



## EMENDATIONS IN THE *DIRAE* AND THE *LYDIA*\*

### ABSTRACT

*This article argues that the text of the Dirae and the Lydia is even more corrupt than current editions give reason to believe, and attempts to emend about a dozen passages.*

**Keywords:** Latin poetry; bucolic poetry; *Appendix Vergiliana*; *Dirae*; *Lydia*; textual criticism

The *Dirae* and the *Lydia* are among the most corrupt poems in the *Appendix Vergiliana*, and at the same time among the least favoured by commentators.<sup>1</sup> The only line-by-line

\* This article was written as part of a project that has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 840190. I am enormously grateful to Stephen Heyworth, who read and commented on an earlier version of the article, and to Tristan Franklino, who discussed with me some of the ideas presented here. I should also like to thank *CQ*'s editor Bruce Gibson and the anonymous reviewers for criticisms and suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> The *Dirae* and the *Lydia* are transmitted as one text, but there are compelling reasons for taking 1–103 and 104–83 as two separate poems, as was first realized by F. Jacobs, 'Ueber die Diras des Valerius Cato', *Bibliothek der alten Litteratur und Kunst* 9 (1792), 56–61 (he identified the latter as the *Lydia* of Valerius Cato: the idea has been widely rejected since then, but the title is convenient). Jacobs adduced three fundamental arguments against the unity of 1–183: (1) the *Dirae* proper (1–103) exhibits a clear ring composition, with the last stanza (98–103)—identified as such (*extremum*) in the refrain (97)—echoing the first stanza (4–8); (2) the situations in the two poems are essentially different (in the *Dirae* the speaker is exiled from his farm, in the *Lydia* he is dying of lovesickness); (3) the style ('Ton' in Jacobs's terms) likewise differs notably between the two poems. Subsequent scholars developed and expanded these arguments, which even led some to believe that the two poems are not by the same author; note especially M. Rothstein, 'De Diris et Lydia carminibus', *Hermes* 23 (1888), 508–24 and cf. e.g. E. Fraenkel, 'The *Dirae*', *JRS* 56 (1966), 142–55, at 151: 'Nowadays it is also generally agreed [...] that the two poems, the *Dirae* and the *Lydia*, cannot have been written by one and the same man. Metre, style, and mentality [...] are all entirely different', though F.R.D. Goodyear, 'The *Dirae*', *PCPhS* 17 (1971), 30–43, at 39 is right to be more cautious. C. van der Graaf, *The Dirae* (Leiden, 1945), 127–34 tried to defend the unity of 1–183, as well as Virgilian authorship; however, the analytical position has been upheld in subsequent scholarship: see especially K.H.E. Schutter, 'De Lydia et Diris carminibus', *Mnemosyne* 6 (1953), 110–15; B. Luiselli, 'Pseudovirgilio: le *Dirae* e la *Lydia*', in B. Luiselli, *Studi sulla poesia bucolica* (Cagliari, 1967), 117–144; E. Van den Abeele, 'Remarques sur les "Dirae" et la "Lydia" de l'"Appendix Vergiliana": les arguments de Van der Graaf sont-ils irréfutables?', *RhM* 112 (1969), 145–54; M. Rodríguez Pantoja, '*Dirae-Lydia*: los argumentos de la métrica', in C. Santini, L. Zurli, L. Cardinali (edd.), *Concentus ex dissonis: scritti in onore di Aldo Setaioli* (Naples, 2006), 577–92. The few dissenting opinions that have been voiced in recent years succeed at best in demonstrating that there exist meaningful points of contact between the *Dirae* and the *Lydia*, possibly implying that they come from a single collection, but not that they are one poem: see A. Salvatore, 'Da un «dramma» politico a un dramma esistenziale: le *Dirae* dell'*Appendix Vergiliana* e il problema dell'unità', in F. Del Franco (ed.), *Storia, poesia e pensiero nel mondo antico: studi in onore di Marcello Gigante* (Naples, 1994), 594–604; S. Lorenz, 'Inuideo uobis, agri: mea gaudia habetis: bukolische Verwünschungen und elegische Eifersucht in den *Dirae*', in N. Holzberg (ed.), *Die Appendix Vergiliana: Pseudepigraphen im literarischen Kontext* (Tübingen, 2005), 1–27; M. Stachon, *Tractavi monumentum aere perennius: Untersuchungen zu vergilischen und ovidischen Pseudepigraphen* (Trier, 2014), 178–200; N. Holzberg, 'Einführung', in F. Zogg (ed.), *Appendix Vergiliana: lateinisch-deutsch* (Berlin, 2020), 11–42, at 16–18.

commentary published in the twentieth century is to be found in van der Graaf's 1945 monograph; yet while the book offers a number of useful essays on the metre and style of the two poems, the commentary itself lacks detail and is extremely conservative in its treatment of textual issues.<sup>2</sup> Subsequent publications usually address individual cruces, but do not scrutinize the text in a more systematic manner.<sup>3</sup> As a result, while a consensus exists that the poems are full of severely—sometimes irreparably—corrupt passages, the remaining superficially intact portions of the text tend to be accepted without questioning. To give just one example, all modern editions print *Lydia* 112 in its transmitted form *o fortunati nimum multumque beati*, despite the fact that *multum* after *nimum* is culpably anticlimactic and even though the correction *nimumque* has been available since the Renaissance.<sup>4</sup> It may appear unlikely that a scribe could miscopy a word that he had just copied correctly, but we should bear in mind that *nimum* and *multum*, having the exact same number of strokes, can in certain hands look almost indistinguishable.<sup>5</sup> While the lack of critical attention to the textual problems of the *Dirae* and the *Lydia* can account to a large extent for such oversights, the situation is aggravated by the fact that the poems do not have a clear narrative frame that could provide either scribes or editors with some sort of control over the text. This can most clearly be seen in the case of the refrains, which both in sense and in syntax are detached from their immediate context and, as some of the following discussions attempt to show, are thus especially prone to be corrupted by scribes (and far less so to be corrected by editors). Without aiming at a comprehensive treatment, in what follows I mainly focus on identifying and solving problems that have been ignored in recent scholarship, while also hoping that the discussions will cumulatively have some weight in demonstrating that the text of the *Dirae* and the *Lydia* is even less certain than the available editions might let us believe.

#### DIRAE 14

In the first stanza of the curses proper (9–13) the speaker execrates his fields, pastures, orchards, vineyards, woods and streams; the second stanza (15–18) is a

<sup>2</sup> Van der Graaf (n. 1). Fraenkel (n. 1) and Goodyear (n. 1) are important treatments, both of which offer a critical text with ample notes, often surpassing van der Graaf's comments in detail and depth; both, however, are selective, and besides only cover the *Dirae* proper. A number of annotated bilingual editions have also appeared, including G.P. Goold's revision of H.R. Fairclough, *Virgil Aeneid VII–XII, Appendix Vergiliana* (Cambridge, MA, 2000), M.G. Iodice, *Appendix Vergiliana* (Milan, 2002) and K. Rupprecht, 'Dirae', in F. Zogg (ed.), *Appendix Vergiliana: lateinisch–deutsch* (Berlin, 2020), 44–59; but these are of little relevance when dealing with textual issues. The commentary by A.F. Naeye, *Carmina Valerii Catonis* (Bonn, 1847), dated though it is, remains fundamental for the textual criticism of the *Dirae* and the *Lydia*.

<sup>3</sup> G. Giardina, 'Nuovi emendamenti al testo delle *Dirae* e della *Lydia* pseudovirgiliane', *QUCC* 92 (2009), 167–73 is one exception.

<sup>4</sup> The closest parallel is supplied by Mart. 8.3.17 *scribant ista graues nimum nimumque seueri*; cf. also e.g. [Tib.] 3.6.21 *conuenit iratus nimum nimumque seueris*, Ov. *Her.* 1.41 *ausus es, o nimum nimumque oblite tuorum*. In general, the reduplication of *nimum* (*nimis*) is quite frequent, whereas the only parallel for pairing *nimum* with *multum* I am aware of comes from Prosper of Aquitaine (fifth century A.D.), *Epigr.* 82.3 *a quo longinquus multum est nimumque remotus*, where the order *multum – nimumque* is less objectionable, though likewise one cannot avoid the suspicion that *multum* is a misreading of *nimum*.

