

TWO HUMANISTIC CONJECTURES IN CATULLUS: 55.17
PAPILLAE AND 61.140 *SOLI*

DÁNIEL KISS
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München
Daniel.Kiss@klassphil.uni-muenchen.de

ABSTRACT

This article investigates the origins of two humanistic conjectures in Catullus. One is *papillae* at 55.17, which is first attested in Palladio Fosco's commentary of 1496. However, Palladio was a plagiarist; and both the conjectural phrase *lacteolae ... papillae* and the transmitted reading *lacteolae ... puellae* are echoed in poems by Gioviano Pontano that were written before 1496. The second conjecture that is studied here is *solī* at 61.140. This has been attributed to the Codex Memmianus (Parisinus lat. 8233) of 1465, where it does not appear. Its earliest attestation may be once again in Palladio's commentary of 1496. The author of this conjecture remains unknown.

KEY WORDS

Catullus, conjectures, Gioviano Pontano.

ABRISS

In diesem Aufsatz wird der Ursprung von zwei humanistischen Konjekturen zu Catull erforscht. *papillae* in 55.17 ist zuerst in Palladio Foscós Catullkommentar von 1496 belegt. Palladio war jedoch Plagiator; und sowohl der konjekturale Ausdruck *lacteolae ... papillae* als die überlieferte Lesart *lacteolae ... puellae* finden Wiederhall in Gedichten Gioviano Pontanos, die vor 1496 geschrieben wurden. Zweitens wird die Konjektur *solī* in 61.140 in diesem Aufsatz untersucht. Diese Lesart ist dem Codex Memmianus (Parisinus lat. 8233) von 1465 zugeschrieben worden; da erscheint sie jedoch nicht. Der früheste datierte Beleg ist wieder Palladios Catullkommentar von 1496. Der Autor dieser Konjektur bleibt unbekannt.

SCHLÜSSELWÖRTER

Catull, Konjekturen, Gioviano Pontano.

Fecha de recepción: 28/02/2013

Fecha de aceptación y versión final: 07/08/2013

In this article I will discuss two humanistic conjectures in Catullus. I will not try to assess their merit, which will be done soon by my friend Antonio Ramírez de Verger¹; I will rather set out where they are attested, and will propose some ideas about their authorship.

These two conjectures belong to a large group of readings that appear for the first time in Catullus' humanistic *codices recentiores*. Catullus' manuscript tradition has not yet been mapped out in full, and the possibility cannot be excluded that some of these readings are not conjectures but transmitted readings that stem not from *OGR* but from a lost manuscript that was independent of them². Scholars have tried to identify such readings since the nineteenth century³, but they have had relatively little success in convincing the scientific community about their findings so far. And even if there did turn up a number of such readings, that would not change the fact that most of the variants that are first attested in the *codices recentiores* are evidently humanistic conjectures. It follows that for any individual reading that appears in the *recentiores*, the balance of probabilities leans heavily towards the possibility that it should be a humanistic conjecture. I do not see any reason to regard the two variants that are discussed here as anything else.

* * *

Catullus 55.15-19⁴

dic nobis ubi sis futurus, ede
audacter, committe, crede luci.
nunc te lacteolae tenent puellae?
si linguam clauso tenes in ore,
fructus proicies amoris omnes.

¹ A. Ramírez de Verger, "Nicolaus Heinsius's notes on Catullus", forthcoming in D. Kiss (ed.), *What Catullus Wrote*. The present article started its existence as an editorial note on this paper; I would like to thank Antonio Ramírez de Verger for having encouraged me to publish it. I should also thank the anonymous referees of *Exemplaria Classica* for their helpful comments, Ewen Bowie for bibliographic advice, and Bruce Barker-Benfield and Giuseppe Gilberto Biondi for having provided information on a manuscript at the Bodleian Library and one at the Vatican, respectively.

² On this possibility see the review of D. F. S. Thomson, *Catullus: A Critical Edition*, Chapel Hill 1978 by M. D. Reeve in *Phoenix* 34, 1980, 179-84, at 179-80, and G. G. Biondi, "Catullo, Sabellico (& Co.) e ... Giorgio Pasquali", forthcoming in *Paideia* 68, 2013, and in English as "Catullus, Sabellicus (& Co.) and ... Giorgio Pasquali" in D. Kiss (ed.), *What Catullus Wrote*.

³ For recent attempts see A. Agnesini, "Catull. 16,10: *hispidosis*, una probabile lezione negletta", *Vichiana* 11.2, 2009, 244-57, and id., "Una possibile rilettura dei carmi 113 e 94 sulle tracce di un ciclo di Mucia", *ExClass* 16, 2012, 45-73, as well as Biondi, "Catullo, Sabellico" and "Catullus, Sabellico".

