

FIVE CRITICAL NOTES ON CATULLUS

In the passages examined I take Mynors' Oxford text¹ as my starting point.

1.2

Cui dono lepidum nouum libellum
arida modo pumice explitum?

The testimonies of Plautus (*Aul.* 297: *pumex non aeque est aridus atque hic est senex*) and Martial (8.72.2: *morsu pumicis aridi politus*)

¹ R. A. B. Mynors, *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*, Oxonii 1960. Other editions and commentaries cited in the course of these notes are: K. Lachmann, *Q. Valerii Catulli Veronensis liber*, Berolini 1829, 1874³; Th. Heyse, *Catulli liber carminum*. (*Catull's Buch der Lieder*), Berolini 1855, 1889²; A. Baehrens, *Catulli Veronensis liber*, I, Lipsiae 1876 (rev. K. P. Schulze, Lipsiae 1893); II, Lipsiae 1885; H. A. Munro, *Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus*, Cambridge 1878, London 1905²; R. Ellis, *A Commentary on Catullus*, Oxford 1889² (= Hildesheim 1988); S. G. Owen, *Catullus with the Pervigilium Veneris*, London 1893; M. Haupt, *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii carmina a M. Hauptio recognita. Septimam editionem curavit J. Vahlen et edidit R. Helm*, Lipsiae 1912; W. Kroll, *Catull*, Stuttgart 1923, 1989⁷; M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis, *Il libro di Catullo Veronese*, Torino 1928, 1980; M. Dolç, *G. Valerio Catulo: Poesias*, Madrid 1963, 1990³; P. Oksala, *Annotationes criticae ad Catulli carmina*, Helsinki 1965; G. B. Pighi, *Il libro di Gaio Valerio Catullo e i frammenti dei 'poeti nuovi'*, Torino 1974, 1996²; H. Bardon, *Catullus: Carmina*, Stutgardiae 1973; C. J. Fordyce, *Catullus: A Commentary*, Oxford 1976²; W. Eisenhut, *Catulli Veronensis Liber*, Lipsiae 1983; G. P. Goold, *Catullus*. London 1983, and *Catullus*. Second edition revised by G. P. Goold, London 1988; A. Seva, *Catull, Poesies*, Barcelona 1990; G. Lee, *The Poems of Catullus*, Oxford 1991; M. Ruiz Sánchez, *Confectum carmine. En torno a la poesía de Catulo*, Murcia 1996, I-II, J. Godwin, *Catullus: the shorter Poems*, Warminster 1999; D. F. S. Thomson, *Catullus*, Toronto 1998²; K. Quinn, *Catullus: The Poems*. Edited with Introduction, revised Text and Commentary, Bristol 2001; M. von Albrecht, *C. Valerius Catullus: Sämtliche Gedichte*, Stuttgart 2001².

are of greater value than Servius' commentary² on Virgil (*Aen.* 12.587: '*in pumice' autem iste masculino genere posuit et hunc sequimur...licet Catullus dixerit feminino*). Neither Baehrens (p. 68) nor Ellis (p. 5) nor Kroll (p. 1) nor Pighi (p. 78) nor von Albrecht (p. 6) nor several other editors³ have followed Servius, in whom Baehrens places little trust: "Servio enim, homini in adferendis locis Catullianis neglegentissimo, fides nulla". The text⁴ should therefore read:

Cui dono lepidum nouum libellum
arido modo pumice expolitum?

2 arido *V.* Baehrens 1876, Ellis, Pighi, Goold (*Phoenix* 12, 1958, 101; *LCM* 6.9, 1981, 233-5), von Albrecht, cf. *Pl. Aul.* 297, *Mart.* 8.72.3: arida *D.* Servius ad *Verg. Aen.* 12.587, *Pastrengicus*, Lachmann, Mynors, edd. plerique, cf. Thomson 197

66.15

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

For some time the *lectio communis* (*anne parentum*) has appeared to me to be out of place, since it is incomprehensible that such a specific amatory formula as *gaudia Veneris*⁵ should be applied to the parents and not, as is only appropriate, to the two young lovers. As Baehrens quite rightly reflected in his

² *arido* is also supported by Caesius Bassus (*GLK* 6.261.1), Terentianus Maurus (*GLK* 6.401.2563), Marius Victorinus (*GLK* 6.148.23), Isidore (*Etyim.* 6.12.3), and the *Schol. Veron.* on Vergil, *ecl.* 6.1 (Hangen 397.7).

