

We can first rule out two of these events as extremely unlikely. The conjunction of 336 involved a separation of fourteen minutes—almost equal to the moon's radius—and Jupiter would therefore probably not have appeared to hide 1 Geminorum. During the conjunction of 360 the minimum separation between Jupiter and 1 Geminorum occurred in daylight, at 3 P.M. By the time the sky was dark, the separation would have increased, Jupiter (at an elongation of 29 degrees) would itself almost have been setting, and 1 Geminorum would have been a dim, barely visible star low in the western sky.

This leaves four candidates. Two of these, the event of 348 and that of 22 July 337, involve large separations between Jupiter and the star—eleven minutes of arc. On both occasions, therefore, Jupiter would probably not have appeared to hide the star.⁴ Of the two remaining events, that of 5 December 337 is by far the more likely candidate: the separation between Jupiter and 1 Geminorum was only five arc-minutes (i.e., less than one-third of a lunar radius); and with an elongation of 169 degrees, the conjunction would have been visible during the whole long, winter night, not just for two or three hours.

It is, of course, possible that the sky was overcast that night, or that Aristotle never looked up. But of all the candidates, 5 December 337 is clearly the favorite. The latest event would push the completion of the treatise to sometime after July 325. But with a larger separation and a much smaller elongation, this event appears a priori the weaker candidate; and in early July the long twilight, beginning around 3:30 A.M., would leave only a thirty-minute "viewing window" for a morning conjunction in the eastern sky.

We conclude that *Meteorologica* 1–3 were probably not finished before December 337.

SHELDON M. COHEN
*The University of Tennessee,
Knoxville*

PAUL BURKE
Lockheed Aerospace

4. It is of course impossible to weigh such factors as atmospheric conditions and the acuity of Aristotle's vision.

NOTES ON THREE LATIN POETS

I. CATULLUS

66. 72–74

namque ego non ullo vera timore tegam,
nec si me infestis discerpent sidera dictis,
condita qui(n) vere pectoris evolam.

"*Vere* is not an adverb naturally found with *evolvere*, which is not primarily a verb of speaking. So editors accept the early conjecture *veri*, but that still involves an imprecision that seems uncharacteristic of Catullus. Doubts about

both *vere* and *veri* are greatly increased by the occurrence of *vera* two lines above." So R. G. M. Nisbet (*PCPS* 24 [1978]: 105); he therefore tentatively suggests *imi*, which has been adopted by G. P. Goold in his recent edition (London, 1983). Paleographically easier would be *n̄rī*, i.e., *nostrī* (for the corruption, cf. [Sen.] *Her. O.* 1880, *uerum A: uestrum E*). For the variation between singular (*ego, me*) and plural (*nostrī*), cf. 64. 225–26 *suspendam . . . nostros . . . nostrae*; 68. 91–92 *nostro . . . mihi*; 68. 132 *lux mea se nostrum contulit in gremium*; 91. 1–2 *mihi . . . nostro*; 100. 5–7 *faveam . . . nobis . . . meas*; 107. 3–4 *nobis . . . mi* (with Fordyce's note on that passage).

68. 89–92 Troia (nefas!) commune sepulcrum Asiae Europaeque,
 Troia virum et virtutum omnium acerba cinis,
 †que uetet id† nostro letum miserabile fratri
 attulit.

To mend the obelized passage nearly twenty suggestions have been made. Of these by far the most popular has been Heinsius' *quaene etiam*; but this has now been rejected, in my view convincingly, by E. Courtney (*BICS* 29 [1982]: 50). Courtney himself proposes <*nam*>*que etiam*, but I agree with the great majority of editors that *que* is much more probably the relative *quae* than the connective *-que*. I should therefore resuscitate the emendation of T. Marcilius (1604), which has apparently not been mentioned since Ellis' edition of 1878: *quae nunc et* (the first two letters of *uetet* being a corruption of *nē*, and *id* a dittography of *et*). *Nunc* points the contrast between the present (the death of Catullus' brother) and the past (the time of the Trojan war). It is true that nowhere else does Catullus use *et* in the sense of "also," but he never uses *etiam* either in that sense (he uses it seven times, either in a temporal sense, "still," or meaning "even"). The use of *et* = *etiam* is frequent with pronouns, including possessive pronouns; see *TLL* 5.2:908–10 *passim*.

II. OVID

Amores 1. 11. 21–22 comprimat ordinibus versus, oculosque moretur
 margine in extremo littera †rasa† meos.

Ovid's message to his girl: she must cram as much writing as possible into the wax tablets containing her reply to him.

The most extensive discussion of this passage is that of D. McKie (*PCPS* 30 [1984]: 79–83). He successfully disposes of *rasa* and suggests, but tentatively rejects, the possibility of replacing it with a word meaning "cramped," like *feria*, *crebra*, or *pressa*: "her writing cramped at the edge of the margin." I agree that none of these three words will do, but what about *densa*? If this acquired a superfluous *ra* by dittography from the end of *littera*, then *radensa* might have been reduced to *rasa* in an attempt to restore a Latin word and repair the meter. At *Epistulae ex Ponto* 1. 4. 36 "*quae tulit Aesoniden, densa carina fuit*," *densa* has suffered the opposite fate, haplography: reduced (after *-den*) to *sa* in our oldest manuscript (A), in the others it has been erroneously expanded to *sacra* or *firma*.

III. MARTIAL

- l. 89. 1-4 garris in aurem semper omnibus, Cinna,
 garrire et illud teste quod licet turba.
 rides in aurem, quereris, arguis, ploras,
 cantas in aurem, *iudicas*, taces, clamas.

Iudicas presumably means "you express opinions," but this is intolerably feeble in the context; we want a verb that denotes making a vocal noise of some sort. There is only one Latin word of suitable meaning that both fits the meter and bears some resemblance to *iudicas*, and that is *iubilas*. In extant literature previous to Martial this verb occurs only in Varro *De lingua Latina* 6. 68 and in a comic fragment there quoted; its very rarity may have assisted its corruption, which, however, involves little more than the common confusion of *b* and *d*.

- l. 92. 7-8 cerea si pendet lumbis et *scripta* lacerna
 dimidiasque nates Gallica paeda tegit . . .

Two indications of extreme poverty: a cloak yellow with age and a cutty *paeda* (s. v. *l*).

The use of *scribere* in the sense "make a representation or likeness of" (*OLD*, s.v. 1b) lends no support to those who take *scripta* as "beklext" (Friedlaender) or "stained" (Howell). I am inclined to replace it with *scissa*, adducing Juvenal 3. 148 *si foeda et scissa lacerna* (likewise in a series of *si*-clauses), which seems a certain reminiscence of our line.

- ll. 30 os male causicis et dicis olere poetis,
 sed fellatori, Zoile, peius olet.

Why should anyone accuse lawyers and poets of having bad breath? Some poor answers have been suggested: because they are anxious about their cases or their poems; because they are nervous people who abstain from food; because they are fellators (this ruins the epigram by anticipating the pentameter). More probably, I suggest, because both lawyers and poets at times indulge in *male-dicta*, virulent or vituperative language that is regarded as befouling the mouth and causing bad breath. At Plautus *Mostellaria* 652, the revolting language of a *danista* is called his *vomitus*.

W. S. WATT
 Aberdeen