

CATVLLI

et quod pruriat incitare possunt,
 non dico pueris, sed his pilosis 10
 qui duros nequeunt mouere lumbos.
 uos, quod milia multa basiorum
 legistis, male me marem putatis?
 pedicabo ego uos et irrumabo.

XVII

O COLONIA, quae cupis ponte ludere longo,
 et salire paratum habes, sed uereris inepta
 crura ponticuli axulis stantis in rediuuiis,
 ne supinus eat cauaque in palude recumbat:
 sic tibi bonus ex tua pons libidine fiat, 5
 in quo uel Salisubsali sacra suscipiantur,
 munus hoc mihi maximi da, Colonia, risus.
 quendam municipem meum de tuo uolo ponte
 ire praecipitem in lutum per caputque pedesque,
 uerum totius ut lacus putidaeque paludis 10
 liuidissima maximeque est profunda uorago.
 insulsissimus est homo, nec sapit pueri instar
 bimuli tremula patris dormientis in ulna.
 cui cum sit uiridissimo nupta flore puella
 et puella tenellulo delicatior haedo, 15
 adseruanda nigerrimis diligentius uuis,
 ludere hanc sinit ut lubet, nec pili facit uni,
 nec se subleuat ex sua parte, sed uelut alnus

12 uos quod] hosque O, uosque G, uosque al. hos al. quod R: uos qui δ
 XVII 1 o colonia que δ (colonia quae θ): oculo in aqae V ludere
 ed. Rom. (loedere Scaliger): ledere V 3 axulis Hand (acsuleis Ellis),
 assulis Statius: ac sulcis V stantis Vossius: tantis V 6 suscipiant
 V: corr. Auantius 10 putidaeque θ: pudiceque V paludis η:
 paludes V 14 cui cum Pall. (quoi cum Scaliger, quoi iam θ): cui
 iocum V 15 et δ: ut V edo V 17 uni al. uim R 18 se
 1472: me V

CARMEN XVII

in fossa Liguri iacet suppernata securi,
 tantundem omnia sentiens quam si nulla sit usquam; 20
 talis iste meus stupor nil uidet, nihil audit,
 ipse qui sit, utrum sit an non sit, id quoque nescit.
 nunc eum uolo de tuo ponte mittere pronum,
 si pote stolidum repente excitare ueternum,
 et supinum animum in graui derelinquere caeno, 25
 ferream ut soleam tenaci in uoragine mula.

XXI

AVRELI, pater esuritionum,
 non harum modo, sed quot aut fuerunt
 aut sunt aut aliis erunt in annis,
 pedicare cupis meos amores.
 nec clam: nam simul es, iocaris una, 5
 haerens ad latus omnia experiris.
 frustra: nam insidias mihi instruentem
 tangam te prior irrumatione.
 atque id si faceres satur, tacerem:
 nunc ipsum id doleo, quod esurire 10

XVII 19 citat sub uoce 'suppernati' Festus p. 396 L.
 XVIII-XX: Huc intrusit Muretus anno MDLIV carmina tria, 'Hunc
 lucum' (fragmentum i) et 'Hunc ego', 'Ego haec' quae libro Catalepton
 Vergiliano praefigi solent, inter Priapeia lxxxvi et lxxxv numerantur;
 exulare iussit Lachmann anno MDCCCXXIX.

19 superata V: corr. Statius 21 meus V: merus Passerat
 (fortasse recte, cf. xiii. 9) nil] nichil V 22 qui V: quid mg
 23 nunc cum X (al. hunc eum R), nunc uolo O 24 potest olidum
 V: corr. Victorius excitare {η: exitare V 25 delinquere X
 26 mulla X
 XXI 1 exuricionum V 4 dedicare V: corr. δ 5 es iocaris cod.
 Berol. anni mcccclxiii: exiocaris V 6 haeres Muretus experiris ed.
 Rom.: experibis V (-bus al. -bis G) 8 irrumatione V: corr. {η
 9 id si δ: ipsi V 10 esurire OI, exurire X

After Isidore such few Catullan tags as appear anonymously in medieval writings are derived from glossaries and compilations. In the next seven centuries there are only two evidences of the existence of a text of Catullus. The first comes in the ninth century, when the manuscript now called Codex Thuaneus,¹ an anthology of Latin poetry, was written; it contains poem 62 with the title 'Epithalamium Catulli'. The second is in the middle of the tenth century, when the see of Verona was held, very insecurely, by a remarkable man, the Fleming Rather,² who in the course of a stormy career found time not only to read such authors as Plautus and Catullus but also to organize the *scriptorium* of Verona and to play an important part in the trans-

¹ From the name of a former owner, the scholar Jacques de Thou (1553-1617).

² On Rather and his work see Giuseppe Billanovich in *Italia Medioevale e Humanistica* ii (1959), 103 ff.; he shows that Rather not only supervised the writing of the Laurentianus 63. 19 of Livy but wrote part of it himself.

mission of the first decade of Livy. In 965 he wrote in a sermon 'Catullum nunquam antea lectum . . . lego' (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxxvi, col. 752).