³ Read the strong case in favour of *arido* by G. P. Goold, "Two notes on Catullus 1", *LCM* 6.9, 1981, 233-5.

⁴ The critical apparatus is from a forthcoming edition of Catullus (*C. Valerii Catulli Carmina/Poemas de Catulo*. Edición de Ana Pérez Vega y Antonio Ramírez de Verger, Huelva 2005).

⁵ Cf., e. g., *Ov.*, *am.* 1.5.25; 1.10.29, 31-6; 1.13.5-6; 2.3.2; 2.5.29, 31; 2.19.58; 3.6.87-8; *ars* 2.307-8, 419, 459, 479-92; 3.793-808.

monumental commentary (p. 463): “*aperta iam sunt omnia, sed cur parentes commemorentur obscurissimum manet*”. Palaeographically, the sequence of the corruption could have been as follows: *an qd* > *atque*, while *parentum* could be a replacement *pudicitiae causa* for *amantum*, since the pleasures of love are experienced, as mentioned above, between lovers and not between parents and children. S. G. Owen, in his edition of 1893⁶, gave the correct reading, which we have before our very eyes at the end of line 31 (*an quod amantes*):

estne nouis nuptis odio Venus? *an quod amantum*
 frustrantur falsis gaudia lacrimulis,
 ubertim thalami quas intra limina fundunt?
 non, ita me diui, uera gemunt, iuerint.

15 *an quod amantum* Owen, *cf. v. 31* : *atque parentum* V, Pighi
 : *anne parentum* *codd. ante a. 1470, def. Kroll, Mynors, edd.*
plerique : *an quod auentum* Munro, *Godwin 1995* : *anne suorum*
Watt (ZPE 31, 2000, 66-7)

68.145

nec tamen illa mihi dextra deducta paterna
 fragrantem Assyrio uenit odore domum,
 sed furtiua dedit *mira* munuscula nocte,
 ipsius ex ipso dempta uiri gremio.

⁶ He read *an quod amantum* on p. 98, with the following comment on pp. 184-5: “*an quod amantum* is my conjecture for *atque parentum* MSS., which it is astonishing that any critic should still retain after what Munro has said, *Criticisms*, 156. It is clear that the parents are out of place. The delights of husbands, not of parents, are interfered with by the pretended reluctance of brides and the tears which they shed *thalami intra limina*. Also even if we adopt the Italian conjecture *anne* for *atque* (retaining *parentum*), *falsis lacrimulis* forms an awkward anticlimax, which spoils the conclusion *non uera gemunt*. Therefore, adopting Munro’s *an quod*, I emend *an quod amantum*. The use of the elliptical expression *an quod* (cp. inf. 31) for *an eo fit quod* is illustrated by Munro, who himself proposes. Schmidt and Postgate independently (“Catulliana”, *JPh*, 17, 1888, 29) have conjectured *anne maritum*: “but *atque* indicates *an quod* rather than *anne*”.

Ellis (p. 428) correctly translates the adjective *mira* (which qualifies *nocte*) as “rare”, “unspeakable”⁷, since he properly understood the passage, which deals with an extraordinary night (*mira ... nocte*) of love and sex (*furtive ... munuscula*), worthy of being recalled as an unforgettable occasion (ll. 147-8). If it is not taken in this way, it is no surprise that the passage should attract comments such as “insolenter admodum dictum *mira nocte*” (Baehrens, p. 532) or that the reading of the *Veronensis* can be questioned with a ‘vix recte’ (Mynors *ad loc. in app.*). The conjectures, therefore, too logical for the amorous sentiments of Catullus, are otiose. The adjective *mirus* is used in the same erotic sense in Virgil (*Aen.* 3.298: *obstipui, miroque incensum pectus amore; cf. 7.57*), Horace (*epod.* 16.31) and others (Sil. 16.197; Plin. *nat.* 9.25.2: *miro amore dilexit*). In addition, a similar idea appears in Propertius 2.15.1-2 (*o me felicem! o nox mihi candida! et o tu/ lectule deliciis facte beatae meis!*), adduced by Arkins (*LCM* 17.8, 1992, 115-6) to support decisively the reading of the manuscripts. The Propertian passage speaks for itself when it comes to understanding the erotic context of Catullus: that context which almost invariably escapes the prudish and over-Cartesian scholar. To the text I add the critical apparatus:

nec tamen illa mihi dextra deducta paterna
 fragrantem Assyrio uenit odore domum,
 sed furtiua dedit *mira* munuscula nocte,
 ipsius ex ipso dempta uiri gremio.