<sup>5</sup> The corruption can be paralleled in Maximianus 2.1 *en dilecta mihi nimum formosa Lycoris*, where some manuscripts read *multum* for *nimum*. An alternative possibility is suggested by J. Trappes-Lomax, 'Sub aqua, sub aqua: submerged repetition in Ovid and Rutilius Namatianus', *PCPhS* 51 (2005), 86–9, at 86 n. 1, who assumes that *nimum* was omitted by haplography and *multum* was then supplied to fill the metre (*nimum nimumque* → *nimumque* → *nimum* <*multum*> *que*).

close repetition, with only slight variations, and it is introduced by a refrain that makes this explicit (14):<sup>6</sup>

rursus et hoc iterum repetamus, Battare, carmen.

A long-acknowledged problem is the apparent superfluity of either *rursus* or *iterum* at 14. In principle, ‘anew and again’ is not as such an impossible turn of phrase, and the majority of scholars seem to understand the line in this way. The intervening *et hoc*, however, makes such a construal rather strained: thus positioned (*rursus et hoc iterum*), *et* would normally go either with *hoc* (‘and this also’) or possibly with the clause as a whole (‘and let us repeat the song, anew again’), but neither option seems to make good sense here. Naeke ascribed to *rursus* an imperative force (‘once more! and let us repeat the song again’), but this is unwarranted.<sup>7</sup> While the transmitted text may not be entirely unacceptable, it seems more likely that *rursus et* is an error for *tristius*, probably initiated by the omission of rubricated *T*; *riſtuſ* would then be read as *rurſuf*, with *et* added subsequently to restore the metre.<sup>8</sup> Thus emended (*tristius hoc iterum repetamus*), the refrain will become more similar to 54 (= 71) *tristius hoc, meminī, reuocasti, Battare, carmen*<sup>9</sup> and 75 *tristius hoc rursum dicit mea fistula carmen*. We may note that in all these cases *tristius* occurs in a refrain introducing the repetition of the previous stanza, and arguably this second stanza can be seen to be phrased in more forceful terms; accordingly, *tristius* should be taken predicatively: ‘let us repeat this curse more grimly’.

#### DIRAE 24

The speaker aims lines 20–4 specifically at his grasslands:

haec Veneris uario florentia sarta decore,  
 purpureo campos quae pingunt uerna colore  
 (hinc aerae dulces, hinc suauis spiritus agri),  
 mutent pestiferos aestus et taetra uenena;  
 dulcia non oculis, non auribus ulla ferantur.

<sup>6</sup> Here and below, I start with the text by E.J. Kenney, ‘*Dirae* (*Lydia*)’, in W.V. Clausen, F.R.D. Goodyear, E.J. Kenney, J.A. Richmond, *Appendix Vergiliana* (Oxford, 1966), 1–14, which as a rule is sufficiently close to the *paradosis*, without being slavishly so; when necessary, I supply a concise critical apparatus of my own. The edition by A. Salvatore, ‘*Dirae*’, in A. Salvatore, A. De Vivo, L. Nicastrì, G. Polara, *Appendix Vergiliana* (Rome, 1997), 1–23, though offering a somewhat fuller account of the manuscripts, does not improve on Kenney’s text.

<sup>7</sup> Naeke (n. 2), 40–1.

<sup>8</sup> Note that here T (Paris. Lat. 8069) further corrupts *Rursus* to *ursus* and similarly reads *ristius* for *Tristius* at 75 (cf. also *estica* for *Pertica* at 45, *ulcius* for *Dulcius* at 71, *nuideo* for *Inuideo* at 123). In general, manuscripts of the L family more or less systematically begin refrains with rubricated capitals, even though this need not imply that the archetype did the same.

<sup>9</sup> At 71 the manuscripts read *dulcius* (instead of *tristius*), which Kenney (n. 6), 8 retains, though noting in the apparatus criticus: ‘non satis explicatum’; in support of *tristius*, cf. Goodyear (n. 1), 43. The corruption is palaeographically transparent: *T* → *D*, *ri* → *u*, *f* → *l*, *t* → *c* (line-initial capitals are particularly variable in shape in minuscule manuscripts, and in this case we may be dealing with the confusion between their insular forms,  $\square$  and  $\square$ ); the fact that *dulcis* is a frequent term in the poem (22, 24, 49, 89 [bis], 98) has no doubt played a role too. J.M. Dillherr, *Satyrici minores de corruptis seculi moribus* (Jena, 1636), B 5 seems to have been the first to suggest *tristius* in print, though it already appears as a marginal variant in Boccaccio’s autograph copy, cod. Laur. 31, 33 (see the apparatus criticus in R. Giomini, *Appendix Vergiliana* [Florence, 1953], 72).

There are some uncertainties throughout the passage,<sup>10</sup> but the general sense seems clear: the plants growing on the meadow should no more produce fragrant flowers but should rather diffuse poisonous substances. Line 24 is intended to sum this up: as van der Graaf translates, ‘may nothing sweet ever reach eyes and ears’.<sup>11</sup> There are two potential difficulties here. First, until the present line the passage does not refer to sound, only to colour and smell: hence Heinsius’s *naribus* for *auribus*, which editors mention even if they rarely accept it.<sup>12</sup> Second, as was likewise felt by Heinsius, the verb too may be inappropriate. As transmitted, the line can be construed in two ways: the datives *oculis* and *auribus* may depend on either the verb *ferantur* (literally ‘may move against the eyes and ears’) or the adjective *dulcia* (‘pleasant to the eyes and ears’). Neither construal, however, is convincing. The former requires for *ferri* a meaning that, as far as I can see, is unparalleled (‘to present itself to’). Taking the datives with the adjective is altogether preferable, but, again, interpreting the verb presents difficulties. One option is to take *ferri* to mean something like ‘to be borne through the air’: this might work for sounds (if reading *auribus*) or smells (if reading *naribus*), but hardly for what one sees, unless we imagine Lucretian *simulacra*. The alternative is to understand *ferri* as a synonym of *gigni*, and, as I suggest below, this is indeed the sense we need. However, while there is no lack of contexts of the type of Verg. *Ecl.* 4.38 *feret omnia tellus*, I am unable to parallel the reverse passive construction with *ferri* meaning ‘to be produced’ (with or without the ablative of agent); the idiom seems to be confined to the active voice.<sup>13</sup> What can *ferantur* have replaced? Heinsius suggested two possible corrections: *serantur*, which is easy palaeographically but less than ideal in sense (to begin with, meadows do not need to be sown), and *creentur*, which gives a reasonable sense but fails to account for *ferantur*.<sup>14</sup> I propose *genantur*: ‘may there grow nothing

<sup>10</sup> See the comments in van der Graaf (n. 1), 19–20.

<sup>11</sup> Van der Graaf (n. 1), 2.

<sup>12</sup> Heinsius in P. Burman, ‘Valerii Catonis Dirae in Battarum’, in P. Burman, *Anthologia veterum latinorum epigrammatum et poematum*, vol. 2 (Amsterdam, 1773), 647–78, at 654; the corruption could be triggered by the loss of initial *n* after *non*. Note e.g. van der Graaf (n. 1), 20: ‘Heinsius’ *naribus* is unnecessary, because the singing of the birds and probably also the *susurrus* of the wind is involved.’

