



Note on Catullus, 84

Author(s): A. J. Bell

Source: *The Classical Review*, Vol. 29, No. 5 (Aug., 1915), pp. 137-139

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/700563>

Accessed: 03/09/2008 13:23

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in his edition of 1854—*i.e.*, the city on the narrow neck of the Thracian Chersonese, near the modern Gallipoli, and a key to the Hellespont. But this city, though the only one in those parts, so far as I can discover, whose name ends in *machia* or *acia*, can hardly be the one we want; the name is hard to reconcile with the MSS., and the town was too strong to be destroyed by a force landing from a fleet. *Sustulit*, in which all MSS. agree, must have this meaning here: (cp. 'Karthago tollenda' in iii. 2. 2 of this work); and Lysimachia did not meet with this fate, for it is mentioned by Strabo (vi. 54) without any reference to such a disaster. Further, if the reader will look again at the passage we are discussing, he will probably conclude that the town we are looking for was not on the Hellespont, but near Thasos—though not in the island, as is made clear by the words *praesidium reliquit*.

I am disposed to think that the missing town was some small one on or near the via Egnatia, and therefore of importance at the moment; one which might easily be destroyed, and of which the name was afterwards forgotten. But if any reader of this paper can make a better suggestion, I shall be only too glad to hear of it.

The second difficulty lies in the word *pulsus*, which might suggest that Lucullus had experienced a reverse imme-

diately after the destruction of the town, whatever it was, and had been compelled to retreat to his base. But *pulsus* is not in the MSS.; those of the group M have *sulsus*, all except C, which seems to stand by itself, and to give us occasionally the true reading. (See Marx, *Prolegomena*, p. 15 f.). C has *rursus*, which has suggested to me *reversus*, as I find it did to Baiter and Kayser for their edition of 1860. If we accept *reversus*, it will mean that Lucullus returned leisurely to the parts whence he had started to prepare the way for Sulla, and immediately seized Abydos, as we have seen. When Sulla arrived shortly afterwards, Lucullus took him safely across the Narrows, and the interview with Mithridates followed which brought a peace. So Plutarch tells us explicitly, perhaps from the memoirs of Sulla, at the beginning of the fourth chapter of his life at Lucullus.

These events happened in the spring of 84. If the author of the *Rhetorica* alludes to them, he had probably heard of them from someone serving in the fleet, and put them in at the very end of his work not long after they happened, perhaps the very next year. In any case we have here some ground for bringing down our *terminus ex quo* for the date of the *Rhetorica* to the year 84.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

NOTE ON CATULLUS, 84.

My attention has been called to the current interpretation of this epigram by a note on a specimen page of a selection of Latin verse, edited by the members of the Latin department of Williams' College. The note is as follows:

Quintilian (I, 5, 20) tells us that the early Romans rarely employed the aspirate, but said *aedos* for *haedos* and *ircos* for *hircos*. By the time of Catullus, largely owing to the influence of the Greek aspirated consonants, the use of aspirates was becoming common, so that, for example, *pulcros* became *pulchros*, and *triumpos*, *triumphos*. Confusion in the application of the principle

led to ridiculous mistakes, especially among the lower classes.

Arrius' pronunciation (*Chommoda dicebat*) seems well worthy of a note; for to this tendency in Catullus' day is due not merely our usual spelling of the Latin word *pulcer*, but the *h* in our English word *sepulchre*. The passage on aspiration in Quintilian, on which the foregoing note is based, runs as follows: 'Quamquam per aspirationem, sive adicitur vitiose, sive detrahitur, apud nos potest quaeri, an in scripto sit vitium? si H litera est, non nota. cuius quidem ratio mutata cum temporibus est saepius. Parcissime ea veteres usi etiam in vocabulis, cum

aedos ircosque dicebant. Diu deinde servatum, ne consonantibus aspiraretur, ut in *Graccis* et *triumphis*. Erupit brevi tempore nimius usus ut *choronae*, *chenturiones*, *praechones* adhuc quibusdam inscriptionibus maneant: qua de re Catulli nobile epigramma est. Inde durat ad nos usque *vehementer*, et *comprehendere*, et *mihī*: et *mehe* quoque pro *me* apud antiquos, tragoediarum praecipue scriptores, in veteribus libris invenimus' (Quint. I, 5, 19-21).