145 *mira* *V*, def. Arkins : nigra *A. Guarinus* : niuea *J. Schrader* :
 rara *Haupt*, von *Albrecht* : muta *Heyse* : media *Landor*
 (*Foreign Quarterly Review* 29, 1842, 361), *Thomson* : pura
 dubitanter *Thomson in notis coll. Verg. ecl. 9.44* : tacita *Lain*
 (*HSCP* 90, 1986, 155-8), def. *Lyne (CQ* 52, 2002, 606)

68.157

sitis felices et tu simul et tua uita,
 et domus <ipsa>, in qua lusimus, et domina,
 et qui principio nobis †*terram dedit aufert*†,
 a quo sunt primo omnia nata bona,
 et longe ante omnes mihi quae me carior ipso est,
 lux mea, qua uiua uiuere dulce mihist.

⁷ Read also J. P. Postgate, *Catulliana*, 253.

Lines 149-60 of poem 68 by Catullus constitute a kind of postscript, addressed to his friend Allius to thank him for the favours he has done him and rounded off by expressions of his best wishes to everyone: to Allius and his love (l. 155), to the owner of the house where our poet sported with his love (l. 156), to Jupiter, who gives and takes away the land on which we live (*OLD s.v. terra*, 7) and the goods which we enjoy (ll. 157-8), and, above all, to the love of his life, Lesbia (ll. 159-60).

The line which has caused the greatest number of problems is 157, for which there have been corrections and conjectures to suit all tastes, such as, for example:

te tradidit (*Scaliger*) Afer (*Munro*), *Goold* 1983 : te tradidit (*Scaliger*)
 auspex (*Lipsius*) : terram dedit (aufert/ nunc), *Pighi* : terram dedit
 haustis *Herzog* (*Catulliana*, *Hermes* 71, 1936, 346-8) : terram dedit,
 hospes *Ellis*, *Bardon* : errorem etiam aufert *Papanghelis* 1982 : et eram
 dat et aufert *Seva* in *app.* : alii alia, *Ruiz Sánchez* II 243

But if we take line 157 as a religious formula along the lines of that of Horace (*serm.* 1.18.111: *sed satis est orare Iouem quae ponit et aufert*)⁸, it all becomes much clearer, since in a context of good wishes one should not leave out the Maker of all things, whether Jupiter, as here, Fortuna (*Hor. carm.* 1.34.12-6⁹) or the Biblical God (*Job* 1.21: The LORD gave, and the LORD has taken away; blessed be the name of the LORD). Hence the proposal of Lenchantin de Gubernatis (*terram dat et aufert*) is the best, because it is palaeographically faultless (*terram dedit aufert* from the *Veronensis*) and because it is the one which makes the fullest sense of the desiderative context of the poem's ending. The text should therefore read:

⁸ Cf. *Hor. epist.* 1.16.33 (*qui dedit hoc hodie, cras, si uolet, auferet*); *serm.* 2.3.288 (*Iuppiter ingentes qui das adimisque dolores* and the commentary of F. Muecke [*Horace, Satires II*, Warminster 1993, 163]); *Manil.* 2.160 (*per socium effectus: multum comes addit et aufert*); *Stat. Theb.* 8.422 (*nunc premit ac uicibus tellurem amittit et aufert*).

⁹ See R. Nisbet-M. Hubbard, *A commentary on Horace, Odes, Book I*, Oxford 1999², 383-6; and D. West, *Horace, Odes I: Carpe diem*, Oxford 1995, 164-7.

sitis felices et tu simul et tua uita,
 et domus <ipsa>, in qua lusimus, et domina,
 et qui principio nobis *terram dat et aufert*,
 a quo sunt primo omnia nata bona,
 et longe ante omnes mihi quae me carior ipsost,
 lux mea, qua uiua uiuere dulce mihist.