<sup>13</sup> See *TLL* 6.1.553.13–554.39. The empirical fact that this (very frequent) sense of *ferre* is unattested in the passive should suffice to demonstrate that *ferantur* cannot mean ‘to be produced’ in our context. My tentative explanation is that this is an inherited feature of the idiom, derived from the fact that *ferre* in the sense ‘to produce’ (*OLD* s.v. *fero* 25: ‘To bear, yield [fruit, produce, etc.]’) is a resultative for *ferre* in the sense ‘to be pregnant’ (*OLD* s.v. *fero* 10), just as, in general, *ferre* ‘to bring’ is the resultative for *ferre* ‘to carry’ (cf. A. Pârdulescu, ‘IE. \**bhrātēr* “brother”’, *IF* 101 [1996], 99–106, at 104): for semantic reasons, *ferre* ‘to carry in the womb’ cannot normally be used in the passive (its object is almost an internal accusative: note that the verb can be used absolutely, Plin. *HN* 10.179 *cameli XII mensibus ferunt*, or with *uentrem*, Varro, *Rust.* 2.1.19 *equa enim uentrem fert duodecim menses*), and, at least historically, *ferre* ‘to be fruitful with’ apparently involves the same construction (note that it can likewise be used absolutely: Cato, *Agr.* 6.2 *ferundo arbor peribit*). In Greek, φέρειν in the sense ‘to produce’ (*LSJ* s.v. φέρω V) seems likewise to be used in the active voice only (and can likewise be used absolutely), which supports the idea that this is an inherited feature (in general, the sense ‘to carry in the womb’ is attested for \**b<sup>h</sup>er-* across different Indo-European languages: see e.g. E.P. Hamp, ‘The Indo-European roots \**bher-* in the light of Celtic and Albanian’, *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* 39 [1982], 205–18, at 207–9; note that in English too the idiom ‘a tree bears fruits’ cannot be turned into the passive).

<sup>14</sup> It is true that the substitution of *creentur* with *ferantur*, especially at the end of a line, is not impossible to imagine; but *ferantur* does not *point* to *creentur* in any way.

pleasant'.<sup>15</sup> Incidentally, this will also favour Heinsius's *naribus* (plants can be pleasant to smell, but far less ordinarily so to listen to).<sup>16</sup> The corruption will have begun with a scribe, unfamiliar with the rare form, changing *genantur* to *gerantur* (as at Lucr. 4.143 and 159), which would then mistakenly be corrected to *ferantur*.<sup>17</sup>

*DIRAE* 25 (= 47)

Above we discussed a refrain which announces that the following stanza is a repetition of the preceding one (14); now we come to consider a different refrain which, by contrast, signals a change of topic (it occurs twice, at 25 and 47):

sic precor, et nostris superent haec carmina uotis.

The line does not yield immediate sense. Naeke considers two options, but both are absurd: 'let this song outlast my prayer' ('praestet efficaciam haec mea carmina tum quoque, quum mecum mea vota mortua erunt') and 'let this song exceed my prayer' ('Optat poeta ut plus praestet hoc carmen suum, quam ipse dicendo vovere possit').<sup>18</sup> Besides, while the former may be possible grammatically (*OLD* s.v. *supero* 7), the latter would require a different syntax (*superare* meaning 'to surpass' takes a direct object). Heinsius conjectured *nostris superentur carmina uotis* and *nostris superent haec carmina uoti*, but I fail to see how either is a plausible improvement.<sup>19</sup> Mähly thus seems to be right that the problem lies in the verb, even if his own proposal, *spirent*, is hardly less objectionable than the paradosis.<sup>20</sup> Giardina's *subeant* is, I believe, a move in the right direction, as it finally makes sense of the juxtaposition of *carmina* and *uotis*: *sic precor* and *nostris ... uotis* refer back to what precedes (note that both 24 *dulcia non oculis, non naribus ulla genantur* and 46 *qua nostri fines olim, cinis omnia fiat* are wishes), whereas *haec carmina* points forward to what follows ('così io prego, e in aggiunta ai miei voti vengano questi versi,

<sup>15</sup> The non-reduplicated variant *genere* (for *gignere*) is almost exclusively confined to two authors, Lucretius (3.797; 4.143, 159) and Varro (*Rust.* 1.31.5, 40.1; 2.2.19, 6.3), and both may constitute relevant precedents. On the one hand, the *Dirae* poet engages with Lucretius, and appears to borrow his phrasing, elsewhere (note e.g. 6 *rerum discordia gliscet*, which evokes Lucr. 6.366 *discordia sit rerum*, while also echoing his frequent use of *gliscere*, a verb largely avoided by Augustan poets). On the other, Varro's usage suggests that the form may have survived as a more or less technical term in farmers' idiom (a parallel of a sort is provided by 9 *sterilescant*: this appears to be a technical term, which otherwise is only attested in Pliny's *Natural History*).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. his comment in Burman (n. 12), 654: 'flores oculos ac nares oblectant; nihil illis rei cum aure.'

<sup>17</sup> It should be noted though that *ferantur* is only the reading of one branch of the manuscript tradition (M), whereas the other reads *forantur* (FL).

<sup>18</sup> Naeke (n. 2), 54–5. For the former, cf. van der Graaf (n. 1), 21: 'The meaning is: may my songs of imprecation surpass my curses as to their duration, may even after my death my curses live on' (which strangely turns the text upside down); yet in the *Dirae* 'songs' (*carmina*) and 'curses' (*uota*) are one and the same thing, so one can hardly imagine what it should mean for the speaker's *carmina* to outlast his *uota*.

<sup>19</sup> Heinsius in Burman (n. 12), 654.

<sup>20</sup> J. Mähly, Review of O. Ribbeck, *Appendix Vergiliana* (Leipzig, 1868), *Heidelberger Jahrbücher der Literatur* 63 (1870), 769–96 and 801–39, at 777–8, paraphrasing: 'Mögen diese meine Gesänge meinen Verwünschungen die gehörige Kraft einhauchen, mögen sie meinem Gefühl adaequat sein.' In particular, it is difficult to see why the reader should take *uotis* as a dative rather than an ablative: 'may these songs breathe with my prayers' is a fairly plausible (if nonsensical) turn of phrase.

questa mia poesia’).<sup>21</sup> In both cases the refrain in fact signals a change of theme: from meadows to woods at 25, and from a fire to a flood at 47. I suggest that Giardina’s proposal can be improved upon by writing *suberunt*, which is slightly closer to the paradoxis (for either corruption, compare the variant *superant* for *suberant* at Ov. *Met.* 10.593).<sup>22</sup> More importantly, the future indicative would be more suitable to introduce a new stanza (compare perhaps 30 *resonabit*) than the jussive subjunctive (for hortative subjunctive, compare 1 and 14 *repetamus*, 2 *canamus*, 97 *reuoemus*, but jussive subjunctive in reference to the speaker’s performance is unparalleled in the *Dirae*).<sup>23</sup>

#### DIRAE 79

The speaker invites heavy rainfall to flood the estate (79–81):

cum delapsa meos agros peruenerit unda,  
piscetur nostris in finibus aduena arator,  
aduena, ciuili qui semper crimine creuit.

79 cum delapsa *Reitzenstein*: unde elapsa *codd.*

Line 79 *delapsa* ... *unda* probably implies rainwater running down the mountains (compare 76) rather than falling down from the sky, and this could account for the point of *peruenerit*: ‘when the stream originating in the mountains has reached the valley’. The resulting picture, however, faces two objections. First, it presents the natural disaster destroying the speaker’s estate as an evolving process, but this is not how the poet seems to imagine it elsewhere.<sup>24</sup> Second, if we do conceive of the flood in such dynamic terms, the transition between 79 and 80 appears somewhat abrupt: when the stream reaches the fields, it has yet to submerge them, before anyone could fish there. Both these points are given additional weight by the use of the prefixed form, which lays emphasis on the process accomplished rather than the resulting state achieved. While I admit that these objections may not make *peruenerit* quite impossible, it seems worth voicing an alternative: *perfuderit*, which finds a parallel in 51 *spissa campos perfundat harena*. The error will have been due to *perfuderit* being written right over *aduena* in the next line, resulting in the scribe’s inadvertently replacing *-fud-* in *perfuderit* with *-uen-* from *aduena*.<sup>25</sup> The one potential objection could be that the same verb, with a different prefix, has already been used in this stanza at 76

<sup>21</sup> Giardina (n. 3), 168.

<sup>22</sup> *OLD* s.v. *subsum* 1d: ‘to be subjoined (in a document); to attach (to a heading)’. Note that the *Dirae* speaker thinks of his composition in terms of a written text: 34 *nostris potius deuota libellis*.

