aen. 6.460 and 6.492-94), I choose to print *tantus*. Finally, for *tantus deus* in the sense of ‘mighty god’ see:

- Stat. Theb. 3.309-10: *tantosque ex ordine vidi / delituisse deos*\(^{56}\)

33. **me Puccius 1502, pro OGR**:

Puccius’ conjecture is certainly a necessary correction of the nonsensical paradosis. The corruption may have occurred


\(^{55}\) Verg. Aen. 2.281-82: ‘O light of Dardania, o most reliable hope of the Trojans, what great delays have held you?’

\(^{56}\) Stat. Theb. 3.309-10: ‘and I saw the mighty gods hide all in a line.’
through an inversion of pro later in the same line in order to make it agree with cunctis.

35. **haud Ald. 1502, aut OGR, haut Statius 1566:**
The Aldine conjecture is necessary to the sense. It could have been corrupted into aud, later corrected into aut, at a time where the h was not pronounced. I prefer the Aldine reading to Statius’ conjecture of the archaic form, as haud is the standard spelling in Catullus and generally (see e.g. Lindsay 1894: 616).

41. **adiurarit Ald. 1502, adiuraret OGR:**
The verb needs to be in the future perfect in order to express the unfulfilled condition for the main clause. The corruption may have been caused by a scribe with insufficient Latin or by a confusion of the similar-looking -i- and -e-.

43. **orbe MS 44 1474, oris OGR**
The paradosis oris is not found anywhere else without a defining adjective. The conjecture is an easy correction, but it does suggest that the poet is exaggerating, since Mount Athos is not larger than Mount Olympus, for instance.

44. **Thiae Bentley, phitie O, phytie GR, Phthiae Parthenius 1485:**
Parthenius’ conjecture is the most attractive palaeographically, but it does not seem to make sense that the agent of the sentence should be a descendant of Achilleus or a Phthian woman. Thia’s descendant is either her son the Sun or her grandson Boreas. I believe that the Sun is meant, since he is traditionally carried across the sky in his carriage (e.g. *Hymn. Hom.* 31.8-9, 14-16); but the northern location of Mount Athos might point towards Boreas.

45. **peperere MS 122, rupere Guarinus 1521 in comm., iterum Pleitner 1876, propere OGR,**
The paradosis is, once again, unmetrical. Trappes-Lomax (2007: 212) recommends Guarinus’ conjecture by referring to *OLD* s.v. 4a, where the sense of *rumpo* is given as “to make or open up by bursting (a passage, hole, or sim.).” However, as the direct object
of the verb is *nouum mare*, ‘a new sea’, and not *montem*, ‘the mountain’, *rupere* seems to make little sense. Better still is the conjecture of *MS 122*, *peperere*, with the sense of ‘create’, ‘produce’ or indeed ‘give birth to’ (*OLD* s.v. 1, 4, 5) a new sea. The corruption may have been caused by haplography or by failure to recognise a rare verb-form.

47. **facient Puteolanus 1473, facient OGR:**
The paradigma is good and well-attested Latin. Cf.:
- Ov. *A.A.* 3.655: *quid sapiens faciet, stultus cum munere gaudet*?

However, in view of the subjunctive in Callimachus’ ρέξωμεν, ‘what can we do’, unknown to Puteolanus, I tend towards the conjecture *faciant*. For a similar subjunctive see:
- Verg. *Ecl.* 3.16: *quid domini faciant, audent cum talia fures*?

The letters *a*, *e* and *u* look rather alike in minuscule manuscripts and can easily be confused.

**cedunt Harrison*, cedant OGR:**
I interpret *cum* as a *cum temporale* which normally requires a verb in the indicative (cf. Rubenbauer-Hofmann §253a). Harrison’s unpublished conjecture has the further advantage of reproducing the indicative mood of Callimachus’ εἴκουσιν, ‘they yield to’.

50. **ferri MS 31 1457, ferris OGR**
The paradigma is a grammatically correct form of *ferrum*, but it is unattested in Latin and is probably the result of dittography here. The conjecture of *MS 31* is paralleled in:
- Varro *Rust.* 2.9.15: *ne noceat collo duritia ferri*.
- Plin. *HN* 36.127: *quid ferri duritia pugnacius*?