157 *terram dat et aufert* *Lenchantin, prob. Dolç* : *terram dedit aufert* *VEs* : *alii alia, cf. Oksala 87-8, Eisenhut in app., Papanghelis (QUCC 11, 1982, 139-49), Ruiz Sánchez II 243*

115.5

Mentula habet iuxta triginta iugera prati,
 quadraginta arui: cetera sunt maria.
 cur non diuitiis Croesum superare potis sit,
 uno qui in saltu tot bona possideat,
 prata arua ingentes siluas *saltusque paludesque* 5
 usque ad Hyperboreos et mare ad Oceanum?
 omnia magna haec sunt, tamen ipsest maximus ultro:
 non homo, sed uere mentula magna minax.

Most editors and commentators of Catullus¹⁰ have respected the manuscript text as transmitted by the *potiores* at line 5: *prata arua ingentes siluas saltusque paludesque*. Before we examine other considerations, I should state at the outset that the doublet *silvae* + *paludes* can be found in numerous passages in the Latin authors (Lucr. 5.201-2; Virg. *Aen.* 10.709; Cic. *fam.* 10.30.2; Caes. *Gall.* 3.28.2, 5.21.2, 5.52.1, 6.5.4, 6.5.7, 7.16.1, 7.32.2; Sall. *Lep.* 25; Liv. 5.53.9, 34.48.1, Vell. 2.119.2; Mela 3.29; Tac. *ann.* 1.68.3, 2.5.3, 2.19.2; *Agr.* 26.2; Flor. *epit.* 3.10.15; Veg. *mil.* 3.13.3; *Hist. Aug.* [Capitol. *Maximin.*] 12.1) and the doublet *saltus* + *paludes* to a much lesser extent (Caes. *Gall.* 7.19.2; Tac. *ann.* 12.39.2, 13.54.1; *Agr.* 31.1). Nowhere have I found the triplet *silvae* + *saltus* + *paludes*.

The *codex Datamus Diez. B. Sant. 137* from the year 1463 and other *recentiores* (ζ or ‘codices ante annum 1470’, according to Mynors’ edition¹¹) read *altasque paludes* in line 5 instead of the

¹⁰ Lachmann, Baehrens, Ellis, Owen, Kroll, Mynors, Oksala, Pighi, Bardon, Fordyce, Eisenhut, Godwin, von Albrecht; *cf.* note 1.

¹¹ *C. Catulli carmina*, X.

saltusque paludesque of the best manuscripts, in an attempt to get round the two main difficulties¹² presented by the line: a) the pointless repetition of *saltus* as large properties included within the large property already alluded to in line 4 (*saltu*) and in the preceding poem (l. 1: *Firmano saltu*; l. 6: *saltum*)¹³; and b) the rare occurrence of a hypermetrical line in elegiac distichs, even though there are examples to be found in other high genres, albeit very sporadically¹⁴. The reading of the *codex Datanus* has been kept by Fordyce, Thomson and Quinn¹⁵, but, as far as I know, no identical or similar *iunctura* has been found in any other Latin author.

Other scholars, who have opted to change the text, have proposed different adjectives to balance the expression *ingentes siluas*. One of the most widely accepted, *vastasque paludes*, was proposed by K. Pleitner¹⁶ in 1849 and defended by G. P. Goold in 1983

¹² See the comments of Baehrens, 607; G. P. Goold, "A new text of Catullus", *Phoenix* 12, 1958, 103; C.J. Fordyce, *Catullus*, 402; J. Godwin, *Catullus: the shorter Poems*, 221-2; K. Quinn, *Catullus: The Poems*, 454-5.

¹³ On *saltus* as an agricultural property, see P. Harvey, "Catullus 114-115: Mentula, bonus agricola", *Historia* 28, 1979, 329-45. C.J. Fordyce (*Catullus*, 402) commented a propos of *saltu ... saltusque paludesque* that "if the text is sound, Catullus (*a*) is so careless as to say that the *saltus* (singular: i.e. the estate, as in 114.1) contains *saltus* (plural: 'rough country') as one of its assets..."; K. Quinn (*Catullus: The Poems*, 454) points out that it would be "an awkward repetition of 4 *saltu* (where the meaning was 'estate', whereas here only the meaning 'glades' will work)".