<sup>23</sup> H. Pinkster, *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume 1: The Simple Clause* (Oxford, 2015), 502 states that the jussive subjunctive can be ‘found in transition formulas – for example, in Varro and Pliny the Elder’, citing V. Naas, *Le projet encyclopédique de Pline l’Ancien* (Rome, 2002), 209–24; but Naas’s dossier rather suggests that in Pliny the first-person hortative subjunctive (8.1 *transeamus*, 10.212 *transeamus*, 11.284 *transeamus*, 23.166 *transeamus*, 26.164 *reddamus*) or future (7.215 *praeuertemur*, 8.229 *dicemus*, 14.150 *dicemus*, 15.138 *dicemus*, 20.1 *ordiemur* and *cogemus*, 28.267 *praeuertemur*, 29.143 *dicemus*, 30.149 *praeuertemur*) or the third-person future (4.122 *dicentur*, 9.1 *dicentur*, 9.186 *dicentur*, 24.188 *dicetur*, 25.1 *dicetur*, 33.1 *dicentur*) are the rule, whereas the third-person jussive subjunctive is at best an exception (34.1 *dicentur*).

<sup>24</sup> Lines 42–4 which describe the gradual destruction of the different parts of the estate by a fire is a different case.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. my discussion of *Lydia* 115 and 116 below.

(*teneant diffuso gurgite campos*), but the poet does not in fact avoid such repetition (in addition to 51 and 76, note 43 *diffusis ignibus*, 49 *auras diffunditis agris*, 63 *tuas infundimus aures*, 68 *diffundite campis*).

*DIRAE* 66

It has long been recognized that 66 is not at home in its transmitted context, and it has plausibly been suggested that the line originally belonged to the passage concluding the curses proper (82–5), though the exact place has been disputed (see below):

o male deuoti, praetorum crimina, agelli,  
tuque inimica tui semper Discordia ciuis,  
exsul ego indemnatus egens mea rura reliqui,  
miles ut accipiat funesti praemia belli?

82 praetorum *cod. Esc. T II 9*: pratorum *SL*: parcarum *M*: raptorum *Scaliger*

Yet before we turn to reconsider the original position of 66, I propose to discuss briefly a well-known problem that affects the middle of 82. One branch of the manuscript tradition offers impossible *pratorum* (SL), which a manuscript descending from the same branch corrects to *praetorum*. This has been a popular solution, adopted among others by Kenney, but a crucial obstacle is the fact that praetors had nothing to do with the settling of the veterans.<sup>26</sup> Courtney has defended *Parcarum* of the other branch of the tradition (M), by adducing Stat. *Achil.* 2.45 *indecores, fatorum crimina, cultus* and Dracontius, *Orest.* 453 *iners, Parcarum crimina, pastor*.<sup>27</sup> In both these cases, however, there is a point in blaming either Fate (Achilles was hidden on Scyros to avoid his destined death at Troy) or the Parcae (Aegisthus was born of incest), whereas in our passage such a reference could only convey a general disappointment at how things have turned out. Ellis cites *prauorum* from the 1482 Zarotti edition, but it is too vague a term; Heinsius proposed *praedonum*, which is more specific but arguably too derogatory.<sup>28</sup> Scaliger's *raptorum* is, I suggest, a somewhat easier correction and more to the point.<sup>29</sup> There is a category of curse tablets known as 'prayers for justice', whose characteristic feature is that, rather than wantonly cursing their victims, they ask for divine retribution in quasi-legal terms.<sup>30</sup> A common subgroup are tablets that 'devote' stolen objects to deities, who are asked, as their new owners, not to let the thieves benefit from their illegally acquired property.<sup>31</sup> This is the logic of 82: the speaker has 'devoted' (*deuoti*) his farmlands (to the underworld, as we shall see),

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Fraenkel (n. 1), 149.

<sup>27</sup> See E. Courtney, 'A new text of the *Appendix*', *CR* 17 (1967), 42–6, at 43; E. Courtney, 'A miscellany on Latin poetry', *BICS* 29 (1982), 49–54, at 51.

<sup>28</sup> R. Ellis, *Appendix Vergiliana* (Oxford, 1907), 5–iv<sup>v</sup> (cf. R. Reitzenstein, *Drei Vermutungen zur Geschichte der römischen Litteratur* [Marburg, 1893], 40); Heinsius in Burman (n. 12), 664.

<sup>29</sup> J. Scaliger, *Publii Virgilii Maronis appendix* (Lyon, 1572), 440.

<sup>30</sup> On 'prayers for justice' as a type of curse tablets, see especially H.S. Versnel, 'Beyond cursing: the appeal for justice in judicial prayers', in C. Faraone, D. Obbink (edd.), *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion* (Oxford, 1991), 60–106; H.S. Versnel, 'Prayers for justice, East and West: new finds and publications since 1990', in R.L. Gordon, F.M. Simón (edd.), *Magical Practice in the Latin West* (Leiden, 2010), 275–354.

<sup>31</sup> See e.g. R. Tomlin, 'Cursing a thief in Iberia and Britain', in R.L. Gordon, F.M. Simón (edd.), *Magical Practice in the Latin West* (Leiden, 2010), 245–73.

because they have been unjustly taken away from him (*raptorum crimina*). This analysis of 82 can help us reconsider the long-standing problem of the original position of 66. It appears certain that 66 *nil est quod perdam ulterius: merita omnia ditis* (Kenney's text) does not belong in its transmitted place (on the one hand, it intrudes into a coherent passage; on the other, it has the air of a closural statement), but simply deleting it, as Kenney does, may not be the optimal solution.<sup>32</sup> First, a few words are in order on the text of the line itself. Since he obelizes it, Kenney prints it as it appears in the manuscripts, but *merita* is difficult to construe; an easy and compelling correction is Putsche's *merito*.<sup>33</sup> It finds support in an interesting bilingual curse-tablet from Spain (first century B.C. – first century A.D.), which reads in part: τοῖς κατὰ Ἄϊδην δίδωμι παραδίδωμι Νεικίαν καὶ Τειμήν καὶ τοὺς ἄ[λ]λους οἷς δικαίως κατηρασάμην (recto) – *deuotos defixos inferis Timen et Niciam et ceteros quos merito deuoui sup[r]a* (verso).<sup>34</sup> The point of *merito* (δικαίως) is that the inscriber has suffered injustice from Nicias and Time and now hands them over (παραδίδωμι) to the gods of the underworld as judges: the curse is not a wanton attempt to hurt but a request for just revenge. In our case it is not the perpetrators who are 'devoted' to the underworld, but what they unjustly took: the speaker cedes his property rights on the estate to Dis, who should now claim it as his own. This reading is also supported by *perdam*, a verb that is often used in 'prayers for justice' in reference to stolen possessions.<sup>35</sup> While lines 82–5, transitional between the curses proper and the final farewells, are as such a likely home for 66, the fact that both 82 and 66 play on the conventions of a 'prayer for justice' strengthens the case for a connection. Ribbeck placed 66 in front of 82, but, on the one hand, the vocatives of 82–3 are a good way to signal the beginning of a new section while, on the other, on its own 66 is not an effective summation of the preceding curses.<sup>36</sup> Goodyear moved it after 83, which is an improvement.<sup>37</sup> Yet after 85 is, I suggest, a more plausible place. On the one hand, making 66 answer the question of 84–5 brings out the logic of a 'prayer for justice' in a clearer way: 'Have I parted with my farm, so that the soldier could have it as his own? Yes, everything has been taken from me, but it now all belongs to Dis.' On the other, the similarity of the beginnings of 85 (*miles*) and 66 (*nil est*) could account for the latter's omission.

#### DIRAE 88

The speaker casts a last glance over his estate (86–8):

hinc ego de tumulo mea rura nouissima uisam,  
hinc ibo in siluas: obstabunt iam mihi colles,  
obstabunt montes, campos audire licebit.

<sup>32</sup> Kenney (n. 6), 8 brackets the line, commenting: 'uersus siue genuinus siue suppositicius siue corruptus his quid sibi uelit nescio: del. Kenney'.

