

Lucilius would seem to be linking belief or disbelief in the *ficta* of Homer with belief in the *ficta* of religion, providing precedent for the thought as well as the language of Lucretius 1.102ff.⁸

Wesleyan University, Connecticut

JAMES J. O'HARA

⁸ For interpretation of 480–1, cf. Charpin ('Les hommes pensent que beaucoup de prodiges rapportés dans les vers d'Homère, sont des monstres véritables') and Warmington ('People think that in the poetry of Homer there are many prodigies which are make-believe monstrosities'). I favour Charpin; see his note, ii.245.

I thank David Konstan and Diane Juffras for comments on a draft of this note.

NOTES ON CATULLUS AND OVID

Catullus 67.7ff.

dic agedum nobis quare mutata feraris
in dominum veterem deseruisse fidem.
'Non (ita Caecilio placeam, cui tradita nunc sum)
culpa mea est, quamquam dicitur esse mea, 10
nec peccatum a me quisquam pote dicere quicquam,
verum† istius populi ianua qui te facit†,
qui, quacumque aliquid reperitur non bene factum,
ad me omnes clamant: ianua, culpa tua est.

The writer purports to be conversing with the door of a house, now owned by a man named Caecilius, which is alleged to have harboured a scandal in the time of its previous occupants. For this the speaker reproaches the door, as having through negligence been partly responsible. The door replies (beginning at line 9) that it is wholly innocent in the matter; but people lay blame on it for everything that is done amiss. Line 12, in the door's speech, is obviously corrupt, and the greater part of it is obelized by editors accordingly.

Did Catullus perhaps write in that line 'verum istuc populi *fabula iniqua* facit'? That is: 'What causes (*facit*) the wrong idea about me that you refer to (*istuc*) is the malice of popular gossip (*populi fabula iniqua*)'. This gives precisely the sense required, and gives it in good Latin: for *istuc facit*, cf. Plautus, *Trinummus* 857 (*argentum hoc facit*); for *populi fabula*, cf. Propertius 2.13–14 (*populi . . . fabula*); for *fabula iniqua*, cf. Ovid, *Fasti* 4.307 (*rumor iniquus*) and Catullus 69.5 (*mala fabula*); for the position of the elision in *fabula iniqua*, cf. Catullus 113.3 (*milia in unum*).

The supposed corruption of *fabula* to the *ianua* given by the MSS might be an example of the substitution of one dactylic word for another by scribal error, remarked by Housman on Manilius 1.476, and here much assisted by the emphatic presence of *ianua* in the context and the identity of the vowel sounds in the two words.

Since writing the above I learn from a friend that Lachmann in his edition of 1829 suggested 'istud populi fabula, Quinte, facit'. Scaliger had printed *Quinte*, but *fabula* was new.

Ovid, *Heroides* 9.59–70

non puduit fortis auro cohibere lacertos,
et solidis gemmas opposuisse toris? 60
nempe sub his animam pestis Nemeaea lacertis
edidit, unde umerus tegmina laevus habet!
ausus es hirsutos mitra redimire capillos?
aptior Herculeae populus alba comae.
nec te Maeonia lascivae more puellae 65
incipi zona dedecuisse pudet?

non tibi succurrit crudi Diomedis imago,
 efferus humana qui dape pavit equas?
 si te vidisset cultu Busiris in isto,
 huic victor victo nempe pudendus eras.

70

Deianira has heard of Hercules' subjection to Omphale, the Lydian Queen, who employed him as a maidservant and caused him to dress accordingly. His appearance when thus attired is satirically imagined, in various aspects.

Line 66 can hardly stand, in the form in which it is given by the MS tradition and is printed here. To make Deianira ask Hercules whether he is not ashamed that to wear a sash like a girl has been unbecoming (or, disgraceful) to him, is to make her talk in a very pointlessly turgid way, singularly un-Ovidian. And altering *pudet* to *putas* or *putes* or *patet* will not help; for it would come very feebly, in the crescendo of Deianira's indignation, for her to ask whether he does not think, or might think, that wearing a sash had been unbecoming (or, disgraceful) to him, or whether it is not obvious that that is so.

What one would expect from Ovid here is

nec te Maeonia lascivae more puellae
 incingi zona sustinuisse pudet?

For this is not turgid or pointless; and *sustineo* with a following infinitive is quite commonly used by Ovid to signify enduring or bearing to do or suffer something offensive to the feelings, as for instance in *Am.* 3.11.9–10

ergo ego sustinui, foribus tam saepe repulsus,
 ingenuum dura ponere corpus humo?

or *Her.* 5.52, 'quam vix sustinuit dicere lingua "vale"!'. It will be noticed further that *sustinuisse* here would have the same rhetorical effect as *ausus es* in 63; and the two phrases, by accident or design, would make a parody on the two characteristically Herculean virtues of courage and endurance. It also tells somewhat against the authenticity of *dedecuisse* here that the verb *dedecet* (unlike the substantive *dedecus*) seems, from the evidence in *TLL*, to be relatively mild in value – nearer usually to 'ill become' than to 'disgrace'.