¹⁴ Hypermetrical lines are not permitted in elegiac distichs, as G. P. Goold pointed out in "A new text of Catullus", *Phoenix* 12, 1958, 103. There are two examples in Catullus: 64.298-9: *inde pater diuum sancta cum coniuge natisque/ aduenit caelo* (epic hexameter) and 34.22-3: *sancta nomine, Romulique,/ antique* (glyconic of elevated style). See K. Lachmann, *In T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libros commentarius quartum editus*, Berolini 1882, 80-2; Kroll, *Catull*, 287-8; E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis Buch VI* (Stuttgart-Leipzig 1995 = 1927), 286-7 on Verg. *Aen.* 6.602; A. Kiessling (revised by R. Heinze), *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Satiren*, Dublin-Zürich 1968¹⁰, 83, on *serm.* 1.4.96.

¹⁵ C.J. Fordyce, *Catullus*, 402; D.F.S. Thomson, *Catullus*, 192 and 553; K. Quinn, *Catullus: The Poems*, 454.

¹⁶ K. Pleitner, *Des Q. Valerius Catullus Epigramme an und über C. Jul. Caesar und Mamurra*, Prog. Speyer 1849.

and 1988¹⁷, and followed by G. Lee¹⁸. The adjective *vasta* applied to *palus* is found in Lucretius (5.200-3: *principio quantum caeli tegit impetus ingens,/ inde auide partem montes siluaequae ferarum/ possedere, tenent rupes vastaeque paludes/ et mare quod late terrarum distinet oras vastaeque paludes*), Virgil (*Aen.* 12.745: *atque hinc uasta palus, hinc ardua moenia cingunt*), Seneca (*nat.* 3.8.1: *quidam existimant, quemadmodum in exteriori parte terrarum vastae paludes iacent magnique et nauigabiles lacus...*) and Tacitus (*ann.* 1.63.4: *angustus is trames vastas inter paludes*). The proposals put forward by Theodor Bergk (*salsasque paludes*) and A. Rossbach (*latasque paludes*), which appeared in the latter's edition¹⁹, presumably to resolve the cacophony, have received no subsequent support.

Pleitner's conjecture is very attractive and well supported by the parallels cited above, but it presents one difficulty: the 'cacemphaton' (κακέμφατον)²⁰ or 'ill-sounding effect', which Quintilian warns us against (*int.* 9.4.41: *videndum etiam ne syllaba uerbi prioris ultima et prima sequentis idem sonet* [leg. Watt]: *quod ne quis praecipere miretur, Ciceroni in epistulis excidit: 'res mihi <inuisae> uisae sunt, Brute', et in carmine: 'o fortunatam <natam> me consule Romam.'*), would be evident to the extreme in this passage of Catullus:

prata arua ingentes siluas uastasque paludes

It is true that Lucan (6.42) employs exactly the same vitium: *et siluas uastaque [uastasque G (p.c.)] feras indagine claudit*. It is

¹⁷ G. P. Goold, *Catullus*, 264: "The strange corruption in the manuscripts comes from a misguided attempt to heal the haplography *silvas<vas>tasque*; id., *Catullus*, London 1988, 180, n. 2: "after *silvas* the *vas* of *uastasque* was lost, *tasque* was expanded to *saltusque*, and the metrically illegitimate *-que* added to make sense".

¹⁸ G. Lee, *The Poems of Catullus*, 144 and 189.

¹⁹ A. Rossbach, *Q. Valerii Catulli Veronensis liber*, Lipsiae 1854, 1863², 74: "*latasque paludes* conieci, *altasque paludes* D, *saltusque paludes* DrP₂F, *saltusque paludesque* ceteri libri, *salsasque paludes* coniecit Bergkianus". Cf. *Rut. Nam.* 1.476: *Subiectas uillae uacat aspectare salinas;/ namque hoc censetur nomine salsa palus,/ qua mare terrenis decliue canalibus intrat/ multifidos que lacus paruula fossa rigat*.

²⁰ Cf. H. Lausberg, *Manual de retórica literaria*, Madrid 1976, II, 328-9.

equally true that Virgil, though criticized by Servius²¹, made famous the most widely-used example of ‘cacemphaton’ at *Aen.* 2.27²²: *panduntur portae, iuuat ire et Dorica castra*, reiterated in 6.88²³, and in *Achaica castra* at 2.462. And it is also true that Ovid, for instance, made abundant use of duplications of this type, as F. Bömer points out in his commentary on *met.* 2.97 (*nullam patiere repulsam*)²⁴.