<sup>33</sup> See K. Putsche, *Valerii Catonis poemata* (Jena, 1828), 90; for the elision, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.188 *quando omnia*.

<sup>34</sup> First published in J.B. Curbera, M. Sierra Delage, I. Velázquez, 'A bilingual curse tablet from Barchin del Hoyo (Cuenca, Spain)', *ZPE* 125 (1999), 279–83.

<sup>35</sup> See J.N. Adams, 'British Latin: the text, interpretation and language of the Bath curse tablets', *Britannia* 23 (1992), 1–26, at 3.

<sup>36</sup> O. Ribbeck, 'Dirarum carmen', *Index scholarum in Academia Regia Christiana Albertina* 1867.2, 1–14, at 8.

<sup>37</sup> Goodyear (n. 1), 41–2.



As Goodyear points out, the second half of 88 can hardly be right: ‘The phrase as it stands is fatally ambiguous, able to mean either “the plains will be able to hear” or “it will be possible to hear the plains”, and no less fatally obscure.’<sup>38</sup> Earlier corrections—humanist *campos nec adire*, Putsche’s *campis nec abire*, Sillig’s *campos haud ire*, Diggle’s *campos laudare*—fail to convince.<sup>39</sup> More recently, Watt has suggested *camposque uidere negabunt*, which appears to produce an apposite sense: ‘the mountains will not let me see the plains’.<sup>40</sup> As he points out, the confusion between forms of *audire* and *uidere* is widespread, and the change of *negabit* to *licebit* can also be paralleled. The one weakness of Watt’s proposal is that, with an infinitive, *negare* means not ‘to forbid to’ but ‘to refuse to’ (*OLD* s.v. *nego* 4). To obtain the required sense, we should adopt Watt’s *camposque uidere* but write *uetabunt* instead of *negabunt*.<sup>41</sup> The corruption of *uetabunt* to *licebit* may be due to the scribe’s eye inadvertently jumping down to *licebit* at the end of 103.

### *DIRAE* 97

The final stanza of the *Dirae* is introduced by the following refrain (97):

extremum carmen reuocemus, Battare, auena.

At first sight it appears unobjectionable, but in fact it has two potential problems. One is that bare *auena* at the end of the line is weak; it has the feel of an afterthought or even a mere metrical filler (contrast 14 or 54 [= 71], which lack such an instrumental ablative). Heinsius proposed changing *extremum* to *extrema*: this improves the syntax, but the harsh metonymy *extrema auena* for ‘my last playing on the panpipe made from reeds’ does not appeal.<sup>42</sup> There is, in fact, a further irregularity, even if on its own it may not be objectionable: elsewhere in the poem, the form *carmen* usually occurs in the sixth foot (14, 30, 54, 71, 75; line 19 is the one exception, which is suspect also for other reasons) and is usually preceded by *Battare* in the fifth (except at 75). Herrmann therefore had a point when he proposed swapping *carmen* and *auena*; since, however, *auena* between *extremum* and *reuocemus* violates the metre, we have to ask what else can have stood there.<sup>43</sup> As 14 and 54 (= 71) suggest, that would be

<sup>38</sup> Goodyear (n. 1), 36.

<sup>39</sup> Putsche (n. 33), 95; J. Sillig, ‘Review of K. Putsche, *Valerii Catonis poemata* (Jena, 1828)’, *Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* 4 (1829), 17–35, at 33; J. Diggle in Goodyear (n. 1), 36 n. 2.

<sup>40</sup> W.S. Watt, ‘Notes on the *Appendix Vergiliana*’, *Eikasmos* 12 (2001), 279–92, at 280.

<sup>41</sup> For pairing *uetare* with *uidere*, cf. *Ov. Rem. am.* 438 *et uidit quae mos ipse uidere uetat*.

<sup>42</sup> Heinsius in Burman (n. 12), 666. Note that *auena* is usually defined by epithets referring to its physical properties as a stalk of reed: e.g. *Verg. Ecl.* 1.2 *tenui*, [*Verg. Aen.*] proem 1 *gracili*, *Tib.* 2.1.53 *arenti*, [*Tib.*] 3.4.71 *perlucenti*, *Calp. Ecl.* 1.93 *tereti*, *Laus Pisonis* 234 *sterili*, *Val. Fl.* 4.386 *leni*; occasionally the reference is to the sound: *Calp. Ecl.* 3.60 *acerbae*, *Nemes.* 3.11 *stridentis*.

<sup>43</sup> L. Herrmann, ‘Trois poèmes de P. Valerius Cato’, *Latomus* 8 (1949), 111–44, at 129. The likeliest explanation for the corruption seems to be that, first, *carmen* was repeated in its transmitted place from the end of the line and, next, the original *carmen* was conjecturally replaced with *auena* (note that a part of *auena* is erroneously introduced in the text of the *Dirae* on at least one other occasion, at 21 *pingunt uerna* [Heinsius: *auena* codd.] *colore*). It may be worth pointing out that cod. Monac. 21562 (copy of m) reads, before correction, *extremum carmen reuocemus, Battare, carmen*: this is, of course, an easier error (especially in view of the frequency of *Battare, carmen* earlier in the poem), but it illustrates the same process.

a good place for an adverb; I have considered borrowing *iterum* from these refrains, but it has two weaknesses: on the one hand, it would make the corruption to *carmen* somewhat less likely; on the other, extra emphasis on the idea of repetition may be less welcome at the close of the poem. I suggest that the adverb we need is *tandem*: it is reasonably similar to *carmen* in both shape and sound (the corruption will, of course, have been influenced by *carmen* at the end of the line), and it appears appropriate in a refrain introducing the final stanza. The second problem is indicated by the fact that all other refrains that refer to the following stanza with *carmen* (*carmina*) define it with *hoc* (*haec*): 14 *tristius hoc iterum repetamus*, *Battare, carmen*, 25 (= 47) *sic precor, et nostris suberunt haec carmina uotis*, 30 *hoc*<sup>44</sup> *mihi saepe meum resonabit*, *Battare, carmen*, 54 (= 71) *tristius hoc iterum reuocasti*, *Battare, carmen*, 75 *tristius hoc rursum dicit mea fistula carmen*. We may also note that the refrains containing the idea of repetition (14, 54, 71, 75) imply specifically the repetition of the preceding stanza. What does the final refrain mean? Without the deictic *hoc* referring to what follows, *extremum carmen* can most naturally be interpreted as ‘the conclusion of the song’; while this is not in itself an implausible meaning, the point of *reuocemus* is lost: ‘let us repeat the end of the song’ makes no sense, because the end of the song has not yet been performed. I suggest that we should restore *hoc* here as well: *extremum hoc tandem reuocemus*, *Battare, carmen*, ‘Battarus, let us at last repeat this stanza as the final one’;<sup>45</sup> the implication will then be that 98–101 reiterate, as in fact they do, 4–8.

#### LYDIA 107–8, 109–10

The speaker of the *Lydia* envies the fields and meadows in which he used to spend time with his girlfriend, but which now have her company to themselves (107–10):

uos nunc illa uidet, uobis mea Lydia ludit,  
uos nunc alloquitur, uos nunc arridet ocellis,  
et mea submissa meditatatur carmina uoce,  
cantat et interea, mihi quae cantabat in aurem.

An overlooked difficulty concerns the sense and construal of 107 *uobis mea Lydia ludit*: what case is *uobis*, and what does *ludit* mean? Van der Graaf translates: ‘my Lydia plays with you’; and explains in the commentary: ‘Lydia’s play is specified in 114, 117, etc. (cf. Catullus’ second poem).’<sup>46</sup> This translation, however, confuses two different senses of the English construction, ‘to play with a friend’ and ‘to play with a toy’: in a context such as this we expect the former, but the Latin (ablative without *cum*) can only convey the latter. In his revision of Fairclough’s Loeb, Goold translates: ‘in you my Lydia plays’; but a locative interpretation of *uobis* is likewise inapposite, since the fields and meadows addressed here are virtually personified (besides, it is doubtful that the ablative of a pronoun can have a locative sense).<sup>47</sup> Before proposing an alternative

<sup>44</sup> This is a conjecture by Ribbeck (n. 36), 5 for the transmitted *nec*, which is untenable; however, the line may be more gravely damaged.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. the opening of Virgil’s final eclogue (10.1): *extremum hunc, Arethusa, mihi concede laborem*, ‘grant me, Arethusa, this work as the last one’.