⁴ Here and below I give the text printed by D. F. S. Thomson, *Catullus Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary*, Toronto 1997; the critical apparatus is mine. For a full up-to-date critical apparatus one can consult *Catullus Online* (www.catullusonline.org).

55.17 puelle *OGR* : papille *manus prima in Vaticano lat. 7044, manus tertia in Parisino lat. 7989, Vaticanus lat. 7192, 'vetus) c(odex)' teste Petreio, Palladius*

The reading *papillae* at 55.17 is found in three places in Catullus' manuscript tradition⁵: in the margin of Vaticanus lat. 7044 and of Parisinus lat. 7989, and in Vaticanus lat. 7192. However, it is first attested in print, in the edition and commentary published by Palladio Fosco in 1496⁶. Palladio claims to have conjectured it himself, but he has been unmasked by Julia Haig Gaisser as a plagiarist⁷, so his words need not be taken at face value.

One of the attestations of *papillae* occurs in a source that is known to be indebted to Palladio's commentary. A later hand added the word in the margin of Parisinus lat. 7989, the famous Codex Traguriensis, known as the *codex unicus* of Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis*; it is also an important source of humanistic conjectures on Catullus. Following Thomson, I used to regard the hand that has added *papillae* as the second hand in the Traguriensis, but in fact it is the third, as has been pointed out by Albinia de la Mare⁸. She dated this hand tentatively to the early sixteenth century. More recently, Bratislav Lučin has shown that this is the hand of the great Croatian humanist Marko Marulić (1450-1524)⁹. Marulić's marginalia display knowledge of Palladio's commentary¹⁰.

⁵ I now have access to a collation, a reproduction, or a transcription of every manuscript of Catullus copied before 1502 that is known today, except for some that only contain short excerpts or fragments. For most manuscripts I rely on the excellent collations or transcriptions by Berthold Ullman and others that are now conserved among the Hale-Ullman Papers at the Department of Classics of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. I have been able to fill in the gaps in the Hale-Ullman Papers by collating, photographing, or obtaining reproductions of the remaining manuscripts. This would not have been possible without generous research funding from the Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa and the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, and the support of friends and colleagues in Chapel Hill and elsewhere.

⁶ *Palladii Fusci in Catullum commentarii*, Venetiis 1496, in contextu: *Num te lacteolæ tenent papillæ; in commentariis: Puellæ: emendo papillæ: quia pauloante dixit. en hic in Rhoseis latet papillis.*

⁷ J. H. Gaisser, *Catullus and his Renaissance Readers*, Oxford 1993, 52 and 97-9.

⁸ Thomson, *Catullus Edited, in apparatu*, e.g. on 37.11 and 42.8; A. C. de la Mare, "The Return of Petronius to Italy", in J. J. G. Alexander & M. T. Gibson (eds.), *Medieval Learning and Literature. Essays presented to Richard William Hunt*, Oxford 1976, 220-51 and plates XXIII-XXVIII, at 242.

⁹ Bratislav Lučin, "Marulićeva ruka na Trogirskom kodeksu Petronija (*Codex Parisiensis lat. 7989 olim Traguriensis*) – Marulić's hand on the Codex Traguriensis (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 7989)", in: *Colloquia Maruliana* 14, Split 2005, 315-22; Id., "Marul, Katul i trogirski kodeks Petronija (*Codex Parisiensis lat. 7989 olim Traguriensis*) – Marulus, Catullus and the Codex Traguriensis", in: *Colloquia Maruliana* 16, Split 2007, 5-48. The two articles are available online at <http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=13648> and <http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=18260> as of 26 July 2013.

¹⁰ De la Mare, "The Return of Petronius to Italy", *loc. cit.*; Lučin, "Marul, Katul", esp. 24-9,

In Vaticanus lat. 7044 the words *papillę / puellę male* have been added in the margin, apparently some time after the main text was completed: the ink seems to be different, but the hand could perhaps be that of the scribe¹¹. Vaticanus lat. 7044 can surely be identified with the Codex Romanus in which Justus Lipsius had found the reading *papillae*¹². A note on the front flyleaf of this manuscript, now partly obliterated but still legible, indicates that it is an exact copy of a manuscript of Gioviano Pontano's (1426-1503) made by Basilio Zanchi (ca. 1501-1558) in 1520; but Julia Haig Gaisser has found reason to call this into doubt¹³. Whatever the case, the marginal readings that were added to the manuscript by this hand and in this ink appear to derive from Palladio's edition and commentary¹⁴.