**stringere Heyse 1855, fingere O, stringere GR**
Heyse’s conjecture is palaeographically elegant given *ferris fringere* in GR. The conjecture reproduces some of the sense of

---

57 Ov. *Ars am.* 3.655: ‘What will the wise man do, when the stupid man is happy?’
58 Verg. *Ecl.* 3.16: ‘What can proprietors do, when thieves dare such things?’
59 Varro *Rust.* 2.9.15: ‘lest the hardness of the iron harms the neck.’
60 Plin. *HN* 36.127: ‘What is more obstinate than the hardness of iron?’
Callimachus’ τυπίδων ἔφρασαν ἐργασίην, ‘they taught the working of hammers’, as stringere is a terminus technicus for increasing the hardness of a metal (OLD s.v. 1b).

53 motantibus Guarinus 1521 in comm., iterum conieci, nutantibus OGR², mutantibus R, nictantibus Bentley 1697:
I suggest that motantibus ... pennis, ‘with rapidly moving wings’, describes the rapid, vigorous movement of Callimachus’ κυκλώσας βαλιᾶ πτερά, ‘having whirled its swift wings’, better than the paradosis and Bentley’s conjecture. The use of motantibus in relation to Zephyrus is paralleled by Vergil, who echoes Catullus 66 in the Aeneid (see entry 31) as well as Catullus 62 and 64 in Eclogues 4 and 6:⁶¹
• Verg. Ecl. 5.5.: siue sub incertas Zephyris motantibus umbras⁶²
The rare participle motantibus could very well have been corrupted into the much commoner nutantibus (OG) and mutantibus (R) through acts of normalisation.

55. aerias ... undas scripsi, aetheræas (aetherias) ... umbras OGR:
I suggest that aerias ... undas, ‘the airy waves’, matches the sense of Callimachus’ ἡέρα ... ύγρόν, ‘the wet air’, better than the paradosis. I have combined the conjecture aerias ... umbras, ‘the airy shadows’, by Trappes-Lomax (2007) with the conjecture aetherias ... undas, ‘the ethereal waves’, by Zwierlein (1987). The expression aerias ... undas is paralleled in Lucretius:
• Lucr. 2.152: quo tardius ire / cogitur, aerias quasi dum diuerberat undas.⁶³
It might be worth mentioning that the auræ seem to be the habitat for winds in the Aeneid:

⁶¹ The song of the Fates (Cat. 64.326-81) is echoed in Verg. Ecl. 4.46-47, while Vesper Olympo (Cat. 62.1) seems to be echoed in Verg. Ecl. 6.86 (and in Aen. 1.374 and 8.280).
⁶² Verg. Ecl. 5.5: ‘or under the shades that are uncertain because the west winds move about’.
⁶³ Lucr. 2.152: ‘Therefore it is forced to go more slowly, while it sort of cleaves the airy waves.’
• Verg. Aen. 1.58-59: ‘If he did not do this, the rapid winds would surely take seas and lands and the lofty heaven with them and sweep through the air.’

58. Graia Lachmann 1829, Gracia O, Gratia GR, grata Ald, Graiia Baehrens 1874:

The word in Callimachus is not preserved; but the paradoxis in Catullus suggests that Callimachus used an ethnic adjective to balance Κανωπίτου, ‘of Canopus’. Thomson (1997: 457) rejects Baehrens’ Graia as unmetrical because “it would surely have to be scanned” as a dactyl. But Lachmann’s conjecture Graia, ‘Greek’, scans perfectly well. Cf.:
• Ov. Met. 15.9: Graia quis Italicis auctor posuisset in oris / moenia
• Val. Flacc. Arg. 1.599: Graia novam ferro molem commenta iuventus

These parallels make it plausible that the correct reading is Graia in Catullus. Pfeiffer (1932: 202-4) rejects the reading of Γραῖα in Callimachus because it would mean “old” rather than “Greek”. But even if this is correct and Callimachus used a more obscure ethnonym such as Φθῖα, ‘from Phthia’, Catullus could have grasped the ethnic sense and written the straightforward Graia.