<sup>46</sup> Van der Graaf (n. 1), 6 and 31.

<sup>47</sup> Fairclough (n. 2), 397; in the original Loeb, H.R. Fairclough, *Virgil*, vol. 2 (London, 1918), 473 translated: ‘with you my Lydia plays’.

construal, I wish to call attention to another potential cause for concern: there seems to be no logic in the order of the activities listed in 107–8 (107a *uidet*, 107b *ludit*, 108a *alloquitur*, 108b *arridet*). In and of itself, this may not be a sufficient reason for intervention; but if we swap the second hemistichs of 107 and 108, by way of an experiment, the advantages of the new arrangement are obvious. First, the triple anaphora of *uos nunc* is now uninterrupted. Second, the progression of ideas from 107a *uidet* ('she sees you') to 108b *arridet ocellis* ('she smilingly looks at you') to 108a *alloquitur* ('she speaks to you') obtains a clear logic (I stop at 108a for the moment). And third, the new position of 107b finally enables us to construe the phrase in a way that makes sense. Placed between *alloquitur* and *meditatur* (and *cantat*), *ludit* can likewise be taken to refer to verbal/vocal performance, with *uobis* being a dative: 'my Lydia plays/performs for you'; what Lydia performs is explained in 109–10. Turning back to an earlier point, we can now take the climactic progression of ideas one step further: she admires you, she smiles at you, she speaks to you—and she sings for you.<sup>48</sup> The corruption is probably due to homoearchon: having copied the first hemistich of the first line, the scribe would jump down to the second hemistich of the second line; he would then add the omitted hemistichs in the margins, but the subsequent copyist would fail to restore them in their original place.

As we have established, 109–10 are intended to explicate 107b *uobis mea Lydia ludit*, but they involve some difficulties too. First, 109 appears to refer to Lydia's repeating the songs which the speaker used to sing to her, but there are reasons to doubt this interpretation. On the one hand, though less crucially, these *carmina* would most naturally be love songs addressed to Lydia, and it will be odd to imagine her repeating them to herself. On the other, *meditatur* should normally mean 'to compose, rehearse', and the same idea seems to be implied by *submissa ... uoce* (Lydia does not sing these songs aloud, because they are not ready yet); this suggests that *carmina* should be Lydia's own.<sup>49</sup> While in principle it could make sense for 109 and 110 to refer to Lydia's singing her lover's and her own songs in turn, the contrast may in fact be between polishing new songs (109) and performing old ones (110).<sup>50</sup> We may thus provisionally mark *mea* as suspect (it could be a reflex of *mea* in 107b). A second difficulty concerns the articulation of the two lines as a whole; we could expect them to be saying that Lydia *meditatur* and *cantat* in turn, but, as it stands, the passage cannot be construed in this way. A glaring problem is 110 *interea* 'in the meantime', which makes no plausible sense in the context and for which

<sup>48</sup> The one potential objection could be the repetition of *mea* at close distance (*uobis mea Lydia ludit* | *et mea submissa meditatur carmina uoce*), but, as I suggest below, *mea* at 109 is probably corrupt. In any event, it will not have much weight in view of 122–4 *dum mea iucundas exponat cura querelas*. | *inuideo uobis, agri: mea gaudia habetis*, | *et uobis nunc est mea quae fuit ante uoluptas* and 157–9 *sacratamque meae uitam temptare puellae* | *immatura mea cogor nece soluere fata?* | *istius atque utinam facti mea culpa magistra*.

<sup>49</sup> The line could in principle be taken to mean 'she rehearses songs I wrote for her to sing', but the idea seems strained.

<sup>50</sup> The exact nuance of *meditari* in reference to musical composition or performance is elusive (*OLD* s.v. *meditor* 7 'To work over (a song, etc.) in performance' is not very helpful), but it never seems to be used of formal singing in front of an audience and rather implies solitary practising (Verg. *Ecl.* 6.82–3 *omnia, quae Phoebus quondam meditante beatus* | *audiu Eurotas* is telling: the Eurotas overhears Apollo). By contrast, *cantare* is the standard term for bucolic singing; see M. Lipka, *Language in Vergil's Eclogues* (Berlin, 2001), 21–2.

Wagner's *interdum* is a compelling correction.<sup>51</sup> While *interdum* 'sometimes' is clearly a fitting word for our context, on its own it may not be sufficient to restore a plausible text. On the one hand, the articulation of the passage would be clearer if the first clause were likewise introduced by *interdum* or a synonym, so as to establish a bipartite *interdum ... interdum* construction, even though this may not be strictly necessary. Writing *nunc* for *et* at 109 might be a possibility,<sup>52</sup> but it would clash with the repeated *nunc* in 107–8, where it has a temporal force (compare 124 *et uobis nunc est mea quae fuit ante uoluptas*); writing *modo* for *mea*—which, as argued above, is also suspect for another reason—seems a better option.<sup>53</sup> On the other hand, as part of a bipartite construction meaning 'now ... now', *interdum* introducing the second clause cannot be preceded by *et*; besides, its normal position would be at the very head of its clause.<sup>54</sup> This suggests that we should write *interdum cantat*; the error is probably due to the omission of *cantat*, which was subsequently restored in the wrong place (with *et* added to fix the metre).

#### LYDIA 115–16

The speaker envies the farmlands in which Lydia will walk (114–17) –

aut roseis uiridem digitis decerpserit uam  
 (dulci namque tumet nondum uitacula Baccho)  
 aut inter uarios, Veneris stipendia, flores  
 membra reclinarit teneramque illiserit herbam.

116 ueneris *recc.*: uenerem *MSL* | stipendia *SL*: spumantia *M*

A long-recognized problem concerns the middle of 116: while it seems virtually certain that between *uarios* and *flores* we should have an appositional phrase comparable to Columella 10.96 *uarios, terrestria sidera, flores* and that, accordingly, *Veneris* is probably right, *stipendia* has duly been suspected. The term is markedly 'unpoetisch': other than in Plautus and until Prudentius, it only occurs three times in poetry: Ennius (*Ann.* 215 *Poeni stipendia pendunt*) and Catullus (64.173 *dira ferens stipendia*

<sup>51</sup> W. Wagner, 'On Ribbeck's Virgil', *TPhS* 12 (1867), 198–239, at 235. Earlier scholars took *interea* to mean *interdum* 'sometimes', but this is unwarranted; explaining *interea* as 'while I am away' does not produce a plausible sense.

<sup>52</sup> I owe the suggestion to Stephen Heyworth.

<sup>53</sup> For the corruption, cf. e.g. Maximianus 1.214 *quaeque breuis fuerat iam modo* [v.l. *mea*] *longa mihi est*, 4.22 *cantabam dulces quos solet illa modos* [v.l. *meos*]; cf. further Stat. *Theb.* 2.450 *si modo* [v.l. *mihī*] *notus amor*, Maximianus 3.41 *sit modo* [v.l. *mihī*] *certa fides*. For *carmina* undefined by an epithet, cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.341 *quae* [sc. *Canens*] *dum feminea modulatur carmina uoce*.

<sup>54</sup> I cite all occurrences of a bipartite *modo ... interdum* construction in poetry I am aware of: Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.9 *ire modo ocius, interdum consistere*, 2.7.7–8 *pars multa natat, modo recta capessens, | interdum prauis obnoxia*, Prop. 2.15.5–6 *nam modo nudatis mecum est luctata papillis, | interdum tunica duxit operta moram*, Ov. *Met.* 2.188–90 *animo metitur utrumque | et modo ... | prospicit occasus, interdum respicit ortus*, 3.7.7–8 *ipse modo immensum spiris facientibus orbem | cingitur, interdum longa trabe rector adstat*, 13.540–2 *duroque simillima saxo | torpet et aduersa figit modo lumina terra, | interdum toruos sustollit ad aethera uultus, Moretum* 29–31 *modo rustica carmina cantat | agrestique suum solatur laborem, | interdum clamat Scybalen*. Less systematically, I have also checked examples of the same construction produced by *interdum* combined with other discourse markers, and am likewise unable to cite any cases of the second clause introduced by *et*.