After Rather darkness falls on Catullus again and lasts till the latter part of the thirteenth century. Towards the end of that century, or early in the fourteenth, a lawyer of Padua, Hieremias de Montagnone, copied seven extracts from Catullus (with references to their position in a text) into an anthology which he called *Compendium Moraliū Notabilium*, and in 1329 an anonymous Veronese included part of poem 22 (with title) in a similar compilation, *Liber Florum Moraliū Auctoritatum*. So, in the unexpected role of a moral preceptor, which he is made to share with Ovid and Martial, Catullus enters the modern world.

The clue to this sudden emergence of an author who had been unknown for more than 300 years is given by an epigram which appears in two of our earliest surviving manuscripts, copied into them from their common source with an ascription to Benvenuto Campesani, a Lombard from Vicenza who died in 1323 (see p. 82); three couplets, put into the mouth of Catullus himself, declare that a manuscript of his poems was restored to his native Verona by a fellow-countryman. The lines do not reveal where the book was found or who the finder was; it was probably the book which Rather read and (since the first line need no more be taken literally than the last) it was probably in the Cathedral Library at Verona, left there by Rather when he had to abandon his see in 968. In any case, that manuscript, thus recovered only to be lost again before long (it seems) for ever, was the unique source from which our text of Catullus is derived.

The three surviving fourteenth-century manuscripts are the descendants of that lost Veronese archetype

(denoted by the symbol V), and from their readings its text has to be recovered. They are Oxoniensis (O: Canonicianus Class. Lat. 30 in the Bodleian Library), Parisinus (G: now Lat. 14137 in the Bibliothèque Nationale, formerly in the library of the Abbey of St. Germain-des-Prés—hence its symbol), and Romanus (R: Ottobonianus Lat. 1829 in the Vatican Library).¹ O, the oldest, was copied directly from the archetype by an ignorant but conscientious scribe who had the virtue of trying to copy faithfully what he did not understand. G, which carries the date 1375 in a subscription, and R, which was probably written somewhat later, were derived from V through a common intermediary (X) whose scribe, more literate and enterprising than the writer of O, often used his judgement on what he saw and offered alternative readings which G and R preserve. For poem 62 we have another witness in the ninth-century Thuanus (T: now Lat. 8071 in the Bibliothèque Nationale), whose errors (notably the omission after l. 32) show that it represents the same tradition.

Petrarch had read the new Catullus by 1347, perhaps in the Verona manuscript, perhaps in a copy of his own; that Catullus does not appear among those 'special books' (*libri peculiāres*) which he constantly reread is not surprising, since the absence of divisions between the poems, which were written for long stretches without a break, combined with a multitude of corruptions, must have made much of the text difficult or even unintelligible.² Of the errors which O, G, and R inherited

¹ Specimens of O, G, and T are given by Chatelain in *Paléographie des classiques latins* (Paris, 1884-92), plates xiv-xva, of R by W. G. Hale (its discoverer) in *Amer. Journ. of Archaeology*, 2nd ser., i (1897), plate 1. O has been photographically reproduced with an introduction by R. A. B. Mynors (Leiden, 1966).

² See B. L. Ullman, *Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (Rome, 1955), pp. 117 ff., 194 ff.

from V a large number were removed by the correctors of G and R (g, r: one of the correctors of R was Coluccio Salutati (1331-1406), chancellor of Florence, who owned it¹) and by the writers of the copies made from O, G, or R in the fifteenth century. About a hundred of these are extant; the strata into which they have been divided by the editor of the text are indicated in the list of *sigla* (p. xxix). Many more errors were corrected by the humanists of the late fifteenth century and the sixteenth whose work appears in the series of printed editions beginning in 1472—first the Italians, Calphurnius (1481), Parthenius (1485), Avantius (1495, 1502, 1534), Palladius (1496), Baptista and Alexander Guarinus (1521), then Muretus (1554), Stadius (1566), and Scaliger (1577), the first editor in northern Europe. More serious than the errors of V are its omissions: by the time when it was copied the text was mutilated. Not only are there omissions of several lines within three poems² and of a single line in four others;³ there is evidence that whole poems had perished. The lines 14*b* are clearly the remnant of a lost poem; 2*b* looks like a fragment of the same kind; and the last four lines of 51 are probably another.

¹ Billanovich (see p. xxv n. 2 above) gives strong ground for believing that the writer of G was another eminent man of affairs, Antonio da Legnago, chancellor to the ruler of Verona.

² After 61. 78 and 107, 62. 32, 68. 46 (and probably 141).

³ After 34. 2, 51. 7, 64. 23, 65. 8; the third of these, which was not obvious, was revealed, and partially repaired, by the accident that half of the missing line had been quoted by the fourth-century Verona Scholia on Virgil.