59. hic liquidi Friedrich 1908, hi dii uen ibi OGR, inde Venus Postgate 1888:

These words are severely obscured in the manuscripts. Postgate’s suggestion is ingenious, but suffers from revealing divine agency earlier than in Callimachus’ version, unknown to Postgate. Friedrich’s conjecture has the attraction of adding an adjective to caeli, ‘of the sky’, and thereby balancing uario ... lumine, ‘the diverse light’. For liquidum caelum, ‘the clear sky’, see:
• Ov. Met. 1.23: et liquidum spisso secreuit ab aere caelum
• Stat. Theb. 4.7: liquido quae stridula caelo / fugit

64 Verg. Aen. 1.58-59: ‘If he did not do this, the rapid <winds> would surely take seas and lands and the lofty heaven with them and sweep through the air.’
65 Ov. Met. 15.9: ‘which ancestor had placed the Greek walls on Italian ground.’
66 Val. Flacc. Arg. 1.599: ‘When the Greek youth had created a strange devise with iron.’
67 Ov. Met. 1.23: ‘and separated the clear sky from the dense atmosphere.’
68 Stat. Theb. 4.7: ‘which fled whistling through the clear sky.’
Friedrich (1908: 419-20) argues that *uen* in the sense of *Venus* is “eine übergeschriebene erklärende Glosse” like *uen* for *diua* in Cat. 64.8 (0, fol. 21r). This leaves us with the manuscript reading *hi dii ibi* which is close to *hic liquidi*, as *cl* and *d* are easily confused in the manuscripts (cf. Cat. 7.5: *oraculum*] *oradum* OR, *ora dum* G).

63. *uuidulam Guarinus 1521, uindulum OGR:*

The paradosis is unmetrical. The conjecture matches Callimachus’ λούομενον, ‘washed’, unknown to Guarinus, and is in accordance with Catullus’ predilection for coining diminutives. The strokes in -uum- are likely to be read as -uin- by an inattentive scribe. As mentioned above, -a- and -u- are so paleographically close that confusion easily occurs.

66. *Callistoe iuncta Parthenius 1485, calixto iuxta OGR:*

Parthenius’ conjecture corresponds to the Greek dative -οῖ (Trappes-Lomax 2007: 214). For a parallel use of -oe for -oī elsewhere in Catullus see:

- Cat. 64.255: *euhoe bacchantes, euhoe capita inflectentes.*

For another Greek dative in Catullus see 66.70: *Tethyi, ‘to Tethys’. The final vowel in the paradosis *iuxta* is long and therefore unmetrical. The conjecture restores the metre.

71. *hic OGR, haec Puteolanus 1473, hoc Owen 1893:*

The paradosis marks a narrative parenthesis. The suggested conjectures all make perfect sense, but since there is no problem with *hic*, ‘here, at this point’, I do not see any reason to emend it.

73. *dictis GR, doctis O, diuis Avancius 1535, dextris Bentley 1697:*

I understand *infestis ... dictis* as an instrumental ablative, ‘with hostile words’, and I do not see any reason to question the reading of GR. The anthropomorphism of Bentley’s conjecture seems to stretch the meaning too much. The lock is the narrator of the
poem, and it is therefore natural for her to utter words (and probably also for the stars to understand them).

74. **imi Nisbet 1978, uere OGR, ueri MS 31:**
As Nisbet (1978: 91) notes, “vere is not an adverb naturally found with euoluere, which is not primarily a verb of speaking.” The conjecture *ueri* is attractive and generally accepted in modern editions, but it is also unparalleled. Nisbet’s conjecture *imi* is palaeographically close to the paradosis (cf. Trappes-Lomax 2007: 216) and reasonably paralleled in:

- Cat. 64.198: *<querelas> quae quoniam uerae nascuntur pectore ab imo*\(^71\)
- Lucr. 3.57-58: *nam uerae uoces tum demum pectore ab imo / eliciunt*\(^72\)

**77. iam Harrison*, dum OGR**

If we accept Skutsch’s conjecture *muliebribus* for *fuit omnibus* (see next entry), the verb is removed from the *dum* clause, which is not really needed. Callimachus’ ὅτ᾽ ἦν ἔτι, ‘when I was still’, can easily be expressed by Harrison’s unpublished *iam*, ‘already (as)’.