*tauro*) use it as a technical term for either ‘soldiers’ wages’ or ‘war reparations’ (respectively); Horace (*Epod.* 17.36 *quod me manet stipendium?*) gives it a less precise sense (‘fine’), but its down-to-earth flavour is clearly what he is after.<sup>55</sup> In our context the term is problematic at least on two counts: first, it does not fit stylistically; second, the exact literal sense underlying the metaphor of *Veneris stipendia* is not clear (‘wages paid to Venus’? ‘tax levied in Venus’ interest’?).<sup>56</sup> If that were not enough, *stipendia* is, in fact, only the reading of one branch of the manuscript tradition (SL). Building on M’s *spumantia*, some scholars have attempted to restore a participial phrase in agreement with 117 *membra* (such as *Venerem spirantia* Eichstädt, *simulantia* Sillig); but this results in a rather awkward syntax.<sup>57</sup> As noted above, it seems clear that we need a noun, and Shackleton Bailey proposed *spiracula* (‘Venus breathes through the flowers, causing their fragrance’): this is absurd, but points in the right direction.<sup>58</sup> I suggest that we should write *spectacula*, ‘Venus’ show’; the underlying image is that of spring as a festival held by, or in honour of, Venus.<sup>59</sup>

Once we have restored *spectacula*, the jingle with *uitecula* (directly above it), though not quite impossible, becomes a cause for concern.<sup>60</sup> There are two further reasons to suspect *uitecula*, even if neither constitutes a decisive objection. First, the diminutive *uiticula* is not used in classical verse, and is quite rare in prose too.<sup>61</sup> Second, the metonymy is rather harsh (‘the vine swells with juice’).<sup>62</sup> I tentatively suggest that *uitecula* is an error for *uindemia*: written exactly over (*specta*)*cula*, (*uīde*)*mia* could

<sup>55</sup> Cf. G. Trimble, ‘A commentary on Catullus 64, lines 1–201’ (Diss., Oxford, 2010), 286.

<sup>56</sup> *Apul. Met.* 9.20 *prima stipendia Veneri militabant nudi milites* suggests a more natural sense that *Veneris stipendia* could have (‘service in Venus’ army’), but it is impossible in our context; here we could expect something like ‘offerings to Venus’ (cf. *Lucr.* 1.17–18), but *stipendia* cannot convey this sense.

<sup>57</sup> H.K.A. Eichstädt, *Valerii Catonis Dirae* (Jena, 1826), 18; J. Sillig, Review of Eichstädt (this note), *Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* 1 (1826), 333–43, at 339.

<sup>58</sup> D.R. Shackleton Bailey, ‘Notes on minor Latin poets’, *Phoenix* 32 (1978), 305–25, at 309.

<sup>59</sup> For the idea, cf. *Lucr.* 1.17–18 *tibi suaues daedala tellus | summittit flores* and, with greater detail, 5.737–40: the earth is adorned with flowers to celebrate Venus’ advent; *spectaculum* is readily used in a variety of figurative ways, cf. *Verg. G.* 4.3 *admiranda tibi leuium spectacula rerum* (of bees), *Hor. Sat.* 2.2.26 *picta pandat spectacula cauda* (sc. the peacock), *Man.* 1.737 *dum noua miratur propius spectacula mundi* (sc. Phaethon), *Aetna* 156 *nulla daret miranda sui spectacula tellus* (of volcanoes), *Paulinus of Nola* 10.176 *spermentes uarias, rerum spectacula, formas* (of the pleasing appearances of material things as opposed to spiritual ones).

<sup>60</sup> Naturally, this could be considered an argument against proposing *spectacula* at 116 in the first place; as I go on to suggest, however, *uitecula* is not unproblematic on its own.

<sup>61</sup> Only five occurrences in classical prose (as a deprecatory term for grapevine as such: *Cic. Nat. D.* 3.86, *Plin. Ep.* 1.24.4; ‘young vine’: *Columella* 4.12.1; ‘vine-twig’: *Plin. HN* 24.98, 27.44). By contrast, *uiticula* has yielded a rich harvest of descendants across Romance languages (see *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 14.552–7 s.v. *uiticula*); this makes it likely that the scribe could be familiar with the term from everyday usage and could therefore introduce it by error.

<sup>62</sup> The usual idiom is ‘the grape cluster swells with juice’, which involves no metonymy (at least, not at that side of the image, though of course ‘wine’ for ‘juice’ is a metonymy): *Ov. Am.* 1.15.11 *mustis uua tumebit*, *Tr.* 5.3.36 *incluso plena sit uua mero*, German. fr. 4.17 *Libra tumescentes musto bene percoquit uuas*, *Mart.* 13.68.2 *turget adhuc uiridi cum rudis uua mero*. *Ov. Tr.* 4.6.9 *extensis tumeat facit uua racemis* (‘the cluster swells with grapes’ for ‘grapes swell on the cluster’) does involve a metonymy but a different and less bold one. *Sil. Pum.* 7.164 *gravidae cui nectare uites* (‘the vine is heavy with juice’ for ‘the vine is heavy with grapes’) and *Sen. Oed.* 157–8 *non plena suo uitis Iaccho | braccia curuat* (‘the vine is replete with wine’ for ‘the vine is replete with grapes’) come closest to our example in that they have *uitis* as the subject, but, unlike *turgere* or *tumere* which can only have the physical meaning ‘to swell’, both *gravidus* and *plenus* can have the figurative sense ‘abundant with’ as opposed to the physical ‘filled with’. In other words, the rule is observed that, in this kind of context, *turgere* and *tumere* always have *uua* as the subject.

easily produce (*uite*)*cula*;<sup>63</sup> for *tumet uindemia*, compare Auson. *Mos.* 195 *uindemia turget*. This conjecture may not be necessary in the sense that it fixes an unquestionably corrupt text, but it is fairly easy and simultaneously solves all the issues (admittedly minor): it removes the unattractive jingle (if *spectacula* is right); eliminates a conspicuous lexical rarity; and replaces the unparalleled metonymy with a standard one ('ripe grapes do not yet swell with sweet wine').

LYDIA 121

The speaker then describes the enjoyment which Lydia's company brings his estate in his absence (119–22):

gaudebunt siluae, gaudebunt mollia prata  
et gelidi fontes, auiumque silentia fient,  
tardabunt riui †labentes currite lymphae,  
dum mea iucundas exponat cura querelas.

Kenney obelized a portion of 121 not because no correction could be found, but because it was uncertain which correction should be adopted.<sup>64</sup> Some scholars have in fact accepted the paradosis, taking *labentes currite lymphae* as a parenthesis and suggesting that *labi* means here something like 'to flow gently, quietly'.<sup>65</sup> Yet this is far-fetched: it is quite doubtful that *labentes* can have this pregnant sense, and the Orphic topos requires that the rivers stop their flow rather than merely reducing its violence. It seems thus more or less certain that the imperative *currite* is corrupt, and one solution has been to change it to *sistite* (humanist). This brings us to a more general objection: a parenthetic apostrophe is out of place here. To begin with, the speaker is separated from the situation he is describing both spatially and temporally: it will happen in the future, and in a place which he has left. It is true that the entire first part of the *Lydia* is addressed to the abandoned farmlands, but the speaker never implies that they can actually hear him; an imperative does involve such an expectation. Perhaps more importantly, the imperative *currite* will jar with the future indicative *tardabunt*: an assertion should not depend on the fulfilment of a command. This is not merely a linguistic issue: the point of the passage is that the rivers, enchanted by Lydia's singing, will stop flowing of their own accord, not in response to the speaker's request. The likeliest correction for *currite* seems therefore to be *currere* of the 1534 Aldine edition, to be construed with *tardabunt*. With this change, the line can in principle make sense: 'the flowing waters of the river will stop to run'. Yet both the general sense and the context (note 119 *gaudebunt siluae*) suggest that it would be preferable to have *riui* as the subject, and Scaliger proposed turning *labentes ... lymphae* into an ablative: *tardabunt riui labenti currere lymphae*, 'the rivers will stop to run with their flowing water'.<sup>66</sup> Again, this is not impossible, but one cannot avoid the feeling that the expression is vague and wordy. I suggest that we need the accusative: *tardabunt riui labentes*

<sup>63</sup> The same kind of corruption has taken place twice elsewhere in our passage: first, *ueneris*, written over *teneram*, became *uenerem*; second, *teneram*, written under *uenerem*, became *tenerem* in one branch of the manuscript tradition (SL).