The first manuscript to read *papillae* is Vaticanus lat. 7192, which contains a set of excerpts from Catullus that were written in 1527 in Italy, perhaps in the Molise¹⁵. In fact several other parallels show that these excerpts too were copied from the edition of Palladio¹⁶.

papillae is found in another manuscript of sorts, namely in Antonius Petreius' marginalia in a copy of the second Aldine edition of 1515 of Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius; this volume is now Berlin, Staatsbibliothek – Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Diez. oct. 2474¹⁷. Next to 55.17 *puellae* Petreius has added the note *papillae v(etus) c(odex)*. It is probably from there that Nicolaus Heinsius knows the conjecture, which he commends hesitantly in

33-40 and 47.

¹¹ I have only been able to consult a digital reproduction of this manuscript.

¹² J. Lipsius *apud* J. Dousa *pater, Praecidanea Pro Q. Valerio Catullo*, Antverpiae 1581, 56.

¹³ Thomson, *Catullus Edited*, 87, who quotes the note on the front flyleaf; J. H. Gaisser, "Pontano's Catullus", forthcoming in D. Kiss (ed.), *What Catullus Wrote*.

¹⁴ The following parallels should illustrate how the correcting (first?) hand in the margin (henceforth Vat.c.m.) of Vat. lat. 7044 (henceforth Vat.) follows Palladio (Pall.): 9.2 *Antestans* in linea et *Qui antistans* super lineam Vat.: *Antistes. Alij Antestans* (nisi forte *Antistans* legendum sit) Vat.c.m.: *Antistes* in contextu et *Antistes ... sunt qui legant antistans* in commentariis Pall. 12.1 *Inter cenam* in linea (postea oblitteratum) et *Marrucine* super lineam Vat.: *Inter Coenam alij* Vat.c.m.: *Matrucine* in contextu et *Matrucine. Quidam eruditorum legunt non Matrucine sed inter coenam quod mihi ualde placet* in comm. Pall. 17.19 *supernata* in linea (oblitteratum) et *expornata* super lineam (obl.) Vat.: *separata. alij supernata* Vat.c.m.: *separata* in contextu et *Separata. caesa: sed nonnulli legunt supernata* in comm. Pall. 22.8 *Directa* in contextu (obl.) et *Desepta* in marg. (obl.) Vat.: *Directa. Dissecta male* Vat.c.m.: *Directa* in contextu et *Dissecta. emendo Directa* in comm. Pall.

¹⁵ The extracts from Catullus are on fols. 165r-84v (55.17 is on fol. 172r). On the volume and the extracts see further Thomson, *Catullus Edited*, 91, and A.-V. Gilles-Raynal *et al.* (eds.), *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, Vatican & Paris 2010, III.2, 661-3.

¹⁶ Cat. 48.4 *saturum inde cor futurum est* Palladius in contextu, Vat.lat. 7192 (henceforth Vx.); 55.4 *labellis* Pall. in cont., Vx.; 55.5 *superi iouis* Pall. in cont., Vx.

¹⁷ For a transcription see J. A. Bellido Díaz, "Las notas a Catulo de A. Petreius y N. Heinsius", *ExClass* 15, 2011, 123-200, at 157.

his *Adversaria*¹⁸. Heinsius was a former owner of this volume, and he added his own extensive marginalia to those of Petreius. He could also have found the conjecture in the *Praecidanea* of Janus Dousa the Elder¹⁹.

To sum up, *papillae* is first attested in 1496 in the commentary of Palladio Fosco, who treats it as a conjecture of his own; but he is a well-known plagiarist. Could it have been conjectured by someone else before him? Given that it appears in Parisinus lat. 7044 and in the marginalia of Petreius, which are two sources for the Catullan conjectures of Gioviano Pontano, I have long suspected that *papillae* too could be his conjecture: he had the linguistic skills and also the erotic imagination necessary to invent such a reading²⁰. But we have just seen that in fact the marginalia in Parisinus lat. 7044 are derived from Palladio's commentary. However, it has already been noted that Palladio was a plagiarist, and it seems doubtful whether he had the linguistic skill and the inventiveness that it will have taken to conjecture *papillae*. In fact there exists proof that *papillae* is not his conjecture, as I discovered in February 2013, when I had the good luck of proofreading Antonio Ramírez de Vergers paper "Nicolaus Heinsius's Notes on Catullus". Ramírez de Verger quotes a series of parallels for the phrase *lacteolae papillae* from the poetry of Pontano. These parallels make it all but certain that *papillae* is a conjecture of Pontano's.