We are left with the question: how could *sustinuisse* have been displaced through scribal error by *dedecuisse*? And here I can suggest only the scribe's mind wandering to *dedecus* as implied object of *sustinuisse*, or intrusion of a gloss meant to explain that implication. This apart, one can appeal only to *res* and *ratio*: what other reading could make sense, and be compatible with Ovid's style?

Ovid, *Tristia* 1.2.99ff.

si tamen acta deos numquam mortalia fallunt,
 a culpa facinus scitis abesse mea.
 immo ita si scitis, si me meus abstulit error,
 stultaque mens nobis, non scelerata fuit, ...

100

.....
 si fuit hic animus nobis, ita parcite divi.

105

Ovid, storm-tossed at sea, is praying to the gods to spare him. He protests that his offence against Augustus was an act not of wickedness but of folly only. To make his point *merus* in place of *meus*... *error* is needed in line 101. The pronoun and possessive juxtaposed occur several times in Ovid's elegiacs (e.g. *Am.* 3.2.48, *me mea terra capit*; *Her.* 6.136, *me mea Lemnos habet*; *Tr.* 4.10.75, *filia me mea* ...), and this may have favoured the corruption of *merus* to *meus* in the passage now in question. But in those

other passages the possessive is useful in the context. Here it would not be – for Ovid is not emphasizing his responsibility for the *error*, but that it was an *error* and nothing worse.

Pembroke College, Cambridge

W. A. CAMPS

THREE CICERONIANA

(1) *Att.* 15.26.5

Mundus istum M. En(n)ius in the manuscripts of *Att.* 15.26.5 is surely corrupt, as has been unanimously acknowledged (above all Cicero would avoid giving the three parts of a name in the order cognomen + praenomen + nomen, not to speak of the inexplicable *istum*). Also the modern Vulgate *Mundus iste cum M. Ennio*, introduced by Wesenberg in his Teubner text, is an improbable guess. Shackleton Bailey has recently proposed *Maenius* or *Men(n)ius* as the gentile name of Mundus.¹ *Mennius*, however, is a very rare name and does not occur in Republican documents, while *Maenius*, although attested in Republican inscriptions, diverges unnecessarily from the manuscript tradition. Moreover, Shackleton Bailey must forcibly change *istum* to *iste* (even if he does not say so expressly). But it is possible to avoid practically any infringement of the transmitted text if we simply read *Mundus Istummenius*. The name (*H*) *istumen(n)ius*, (*H*) *istimen(n)ius* (also *Inst-*), written in a wide variety of ways, does occur some 20 times in urban inscriptions, mostly of the early Imperial period. It is attested also outside Rome: at Velitrae (*CIL* X 6556, of the early Imperial period), and even as far away as Gallia (*CIL* XIII 739, Bordeaux, early Empire).² This gens must therefore have been somehow present among the Roman population of the Julio-Claudian age. In particular, attention should be paid to an *Instumennius* on a tessera nummularia of 60 B.C. (*CIL* I² 915). No major figures occur in this gens, the name remaining restricted to the lower strata of the Roman population. That suits Mundus down to the ground. He clearly belongs to the grey mob of Rome. If he is, as it seems, identical with that Mundus mentioned in 15.29.1,³ then Cicero gives his family name in the first instance. The transmitted form with *-mm-* could represent a transposition of the double consonant of the common form *Istumennius*.

(2) *Har. resp.* 1

P. Tullioni Syro, as transmitted in the manuscripts, has also become the modern Vulgate, repeated confidently in all editions. That is an impossible name-form, for a gentile name *Tullio* would be a monster, and the cognomen *Tullio* (in itself a good Latin formation)⁴ can be ruled out, for Cicero does not call people outside the nobility by their praenomen + cognomen. The fragility of the transmitted text has been noted only by Shackleton Bailey,⁵ but his own improvement *Pantoleoni* is odd. It deviates quite markedly from the manuscript tradition (I really cannot understand how *Pantoleon(t)i* could have become *P. Tullioni*). Moreover, the name *Pantoleon* (Παντο-

¹ D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature* (*American Classical Studies* 3, New York, 1976), 36; see also his edition of the *Letters to Atticus*, *ad. loc.*

² 'M. Histimenius Treptus Histimeniae fil(iae)... Histimeniae Rufinae uxori.' The family may be of Roman origin. Some other attestations: *AE* 1980, 386 (Histimennius, Interamnia), 1981, 479 (Istumennius, Sardinia).

³ *Mundus* is by no means improbable as a Republican cognomen, even if attested only rarely.

⁴ '*Tullio* is an odd cognomen even for a Roman', says Shackleton Bailey (see the following note). This is not, in fact, true. Cognomina formed with *-io* from gentilicia or praenomina (like *Tullus*) are not uncommon; see Kajanto, *Latin Cognomina*, 163–5, where many items could be added.

⁵ *Two Studies*, 70.