However, if the resulting ‘cacemphaton’, which, it must be said, would be the only such example in Catullus, strikes us as shocking, the adjective which best goes with *paludes* (if I may be so bold as to make the proposal) would be *udas*, as in Ovid (*met.* 1.416: *percaluit solis caenumque udaeque paludes*; *fast.* 6.401: ‘*hoc, ubi nunc fora sunt, udae tenuere paludes*; *epist.* 6.107: *illa sibi Tanai Scythiaequae paludibus udae* with enallage²⁵ of *udae*) and Lucan (3.85: *et qua Pomptinas via dividit uda paludes*). The adjective *udus* was not unknown to Catullus (64.131: *udo singultus ore*) and after him it was used by Virgil, Horace, Propertius, Ovid and others²⁶.

How could an *udasque* in the manuscripts have ended up as *saltusque* in the text? It can be argued that either the copyist failed to understand a *lectio difficilior* and replaced it with another facing him in the previous line, or simply made a mistake in reading, introducing into line 5 (*saltus* > *saltusque*) a term from line 4 (*saltu*) which was also in his mind from lines 1 and 6 of the previous epigram, which, it should be pointed out, was

²¹ Serv. *Aen.* 2.27: *DORICA CASTRA mala est compositio ab ea syllaba incipere, qua superius finitus est sermo; nam plerumque et cacemphaton facit, ut hoc loco; cf. in georg.* 2.13: *sane cacemphaton est ‘glauca canentia’.*

²² Cf. R. G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber secundus*, Oxford 1964, 1991², 40.

²³ E. Norden, *Vergilius. Aeneis Buch VI*, 150-1; the same *iunctura* (*Dorica castra*) is to be found in Prop. 2.8.32, 4.6.34, and Ov. *Her.* 16.372.

²⁴ F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen*. Buch I-III, Heidelberg 1969, 265; cf. G. Luck, *P. Ovidius Naso. Tristia. II Kommentar*, Heidelberg 1977, 316 on 5.10.23; E. J. Kenney, *Ovid, Heroides XVI-XXI*, Cambridge 1996, 162 on 18.175.

²⁵ Cf. P. E. Knox, *Ovid, Heroides: select epistles*, Cambridge 1995, 193; Bömer, *Metamorphosen*, I, 134-5.

²⁶ Cf. numerous examples in P. Tombeur, *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina (BTL-2)*, München-Turnhout 2002, s.v. ‘udus’.

transmitted together with 115 as a single epigram²⁷ until the first Aldina edition of 1502. The hypermetrical *-que* would then be added later to make sense of the line, as Goold²⁸ has explained in his defence of *vastasque*.

I am inclined to believe that the most plausible text is the following:

Mentula habet iuxta triginta iugera prati,
 quadraginta arui: cetera sunt maria.
 cur non diuitiis Croesum superare potis sit,
 uno qui in saltu tot bona possideat,
 prata arua ingentes siluas *udasque paludes* 5
 usque ad Hyperboreos et mare ad Oceanum?
 omnia magna haec sunt, tamen ipsest maximus ultro:
 non homo, sed uere mentula magna minax.

5 *udasque paludes scripsi, cf. Ov. Her. 6.107, met. 1.418, fast. 6.401, Lucan. 3.85 : saltusque paludesque V, edd. plerique : altasque paludes D, Fordyce, Quinn, Thomson : uastasque paludes Pleitner, Goold, Lee, cf. Lucr. 5.203 : latasque paludes Rossbach : salsasque paludes Bergk (ap. Rossbach)*²⁹

ANTONIO RAMÍREZ DE VERGER
 Universidad de Huelva
 ramirezdeverger@uh.es

²⁷ *Adhaeret priori in V* in Baehrens' edition, *Catulli Veronensis liber*, 111; cf. J.H. Gaisser, *Catullus and his Renaissance Readers*, Oxford 1993, 105.

²⁸ Goold, *Catullus*, 1988, 180, n. 2.

²⁹ I would like to express my thanks to Prof. G. Laguna for his valuable suggestions and to J. Zoltowski for his help with the English version. The present article is part of a research project (BFF 2002-02113) financed by the DGICYT of Spain.