It is natural to suspect that so great a change as we find in the pronunciation of *choronae* for *coronae* or *chommoda* for *commoda* is due to a foreign influence. But it seems to me far more likely that the change was due to the corruption of these Latin words in the mouths of men of alien stock than to any alteration effected in the pronunciation of the Romans themselves by the influence of the Greek aspirated consonants. Surely in that event we should meet with χ for K in the Greek transliterations of names like *Caesar* and *Lucilius*. There is reason to believe that the tendency among the early Romans to neglect the aspiration did not pass away, but became more intense in the mouths of genuine Romans; and to this seems due the utter disappearance of the Latin *h* in the Romance languages. I remember that my old teacher, Studemund, who had spent much of his early life in Italy, used to tell us that the Roman of to-day is quite incapable of aspirating a vowel. It seems unlikely that the Roman of Quintilian's day heard anything in *mehe* but *mē*, or in *vehementer* but *vēmenter*. The *ehe* in these words seems merely a special form of Accius' device for representing the long vowel. Hence Quintilian's doubt: 'si H litera est, non nota.'

To me Catullus seems to indicate here with the indirectness, it is true, characteristic of the poet, but with a clearness intelligible to a man of his day, the real source of this change. Arrius, in his pronunciation of *chommoda*, was following the custom of his own people:

Credo, sic mater, sic Liber avunculus eius,
Sic maternus avus dixerat, atque avia.

You will notice that all the relations here mentioned are relations on the mother's side; and one of the marked differences between the Roman and the Etruscan in domestic relations was the attention paid by the latter to descent on the mother's side (see Pauly-Wissowa *v. Etrusker*, col. 754). In this way Catullus indicates Arrius as of Etruscan stock, and not, as is generally supposed, as a Roman *parvenu* of the lowest class. His uncle's name, Liber, will have nothing to do with servile origin, but will rather be due to his valour in dealing with *plenae pocula mensae*. This view seems to me to be strongly confirmed by the Florentine dialect of to-day, which pronounces *casa*, *hasa*, and speaks of the horse races as *i horsi dei havalli*. This is the exact result we should expect from the substitution of *chommoda* for *commoda*; the *ch* would certainly pass in time to the simple aspirate. That this tendency is not merely Florentine, but Tuscan, seems plain from Groeber's statement (*Gr. d. Rom. Phil.* I. 555) that *c* becomes *h* between vowels in the Tuscan dialect.

More difficult is the aspiration of the vowel in *hinsidias*, for I know of no such aspiration in modern Etruscan. But it is still more difficult to imagine that this resulted directly from Greek influence, and I know of no one who has suggested this. The pronunciation of *hinsidias* for *insidias* seems due to the same phonetic cause as that of *chommoda* for *commoda* in the pronunciation of a *media aspirata* like *ch*. Ellis and Sievers think we have merely 'a momentary energising of the following vowel'; and this seems to agree with Catullus' description of Arrius' pronunciation of *hinsidias*:

cum quantum poterat dixerat *hinsidias*.

The effort involved is disagreeable to many, as it was, for example, to Voltaire, who said: 'Je n'aime pas les *h* aspirées; cela fait mal à la poitrine; je suis pour l'euphonie: on disait autrefois *je hésite*, et à présent on dit *j'hésite*; on est fou d'*Henri IV.*, et non plus de *Henri IV.*' (*v. Storm. Englische Philologie*,² pp. 75 and 95). It seems to me probable that the aspiration in *hin-*

sidias, as well as that in *chommoda*, was an Etruscan habit, and that its disappearance in modern Tuscan is due to that same Roman influence which led to the disappearance of the Latin *h* in all Romance languages.