<sup>64</sup> Kenney (n. 6), 11: 'inter tot ueri similia uerum latet'.

<sup>65</sup> See e.g. van der Graaf (n. 1), 33.

<sup>66</sup> Scaliger (n. 29), 442.

*currere lymphas*, ‘the rivers will make their flowing waters stop their course’.<sup>67</sup> This has the advantage of giving both *riui* and *lymphae* a clear role to play, which moreover can be paralleled in the *Dirae*: note especially 67 *flectite currentes lymphas, uaga flumina, retro*, but also 48 *undae, quae uestris pulsatis litora lymphis*, where similarly ‘streams’ (*flumina*) and ‘waves’ (*undae*) appear as active agents which have control over their ‘waters’ (*lymphas/lymphis*).<sup>68</sup>

LYDIA 175

After the references to Jupiter’s premarital affair with Juno (166–8) and to Venus’ affair with virginal Adonis (169–74), Aurora is added to the list of divine seducers (175–6):

non Aurora nouos etiam plorauit amores  
atque rubens oculos roseo celauit amictu?

Although it is true that she eventually lost her lovers Orion, Cephalus and Clitus, in one way or another, the idea that ‘Aurora was unhappy in love’ (suggested by *plorauit*) seems out of place here.<sup>69</sup> Hiding one’s eyes is a gesture of shame (note also *rubens*, ‘blushing’), and while in principle the implication could be that Aurora was ashamed of crying (compare Stat. *Achil.* 1.233–4 *udaque celat | lumina*), this would give too much prominence to an action that could only indicate her affairs in the most indirect way, if at all. The most natural reason for Aurora’s feeling of shame would be her indecorous behaviour, an idea which *plorauit* can hardly imply. A passage from Ovid provides an illuminating parallel (*Ars am.* 3.83–4):

Latmius Endymion non est tibi, Luna, rubori,  
nec Cephalus roseae praeda pudenda deae.

Ovid playfully denies that Luna’s and Aurora’s ‘blushing’—the rising moon can be reddish, and so is dawn—was caused by their affairs with mortal lovers; the idea rejected by Ovid must be implied in the *Lydia*.<sup>70</sup> What can *plorauit* be concealing? One possibility is to assume that the line should refer to Aurora’s enjoying her

<sup>67</sup> For construing *tardare* with an accusative and infinitive, cf. *OLD* s.v. *tardo* 1b; note especially *TrRF adesp.* 1.74.6 *illum ut maeror tardaret sequi*.

<sup>68</sup> J.P. Postgate, *Select Elegies of Propertius* (London, 1885<sup>2</sup>), lxxvii–lxxix discusses the more general phenomenon (which he calls ‘disjunctiveness’) when the same object or idea is referred to by two synonymous terms in a seemingly pleonastic way, citing in particular Prop. 1.11.11–12 *aut teneat clausam tenui Teuthrantis in unda | alternae facilis cedere lymphae manu*, but this may rather parallel Scaliger’s correction of our line. The *Dirae* poet has a clearer and more specific image in mind, in that *flumina* and *undae* are conceived of as entities (deities?) endowed with agency (note that they are addressed in the vocative), whereas *lymphae* merely refers to their physical substance.

<sup>69</sup> *Pace* van der Graaf (n. 1), 42.

<sup>70</sup> The implication is probably that, when Luna and Aurora appear in the sky, they have just left their lovers, so it is natural to interpret their redness as a sign of embarrassment. Note that the catalogue of divine lovers, which Aurora closes, was opened with Luna, who was said to spend every day with Endymion (142–5); the latter passage is severely corrupt, but M. Sonntag, ‘Pseudo-Vergil Lydia 39–41’, *WKPh* 13 (1896), 478 must be right about its intended sense: ‘Während der Sonnengott die Nacht benutzen muß, um die Geliebte aufzusuchen, bleibt der noctivaga Phoebe nur der Tag zu solchem Verkehr übrig.’ This strengthens the case for taking 176 to imply a previous night spent with a lover (while epic decorum presupposes that Aurora spends nights with her husband Tithonus).

relationships with men other than her husband, and *gustauit* or *libauit* could convey such a sense (compare 168 *gaudia libauit dulcem furatus amorem*). This may not be entirely impossible, but the context suggests that the passage should be making a different point: not that Aurora was unfaithful to Tithonus, but that she seduced inexperienced young men.<sup>71</sup> I have thought of *uiolauit*, yet while *uiolare* can in principle imply rape, with *amores* it would more naturally mean ‘to betray love’ than ‘to seduce a lover’. I suggest that *raptauit* would be a more suitable term, for which compare Ov. *Her.* 15.87–8 *hunc ne pro Cephalo raperes, Aurora, timebam, | et faceres, sed te prima rapina tenet*, Eur. *Hipp.* 454–5 ἀνήρπασέν ποτε | ἡ κάλλιφεγγής Κέφαλον ἐς θεοῦς Ἔως.<sup>72</sup> While Cephalus may well be implied here in the first place, the vagueness of *nouos ... amores*, as well as the frequentative *raptauit*, could hint that this was not an isolated occasion and other young men had likewise been abducted by Aurora.<sup>73</sup> One difficulty remains: the point of *etiam* should be ‘did not Aurora too?’ (that is, as well as the other deities mentioned earlier), but positioned between *nouos* and *raptauit* it can more naturally be construed with either of them. A conceivable option would be to write *nonne nouos Aurora etiam*, but the elision at the penthemimeres does not appeal. I tentatively propose replacing *etiam* with *totiens* instead, which will make Aurora a suitable capping for Jupiter and Venus; for the idea, we may compare ps.-Apollodorus’ report that, after Eos slept with Ares, Aphrodite in revenge made her repeatedly fall in love with men one after the other (1.27 ἐποίει γὰρ αὐτὴν Ἀφροδίτη συνεχῶς ἐράν, ὅτι Ἄρει συνευνάσθη).<sup>74</sup>

*Faculty of Classics, University of Oxford*

BORIS KAYACHEV  
boriskayachev@gmail.com

<sup>71</sup> To begin with, this is what is at issue for the speaker: he is punished for seducing virginal Lydia (156–8). The mythological examples—Jupiter raping Juno before they were married (166–8), and Venus making young Adonis her lover (169–71)—point in the same direction.

<sup>72</sup> The corruption is probably due to the scribe’s memory of 139 *plorauit amores*; but internal transposition (*ra-pta-* → *plo-ra-*) may also have played a role.

<sup>73</sup> Note e.g. *Od.* 15.251 Κλείτων χρυσόθρονος ἤρπασεν Ἥώς, *Hom. Hymn* 5.218 Τιθωνὸν χρυσόθρονος ἤρπασεν Ἥώς, [Apollod.] 1.27 Ὠρίωνος δ’ Ἥώς ἐρασθεῖσα ἤρπασε καὶ ἐκόμισεν εἰς Δῆλον.

<sup>74</sup> For *totiens* in reference to a person’s behaviour, cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 4.536 *quos ego sim totiens iam dedignata maritos*, Prop. 2.33.5 *quae dea tam cupidos totiens diuisit amantes*, Ov. *Met.* 1.606 *deprenti totiens iam nosset furta mariti*.