**muliebribus Skutsch 1970, fuit omnibus OGR:**

Skutsch’s conjecture agrees with Callimachus’ γυναικείων, ‘of married women’, whereas the paradosis is not to be found in Callimachus. Although Catullus in 64.338 and 66.91 uses *expers*, ‘without’, with the normal genitive, the ablative according to *LS* s.v. is “ante-class.”, and (based on the examples given) quite Plautine. This agrees with the lock’s archaic and colloquial manner of speech (cf. entry 12 on *ierat*). The use of *expers* with ablative is attested in Lucretius:

- Lucr. 2.1092: *<natura uidetur> ipsa sua per se sponte omnia dis agere expers*\(^73\)

---

71 Cat. 64.198: ‘For <the complaints> are truthfully born from the bottom of my heart.’
72 Lucr. 3.57-58: ‘For only when true words are being drawn from the bottom of the heart.’
73 Lucr. 2.1092: ‘Nature appears to do everything herself of her own accord without the gods.’
• Lucr. 6.1181: *lumina uersarent oculorum expertia somno*\(^{74}\)

78. *uilia Lobel 1949, milia OGR:*
Lobel’s conjecture matches Callimachus’ λίτα, ‘plain’. It has probably been corrupted into the similar-looking *milia*, ‘thousands’, through an act of normalisation.

80. *prius Palladius 1494, post OGR*
Palladius’ conjecture corresponds to quam, ‘(before) that’, in line 82. The medieval abbreviations of *post* and *prius* look alike and can easily be confused by an inattentive scribe (cf. Cappelli 1982: 15).

83. *casti ... cubilis Gigli 1880, casto ... cubili OGR:*
The ablative in the paradosis does not qualify *iura*, ‘the laws’, very clearly (is the sense instrumental or locative?). Gigli’s conjecture makes the sense of *iura* clear. For a possible parallel see:
• Ov. *Her.* 16.286: *<metuis> castaque legitimi fallere iura tori*\(^{75}\)

85 *dona leuis bibat ed. 1472, leuis bibat dona OGR*
The correction by the *editio princeps* restores the metre which has been corrupted through a transposition of *dona*.

*aue! mala, Trappes-Lomax 2007, amala OGR:*
Trappes-Lomax (2007: 218) argues that the exclamatory *a* does not fit the context. Instead he suggests the exclamation *aue!* “as prophetic of well-deserved misfortune.” This parenthetical exclamation is suitable for an imprecation (*OLD* s.v. 2b), and it finds parallels in:
• Ov. *Ib.* 205: *tot tibi aue! misero uenient talesque ruinae*\(^{76}\)
• Ov. *Am.* 3.6.101: *Huic ego, aue! demens narrabam fluminum amores!*\(^{77}\)

---

\(^{74}\) Lucr. 6.1181: ‘they rolled their eyes which were devoid of sleep.’

\(^{75}\) Ov. *Her.* 16.286: ‘Are you afraid to deceive the chaste laws of a lawful marriage-bed’?

\(^{76}\) Ov. *Ib.* 205: ‘So many and such destructions will come down upon you, cursed, miserable man!’

\(^{77}\) Ov. *Am.* 3.6.101: ‘To such a stream I, cursed one!, was so foolish as to tell the love-stories of the rivers!’
91 **unguinis Bentley 1697 438, sanguinis OGR:**
Bentley’s conjecture certainly fits the context better than the paradosis. The corruption may have been caused by normalisation, since *sanguis*, ‘blood’, would be the normal thing to offer to a deity, as in Catullus 66.33-34 and 68.75-76.

**tui Calphurnius 1481, tuum OGR, tuam Ald. 1502:**
In 66.77-78 the lock distinguishes between the scents of married women and the cheap scents of maidens. A similar specification may be seen in 66.82-83 where the lock stresses that the new brides should make offerings from their own perfume jars. Calphurnius’ conjecture fits well with this context, as it specifies that the newly wed Berenice should make offerings of her own perfume to the lock. The Aldine conjecture *tuam* (*me*) is an idiom frequently found in Latin love poetry; but as the lock is not Berenice’s lover, and Nisbet and Hubbard furthermore note that this expression is unparalleled in Greek, from which Catullus translates, I find Calphurnius’ conjecture most attractive. The corruption may have been caused by dittography: *tuim me*, and a later scribe correcting the nonsensical *tuim* into *tuum* without acknowledging the gender of the speaker.