Pontano uses the phrase *lacteolae ... papillae* at *De amore coniugali* 2.15.7 *en tibi lacteolae, Luci formose, papillae*, and at *Hendecasyllabi siue Baiae* 1.18.19-21 *nec erubescas / mox ad lacteolas manum papillas / tractans inicere*. He also echoes it at *Hend.* 1.4.7-8 *nam quid lacteolos sinus et ipsas / prae te fers sine linteo papillas?*, at *Hend.* 1.16.39 *colla et candida, uesculas papillas*, and at *Hend.* 2.18.22 *in te lacteolo sinu refusa*. Furthermore, he echoes *lacteolae puellae*, the transmitted reading at Catullus 55.17, at *Hend.* 1.9.20 *uel te ut lacteolae petant puellae*, and at *Hend.* 1.1.15-17 *inter lacteolas simul puellas, / inter molliculos simul maritos / ludetis simul atque prurietis*. These parallels show that both versions of the passage – not only the conjectural variant *lacteolae ... papillae*, but also the transmitted reading *lacteolae ... puellae* – were present in his mind while he was writing these poems²¹. The only plausible explanation for this is that it was he who had conjectured *papillae*. In playing with a textual problem in his poetry he resembles the great scholar-poets of Hellenistic Alexandria²².

¹⁸ N. Heinsius, P. Burmannus Jr. (ed.), *Adversariorum Libri IV*, Harlingae 1742, 643.

¹⁹ Dousa pater, *Praecidanea*, loc. cit.

²⁰ On Pontano and Catullus see Gaisser, *Catullus and his Renaissance Readers*, 126-9 and 220-9; Gaisser, "Pontano's Catullus"; and T. Baier (ed.), *Pontano und Catull*, Tübingen 2003.

²¹ Pontano, *Hend.* 1.18.20 was soon imitated by Naugerius (Andrea Navagero, 1483-1529), *Lusus* 21.7-8 *mox ubi lacteolas et dignas matre papillas / uidit*.

²² For the phenomenon see e.g. Callimachus, *Aetia* frg. 67.3, Pfeiffer with A. Harder, *Cal-*

Almost all the parallels come from the *Hendecasyllabi siue Baiae*, composed by Pontano “during the last thirty years of his life”²³. Many of the poems in this collection cannot be dated, but 1.16 is addressed *Ad Alfonsum ducem Calabriae*, and it must have been written before Duke Alfonso became King of Naples on 25 January 1494²⁴. One echo appears in *De amore coniugali*, which is much earlier: poem 1.3 was written to celebrate Pontano’s marriage to Adriana Sassone on 1 February 1461, and the collection as a whole evidently predates her death on 1 March 1490²⁵. These two echoes at any rate clearly predate Palladio’s commentary.

How did this conjecture of Pontano’s reach Palladio? We cannot tell; but there is a parallel in Pontano’s supplement to line 34.3 *Diane pueri integri*, which was added by a fifteenth-century hand to Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Codex lat. medii aevi 137, probably while it still belonged to Pontano’s friend Antonello Petrucci (†1487); and it is attributed to *Pon. ex v. c.* by Antonio Petreio in his marginalia to Catullus in Berlin, Diez. oct. 2474; however, Palladio claimed the credit for having found this line *in vetustiore exemplari*²⁶. Evidently, several ideas of Pontano’s found their way into Palladio’s commentary.

* * *

Catullus 61.139-143

scimus haec tibi quae licent
sola cognita, sed marito
ista non eadem licent.
io Hymen Hymenaeae io,
io Hymen Hymenaeae.

61.147 sola *OGR* : soli manus prima in *Oxonienſi Canon. Class. Lat. 34, Parisinus lat. 8236, nescio quis in Vaticano lat. 7044, manus tertia in Parisino lat. 7989, Palladius*

limachus. Aetia, Oxford 2012, II, *ad loc.*, and A. S. Hollis, *Callimachus. Hecale*, Oxford 1990, 11.

²³ R. G. Dennis, *Giovanni Gioviano Pontano. Baiae*, Cambridge, Ma. & London 2006, vii.

²⁴ Compare also lines 2, 11, 28-9 and 49 of the poem.

²⁵ Cf. L. Monti Sabia, *Giovanni Gioviano Pontano. Poesie Latine*, Milano-Napoli 1964, I, 134-5.