A further note seems needed to explain the *nuntius horribilis* mentioned in the conclusion of this epigram—for that is what Quintilian calls it. What is an epigram without a point? and surely the point of an epigram should come at the end of it? So the point of this epigram must be in the word *Hionios*. But this point, which was no doubt obvious enough to a contemporary of Catullus, seems to require a word of explanation to-day. That the aspiration is in itself rough and harsh seems to have been clear to Catullus, for he says that after Arrius' departure to Syria all heard the same words pronounced softly and lightly (*leniter et leviter*). When he says that after Arrius' voyage to Greece the Ionian waves were no longer Ionian,

but Hionian, he probably means what we should mean if we said that 'Arry's tendency to aspirate was so infectious that after his passage to Calais the waves of the Straits of Dover were even rougher than before. Such a bit of news would surely prove a *nuntius horribilis* to many an Englishman who had already experienced the power of these waves. The passage from Brundisium to Dyrrachium was to the Roman very much what the passage from Dover to Calais is to the Englishman, and the roughness of the Adriatic was proverbial. Of course the news that it had acquired a new roughness after Arrius' passage would be a *nuntius horribilis* to the Roman.

In conclusion, I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to my old friend, Professor Keys, of University College, Toronto, for help given me with regard to modern Tuscan and Romance generally.

A. J. BELL.

Victoria College, Toronto.

NOTES

CASES OF CONFUSION BETWEEN ΟΤΑΕ ΤΙ AND ΟΤΑ' ΕΤΙ.

IN our manuscripts the collocation οὐδέ τι is often correct, but there can be little doubt that it has sometimes been written by mistake for οὐδ' ἔτι. Thus, in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 237, οὐδέ τι κίκυς | ἔσθ', οἴη πάρος ἔσκεν ἐνὶ γναμπτοῖσι μέλεσσιν, it seems better to read οὐδ' ἔτι, 'nor any longer,' which supplies the obvious contrast with πάρος, 'aforetime,' in the subsequent context. Cp. the *Hymn to Apollo*, 476 (298), τὸ πρὶν, ἀτὰρ νῦν οὐκ ἔσθ'. Similarly, in the *Hymn to Demeter*, 306, I should prefer οὐδ' ἔτι γαῖα σπέρμ' ἀνίει, to οὐδέ τι γαῖα. In the *Hymn to Apollo*, 129, I observe that Baumeister, Goodwin, and Allen and Sikes rightly print οὐδ' ἔτι δεσμά σ' ἔρυκε, while οὐδέ τι is found in Gemoll's edition. (Here the evidence of the manuscripts is divided.)

Again, in Quintus Smyrnaeus, X 448, οὐδέ τί οἱ κάμε γυῖα, I prefer

οὐδ' ἔτι, and the argument in favour of the same correction is still stronger, two lines below, οὐδέ τι θήρας ἐδείδιε λαχνηέντας, where οὐδ' ἔτι is clearly confirmed by the following phrase: πάρος μέγα πεφρικυῖα.

J. E. SANDYS.

Cambridge.

A CORRECTION OF ISIDORE, VIII xi § 83.

DR. L. C. PURSER, in the course of a review of Professor Lindsay's *Isidore*, in *Hermathena*, No xxviii (1912), p. 188, suggests that, in the corrupt passage on Pan, in VIII xi § 83 'villosus est, quia tellus convestita est tagitventibust,' we should perhaps read *vegetantibus*, 'with growing things,' lit. life-giving things; cp. § 61, 'dicunt etiam eam (*i.e.* Cererem id est terram). . . . Vestam quod *herbis* vel variis *vestita* sit rebus.' Dr. Purser adds that he 'can offer no parallel' for this use of *vegetantibus*. It is therefore worth while to suggest that