93 **correrint Lachmann 1829, cur iterent OGR, cur retinent Puccius 1502, cursum iterent Lenchantin de Gubernatis 1928**
Lines 93 and 94 are notoriously difficult. Every conjecture in line 93 needs to make sense of the miraculous proximity in 66.94 of the normally widely separated constellations Aquarius and Orion. Neither Puccius’ conjecture (‘why do the stars restrain me?’) nor that of Lenchantin de Gubernatis (‘may the stars repeat their course’) seem to explain the proximity of Aquarius and Orion in 66.94. Lachmann’s conjecture is closest to enabling this proximity, as the two constellations certainly could be shining next to each other, if all the constellations had fallen from the heaven. Critics sometimes object that this destruction of the universe would kill Berenice and so prevent the lock from obtaining her wish to be reunited with the queen; but as Heyworth (2015:

---

136) has recently argued, the line could simply illustrate that the lock is so eager “to return to Berenice’s head that it wishes for the destruction of the universe in order to bring this about.” The further implications of the proposed catastrophe should probably not be taken too literally.

**iterum ut Corradinus de Allio 1738, utinam GR, utina O**

The sense of the line seems to require an indication that the lock wishes to return to her previous state. This sense is made clear by the conjecture of Corradinus de Allio. The corruption may have happened at some point after *corruerint* was corrupted into *cur iterent* through an act of haplography due to the similarity of *iterent* and *iterum*. This would have left *ut* which may in turn have been corrected into *utinam* (GR) in order to make it agree with the wish seemingly to be expressed in the subjunctive *fiam*, ‘I wish I could become’.

**fulguret ‘codex antiquus’ teste Avancio 1495, fulgeret OGR, fulgeat Ald. 1502:**

For the verb to agree with the present subjunctives in 66.93, it needs to be in the present tense. The conjecture ascribed to an old manuscript by Avancius is closer to the paradosis than that of the Aldine edition, and it is paralleled in Statius’ description of Sirius, the brightest star in the night sky:


**[Cat. 67.1-2] add. Agnesini 2011**

In every printed edition of Catullus 66 the poem ends after line 94, and poem 67 begins with the lines:

- Cat. 67. 1-3: *o dulci iucunda uiro, iucunda parenti, salue, teque bona Iuppiter auctet ope, ianua, quam Balbo dicunt seruisse benigne* 80


80 Cat. 67.1-3: ‘O you, delightful to the sweet man, delightful to the parent, I salute you, and may Jupiter enrich you with good help, you door, whom they say served Balbus in a friendly manner.’
However, although the last part of the poem by Callimachus is in a severely fragmentary condition, the poem seems to have contained two further lines. According to Harder (2012: 852) an initial χαῖρε, ‘farewell’, “seems fairly certain”, while the papyrus also attests the words φίλη τεκέσσι, ‘dear to (your) children’. Lobel (1952: 98), the first editor of the papyrus, suggested in his commentary that the correct reading might have been φίλη τοκέσσι, ‘dear to (your) parents’.

It is well-established that “divisions between poems in Catullus should always be open to editorial judgement”, as OGR mark very few divisions themselves.\(^\text{81}\) Thus, Ö has no division between poem 66 and 67, while G and R have in their margins a rubricated sign, written in a different ink, of a division after 66.94. But in view of the words *iucunda parenti / salue* in Catullus 67.1-2, which, translated as ‘farewell (my queen), delightful to your parent’, is an almost precise translation of the few attested words in Callimachus (with Lobel’s suggestion): χ[αιρε] φίλη τοκέσσι, ‘farewell (my queen), dear to your parents’, I think that Agnesini (2011: 527-40) and Du Quesnay (2012: 181-83), who have separately come to the same conclusion, are right in suggesting that the couplet *o dulci iucunda uiro, iucunda parenti, / salue, teque bona Iuppiter auctet ope* is in fact the conclusion of poem 66 and not the beginning of poem 67. As Du Quesnay (2012: 182) rightly notes, *dulci ... uiro* neatly picks up *dulci coniuge* in 66.33, and Heyworth (2015: 136) further demonstrates that poem 67 can begin in a perfectly intelligible and Catullan manner with the vocative *ianua* (67.3). For parallels to the sense of *salue* as ‘farewell’ at the end of an address or a hymn and to its similarity to the Greek χαῖρε, see the list and discussion in Heyworth (2015: 136-37).

\(^{81}\) Heyworth 2015: 135.
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