²⁶ For Petreius’ note see Bellido Díaz, “Las notas a Catulo”, 147; on this supplement see further D. Kiss, “A Renaissance manuscript of Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius: Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Codex latinus medii aevi 137 and Cologne, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, MS. Bodmer 141”, *AAntHung* 52, 2012, 249-71, at 254-5.

soli appears in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canonicianus Class. Lat. 34 as a correction by the first hand, and it stands in the text of Parisinus lat. 8236. Thomson dates the former to the end of the 15th century and the latter to around the year 1500, and he notes that the former “seems to have influenced” the latter²⁷. The reading also appears in our old acquaintances Vaticanus lat. 7044 as a correction by an early hand, and in Parisinus lat. 7989 as a correction apparently by the third hand, that is, by Marko Marulić. Once again, Marulić seems to have taken this reading from Palladio’s commentary of 1496, who prints it in the text without comment. The reading also appears in a number of sources from the sixteenth century, including Girolamo Avanzi’s rare last edition of Catullus that was printed in 1535, and Achilles Statius’ commentary of 1566.

However, Otto Skutsch has stated that *soli* also appears in a manuscript copied in 1465, namely in Parisinus lat. 8233, the beautiful Codex Memmianus; and he has been followed in this by George P. Goold²⁸. I have checked a photographic reproduction of the manuscript as well as a collation made of it by Berthold L. Ullman in 1907; and I can confirm that it reads *sola*. The misattribution arose because Passerat wrote in his commentary “At veteres libri Memmij, *Coelibis soli, pro quæ licent solæ*”²⁹; and Skutsch took this to be a reference to the Memmianus.

Where does *coelibis soli* come from? The only manuscript to read *soli* that Passerat could have seen is Parisinus lat. 8236; but that does not read *coelibis*. Passerat must have taken *coelibis soli* from somewhere else – but where? There are three possibilities. The two words occur together in Girolamo Avanzi’s last edition of Catullus, which was printed in 1535; but it is unlikely that Passerat should have come across that extremely rare book, and if he had seen it, he would probably have quoted it by the name of its editor. It is also possible that the French scholar found *coelibis soli* in the margins of an annotated early printed edition of Catullus, or perhaps in several, if the plural in “veteres libri” is to be taken literally. I have not been able to identify any such annotated volume; those that ultimately descend from Francesco Puccis marginalia of 1502, including Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Rés. p. Yc. 379, read *coelibis*, but not *soli*³⁰. The third possibility is that Passerat found

²⁷ Thomson, *Catullus Edited*, 81-2 (quotation from 81).

²⁸ O. Skutsch, “Metrical variations and some textual problems in Catullus”, *BICS* 16, 1969, 38-43, at 43, n. 8; G. P. Goold, *Catullus*, London 1983, 230, cf. 226. On Parisinus lat. 8233 see J. Butrica, *The Manuscript Tradition of Propertius*, Toronto 1984, 280-1, and Kiss, “A Renaissance manuscript”, esp. 266-7.

²⁹ I. Passeratius, *Ioannis Passeratii, Professoris et Interpretis Regii, Commentarii in C. Val. Catullum, Albium Tibullum, et Sex. Propertium*, Parisiis 1608, 18. – Ullman’s collation is conserved among the Hale-Ullman Papers at the Department of Classics of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (see n. 5 above).

³⁰ On these volumes see J. H. Gaisser, “Catullus, Gaius Valerius”, in V. Brown (ed.), *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*, Washington D.C. 1992, VII, 198-292, at 243-9.

soli in Parisinus lat. 8236 and *coelibi* somewhere else, and he put them together himself, perhaps quite unintentionally. It must have been just as hard for a scholar to keep his notes in order four centuries ago as it is today.

Three other manuscripts offer a suggestive variant in this passage, namely *solita*, which stands in Dublin, Trinity Coll. Library 1759; Vatican, Ottobonianus lat. 1799; and Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek 283 Gudianus lat. This is an unmetrical variant: how did it arise? I believe that it descends from *solita*, which stands for *soli (ue)t (sol)a*, where a variant has been incorporated into the text. If that is correct, then *soli* must predate these three manuscripts. Thomson dates them to the second half of the fifteenth century, to around 1500 and to after 1460, respectively³¹.

That means that the earliest dated attestation of *soli* is in Palladio's commentary of 1496, although some of the manuscripts mentioned above could conceivably be earlier. In view of the quality of the conjecture, of Palladio's track record in reproducing the conjectures of others, and of the fact that he does not claim this conjecture as his own but merely prints it without comment, it is very likely that he has not made it himself *ope ingenii*, but he has taken it from somewhere else. From where we cannot tell; there existed a lively exchange in Catullian variants in Renaissance Italy, and this is one of many conjectures the authorship of which cannot be determined.

³¹ Thomson, *Catullus Edited*, 75, 89 and 86.